

**GEOENVIRONMENTAL AND GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERIZATION
OF PROCESSED AND UNPROCESSED C&D WASTE FOR BULK REUSE
IN GEOTECHNICAL APPLICATIONS**

APOORVA AGARWAL



**DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
HAUZ KHAS, NEW DELHI – 110016, INDIA
JUNE 2023**

**GEOENVIRONMENTAL AND GEOTECHNICAL
CHARACTERIZATION OF PROCESSED AND UNPROCESSED C&D
WASTE FOR BULK REUSE IN GEOTECHNICAL APPLICATIONS**

by

APOORVA AGARWAL

Department of Civil Engineering

Submitted

in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

HAUZ KHAS, NEW DELHI – 110016, INDIA

JUNE 2023

**DEDICATED TO
MY MOTHER**

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled **“GEOENVIRONMENTAL AND GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF PROCESSED AND UNPROCESSED C&D WASTE FOR BULK REUSE IN GEOTECHNICAL APPLICATIONS”** is being submitted by **Ms Apoorva Agarwal** in the fulfilment for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** to the **Indian Institute of Technology Delhi**. This is the record of the research work and is entirely carried out by her under our supervision and guidance. The research report and results presented in this thesis have not been submitted, in part or full, to any university or Institute for the award of any degree or diploma.

Prof. Manoj Datta
Emeritus Professor,
Department of Civil Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi,
New Delhi-110016
INDIA

Prof. G. V. Ramana
Professor,
Department of Civil Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi,
New Delhi-110016
INDIA

Dr N. K. Soni
Manager,
NTPC-NETRA,
Greater Noida-201306
INDIA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Words cannot register my gratitude and indebtedness to my eminent supervisors, Prof. Manoj Datta, Prof. G.V. Ramana and Dr N.K. Soni. It has been a long period of association in which they have subtly guided the development of my ideas and presided over the unfolded of my understanding. Without their supervision and constant encouragement, this thesis would not have materialized. I am incredibly grateful to Prof. Manoj Datta and Prof. G.V. Ramana for providing me with the opportunity and introducing me to this novel idea. I am also grateful to Dr N.K. Soni for providing insight from the industry perspective and providing me with the necessary resources from NTPC-NETRA. Thanks for their guidance, invaluable advice and constant support throughout this work.

I express my sincere thanks to the members of the Student Research Committee, namely Prof. D.R. Kaushal, Prof. D. Ravi Kumar, Prof. R. Ayothiraman and Mr Rajiv Satyakam, for their suggestions during this work. I would like to recognize the help and support of the laboratory technicians for all their help. I am also grateful to Ms Garima Gupta, Mr Lalit Kandpal, Mr Deepesh Bansal, Mr Devprakash Parida, Dr Riya Bhowmik, Dr Aali Pant and other lab mates for helping me with all the technical problems and discussions while carrying out experimental works.

I would also like to acknowledge NTPC-NETRA for their financial support in carrying out the work. I would also like to acknowledge North Delhi Municipal Corporation, East Delhi Municipal Corporation, M/s IL&FS and M/s Ramky Enviro Engineers Ltd for providing the logistics support during sample collection from C&D waste processing plants. I would also like to convey my regards to Mr Gautam Dalmia of M/s Strata Geosystems (India) Pvt. Ltd and Mr Atanu Adhikari from M/s Terre Armees India Ltd for their support in providing geosynthetic reinforcement for the work.

I have a galaxy of friends who have been the source of my continued strength during the course of this research and made this arduous task a pleasurable experience through their spiritual and moral support. I also sincerely thank my friends, colleagues and well-wishers for their valuable suggestions and help in completing the project. I further honestly thank many people who supported me directly/indirectly and whom I had encountered during the journey whose names are not mentioned here.

I want to express gratitude to my family members, without whom my dreams of completing the PhD would not have come true. I thank my parents (Mr Govind Saran Agarwal and Dr. (Mrs) Beena Agarwal) and parents-in-law (Mr Avdhesh Kumar Agarwal and Mrs Amita Agarwal) for their constant support throughout this journey. Special thanks to my brother Mr Aman Agarwal and my brother-in-law Mr Aditya Agarwal for their constant support throughout the journey. Particularly thanks to my husband, Mr Ankur Agarwal, for his love, constant support, understanding and affection during the tenure of my study that provided me with the necessary impetus to work on this thesis.

If someone's explicit mention is missing, it is more due to limitations or the shortcomings of my memory than anything else. I apologize for that. Finally, I would like to thank God. Without His great support, none of this would be possible.

Apoorva Agarwal

ABSTRACT

The scarcity of natural materials along with the environmental constraints and prohibition of mining and quarrying demands the exploration of secondary materials as substitutes. Efforts are in progress worldwide to explore the possible use of construction and demolition (C&D) waste for a wide range of applications. The present study assesses the feasibility of using C&D waste for geotechnical applications e.g., structural fill for constructing mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) walls or as an earthfill. The study assessed the following:

- i. Feasibility of using processed C&D waste termed sand-sized mixed recycled aggregate (SS_MRA) as structural fill for MSE walls
- ii. Feasibility of using unprocessed C&D waste as backfill for embankments.

The first part of the thesis experimentally evaluates the suitability of SS_MRA as structural fill in MSE walls in lieu of conventional fill material (CFM). Detailed physicochemical, geoenvironmental and geotechnical characterization of SS_MRA are carried out, and results are compared with locally available Badarpur sand (BS) and Yamuna sand (YS) (natural reference materials/CFM). The geoenvironmental characterization of SS_MRA shows that heavy metals and total soluble solids are more than the reference materials but are within limits for inert waste and the values reported in the literature. Experimentally determined gradation, physical and shear strength characteristics, and electrochemical properties of SS_MRA met the standard specifications for the structural fill of different guidelines/codes of practice. Pullout tests were conducted to evaluate the soil-geosynthetic peak interface apparent coefficient of friction ($\mu_{S/GSY}$) between geosynthetic reinforcement (geogrids (GG-80 and GG-350) and polymeric strips (PS-25 and PS-50)) and selected structural fill (SS_MRA). The influence of poor compaction on geosynthetic reinforcement – SS_MRA interactions are evaluated, and the results are compared with those of geosynthetic

reinforcement in natural reference materials. Poor compaction significantly lowers $\mu_{S/GSY}$ particularly in polymeric strips. $\mu_{S/GSY}$ of geosynthetic reinforcement embedded in MRA is comparable with the reference materials and the values reported in the literature.

The second part examines the suitability of using (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste in earthfill applications. The detailed physicochemical, geoenvironmental and geotechnical characterization was carried out, and the results are compared with the local available soil (Delhi silt (DS)). The geoenvironmental characterization reveals that (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste has elevated heavy metals and total soluble solids compared to local soil but is within limits for inert waste criteria. From the geotechnical characterization, it can be concluded that (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste has properties similar to local soil and, thus, can be used in earthfills.

In addition, geoenvironmental characterization of fines obtained during processing C&D waste, termed recycled aggregate sludge (RA_S), has been carried out. The experimental results reveal that RA_S has a very high total soluble solids concentration and is within limits for non-hazardous waste. Thus, it is unsuitable for reusing without prior treatment.

Thus, the results of the present study encourage the construction industry in bulk utilization of SS_MRA as structural fill in MSE walls and (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste for earthfills.

सार

पर्यावरणीय बाधाओं और खनन और उत्खनन पर रोक के साथ-साथ प्राकृतिक सामग्रियों की कमी विकल्प के रूप में माध्यमिक सामग्रियों की खोज की मांग करती है। अनुप्रयोगों की एक विस्तृत श्रृंखला के लिए निर्माण और विध्वंस (सी एंड डी) कचरे के संभावित उपयोग का पता लगाने के लिए दुनिया भर में प्रयास जारी हैं। वर्तमान अध्ययन भू-तकनीकी अनुप्रयोगों के लिए सी एंड डी कचरे का उपयोग करने की व्यवहार्यता का आकलन करता है, जैसे यांत्रिक रूप से स्थिर पृथ्वी (एमएसई) की दीवारों के निर्माण के लिए संरचनात्मक भराव या मिट्टी के भराव के रूप में। अध्ययन ने निम्नलिखित का आकलन किया:

- i. एमएसई की दीवारों के लिए संरचनात्मक भराव के रूप में प्रसंस्कृत सी एंड डी कचरे को रेत के आकार के मिश्रित पुनर्नवीनीकरण कुल (एसएस_एमआरए) का उपयोग करने की व्यवहार्यता
- ii. तटबंधों के लिए बैकफ़िल के रूप में असंसाधित सी एंड डी कचरे का उपयोग करने की व्यवहार्यता।

थीसिस का पहला भाग प्रयोगात्मक रूप से SS_MRA की उपयुक्तता का मूल्यांकन करता है क्योंकि पारंपरिक भरण सामग्री (CFM) के बदले MSE की दीवारों में संरचनात्मक भरण होता है। SS_MRA का विस्तृत भौतिक रासायनिक, भू-पर्यावरण और भू-तकनीकी लक्षण वर्णन किया जाता है, और परिणामों की तुलना स्थानीय रूप से उपलब्ध बदरपुर रेत (BS) और यमुना रेत (YS) (प्राकृतिक संदर्भ सामग्री / CFM) से की जाती है। SS_MRA के भू-पर्यावरणीय लक्षण वर्णन से पता चलता है कि भारी धातु और कुल घुलनशील ठोस संदर्भ सामग्री से अधिक हैं लेकिन निष्क्रिय अपशिष्ट और साहित्य में बताए गए मूल्यों की सीमा के भीतर हैं। प्रयोगात्मक रूप से निर्धारित ग्रेडेशन, भौतिक और कतरनी ताकत विशेषताओं, और एसएस_एमआरए के इलेक्ट्रोकेमिकल गुणों ने विभिन्न दिशानिर्देशों/अभ्यास के कोडों के संरचनात्मक भरने के लिए मानक विनिर्देशों को पूरा किया। भू-संश्लेषक सुट्टीकरण (जियोग्रिड्स (GG-80 और GG-350) और बहुलक स्ट्रिप्स (PS-25 और PS-50)) के बीच घर्षण (μ_s/GSY) के मृदा-भू-संश्लेषण शिखर

इंटरफ़ेस स्पष्ट गुणांक का मूल्यांकन करने के लिए पुलआउट परीक्षण किए गए थे और चयनित संरचनात्मक भरण (SS_MRA)। जियोसिंथेटिक सुदृढीकरण पर खराब संघनन का प्रभाव - SS_MRA इंटरैक्शन का मूल्यांकन किया जाता है, और परिणामों की तुलना प्राकृतिक संदर्भ सामग्री में जियोसिंथेटिक सुदृढीकरण के साथ की जाती है। विशेष रूप से पॉलीमरिक स्ट्रिप्स में खराब संघनन $\mu_{S/GSY}$ को काफी कम करता है। MRA में सन्निहित जियोसिंथेटिक रीइन्फोर्समेंट का $\mu_{S/GSY}$ संदर्भ सामग्री और साहित्य में रिपोर्ट किए गए मूल्यों के साथ तुलनीय है।

दूसरा भाग अर्थफिल अनुप्रयोगों में (-4.75 मिमी) असंसाधित सी एंड डी कचरे के उपयोग की उपयुक्तता की जांच करता है। विस्तृत भौतिक-रासायनिक, भू-पर्यावरण और भू-तकनीकी लक्षण वर्णन किया गया था, और परिणामों की तुलना स्थानीय उपलब्ध मिट्टी (दिल्ली गाद (डीएस)) से की गई है। भू-पर्यावरण लक्षण वर्णन से पता चलता है कि (-4.75 मिमी) असंसाधित सी एंड डी कचरे में स्थानीय मिट्टी की तुलना में भारी धातु और कुल घुलनशील ठोस पदार्थ हैं, लेकिन निष्क्रिय अपशिष्ट मानदंड की सीमा के भीतर है। भू-तकनीकी लक्षण वर्णन से, यह निष्कर्ष निकाला जा सकता है कि (-4.75 मिमी) असंसाधित सी एंड डी कचरे में स्थानीय मिट्टी के समान गुण होते हैं और इस प्रकार, मिट्टी के भराव में इस्तेमाल किया जा सकता है।

इसके अलावा, सी एंड डी कचरे के प्रसंस्करण के दौरान प्राप्त महीन कणों का भू-पर्यावरणीय लक्षण वर्णन किया गया है, जिसे पुनर्नवीनीकरण कुल कीचड़ (RA_S) कहा जाता है। प्रायोगिक परिणामों से पता चलता है कि RA_S में बहुत अधिक कुल घुलनशील ठोस सांद्रता है और यह गैर-खतरनाक कचरे की सीमा के भीतर है। इस प्रकार, यह पूर्व उपचार के बिना पुनः उपयोग के लिए अनुपयुक्त है।

इस प्रकार, वर्तमान अध्ययन के परिणाम एमएसई दीवारों में संरचनात्मक भराव के रूप में एसएस_एमआरए के थोक उपयोग में निर्माण उद्योग को प्रोत्साहित करते हैं और (-4.75 मिमी) अर्थफिल के लिए असंसाधित सी एंड डी अपशिष्ट।

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xix
LIST OF FIGURES	xxiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxix
LIST OF NOTATIONS	xxxii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 TERMINOLOGY	3
1.3 OBJECTIVES	4
1.4 SCOPE	6
1.5 METHODOLOGY	7
1.6 ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS	8
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1 INTRODUCTION	10
2.2 CONSTRUCTION & DEMOLITION WASTE GENERATION, COMPOSITION AND RECYCLING: INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL SCENARIO	10

2.2.1	Generation, composition, and recycling: International scenario	10
2.2.2	Generation, composition, and recycling: National scenario	15
2.2.3	Types of recycled aggregates from C&D waste recycling plants	16
2.3	CHARACTERIZATION OF MIXED RECYCLED AGGREGATE (MRA)	18
2.3.1	Compositional analysis	23
2.3.2	Physicochemical characteristics	24
2.3.3	Geoenvironmental characteristics	28
2.3.4	Geotechnical properties	31
2.4	CHARACTERISTICS OF UNPROCESSED C&D WASTE MIXED WITH SOIL	33
2.4.1	Physicochemical characteristics	33
2.4.2	Geoenvironmental characteristics	38
2.4.3	Geotechnical characteristics	38
2.5	CHARACTERISTICS OF RECYCLED AGGREGATE SLUDGE (RA_S)	39
2.5.1	Physicochemical characteristics	39
2.5.2	Geoenvironmental characteristics	40
2.6	REGULATORY THRESHOLD LIMITS FOR REUSE OF C&D WASTE	40
2.6.1	Sources of contamination	40
2.6.2	Geoenvironmental characteristics	42
2.6.3	Structural fill for MSE walls	55
2.6.4	Earth fill	57

2.7	PULLOUT BEHAVIOUR OF GEOSYNTHETIC REINFORCEMENT	57
2.8	HEAVY METAL CONTAMINATION INDICES	58
2.8.1	Contamination factor (C_f) and modified degree of contamination (mC_d)	59
2.8.2	Geoaccumulation index (I_{geo})	59
2.8.3	Pollution load index (PLI)	60
2.9	CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RESEARCH GAPS	62
CHAPTER 3 SAMPLE COLLECTION AND EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATIONS		64
3.1	INTRODUCTION	64
3.2	STUDY SITES	65
3.2.1	Basic functioning of plants	65
3.3	SAMPLE COLLECTION	68
3.3.1	Sand-sized mixed recycled aggregate (SS_MRA)	68
3.3.2	Unprocessed C&D waste	69
3.3.3	Recycled aggregate sludge (fines)	72
3.3.4	Local Soil (Delhi Silt)	73
3.3.5	Reference material (local sands) (Badarpur Sand and Yamuna Sand)	73
3.3.6	Geosynthetic Reinforcements	75
3.4	EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATIONS	76
3.4.1	Testing program	76

3.4.1.1	Compositional analysis and grain size distribution of (-20 mm) unprocessed C&D waste	78
3.4.1.2	Physicochemical characterization of SS_MRA, (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste and RA_S	78
3.4.1.3	Geoenvironmental characterization of SS_MRA, (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste and RA_S	79
3.4.1.4	Geotechnical characterization of SS_MRA and (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste	80
3.4.1.5	Pullout characterization of geogrids and polymeric strips embedded in SS_MRA	82
3.4.2	Testing methodology	83
3.4.2.1	Compositional analysis and grain size distribution of (-20 mm) unprocessed C&D waste	85
3.4.2.2	Physicochemical characterization	85
3.4.2.3	Geoenvironmental characterization	87
3.4.2.4	Geotechnical characterization	88
3.4.2.5	Pull-out testing	90
3.5	CONCLUDING REMARKS	94
CHAPTER 4 COMPOSITION AND GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION OF (- 20 MM) UNPROCESSED C&D WASTE		96
4.1	INTRODUCTION	96
4.2	PHYSICAL CHARACTERIZATION	96
4.2.1	Compositional analysis	96

4.2.2	Grain size distribution (GSD)	98
4.3	CONCLUDING REMARKS	99
CHAPTER 5	GEOENVIRONMENTAL AND GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF (-4.75 MM) RECYCLED C&D WASTE: SAND-SIZED MIXED RECYCLED AGGREGATE (SS_MRA)	100
5.1	INTRODUCTION	100
5.2	COMPOSITIONAL ANALYSIS OF MIXED RECYCLED AGGREGATE (MRA)	100
5.3	PHYSICOCHEMICAL CHARACTERIZATION	102
5.3.1	pH	102
5.3.2	Electrical conductivity (EC)	103
5.3.3	Loss on ignition (LOI)	103
5.3.4	X-Ray Diffraction (XRD)	104
5.3.5	Energy Dispersive X-Ray Fluorescence (ED-XRF)	107
5.4	GEOENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERIZATION	110
5.4.1	Total soluble solids (TSS)	110
5.4.2	Heavy metals	112
5.4.2.1	Leachable heavy metals	112
5.4.2.2	Total heavy metals	117
5.4.2.3	Contamination Indices for SS_MRA	121
5.5	GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERIZATION	123

5.5.1	Grain Size Distribution	123
5.5.2	Specific gravity	124
5.5.3	Compaction characteristics	126
5.5.4	Permeability	128
5.5.5	Compressibility	129
5.5.6	Shear Strength	131
5.6	CONCLUDING REMARKS	143
CHAPTER 6 GEOENVIRONMENTAL AND GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF (-4.75 MM) UNPROCESSED C&D WASTE		146
6.1	INTRODUCTION	146
6.2	PHYSICOCHEMICAL CHARACTERIZATION	146
6.2.1	pH	147
6.2.2	Electrical conductivity (EC)	147
6.2.3	Loss on ignition (LOI)	148
6.2.4	X-Ray Diffraction (XRD)	149
6.2.5	Energy Dispersive X-Ray Fluorescence (ED-XRF)	152
6.3	GEOENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERIZATION	156
6.3.1	Total soluble solids (TSS)	157
6.3.2	Heavy metals	158
6.3.2.1	Leachable heavy metals	158
6.3.2.2	Contamination factor (Cf) for leachable heavy metals	159

6.3.2.3	Total heavy metals	160
6.3.2.4	Contamination indices for (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste	164
6.4	GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERIZATION	166
6.4.1	Grain Size Distribution	167
6.4.2	Plasticity characteristics	168
6.4.3	Specific gravity	168
6.4.4	Compaction characteristics	168
6.4.5	Permeability	169
6.4.6	Compressibility	169
6.4.7	Shear Strength	171
6.5	CONCLUDING REMARKS	173
CHAPTER 7 GEOENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FINES(SLUDGE) OBTAINED DURING WASHING OF PROCESSED C&D WASTE: RECYCLED AGGREGATE SLUDGE (RA_S)		175
7.1	INTRODUCTION	175
7.2	PHYSICOCHEMICAL CHARACTERIZATION	176
7.2.1	pH	176
7.2.2	Electrical conductivity (EC)	176
7.2.3	Loss on ignition (LOI)	177
7.2.4	X-Ray Diffraction (XRD)	178

7.2.5	Energy Dispersive X-Ray Fluorescence (ED-XRF)	178
7.3	GEOENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERIZATION	180
7.3.1	Total soluble solids (TSS)	181
7.3.2	Heavy metals	181
7.3.2.1	Leachable heavy metals	181
7.3.2.2	Contamination factor (C_f) for leachable heavy metals	182
7.3.2.3	Total heavy metals	183
7.3.2.4	Empirical Indices for RA_S	186
7.4	CONCLUDING REMARKS	188
CHAPTER 8 SUITABILITY OF USING SAND-SIZED MIXED RECYCLED AGGREGATE WASTE (SS_MRA) AS STRUCTURAL FILL IN MSE WALLS		190
8.1	INTRODUCTION	190
8.2	POTENTIAL FOR REUSE AS STRUCTURAL FILL IN MSE WALLS	190
CHAPTER 9 PULLOUT BEHAVIOUR OF GEOGRIDS AND POLYMERIC STRIPS IN SAND-SIZED MIXED RECYCLED AGGREGATE (SS_MRA)		196
9.1	INTRODUCTION	196
9.2	CHARACTERIZATION OF GEOSYNTHETIC REINFORCEMENT	196
9.3	PULLOUT TEST RESULTS	198
9.3.1	Sand-sized mixed recycled aggregates (SS_MRA)	201
9.3.1.1	Geogrids	201

9.3.1.2	Polymeric strips	206
9.3.2	Reference materials	210
9.3.2.1	Geogrids	210
9.3.2.2	Polymeric strips	213
9.3.3	Comparison of pullout response in SS_MRA and reference materials	216
9.3.3.1	Comparison among different plants	216
9.3.3.2	Comparison of SS_MRA with reference materials	217
9.3.4	Effect of constrained dilatancy on the effective normal stress at reinforcement level for polymeric strip	218
9.4	SOIL GEOSYNTHETIC INTERFACE APPARENT COEFFICIENT OF FRICTION ($\mu_{S/GSY}$) IN PULLOUT	221
9.5	FACTORS AFFECTING PULLOUT BEHAVIOUR	228
9.5.1	Influence of confining stress	228
9.5.2	Influence of density	229
9.5.3	Influence of different types of geogrids and polymeric strips	230
9.6	CONCLUDING REMARKS	231
	CHAPTER 10 COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF USING SS_MRA IN THE DESIGN OF MSE WALLS	233
10.1	INTRODUCTION	233
10.2	DESIGN METHODOLOGY OF GEOGRIDS AND POLYMERIC STRIPS	233

10.3	DESIGN OF MSE WALL WITH SS_MRA AND REFERENCE MATERIAL	234
10.3.1	Design Parameters	234
10.3.2	Design of MSE wall	236
10.4	COST BENEFIT OF USING SS_MRA AS STRUCTURAL FILL	239
10.5	CONCLUDING REMARKS	244
CHAPTER 11 SUITABILITY OF USING (-4.75 MM) UNPROCESSED C&D WASTE AND FINES (SLUDGE) (RA_S) AS EARTHFILLS		245
11.1	INTRODUCTION	245
11.2	POTENTIAL FOR REUSE AS AN EARTHFILL IN EMBANKMENTS, FILLING DEEP-PITS AND FILLING LOW-LYING AREAS	245
11.3	MEASURES REQUIRED FOR UNRESTRICTED USE	249
CHAPTER 12 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS		250
12.1	MAJOR CONCLUSIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY	251
12.2	SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS OF THE PRESENT STUDY	253
12.2.1	Composition of unprocessed C&D waste	253
12.2.2	Characterization of SS_MRA	253
12.2.3	Pullout characteristics of SS_MRA	254
12.2.4	Characterization of (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste	255
12.2.5	Characterization of RA_S	256
12.3	RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON THE PRESENT STUDY	257

12.4	LIMITATIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY	257
12.5	FUTURE SCOPE OF WORK	257
	REFERENCES	259
	APPENDIX-A: RESULTS OF COMPOSITIONAL ANALYSIS FOR (-20 MM) UNPROCESSED C&D WASTE	296
	APPENDIX-B: RESULTS OF PHYSICOCHEMICAL TESTING ON SS_MRA, (-4.75MM) UNPROCESSED C&D WASTE, RA_S, LOCAL SOIL AND REFERENCE MATERIALS	298
	APPENDIX-C: RESULTS OF GEOENVIRONMENTAL TESTING ON SS_MRA, (-4.75MM) UNPROCESSED C&D WASTE, RA_S, LOCAL SOIL AND REFERENCE MATERIAL	303
	APPENDIX-D: RESULTS OF BATCH LEACHING AND TOTAL HEAVY METAL ON SS_MRA, (-4.75MM) UNPROCESSED C&D WASTE, RA_S, LOCAL SOIL AND REFERENCE MATERIAL	308
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS FROM THE PRESENT STUDY	321
	BIODATA	323

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 2.1	C&D waste generation and recycling around the globe	12
Table 2.2	C&D waste estimates in India	15
Table 2.3	C&D waste recycling plants operational in India (Roychowdhury et al., 2020)	15
Table 2.4	Composition of C&D waste in India	16
Table 2.5	List of the standard/ guidelines used worldwide for the reuse of recycled aggregate from C&D waste in concrete applications (Bureau of Indian Standards, 2016; de Brito et al., 2019; Tam et al., 2018; Torgal et al., 2013)	17
Table 2.6	Summary of literature available on using MRA for various applications	18
Table 2.7	Classification of recycled aggregates according to their physical and chemical properties (Agrela et al., 2021; de Brito et al., 2019)	19
Table 2.8	Literature pertaining to the mixed recycled aggregates (MRA) as per physicochemical properties suggested by Agrela et al. (2021)	20
Table 2.9	Geotechnical, physicochemical and geoenvironmental properties of MRA reported in the literature	22
Table 2.10	Compositional analysis for mixed recycled aggregate reported in the literature	23
Table 2.11	Summary of pH and LOI of MRA as reported in the literature	24
Table 2.12	Minerals from XRD analysis for MRA	25
Table 2.13	Summary of oxides obtained from ED-XRF for MRA	25
Table 2.14	Components of C&D waste reported in the literature based on ED-XRF studies	26
Table 2.15	Summary of TSS, SO ₄ ²⁻ and Cl ⁻ (%) for MRA	28
Table 2.16	Leaching test results reported for MRA at L/S=10, expressed in mg/kg	30
Table 2.17	Summary of geotechnical properties of MRA reported in the literature	32
Table 2.18	Shear strength parameters evaluated through the direct shear test (Vieira, 2020)	33

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 2.19	Compositional analysis for unprocessed C&D waste reported in the literature	34
Table 2.20	XRF of C&D waste reported in the literature	35
Table 2.21	XRD for C&D waste reported in the literature	37
Table 2.22	Concentration of SO_4^{2-} and Cl^- in unprocessed C&D waste (Kataguri et al., 2019)	38
Table 2.23	Geotechnical properties of unprocessed C&D waste	39
Table 2.24	Physicochemical properties of RA_S	40
Table 2.25	Source of heavy metals in C&D waste	41
Table 2.26	Abbreviations for the regulatory limits used in the present study	43
Table 2.27	Threshold limits through batch leaching adopted worldwide for assessing the reuse of C&D waste for offsite applications (mg/kg)	44
Table 2.28	Threshold limits for C&D waste reuse through column leaching adopted by various countries worldwide, expressed in mg/kg	48
Table 2.29	Limits for total heavy metals specified in various countries worldwide, expressed in mg/kg	49
Table 2.30	Additional specifications applied to regulatory limits for C&D waste reuse for offsite applications	51
Table 2.31	Total heavy metal limits defined for contaminated soil for reuse (mg/kg)	53
Table 2.32	Specifications for structural fill for MSE walls	56
Table 2.33	Specifications specified in international codes/guidelines for earthfill	57
Table 2.34	Summary of Indian codes for road embankment	57
Table 2.35	Summary of $\mu\text{S/GSY}$ reported in the literature for different geosynthetic reinforcements	58
Table 2.36	Classification into contamination classes based on calculated indices	61
Table 3.1	Information about the C&D waste recycling plants	66
Table 3.2	Material flow quantity in the wet processing (in t)	67
Table 3.3	Location for sample collection for the study	68

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 3.4	Number of samples collected from recycling plants and nearby areas	74
Table 3.5	Nomenclature for geosynthetic reinforcement	75
Table 3.6	Testing program for characterizing materials adopted	77
Table 3.7	Summary of the test program for (-20 mm) unprocessed C&D waste	78
Table 3.8	Summary of physicochemical testing	79
Table 3.9	Summary of geoenvironmental testing	80
Table 3.10	Summary of geotechnical testing	81
Table 3.11	Summary of pullout test program: Influence of normal stress	82
Table 3.12	Summary of pullout test program: Influence of compaction	83
Table 3.13	Standards/protocols adopted for carrying out laboratory experiments	84
Table 3.14	Constituents of recycled aggregate (EN 933-11 (2009))	85
Table 4.1	Compositional analysis of (-20 mm) unprocessed C&D waste on a visual basis	97
Table 5.1	Compositional analysis for SS_MRA (fraction between 4.75 mm and 2 mm)	100
Table 5.2	pH and electrical conductivity (EC) values of SS_MRA	102
Table 5.3	LOI of SS_MRA and reference material	103
Table 5.4	Chemical composition of SS_MRA and reference material by XRF analysis	107
Table 5.5	TSS, SO_4^{2-} and Cl^- in SS_MRA, reference material and comparison with inert waste (IW) and non-hazardous waste (NHW) (European Council Decision 2003/33/EC, 2003), expressed in mg/kg	111
Table 5.6	Leachable heavy metals in SS_MRA and reference material and comparison with IW limits (European Council Decision 2003/33/EC, 2003), expressed in $\mu g/kg$	112
Table 5.7	Concentration of total heavy metals (mg/kg) obtained from testing	117
Table 5.8	Contamination indices (C_f and I_{geo}) for SS_MRA	122

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 5.9	Contamination indices (mC _d and PLI) for SS_MRA and reference material	122
Table 5.10	Geotechnical properties of SS_MRA and reference material	126
Table 5.11	Shear strength parameters	142
Table 6.1	pH and electrical conductivity (EC) values of (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste and local soil (DS)	147
Table 6.2	Loss on Ignition of (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste and local soil (DS)	148
Table 6.3	ED-XRF of (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste and comparison with local soil (DS)	153
Table 6.4	Correlation coefficients of constituents of the (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste sample	155
Table 6.5	TSS, SO ₄ ²⁻ and Cl ⁻ in (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste and local soil and comparison with IW and NHW (European Council Decision 2003/33/EC, 2003) expressed in mg/kg	157
Table 6.6	Concentration of leachable heavy metals in (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste and local soil (DS) and comparison with IW limits expressed in µg/kg	159
Table 6.7	Total heavy metal analysis results for (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste and local soil (DS) (mg/kg)	161
Table 6.8	Geotechnical characteristics of (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste and local soil (DS)	168
Table 7.1	pH and electrical conductivity (EC) and loss on ignition (LOI) of RA_S and DS	176
Table 7.2	Major oxides from XRF for RA_S and local soil (DS)	179
Table 7.3	TSS, SO ₄ ²⁻ and Cl ⁻ in RA_S and local soil and comparison with IW and NHW, expressed in mg/kg	181
Table 7.4	Leachable heavy metals from RA_S and DS and comparison with regulatory limits for IW, expressed in µg/kg	182
Table 7.5	Contamination factor (C _f) for leachable heavy metals with respect to local soil and inert waste	182
Table 7.6	Total heavy metals from RA_S and local soil (mg/kg)	183
Table 7.7	Contamination indices (C _f and I _{geo}) for RA_S	187

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 7.8	Contamination indices (mC_d and PLI) for RA_S	187
Table 8.1	Comparison of properties of materials under study with standard specification specified in Indian code for use as a structural fill for MSE walls	192
Table 8.2	Assessment of factors influencing the suitability of SS_MRA for use in MSE walls	193
Table 9.1	Properties of geosynthetic reinforcements	197
Table 9.2	Pullout behaviour of GG-80 embedded in SS_MRA	204
Table 9.3	Data from pullout behaviour of GG-350 embedded in SS_MRA	204
Table 9.4	Literature pertaining to tension failure of uniaxial geogrid during pullout testing	205
Table 9.5	Data from pullout behaviour of PS-25 embedded in SS_MRA	210
Table 9.6	Data from pullout behaviour of PS-50 embedded in SS_MRA	210
Table 9.7	Data from pullout behaviour of GG-80 embedded in reference material	212
Table 9.8	Data from pullout behaviour of GG-350 embedded in reference material	213
Table 9.9	Data from pullout behaviour of PS-25 embedded in reference material	214
Table 9.10	Data from pullout behaviour of PS-50 embedded in reference material	215
Table 9.11	Calculated effective net stress at polymeric reinforcement level for polymeric strip due to constrained dilatancy	219
Table 10.1	Material parameters used in the design of MSE wall	236
Table 10.2	Design with geogrid	237
Table 10.3	Design with polymeric strips	238
Table 10.4	Cost of materials used in the present study	240
Table 11.1	Assessment of factors influencing the suitability of (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste for use in embankments	247
Table 11.2	Assessment of factors influencing the suitability of RA_S for use in embankments	248

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 2.1	Compositional analysis for C&D waste around the globe	14
Figure 3.1	Material flow at the plants	67
Figure 3.2	Sample collection from (a) plant P1; (b) plant P2, and (c) plant P3	69
Figure 3.3	Stockpile of unprocessed C&D waste at (a) Plant P1 and (b) Plant P2 (Google Earth)	70
Figure 3.4	(a) Stockpile of unprocessed C&D waste at a plant; (b) Sampling of unprocessed C&D waste at plant P1; (c) Sampling of unprocessed C&D waste at plant P2	70
Figure 3.5	Sampling procedure for obtaining different fractions of unprocessed C& waste	71
Figure 3.6	(a) Screening through 20 mm sieve to obtain (-20 mm) unprocessed C&D waste at the plant; (b) screened sample of (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste	72
Figure 3.7	Samples of RA_S from (a) filter press and (b) sedimentation tank	72
Figure 3.8	Photographs of (a) GG-80; (b) GG-350; (c) Polymeric strip (d) cross sectional view of PS-25 at X-X; and (e) cross sectional view of PS-50 at X-X	75
Figure 3.9	Photograph of the pullout box used in the study	91
Figure 3.10	Schematic presentation of pullout machine	92
Figure 3.11	Position of geogrid in the pullout test box	93
Figure 3.12	Position of two parallel polymeric strips in the pullout test box	93
Figure 4.1	Constituents of a representative sample of (-20 mm) unprocessed C&D waste (a) R _c : concrete, (b) R _u : unbound aggregates, (c) R _b : brick and (d) fraction below 4.75 mm	97
Figure 4.2	Grain size distribution of (-20 mm) unprocessed C&D waste of ten representative samples in two recycling plants	98
Figure 5.1	Comparison of constituents in MRA reported in the literature with the present study	101
Figure 5.2	Comparison of LOI results of SS_MRA with the values reported in the literature for MRA and regulatory limits specified for structural fill for MSE walls	104

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 5.3	XRD patterns for SS_MRA and reference material (BS and YS)	106
Figure 5.4	Comparison of major oxides (wt. %) obtained from ED-XRF analysis with values reported in the literature on MRA and components of C&D waste	109
Figure 5.5	Comparative assessment of leaching parameters for SS_MRA, reference material, compiled literature, and the regulatory limits for C&D waste	116
Figure 5.6	Comparison of concentration of total heavy metals from the study to the regulatory limits defined for C&D waste and contaminated soil	120
Figure 5.7	Grain size distribution of the materials considered in the study	123
Figure 5.8	Grain size distribution of SS_MRA and the values reported in the literature	124
Figure 5.9	Comparison of specific gravity (G_s) of SS_MRA, reference materials and the values reported in the literature	125
Figure 5.10	Compaction curve for SS_MRA	127
Figure 5.11	Comparison of compaction characteristics with the values reported in the literature	128
Figure 5.12	Axial strain v/s square root time history plot	130
Figure 5.13	Oedometeric compression test result showing e - $\log \sigma_n$ plot	131
Figure 5.14	Shear stress and volume change behaviour with horizontal displacement of the materials considered in the present study for the dry sample in direct shear testing at $Dr = 80\%$ (dense condition)	133
Figure 5.15	Shear stress and volume change behaviour with horizontal displacement of the materials considered in the present study for the dry sample in direct shear testing at $Dr = 40\%$ (loose condition)	135
Figure 5.16	Strength envelopes under dry conditions in direct shear testing at $Dr = 80\%$ (dense condition)	136
Figure 5.17	Strength envelopes under dry conditions in direct shear testing at $Dr = 40\%$ (loose condition)	13;7
Figure 5.18	Deviatoric stress and volumetric strain with axial strain of the materials considered in the present study for the saturated sample in consolidated drained triaxial test in dense condition	140

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 5.19	p-q plot of the consolidated drained triaxial tests	141
Figure 6.1	Comparison of LOI results of (-4.75 mm) C&D waste with local soil, the values reported in the literature and regulatory limits specified for embankments.	149
Figure 6.2	XRD patterns for (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste and local soil (DS)	152
Figure 6.3	Comparison of major oxides (wt. %) obtained from ED-XRF with values reported in the literature	154
Figure 6.4	Correlation between CaO and LOI results and values reported in the literature	155
Figure 6.5	Graphical representation of contamination factor (C _f) of (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste with respect to local soil and inert waste	160
Figure 6.6	Comparison of total heavy metals from the study with the regulatory limits specified for contaminated soil	164
Figure 6.7	C _f and I _{geo} of total heavy metals for (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste sample for both the plants	165
Figure 6.8	mCd and PLI of two plants based on various sampling locations	166
Figure 6.9	Grain size distribution of all the samples of (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste	167
Figure 6.10	Compaction behaviour of (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste and local soil	169
Figure 6.11	Oedometeric compression test results showing axial strain vs time history plot	170
Figure 6.12	Oedometeric compression test result showing e-logσ _n plot	170
Figure 6.13	(a) Shear stress, and (b) volumetric change with respect to horizontal displacement for (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste; (c) Shear stress, and (d) volumetric change with respect to horizontal displacement for DS	172
Figure 6.14	Mohr-Coulomb strength envelop for (-4.75 mm) unprocessed C&D waste and DS	172
Figure 7.1	Grain size distribution of RA_S and local soil (DS)	175

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 7.2	Comparison of LOI results of RA_S with the values reported in the literature for RA_S and regulatory limits specified for embankments	177
Figure 7.3	XRD patterns for RA_S and local soil	178
Figure 7.4	Comparison of SiO ₂ , Al ₂ O ₃ , CaO and LOI obtained from ED-XRF with values of SS_MRA and the values reported in the literature	180
Figure 7.5	Comparison of total heavy metals (As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Ni, Pb and Zn) from RA_S and DS with international regulatory standards for contaminated soil.	186
Figure 8.1	Comparison of the grain size distribution of SS_MRA with the recommendation of IRC SP 102 (2014) and BS 8006 (2010)	191
Figure 9.1	Typical pullout load response of clamp alone; clamp and geosynthetic reinforcement embedded in structural fill	199
Figure 9.2	Pullout load v/s horizontal displacement plots for clamp without geosynthetic reinforcement embedded in SS_MRA for dense and loose condition	200
Figure 9.3	Pullout resistance v/s horizontal displacement plots for geogrid of T _{ult} = 80 kN/m (GG-80) embedded in SS_MRA for dense and loose condition	202
Figure 9.4	Pullout resistance v/s horizontal displacement plots for geogrid of T _{ult} = 350 kN/m (GG-350) embedded in SS_MRA for dense and loose condition	203
Figure 9.5	Pullout resistance v/s horizontal displacement plots for polymeric strip of T _{ult} = 25 kN (PS-25) embedded in SS_MRA for dense and loose condition	207
Figure 9.6	Pullout resistance v/s horizontal displacement plots for polymeric strip of T _{ult} = 50 kN (PS-50) embedded in SS_MRA for dense and loose condition	208
Figure 9.7	Pullout resistance v/s horizontal displacement plots for geogrid of T _{ult} = 80 kN /m (GG-80) embedded in the reference material (BS and YS) for dense and loose condition	211
Figure 9.8	Pullout resistance v/s horizontal displacement plots for geogrid of T _{ult} = 350 kN /m (GG-350) embedded in the reference material (BS and YS) for dense and loose condition	212
Figure 9.9	Pullout resistance v/s horizontal displacement plots for polymeric strip of T _{ult} = 25 kN (PS-25) embedded in the reference material (BS and YS) for dense and loose conditions	214

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 9.10	Pullout resistance v/s horizontal displacement plots for polymeric strip of $T_{ult} = 50$ kN (PS-50) embedded in the reference material (BS and YS) for dense and loose condition	215
Figure 9.11	% Increment of effective confining stress due to constrained dilatancy at different confining pressures for fill materials considered in the present study	220
Figure 9.12	Peak interface apparent friction coefficient ($\mu_{S/GSY}$) and $\tan \phi$ for SS_MRA at different normal stress for dense condition	224
Figure 9.13	Peak interface apparent friction coefficient ($\mu_{S/GSY}$) and $\tan \phi$ for SS_MRA at different normal stress for loose condition	225
Figure 9.14	Comparison of peak interface apparent friction coefficient ($\mu_{S/GSY}$) for different soil reinforcements embedded in SS_MRA and the reference material (BS and YS) at different confining stress for dense and loose condition	226
Figure 9.15	Comparison of $\mu_{S/GSY}$ for geogrids (GG-80 and GG-350) embedded in SS_MRA with the values reported in the literature	227
Figure 9.16	Comparison of $\mu_{S/GSY}$ for polymeric strips (PS-25 and PS-50) embedded in SS_MRA with the values reported in the literature	227
Figure 9.17	Normalised pullout curves (P_R/σ'_v) for different materials under the dense and loose condition	229
Figure 9.18	% reduction of peak pullout resistance (P_R) with respect to dense condition for different types of fill materials	230
Figure 10.1	Typical cross section of MSE wall	235
Figure 10.2	Cost Analysis for different heights of MSE walls in which structural backfills are transported from different hauling distances and the design is carried out for different seismic zones and with different geosynthetic reinforcement	242
Figure 10.3	Comparison of cost of construction of MSE wall when YS is available within 5 km of the construction site and SS_MRA is transported from 5 km, 10 km, 20 km and 50 km for geogrids (GG) and polymeric strips (PS)	243

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AASHTO	:	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
APHA	:	American Public Health Association
ASTM	:	American Society of Testing and Materials
BDL	:	Below Detection Limit
BMTPC	:	Building Material and Technology Promotion Council
BS	:	Badarpur Sand
C&D	:	Construction & Demolition
CBR	:	California Bearing Ratio
CC	:	Consolidation Characteristics
CCA	:	Chromated Cooper Arsenate
CD	:	Consolidated Drained Triaxial Test
CFM	:	Conventional Fill Material
CMD	:	Cross Machine Direction
CoV	:	Coefficient of Variation
DC	:	Degree of Compaction
DI	:	Deionised Water
DOC	:	Dissolved Organic Carbon
DOT	:	Department of Transportation
DS	:	Delhi Silt
DST	:	Direct Shear Test
EC	:	Electrical Conductivity
ECDGE	:	European Commission Director General Environment
ED-XRF	:	Energy Dispersive X-Ray Fluorescence
EU	:	European Union
FDOT	:	Florida Department of Transportation
FHWA	:	Federal Highway Administration
GG	:	Geogrid
GSD	:	Grain Size Distribution
HW	:	Hazardous Waste
HDPE	:	High-Density Polyethylene
IW	:	Inert Waste
ICP-MS	:	Inductive Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry
IDOT	:	Illinois Department of Transportation
INDOT	:	Indiana Department of Transportation
IRC	:	Indian Road Congress
IS	:	Indian Standards
LaDOT	:	Louisiana Department of Transportation
LA	:	Los Angeles value
LL	:	Liquid Limit
LLDPE	:	Linear Low-Density Polyethylene
LOI	:	Loss on Ignition

LVDT	: Linear Variable Differential Transducers
MD	: Machine Direction
MDD	: Maximum Dry Density
MDOT	: Michigan Department of Transportation
MODOT	: Missouri Department of Transportation
MoRTH	: Ministry of Road Transport and Highways
MNDOT	: Minnesota Department of Transportation
MP	: Modified Proctor
MRA	: Mixed Recycled Aggregate
MSDOT	: Mississippi Department of Transportation
MSE	: Mechanically Stabilized Earth
NCDOT	: North Carolina Department of Transportation
NHW	: Non-Hazardous Waste
NJDOT	: New Jersey Department of Transportation
NP	: Non-Plastic
NR	: Not Reported
NVDOT	: Nevada Department of Transportation
ODOT	: Oregon Department of Transportation
OMC	: Optimum Moisture Content
PCB	: Polychlorinated Biphenyls
PET	: Polyethylene Terephthalate
PI	: Plasticity Index
PLI	: Pollution Load Index
PS	: Polymeric Strips
RA	: Recycled Aggregate
RAP	: Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement
RA_S	: Recycled Aggregate Sludge
RCA	: Recycled Concrete Aggregate
RMA	: Recycled Masonry Aggregate
RIDOT	: Rhode Islands Department of Transportation
RMA	: Recycled Masonry Aggregate
SDOT	: Seattle Department of Transportation
SP	: Standard Proctor
SS_MRA	: Sand-Sized Mixed Recycled Aggregate
SS	: Shear Strength
SSD	: Saturated Surface Density
TDS	: Total Dissolved Salts
TOC	: Total Organic Carbon
TNDOT	: Tennessee Department of Transportation
TSS	: Total Soluble Solids
UHMI	: Ultra-High Matrix Introduction
USCS	: Unified Soil Classification System
XRD	: X-Ray Diffraction

WA : Water Absorption
WV DOT : West Virginia Department of Transportation
YS : Yamuna Sand
ZAV : Zero Air Void

LIST OF ANNOTATIONS

Al	: Aluminium
Al₂O₃	: Aluminium oxide
Ag	: Silver
As	: Arsenic
Ba	: Barium
Be	: Beryllium
C	: Cost of the MSE wall
CaCO₃	: Calcite
CaO	: Calcium oxide
C_c	: Compression index
C_s	: Swell index
Cd	: Cadmium
C_f	: Contamination factor
Cl⁻	: Water-soluble chlorides
Co	: Cobalt
Comp.	: Composition
Cr (VI)	: Hexavalent chromium
Cr	: Chromium
Cr₂O₃	: Chromium (III) oxide
Cu	: Copper
d	: Rate of transportation of fill material
D_{max}	: Maximum particle size
D_r	: Relative density
d_{t1}	: Transportation cost for an initial 5 km
d_{t2}	: Transportation cost per km beyond 5 km to 10 km
d_{t3}	: Transportation cost per km beyond 10 km to 20 km
d_{t4}	: Transportation cost per km beyond 20 km
e	: Voids ratio
e_{max}	: Maximum void ratio
e_{min}	: Minimum void ratio
F	: Fluoride
Fe₂O₃	: Ferric oxide
G_s	: Specific gravity
H	: Height of wall
Hg	: Mercury
I_{geo}	: Geoaccumulation index
k	: Permeability
K₂O	: Potassium oxide
L	: Total length of reinforcement
L_e	: Effective length/length of the reinforcement in the resistant zone/ embedment length
L_R	: Rankine length
L/S	: Liquid to Solid ratio
mC_d	: Modified degree of contamination
MgO	: Magnesium oxide
Mo	: Molybdenum
Mn	: Manganese
MnO	: Manganese oxide

Mt	: Million tonnes
n	: Number of layers of reinforcement
Na	: Sodium
Na₂O	: Sodium oxide
Ni	: Nickel
P₂O₅	: Phosphorus pentoxide
Pb	: Lead
P_R	: Peak pullout resistance
PTFE	: Polytetrafluoroethylene
R	: Cost of the fill material
r	: Cost of reinforcing element
R_b	: Bricks
Rep.	: Reported
R_c	: Concrete
R_u	: Unbound aggregate
R_a	: Asphalt
r_{GG}	: Rate for GG
r_{PS}	: Rate for PS
R_{SS_MRA}	: Cost for SS_MRA
R_{YS}	: Cost for YS
Sb	: Antimony
Se	: Selenium
SiO₂	: Silicon dioxide
Sn	: Tin
SO₃	: Sulphur trioxide
SO₄²⁻	: Water-soluble sulphates
S_v	: Vertical spacing of reinforcement
SrO	: Strontium oxide
t	: tonnes
T_{allow}	: Allowable tensile strength
Ti	: Titanium
TiO₂	: Titanium oxide
T_{ult}	: Ultimate tensile strength
V	: Vanadium
Vol.	: Volume
X	: Others
Zn	: Zinc
ZnO	: Zinc oxide
γ_{dmax}	: Maximum dry density
#N	: Number of samples
α_h	: Horizontal acceleration
γ_{dmin}	: Minimum dry density
φ_p	: Peak angle of shearing resistance
ε_v	: Volumetric strain
φ_r	: Residual angle of shearing resistance
Δσ_n	: Net effective stress
v	: Poisson's ratio of sand
k_o	: Coefficient of lateral earth pressure at rest
τ	: Maximum shear stress
ψ	: Dilation angle

f_b	: Bond coefficient/interaction coefficient
$\mu_{S/GSY}$: Soil-geosynthetic interface apparent coefficient of friction
RF_{ID}	: Reduction factor for installation damage
RF_{CR}	: Reduction factor for creep
RF_D	: Reduction factor for degradation
T_{allow}	: Allowable tensile strength