

EFFECTS OF STRESS-RATIO ON CRACK INTENSITY IN TUNNEL LINING

AMBER ISLAM

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the  
requirements for the award of the degree of  
Master of Philosophy

School of Civil Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

FEBRUARY 2021

## **DEDICATION**

Dedicated to my late teacher/mentor Dr. Mahmood Arshad who motivated and inspired me before embarking on this journey of exploring the mysterious world.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The most important part of being able to present this thesis is the chance that I have to thank a number of generous and very invaluable people who without them, I wouldn't have achieved and done as much I have in this study. Unfortunately, expressions and feeling cannot fully be expressed on this piece of paper otherwise it would take another 60-page report to thank them enough.

First and foremost, I would like to praise and thanks Allah Almighty for making this journey possible, as there is no power nor movement without His will. He was my soul guardian in lonely expat of this life Who pulled me through every hardship encountered during this journey.

I would like to thank wholeheartedly the Govt. of PAKISTAN and HEC for giving this opportunity. I express my sincere gratitude and exultation to my supervisor Ir. Dr. Rini Asnida Binti Abdullah for her inestimable kindness and efforts rendered during this study. Not forgotten, my appreciation to co-supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Izni Syahrizal Bin Ibrahim for his support and guidance regarding laboratory testing. Their wise advices, effort and directions have helped me understands the process and other requirements needed to complete this study.

I am deeply indebted to my family back home for their unconditional love, support, and prayers, especially to my parents who are source of all my accomplishments. I would like to extend my warmest thanks to my wife for pulling up with me in hard and tough times like these where I was supposed to be socializing with her. She did not give up on me, she always encouraged me to carry on regardless of how hard it was. Without her support and understanding, I would not be where I am now, and this study would have been abandoned in the early stage.

Last but not the least, I want to thank my seniors, friends and mentors for their support and help in completion of this study.

## ABSTRACT

Tunnels after serving period over time needs to be inspected and maintained for them to perform without any structural failure and posing no hazard to the ongoing traffic. Structural health assessment of tunnel lining is carried out to investigate and mitigate the cause of defects in tunnel lining to ensure user safety. In conjunction with other tunnel liner defects, liner cracks were found to be considered as the most critical defect because of their potential to trigger subsequent defects and cause tunnel instability. Until now, the relationship between the developing anomalies in tunnel liner and their cause is still unclear and studies have addressed the cause of liner crack due to topography (in terms of overburden) on the stability of tunnel liner, especially for the varying overburden. The research mainly aims at understanding the effect of varying overburden on liner cracks. For this purpose, visual inspection was conducted and cracks in the tunnel liner were mapped and quantified and numerical analysis was performed to see the effect of varying topography (overburden) using parameter Stress-Ratio ( $K$ ) on the intensity of liner in terms of state of stress-displacement using Induced Stress (IS) and Stress Concentration Factor (SCF) as a performance evaluation criteria's. The result from this study shows the shift in magnitude as well as position of crack density along different portions of tunnel liner with varying overburden depth. Moreover, based on the regional diversity of crack along longitudinal profile of tunnel for advances in tunnel assessment, tunnel was divided into zones based on the varying overburden with a view to identify varying intensity of crack on tunnel liner. The crack density increased with increasing overburden depth such as shallow zone is ranging from 0 to 96 m overburden depth with crack density (575 m to 628 m), while transition zone has range from 97 to 160 m having density (650 m to 700 m) whereas the overburden depth for deep zone with denser cracks at vertical wall and lower hance portion ranges from 161 to 204 m with crack density (704 m to 724 m). On the basis of results, the method applied for mapping and quantification of crack can serve inspectors and owners of tunnels for technical guidance to conduct health assessment of tunnel liner.

## ABSTRAK

Terowong, selepas suatu tempoh masa operasi, perlu diperiksa dan diselenggara agar terowong ini dapat beroperasi tanpa kegagalan struktur dan tidak menimbulkan bahaya kepada lalu lintas. Penilaian kesihatan struktural pelapik terowong dilakukan untuk menyiasat dan mengurangkan punca kerosakan pada pelapik terowong bagi memastikan keselamatan pengguna. Bersama dengan kecacatan pelapik terowong lain, keretakan kapal didapati dianggap sebagai kecacatan paling kritikal kerana berpotensi mencetuskan kecacatan berikutnya dan menyebabkan ketidakstabilan terowong. Sehingga kini, hubungan antara anomali yang berkembang pada pelapik terowong dan penyebabnya masih belum jelas dan kajian mengenai penyebab keretakan pelapik terowong oleh faktor topografi (dari segi tanggungan atas) terhadap kestabilan pelapik terowong, terutamanya untuk tanggungan atas yang berbeza-beza. Tujuan utama kajian ini adalah untuk memahami kesan tanggungan atas pelbagai pada retakan pelapik terowong. Untuk tujuan ini, pemeriksaan visual dilakukan dan retakan pada pelapik terowong dipetakan, diukur dan analisis numerik dilakukan untuk melihat kesan topografi yang berbeza-beza (tanggungan atas) menggunakan parameter nisbah tegasan ( $K$ ) pada intensiti pelapik dari segi keadaan tekanan-anjakan menggunakan Induced Stress (IS) dan Stress Concentration Factor (SCF) sebagai kriteria penilaian prestasi. Hasil dari kajian ini menunjukkan perubahan magnitud serta kedudukan kepadatan retakan di sepanjang bahagian pelapik terowong pada kedalaman dan tanggungan atas yang berbeza-beza. Tambahan lagi, berdasarkan kepelbagaian keretakan di sepanjang profil membujur terowong, terowong dibahagikan kepada beberapa zon berdasarkan tanggungan atas yang bervariasi dengan tujuan untuk mengenal pasti pelbagai intensitas retakan pada pelapik terowong. Kepadatan retakan bertambah dengan peningkatan tanggungan atas, di mana zon cetek berkisar antara kedalaman 0 hingga 96 m tanggungan atas, dengan kepadatan retakan (575 m hingga 628 m), sementara zon peralihan berkisar di antara 97 hingga 160 m dengan kepadatan (650 m hingga 700 m), manakala kedalaman tanggungan atas untuk zon dalam dengan retakan yang lebih padat pada dinding menegak dan bahagian *hance* yang lebih rendah berkisar antara 161 hingga 204m dengan kepadatan retakan (704 m hingga 724m). Berdasarkan hasil kajian, kaedah yang digunakan untuk pemetaan dan pengukuran retak ini dapat membantu pemeriksa dan pemilik terowong sebagai garis panduan teknikal untuk menjalankan kerja-kerja penilaian kesihatan pelapik terowong.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
	<b>DECLARATION</b>	<b>iii</b>
	<b>DEDICATION</b>	<b>iv</b>
	<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	<b>v</b>
	<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>vi</b>
	<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>vii</b>
	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>viii</b>
	<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>xiv</b>
	<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>xvi</b>
	<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>xxi</b>
	<b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>	<b>xxiii</b>
	<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	<b>xxv</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background of Study	1
1.2	Problem Statement	2
1.3	Significance of Study	3
1.4	Research Aim and Objectives	4
1.5	Scope and Limitations	4
1.6	Structure of Thesis	5
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Introduction	7
2.2	Tunneling and Its Application	7
2.3	Construction Industry and Tunneling in Malaysia	8
2.4	Tunnel Anatomy	12
2.5	Construction Method	13
2.5.1	Cut and Cover Tunneling Method	13
2.5.2	Drill and Blast Tunneling Method	14

2.5.3	Tunnel Boring Machine (TBM) Method	14
2.5.3.1	Shield Method	15
2.5.3.2	Earth Pressure Balance Method (EPB)	15
2.5.4	New Austrian Tunneling Method (NATM)	16
2.6	In-situ and Induced Stresses in Rock Tunneling	17
2.7	Tunnel Support System	21
2.7.1	Types of Initial Supports	22
2.7.1.1	Pre-Cast Tunnel Liner	24
2.7.1.2	Steel Ribs	24
2.7.1.3	Lattice Girder	24
2.7.1.4	Reinforcements	24
2.7.1.5	Shotcrete	26
2.7.2	Shotcrete Tunnel Liner	26
2.8	Failure History of Tunnel Lining	27
2.9	Tunnel Lining Anomalies	30
2.9.1	Spalling/Delamination	31
2.9.2	Water Leakage	33
2.9.3	Efflorescence/Rust Staining	33
2.9.4	Exfoliation	33
2.9.5	Carbonation	34
2.9.6	Liner Cracks	34
2.10	Factors Causing Tunnel Lining Anomalies	36
2.10.1	Internal Factors	38
2.10.2	External Factors	38
2.11	Topographic Loading (Tunnels Constructed with Varying Topography)	39
2.11.1	Effect of Varying Topography (Overburden) on Tunnel Liner	39
2.12	Structural Health Assessment of Tunnel Liner	42
2.12.1	Initial Inspection (Visual)	43
2.12.2	Specific Inspection Followed by Non-destructive Technique (NDT)	44

2.12.2.1	Application of UPV in Shotcrete Tunnel Liner	46
2.12.3	Application of Schmidt Hammer in Shotcrete Tunnel Liner	48
2.12.4	Previous Study Related to Health Assessment of Tunnel Liner	49
2.12.4.1	Assessment of Tunnel liner Due to Damaged Induced by Topography	52
2.13	Crack Mapping of Tunnel Liner	53
2.14	Material Testing to Find Properties of Rock and Liner	53
2.14.1	Laboratory Testing for Rock Properties	54
2.14.2	Uniaxial Compressive Test	54
2.14.3	Direct Shear Test	55
2.14.4	Laboratory Testing for Concrete Liner Properties	57
2.15	Calculation of Elevation Data to Model Real Topography	58
2.15.1	Software Used	58
2.16	Numerical Analysis Method	59
2.16.1	Benefits of Numerical Analysis Method	60
2.16.2	Applications of Numerical Methods in Tunnel Engineering	60
2.16.3	Types of Modeling Methods in Rock Mechanics	61
2.16.4	Overview of FEM	64
2.17	Failure Criteria Used in Numerical Model	64
2.17.1	Mohr-Coulomb Criteria	64
2.18	Software Used for Numerical Modeling	66
2.18.1	RS2 Software	66
2.19	Verification of Model	67
2.20	Summary	68
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>69</b>
3.1	Introduction	69
3.2	Research Procedures	69



3.3	Description of Study Area	72
3.4	Geology of Area	74
3.5	Inspection of Multi-Arch Tunnel	75
3.5.1	Identification and Detection of Liner Crack	76
3.5.2	Evaluation of Identified Liner Crack	79
3.6	Crack Mapping and Crack Density Quantification	82
3.7	Material Testing Performed on Core Samples	86
3.7.1	Laboratory Test Performed on Granite Core Sample	86
3.7.2	Determining Friction Angle and Cohesion of Granite Using RocData Software	90
3.7.3	Laboratory Test Performed on Concrete Core Samples	91
3.8	Selection of Transverse Tunnel Section for Elevation data and 2D Numerical Modeling	96
3.9	Extraction of Elevation Data Using Arc-GIS	96
3.10	Numerical Modeling Procedures in RS2	101
3.11	Constructing Simplified Numerical Model	102
3.11.1	Geometry of Tunnel	102
3.11.2	External Boundary of Model	103
3.11.3	Mesh and Discretization	104
3.11.4	Boundary Conditions	105
3.11.5	Assigning Material with Sequential Excavation and Support Installation	106
3.12	Parametric Study	108
3.13	Assigning Monitoring Point on the Tunnel Boundary	108
3.14	Evaluation Criteria	109
3.15	Summary	110
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS</b>	<b>111</b>
4.1	Introduction	111
4.2	Observation on Tunnel Inspection	111
4.2.1	Compressive Strength Results Obtained from Rebound Hammer	111

4.2.2	Interpretation of Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity Test (UPV)	114
4.3	Results from Material Testing Performed on Core Samples	117
4.3.1	Engineering Properties of Granite	117
4.3.2	Engineering Properties of Tunnel Liner Core Samples	120
4.4	Stress Ratio K and Average Elevation Calculated at Chosen Sections	121
4.5	Consideration of Analysis Pattern from Numerical Modeling	123
4.6	Results from Numerical Analysis of Tunnel Section at Different Chainage	124
4.6.1	Induced stress and Stress Concentration Factor at Chainage (01+35)	124
4.6.1.1	Topographic Effect on Total Displacement	127
4.6.1.2	Validation of Results of Numerical Model	129
4.6.2	Induced stress and Stress Concentration Factor at Chainage (15+00)	131
4.6.2.1	Topographic Effect on Total Displacement	134
4.6.2.2	Comparison of Results of Crack Density and Numerical Analysis	135
4.6.3	Induced stress and Stress Concentration Factor at Chainage (04+20)	137
4.6.3.1	Topographic Effect on Total Displacement at Chainage (04+20)	140
4.6.3.2	Comparison of Results at Chainage (04+20)	141
4.6.4	Induced Stress and Stress Concentration Factor at Chainage (10+35)	143
4.6.4.1	Topographic Effect on Total Displacement at Chainage (10+35)	146
4.6.4.2	Comparison of Crack Density and Numerical Analysis Results at (10+35)	148

4.6.5	Induced Stress and Stress Concentration Factor at Chainage (08+00)	149
4.6.5.1	Topographic Effect on Total Displacement at Chainage (08+00)	153
4.6.5.2	Comparison of Crack Density and Numerical Analysis Results at (08+00)	154
4.7	Discussion on Significant Findings from Results of Numerical Analysis and Crack Density Quantification	156
4.7.1	Effect of Topography (varying overburden) on Induced Stresses (IS) and Stress Concentration Factor (SCF)	156
4.7.2	Effect of Varying Overburden on Total Displacement	157
4.7.3	Effect of Overburden on Crack Intensity	158
4.8	Summary	162
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>	<b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>163</b>
5.1	Conclusions	163
5.2	Recommendations	165
	<b>References</b>	<b>167</b>
	<b>List of Publication</b>	<b>175</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>TABLE NO.</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Table 2.1	General applications of tunnels, modified after [10]	8
Table 2.2	Tunnelling construction project in Malaysia [12]	11
Table 2.3	Advantages and disadvantages of tunnelling method, modified after [19]	17
Table 2.4	Advantages and disadvantages of different tunnel lining supports, modified after [30]	23
Table 2.5	List of major tunnel loses in the world [12]	28
Table 2.6	Classification of causes of anomalies of tunnel [13]	37
Table 2.7	Comparison of different NDT test with application in tunnel lining, modified after [13]	45
Table 2.8	Cause of inducement of liner crack with method of assessment	51
Table 2.9	Tools of Arc-GIS along with their functions, modified after [105]	59
Table 2.10	Comparison of different numerical analysis method, modified after [114, 115]	63
Table 3.1	Longitudinal tunnel sections (50 m) selected for crack density quantification	85
Table 3.2	Details of granite core samples	88
Table 3.3	Details of direct shear test	90
Table 3.4	Summary of concrete core samples	92
Table 3.5	Tunnel sections chosen for 2D numerical modelling	96
Table 3.6	Properties of granite rock	107
Table 3.7	Properties of shotcrete tunnel liner	107
Table 4.1	Compressive strength of cracked liner surface obtained from rebound hammer performed at Tunnel 1 (T1)	112
Table 4.2	Compressive strength of cracked liner surface obtained from rebound hammer performed at Tunnel 2 (T2)	113
Table 4.3	Location of UPV test performed in Tunnel 1	114

Table 4.4	Location of UPV test performed in Tunnel 2	115
Table 4.5	Mechanical properties of granite obtained from UCS test	118
Table 4.6	Results of direct shear test	119
Table 4.7	Parameters of concrete obtained from testing of core sample	121
Table 4.8	Varying stress ratio $K$ -value and average elevation obtained at different section of tunnel along tunnel length	122
Table 4.9	Estimated Induced major principal stress at $K= 1.55$	124
Table 4.10	Stress concentration factor (SCF) around boundary of tunnels at $K=1.55$	125
Table 4.11	Estimated Induced major principal stress at $K= 1.81$	132
Table 4.12	Stress concentration factor (SCF) around boundary of tunnels at $K= 1.81$	132
Table 4.13	Estimated Induced major principal stress at $K= 1.12$	138
Table 4.14	Stress concentration factor (SCF) around boundary of tunnels at $K=1.12$	138
Table 4.15	Estimated Induced major principal stress at $K= 0.88$	144
Table 4.16	Stress concentration factor (SCF) around boundary of tunnels at $K=0.88$	144
Table 4.17	Estimated Induced major principal stress at $K= 0.75$	150
Table 4.18	Stress concentration factor (SCF) around boundary of tunnels at $K=0.75$	151

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>FIGURE NO.</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Figure 2.1	Construction output (1991-2010) [2]	9
Figure 2.2	Construction sector share to GDP [11]	10
Figure 2.3	Cross section of horseshoe tunnel	12
Figure 2.4	Distribution status of different construction methods [4]	13
Figure 2.5	The Demonstration of In-Situ and Induced Stresses in a Rock Mass Surrounding a Tunnel [23]	20
Figure 2.6	Types of tunnel support system [1]	22
Figure 2.7	Components of tunnel support	25
Figure 2.8	Cross section of shotcrete liner [33]	27
Figure 2.9	Illustration of structural defect in tunnel lining [46]	32
Figure 2.10	Types of cracks in tunnel lining	35
Figure 2.11	In-situ stresses at a point under varying ground surface at depth “z”	40
Figure 2.12	Comparison of In-Situ stress ratio ( $K$ ) obtained by Shorey and others [68]	42
Figure 2.13	Transducer arrangement (a) direct method, (b) semi-direct method, (c) indirect method [82]	46
Figure 2.14	Measurement of UPV by Indirect-Transmission method	48
Figure 2.15	Schematic diagram of sample	56
Figure 2.16	Cross-Section of Core Sample	56
Figure 2.17	Graphical representation of Mohr-Coulomb failure criteria	66
Figure 3.1	Flow chart of Research Activities	70
Figure 3.2	General map of Meru and Menora Tunnel with study area underlain by granitic rocks box [124]	73
Figure 3.3	Layout of Meru-Menora tunnel, modified after [126]	74
Figure 3.4	Geological cross section across Kledang Range, Menglembu, Simpang Pulai and Main Range, from West to East (Source: Peta Geologi Semenanjung Malaysia, 2014)	75

Figure 3.5	Diagrammatical representation of Meru-Menora tunnel	77
Figure 3.6	Illustration of schematic diagram of tunnel cross section	77
Figure 3.7	Capturing photo of liner crack using sky lift	78
Figure 3.8	Establishing chainage along tunnel	78
Figure 3.9	Crack measurement by microscope	78
Figure 3.10	Marking of points for indirect method	79
Figure 3.11	UPV performed on cracked liner in T1	79
Figure 3.12	Schmidt Hammer conversion curve to determine compressive strength	80
Figure 3.13	Rebound Hammer used with vertical position	81
Figure 3.14	Rebound Hammer test performed using grid	81
Figure 3.15	Hand operated drill machine	81
Figure 3.16	Core drilling on liner	81
Figure 3.17	Recovered core sample	82
Figure 3.18	Inside view of drilled hole	82
Figure 3.19	Division of peripheral length liner into grids	83
Figure 3.20	Mosaicking of images obtained from visual inspection in fast lane Tunnel 1	83
Figure 3.21	Layout of tunnel liner with past and new crack	84
Figure 3.22	Schematic diagram of one construction unit	85
Figure 3.23	Tunnel sections of 50 m span chosen under varying overburden depth for crack mapping	86
Figure 3.24	Prepared core samples along with strain gauges attached	87
Figure 3.25	Sample loaded in the 3000 kN Times Olsen Testing Machine	88
Figure 3.26	Failed sample after being tested	88
Figure 3.27	Sample mounted in shear box	89
Figure 3.28	Direct shear test performed on granite	89
Figure 3.29	Core sample cutting	91
Figure 3.30	Grinding of core surface	91
Figure 3.31	Capping of core samples	93

Figure 3.32	Completed core samples with capping material	93
Figure 3.33	Strain gauges attached on the core sample	94
Figure 3.34	Sample prior to testing	95
Figure 3.35	Failed sample after the compression test	95
Figure 3.36	Flow chart to extract elevation data using Arc-GIS	97
Figure 3.37	Cross-sectional profile marked on Google Earth	97
Figure 3.38	Conversion of cross sections to shape file	98
Figure 3.39	Georeferenced topographic map (scale 1: 50 000) with study area highlighted (JUPEM)	99
Figure 3.40	Digitized contour lines with elevation showing area of study	99
Figure 3.41	Generating Dem using "topo to raster 3D analyst tool"	100
Figure 3.42	DEM of clipped required area	100
Figure 3.43	Equidistance points generated from cross sections	101
Figure 3.44	Adding cross-sections points over DEM to extract elevation data	101
Figure 3.45	Workflow of numerical modelling in RS2	102
Figure 3.46	Geometry of Meru-Menora tunnel	103
Figure 3.47	Discretization of 2D finite element model in RS2	104
Figure 3.48	Boundary conditions applied in model in RS2	106
Figure 3.49	Multi-Stage excavation sequence with support installation	108
Figure 3.50	Reference points assigned on each tunnel boundary	109
Figure 4.1	Compressive strength calculated from rebound hammer results on different section of tunnel liner in T1 and T2	113
Figure 4.2	Comparison of UPV performed on sound and cracked portion of Tunnel 1	115
Figure 4.3	Comparison of UPV performed on sound and cracked portion of Tunnel 2	116
Figure 4.4	Comparison of wave path in (a) sound concrete (b) cracked concrete	117
Figure 4.5	Internal friction angle and cohesion from RocData	120
Figure 4.6	Induced stress ( $\sigma_1 - \sigma^0$ ) around boundary of T1 and T2 at chainage (01+35)	125



Figure 4.7	SCF around boundary of T1 and T2 at chainage (01+35)	126
Figure 4.8	Total displacement of T1 at section (01+35)	128
Figure 4.9	Total displacement of T2 at section (01+35)	128
Figure 4.10	Crack mapping at shallow depth. (a, b, c, d) Layout of liner crack in T1 and T2 at Ch: 01+00-02+00	130
Figure 4.11	Crack density plot at Chainage (01+00 - 02+00)	131
Figure 4.12	Induced stress ( $\sigma_I - \sigma^0$ ) around boundary of T1 and T2 at chainage (15+00)	133
Figure 4.13	SCF around boundary of T1 and T2 at chainage (15+00)	133
Figure 4.14	Total displacement of T1 at section (15+00)	134
Figure 4.15	Total displacement of T2 at section (15+00)	135
Figure 4.16	Crack mapping at shallow depth. (a, b, c, d) Layout of liner crack in T1 and T2 at Ch: 15+00-16+00	136
Figure 4.17	Crack density plot at Chainage (15+00 - 16+00)	137
Figure 4.18	Induced stress ( $\sigma_I - \sigma^0$ ) around boundary of T1 and T2 at chainage (04+20)	139
Figure 4.19	SCF around boundary of T1 and T2 at chainage (04+20)	139
Figure 4.20	Total displacement of T1 at section (04+20)	140
Figure 4.21	Total displacement of T2 at section (04+20)	141
Figure 4.22	Crack mapping at intermediate depth. (a, b, c, d) Layout of liner crack in T1 and T2 at Ch: 04+00-05+00	142
Figure 4.23	Crack density plot at Chainage (04+00 - 05+00)	143
Figure 4.24	Induced stress ( $\sigma_I - \sigma^0$ ) around boundary of T1 and T2 at chainage (10+35)	145
Figure 4.25	SCF around tunnel boundary of T1 and T2 at chainage (10+35)	145
Figure 4.26	Total displacement of T1 at section (10+35)	147
Figure 4.27	Total displacement of T2 at section (10+35)	147
Figure 4.28	Crack density plot at Chainage (10+00 - 11+00)	148
Figure 4.29	Crack mapping at intermediate depth. (a, b, c, d) Layout of liner crack in T1 and T2 at Ch: 10+00-11+00	149
Figure 4.30	IS ( $\sigma_I - \sigma^0$ ) around boundary of T1 and T2 at chainage (08+00)	152

Figure 4.31	SCF of T1 and T2 at chainage (08+00)	152
Figure 4.32	Total displacement of T1 at section (08+00)	153
Figure 4.33	Total displacement of T2 at section (08+00)	154
Figure 4.34	Crack mapping at high depth. (a, b, c, d) Layout of liner crack in T1 and T2 at Ch: 08+00-09+00	155
Figure 4.35	Crack density plot at Chainage (08+00 - 09+00)	156
Figure 4.36	Cumulative crack density of (T1, T2) against varying average overburden depth and stress ratio (K) value at different section along tunnel	160
Figure 4.37	Different zones of Tunnel along its longitudinal profile based on crack density of tunnel liner along with crack layout under different zones	1561

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

NATM	-	New Austrian Tunnelling Method
2D	-	2-Deimentional
ASTM	-	American Society for Testing and Material
BEM	-	Boundary Element Method
BS-EN	-	British Standard European Norm
CCD	-	Charge-coupled Device
CIRIA	-	Construction Industry Research and Information Association
DEM	-	Digital Elevation Model
DEM	-	Discrete Element Method
DFN	-	Discrete Fracture Network
DXF	-	Drawing Interchange Format
EPBM	-	Earth Pressure Balance Machine
ER	-	Electrical Resistivity
ESRI	-	Environmental System Research Institute
FDM	-	Finite Difference Model
FEM	-	Finite Element Modelling
FHWA	-	Federal Highway Administration
FL	-	Fast Lane
GCP	-	Ground Control Point
GIS	-	Geographical Information system
GPR	-	Geological Point Radar
GSI	-	Geological Strength Index of Rock
H-d	-	Lower Hance
H-u	-	Upper Hance
IS	-	Induces Stress
ISRM	-	International Society of Rock Mechanics
JUPEM	-	Jabatan Ukur Dan Pemetaan Malaysia
KML	-	Keyhole Marked-Up Language
KMZ	-	Keyhole Marked-Up Language Zipped
NDT	-	Non-Destructive Test

RQD	-	Rock Quality Designation
SCF	-	Stress Concentration Factor
SCL	-	Sprayed Concrete Lining
SL	-	Slow Lane
T1	-	Tunnel 1
T2	-	Tunnel 2
TBM	-	Tunnel Boring Machine
UCS	-	Uniaxial Compression Strength
UCT	-	Universal Compression Test
UPV	-	Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity
UTM	-	Universal Testing Machine
V	-	Vault
VW	-	Vertical Wall

## LIST OF SYMBOLS

$\sigma_v$	-	Vertical In-situ Stress
$\sigma_h$	-	Horizontal In-situ stress
$\sigma_1$	-	Major Principal Stress
$\sigma_3$	-	Minor Principal Stress
$\sigma_2$	-	Intermediate Stress
$\sigma_n$	-	Normal Stress
$\tau$	-	Shear Strength
$\gamma$	-	Unit Weight of Rock
$Z$	-	Overburden Depth
$K$	-	In-situ Stress Ratio
$\sigma_c$	-	Intact Compressive Strength of Rock
$E_h$	-	Deformation Modulus of Rock
$E_{rm}$	-	Rock Mass Modulus
$E_i$	-	Intact Rock Modulus
$\mu$	-	Poisson's Ratio
$D$	-	Blasting induced Disturbance Factor
$C$	-	Cohesion Strength
$\phi$	-	Internal Frictional Angle
$K_{is, cyl}$	-	Correction Factor
$A$	-	length to Diameter Ratio
$F_{is corr, cyl}$	-	In-situ Concrete Strength
$f_c$	-	Core Strength
$f_{cm}$	-	Mean Compressive Strength
$f_{ck}$	-	Characteristic Cylindrical Strength
$E_{cm}$	-	Young's Modulus
$P$	-	Compressive Strength
$F$	-	Failure Load
$L_h$	-	Shear Load
$P_h$	-	Horizontal Pressure

$P_v$	-	Vertical Pressure
$A_p$	-	Area of Piston
$A_s$	-	Gross Contact Area
$A$	-	Cross-Sectional Area
$V$	-	Pulse Velocity
$T$	-	Time Travel by pulse
$\sigma_l$	-	Post-Excavation Stress
$\sigma^0$	-	Pre-Excavation Stress

## LIST OF APPENDICES

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
APPENDIX A	Tunnel Visual Inspection Form	<b>177</b>
APPENDIX B	Geographical Index Strength Summary and Chart by Independent Laboratory	<b>178</b>
APPENDIX C	Strength and Deformation Characteristics for Concrete ( <i>Ref. Section 3: MS EN 1992-1-1: 2010</i> )	<b>179</b>
APPENDIX D	Topographic Map of IPOH	<b>180</b>
APPENDIX E	Stress-Strain Relationship of Granite Core Samples	<b>181</b>
APPENDIX F	Lateral Strain vs Axial Strain Relationship for Poisson's Ratio	<b>183</b>
APPENDIX G	Overburden depth Data in (m) Along Transverse Direction of Chosen Sections of Meru-Menora Tunnel	<b>184</b>
APPENDIX H	Stress Distribution Around Tunnel Boundary Generated from RS2 at 3 <sup>rd</sup> Stage	<b>187</b>
APPENDIX I	Contours of Total Displacement at Different Chainage with Varying Overburden	<b>189</b>





# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of Study

The role of construction industry in the development of any country cannot be ignored. A nation's competitiveness can be seen and realized in terms of its infrastructure. Being a developing nation Malaysia has realized the role of construction industry not only from economic perspective but also in the quality-of-life standard of its people. The increasing interest and inevitable need of construction industry is due to vision 2020. According to which, Malaysia must maintain GDP of 6% by the end of 2020 to be recognized one of the developed nations. The main purpose of vision 2020 is to turn Malaysia into developed, strong, economically healthy and vigorous nation by the end of 2020, which has resulted in the execution of many civil infrastructures including tunnels in Malaysia [2].

Since construction industry depends on the development of new infrastructure, but the condition of existing aging structures cannot be overlooked in terms of loss of revenue and disruption to industry and life of people. In addition, construction of new structure will cost more than that of reinstatement of already built structure. Tunnel is one of the major structures of civilization and an attractive civil infrastructure because of its advantage of providing better transportation facilities. After providing services over years, deterioration or other defects in the tunnels especially on the tunnel lining can be seen due to lack or improper maintenance, delay in repair or mainly due to aging, which results in decrease in the integrity of tunnel lining caused by the deterioration which may leads to tunnel collapse [3]. Hence the collapse of tunnel will seriously damage the socio-economic development and life quality of people in the city [4].

The deterioration of tunnel lining which is manifested in lining anomalies such as: crack, water-leakage, spalling or delamination, rusting of re-enforcement etc. Among them the most serious and damaging anomaly is liner crack. To avoid these unwanted situations to happen a monitoring system is required to identify, monitor, and determine the types of anomalies and cause of their development in the tunnel lining. Therefore, to ensure the durability of the tunnel the structural health assessment of tunnel lining is needed during its service life [5].

For the abovementioned problem, many approaches have been established in the past regarding finding the cause of development of liner cracks and their respective effects on tunnel liner for the health assessment of tunnel such as movement of neighbouring slope, difference of temperature in environments, geological condition, construction deficiencies and topography [6-9]. Among them effect of varying topography, in terms of overburden especially in tunnels buried under shallow overburden, has widely been studied for development of crack to ensure stability of tunnel [7]. Many researchers have studied effect of varying topography on liner in terms of subsidence or settlements of crown mostly in shallow tunnels, but no study is available on effect of varying overburden on the intensity of crack along the longitudinal profile of tunnel.

Numerical modelling is best way to demonstrate real life physical phenomenon in an idealized and simplified conceptual model. Although, result generated from numerical simulation are not exactly accurate, but they give approximation and aids knowledge in the understanding of solution of existing problem. Contrary to the previous studies constructing numerical model using horizontal ground surface to see the effect of topography, better result can be achieved using real topography.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

The realization of vision 2020 mentioned above shows the importance of development of new and maintenance of the existing civil infrastructures. Since tunnel is one of the significant underground structures which support transportation of goods

and people, but tunnel deteriorate over period of time. And out aging of existing tunnels are inevitably expensive in terms of loss to national asset and life quality of people. The main reason of tunnel deterioration is the development of liner cracks which may leads to tunnel collapse if not properly addressed. Therefore, to avoid disruption to industry the health condition of existing tunnels needs to be maintained for which we need health assessment system. Usually, concept of topography is used to know the inducement of crack but there is lack of understanding about the effect of varying topography on behaviour of crack in terms of its intensity on tunnel liner. Therefore, novel approach is needed to understand the influence of varying overburden on crack with a view to use it as a practical tool to facilitate health assessment of tunnel liner.

### **1.3 Significance of Study**

This study has given fair amount of understanding about the crack intensity along with their cause of inducements on tunnel liner for which health monitoring has received significant attraction. Especially, the effect of real topography on the tunnel liner was limited in previous literature with respect to behaviour of crack in terms of intensity along longitudinal profile of tunnel. This study validates and illustrates the application of proposed diagnostic approach in health assessment of tunnel by considering the effect of real topography on tunnel liner. The methodology presented and finding from this study may kick start serious efforts in providing technical guideline to the tunnel inspector and tunnel owners for the subsequent technical and maintenance program to increase the lifespan of tunnel. The results from numerical analysis may also give fair amount of idea to designers and engineers, keeping role of varying overburden in mind, during design and construction phase of tunnel. The outcome of this research will provide comprehensive knowledge and idea that can be pursued for future study.

## **1.4 Research Aim and Objectives**

The aim of this study is to gain understanding of crack density at shotcrete tunnel liner by incorporating the influence of varying overburden factor on the intensity of crack. To achieve this aim, following objectives were needed:

- i. To identify the cracks on tunnel liner.
- ii. To quantify intensity of cracks mapped from visual inspection.
- iii. To validate the effect of varying overburden on crack intensity using numerical simulation.

## **1.5 Scope and Limitations**

The multi-arch tunnel Meru (T1) and Menora (T2) located at Jelapang, Perak, Malaysia on the North-South Expressway was chosen as case study. They are situated in the Kledang Range which comprises of granitic igneous rock. The tunnels are 800 m long in length. Different section of tunnel along tunnel length were chosen depending upon the crack intensity. The tunnel was constructed employing New Austrian Tunnelling Method (NATM) and liner of tunnel was built out of shotcrete. Among different types of anomalies in tunnel, cracks were chosen focusing on the intensity of these cracks on different portions of shotcrete tunnel liner such as wall, hance and vault. Moreover, the effect of varying overburden is studied on the intensity of cracks along the length of tunnel. Arc-GIS software was utilized to get elevation data to construct real topographical surface. Effect of varying topography in terms of induced stresses, stress concentration, and total displacement was studied incorporating two-dimensional (2D) Finite Element software RS2, used for 2D numerical simulation using Mohr-Coulomb failure criteria.

Required data for research was gathered by conducting series of field inspection i.e., visual and technical, as-build drawing, previous reports, liaising with

project contractors and project owners, personal contact to government departments and related professionals for topographic map, literature review and laboratory testing. Serious constraints were faced conducting tunnel inspection and getting design data pertaining to construction of tunnel due to confidentiality which resulted in unavailability of some data. In these cases, some assumptions were made based on engineering judgement during numerical analysis.

## **1.6 Structure of Thesis**

The thesis has been structured and organized in five chapters as:

Chapter 1: gives the background of study and outlined the research problem. It also discussed the objectives needs to achieve the aim of study. And then it illustrates the significance of study as well as scope and limitations. It also provides overview of forthcoming chapters.

Chapter 2: This chapter aims at providing previous literature review regarding general concepts, theories, procedure, standards, and overview of software utilized in this study. In this chapter overview of tunnel application, anatomy, types of tunnel based on construction method along with tunnel supports and failure history of tunnel is also presented. Moreover, understanding of stresses around opening during underground excavation is also given. And then types of anomalies on tunnel liner as well as cause of their inducement is presented focusing on varying topography. And then this chapter discussed the background studies of health assessment, laboratory testing procedure and different method of numerical analysis along with software employed.

Chapter 3: In this chapter flow chart of research activities is demonstrated. Brief description of geology and study area is also provided which is chosen as case study. Then this chapter explains technical procedures, descriptions adopted to conduct field inspections and further discusses laboratory testing conducted on core samples. This chapter also illustrates the method employed to extract elevation data using Arc-

GIS. And it puts forward the input of collected data and then explains the step-by-step procedure adopted to develop numerical model at different section of tunnel along its length.

Chapter 4: This chapter discusses results obtained from field inspection, material testing in laboratory and 2D numerical modelling of tunnel at different section along tunnel length. Moreover, this chapter elaborate effect of varying overburden on the intensity of crack by comparing and validating results from field observation and numerical analysis. In addition, this chapter also shed light on the findings of this study.

Chapter 5: The chapter summarize the conclusions derived from findings and results of numerical analysis and field inspection. Moreover, this chapter briefs practical applicability of the study conducted. And at the end recommendations for further study and future work is stated.

## REFERENCES

1. Hung, C.J., *Technical Manual for Design and Construction of Road Tunnels — Civil Elements*. 2009.
2. Khan, R.A., M.S. Liew, and Z.B. Ghazali, *Malaysian construction sector and Malaysia vision 2020: developed nation status*. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences*, 2014. **109**: p. 507-513.
3. Jiang, Y., X. Zhang, and T. Taniguchi, *Quantitative condition inspection and assessment of tunnel lining*. *Automation in Construction*, 2019. **102**: p. 258-269.
4. An, J.-W., et al. *A Study on the Performance-based Evaluation Techniques of Tunnel In Use*. in *The 26th International Ocean and Polar Engineering Conference*. 2016. International Society of Offshore and Polar Engineers.
5. Lai, et al., *Structural safety assessment of existing multiarch tunnel: a case study*. *Advances in Materials Science and Engineering*, 2017. **2017**.
6. Chiu, Y.-C., C.-H. Lee, and T.-T. Wang, *Lining crack evolution of an operational tunnel influenced by slope instability*. *Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology*, 2017. **65**: p. 167-178.
7. Ziaei, A. and K. Ahangari, *The effect of topography on stability of shallow tunnels case study: The diversion and conveyance tunnels of Safa Dam*. *Transportation Geotechnics*, 2018. **14**: p. 126-135.
8. Zhao, Y., et al., *Damaging behavior investigation of an operational tunnel structure induced by cavities around surrounding rocks*. *Engineering Failure Analysis*, 2019. **99**: p. 203-209.
9. Swart, A., et al., *Influence of surface topography on the loading of pillar workings in near surface and shallow mines*. *Safety in Mines Research Advisory Committee*, Johannesburg, 2000.
10. Society, B.T., *Tunnel lining design guide*. 2004: Thomas Telford.
11. DOSM. 2018; Available from: [https://www.dosm.gov.my/v1/index.php?r=column/ctwoByCat&parent\\_id=99&menu\\_id=TE5CRUZCb1h4ZTZMODZlbnk2aWRRQT09](https://www.dosm.gov.my/v1/index.php?r=column/ctwoByCat&parent_id=99&menu_id=TE5CRUZCb1h4ZTZMODZlbnk2aWRRQT09).
12. Ghazali, F. and H. Wong, *Risk Ranking for Tunnelling Construction Projects in Malaysia*. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Project Management*, 2014. **4**(1): p. 29-36.
13. Lee, C.H. and T.T. Wang. *Rock tunnel maintenance in Taiwan*. in *Proc., 6th Asian Young Geotechnical Engineers Conf., TG Sitharam, ed., Dept. of Civil Engineering, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India*. 2008.
14. Abdallah, M. and M. Marzouk, *Planning of tunneling projects using computer simulation and fuzzy decision making*. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Management*, 2013. **19**(4): p. 591-607.
15. Sharma, P., *Tunnel Construction Methods and their comparison*. 2016, Retrieved.
16. Kolymbas, D., *Tunnelling and tunnel mechanics: A rational approach to tunnelling*. 2005: Springer Science & Business Media.
17. Rudolf, J., V. Gall, and A. Nitschke. *Selection of alignment and tunneling methods in urban settings*. in *World Tunnel Congress—2008 Underground*

- Facilities for better Environment and Safety, Central Board of Irrigation and Power, New Dehli. 2008.*
18. Karakuş, M. and R. Fowell, *An insight into the new Austrian tunnelling method (NATM)*. Proc. ROCKMEC, 2004.
  19. Abdullah, R., *A Review on Selection of Tunnelling Method and Parameters Effecting Ground Settlement*. Mal. Eng., 2016. **21**.
  20. Shrestha, G.L., *Stress induced problems in Himalayan tunnels with special reference to squeezing*. 2006.
  21. Stille, H. and A. Palmström, *Ground behaviour and rock mass composition in underground excavations*. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 2008. **23**(1): p. 46-64.
  22. Nilsen, B. and A. Palmström, *Handbook no. 2, engineering geology and rock engineering*. Norwegian Group for Rock Mechanics (NBG), 2000.
  23. Hoek, E., P.K. Kaiser, and W.F. Bawden, *Support of underground excavations in hard rock*. 2000: CRC Press.
  24. Brown, E.T. and E. Hoek. *Trends in relationships between measured in-situ stresses and depth*. in *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences & Geomechanics Abstracts*. 1978. Pergamon.
  25. Herget, G., *Stresses in rock*. 1988: Balkema Rotterdam.
  26. Ongodia, J.E., *Geotechnical engineering design of a tunnel support system-a case study of Karuma (600MW) hydropower project*. 2017, University of Cape Town.
  27. Terzaghi, K., *Rock defects and loads on tunnel supports*. 1946, Harvard Univ.
  28. Kim, K. and C. Yoo, *Design Loading for deeply buried box culverts*. Highway Research Center, Auburn University. 2002, Report No. IR-02-03., Alabama, USA, p 215.
  29. Yu, Z., P.H. Kulatilake, and F. Jiang, *Effect of tunnel shape and support system on stability of a tunnel in a deep coal mine in China*. Geotechnical and Geological Engineering, 2012. **30**(2): p. 383-394.
  30. Hjálmarsson, E.H., *Tunnel Support. Use of Lattice Girders in Sedimentary Rock*. 2011.
  31. Hoek, E., C. Carranza-Torres, and M. Diederichs, *The 2008 Kersten Lecture Integration of geotechnical and structural design in tunneling*. 2008.
  32. Komselis, C., N. Blayney, and D. Hindle. *The use of lattice girders in the construction of tunnels*. in *AITES-ITA Downunder 2002: 28th ITA General Assembly and World Tunnel Congress, Sydney, Australia, 2-8 March 2002: Modern Tunnels-Challenges and Solutions*. 2002. Institution of Engineers.
  33. Thomas, A., *Sprayed concrete lined tunnels*. Vol. 2. 2008: CRC Press.
  34. Huang, C., et al., *Technical manual for design and construction of road tunnels--Civil elements*. US Federal Highway Administration. 2009, Final Report FHWA/NHI-10-034, National Highway Institute, Washington, DC.
  35. Institute, N.H., et al., *Technical Manual for Design and Construction of Road Tunnels--civil Elements*. 2010: AASHTO.
  36. Usman, F., N. Banuar, and Z.C. Muda, *Development of condition rating of shotcrete lining of hydroelectric power station based on condition assessment of its distresses*. ARPN J. Eng. Appl. Sci, 2016. **11**(24): p. 1-6.
  37. Chiu, Y.-C., T.-T. Wang, and T.-H. Huang, *Investigating continual damage of a nineteenth century masonry tunnel*. Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Forensic Engineering, 2014. **167**(3): p. 109-118.



38. Kendorski, F. *Some modes of deformation and failure of lined tunnels*. in *International journal of rock mechanics and mining sciences & geomechanics abstracts*. 1993. Elsevier.
39. Tai-Tien WANG<sup>1</sup>, W.-L.W., *Tunnel Rehabilitation in Taiwan, Recent Cases Study*. 2006.
40. Lee, C.H.W., Tai Tienb, *ROCK TUNNEL MAINTENANCE IN TAIWAN*. 2008.
41. Richards and JA, *Inspection, maintenance and repair of tunnels: international lessons and practice*. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 1998. **13**(4): p. 369-375.
42. Mashimo, H., et al., *Effect of fiber reinforced concrete on shrinkage crack of tunnel lining*. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 2006. **21**(3): p. 382-383.
43. Chiu, Y.-C., T.-T. Wang, and T.-H. Huang, *A novel characteristic matrix approach for analyzing displacement patterns of tunnels in operation*. International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences, 2014. **72**: p. 117-126.
44. Haack, A., J. Schreyer, and G. Jackel, *State-of-the-art of Non-destructive Testing Methods for Determining the State of a Tunnel Lining*. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology incorporating Trenchless Technology Research, 1995. **4**(10): p. 413-431.
45. C. Jeremy Hung and J.M. PE, PhD, PE, Nasri Munfah, PE, and John Wisniewski, PE, *TECHNICAL MANUAL FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD TUNNELS – CIVIL ELEMENTS*. 2009, U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration. p. 702.
46. William Bergeson, P.a.S.E., PE (FHWA), *Tunnel Operations, Maintenance, Inspection, and Evaluation (TOMIE) Manual*. 2015.
47. J.A.Richard, *Inspection, Maintenance and Repair of Tunnels: International Lessons and Practice*. 1998.
48. Tellioglu, V., *Observations on groundwater leakage through cracks and segment joints in a concrete segmental tunnel lining*. 2014.
49. Kimura<sup>2</sup>, T.T.a.S., *Examination of exfoliation mechanism in tunnel lining joints*.
50. Yuan, Y., Y. Bai, and J. Liu, *Assessment service state of tunnel structure*. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 2012. **27**(1): p. 72-85.
51. Gehlen, C., *Assessment and service life updating of existing tunnels*. Feb, 2004.
52. Lee, C.-H. and T.-T. Wang, *Diagnosing causes of lining cracks in mountain tunnels*. Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Forensic Engineering, 2014. **167**(4): p. 151-164.
53. Sandrone, F. and V. Labiouse, *Identification and analysis of Swiss National Road tunnels pathologies*. Tunnelling and underground space technology, 2011. **26**(2): p. 374-390.
54. Mansoor, Y.A., *Evaluating the cracks of Highway Tunnel Concrete Lining by Using a Fuzzy Inspection System*. Iraqi Journal of Civil Engineering, 2017. **11**(2): p. 9-15.
55. Chao Yuan<sup>1</sup>, S.L.a.S.L., *Study on the Defects Characteristics of Water Leaking of Old Tunnels in Cold Regions*. 2011.

56. Zhao, Y., J. Yang, and Y. Zhang, *Failure behavior of tunnel lining caused by concrete cracking: a case study*. Journal of failure analysis and prevention, 2019. **19**(4): p. 1158-1173.
57. Usman, F., et al. *Evaluation of Condition Assessment of Tunnel Lining using Inspection Manual of CIRIA and FHWA*. in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*. 2016. IOP Publishing Ltd.
58. Zhang, N., X. Zhu, and Y. Ren, *Analysis and Study on Crack Characteristics of Highway Tunnel Lining*. Civil Engineering Journal, 2019. **5**(5): p. 1119-1123.
59. Wang, T.-T., *Characterizing crack patterns on tunnel linings associated with shear deformation induced by instability of neighboring slopes*. Engineering geology, 2010. **115**(1-2): p. 80-95.
60. Zhi-Guo, L. and Z. Yujun, *Stability analysis for tunnels with cracked linings and the techniques for repairing the cracked linings*. Modern Tunnelling Technology, 2004. **41**(1): p. 29-34.
61. Perri, G. *Behavior category and design loads for conventionally excavated tunnels*. in *11th ISRM congress*. 2007. International Society for Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering.
62. Abdellah, W.R., M.A. Ali, and H.-S. Yang, *Studying the effect of some parameters on the stability of shallow tunnels*. Journal of Sustainable Mining, 2018. **17**(1): p. 20-33.
63. Das, R., et al., *Numerical analysis of surface subsidence in asymmetric parallel highway tunnels*. Journal of Rock Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering, 2017. **9**(1): p. 170-179.
64. Rocscience Inc. 1998-2001.
65. Sheorey, P. *A theory for in situ stresses in isotropic and transversely isotropic rock*. in *International journal of rock mechanics and mining sciences & geomechanics abstracts*. 1994. Elsevier.
66. Palmström, A. and R. Singh, *The deformation modulus of rock masses—comparisons between in situ tests and indirect estimates*. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 2001. **16**(2): p. 115-131.
67. Hoek, E. and E.T. Brown, *Practical estimates of rock mass strength*. International journal of rock mechanics and mining sciences, 1997. **34**(8): p. 1165-1186.
68. Pei, Q., et al., *An improved method for estimating in situ stress in an elastic rock mass and its engineering application*. Open Geosciences, 2016. **8**(1): p. 523-537.
69. Inokuma, A. and S. Inano, *Road tunnels in Japan: deterioration and countermeasures*. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 1996. **11**(3): p. 305-309.
70. Xuezheng Wu 1, Y.J., 4\*, Jianhua Wang 1, Kusaba Masaya 1, Tetsuya Taniguchi 2 and and T.Y. 3, *A New Health Assessment Index of Tunnel Lining Based on the Digital Inspection of Surface Cracks*. 2017.
71. Bossi, G., L. Schenato, and G. Marcato, *Structural health monitoring of a road tunnel intersecting a large and active landslide*. Applied sciences, 2017. **7**(12): p. 1271.
72. Brownjohn, J.M., *Structural health monitoring of civil infrastructure*. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 2007. **365**(1851): p. 589-622.
73. FHWA, *Colorado Tunnel Inventory & Inspection Manual*. 2018.

74. C671, C., *Tunnels: inspection, assessment and maintenance*. 2009.
75. Toshihiro Asakuraa, Y.K., \*, *Tunnel maintenance in Japan*. 2003.
76. SERIES, T.C., *Guidebook on non-destructive testing of concrete structures*. 2002, Vienna, Austria: Int. Atomic Energy Agency.
77. Yuan, C., S. Li, and S. Li, *Study on the defects characteristics of water leaking of old tunnels in cold regions*, in *Tunnel management, emerging technologies, and innovation*. 2011. p. 187-193.
78. Inaudi, D., et al., *SOFO: tunnel monitoring with fiber optic sensors*. Reducing risk in tunnel design and construction, Basel, 1998.
79. Zan, Y., et al., *An innovative vehicle-mounted GPR technique for fast and efficient monitoring of tunnel lining structural conditions*. *Case Studies in Nondestructive Testing and Evaluation*, 2016. **6**: p. 63-69.
80. Liu, S., et al., *Damage behavior and maintenance design of tunnel lining based on numerical evaluation*. *Engineering Failure Analysis*, 2020. **109**: p. 104209.
81. Karaiskos, G., et al., *Monitoring of concrete structures using the ultrasonic pulse velocity method*. *Smart Materials and Structures*, 2015. **24**(11): p. 113001.
82. Shariati, M., et al., *Assessing the strength of reinforced concrete structures through Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity and Schmidt Rebound Hammer tests*. *Scientific Research and Essays*, 2011. **6**(1): p. 213-220.
83. ASTM, C., *597, 2016*. Standard Test Method for Pulse Velocity through Concrete. American Society for Testing and Materials. **100**.
84. EN, B., *12504-4: 2004, "Testing Concrete*. Determination of ultrasonic pulse velocity, 2004.
85. Komlos, K., et al., *Ultrasonic pulse velocity test of concrete properties as specified in various standards*. *Cement and Concrete Composites*, 1996. **18**(5): p. 357-364.
86. EN, B., *Testing Concrete in Structures*, in *Non-destructive Testing Determination of Rebound Number*. 2012.
87. Wang, W., et al., *Assessment of damage in mountain tunnels due to the Taiwan Chi-Chi earthquake*. *Tunnelling and underground space technology*, 2001. **16**(3): p. 133-150.
88. Zhang, Y.X., et al., *Damage in Concrete Lining of an Operational Tunnel*. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, 2017. **31**(4): p. 06017002.
89. Zhang, Y., et al., *Determining the cause of damages in a multiarch tunnel structure through field investigation and numerical analysis*. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, 2017. **31**(3): p. 04016104.
90. Lai, H., et al., *Influence of flooded loessial overburden on the tunnel lining: case study*. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, 2017. **31**(6): p. 04017108.
91. Yang, C., et al., *Deformation behavior of topographic unsymmetrical loaded tunnels and their pre-reinforcements after excavation*. *Journal of Highway and Transportation Research and Development (English Edition)*, 2013. **7**(3): p. 69-75.
92. Hu, Q. and Y. Zhou. *Study on the influence of topography on mechanics effect of tunnels*. in *2011 International Conference on Electrical and Control Engineering*. 2011.

93. Lee, S.Y., et al., *Development of an inspection system for cracks in a concrete tunnel lining*. Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering, 2007. **34**(8): p. 966-975.
94. Chang, C., M.D. Zoback, and A. Khaksar, *Empirical relations between rock strength and physical properties in sedimentary rocks*. Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, 2006. **51**(3-4): p. 223-237.
95. Hongzhi, L.B.B., *Advances in Calculation Methods for Rock Mechanics Parameters [J]*. Petroleum Drilling Techniques, 2005. **5**.
96. Xu, H., et al., *Characterization of rock mechanical properties using lab tests and numerical interpretation model of well logs*. Mathematical Problems in Engineering, 2016. **2016**.
97. Bieniawski, Z. and M. Bernede. *Suggested methods for determining the uniaxial compressive strength and deformability of rock materials: Part 1. Suggested method for determining deformability of rock materials in uniaxial compression*. in *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences & Geomechanics Abstracts*. 1979. Elsevier.
98. Isah, B., et al. *Uniaxial compression test of rocks: Review of strain measuring instruments*. in *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*. 2020. IOP Publishing.
99. Hoek, E. and M.S. Diederichs, *Empirical estimation of rock mass modulus*. International journal of rock mechanics and mining sciences, 2006. **43**(2): p. 203-215.
100. Saiang, D., L. Malmgren, and E. Nordlund, *Laboratory tests on shotcrete-rock joints in direct shear, tension and compression*. Rock mechanics and rock engineering, 2005. **38**(4): p. 275-297.
101. BSI, B., *BS EN 12504-1: 2009 Testing concrete in structures. Cored specimens. Taking, examining and testing in compression*. BSI, London, UK, 2009.
102. MS, E., *Strength and deformation characteristics for concrete*. 2010.
103. Sharma, A. and D. Gupta, *Derivation of topographic map from elevation data available in google earth*. Civil Engineering and Urban Planning, 2014. **1**(2): p. 14-21.
104. Maguire, D.J., *ArcGIS: General Purpose GIS Software System*, in *Encyclopedia of GIS*, S. Shekhar and H. Xiong, Editors. 2008, Springer US: Boston, MA. p. 25-31.
105. Surani, M.D.J., G.V. Dihora, and Y.P. Pathak, *Digitizing Water Distribution Network and Topography Mapping from Digital Elevation Model (DEM) using 3D Analyst & Spatial Analyst*. International Journal for Innovative Research in Science & Technology, 2015. **1**(11): p. 472-476.
106. Pradhan, R., et al., *Contour line tracing algorithm for digital topographic maps*. International Journal of Image Processing (IJIP), 2010. **4**(2): p. 156-163.
107. Jacobson, A., et al., *A novel approach to mapping land conversion using Google Earth with an application to East Africa*. Environmental Modelling & Software, 2015. **72**: p. 1-9.
108. GoogleEarth. 2014; Available from: <https://www.google.com/earth/index.html>.
109. Yahya, S. and R. Abdullah, *A Review on Methods of Predicting Tunneling Induced Ground Settlements*. EJGE, 2014. **19**: p. 5813-5826.

110. Imran Khan, R.M.S. and K. Man Shrestha, *Stability Analysis of Shallow Tunnel of Norra Länken*. 2011.
111. Jing, L. and J. Hudson, *Numerical methods in rock mechanics*. International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences, 2002. **39**(4): p. 409-427.
112. Jing, L., *A review of techniques, advances and outstanding issues in numerical modelling for rock mechanics and rock engineering*. International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences, 2003. **40**(3): p. 283-353.
113. Bobet, A., *Numerical methods in geomechanics*. The Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering, 2010. **35**(1B): p. 27-48.
114. Coggan, J., et al., *Numerical modelling of the effects of weak immediate roof lithology on coal mine roadway stability*. International Journal of Coal Geology, 2012. **90**: p. 100-109.
115. Cai, M., *Influence of stress path on tunnel excavation response–Numerical tool selection and modeling strategy*. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 2008. **23**(6): p. 618-628.
116. Hoek, E. *Estimating Mohr-Coulomb friction and cohesion values from the Hoek-Brown failure criterion*. in *Intl. J. Rock Mech. & Mining Sci. & Geomechanics Abstracts*. 1990.
117. Labuz, J.F. and A. Zang, *Mohr–Coulomb failure criterion*, in *The ISRM Suggested Methods for Rock Characterization, Testing and Monitoring: 2007-2014*. 2012, Springer. p. 227-231.
118. rocscience. rocscience. Available from: [https://www.rocscience.com/help/rocddata/rocddata/Mohr-Coulomb\\_Criterion.htm](https://www.rocscience.com/help/rocddata/rocddata/Mohr-Coulomb_Criterion.htm).
119. Sargent, R.G. *Verification and validation of simulation models*. in *Proceedings of the 2010 winter simulation conference*. 2010. IEEE.
120. Lee, S., M. Ismail, and S.M. Ng, *The Evaluation of Tunnel Behaviours under High Rock Stress Using Numerical Analysis Method*. EJGE:(January 2012), 2012: p. 3605-3626.
121. Ravandi, E.G. and R. Rahmangeb, *Wall displacement prediction of circular, D shaped and modified horseshoe tunnels in non-hydrostatic stress fields*. Tunnelling and underground space technology, 2013. **34**: p. 54-60.
122. Vardakos, S.S., M.S. Gutierrez, and N.R. Barton, *Back-analysis of Shimizu Tunnel No. 3 by distinct element modeling*. Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology, 2007. **22**(4): p. 401-413.
123. Kontogianni, V.A. and S.C. Stiros, *Predictions and observations of convergence in shallow tunnels: case histories in Greece*. Engineering geology, 2002. **63**(3-4): p. 333-345.
124. Mang, W.J. and A.G.M. Rafek, *Durability characterisation of weathered sedimentary rocks using slake durability index and jar slake test*. 2018.
125. Hui, T.W. and O.T. Aun, *Key Developments of Tunnels in Malaysia*. 2018.
126. Baharun, A., N. Murad, and N. Malik, *Harmful Gases Profiling in Meru Menora Tunnel using SICK Sensor*. Telkomnika, 2017. **15**(2): p. 888.
127. Ulusay, R. and J. Hudson, *The Blue Book–The Complete ISRM Suggested Methods for Rock Characterization, Testing and Monitoring: 1974–2006*. ISRM and Turkish National Group of ISRM, Ankara, 2007.
128. RocData, *RocData*, in *5.0*.
129. Alaud, S. and G.P. van Zijl. *Effects on Concrete Properties by ASR Deterioration under Different Exposure Conditions*. in *Proceedings of the*

- Sixth International Conference on Structural Engineering, Mechanics, and Computation (SEMC), Cape Town, South Africa. 2016.*
130. 1992-1-1, M.E., *MALAYSIA NATIONAL ANNEX TO EUROCODE 2: DESIGN OF CONCRETE STRUCTURES - PART 1-1: GENERAL RULES AND RULES FOR BUILDINGS*. 2010.
  131. Harms, M.S.S., *Shotcrete in tunnelling and mining*. 2017.
  132. Zeeshan, B., A. De Stefano, and S. Invernizzi, *Effects of using innovative seismic isolation technique on masonry: tunnelling work required*. *Earthquake Resistant Engineering Structures IX*, 2013. **132**: p. 369.
  133. Rezaei, A., et al. *The influence of buildings and ground stratification on tunnel lining loads using finite element method*. in *Proceedings of the 18th international conference on soil mechanics and geotechnical engineering*. 2013.
  134. Zhang, L., X. Wu, and H. Liu, *Strategies to reduce ground settlement from shallow tunnel excavation: A case study in China*. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 2016. **142**(5): p. 04016001.
  135. Zhang, Y. and H.S. Mitri, *Elastoplastic stability analysis of mine haulage drift in the vicinity of mined stopes*. *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences*, 2008. **45**(4): p. 574-593.
  136. Aydin, A. and A. Basu, *The Schmidt hammer in rock material characterization*. *Engineering Geology*, 2005. **81**(1): p. 1-14.
  137. Zhu, W., et al., *Systematic numerical simulation of rock tunnel stability considering different rock conditions and construction effects*. *Tunnelling and underground space technology*, 2003. **18**(5): p. 531-536.
  138. Mitra, S., *STRESS DISTRIBUTION AROUND UNDERGROUND EXCAVATIONS IN ROCK*. 1990.
  139. Song, W., et al., *Field and laboratory study of cracking and safety of secondary lining for an existing highway tunnel in loess ground*. *Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology*, 2019. **88**: p. 35-46.

## **LIST OF PUBLICATION**

### **Conference Proceedings**

- 1- Amber Islam, Rini Asnida Abdullah, Izni Syahrizal Ibrahim, Goh Thian Lai, Haryati Awang. Evaluation of Structural Health Assessment of Existing Multi-Arch Tunnel Lining. In 2019 Proceeding of VCRES-2019 ISRM Specialized Conference on Rock Mechanics and Engineering for Sustainable Energy. ISBN: 978-604-913-909-3