

# List of Figures

---

Figure 1.1.	Buried protective structure. . . . .	6
Figure 1.2.	Stress attenuation from a 454 kg charge of TNT in three different backfill materials. . . . .	7
Figure 2.1.	DHT test device . . . . .	54
Figure 2.2.	DHT and SECO ram loader . . . . .	55
Figure 2.3.	PPUX test device . . . . .	56
Figure 2.4.	HPTX test device . . . . .	57
Figure 2.5.	WES 6-kbar test device . . . . .	58
Figure 2.6.	WES 10-kbar test device . . . . .	59
Figure 2.7.	9 MN dynamic loader and 1 GPa pressure vessel . . . . .	60
Figure 2.8.	Changes in material grading due to triaxial compression testing (from Vesic and Barksdale 1963) . . . . .	61
Figure 2.9.	Comparison of posttest gradings from hydrostatic and triaxial compression tests (from Vesic and Barksdale 1963) . . . . .	62
Figure 2.10	Constrained modulus versus vertical stress for four sands (from Hendron 1963) . . . . .	63
Figure 2.11.	Energy absorption during the first cycle of loading as a function of relative density (after Hendron 1963) . . . . .	64
Figure 2.12.	Variation in vertical stress versus void ratio during uniaxial strain loading (from Hendron 1963) . . . . .	65
Figure 2.13.	Volumetric strain at failure versus octahedral normal stress (from Clough 1964) . . . . .	66
Figure 2.14.	Changes in grading at various confining pressures (from Clough 1964) . . . . .	67
Figure 2.15.	Failure envelopes for various soils (from Bishop 1965a) . . . . .	68
Figure 2.16.	Changes in grading during drained triaxial compression tests (from Lee and Seed 1966) . . . . .	69
Figure 2.17.	Strength components for drained triaxial compression tests on sand (from Lee and Seed 1966) . . . . .	70
Figure 2.18.	Summary of strength parameters (from Banks and MacIver 1969) . . . . .	71
Figure 2.19.	Effect of maximum particle size on angle of internal friction (from Marachi, et al. 1969) . . . . .	72

Figure 2.20.	Effect of confining pressure on angle of internal friction (from Marachi, et al. 1969) . . . . .	73
Figure 2.21	Particle breakage factor versus confining pressure (from Marachi, et al. 1969) . . . . .	74
Figure 2.22	Angle of internal friction versus particle breakage factor (from Marachi, et al. 1969) . . . . .	75
Figure 2.23.	Critical stress states for densest packing of elastic-brittle spheres (from Leussink and Brauns 1969) . . . . .	76
Figure 2.24	Failure strains versus mean normal stress for Ottawa sand (from Tai 1970) . . . .	77
Figure 2.25	Failure strains versus mean normal stress for Chattahoochee River sand (from Tai 1970) . . . . .	78
Figure 2.26.	Secant friction angle versus mean normal stress for Chattahoochee River sand (from Tai 1970) . . . . .	79
Figure 2.27.	Secant friction angle versus mean normal stress for Ottawa sand (from Tai 1970) . . . . .	80
Figure 2.28.	Components of shearing resistance for hard minerals (from Murphy 1970) . . . .	81
Figure 2.29.	Components of shearing resistance for soft minerals (from Murphy 1970) . . . .	82
Figure 2.30.	Strength versus hardness relationship (from Murphy 1970) . . . . .	83
Figure 2.31.	Secant friction angle versus mean normal stress (from Murphy 1970) . . . . .	84
Figure 2.32.	Relationship between dilatancy rate and confining pressure (from Lo and Roy 1973) . . . . .	85
Figure 2.33.	Beach sand grading curves . . . . .	86
Figure 2.34.	Beach sand UX stress-strain curves at four loading rates . . . . .	87
Figure 2.35.	Beach sand static and dynamic UX stress-strain curves . . . . .	88
Figure 2.36.	Grading curves for Sands A-D . . . . .	89
Figure 2.37.	Failure envelopes for Sands A-D . . . . .	90
Figure 2.38.	$K_0$ stress paths for Sands A-D . . . . .	91
Figure 2.39.	$K_0$ stress-strain curves for Sands A-D . . . . .	92
Figure 2.40.	Drained pressure-volume response for Salem limestone (from Chitty and Blouin 1993) . . . . .	93
Figure 2.41.	Drained $K_0$ stress-strain response for Salem limestone (from Chitty and Blouin 1993) . . . . .	94
Figure 2.42.	Drained $K_0$ stress-path response for Salem limestone (from Chitty and Blouin 1993) . . . . .	95
Figure 2.43.	Stress-strain responses from drained Salem limestone TX tests (from Chitty and Blouin 1993) . . . . .	96
Figure 2.44.	Volume strains during shear from drained Salem limestone TX tests (from Chitty and Blouin 1993) . . . . .	97
Figure 2.45.	Pressure-volume responses from drained Salem limestone TX tests (from Chitty and Blouin 1993) . . . . .	98
Figure 2.46.	Failure envelope generated from drained Salem limestone TX data (from Chitty and Blouin 1993) . . . . .	99

Figure 2.47.	Stress paths from an undrained Salem limestone $K_0$ test (from Chitty and Blouin 1993) . . . . .	100
Figure 2.48.	Stress-strain curves from undrained Salem limestone TX tests (from Chitty and Blouin 1993) . . . . .	101
Figure 2.49.	Effective stress paths from undrained Salem limestone TX tests (from Chitty and Blouin 1993) . . . . .	102
Figure 3.1.	Pressure versus volumetric strain response of water . . . . .	124
Figure 3.2.	Pressure-volume response of partially-saturated material . . . . .	125
Figure 3.3.	Pressure versus volumetric strain response of carbonate . . . . .	126
Figure 3.4.	Nonlinear-hysteretic model . . . . .	127
Figure 4.1.	Cap model yield surfaces . . . . .	148
Figure 4.2.	Simulated hydrostatic loading stress-strain response . . . . .	149
Figure 4.3.	Simulated triaxial compression stress-strain response . . . . .	150
Figure 4.4.	Simulated stress-strain response of constant mean normal stress tests . . . . .	151
Figure 4.5.	Stress-strain response of simulated UX test . . . . .	152
Figure 4.6.	Stress path from simulated UX test . . . . .	153
Figure 4.7.	Stress-strain response of simulated UX/BX test . . . . .	154
Figure 4.8.	Stress path from simulated UX/BX test . . . . .	155
Figure 5.1.	Mesh geometry for Verification Problem 5 . . . . .	162
Figure 5.2.	Pore pressure versus depth at two time increments . . . . .	163
Figure 5.3.	Displacement versus time for one-dimensional consolidation of an idealized elastic material . . . . .	164
Figure 5.4.	Mesh geometry for Axisymmetric Consolidation Problem . . . . .	165
Figure 5.5.	Displacement vs Time from 2D Consolidation Problem . . . . .	166
Figure 5.6.	Mesh geometry for Cryer Problem . . . . .	167
Figure 5.7.	Dimensionless pore pressure response for Cryer's problem . . . . .	168
Figure 5.8.	Dimensionless displacement response for Cryer's problem . . . . .	169
Figure 5.9.	Pore pressure contours for Cryer Problem . . . . .	170
Figure 6.1.	Drained $K_0$ stress-strain comparison . . . . .	186
Figure 6.2.	Drained $K_0$ stress path comparison . . . . .	187
Figure 6.3.	Drained $K_0$ pressure-volume comparison . . . . .	188
Figure 6.4.	Drained hydrostatic load-unload comparison . . . . .	189
Figure 6.5.	Drained TXC stress-strain comparison at 100 MPa confining pressure . . . . .	190
Figure 6.6.	Drained TXC stress-strain comparison at 400 MPa confining pressure . . . . .	191
Figure 6.7.	Undrained $K_0$ stress-strain comparison . . . . .	192
Figure 6.8.	Undrained $K_0$ stress path comparison . . . . .	193
Figure 6.9.	Stresses in a simulated undrained $K_0$ test . . . . .	194
Figure 6.10.	Total and effective stress paths from TXC and CP tests . . . . .	195
Figure 6.11.	Effective stress paths from tests with different back pressures . . . . .	196
Figure 6.12.	Pressure-volume results from five HC simulations . . . . .	197
Figure 6.13.	Effective pressure-volume results from five HC simulations . . . . .	198
Figure 6.14.	Pressure-volume results from HC simulation at 1% air porosity . . . . .	199
Figure 6.15.	Stress-strain results from $K_0$ simulation at 2% air porosity . . . . .	200

Figure 6.16.	Stress paths from Ko simulations at 2% air porosity .....	201
Figure 6.17.	Stress-strain results from five Ko simulations .....	202
Figure 6.18.	Effective stress-strain results from five Ko simulations .....	203
Figure 6.19.	Total stress paths from five Ko simulations .....	204
Figure 6.20.	Effective stress paths from five Ko simulations .....	205
Figure 6.21.	Stress-strain results from five Ko/BX simulations .....	206
Figure 6.22.	Stress paths from Ko/BX simulation at 1% air porosity .....	207
Figure 6.23.	Total stress paths from five Ko/BX simulations .....	208
Figure 6.24.	Effective stress paths from five Ko/BX simulations .....	209
Figure 6.25.	Total stress paths from five TXC simulations: confining pressure = 150 MPa .....	210
Figure 6.26.	Total stress paths from five TXC simulations: confining pressure = 250 MPa .....	211
Figure 6.27.	Total stress paths from five TXC simulations: confining pressure = 350 MPa .....	212
Figure 6.28.	Effective stress paths from five TXC simulations: confining pressure = 150 MPa .....	213
Figure 6.29.	Effective stress paths from five TXC simulations: confining pressure = 250 MPa .....	214
Figure 6.30.	Effective stress paths from five TXC simulations: confining pressure = 350 MPa .....	215
Figure 6.31.	Effective stress paths from fifteen TXC simulations .....	216
Figure 6.32.	Stress-strain results from five TXC simulations: confining pressure = 150 MPa .....	217
Figure 6.33.	Stress-strain results from five TXC simulations: confining pressure = 250 MPa .....	218
Figure 6.34.	Stress-strain results from five TXC simulations: confining pressure = 350 MPa .....	219
Figure 6.35.	Undrained failure surfaces at five values of air porosity .....	220
Figure 6.36.	Pressure-volume results from HC and TXC simulations .....	221
Figure 6.37.	Finite element grid for specimen simulation .....	222
Figure 6.38.	Contour plots of $\sqrt{J_2D}$ and plastic volume strain for a drained TXC test .....	223
Figure 6.39.	Contour plots of axial and radial strain for a drained TXC test .....	224
Figure 6.40.	Contour plots of stress and volume strain. ....	225
Figure 6.41.	Contour plots of axial and radial strain. ....	226
Figure F.1.	Geometry and loading conditions for Verification Problem 1 .....	276
Figure F.2.	Geometry and loading conditions for Verification Problem 2 .....	277
Figure F.3.	Geometry for Verification Problem 3 .....	278
Figure F.4.	Geometry for Verification Problem 4 .....	279