

**PHYSICAL MODELLING OF ENCASED STONE COLUMNS
WITH TIRE-DERIVED AGGREGATES: MODEL AND
FIELD EXPERIMENTS**

UPENDRA MODALAVALASA



**DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

JULY 2025

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2025

**PHYSICAL MODELLING OF ENCASED STONE COLUMNS WITH
TIRE-DERIVED AGGREGATES: MODEL AND FIELD
EXPERIMENTS**

by

UPENDRA MODALAVALASA

2019CEZ8257

Department of Civil Engineering

Submitted

in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

JULY 2025

DEDICATED
TO
MY BELOVED PARENTS

&

In the memory of my Late friend TAMMU MAHESH

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled "**PHYSICAL MODELLING OF ENCASED STONE COLUMNS WITH TIRE-DERIVED AGGREGATES: MODEL AND FIELD EXPERIMENTS**" submitted by **Mr. UPENDRA MODALAVALASA** to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, is a record of the bonafide research work carried out by him under our supervision and guidance. This thesis work, in our opinion, has reached the standard, fulfilling the requirements for **DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY** degree. The research report and the results presented in this thesis have not been submitted, in part or full, to any other university or institute, for the award of any degree or diploma.

Dr. R. Ayothiraman
Professor
Department of Civil Engineering
IIT Delhi, New Delhi-110016
INDIA

Place: IIT Delhi

Date: July 2025

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to **Prof. R. Ayothiraman** for his exceptional guidance throughout my doctoral journey—from shaping the research plan to experimental work and data analysis—his support was truly invaluable. I want to express my heartfelt gratitude to the esteemed members of my SRC—**Prof. A. K. Swamy (Chairman), Prof. Bappaditya Manna, and Prof. Rajendra Prasad**—for their invaluable guidance and unwavering support throughout my Ph.D. journey. Their insightful feedback during my initial comprehensive seminar and periodic progress reviews helped shape the direction and depth of my work. I am deeply thankful for the wisdom they generously shared when seeking their counsel.

I extend my sincere gratitude to all faculty of the Department of Civil Engineering, IIT Delhi, who have enriched my knowledge in some way or the other. My heartfelt thanks to Prof. G. V. Ramana, Prof. Manoj Datta, Prof. J T Sahoo, Prof. Bappaditya Manna, Prof. Prasanth Vangla, and Prof. Arnab Banerjee for the ideas gained and lessons learnt during my coursework.

I am sincerely thankful to the staff of Geotechnical Engineering Laboratory, Rock Mechanics Laboratory, especially Mr. Manoj Kumar Neelam, Mr Dinesh Kumar, Mr Alok, Mr Lokendra, Mr Ramjanam and Mr Suraj for all their help and assistance throughout my experimental work. Special thanks to Mr Jewesh Ji for helping get the materials used in the study.

For their assistance during the experimental work, Mr. Vinay Singh, Mr. Ashwinth Raj, Mr. Venkateswalru, Mr. Murali, Mr. Koushik, Mr Befkadu, Mr. Nirbhay, Dr. Deepesh Bansal, Dr. Dev Prakash and Mr Harshal Verma, have my sincere gratitude for their help in this journey. I am thankful to all workers who were involved in conducting the model and field tests.

I am very grateful to **Dr. Bhargav** (Institute Post-Doctoral Fellow) for his involvement and contribution from the planning to execution of full-scale field testing on stone columns. We are thankful to Prof. K. Muthukkumaran (NIT Trichy) and Dr. Prakash (Kesse Associates, Tamil Nadu) for their support in the arrangement of load testing setup. A special thanks and acknowledgement to Mr Suraj from “Strata Geosystems (India) Pvt. Ltd.” for providing the Bi-axial

geogrid for free of cost to perform field tests on encased stone columns. I am very grateful to Amma (Ayothi sir mother) for her love and care during my stay in Kallambal.

I am grateful to friends in and out of IIT Delhi, Ms. Arpita Mondal (Chellama), Mr. Murali, Mr Vivek kumar, Mr. Saurabh, Mr. Komal, Mr. Sai Kishore, Mr. Sandeep, Mr. Naresh, Mr. Ramana, Mr. Pentayya, Mr. Venkat, Mr. Akshit, Mr. Sai kiran, Mr. Sivunnaidu, Mr. Narayana, Mr. Prasanth, Mr. Mahesh and others for their moral and mental support in this journey.

I am also deeply indebted and extend my sincere regards to Prof. Koteswarao (JNTU Kakinada); Prof. C H Solanki, Prof. J B Patel, Dept. of Civil Engineering, NIT Surat; Dr Dinesh Bishnoi, Dr. Tanwee Mazumder, Neeraj Verma, Lalith, Vijay for their bountiful affection, support and inspiration.

For their unwavering love, care, support, encouragement, motivation, inspiration, and innumerable other attempts to help me become a better, more grounded person and to inspire me to dream and reach higher goals, I am incredibly grateful to my parents and sister. I will never be able to express how grateful I am to them for being my closest friends and confidantes, for helping me keep going forward in life, and for enduring all the hardships and suffering they have endured to support me through life's highs and lows and help me see the positive side.

Last but not the least, to my dear wife, **Dr. Susmita Panda** (Khanna), I express my loving thanks, since she enduringly stood by me and gave confidence in the entire journey of fulfilment of my Ph.D.

Above all, I am grateful to Almighty God for giving me the strength, health, and knowledge to start this study project and for seeing it through to completion.

Date: 21.07.2025

Upendra Modalavalasa

ABSTRACT

With the expansion of industrialization, the need for land with sufficient load-bearing capacity—especially soft soils—has grown to accommodate infrastructure such as heavy buildings, machinery, runways, port facilities, embankments, and oil storage tanks. However, the rising consumption of natural resources like stone aggregates, commonly used in stone columns for ground improvement, has led to the search for sustainable alternatives. This study focuses on shredded tire chips, known as Tire Derived Aggregate (TDA), as a potential replacement for stone aggregates in stone column applications. Discarded tires, which are difficult to dispose of due to their slow decomposition and landfill limitations, present a significant environmental issue. Recent developments in geotechnical engineering have highlighted the feasibility of using scrap tires as economical and eco-friendly materials. This research examines the performance of stone columns made with various combinations of stone aggregates and TDA, in accordance with ASTM D6270 guidelines for the use of scrap tires in civil engineering projects.

A comprehensive series of 170 element tests were conducted using large-scale triaxial tests to analyze the stress-strain response of stone columns with different TDA sizes and varying mix proportions with stone aggregates (SA). The results indicated that increasing the proportion of TDA reduces the failure deviatoric stress, decreases the angle of shearing resistance, and increases the apparent cohesion. Attempts were made to compensate the loss in shear strength of stone aggregates due to the inclusion of TDA by various reinforcing methods. Element tests were performed on SA+TDA mix proportions by horizontally reinforcement; encasement; horizontally reinforcement and encasement. The performance of the stone columns made up with SA+TDA mix proportions are compared to that of OSC made of 100% SA as a benchmark. The results indicated that with the help of encasement about 65% of SA can be replaced with TDA by volume.

To further evaluate the performance of TDA-based stone columns, 20 single-column and 4 group-column model tests were conducted on geogrid encased stone columns with a length of 660 mm and a diameter of 110 mm. Two types of geogrids with different tensile strengths were used to assess the influence of tensile strength on the load-carrying capacity and bulging behaviour of the columns. Strain gauges were placed along the geogrid encasement to monitor the bulging behaviour of the columns. The model tests results are accessed with the help of efficiency of stone columns made of SA+TDA with that of OSC_100SA. The results from model tests indicated that with the help of encasement about 70% of SA can be replaced with TDA by volume.

To validate the findings from the model tests, six full-scale field studies were conducted in Madurai, Tamil Nadu, on encased stone columns with different proportions of stone aggregates and TDA. The field columns, measuring 300 mm in diameter and 4.5 m in depth, were installed in strata comprising 4 m of clay followed by 2 m of silt. Borehole investigations were carried out prior to field testing, and plate load tests were performed on the installed columns using a reaction arrangement. The results obtained from the field tests closely aligned with the outcomes of the model tests, confirming that encased stone columns with TDA aggregates perform comparably to conventional stone columns.

Following the successful completion of field tests, numerical analysis was performed using PLAXIS 3D software to simulate the behaviour of encased stone columns with varying proportions of TDA and stone aggregates. The simulations were conducted to analyse the load-settlement behaviour, stress distribution, and deformation characteristics of the columns. The results obtained from the PLAXIS 3D analysis further validated the experimental and field findings, providing deeper insights into the interaction between the encasement, stone aggregates, and TDA. Parametric study is also conducted on stone

columns made of 70SA+30TDA mix proportions to quantify the improvement ratios by varying the stiffness of geogrid, diameter of column, undrained shear strength of clay.

The findings of this study demonstrate that TDA can serve as a viable and sustainable alternative to stone aggregates in stone columns. The use of TDA not only reduces dependency on natural resources but also provides an environmentally responsible solution for the disposal of non-biodegradable waste. Encased stone columns with TDA can effectively stabilize soft ground, reduce settlement, and maintain load-carrying capacity. The results from the comprehensive study done through triaxial tests, model tests, field tests and numerical analysis confirms that TDA-based stone columns perform similarly to conventional stone columns, making them a promising solution for sustainable ground improvement.

सार

औद्योगीकरण के विस्तार के साथ, भारी इमारतों, मशीनरी, रनवे, बंदरगाह सुविधाओं, तटबंधों और तेल भंडारण टैंकों जैसे बुनियादी ढाँचे के लिए पर्याप्त भार वहन क्षमता वाली भूमि-विशेषकर नरम मिट्टी-की आवश्यकता बढ़ गई है। हालाँकि, प्राकृतिक संसाधनों जैसे पत्थर के समुच्चय, जिनका उपयोग आमतौर पर भूमि सुधार के लिए पत्थर के स्तंभों में किया जाता है, की बढ़ती खपत ने स्थायी विकल्पों की खोज को जन्म दिया है। यह अध्ययन टायर व्युत्पन्न समुच्चय (TDA) के रूप में जाने जाने वाले कटे हुए टायर चिप्स पर केंद्रित है, जो पत्थर के स्तंभ अनुप्रयोगों में पत्थर के समुच्चय के संभावित प्रतिस्थापन के रूप में है। त्यागे गए टायर, जिनका उनके धीमे अपघटन और लैंडफिल सीमाओं के कारण निपटान करना मुश्किल होता है, एक गंभीर पर्यावरणीय समस्या प्रस्तुत करते हैं। भू-तकनीकी इंजीनियरिंग में हाल के विकासों ने स्क्रेप टायरों को किफायती और पर्यावरण-अनुकूल सामग्री के रूप में उपयोग करने की व्यवहार्यता पर प्रकाश डाला है। यह शोध सिविल इंजीनियरिंग परियोजनाओं में स्क्रेप टायरों के उपयोग के लिए ASTM D6270 दिशानिर्देशों के अनुसार, पत्थर के समुच्चय और TDA के विभिन्न संयोजनों से बने पत्थर के स्तंभों के प्रदर्शन की जाँच करता है।

विभिन्न TDA आकारों और भिन्न मिश्रण अनुपात वाले पत्थर के स्तंभों के प्रतिबल-विकृति अनुक्रिया का विश्लेषण करने के लिए बड़े पैमाने पर त्रिअक्षीय परीक्षणों का उपयोग करते हुए 170 तत्व परीक्षणों की एक व्यापक श्रृंखला आयोजित की गई, जिसमें पत्थर समुच्चयों (SA) के साथ उनका विश्लेषण किया गया। परिणामों से संकेत मिला कि TDA का अनुपात बढ़ाने से विफलता विचलन प्रतिबल कम होता है, कतरनी प्रतिरोध का कोण घटता है, और स्पष्ट संसंजकता बढ़ती है। TDA के समावेश के कारण पत्थर समुच्चयों की कतरनी शक्ति में हुई हानि की विभिन्न सुदृढ़ीकरण विधियों द्वारा क्षतिपूर्ति करने का प्रयास किया गया। SA+TDA मिश्रण अनुपातों पर क्षैतिज सुदृढ़ीकरण; आवरण; क्षैतिज सुदृढ़ीकरण और आवरण द्वारा तत्व परीक्षण किए गए। SA+TDA मिश्रण अनुपातों से बने पत्थर के स्तंभों के प्रदर्शन की तुलना बेंचमार्क के रूप में 100% SA से बने OSC से की गई।

परिणामों से संकेत मिला कि आवरण की सहायता से लगभग 65% SA को आयतन के हिसाब से TDA से प्रतिस्थापित किया जा सकता है। टीडीए-आधारित पत्थर के स्तंभों के प्रदर्शन का और अधिक मूल्यांकन करने के लिए, 660 मिमी लंबाई और 110 मिमी व्यास वाले जियोग्रिड आवरण वाले पत्थर के स्तंभों पर 20 एकल-स्तंभ और 4 समूह-स्तंभ मॉडल परीक्षण किए गए। स्तंभों की भार वहन क्षमता और उभार व्यवहार पर तन्य शक्ति के प्रभाव का आकलन करने के लिए विभिन्न तन्य शक्तियों वाले दो प्रकार के जियोग्रिड का उपयोग किया गया। स्तंभों के उभार व्यवहार की निगरानी के लिए जियोग्रिड आवरण के साथ तनाव गेज लगाए गए थे। मॉडल परीक्षण के परिणाम SA+TDA से बने पत्थर के स्तंभों की दक्षता का OSC_100SA से तुलना करके प्राप्त किए गए हैं। मॉडल परीक्षणों के परिणामों से संकेत मिलता है कि आवरण की सहायता से लगभग 70% SA को आयतन के हिसाब से TDA से बदला जा सकता है।

300 मिमी व्यास और 4.5 मीटर गहराई वाले क्षेत्र स्तंभों को 4 मीटर मिट्टी और उसके बाद 2 मीटर गाद वाले स्तर पर स्थापित किया गया था। क्षेत्र परीक्षण से पहले बोरहोल जांच की गई और प्रतिक्रिया व्यवस्था का उपयोग करके स्थापित स्तंभों पर प्लेट लोड परीक्षण किए गए। क्षेत्र परीक्षणों से प्राप्त परिणाम मॉडल परीक्षणों के परिणामों के काफी हद तक अनुरूप थे, जिससे पुष्टि हुई कि टीडीए समुच्चय वाले आवरणयुक्त पत्थर के स्तंभ पारंपरिक पत्थर के स्तंभों के समान ही प्रदर्शन करते हैं।

क्षेत्र परीक्षणों के सफल समापन के बाद, टीडीए और पत्थर के समुच्चय के अलग-अलग अनुपातों वाले आवरणयुक्त पत्थर के स्तंभों के व्यवहार का अनुकरण करने के लिए PLAXIS 3D सॉफ्टवेयर का उपयोग करके संख्यात्मक विश्लेषण किया गया। स्तंभों के भार-निपटान व्यवहार, प्रतिबल वितरण और विरूपण विशेषताओं का विश्लेषण करने के लिए सिमुलेशन आयोजित किए गए। PLAXIS 3D विश्लेषण से प्राप्त परिणामों ने प्रयोगात्मक और क्षेत्र निष्कर्षों को और अधिक मान्य किया, जिससे आवरण, पत्थर के समुच्चय और टीडीए के बीच परस्पर क्रिया के बारे में गहन

जानकारी मिली। 70SA+30TDA मिश्रण अनुपात से बने पत्थर के स्तंभों पर भी पैरामीट्रिक अध्ययन किया गया है ताकि जियोग्रिड की कठोरता, स्तंभ का व्यास, मिट्टी की अपरदन शक्ति को बदलकर सुधार अनुपातों को मापा जा सके।

इस अध्ययन के निष्कर्ष दर्शाते हैं कि TDA पत्थर के स्तंभों में पत्थर के समुच्चय के लिए एक व्यवहार्य और टिकाऊ विकल्प के रूप में काम कर सकता है। TDA का उपयोग न केवल प्राकृतिक संसाधनों पर निर्भरता को कम करता है, बल्कि गैर-जैवनिम्नीकरणीय कचरे के निपटान के लिए एक पर्यावरणीय रूप से जिम्मेदार समाधान भी प्रदान करता है। TDA के साथ संलग्न पत्थर के स्तंभ प्रभावी रूप से नरम जमीन को स्थिर कर सकते हैं, निपटान को कम कर सकते हैं, और भार वहन क्षमता बनाए रख सकते हैं। त्रिअक्षीय परीक्षणों, मॉडल परीक्षणों, क्षेत्र परीक्षणों और संख्यात्मक विश्लेषण के माध्यम से किए गए व्यापक अध्ययन के परिणाम इस बात की पुष्टि करते हैं

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Certificate		i
Acknowledgements		iii
Abstract (English)		v
Abstract (Hindi)		ix
Table of contents		xiii
List of figures		xix
List of tables		xxvii
List of notations		xxix
CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	General	1
1.2	Problems of Soft Soil Deposits	1
1.3	Foundation Engineering in Soft Soils	2
1.4	Ground Improvement using Stone Columns	3
1.4.1	Ordinary stone columns	3
1.4.2	Encased stone columns	4
1.5	Aggregates in Stone Columns	4
1.5.1	Depletion of conventional materials	5
1.5.2	Alternative materials	5
1.6	Objectives of the Study	6
1.7	Organisation of Thesis	7
1.8	Summary	10

CHAPTER 2	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
2.1	Introduction	11
2.2	Ordinary Stone Columns	12
2.3	Encased stone columns	19
2.4	Full-Scale Field Studies on OSC and ESCs	37
2.5	Studies on Alternative Materials to Conventional stone aggregates in stone columns	39
2.6	Studies on the Application of TDA in Geotechnical Engineering	44
2.7	Gap in Literature	49
2.8	Summary	50
CHAPTER 3	MATERIAL CHARACTERIZATION	51
3.1	Introduction	51
3.2	Jhajjar clay	52
3.2.1	Soil classification	52
3.2.2	Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) analysis	56
3.2.3	X-Ray Diffraction (XRD) analysis	58
3.3	Geogrid	60
3.4	Stone Aggregates (SA)	61
3.5	Tire Derived Aggregates (TDA)	64
3.5.1	Sphericity of TDA	64
3.5.2	Triaxial tests on TDA	71
3.5.3	Empirical correlation for stress-strain response	76
3.6	Mixture of SA+TDA	78
3.7	Summary	85

CHAPTER 4	ELEMENT TESTS ON ENCASED STONE	87
	COLUMNS	
4.1	Introduction	87
4.2	Horizontally Reinforced Ordinary Stone Columns (HROSC)	87
4.2.1	Methodology and testing program	87
4.2.2	Response of HROSC	89
4.2.3	Stress ratio	94
4.2.4	Shear strength parameters	95
4.2.5	Secant Modulus	99
4.3	Encased Stone Columns (ESC)	100
4.3.1	Response of ESC	102
4.3.2	Optimal configuration	106
4.4	Horizontally Reinforced Encased Stone Columns (HRESC)	108
4.4.1	Response of HRESC	109
4.4.2	Optimal configuration	110
4.5	Summary	111
CHAPTER 5	MODEL TESTS ON ENCASED STONE COLUMNS	115
5.1	Introduction	115
5.2	Modelling Considerations	116
5.2.1	Scale factor	116
5.2.2	Boundary conditions	117
5.3	Test Setup and Instrumentation	120

5.3.1	Loading/reaction frame	120
5.3.2	Hydraulic jack	120
5.3.3	LVDT	121
5.3.4	Pocket shear vane tester	122
5.3.5	Load cell	122
5.3.6	Strain gauges	123
5.3.7	Pore Pressure Transducer (PPT)	123
5.3.8	Data logger	124
5.4	Construction of Stone Column in Clay Bed	124
5.3.1	Preparation of clay bed	124
5.3.2	Single OSC	126
5.3.3	Single ESC	127
5.3.4	Single HRESC	128
5.3.5	Group of stone columns	128
5.3.3	Loading of stone column	132
5.4	Testing program	135
5.5	Results of Single Column Tests	136
5.5.1	Clay bed and columns made of 100SA	136
5.5.2	Columns made of 70SA + 30TDA	141
5.5.3	Columns made of 50SA + 50TDA	145
5.5.4	Columns made of 30SA + 70TDA	150
5.5.5	Columns made of 100TDA	154
5.5.6	Effect of TDA content on mobilization of hoop strain	159
5.6	Results of Group Column Tests	161
5.7	Efficiency and Optimum Mix Proportion	164

5.7.1	Efficiencies from single column tests	164
5.7.2	Efficiencies from group column tests	166
5.8	Summary	167
CHAPTER 6	FIELD TESTS ON ENCASED STONE COLUMNS	169
6.1	Introduction	169
6.2	Ground Investigation	170
6.2.1	Bore hole analysis	171
6.2.2	Standard Penetration Tests (N-values)	172
6.2.3	Undisturbed and representative sample testing	175
6.3	Materials	176
6.3.1	Stone aggregates	176
6.3.2	Tire Derived Aggregates (TDA)	176
6.3.3	Geogrid	177
6.4	Testing Program	178
6.5	Installation of ESC	179
6.6	Loading on stone column	182
6.7	Results of Full-Scale Field Tests	185
6.8	Efficiency from Field Tests	187
6.9	Comparison of Model Tests and Full-Scale Tests Data	189
6.10	Summary	190
CHAPTER 7	NUMERICAL ANALYSIS ON ENCASED STONE COLUMNS	191
7.1	Introduction	191
7.2	Modelling Features in PLAXIS 3D	192

7.2.1	Boreholes (Soil layers)	192
7.2.2	Structures	193
7.2.3	Materials/ Constitutive models	193
7.2.4	Mesh generation	194
7.2.5	Stage construction/ Loading	195
7.2.6	Output/ Interpretation of results	195
7.3	Validation of Numerical Model from Literature	196
7.4	Numerical analysis of Field tests	197
7.5	Parametric Study on ESC made of 70SA+30TDA	206
7.5.1	Load-settlement behaviour of OSC and MSC	209
7.5.2	Load-settlement behaviour of GMSC	212
7.5.3	Effect of geogrid stiffness	213
7.5.4	Effect of geogrid encasement length	216
7.6	Summary	219
CHAPTER 8	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	221
8.1	Introduction	221
8.2	Major Conclusions	224
8.3	Major Contributions of the Present Study	224
8.4	Limitations of the Present Study	224
8.5	Suggestions for Future Research	225
REFERENCES		227
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS		245
BIO-ATA		247

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Figure Caption	Page No.
1.1	Flow chart outlining the works of thesis	8
2.1	Failure mechanism of a single stone column in a homogeneous layer	15
2.2	Different types of loading on stone column	15
2.3	(a) Vibrofloat (b) Mechanism of vibrofloat	16
2.4	Stone column installation by vibroflotation (a) Top feed method (b) Bottom feed method. (google images)	17
2.5	Rammed stone column	18
2.6	Construction of Encased stone column	36
2.7	Sand, gravel, and crushed stone produced in the US and Europe from 2012-22	40
3.1	Stacking of collected Jhajjar clay near the laboratory	52
3.2	Hydrometer analysis for Jhajjar clay	53
3.3	Laboratory tests on Jhajjar clay	54
3.4	Undrained shear strength vs water content (%) for clay	56
3.5	Scanning Electron Microscopy	57
3.6	SEM images of the structure of clay	57
3.7	X-Ray Diffraction Analysis	58
3.8	XRD pattern for qualitative analysis of minerals	59
3.9	Tensile strength vs displacement of geogrids	60
3.10	Stone aggregates used in the study	61
3.11	Triaxial tests on stone aggregates	62
3.12	Stress-strain response of 100SA	63
3.13	Mohr circle and failure envelope of 100SA	64
3.14	Typical figure showing the three types of tire chips	65
3.15	Deformed samples at different confining pressures	72
3.16	Deviatoric stress vs axial strain (%) for different TDA used in the study	73
3.17	Mohr-coulomb failure envelope for TDA used in the study	74
3.18	Secant modulus vs confining pressure of TDA	76

Figure No.	Figure Caption	Page No.
3.19	Comparison between the laboratory results and empirical equation for TDA	78
3.20	Density vs TDA content	79
3.21	Stress-strain response of 70SA+30TDA mix proportion	80
3.22	Mohr circle and failure envelope of 70SA+30TDA mix proportion	81
3.23	Stress-strain response of 50SA+50TDA mix proportion	82
3.24	Mohr circle and failure envelope of 50SA+50TDA mix proportion	82
3.25	Stress-strain response of 30SA+70TDA mix proportion	83
3.26	Mohr circle and failure envelope of 30SA+70TDA mix proportion	84
4.1	Triaxial tests on HROSC	90
4.2	Deviatoric stress (kPa) vs axial strain (%) for different SA+TDA mixtures	91
4.3	Deviatoric stress (kPa) vs axial strain (%) for different SA+TDA mixtures with one layer of horizontal reinforcement at a spacing of $h/2$	92
4.4	Deviatoric stress (kPa) vs axial strain (%) for different SA+TDA mixtures with two layers of horizontal reinforcement at a spacing of $h/3$	92
4.5	Deviatoric stress (kPa) vs axial strain (%) for different SA+TDA mixtures with three layers of horizontal reinforcement at a spacing of $h/4$	93
4.6	Deviatoric stress (kPa) vs axial strain (%) for different SA+TDA mixtures with four layers of horizontal reinforcement at a spacing of $h/5$	94
4.7	Effect of reinforcement layers on SA+TDA mixtures in stress ratio at different confining pressures	95
4.8	p-q plot for SA+TDA mixture without reinforcement layer	96

Figure No.	Figure Caption	Page No.
4.9	p-q plot for SA+TDA mixture with multiple horizontal layers of geogrid	96
	(a) Angle of shearing resistance vs TDA content	
4.10	(b) Cohesion vs TDA content (c) Comparison of shear strength with the study of Pasha et al. (2019)	97
4.11	Effect of reinforcement layers on SA+TDA mixtures, secant modulus at different confining pressures	99
4.12	Typical photograph showing the Elemental ESC	101
4.13	Encased stone column using GG1 as encasement	103
4.14	Encased stone column using GG2 as encasement	104
4.15	Encased stone columns made up of TDA using GG1 and GG2 as encasement	105
4.16	Effect of TDA content on performance of ESC	107
4.17	HRESC using GG1 as encasement	109
4.18	HRESC using GG2 as encasement	110
4.19	Effect of TDA content on performance of HRESC	111
5.1	Schematic view of single stone column foundation	119
5.2	Schematic view of group of stone column foundation	119
5.3	Hydraulic pump	121
5.4	LVDT with 80 mm displacement capacity	121
5.5	Pocket vane shear tester	122
5.6	Load cell	122
5.7	(a) Strain gauge (b) PPT	123
5.8	(a) schematic figure showing PPTs placed in the tank (b) Top view	123
5.9	(a) Data acquisition system (HBM) (b) Data visualization using Catman Easy software	124
5.10	Clay mixer	125
5.11	Variation of moisture content (%) and undrained shear strength (kPa) with clay bed depth (mm)	125
5.12	(a) Helical auger (b) geogrid with strain gauges	127

Figure No.	Figure Caption	Page No.
5.13	Typical photographs showing construction of stone column in model tests	131
5.14	Loading arrangement for single column tests	132
5.15	Loading for single column tests (closer view of loading)	133
5.16	Loading arrangement for group column tests	134
5.17	Loading for group column tests (closer view of loading)	134
5.18	Load vs settlement plot of Clay bed and stone columns made up of 100SA	137
5.19	Excess PWP vs load, along the depth of the column in the clay	138
5.20	Excess PWP vs time, along the depth of the column in the clay	139
5.21	Mobilization of hoop strain (%) along length of the column for ESC_100SA	140
5.22	Load vs settlement plot of stone columns made up of 30% TDA	142
5.23	Excess PWP vs load, along the depth of the column (70SA+30TDA)	143
5.24	Excess PWP vs time, along the depth of the column (70SA+30TDA)	144
5.25	Mobilization of hoop strain (%) along length of the column made of 70SA+30TDA	145
5.26	Load vs settlement plot of stone columns made up of 50% TDA	146
5.27	Excess PWP vs load, along the depth of the column (50SA+50TDA)	147
5.28	Excess PWP vs time, along the depth of the column (50SA+50TDA)	148
5.29	Mobilization of hoop strain (%) along length of the column made of 50SA+50TDA	149

Figure No.	Figure Caption	Page No.
5.30	Load vs settlement plot of stone columns made up of 70% TDA	151
5.31	Excess PWP vs load, along the depth of the column (30SA+70TDA)	152
5.32	Excess PWP vs time, along the depth of the column (30SA+70TDA)	153
5.33	Mobilization of hoop strain (%) along length of the column made of 50SA+50TDA	153
5.34	Load vs settlement plot of stone columns made up of 100% TDA	155
5.35	Excess PWP vs load, along the depth of the column (100TDA)	156
5.36	Excess PWP vs time, along the depth of the column (100TDA)	157
5.37	Mobilization of hoop strain (%) along length of the column made of 100TDA	158
5.38	Maximum hoop strain (%) vs TDA content	160
5.39	Maximum hoop strain (%) along the length of column vs TDA content	161
5.40	Load vs settlement plot for group of encased stone columns	162
5.41	Efficiency of single columns made of TDA	165
5.42	Efficiency of group columns made of TDA	166
6.1	Project location	170
6.2	Bore hole drilling machine set up	171
6.3	Soil profiles observed from the borehole data	172
6.4	Typical photograph showing the SPT test	173
6.5	Variation of (a) SPT N-value, (b) Natural water content and (c) Bulk unit weight, along the depth of boreholes	174
6.6	(a) Undisturbed/representative samples, (b) water content samples	175
6.7	(a) Stone aggregates (b) TDA used in the field tests	176
6.8	Geogrid used in the field test study	177

Figure No.	Figure Caption	Page No.
6.9	Schematic layout of stone column locations	178
6.10	Installation of ESC (a) auger is used to remove soil (b) Manual auger to form the hole (c) The finished borehole for column (d) Placing of stone aggregates in OSC (e) Geogrid (f) placing of geogrid and pouring (g) placing of geogrid and pouring (h) Fully constructed ESC made of SA+TDA.	180
6.11	Schematic sketch of the load test arrangement on stone columns	182
6.12	(a) Typical photograph showing the placement of loading plate, jack and dial gauges (b) Hydraulic pump to apply load (c) Loading arrangement using 22t earth mover.	184
6.13	Load vs settlement of stone columns (prototype)	185
6.14	Variation of field column efficiency with the TDA content	188
7.1	Validation of numerical model with the results of Yoo and Lee (2012)	196
7.2	Modelling of stone column in Plaxis 3D for Yoo and Lee (2012) filed test.	198
7.3	Comparison of load vs settlement from numerical simulations and field tests (a) OSC_100SA and ESC_100SA (b) ESC_70SA+30TDA and ESC_50SA+50TDA (c) ESC_30SA+700TDA and ESC_100TDA	200
7.4	Typical stress countours (a) OSC_100SA (c) ESC_100SA (e) ESC_70SA+30TDA; Typical total displacement countours of (b) OSC_100SA (d) ESC_100SA (f) ESC_70SA+30TDA; (g) Lateral displacemnts (U _x) profiles from numerical analysis of stone column made SA+TDA mixtures	204
7.5	Lateral displacement (bulging) of stone columns made of SA+TDA along the length of the column	205

Figure No.	Figure Caption	Page No.
7.6	(a) 3D soil model (b) top view showing the stone columns, (c) front view along x-x axis showing geogrid encased stone column.	207
7.7	Variation of bearing ratio with the settlement ratio for the stone column of 0.6 m diameter	209
7.8	Variation of improvement ratio for OSC and MSC with different surrounding soil strengths and L/D values	211
7.9	Variation of normalized load carrying capacity with the settlement ratio (S/B) for geogrid encased mixture stone columns.	213
7.10	Effect of geogrid stiffness on the normalized improvement Ratio at different encasement lengths, (a) 2D, (b) 4D, and (c) Fully encased.	215
7.11	Effect of encasement length on the bearing improvement ratio of the 70SA+30TDA mixed stone column, for Different L/D ratio with different surrounding soil strengths, (a) $S_u = 15$ kPa, (b) $S_u = 25$ kPa, (c) $S_u = 35$ kPa.	218

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Table Caption	Page No.
2.1	Literature on field test studies on stone columns and encased stone columns	37
2.2	Review of studies on application of TDA in geotechnical engineering	45
3.1	Summary of physical properties of Jhajjar clay	55
3.2	Tensile strength properties of the geogrid used in the study	60
3.3	Material properties of the tire chips used in the study	66
3.4	Statistics of sphericity of different TDA	67
3.5	Image analysis for sphericity calculations for TDA-A	68
3.6	Image analysis for sphericity calculations for TDA-B	69
3.7	Image analysis for sphericity calculations for TDA-C	70
3.8	Shear strength parameters of tire chips obtained by various using triaxial testing	75
3.9	Shear strength and modulus of mix proportions of SA+TDA	84
4.1	Details of element tests performed on HROSC	88
4.2	Details of element tests performed on ESC	101
4.3	Details of element tests performed on HRESC	108
5.1	Scaling laws used for 1-g physical modeling of ESC	117
5.2	Summary of test program for model stone columns	135
6.1	Summary of the results obtained from the laboratory tests	175
6.2	Properties of the geogrid used in the field study	177
6.3	Summary of field test program	179
6.4	Comparison of model scale up results with prototype results	189
7.1	Input parameters for numerical analysis on field tests	198
7.2	Details of spacing and loading diameter for stone column patterns considered	207
7.3	Materials properties considered in the numerical (parametric) analysis.	208

LIST OF NOTATIONS

c	Apparent cohesion
S_u	undrained shear strength of kaolinite clay
N	Number of blows
ϕ	angle of internal friction
ν	Poisson's ratio
τ	shear stress
σ_3 and σ_c	Confining pressure
ϕ_s	Sphericity
σ	Normal stress
σ_1	Triaxial compressive strength
ε	Axial strain
ε_h	Hoop strain
p	Mean principle stress
q	Mean shear stress
$\Delta\sigma_f$	Failure deviatoric stress
d and D	diameter of the column
d_s	size of aggregates
d_{smax}	maximum size of aggregates
E_{50}	Secant modulus of elasticity
h	Height of the specimen
L	length of the column

n	prototype stone column diameter/model test column diameter
$1/n^3$	scale factor for force (for 1g laboratory)
U_x	Lateral displacement
IS	Indian Standard
HRG	Horizontal Reinforced Geogrid layer
SPT	Standard Penetration Test
SA	Stone Aggregates
TDA	Tire Derived Aggregates
MP	Mix Proportions
GG	Geogrid
100SA	100% Stone Aggregates
70SA+30TDA	70% Stone Aggregates + 30% Tire Derived Aggregates
50SA+50TDA	50% Stone Aggregates + 50% Tire Derived Aggregates
30SA+70TDA	30% Stone Aggregates + 70% Tire Derived Aggregates
100TDA	100% Tire Derived Aggregates
OSC	Ordinary Stone Columns
ESC	Encased Stone Columns
HROSC	Horizontally reinforced Ordinary Stone Column
HRESC	Horizontally reinforced Encased Stone Column
MSC	Mix proportion ordinary Stone Column
GMSC	Geogrid encased MSC