



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

***CHARACTERIZATION OF DUMPING SOIL AND
SETTLEMENT PREDICTION USING MONTE
CARLO APPROACH***

NUR IRFAH MOHD PAUZI

FK 2013 129

**CHARACTERIZATION OF DUMPING SOIL AND
SETTLEMENT PREDICTION USING MONTE
CARLO APPROACH**

NUR IRFAH MOHD PAUZI

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

2013

**CHARACTERIZATION OF DUMPING SOIL AND SETTLEMENT
PREDICTION USING MONTE CARLO APPROACH**

By

NUR IRFAH BINTI MOHD PAUZI

**Thesis Submitted in Fulfillment of the Requirement for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School
Universiti Putra Malaysia**

April 2013

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

**CHARACTERIZATION OF DUMPING SOIL AND SETTLEMENT
PREDICTION USING MONTE CARLO APPROACH**

By

NUR IRFAH BINTI MOHD PAUZI

APRIL 2013

Chairman : Professor Husaini Omar, Ph.D.

Faculty : Engineering

Failures at the dumping sites are usually associated with settlement. Differential settlements of dumping soil cause leaking of methane gas to the air and infiltration of leachate to the river which are dangerous to human and environment. Settlement of dumping soil occurs for many years due to biodegradation process and creep. The behaviors of dumping soil are to be investigated and characterized so that the settlement could be predicted using Monte Carlo approaches. Dumping soil contains heterogeneous material such as concrete debris, decayed wood, clay, silt, sand and gravel. Dumping soil are characterize based on its characteristics such as Category I: soil like and non soil like, Category II: waste types and Category III: waste or soil. The importance of dumping soil characterization are that it helps the engineer to differentiate between soil and non soil like, the types of waste and to determine whether the soil mostly contains waste or soil. Settlement of dumping soil is very challenging to be evaluated and modeled since the settlement are non-uniform due to the different content of the soil. Waste materials were decomposed by the bacteria biodegrades the organic content in the waste would cause settlement. The settlement rate is assumed to be the amount of subsidence that is directly proportional to the amount of solids solubilized. Five settlement models used to calculate the settlement of dumping soil at Kuala Lumpur open dumping area were reviewed. These models are soil mechanics

based model, Bjarngard and Edgers model, Power Creep function, hyperbolic function and rheological function. These five models are simulated using Monte Carlo approaches. Monte Carlo simulation is a method employed an algorithm that must be used with repeated random sampling of uncertainty for ca. 50-5000 number of iterations in order to obtain the parameters such as primary compression ratio (C_c^*), secondary compression ratio (C_α), compressive stress ($\Delta\sigma$) and ultimate settlement (S_{ult}) of the soil at the dumping area. It is predicted that the final settlement of dumping soil can settled up to 20% to 30% of initial fill height. The expected outcome of the research is settlement prediction model of closed dumping area for post-development using Monte Carlo simulation. The predicted settlement by Monte Carlo simulation method could save time and cost. It could also be used by geotechnical engineers to determine the preliminary settlement. Moreover, it gives preliminary total settlement value for the design engineer and decision maker to decide on the remedial works and the depth of foundation level for post-development.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**KRITERIA TANAH SISA DAN RAMALAN MENDAPAN TANAH
MENGUNAKAN KAEDAH MONTE CARLO**

Oleh

NUR IRFAH BINTI MOHD PAUZI

APRIL 2013

Pengerusi : Professor Husaini Omar, Ph.D.

Fakulti : Kujuruteraan

Kegagalan yang berlaku di tempat pelupusan sisa selalunya dikaitkan dengan mendapan. Ketidakseimbangan mendapan tanah sisa boleh menyebabkan kebocoran gas methane dan bahan larut resap daripada sisa buangan ke udara dan air yang boleh mengancam nyawa manusia dan alam sekitar. Mendapan tanah sisa yang berlaku selama beberapa tahun adalah disebabkan oleh proses biodegradasi dan rayap. Tindak balas mendapan tanah sisa akan disiasat dan dikategorikan supaya mendapan tanah sisa dapat diramal dengan menggunakan kaedah Monte Carlo. Tanah sisa mengandungi bahan-bahan yang heterogenus seperti ketulan konkrit, kayu yang reput, tanah liat, tanah kelodak, batu dan pasir. Berdasarkan kajian, tanah sisa boleh dikategorikan kepada 3 kategori mengikut kriteria yang terdapat pada tanah sisa tersebut iaitu Kategori I: tanah dan bukan tanah, Kategori II: jenis sisa dan Kategori III: sisa atau tanah. Kepentingan untuk menentukan kriteria tanah sisa ini adalah kerana ia membantu jurutera untuk membezakan antara tanah atau bukan tanah, jenis sisa yang terdapat dalam kandungan tanah itu dan untuk menentukan bahawa tanah itu mengandungi paling banyak sisa atau tanah. Ia juga akan menjadikan satu ketentuan bahawa tanah tersebut adalah jenis tanah sisa dengan 3 jenis kategori tadi. Mendapan tanah sisa adalah paling mencabar untuk dinilai dan dimodel kerana mendapan tanah tersebut tidak sekata oleh kerana kandungan yang heterogenus di dalam tanah sisa itu. Tanah sisa akan

dibiokomposkan oleh bakteria dengan proses biodegradasi bahan organik di tanah sisa yang boleh menyebabkan berlakunya mendapan. Kadar mendapan tanah sisa adalah dianggarkan sama dengan kadar penurunan di mana ia berkadar terus dengan kandungan pepejal yang larut/terbiodegradasi. Terdapat lima jenis model mendapan tanah sisa yang telah dikenalpasti untuk mengira mendapan tanah sisa di kawasan pembuangan terbuka di Kuala Lumpur. Model-model tersebut adalah Model berdasarkan Mekanik Tanah, Model Bjarngard dan Edgers, Fungsi Kuasa Rayap, Fungsi Hiperbolik dan Fungsi Reologi. Kelima-lima model tersebut disimulasikan menggunakan kaedah simulasi Monte Carlo. Kaedah Monte Carlo yang menggunakan konsep algoritma diaplikasikan bersama sampel rawak yang berulang untuk menentukan parameter ketidakpastian pada 50-5000 nombor iterasi supaya parameter seperti nisbah kompresi primer (C_c^*), nisbah kompresi sekunder (C_α), tekanan kompresif ($\Delta\sigma$) dan mendapan tertinggi (S_{ult}) pada tanah sisa dapat ditentukan. Ianya diramalkan bahawa mendapan terakhir untuk tanah sisa boleh mencapai sehingga 20% ke 30% daripada tinggi tanah tambus yang asal. Hasil daripada penyelidikan ini adalah model ramalan mendapan tanah sisa untuk tapak pembuangan yang telah tutup supaya boleh digunakan untuk pembangunan yang baru dengan menggunakan kaedah simulasi Monte Carlo. Ramalan mendapan menggunakan kaedah simulasi Monte Carlo telah menjimatkan masa dan kos untuk menentukan mendapan tanah sisa di tapak pembuangan sisa terbuka. Ia juga boleh digunakan oleh jurutera geoteknik untuk menentukan mendapan awal. Disamping itu, ia juga memberikan nilai mendapan awal tanah untuk jurutera pereka dan pembuat keputusan dalam menentukan kerja-kerja pembaikan pulih yang boleh dilakukan sebelum pembangunan yang baru boleh dilaksanakan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, praise is due to Allah almighty with his compassion and mercifulness that allowing me to finish this PhD studies within the time frame given. I would like to acknowledge Universiti Tenaga Nasional for my scholarship (2010 -2013), which gave me the opportunity to obtain PhD in Geotechnical and Geological Engineering in UPM.

Special appreciation goes to my supervisory committee, Prof Dr Husaini Omar, Prof Dr Bujang Kim Huat, Dr Zainuddin Md Yusoff, and Dr Halina Misran for the supervisions and constant support. Their invaluable help of constructive comments and suggestions throughout the experimental and thesis works have contributed to the success of this research. Sincere big thanks to all my lecturers at UPM and my colleagues at Civil Engineering Department, UNITEN. Special thanks to all my friends in PhD/Master course at Faculty of Engineering for their kindness and moral support.

Last but not least, my deepest gratitude goes to my beloved parents, Mohd Pauzi Abdul Hamid, Dr Nik Nawal Nik Mohd Adeeb, and especially my husband, Mohd Shahril Mat Radhi and our daughter, Nurul Izzah Sofea for their endless love, prayers and encouragement. Thank you.

Nur Irfah Mohd Pauzi

I certify that an Examination Committee met on 1st April 2013 to conduct the final examination of Nur Irfah Mohd Pauzi on her thesis entitled “Characterization of Dumping Soil and Settlement Prediction using Monte Carlo Approach” in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the students be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy.

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Shattri Mansor, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Thamer Ahmed Mohamed, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Ratnasamy Muniandy, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Vernon Schaefer, PhD

Professor
College of Engineering,
Department of Civil, Construction and Environmental Engineering
Iowa State University of Science and Technology
United States of America
(External Examiner)

NORITAH OMAR, PhD.

Associate Professor and Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 19th September 2013

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Husaini Omar, PhD

Professor,
Faculty of Engineering,
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Bujang Kim Huat, PhD

Professor and Dean,
School of Graduate Studies,
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Zainuddin Mohd Yusof, PhD

Faculty of Engineering,
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Halina Misran, PhD

Mechanical Engineering Department,
University Tenaga Nasional
(Member)

NORITAH OMAR, PhD.

Associate Professor and Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 19th September 2013

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledge. I also declare that it has not been previously and is not concurrently, submitted for any other degree at Universiti Putra Malaysia or at any other institution.

NUR IRFAH MOHD PAUZI

Date: 19th September 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ABSTRAK	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
APPROVAL SHEETS	vii
DECLARATION	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xvii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxvi
 CHAPTER	
 1. INTRODUCTION	 1
1.1 General Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement	5
1.3 Research Aims and Objectives	7
1.4 Scope and Limitation	8
1.5 Significance of Study	9
1.6 Expected Outcome of the Research	10
1.7 Thesis Organization	10
 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	 13
2.1 Introduction	13
2.2 Composition of Dumping Soil	16
2.2.1 Composition of Dumping Soil in Malaysia	16
2.2.2 Composition of Dumping Soil in Asian Region	19
2.2.3 Composition of Dumping Soil in European and US	21
2.3 Comparison between Landfill and Open Dumping Method	24
2.4 Settlement Scenario at Landfill/Open Dumping Area	26
2.5 Dumping Soil Geotechnical Engineering Properties	30
2.6 Waste Classification System	31
2.7 Particle Size Distribution of Dumping Soil	34
2.8 Hydraulic Conductivity of Dumping Soil	36
2.9 Moisture Content	37
2.10 Compressibility	38

2.10.1	Primary Compression	40
2.10.2	Secondary Compression	41
2.10.3	Total Compression	42
2.11	Shear Strength of Dumping Soil	43
2.12	Settlement Model of Dumping Soil	46
2.12.1	Soil Mechanics Based Model	47
2.12.2	Empirical Model	49
2.12.3	Rheological Model	52
2.12.4	Settlement Model Incorporating Biodegradation	52
2.12.5	Constitutive Model for Long Term Prediction of MSW Settlement	57
2.12.6	Numerical Model for Settlement Prediction	59
2.12.7	Monitoring and Modelling of Long Term Settlement	60
2.12.8	Comparison of Settlement of Waste soil Model Between Landfill and Open Dumping Method	61
2.12.9	Future Trends of Settlement Prediction	63
2.13	Integrated of Electrical Resistivity Method and Borehole Logging for Determining the Heterogeneous Content of Dumping Soil	68
2.14	Summary of Key Issues	75
3.	METHODOLOGY	79
3.1	Introduction	79
3.2	Methodology of Research	79
3.3	Study Area	82
3.4	Site Investigation	84
3.4.1	Site Observation	88
3.4.2	Electrical Resistivity Method	94
3.5	Borehole Logging Method	96
3.6	Data Collection	97
3.7	Determination of Dumping Soil Characterizations	100
3.7.1	Category I and III: Determination of DS Composition	105
3.7.2	Category I and II: Determination of DS Specific Gravity	107
3.7.3	Category II: Determination of DS Chemical Composition	108
3.7.4	Category I: Determination of DS Compressibility	110
3.7.5	Category I and II: Determination of DS Shear Strength	111
3.7.6	Category I: Determination of DS Compaction	112
3.7.7	Category I: Determination of DS Unconsolidated Undrained Triaxial Test	115
3.8	Statistical Analysis of Settlement Model Parameters of DS	117
3.9	Determination of Settlement Prediction of Dumping Soil using Monte Carlo Simulation Approaches	118
3.9.1	Model Calibration of Monte Carlo Simulation	121

3.9.2 Model Parameters of Settlement Predictions of DS	125
3.10 Validation of Dumping Soil Settlement Prediction	130

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	131
4.1 Introduction	131
4.2 Soil Sub-Surface Profile at Sri Hartamas Dumping Area	131
4.2.1 Borehole Logging Analysis	132
4.2.1.1 Analysis of BH1	134
4.2.1.2 Analysis of BH2	134
4.2.1.3 Analysis of BH3	135
4.2.1.4 Analysis of BH4	135
4.2.1.5 Analysis of BH5	136
4.2.1.6 Discussion on Borehole Logging Interpretation	137
4.2.2 Electrical Resistivity 2D Imaging Analysis	139
4.2.2.1 Resistivity Analysis Line 1	139
4.2.2.2 Resistivity Analysis Line 2	142
4.2.2.3 Interpretive of Resistivity 2D image for Line 1 and Line 2	143
4.3 Integrated Approach of Determining Heterogeneous Layers of Dumping Area	145
4.4 Category I: Geotechnical Properties of Waste Soil	147
4.4.1 Category I and III: PSD Curve	148
4.4.2 Category I and II: Specific Gravity	152
4.4.3 Category II: Mineral Composition	154
4.4.4 Category I: Compressibility	174
4.4.5 Category I and II: Shear Strength	180
4.4.6 Category I: Compaction	188
4.4.7 Category I: Unconsolidated Undrained Triaxial Strength	191
4.4.8 Normalization of Geotechnical Parameters	200
4.5 Statistical Approach of Settlement Parameters	202
4.5.1 Scatterplot Analysis of Settlement and PSD curve	204
4.5.2 Scatterplot Analysis of Settlement and Shear Strength	205
4.5.3 Scatterplot Analysis of Settlement and Compaction	206
4.5.4 Scatterplot Analysis of Settlement and Triaxial Strength Parameters	207
4.5.5 Scatterplot Analysis of Settlement and Borehole	208
4.5.6 Scatterplot Analysis of Settlement and Electrical Resistivity Data	209
4.5.7 Scatterplot Analysis of Settlement and Specific Gravity	210
4.5.8 Scatterplot Analysis of Settlement and XRD	211
4.6 Statistical Modeling for Settlement of Dumping Soil	212
4.6.1 Soil Mechanics Based Model	213
4.6.2 Bjarngard and Edgers Model	218

4.6.3 Power Creep Function	225
4.6.4 Hyperbolic Function Model	231
4.6.5 Rheological Model	237
4.7 Probability of Dumping Soil Settlement by Monte Carlo Simulations Method	243
4.7.1 Settlement Prediction by Soil Mechanics Based Model	244
4.7.2 Settlement Prediction by Bjarngard and Edgers Model	252
4.7.3 Settlement Prediction by Power Creep Function	259
4.7.4 Settlement Prediction by Hyperbolic Function	265
4.7.5 Settlement Prediction by Rheological Model	272
4.8 Validation of Predicted Settlement by Monte Carlo Simulations	278
4.8.1 Monte Carlo Simulations and Excel Spreadsheet	279
4.8.2 Monte Carlo Simulation and Others Model for Prediction of waste settlement	281
4.9 Summary on Settlement Prediction by Monte Carlo Simulation	289
4.10 Characterization of Dumping Soil	292
4.11 Settlement Evaluation Statement and Risk Level	302
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	307
5.1 Conclusions	307
5.2 Major Findings	309
5.2.1 Characterization of Dumping Soil	309
5.2.2 Total Settlement of Dumping Soil	310
5.2.3 Settlement Prediction of Dumping Soil by Monte Carlo Simulation Method	312
5.3 Minor Findings	314
5.3.1 Statistical Approach in Determining Factors Influencing Settlement	314
5.3.2 Risk Level and Suggestion Work	315
5.4 Future Studies	316
REFERENCES	317
APPENDIX 1: SIEVE ANALYSIS TEST	324
APPENDIX 2: SPECIFIC GRAVITY	328
APPENDIX 3: CONSOLIDATION TEST	330
APPENDIX 4: DIRECT SHEAR TEST	334
APPENDIX 5: COMPACTION TEST	344
APPENDIX 6: TRIAXIAL TEST	347

APPENDIX 7: HAND AUGER METHOD AT BUKIT CHUPING	352
BIODATA OF STUDENTS	355
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	359



LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Types and number of disposal site in Malaysia	15
2.2 Average composition of weight percentage of components in MSW Generates by various sources in Kuala Lumpur	18
2.3 Waste composition from various Asian countries	21
2.4 Percentage of Five Major Components of MSW in various countries	21
2.5 Percentage of Five Major Components of MSW in UK, European Countries and United States of America	24
2.6 Description of class category	24
2.7 Waste Components for Classification	32
2.8 Classification system of dumping soil	34
2.9 Waste compression mechanisms and factors controlling magnitude of settlement	38
2.10 Secondary parameters for MSW materials	42
2.11 Measured shear strength parameters from Literature Review	44
2.12 Review of methods for measuring shear behavior of MSW	45
2.13 Comparison of Settlement of Waste Model for Landfill and Open Dumping	62
2.14 Settlement model and software for settlement prediction	65
2.15 Electrical resistivity range for different types of formation	71
3.1 Total numbers of samples for dumping soil characterizations from Dumping area Sri Hartamas and Bukit Chuping area	100
3.2 Classification of dumping soil	103
3.3 Monte Carlo simulations by Risk Amp software at N=50 number of iterations	120

3.4	Settlement value, mean and standard deviation of the calibration model	124
3.5	Comparison of Monte Carlo approach and Excel Spreadsheet	125
3.6	Monte Carlo parameters for Soil Mechanics Based Model	126
3.7	Monte Carlo parameters for Bjarngard and Edgers model	127
3.8	Monte Carlo parameters for Power Creep Function	128
3.9	Monte Carlo parameters for Hyperbolic Function Model	128
3.10	Monte Carlo parameters for Rheological Model	129
4.1	Borehole number, depth, SPT and standing water level	133
4.2	Electrical resistivity range for different types of formation	141
4.3	Sub-surface profiles of Line 1	141
4.4	Sub-surface profiles of Line 2	144
4.5	Grain size for different types of soil	148
4.6	Average soil composition of dumping soil and normal soil	148
4.7	Average Coefficient of uniformity and coefficient of curvature for dumping soil	150
4.8	Coefficient of uniformity and coefficient of curvature for normal soil	151
4.9	Composition of Dumping Soil in Sri Hartamas Dumping Area	152
4.10	Specific gravity data	153
4.11	General specific gravity of soils	154
4.12	Percent by weight of mineral composition in SHL 1 sample	160
4.13	Percent by weight of mineral composition in SHL 2 sample	163
4.14	Percent by weight of mineral composition in SHL 3 sample	166
4.15	Percent by weight of mineral composition in BK 1 sample	169
4.16	Percent by weight of mineral composition in BK 2 sample	172
4.17	Percent by weight of mineral composition in BK 3 sample	172
4.18	Compressibility of Dumping Soil at 0.03kN Loading	176
4.19	Compressibility of Dumping Soil at 0.05 kN Loading	176
4.20	Compressibility of Dumping Soil at 0.07 kN Loading	177
4.21	Compressibility of Dumping Soil at 0.09 kN Loading	177

4.22	Typical measurement of Shear Displacement, Normal Displacement and Proving Ring Dial of Dumping Soil	181
4.23	Shear Strength parameters for WS and NS	183
4.24	Deformation and Deviator Stress Data at $\sigma_3 = 40 \text{ kN/m}^2$	191
4.25	Deformation and Deviator Stress Data at $\sigma_3 = 60 \text{ kN/m}^2$	192
4.26	Deformation and Deviator Stress Data at $\sigma_3 = 80 \text{ kN/m}^2$	193
4.27	Deformation and Deviator Stress Data at $\sigma_3 = 100 \text{ kN/m}^2$	194
4.28	Triaxial Data on Minor Principal Stress, Maximum Deviator Stress and Maximum Deviator Stress and Major Principal Stress	195
4.29	The undrained strength parameters of dumping soil, normal soil, and fresh Landfill soil based on triaxial testing.	200
4.30	Normalization Data Analysis	201
4.31	Scatterplot Parameters Relating to Settlement	203
4.32	Statistical parameters for Soil Mechanics Based Model	216
4.33	Statistical parameters for Bjarngard and Edgers model	222
4.34	Statistical parameters for Power Creep Function	229
4.35	Statistical parameters for Hyperbolic Function Model	235
4.36	Statistical parameters for Rheological Model	240
4.37	Monte Carlo simulation of Soil Mechanics Based Model	245
4.38	Monte Carlo simulation of Bjarngard and Edgers model	253
4.39	Monte Carlo simulation of Power Creep function	260
4.40	Monte Carlo simulation of Hyperbolic function	266
4.41	Monte Carlo simulation of Rheological Model	273
4.42	Comparison of Monte Carlo simulation prediction and Excel Spreadsheet	279
4.43	Soil Engineering Parameters from Published Settlement Model	283

4.44	Monte Carlo simulation to determine total settlement of open dumping	285
4.45	Percentage difference between Monte Carlo simulation model and published settlement model	287
4.46	Category I: Non-Soil like Behavior	293
4.47	Category I: Soil Like Behavior	294
4.48	Category II: Waste Types	295
4.49	Category III: Soil or Waste Types	295
4.50	Category I: Soil like or non soil like of Sri Hartamas Dumping Soil	296
4.51	Category I: Soil like or non soil like of Sri Hartamas Dumping Soil	297
4.52	Category II: Waste Types of Sri Hartamas Dumping Soil	299
4.53	Category II: Waste Types of Sri Hartamas Dumping Soil	300
4.54	Category III: Soil or Waste Types of Sri Hartamas Soil and Bukit Chuping Soil	301
4.55	Settlement Evaluation Statement and Level of Risk	302
4.56	Suggestion work for Settlement of Dumping Soil	304
4.57	Total settlement and level of risk of open dumping area, Sri Hartamas, Kuala Lumpur by Statistical Method at N=16	305
4.58	Total settlement and level of risk of open dumping area, Sri Hartamas, Kuala Lumpur by Monte Carlo Simulation at N=50	306

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 The illegal dumping of waste which was left lying in Jalan Besar Medan Medan Selera Bendahara, Batu Caves	14
2.2 Construction wastes are the main component in the illegal dumping waste	19
2.3 Composition of UK MSW (1935-2000)	
2.4 Settlement on the pavement surface at the parking lot of Tampa, Florida USA	27
2.5 No settlement or sign of distress on the garden of the reused landfill, City of Tampa, Florida, USA	27
2.6 Erosion and settlement clearance at Hanes Mill, Landfill, USA	28
2.7 Settlement of man-made landfill in 1986 due to earthquake at Marina, USA	29
2.8 Settlement of man-made landfill in 1986 due to earthquake at Marina, USA	30
2.9 Typical gradation curve for shredded municipal solid waste	35
2.10 Electrical resistivity method used to detect contaminated plume in a dumping soil (a) 2D electrical mapping which was accumulated for 5 years in Pera Galini, Greece (b) 2D electrical mapping which was accumulated for 8 years in Pera Galini, Greece	74
3.1 Methodology of the Research	80
3.2 Waste disposal area in Peninsular Malaysia	83
3.3 Site location of Sri Hartamas open dumping area	85
3.4 Topography of the Study Area	86
3.5 Study area (a) hydrogeological map and (b) location in Peninsular Malaysia Map	87
3.6 Location of collected samples at Bukit Chuping, Perlis	88
3.7 Layout plan and the locations of leachate and water ponding of open dumping of Kuala Lumpur area	90
3.8 Cavity area at the cut slopes beside the landfill area (a) Cavity area from a distance (b) Closed view of cavity area (c) Cavity area has been	91

filled with wood from construction materials and (d) No groundwater is observed inside the cavity.

3.9	Cloudy water at the dumping area (a) The location of the cloudy water, (b) Cloudy water leaking from under surface, (c) Contaminated water	92
3.10	Excavated area, (a) excavated area located on the left of the dumping site from the entrance, (b) the excavated area filled with water, (c) and (d) closed view of excavated area	93
3.11	Layout plan and electrical resistivity Line 1 and Line 2	95
3.12	Site Investigation Plan Map in open dumping Sri Hartamas, KL, Malaysia	97
3.13	Location of the collected sample with the sampling grid at open dumping Sri Hartamas, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	99
3.14	Grid point method of sampling for Sample Location 1	99
3.15	Dumping Soil (Sri Hartamas, Dumping Area, Kuala Lumpur)	102
3.16	Normal Soil Sample (Bukit Chuping, Not Dumping area, Perlis)	102
3.17	Gold coated soil samples	109
3.18	Procedure of chemical composition determination using SEM-EDX	109
3.19	Compaction test apparatus using Standard Proctor Test	114
3.20	Compaction curve for fresh municipal solid waste	114
3.21	Calibration simulation of N=50 for SMBM model	121
3.22	Calibration simulation of N=100 for SMBM model	122
3.23	Calibration simulation of N=500 for SMBM model	122
3.24	Calibration simulation of N=1000 for SMBM model	123
3.25	Calibration simulation of N=5000 for SMBM model	123
4.1	Water movement on the layout plan based on contour of the plan	133
4.2	Sub-surface profiles of dumping soil layers in BH2, BH3 and BH4 at Sri Hartamas dumping area	137
4.3	Sub-surface profiles of dumping soil layers in BH1, BH3 and BH5 at Sri Hartamas, dumping area	138
4.4	Resistivity 2D image for Line 1	140

4.5	Resistivity 2D image for Line 2	143
4.6	Comparison between borehole BH 5 and electrical resistivity for Line 1 And Line 2	146
4.7	Particle size distribution of dumping soil	150
4.8	Particle size distribution of dumping soil and normal soil	151
4.9	Scanning Electron Microscope Image of SHL 1 sample	155
4.10	Scanning Electron Microscope Image of SHL 2 sample	156
4.11	Scanning Electron Microscope Image of SHL 3 sample	156
4.12	Scanning Electron Microscope Image of BK 1 sample	157
4.13	Scanning Electron Microscope Image of BK 2 sample	157
4.14	Scanning Electron Microscope Image of BK 3 sample	158
4.15	XRD analysis on mineral composition in Sample SHL 1 for Spectrum 1 to Spectrum 4	159
4.16	XRD analysis on mineral composition in Sample SHL 1 for Spectrum 5 to Spectrum 6	160
4.17	XRD analysis on mineral composition in Sample SHL 2 for Spectrum 1 to Spectrum 2	161
4.18	XRD analysis on mineral composition in Sample SHL 2 for Spectrum 3 to Spectrum 5	162
4.19	XRD analysis on mineral composition in Sample SHL 2 for Spectrum 6	163
4.20	XRD analysis on mineral composition in Sample SHL 3 for Spectrum 1 to Spectrum 3	164
4.21	XRD analysis on mineral composition in Sample SHL 3 for Spectrum 4 to Spectrum 6	165
4.22	XRD analysis on mineral composition in Sample BK 1 for Spectrum 1 to Spectrum 3	167
4.23	XRD analysis on mineral composition in Sample BK 1 for Spectrum 4 to Spectrum 6	168
4.24	XRD analysis on mineral composition in Sample BK 2 for Spectrum 1 to Spectrum 3	170
4.25	XRD analysis on mineral composition in Sample BK 2 for Spectrum 4 to Spectrum 6	171

4.26	XRD analysis on mineral composition in Sample BK 3 for Spectrum 1 to Spectrum 3	173
4.27	Displacement versus Square Root of Time for SHL 1	178
4.28	Displacement versus Square Root of Time for SHL 2	178
4.29	Displacement versus Square Root of Time for SHL 3	179
4.30	Displacement versus Square Root of Time for Normal Soil and And Dumping Soil (WS)	179
4.31	Shear stress vs. Shear Displacement for Dumping Soil	185
4.32	Shear stress vs. Shear Displacement for Normal Soil	186
4.33	Shear stress vs. Shear Displacement for NS and WS	186
4.34	Shear stress vs. Strain for WS	187
4.35	Shear stress vs. Strain for NS	187
4.36	Shear stress vs. Strain for NS and WS	188
4.37	Compaction curve of dumping soil	189
4.38	Compaction curve for two different soils such as Dumping Soil (SHL 1, SHL 2, SHL 3) and Normal Soil (BK1, BK2, BK3)	190
4.39	Mohr's circle of waste soil (SHL 1) with $\sigma_3 = 60$ kPa, $\sigma_3 = 80$ kPa and $\sigma_3 = 100$ kPa	196
4.40	Mohr's circle of waste soil (SHL 2) with $\sigma_3 = 60$ kPa, $\sigma_3 = 80$ kPa and $\sigma_3 = 100$ kPa	197
4.41	Mohr's circle of waste soil (SHL 3) with $\sigma_3 = 60$ kPa, $\sigma_3 = 80$ kPa and $\sigma_3 = 100$ kPa	197
4.42	Mohr's circle of waste soil (BK 1) with $\sigma_3 = 60$ kPa, $\sigma_3 = 80$ kPa and $\sigma_3 = 100$ kPa	198
4.43	Mohr's circle of waste soil (BK 2) with $\sigma_3 = 60$ kPa, $\sigma_3 = 80$ kPa and $\sigma_3 = 100$ kPa	198
4.44	Mohr's circle of waste soil (BK 3) with $\sigma_3 = 60$ kPa, $\sigma_3 = 80$ kPa and $\sigma_3 = 100$ kPa	199
4.45	Scatter plot of. Settlement (mm) vs. PSD (%)	205

4.46	Scatter plot of Settlement (mm) vs. Shear stress (kPa)	206
4.47	Scatter plot of Settlement (mm) vs. Dry density (kg/m^3)	207
4.48	Scatter plot of Settlement (mm) vs. Major Principal Stress (kPa)	208
4.49	Scatter plot of Settlement (mm) vs. Borehole Log (m)	209
4.50	Scatter plot of Settlement (mm) vs. Electrical Resistivity (m)	210
4.51	Scatter plot of Settlement (mm) vs. Specific Gravity	211
4.52	Scatter plot Settlement (mm) vs. XRD	212
4.53	Statistical Model Spreadsheet of Soil Mechanics based model	213
4.54	Settlement vs. Number of Iteration (Case 1)	214
4.55	Settlement vs. Number of Iteration (Case 2)	214
4.56	Scatterplot with histogram against settlement (Case 1 versus Case 2)	215
4.57	The 3D plot using area plot of case 1 versus case 2	217
4.58	The 3D plot using area plot of case 2 versus case 1	218
4.59	Statistical Model Spreadsheet of Bjarngard and Edgers model	219
4.60	Settlement vs. Number of Iteration (Case 1)	220
4.61	Settlement vs. Number of Iteration (Case 2)	220
4.62	Scatterplot with histogram against settlement (Case 1 versus Case 2)	221
4.63	Scatterplot with histogram against settlement (Case 2 versus Case 1)	221
4.64	The 3D plot using area plot of case 1 versus case 2	223
4.65	The 3D plot using area plot of case 2 versus case 1	223
4.66	The 3D plot using area plot of N iterations against Case 1 and Case 2	224
4.67	Statistical Model Spreadsheet of Power Creep Function model	226
4.68	Settlement vs. Number of Iteration (Case 1)	227
4.69	Settlement vs. Number of Iteration (Case 2)	227
4.70	Scatterplot with histogram against settlement (Case 1 versus Case 2)	228
4.71	Scatterplot with histogram against settlement (Case 2 versus Case 1)	228
4.72	The 3D plot using area plot of case 1 versus case 2	230
4.73	The 3D plot using area plot of case 2 versus case 1	231
4.74	Statistical Model Spreadsheet of hyperbolic function model	232

4.75	Settlement vs. Number of Iteration (Case 1)	233
4.76	Settlement vs. Number of Iteration (Case 2)	233
4.77	Scatterplot with histogram against settlement (Case 1 versus Case 2)	234
4.78	Scatterplot with histogram against settlement (Case 2 versus Case 1)	234
4.79	The 3D plot using Area Plot of Case 1 versus Case 2	236
4.80	Statistical Model Spreadsheet of rheological model	238
4.81	Settlement vs. Number of Iteration (Case 1)	238
4.82	Settlement vs. Number of Iteration (Case 2)	239
4.83	Scatterplot with histogram against settlement (Case 1 versus Case 2)	239
4.84	Scatterplot with histogram against settlement (Case 2 versus Case 1)	241
4.85	The 3D plot using area plot of case 1 versus case 2	242
4.86	The 3D plot using area plot of case 2 versus case 1	242
4.87	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (i) N = 5000 Iterations	247
4.88	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (ii) N = 1000 Iterations	247
4.89	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (iii) N = 500 Iterations	248
4.90	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (iv) N = 100 Iterations	248
4.91	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (v) N = 50 Iterations	249
4.92	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (i) N = 5000 Iterations	249
4.93	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (ii) N = 1000 Iterations	250
4.94	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (iii) N = 500 Iterations	250
4.95	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (iv) N = 100 Iterations	250

4.96	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (v) N = 50 Iterations	251
4.97	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (i) N = 5000 Iterations	254
4.98	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (ii) N = 1000 Iterations	255
4.99	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (iii) N = 500 Iterations	255
4.100	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (iv) N = 100 Iterations	256
4.101	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (v) N = 50 Iterations	256
4.102	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (i) N = 5000 Iterations	257
4.103	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (ii) N = 1000 Iterations	257
4.104	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (iii) N = 500 Iterations	257
4.105	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (iv) N = 100 Iterations	258
4.106	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (v) N = 50 Iterations	258
4.107	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (i) N = 5000 Iterations	261
4.108	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (ii) N = 1000 Iterations	262
4.109	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (iii) N = 500 Iterations	262
4.110	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (iv) N = 100 Iterations	262
4.111	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (v) N = 50 Iterations	263

4.112	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (i) N = 5000 Iterations	263
4.113	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (ii) N = 1000 Iterations	263
4.114	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (iii) N = 500 Iterations	264
4.115	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (iv) N = 100 Iterations	264
4.116	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (v) N = 50 Iterations	264
4.117	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (i) N = 5000 Iterations	268
4.118	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (ii) N = 1000 Iterations	268
4.119	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (iii) N = 500 Iterations	268
4.120	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (iv) N = 100 Iterations	269
4.121	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (v) N = 50 Iterations	269
4.122	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (i) N = 5000 Iterations	269
4.123	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (ii) N = 1000 Iterations	270
4.124	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (iii) N = 500 Iterations	270
4.125	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (iv) N = 100 Iterations	270
4.126	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (v) N = 50 Iterations	271
4.127	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (i) N = 5000 Iterations	274

4.128	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (ii) N = 1000 Iterations	275
4.129	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (iii) N = 500 Iterations	275
4.130	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (iv) N = 100 Iterations	275
4.131	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 1 (v) N = 50 Iterations	276
4.132	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (i) N = 5000 Iterations	276
4.133	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (ii) N = 1000 Iterations	276
4.134	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (iii) N = 500 Iterations	277
4.135	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (iv) N = 100 Iterations	277
4.136	Percentile Distribution and Histogram data for Case 2 (v) N = 50 Iterations	277
4.137	Comparison on settlement by Excel Spreadsheet and settlement by Monte Carlo simulation	281
4.138	Total settlement versus Settlement model for published model And Monte Carlo simulation model	286
4.139	Total Settlement from Monte Carlo Simulation and Published Model	288
4.140	Radar graph plot relating the 5 settlement models based on published Model and Monte Carlo simulations	289
4.141	Settlement versus time for PCF model	290
4.142	Level of Settlement based on Monte Carlo simulations and Statistical Modeling for Line 1	291
4.143	Level of Settlement based on Monte Carlo simulations and Statistical Modeling for Line 2	292

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

C_c^*	Primary compression ratio
C_α	Secondary compression ratio
$C_{\alpha 1}$	Intermediate coefficient of secondary compression
$C_{\alpha 2}$	Final coefficient of secondary compression
c	cohesion
BEM	Bjarngard and Edgers Model
DS	Dumping Soil
EDX	Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectroscopy
H	Initial thickness of waste
HF	Hyperbolic Function
Km	kilometers
KN	kilo Newton
L, l	Length
MPa	Mega Pascal
m	meters
mm	millimeters
MSW	Municipal Solid Waste
NS	Normal Soil
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscope
SMBM	Soil Mechanics Based Model
PCF	Power Creep Function
RM	Rheological Model
t_1	time for initial compression
t_2	time for intermediate compression
t_3	time for total period of time
ϕ	Angle of internal friction
σ^2	variance
σ	standard deviation
μ	mean/Average value

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Background

Failure of landfill/dumping area usually associated with settlement. Koerner and Soong (2000) and Jones and Dixon (2003) provide information on a range of landfill failures. High profile failure includes Kettleman Hills, USA (Seed et al., 1988; Byrne, 1994), Bulbul Drive, South Africa (Brink et al., 1999), Cincinnati, USA (Eid et al., 2000; Stark et al., 2000), Dona Juana, South American (Hendron et al., 1999) and Payatas, Philippines. There are many other failures that do not get reported since the failures occur at dumping area with no human casualties. The failure of landfill/dumping area are caused by settlement of dumping soil.

Dumping soil can be defined as that soil that contains concrete debris, decayed wood, paper, clay, silts, sand and gravel. The difference between dumping soil and normal soil is that the dumping soil contains waste materials as much as 30% to 35%. Other than that it also consists of sand, silt, clay and gravel. The waste material grain particle size is in the range of 2 to 6 mm of sieve size with the content of 30% to 35% of waste. Dumping soil is not residual soil. Dumping soil originates from the waste material that

was dumped at the dumping area. The waste which has gone through sedimentation process, chemical reaction between the waste and rainfall, and biodegradation of waste that causing the waste to become dumping soil.

By literature search, settlement of dumping soil occur due to these four attributes namely (1) physical and mechanical processes that includes the reorientation of particles, movement of fine materials into larger voids and collapse of void spaces, (2) chemical processes that include corrosion, combustion and oxidation, (3) dissolution process that consist of dissolving soluble substances by percolating liquids and then forming leachate, (4) biological decomposition of organics with time depending on humidity and the amount of organic present in the waste (Sivakumar Babu et al, 2010a). Moreover, the occurrence of differential settlement due to inhomegeneity of solid wastes promotes other problems such as water ponding on the soil surface and accumulation of water on the drainage layer, hence increasing the rate of water infiltrations into the waste and leachate formation. The understanding on the settlement behavior of dumping soil of dump area is becoming essential in Malaysia, since there are many dumping area to be reused for new constructions where the settlement issues should be considered.

There are three main stages of settlement in dumping soil, namely, initial compression, primary compression and secondary compression. Initial compression, which is defined as settlement that occurs immediately, when an external load is applied to a dumping soil. It is generally associated with the immediate compaction of void

space and particles due to an applied load. Primary compression is consolidation due to the dissipation of pore water and gas from the void spaces. In general, it occurs 30 days after final load placement. Secondary compression is due to creep of the waste skeleton and biological decay. In general, settlement due to secondary compression accounts for a major portion of total settlement of dump area and occurs over many years (El-Fadel and Khoury, 2010).

Numerous studies have been previously conducted on the geotechnical properties of dumping soil so that settlement can be evaluated (Landva and Clark, 1990; Fasset et al., 1994; Gabr and Valero, 1995; Kavazanjian, 2001; Hossain, 2002; Dixon et al., 2005, Zekkos, 2005). A constitutive model is proposed by Sivakumar Babu et al., (2010) to describe the stress-strain behavior of waste type of soil under loading using the critical state of soil mechanics framework. Many mathematical model and settlement model has been developed to simulate settlement mechanism at landfill area (Sowers (1973); Bjarngard and Edgers (1990); Hossain and Gabr (2005); Yen and Scanlon (1975); Edil et al. (1990); Ling et al. (1998); Gibson and Lo (1961); Park and Lee (1997); Hettiarachchi et al. (2009); Marques (2001) and Sivakumar Babu et al. (2010). However, not many focus on settlement prediction of the dumping soil based on Monte Carlo simulation approaches and not many settlement model focuses to the dumping area in Malaysia. This study would attempt to establish the settlement prediction of dumping soil in two dumping area in Malaysia which is Sri Hartamas, Kuala Lumpur and Bukit Chuping, Perlis.

Monte Carlo methods are a class of computational algorithm that must be used together with repeated random sampling in order to compute their results. Monte Carlo methods are usually used together with computer software to simulate the physical and mathematical systems. This method tends to be useful to compute an exact result with a deterministic algorithm. Monte Carlo method are especially useful for simulating systems with many coupled degrees of freedom such as fluids, disordered materials, strongly coupled solids and cellular structure. Monte Carlo is also used to model phenomena with significant uncertainty inputs such as the calculation of risk in business. The Monte Carlo method is further explored to be used as dumping soil settlement prediction so that the total settlement could be determined. The dumping soil settlements are to be studied at the open dumping area rather than landfill because of terms that was widely misused in Malaysia.

A site may refer to “landfill” when in fact it is an “open dumping” (Idris et al., 2004) due to the differences in the operational aspect of landfill is unclear. There were 77 open dumps, 49 controlled tipping and only 35 landfill in Malaysia (Idris et al., 2004). Besides illegal dumping, landfilling is the only method used for the disposal of municipal solid waste in Malaysia, and most of the landfill sites are open dumping areas, which pose serious environmental and social threats (Yunus and Kadir, 2003). The open dumping will increase over time because the population in Malaysia has been increasing at a rate of 2.4% per annum or about 600,000 per annum since 1994. With this population growth, the municipal solid waste generation also increases. In 2003, the average amount of municipal solid waste generated in Malaysia was 0.5 -0.8

kg/person/day. It has increased to 1.7 kg/person/day in major cities (Kathirvale et al., 2003). By the year 2020, the quantity of municipal solid waste generated was estimated to have increased to 31,000 tons.

The increased in waste generated would become a problem since the land price has increased and the spaces allocated for disposal site are limited in urban area due to increase in population. Thus more illegal open dumping sites would be generated. These illegal open dumping sites are studied to determine the characteristics and to predict future settlement of dumping soil after the closure of the dumping area. The abandoned landfill would pose serious hazards where differential settlement would occur. Differential settlements would result in problems such as surface ponding, and development of cracks. The decomposition of dumping soil would generate gas; leachate and refuse settlement. The differential settlements of dumping soil are caused by different composition of waste. Thus, we need to characterize the dumping soil in order to understand its behavior.

1.2 Problem Statement

The problem statements of this research are as follows:-

- a) Dumping area consists of many layers of soil strata which may consist of clay, silt, gravel, sand, decayed wood and waste layers. The heterogeneous content of dumping soil is not easy to characterize. The characterizations of dumping soil need to be determined so that the closed dumping area could be reused for new

constructions. Nowadays, there are increases in the population which will generate the waste. An increase in waste generation would increase the numbers of open dumping area (Kathirvale et al., 2003). Thus, the land for new development would not be enough and need to be reused. This study will help in predicting the settlement of dumping soil at closed or abandoned open dumping area. The determination of dumping soil characterizations are conducted in Malaysia area for this study since there are not many research works has been done on dumping soil characterizations in Malaysia. The Sri Hartamas were chosen to be the study area because that area is to be developed for new substation which was meant to supply electricity for the resident area. Thus the settlements need to be predicted at the Sri Hartamas area before new constructions are to be constructed. Another area is Bukit Chuping area which is not the dumping area so that the soil with natural content could be studied as controlled parameters.

- b) Numerous studies have been previously conducted on the geotechnical properties of dumping soil however there are problems in the uncertainty of the data. The uncertainty parameters are such as C_c^* (primary compression ratio), C_α (secondary compression ratio), $\Delta\sigma_a$ (primary compressibility stress), $\Delta\sigma_b$ (secondary compressibility stress) and S_{ult} (ultimate settlement) are not easy to be evaluated. The range for the uncertainty need to be established and evaluated based on the performance comparison of settlement prediction models in various

landfill types (Park et. al., 2007). This study is attempted to use the Monte Carlo simulation to choose the range for the uncertainty.

- c) The available data for determining geotechnical parameters of dumping soil are not many. One site may consist of 5 to 10 boreholes. The sampling may only be about 20 samples to be used for settlement calculation of geotechnical parameters. Hundreds or more data of geotechnical are needed in order to improve accuracy of the settlement computation and settlement prediction. The Monte Carlo Simulation has the capabilities to simulate the range of geotechnical properties for settlement calculations and predictions.

1.3 Research Aims and Objectives

The main research aim is to determine the dumping soil characterization and settlement prediction using Monte Carlo approaches. The characterizations are important in the determining the behavior of dumping soil for post closure of the dumping area. The settlement needs to be predicted so that the risks of settlement are known before construction of the new project. The research objectives developed in order to achieve the research aims are as follows:-

- I. To characterize dumping soil settlement based on its categories such as soil like or non soil like properties, waste types and soil or waste

- II. To calculate and evaluate settlement based on dumping soil settlement model
- III. To predict settlement by Monte Carlo simulation approaches and validate dumping soil settlement

1.4 Scope and Limitation

The study focuses on the determination on the characterization of dumping soil and prediction of dumping soil settlement using Monte Carlo approaches. The characterizations of dumping soil are based on its category such as soil like or non soil like, waste types and waste or soil. The data on the geotechnical properties, mineral composition and particle size distribution would determine the category of the dumping soil. The characterizations are done to confirm the soil consists of waste and settlements that occur are due to the waste that consists most of the dumping soil.

Once characterization has been done, the total settlement of dumping soil settlements were calculated using five settlement models such as Soil Mechanics Based Model, Bjarnagard and Edgers model, Rheological model, Hyperbolic function and Power Creep Function model. The Monte Carlo Simulation are integrate with these 5 models to simulates hundreds and more data for better accuracy in predicting the total settlement at the open dumping area.

The limitations of the study are the types of bacteria that decomposed the waste. Different types of bacteria would decompose the waste in different rate of decomposition depending on the types of waste. The urban area tends to have more plastic waste compared to organic matter. Plastic are not easy to degradable compared to organic waste. This study would not investigate the types of bacteria to decompose the waste with different rate of settlement.

1.5 Significance of Study

- a) The characterization of dumping soil would help the operator of landfill/dumping area to maintain and monitor long-term settlement of the landfill/dumping area in Malaysia.
- b) To help geotechnical engineer to understand the behavior of waste settlement at the closed dumping area in Malaysia
- c) To characterize the dumping soil into category I, II and III at open dumping area in Malaysia so that the geotechnical properties of dumping soil in Malaysia could be established for long term monitoring and future development
- d) To predict settlement at open dumping area so that the dumping area could be used for future constructions where the land are very limited to be used for dumping area with increase of solid waste generations and populations.

1.6 Expected Outcome of the Research

The expected outcomes from the research are the development of characterization of dumping soil category based on the behavior of waste or soil and the settlement prediction via Monte Carlo approaches. The total settlement is the output from the settlement analysis. The potential to settle of dumping soil settlement are assessed based on the total settlement determine from the settlement model. Settlement evaluation statement and the level of risk for the calculated total settlement would give the suggestion work that could be applied at the dumping area. This suggestion work could be used as preliminary decision on managing the dumping soil settlement problems at the open dumping area.

1.7 Thesis Organization

The thesis is divided into 5 chapters. The chapters are organized as follows:-

I. CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the introductions about settlement at open dumping area. The objectives, the problem statement, scope and limitation, expected outcome of the research and thesis organization are also defined in this chapter.

II. CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the composition of dumping soil in Malaysia is compared with Asian region, and European country. The summary of the composition is made based on the comparison. The composition of waste is compared as to know the difference in the content of the waste for different countries. The review on the geotechnical properties of dumping soil are also included in this chapter based on the previous researcher. The geotechnical properties such as moisture content, waste classification system, particle size distribution, hydraulic conductivity, compressibility for primary settlement, secondary settlement and total settlement, shear strength, and settlement model of MSW. The settlement model for landfill method is compared with the settlement model for open dumping method.

III. CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter explained on the methodology of the research. The characterization based on geotechnical properties of dumping soil are obtained from the experimental work. The experimental work involves are sieve analysis test, specific gravity test, SEM-EDX test, compaction test, consolidation test, direct shear test and triaxial test. The electrical resistivity test and borehole logging test are also used in this research to characterize the heterogeneous content of dumping soil layers at dumping area. The methods on integration of Monte Carlo simulation to calculate settlements and probability are also explained.

IV. CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter described the results and discussions of the dumping soil settlement characterization, the dumping soil settlement calculation for determining the total settlement. The modeling of dumping soil settlement are also analyzed and discussed by integrating existing model and simulation of the model using Monte Carlo simulation. The data interpretations and discussions are also included in this chapter.

V. CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusion and recommendations of the research is concluded in Chapter 5. The major findings, minor findings and future studies are described in this chapter.

REFERENCES

- Amalendu Bagchi, (2004), Design of Landfills and Integrated Solid Waste Management, 3rd Edition, John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York
- Amaya L. G. C. and Inaki T.M., (2007), Application of simulation models to the diagnosis of MSW landfills: An Example, Journal of Waste Management 27, 691-703
- ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials), (2006), Annual Book of Standards, West Conshohocken, PA
- Au S.K., Cao Z.J. and Wang Y., (2010), Implementing advanced Monte Carlo simulation under spreadsheet environment, Journal of Structural Safety 32, 281-292
- Bjarngard A. and Edgers L., (1990), Settlement of municipal solid waste landfills, Proc. 13th Annual Madison Waste Conf., University of Wisconsin, Madison Wis., 192-205
- Brink, D., Day, P.W., and Preez, Du, L., (1999), Failure and remediation of Bulbul Drive landfill: Kwazulu-natal, South Africa, Proceedings Sardinia '99, Fifth International Landfill Symposium, Cagliari, Italy, pp. 744-760
- British Standard Code of Practice, BS 5930:1981, Code of Practice for Site Investigation
- Byrne, R.J., (1994), Design issues with strain-softening interfaces in landfill liners, Proceedings Waste Technology 94, Charleston, South Carolina, USA, Session 4, Paper No. 4
- Calvo F., Moreno B., Ramos A., and Zamorano M., 2007, Implementation of a new environmental impact assessment for municipal waste landfills as tool for planning and decision-making process, Journal of Renewable and Sustainable Energy Review 11, 98-115
- Coumoulus D.G. and Koryalos T.P., (1997), Prediction of attenuation of landfill settlement rates with time, Proc 14th Int. Conf. on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Vol. 3, ISSMFE, Hamburg, Germany, 1807-1811.

Cowland, J.W., Tang K.Y., and Gabay, J., (1993), Density and strength properties of Hong Kong refuse, Proceedings Sardinia 1993, Fourth International Landfill Symposium, Cagliari, Italy, pp. 1433-1446

Dixon N., and Jones D.R.V., (2005), Engineering properties of municipal solid waste, Journal of Geotextiles and Geomembranes 23, 205-233

Dixon N., and Langer U., (2006), Development of a MSW classification system for the evaluation of mechanical properties, Journal of Waste Management 26, 220-232

Durmusoglu, E., Corapcioglu, M.Y., and Tuncay, K., (2005), Landfill settlement with decomposition and gas generation, Journal of Environmental Engineering 131 (9), 1311-1321

Edgers L., Noble J.J., and Williams E., (1992), A biological model for long term settlement in landfills in Useman, Acer (Eds), Environmental Geotechnology, Balkema, Rotterdam, pp 177-184

Edil T.B., Ranguette V.J. and Wuellner W.W., (1990), Settlement of municipal refuse, Geotechnics of wastefills: Theory and practice, STP 1070, A. Landva and G.D. Knowles, eds, ASTM, West Conshohocken, Pa 225-239

Eid, H.T., Stark, T.D., Evans, W.D., and Sherry, P.E., (2000), Municipal solid waste slope failure, I: waste and foundation soil properties, Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, ASCE, pp. 397-407

El-Fadel, M., Shazbak, S., Saliby, E. and Leckie J., (1999), Comparative assessment of settlement models for municipal solid waste landfill applications, Waste Manage. Res., 17(5), 347-368.

El-Fadel, M., and Khoury, R., (2000), Modeling Settlement in MSW Landfills: A critical reviews in Environmental Science and Technology, 30(3), pp 327-361

EPA (1982a), Draft RCRA guidance document: Landfill Design – Liner Systems and Final Cover, U.S., Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C., U.S.A

EPA (1982b), Hazardous Waste Management System, Permitting Requirement for Land Disposal Facilities, Federal Register (1982), Part II Environmental Protection Agency

40 CFR, Parts 122, 260, 264 and 265, 47(143), Rules and Regulations, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington D.C., U.S.A

Fassett, J.B., Leonard, G.A. and Repetto, P.C., (1994), Geotechnical properties of municipal solid waste and their use in landfill design, Waste Technology 1994, Landfill Technology Technical Proceedings, Charleston, SC (USA), January 13-14.

Gabr M.A. and Valero, S.N., (1995), Geotechnical properties of municipal solid waste, Geotechnical Testing Journal, ASTM 18(2), 241-251

Gabr M.A., Hossain M.S. and Barlaz M.A., (2007), Shear Strength Parameters of MSW with Leachate Recirculation, Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering 133(4), 478-484

Guerin R., Munoz M.L., Aran C., Laperrelle C., Hidra M., Drouart E., and Grellier S., (2004), Leachate recirculation: Moisture content assessment by means of a geophysical technique, Journal of Waste Management 24, 785-794

Georgaki I., Soupios P., Sakkas N., Ververidis F., Trantas E., Vallianatos F. and Manios T., (2008), Evaluating the use of electrical resistivity imaging technique for improving CH₄ and CO₂ emission rate estimations in landfills, Science of the Total Environment 389, 522-531

Gibson, R.E. and Lo, K.Y., (1961), A theory of soil exhibiting secondary compression, Acta Polytech Scand, C(10), 1-15.

Gotteland, P., Gachet, C., and Vuillemin, M., (2001), Mechanical study of a municipal solid waste landfill, Proceedings Sardinia 2001, Eight International Waste Management and Landfill Symposium, Cagliari, Italy, pp. 425-433

Gotteland, P., Gourc, J.P., Alboursa, A., and Thomas S., (2002), On site determination of geomechanical characteristics of waste, Proceedings GeoEng 2000, The Institute of Engineers, Australia.

Grisolia, M., Napoleoni, Q., and Tancredi, G., (1995a), Contribution to a technical classification of MSW, Proceedings Sardinia '95, Fifth International Landfill Symposium, Cagliari, Italy, pp. 761-767

Grisolia, M., Napoleoni Q. and Trancredi G., (1995b), The use of triaxial tests for the mechanical characterization of MSW, Proceedings Sardinia 1995, Fifth International Landfill Symposium, Cagliari, Italy, pp 703-710

Hendron, D.M., Fernandez, G., Prommer, P.J., Giroud, J.P., and Orozco, L.F., (1999), Investigation of 27th September 1997 slope failure at the Dona Juana landfill, proceedings Sardinia '99, Seventh International Waste Management and Landfill Symposium, Cagliari, Italy, pp. 545-554

Hettiarachchi C.H., Meegoda J.N., and Hettiaratchi J.P.A, (2003), Settlement of Bioreactor Landfills, Modeling of Settlement Behavior of Bioreactor Landfills; Interim Report, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Hettiarachchi, C.H., Meegoda, J. and Hettiarachchi P., (2009), Effects of gas and moisture on modeling of bioreactor landfill settlement, Waste Manage., 29(3), 1018 – 1025.

Hettiarachchi C.H., Meegoda J.N., Tavantzis J. and Hettiaratchi P., (2007), Numerical model to predict settlements coupled with landfill gas pressure in bioreactor landfills, Journal of Hazardous Waste Materials B139, 514-522

Hossain, M.S., (2002), Mechanics of Compressibility and Strength of Solid Waste in Bioreactor Landfills, PhD Dissertation, Department of Civil Engineering, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, N.C.

Hossain S.M. and Gabr M.A., (2005), Prediction of municipal solid waste landfill settlement with leachate recirculation, Proc. Geo. Frontier, Austin Tex., Vol. 168. ASCE 50.

Idris A., Inanc B., and Hassan M.N., (2004), Overview of Waste Disposal and Landfill/Dumps in Asian Country, Journal Material Cycles Waste Management, Springer-Verlag, 6:104-110

Jessberger, H.L. and Kockel, R., (1993), Determination and assessment of the mechanical properties of waste materials, Proceedings Sardinia 1993, Fourth International Landfill Symposium, Cagliari, Italy, pp 167-177

Jessberger, H.L., (1994), Geotechnical aspects of landfill design and construction, Part 2: materials parameters and test methods, Institution of Civil Engineering Geotechnical Engineering Journal 107, 105-113

Jones, D.R.V. and Dixon N., (2003), Stability of landfill lining systems: report No. 1 literature review, R& D Technical Report, P1-385, Environment Agency, UK, p. 219

Kang S.T., Shin H.S., Lee C.Y., and Lee N.H., (1997), Relationship between biological decomposition and landfill settlement at various leachate recirculation rates in: Proceedings of the Seventh KAIST-NTU-KU tri-Lateral Seminar/Workshop on Environmental Engineering, Kyoto, Japan, pp 29-31

Kathirvale, S., Muhd Yunus, M.N., Sopian, K., and Samsuddin, A.H., (2003), Energy potential from municipal solid waste in Malaysia, Renewable Energy 29, 559-567

Kavazanjian, E., (2001), Mechanical properties of municipal solid waste, Proceedings Sardinia, Eight International Waste Management and Landfill Symposium, Cagliari, Italy, pp. 415-424

Kavazanjian, E., (2003), Evaluation of MSW properties using field measurements, In: Koerner, R.M., Koerner, G.R., Hsuan, Y., Ashley, M.V. (Eds), Proceedings 17th Geosynthetic Research Institute Conference, Hot Topics in Geosynthetic – IV, pp. 74 - 113

Kavazanjian E., Matasovic, R., and Bachus, R.C., (1999), Large-diameter static and cyclic laboratory testing of municipal solid waste, Proceedings Sardinia 1999, Seventh International Waste Management and Landfill Symposium, Cagliari, Italy, pp. 437-444

Koerner, R.M. and Soong, T.Y., (2000), Stability assessment of ten large landfill failures, Advances in transportation and geoenvironmental systems using geosynthetic, Proceedings of sessions of Geo Denver 2000, ASCE Geotechnical special publication No. 103, pp. 1-38

Kolsch F., (1995), Material values for some mechanical properties of domestic waste, Proceedings Sardinia 1995, Fifth International Landfill Symposium, Sardinia, vol. 2, p. 20

Kolsch, F., (1996), The Influence of fibrous constituents on shear strength of municipal solid waste, PhD thesis, Leichtweiss-Institute für Wasserbau der TU Braunschweig, Germany

Kurian J., Visvanathan C., Trankler J., Basnayake B.F.A., Chart C., and Gong M.Z., (2003), Regional Networking for Sustainable Landfill Management in Asia, Workshop on Sustainable Landfill Management , pp 39-47

Latifah, A.M., Mohd Armi A.S., and Nur Illyana, .M.Z., (2009), Municipal solid waste management in Malaysia: Practices and challenges, Journal of Waste Management 29 (2009), 2902-2906

Landva, A. and Clark, J.I., (1986), Geotechnical testing of waste fill, Proceedings of Canadian Geotechnical conference, Ottawa, Ontario, pp 371-385

Landva, A.O., and Clark, J.I., (1990), Geotechnics of Waste Fill, Geotechnics of Waste Fills – Theory and Practice, ASTM STP 1070, Philadelphia, pp 86-113

Ling H.I., Leschinsky D., Mohri I. and Kawabata T., (1998), Estimation of municipal solid waste landfill settlement, J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng., 124(1), 21-28.

Machado SL, Carvalho MF, and Vilar OM, (2002), Constitutive model for municipal solid waste, Journal Geotechnical Geoenvironmental Eng ASCE 2002; 128(11):940–51.

Machado SL, Vilar OM, and Carvalho MF, (2008), Constitutive model for long term municipal solid waste mechanical behavior, Journal of Computers and Geotechnics 35, 775-790

Manassero, M., Van Impe, W.F., and Bouazza, A., (1996), Waste disposal and containment, Proceedings Second International Congress on Environmental Geotechnics, Osaka, vol. 3, pp 193-242

Marques A.C.M., (2001), Compaction and compressibility of municipal solid waste, PhD thesis, Sao Paulo Univ., Sao Carlos, Brazil.

Marques A.C.M., Filz G.M. and Vilar O.M., (2003), Composite compressibility model for municipal solid waste, J. Geotechnical Geoenvironmental Eng., 129 (4), 372-378.

Mendez AP, Ridao AR, Toro MZ, (2008), Environmental diagnosis and planning actions for municipal solid waste landfills in Estado Lara, Venezuela, *Journal of Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 12, 752-771

Ministry of Housing and Local Government, Malaysia, (1990), Technical guidelines on sanitary landfill design and operation, Technical Section of the Local Government Division, Kuala Lumpur

New Straits Times, (2010), RM 500 reward for real dirt, 21st December 2010

Schepers r., Rafat G., Gelbke C. and Lehman B., (2001), Application of borehole logging, core imaging and tomography to geotechnical exploration, *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences* 38, 867-876

Schevon GR and Damas G, (1986), Using Double Liners in Landfill Design and Operation, *Journal of Waste Management and Research* 4, 161-176

Seed, R.B., Mitchell, J.K., and Seed, H.B, (1988), Slope stability failure investigation: Landfill Unit B-19, Phase 1-A, Kettleman Hills, California, Report No. UCB/GT/88-01, Department of Civil Engineering, University of California, Berkley, July

Siegel, R.A., Robertson, R.J., and Anderson, D.G., (1990), Slope stability investigations at landfill in Southern California, *Geotechnics of Waste Fill – Theory and Practice*; ASTM STP 1070

Singh, S., Murphy, B., (1990), Evaluation of the stability of sanitary landfills, *Geotechnics of Waste Fills – Theory and Practice*; ASTM STP 1070, pp. 240-258

Simoes, G.F. and Catapreta, C.A.A., (2012), Monitoring and modeling of long-term settlements of an experimental landfill in Brazil, *Waste Management*, Article in Press

Sivakumar Babu G.L., Krishna R.R., and Sandeep K.C., (2010a), Constitutive model for municipal solid waste incorporating mechanical creep and biodegradation compression, *Journal of waste management* 30, 2010, 11-22

Sivakumar Babu G.L., Krishna R.R., Sandeep K. C., and Hanumanth S.K., (2010b), Prediction of long-term municipal solid waste landfill settlement using constitutive

model, Practice Periodical of Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste Management, ASCE, April 2010, 139-150.

Sowers G.F., (1973), Settlement of waste disposal fills, Proc. 8th Int. Conf. on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Moscow, Vol. 1, 2(2), 207-210

Stark, T.D., Eid, H.T., Evans, W.D., and Sherry, P.E., (2000), Municipal soil waste slope failure, II: stability analyses, Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, ASCE, pp. 408-419

Swati M. and Joseph K., (2008), Settlement analysis of fresh and partially stabilized municipal solid waste in simulated controlled dumps and bioreactor landfills, Journal of Waste Management (28), 1355 -1363

Tariq Y. and Mostafizur R., (2007), Monitoring quantity and characteristics of municipal solid waste in Dhaka City, Environmental Monitoring Assessment 135:3-11, Springer Science and Business Media B.V.

Tchobanoglous G., Theisen H., and Vigil S., (1993), Integrated solid waste management, Engineering principles and management issues, Mc Graw Hill Inc., Singapore

Terazono A., Sakai S., Moriguchi Y., Yang J., Inanc B., and Sato Y., (2003) Structural analysis of material cycles and waste management in Asia, Interim report submitted to the Ministry of Environment Japan, National Institute for Environmental Studies, Tsukuba, Japan

The Star Online (2009), Illegal Dumping of Rubbish, <http://www.thestar.com.my/>

Thomas, S., Aboura, A.A., Gourc, J.P., Gotteland, P., Billard, H., Delineau, T., Gisbert, T., Ouvry, J.F., and Vuillemin, M., (1999), An in-situ waste mechanical experimentation on a French landfill, Proceedings Sardinia '99, Seventh International Waste Management and Landfill Symposium, Cagliari, Italy, pp 445-452

Turczynski, U., (1988), Geotechnische Aspekte beim Aufbau von Mehrkomponentendeponien, PhD Thesis, Fakultät der technischen Wissenschaften, Bergakademie Freiberg, Germany

Oweis, I.S. and Khera, R., (1998), *Geotechnical of Waste Management*, Second Edition, PWS Publishing Company

Park H.I., and Lee S.R., (1997), Long-term settlement behavior of landfills with refuse decomposition, *Journal Resource Management Technology*, 24(4), 159-165.

Park H.I., Park B., Lee S.R. and Hwang D., (2007), Parameter Evaluation and Performance Comparison of MSW Settlement Prediction Models in Various Landfill Types, *Journal of Environmental Engineering*, ASCE 133 (1)

Reddy, K.R., Hettiarachchi H., Naveen S.P., and Janardhanan G., (2009), Geotechnical properties of fresh municipal solid waste at Orchard Hills Landfill, USA, *Journal of Waste Management* 29, 952-959

Wan, A., and Kadir, W.R., (2001), *A comparative analysis of Malaysian and the UK* Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc

Wall D.K., and Zeiss, C., (1995), Municipal landfill biodegradation and settlement, *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 121 (3), 214–224.

Watts, K.S., Charles J.A., Blaken, N.J.R., (2002), Settlement of landfills: measurements and their significance. *Wastes 2002, Integrated Waste Management and Pollution Control: Research, Policy and Practice*, pp. 673 - 682

Yunus, M.N.M., Kadir, K.A., (2003), The development of solid waste treatment technology based on refuse derived fuel and biogasification integration, In: *International Symposium on Renewable Energy*, Kuala Lumpur, 14-17 September 2003

Yen B.C. and Scanlon, B.S., (1975), Sanitary landfill settlement rates, *Journal Geotechnical Eng*, 101(5), 475-487

Zekkos, D.P., (2005), *Evaluation of Static and Dynamic Properties of Municipal Solid Waste*, PhD Dissertation, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, California, USA