



**Three-Dimensional Numerical and Physical
Modelling of Soft Soil Improvement Using Concrete
Injected Columns**

A thesis in fulfilment of the requirement
for the award of the degree

Doctor of Philosophy

from

University of Technology Sydney

by

Hamed Mahdavi, BSc Eng, MSc Eng

School of Civil and Environmental Engineering,
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology

July 2018

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Candidate:

Production Note:
Signature removed prior to publication.

Hamed Mahdavi

July 2018

To My Family

ABSTRACT

Concrete injected columns (CICs) are a popular method for improving soft soil properties to support road and bridge approach embankments due to quick construction, absence of spoil, and limited post-construction settlement. While the limited settlement of CICs makes them attractive for cases where there are stringent settlement criteria, low-cost methods of improving soils are used where there are no such limitations. The lack of comprehensive experimental studies on CICs in the available literature showed the necessity of further laboratory modelling. Moreover, the equivalent comparison between frictional and socketed CICs has not been thoroughly studied.

In this study, a well-instrumented physical modelling of soft clay improved with CICs was performed. A granular layer was used to model the load transfer platform (LTP), and a geotextile layer was utilised to model the geosynthetic reinforcement (GR) layer. The load was applied and controlled in stages using a large loading frame on top of the granular layer. Pore pressure dissipation, stresses transferred to the soft soil and CICs, and the strains in the geotextile were monitored with time. A three-dimensional numerical model was also developed using finite difference software FLAC^{3D}, and the results were validated against the experimental data. The numerical model considered coupled flow-deformation allowing prediction of the excess pore water pressure (EPWP) dissipation with time, while the permeability of the soft soil varied with time. Modified Cam-Clay (MCC) soft soil model was used as the constitutive model for the soft clay deposit, while elastic-perfectly plastic Mohr-Coulomb failure criterion was used to simulate the LTP layer. Hoek-Brown constitutive model was used to model the unreinforced concrete used for CIC construction. A good agreement was perceived between the numerical results and the

measurements from the experiment. Referring to both measurements and predictions, despite the low permeability of the soft clay, a rather quick dissipation in the EPWP occurred due to the load transfer mechanism between the soft soil and CICs. The stress concentration ratio decreased at the beginning of the loading stages and then later increased with time, and was higher for higher applied loads.

This thesis also sets out to investigate the options available for the transition zone from CICs to other ground improvement methods away from the abutment. Two possible alternatives were numerically simulated using FLAC^{3D} software considering the dissipation of pore water pressure and variation of soil permeability with time. A geosynthetic layer was introduced into the load transfer platform (LTP) located above the CICs, and interface elements were incorporated to simulate CIC-soil interaction. The first option for the transition zone was widely spaced CICs socketed into stiff material and the second was using shorter, closely spaced, frictional CICs. A comparison was then made between the predicted ground settlement, the force mobilised in the geosynthetic, the excess pore water pressure, and stresses in the CICs for the two scenarios. The total length of the CICs and thus the total volume of the concrete used for their construction were kept the same for both alternatives. Indeed, the embankment on frictional CICs experienced less settlement, the forces mobilised in the geosynthetic were reduced, and the bending moments and shear forces generated in the columns were less than the corresponding values for the case of socketed CICs. This study showed that for a given volume of concrete, shorter, frictional CICs perform better than longer CICs socketed into stiff strata.

Furthermore, a comparison was made between drained and coupled flow-deformation numerical analyses. This study revealed that while performing drained analysis by simply assigning drained parameters to the material was less computationally demanding, it led to inaccuracies in the predictions. The perceived discrepancies were attributed to the difference in the stress-path of drained and coupled analyses.

The results from this study can be beneficial for the practicing engineers for designing structures on CIC-improved grounds, particularly for predicting the time-dependent performance of the system.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to sincerely acknowledge the support of the people who made the completion of this thesis possible. I would like to express my gratitude to my principal supervisor, A/Prof. Behzad Fatahi, for his patience and boundless support during my candidacy. He was always available to discuss the project during this time. I would also like to thank my co-supervisor A/Prof. Hadi Khabbaz for his encouragement, optimistic approach, and constructive guidance throughout this time.

I gratefully acknowledge and appreciate the financial support and technical advice received from Roads and Maritime Services (RMS), SMEC Australia, Fulton Hogan, and Menard-Oceania to complete my PhD studies.

I specially thank Dr. Aslan Sadeghi Hokmabadi, and Dr. Babak Azari for generously sharing their experiences and insight, and helping me on this journey. I also extend my gratitude to the UTS laboratory technical staff Dr. Lam Nguyen, Peter Brown, and Antonio Reyno, and also PhD students Balaka Ghosh and Harry Nguyen for their valuable help.

The completion of this work would have not been possible without the encouragement and support of my family. Their unconditional support and unfailing confidence in me made this moment achievable. Special thanks to my sister who has been a friend and inspiration to me, and my beautiful partner for her patience and support.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

1. Mahdavi, H., Fatahi, B., Khabbaz, H., 2018. “Physical and Numerical Modelling of Ground Improvement Using Concrete Injected Columns and Geosynthetics Reinforced Load Transfer Platform.” Submitted to *Geotextiles and Geomembranes*
2. Mahdavi, H., Fatahi, B., Khabbaz, H., 2018. “A Comparison of Frictional and Socketed Concrete Injected Columns in a Transition Zone.” Submitted to *Geosynthetics International*
3. Mahdavi, H., Fatahi, B., Khabbaz, H., Vincent, P. and Kelly, R., 2016. “Comparison of Coupled Flow-deformation and Drained Analyses for Road Embankments on CMC-Improved Ground.” *Procedia engineering, 143*, pp.462-469.
4. Mahdavi, H., Fatahi, B., Khabbaz, H., Krzeminski, M., Santos, R. and Marix-Evans, M., 2016. “Three-Dimensional Simulation of a Load Transfer Mechanism for Frictional and End-Bearing CMC-Supported Embankments on Soft Soil.” In *Geo-China 2016*, pp. 60-67

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Concrete Injected Columns for Ground Improvement.....	2
1.3	Load Sharing between Soil and CICs	3
1.4	Objectives of the Present Study	4
1.5	Organisation of Dissertation	6
2	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1	General.....	7
2.2	CIC Ground Improvement Method.....	7
2.2.1	<i>Construction Process</i>	10
2.2.2	<i>Advantages of CICs in Comparison to Other Ground Improvement Techniques</i>	15
2.2.3	<i>Design</i>	16
2.3	Experimental Background on Column Supported Embankments.....	31
2.3.1	<i>Tests Investigating the Stress Concentration Ratio</i>	31
2.3.2	<i>Tests Investigating the Failure Modes of the Columns</i>	34
2.3.3	<i>Tests Investigating the Influence of Different Parameters on the Overall Performance</i>	41
2.4	Raft Foundations	47
2.5	Physical Modelling of Axially Loaded Piles	48
2.6	Numerical Background on Column Supported Embankments	52
2.7	Material Models for Plain Concrete Simulation	67
2.8	Summary	67

3 PHYSICAL AND NUMERICAL MODELLING OF GROUND IMPROVEMENT USING CONCRETE INJECTED COLUMNS 70

3.1	General.....	70
3.2	Physical Modelling	72
3.2.1	<i>Dimensional Analysis and Materials</i>	72
3.2.2	<i>Test set-up</i>	80
3.3	Three-Dimensional Numerical Simulation	88
3.3.1	<i>Clay Deposit Properties</i>	91
3.3.2	<i>CIC Simulation</i>	93
3.3.3	<i>Interface Elements</i>	95
3.3.4	<i>Geotextile Layer</i>	96
3.4	Results and Discussion.....	97
3.4.1	<i>Stress Concentration Ratio (SCR)</i>	97
3.4.2	<i>Settlement</i>	106
3.4.3	<i>Pore Pressure</i>	109
3.4.4	<i>Tension in the Geotextile Layer</i>	112
3.5	Summary	115

4 A COMPARISON BETWEEN FRICTIONAL AND SOCKETED CONCRETE INJECTED COLUMNS FOR DESIGNING GROUND IMPROVEMENT IN A TRANSITION ZONE 117

4.1	General.....	117
4.2	Numerical Modelling	119
4.2.1	<i>Model Geometry and Overview</i>	119
4.2.2	<i>Soft Soil Properties</i>	123
4.2.3	<i>CIC Simulation</i>	127
4.2.4	<i>Geosynthetic Layer</i>	130
4.2.5	<i>Embankment Properties and Construction Sequence</i>	131
4.3	Results and Discussion.....	131

4.3.1	<i>Settlement Predictions</i>	131
4.3.2	<i>Excess Pore Water Pressure Predictions</i>	136
4.3.3	<i>Tension in the Geosynthetic Layer</i>	138
4.3.4	<i>Axial Stresses in the CICs</i>	141
4.3.5	<i>Predicted Lateral Displacement</i>	145
4.3.6	<i>Predicted Bending Moments and Shear Forces in CICs</i>	149
4.4	Verification Exercise Against Analytical Solution.....	155
4.5	Summary.....	157
5	COMPARISON OF COUPLED FLOW-DEFORMATION AND DRAINED ANALYSES FOR ROAD EMBANKMENTS ON CIC-IMPROVED GROUND	159
5.1	General.....	159
5.2	Numerical Modelling.....	159
5.3	Results and Discussion.....	163
5.3.1	<i>Settlement</i>	163
5.3.2	<i>Tension in the Geosynthetic Layer</i>	164
5.3.3	<i>Lateral Displacement</i>	165
5.3.4	<i>Summary</i>	167
6	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	169
6.1	Summary.....	169
6.2	Key Conclusions.....	170
6.3	Recommendations for Future Research.....	173
	REFERENCES	175
	APPENDIX A	191
	APPENDIX B	197

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 CIC installation, Heathcote project, NSW, Australia.....	3
Figure 1.2 Load transfer mechanism in CIC-improved ground.....	4
Figure 2.1 Different types of inclusions (Modified after Yee et al. 2012).....	10
Figure 2.2 CIC Installation augers (Courtesy of Menard 2018).	13
Figure 2.3 CIC installation steps (Courtesy of Menard 2016).	14
Figure 2.4 Load sharing mechanism in CIC (Modified after ASIRI 2012).....	17
Figure 2.5 Stress distribution in soil-CIC mass, σ_{soil} = stress transferred to the soil, u_{soil} = vertical deformation of the soil, σ_{CIC} = stress transferred to the CIC, u_{CIC} = vertical deformation of the CIC (Modified after Simon & Schlosser 2006)	17
Figure 2.6 Distribution of vertical effective stress around an inclusion awn (Modified after ASIRI 2012).....	19
Figure 2.7 Group of rigid inclusions (Modified after ASIRI 2012).....	21
Figure 2.8 Negative skin friction for inclusions in a group (Modified after Combarieu 1985)	22
Figure 2.9 Fictitious inclusion method for LTP design (Modified after Combarieu 1988)	26
Figure 2.10 Failure mode in the load transfer platform (Modified after ASIRI 2012)	28
Figure 2.11 Inverted pyramid load transfer mechanism in the LTP according to Carlsson (1987).....	28
Figure 2.12 (a) Shaft friction on a CIC and (b) the position of neutral planes in a CIC system (Modified after ASIRI 2012)	29
Figure 2.13 <i>Egg carton (or mushroom) effect on rigid inclusions (ASIRI 2012)</i>	30
Figure 2.14 Failure modes for single columns (Modified after Broms 2004).....	37
Figure 2.15 Photographs of deformed sand columns exhumed at the end of footing penetration (arrows indicate original level of column bases):(a) $L/ro=2$, $A_s=24\%$, $rc=$ $5:5$ mm, (b) $L/ro= 2$, $A_s=30\%$, $rc=8:75$ mm, (c) $L/ro=3:4$, $A_s=24\%$, $rc=8:75$ mm and (d) $L/ro=3:2$, $A_s=24\%$, $rc=5:5$ mm (Wood et al. 2000).....	39

Figure 2.16 Sketches of deformation modes: (a) bulging and shear failure plane mode, (b) Short column versus long column, and (c) slender column (Modified after Wood et al. 2000).....	40
Figure 2.17 Foundation systems (Modified after Mandolini et al. 2013)	47
Figure 2.18 Idealization of H-section pile (Modified after Fleming et al. 2008).....	49
Figure 2.19 Pile under axial loading (Modified after Wood 2004).....	51
Figure 3.1 The set-up of CIC-improved ground	73
Figure 3.2 CIC arrangement in the consolidation cell showing hexagonal unit cell tributary area	75
Figure 3.3 Schematic diagram of the physical model and instrument locations (in mm) (a) cross-section view and (b) plan view (Note: cylindrical coordinates in brackets; first number shows the radial distance (mm), second number is the azimuth or angular coordinate, and the third number is the distance from the bottom of the cell (mm)).....	82
Figure 3.4 (a) Three-dimensional view of the CICs with the clay excavated after the test completion and (b) Plan view of the position of EPCs on the CICs and soft soil	84
Figure 3.5 Schematic diagram of the large consolidometer set-up.....	85
Figure 3.6 (a) Locations and orientations of strain gauges on the geotextile layer (Note: SGX: strain gauge in X direction; SGY: strain gauge in Y direction) and (b) Geotextile harnessed using two timber washers and epoxy glue.....	87
Figure 3.7 Model geometry and zoning (a) elevation view, (b) 3D view and (c) cross section view.....	90
Figure 3.8 Boundary conditions in (a) the numerical simulation and (b) the experiment.....	91
Figure 3.9 Permeability variation versus void ratio	93
Figure 3.10 Stress on (a) CIC1 measured by EPC1 and (b) CIC2 measured by EPC2 versus time	99
Figure 3.11 Stress on soil measured by EPC5 versus time	100
Figure 3.12 Stress concentration ratio (SCR) versus time based on stresses measured by EPC2 and EPC5	101
Figure 3.13 Stress on the side wall measured by EPC3.....	102

Figure 3.14 Stress at the bottom of the cell measured by EPC4.....	103
Figure 3.15 Stress variation with depth in CIC1 and the soft soil midway between CIC1 and CIC6 at the end of the test under 80 kPa surcharge.....	104
Figure 3.16 Variations of stress concentration ratio (SCR) with depth at the end of the test under 80 kPa surcharge.....	104
Figure 3.17 Contours of vertical stress on the soil surface at the end of the test.....	105
Figure 3.18 Settlement of the soil surface measured by the LVDT on the loading platen.....	106
Figure 3.19 Deformed shape of the system at the end of the test under 80 kPa surcharge.....	107
Figure 3.20 Settlement profile at the CIC-head level along Section A-A at the end of the test under 80 kPa surcharge.....	108
Figure 3.21 Differential settlement at the CIC-head level along Section A-A at the end of the test under 80 kPa surcharge.....	108
Figure 3.22 Variations of EPWP with time measured by PWPT1 between the two CICs.....	109
Figure 3.23 Variations of EPWP with time measured by PWPT2 between the two CIC.....	110
Figure 3.24 Variations of EPWP with time for PWPT3 on the side wall.....	111
Figure 3.25 Variations of EPWP with time for PWPT4 at the bottom of the cell...	111
Figure 3.26 Tension in the geotextile layer in Y-direction.....	112
Figure 3.27 Tension in the geotextile layer in X-direction.....	113
Figure 3.28 Profile of the tension in the geotextile along Section A-A at the end of the test under 80kPa surcharge.....	114
Figure 3.29 Contours of tensile stress in the geotextile at the end of the test under 80kPa surcharge.....	114
Figure 4.1 Longitudinal cross section of a typical transition zone design of a CIC project (a) Frictional CICs (b) Socketed CICs.....	119
Figure 4.2 Model geometry for socketed CICs: (a) elevation view (b) cross section A-A.....	120

Figure 4.3 Model geometry for frictional CICs: (a) elevation view (b) cross section A'-A'	121
Figure 4.4 FLAC ^{3D} model for socketed CICs	122
Figure 4.5 Variation of permeability versus void ratio in the soft soil	125
Figure 4.6 Variations of (a) vertical effective stress; (b) overconsolidation ratio; (c) shear strength of the soil with depth	126
Figure 4.7 Construction sequence of the embankment	131
Figure 4.8 Settlement profile at the end of consolidation at the embankment base along Sections A-A and A'- A'	132
Figure 4.9 Settlement profile at the end of consolidation on the embankment surface	133
Figure 4.10 Deformed shape of the embankment at the end of consolidation for (a) socketed CICs (Magnification Factor: 10) , and (b) frictional CICs (Magnification Factor: 10)	134
Figure 4.11 Additional stress in soil at the end of consolidation along Sections B-B and B'- B'	134
Figure 4.12 Differential settlement profile at the end of consolidation at the embankment base along Sections A-A and A'- A'	135
Figure 4.13 Illustration of method to determine Change in Grade (CIG) (modified after His 2016)	136
Figure 4.14 Pore pressure dissipation versus time at points C and C'	137
Figure 4.15 Excess pore water pressure profile with depth along Sections B-B and B'-B' one week after completion of embankment construction	138
<i>Figure 4.16 Tension in the geosynthetic layer at the end of consolidation along Sections A-A and A'-A'</i>	<i>139</i>
Figure 4.17 Contour of tensile forces in the geosynthetic layer at the end of consolidation for (a) socketed CICs (b) frictional CICs	140
Figure 4.18 Change in the maximum tension in the geosynthetic layer vs. time at the edge of the socketed CIC1 and frictional CIC1	141
Figure 4.19 Axial stress at the end of consolidation in socketed CIC1 and frictional CIC1 versus depth	142

Figure 4.20 Settlement of the soil at the end of consolidation along Sections B-B and B'-B'	143
Figure 4.21 Axial stress at the end of consolidation in (a) socketed CICs (b) frictional CICs	144
Figure 4.22 Lateral displacement at the end of consolidation in soil with depth along section X-X and X'- X'	145
Figure 4.23 Lateral displacement at the end of consolidation of the (a) socketed CICs (b) frictional CICs with depth	147
Figure 4.24 Lateral displacement contours at the end of consolidation for (a) socketed CICs and (b) frictional CICs	148
Figure 4.25 Bending moment at the end of consolidation in (a) socketed CICs (b) frictional CICs versus depth.....	151
Figure 4.26 Yielded zones in tension at the end of consolidation on the (a) socketed CICs and (b) frictional CICs	152
Figure 4.27 Shear forces at the end of consolidation in (a) socketed CICs and (b) frictional CICs.....	154
Figure 5.1 Model geometry for end-bearing CIC (a) cross-section view and (b) plan view	161
Figure 5.2 Model mesh with CIC-soil interfaces	162
Figure 5.3 Settlement at the base of the embankment	163
Figure 5.4 Differential settlement at the base of the embankment	164
Figure 5.5 Tension in the geosynthetic layer	165
Figure 5.6 Lateral displacement at the geosynthetic level	166
Figure 5.7 Lateral displacement contours for drained analysis (S_{max} : 23mm).....	166
Figure 5.8 Lateral displacement contours for coupled flow-deformation analysis (S_{max} : 38mm).....	167
Figure A.1 Slurry placed in layers in the consolidation cell	192
Figure A.2 A strain gauge attached on the epoxy base in the direction of the geotextile fibres.....	192
Figure A.3 Initial simplified tensile tests on a single strain gauge using weights ...	193

Figure A.4 Initial simplified tests on the effect of boundary condition on the geotextile layer	193
Figure A.5 Butyl rubber (SB) tape applied on the strain gauge to water-proof and protect the gauges.....	194
Figure A.6 Earth pressure cell (EPC) positioned and fixed on the CIC using plaster of Paris.....	194
Figure A.7 Top view of the test after half the soft soil was excavated	195
Figure A.8 CICs at the end of the test after the soft soil was excavated.....	195
Figure A.9 Vane shear test to determine the shear strength of the soft soil.....	196

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Experimental studies on columnar ground improvement methods.....	45
Table 2.2 The degree of influence of different parameters in percentages(after Yapage & Liyanapathirana 2014)	54
Table 2.3 Numerical background on columnar ground improvement methods.....	64
Table 3.1 Concrete mix design for CIC construction for one cubic meter	76
Table 3.2 Composition of the soil mix used in this study	80
Table 3.3 Properties of the soil mix used in this study	80
Table 3.4 Properties adopted in the numerical simulation.....	92
Table 3.5 Proprieties adopted for CIC simulation	95
Table 3.6 Adopted geotextile properties in the numerical simulation*	96
Table 4.1 Material models and properties.....	124
Table 4.2 CIC material model and properties adopted in this study	129
Table 4.3 Geosynthetic properties adopted in this study	130
Table 4.4 Comparison of numerical predictions in this study and existing analytical solutions for the socketed CICs	157
Table 5.1 Material properties adopted in this study.....	162

LIST OF SYMBOLS

a	Pile cap width
A_r	Area replacement ratio
c'	Effective cohesion
C_k	Slope of the logk-e graph
c_u	Undrained shear strength of the soft soil
D	Inclusion diameter
d_{LTP}	Average size of the LTP granular material
e	Void ratio
E	Elastic modulus
e_0	Reference void ratio/Initial void ratio
E_c	Elastic modulus of the CIC material
E_{LTP}	Elastic modulus of the LTP material
E_s	Elastic modulus of the soft soil
f_c'	Characteristic compressive (cylinder) strength of concrete
f_{cmi}	Mean value of the in situ compressive strength of concrete
f_{ct}	Characteristic uniaxial tensile strength of concrete
F_N	Resultant of negative friction
G	Shear modulus
H	LTP height
h_a	Height of the upper plane of equal settlement
h_c	Height of negative friction action taking place in the soft layer (critical height)
H_m or H_M	Platform height
h_r, h_a	Height of negative friction application on the fictitious column positioned on top of the inclusion head
I	Area moment of inertia
J	Geosynthetic stiffness
K	Bulk modulus
k	Permeability
K_0	Coefficient of lateral earth pressure at rest
$K_{0(NC)}$	Lateral earth pressure coefficient at rest for normally consolidated soils
$K_{0(OC)}$	Lateral earth pressure coefficient at rest for over-consolidated soils
K_a	Coefficient of active earth pressure
k_i	Reference permeability
k_n	Interface normal stiffness

K_p	Coefficient of passive earth pressure
k_s	Interface shear stiffness
L	CIC length
m	Exponent capturing the increase in strength due to preconsolidation
M	Critical state stress ratio
n	Porosity
N	Scaling factor
n_s	Stress concentration ratio
p_0	Uniform pressure applied on the geosynthetic
p'_c	Preconsolidation pressure
Q_p	Vertical net force of loads applied at the head of an inclusion
q_s^+	Stress applied on the soft soil (without an inclusion)
Q_{Ult}	Ultimate bearing capacity of the CIC-supported ground
R_c	Interface interaction coefficient for soil-CIC
R_G	Interface interaction coefficient for geotextile-LTP
R_{int}	Coefficient for interface strength reduction
r_p	Inclusion radius
s	Hoek-Brown constant
S	CIC spacing
S_u	Shear strength of soil
t	Geosynthetic thickness
T	Tension in the geosynthetic
T_{ult}	Tensile strength of the geosynthetic
u	Pore water pressure
V	Initial specific volume
W_p	Weight of the load platform supported by an inclusion head in a unit cell

Greek Symbols

α_L	Scaling factor for length
α_T	Scaling factor for geosynthetic tensile strength
α_σ	Scaling factor for stress
γ	Unit weight
γ_c	Unit weight of the CIC material
γ_{dry}	Dry unit weight
γ_{LTP}	Unit weight of the LTP soil
γ_r	Unit weight of the embankment
γ_s	Unit weight of the soft soil
ε	Strain

κ	Slope of elastic swelling line
λ	Slope of normal consolidation line
ρ	Density of the concrete
σ'	Effective stress
σ_1	Major principal effective stress
σ_3	Minor principal effective stress
σ_c	Stress on the inclusion
σ_{CS}	Uniaxial strength of the concrete
σ_M	Extreme stress due to bending
σ_N	Axial stress in CIC
σ_s	Stress on soil
σ_v	Total vertical stress
σ_v'	Effective vertical stress
σ_v^*	Average effective vertical stress within a horizontal cross-section
ν	Poisson's ratio
ϕ	Friction angle
ϕ'	Effective friction angle
ϕ'_{LTP}	Angle of internal friction for LTP material
ψ	Dilation angle

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<i>2D</i>	Two-dimensional
<i>3D</i>	Three-dimensional
<i>CIC</i>	Concrete Injected Columns
<i>DL</i>	Data logger
<i>DT</i>	Data taker
<i>EPC</i>	Earth pressure cells
<i>EPWP</i>	Excess pore water pressure
<i>GRCS</i>	Geosynthetic-reinforced column-supported
<i>KBS</i>	Kaolin-Bentonite-Sand
<i>LC</i>	Load cell
<i>LTP</i>	load transfer platform
<i>LVDT</i>	Linear variable differential transformer
<i>MCC</i>	Modified Cam-clay
<i>MT</i>	mobile tray
<i>PWPT</i>	Pore water pressure transducer
<i>SCR</i>	Stress Concentration Ratio
<i>SG</i>	Strain Gauge
<i>SRR</i>	Stress reduction ratio