



# **DEVELOPMENT OF EPS GEOFOAM TO REDUCE LATERAL PRESSURE BEHIND RETAINING WALLS**

By

**Salem Ali Salem Azzam**

A Thesis Submitted to the  
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University  
in Partial Fulfilment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
**MASTER OF SCIENCE**  
In  
**Civil Engineering – Public Works**

**FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY  
GIZA, EGYPT**

2018

# **DEVELOPMENT OF EPS GEOFOAM TO REDUCE LATERAL PRESSURE BEHIND RETAINING WALLS**

By

**Salem Ali Salem Azzam**

A Thesis Submitted to the  
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University  
in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
**MASTER OF SCIENCE**  
In  
**Civil Engineering – Public Works**

Under the Supervision of

**Prof. Dr. Abdelsalam M. Salem**

**Dr. Sherif S. AbdelSalam**

.....  
Professor of Foundations & Geotechnical  
Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

.....  
Associate Professor Foundations &  
Geotechnical Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering and Applied  
Science, Nile University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY  
GIZA, EGYPT

2018

# **DEVELOPMENT OF EPS GEOFOAM TO REDUCE LATERAL PRESSURE BEHIND RETAINING WALLS**

By

**Salem Ali Salem Azzam**

A Thesis Submitted to the  
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University  
in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
**MASTER OF SCIENCE**  
In  
**Civil Engineering – Public Works**

Approved by the  
Examining Committee

---

**Prof. Dr. Abdelsalam M. Salem,**

Thesis Main Advisor

---

**Dr. Sherif S. AbdelSalam,**

Advisor

Associate Professor at Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science,  
Nile University

---

**Prof. Dr. Hessiun Elmamlouk,**

Internal Examiner

---

**Prof. Dr. Amira Abdelrahman,**

External Examiner

Housing and Building National Research Center “HBRC”

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY  
GIZA, EGYPT

2018

**Engineer's Name:** Salem Ali Salem Azzam  
**Date of Birth:** 20/09/1992  
**Nationality:** Egyptian  
**E-mail:** [Salemazzam6@gmail.com](mailto:Salemazzam6@gmail.com)  
**Phone:** 01067938117  
**Address:** El-Gabria, El-Mahalla Elkubra, Gharbia  
**Registration Date:** 01 / 10 / 2015  
**Awarding Date:** 2018  
**Degree:** Master of Science  
**Department:** Civil Engineering - Public Works  
**Supervisors:** **Prof. Abdelsalam M. Salem** (Cairo Univ.)  
**Associate Prof. Sherif S. Abdelsalam** (Nile Univ.)



**Examiners:** **Prof. Dr. Amira Abdelrahman** (External examiner)  
Housing and Building National Research Center "HBRC"  
**Prof. Dr. Hessiun Elmamlouk** (Internal examiner)  
**Prof. Dr. Abdelsalam M. Salem** (Thesis main advisor)  
**Associate Prof. Sherif S. Abdelsalam** (Advisor)  
**Title of Thesis:** Development of EPS Geofoam to Reduce Lateral Pressure Behind Retaining Walls

**Key Words:** Geofoam, Geosynthetics, Lateral Pressure, Retaining Walls.

**Summary:**

Expanded polystyrene (EPS) Geofoam has long been used as a geotechnical highly compressible and lightweight alternative material with an approximate weight less than 1% compared to soil. Several infrastructure projects require the use of large retaining walls with lengthy free heights. The classical backfill behind such walls typically consists of heavy compacted soils, which add more loads and lead to wall outsized dimensions. As a lightweight material, EPS Geofoam significantly reduces the loads imposed on retaining walls and underlying soils, and is not just a soil backfill replacement material but is intended to solve engineering challenges. A pilot study intended to characterize the properties and interface behavior of the EPS Geofoam was planned, including developing a finite element model to simulate the behavior of rigid retaining walls with Geofoam inclusion. Two main concepts of Geofoam inclusion were studied, the reduced earth pressure (REP) and the zero earth pressure (ZEP) concepts. Static loading conditions (at rest and active pressures) were modeled to determine the reduction in the coefficient of lateral pressure after using Geofoam. From the main outcomes, it was found that a 5 cm Geofoam inclusion is enough to make a 1 m rigid wall act as flexible wall. It was also found that the coefficient of lateral earth pressure can significantly be reduced by 50% in some cases.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Several sections in this thesis were conducted as part of research project "Development of EPS Geofoam to Improve Infrastructure Efficiency", which was funded by National Science and Technology Development Fund (STDF) – project number 12629. The author is grateful to the British University in Egypt (BUE), which hosted material testing and prototype fabrication in its laboratories. Thanks are also due to the Centre for Advanced Materials (CAM) at the BUE.

The author highly appreciates and would like to thank the advisory panel members, main advisor, Prof. Dr. Abdelsalam M. Salem – Cairo University, and co-advisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sherif S. AbdelSalam – Nile University, for their support, guidance, and cooperation during the supervision on this Masters study. My supervisors encouraged me to write this thesis and publish technical papers by giving thoughts, ideas, and experience, which supported and classified my way of thinking before writing.

I am very thankful to workshop and laboratory technicians at the BUE for their support on the execution of laboratory tests. Special thanks goes to Prof. Yehia Bahy-El-Din, Dr. Mostafa Shazly, Mr. Ahmed Youssef, Eng. Bishoy M. Fakhry, Eng. Abdel Rahman Abdel-Awad, and Mr. Ahmed Medhat for their help during the entire research period.

Finally, I would like to forward my deepest gratitude to my family members and friends for their encouragement and full understanding throughout the past three years of this research.

Sincerely,

Salem A. Azzam, 2018

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES.....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES.....</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>NOMENCLATURE .....</b>	<b>VIII</b>
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>IX</b>
<b>1. CHAPTER.1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1. Background .....	4
2.2. Engineering properties of EPS .....	6
2.3. Applications of EPS.....	10
2.3.1. EPS for road construction.....	11
2.3.2. EPS for earth retaining structures.....	12
2.4. Partial Resistance Factors .....	13
2.4.1. Evaluation of design variables.....	13
2.4.2. Determination of characteristic values .....	13
<b>3. CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1. Introduction .....	16
3.2. Methodology.....	16
<b>4. CHAPTER 4. LABORATORY TESTING.....</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1. Unconfined Compression (UC) tests .....	18
4.2. Shear Strength and Interface Properties .....	19
4.2.1. Direct shear for unit EPS block (F) .....	20
4.2.2. Direct shear between EPS blocks (F/F).....	21
4.2.3. Direct shear between EPS block and coarse sand (F/S) .....	21
4.2.4. Direct shear between EPS block and concrete surfaces (F/C).....	22
4.3. Determination of EPS characteristic values .....	23

<b>5.</b>	<b>CHAPTER 5. MODELLING LAB TESTS .....</b>	<b>27</b>
5.1.	Introduction .....	27
5.2.	Stiffness and Material Modulus.....	27
5.1.	Shear Strength and Interface Properties .....	29
5.1.1.	FE model for direct shear for unit EPS block (FE-F-D).....	29
5.1.2.	FE model for Direct Shear between EPS Sheets (FE-F/F-D).....	30
5.1.3.	FE model for direct shear between EPS and concrete (FE-F/C-D).....	31
5.1.4.	FE model for Direct Shear between EPS and coarse sand (FE-F/S-D).....	33
<b>6.</b>	<b>CHAPTER 6. NUMERICAL MODELLING FOR WALLS (2D) .....</b>	<b>36</b>
6.1.	Finite Element Model for Rigid Walls .....	36
6.2.	Finite Element Model for Flexible Walls .....	38
6.3.	Prototype by Ertugrul and Trandafir (2013).....	40
6.4.	Comparison between [E&T] Prototype and the FE Model .....	42
<b>7.</b>	<b>CHAPTER 7. NUMERICAL MODELLING FOR WALLS (3D) .....</b>	<b>43</b>
7.1.	Finite Element Model for Flexible Walls .....	43
7.1.1.	Arching mechanism in 3D model of flexible walls with EPS.....	44
7.2.	Limitations and Design Example .....	45
<b>8.</b>	<b>CHAPTER 8. APPLICATION AND VERIFICATION .....</b>	<b>47</b>
8.1.	Prototype Description .....	47
8.2.	Prototype Instrumentation .....	47
8.3.	Test Procedures.....	49
8.3.1.	Prototype with EPS thickness ( $t/h=0.1$ ).....	50
8.3.2.	Prototype with EPS thickness ( $t/h=0.25$ ).....	51
8.3.3.	Prototype with EPS thickness ( $t/h=0.4$ ).....	51
8.3.4.	Prototype with EPS thickness ( $t/h=0.5$ ).....	52
<b>9.</b>	<b>CHAPTER 9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>DESCLOSER .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>57</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Percentage volume of water absorption after Van Dorp (1988) .....	5
Table 2.2: Change in compressive strength of EPS with varying temperature (copied from Ertugrul & Trandafir, 2013) .....	8
Table 2.3. Results of temperature controlled creep tests performed on 20 kg/m <sup>3</sup> (copied from Harvath, 1994) .....	9
Table 4.1: Summary of the DST results .....	25
Table 4.2. Young's modulus and yielding stress for each trial .....	25
Table 4.3. Partial factors on EPS Parameters .....	26
Table 5.1: Material properties used in finite element analysis (FEA) .....	28
Table 8.1: Pressure cells technical specifications .....	48

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: EPS manufacture a) expandable polystyrene beads, and b) EPS blocks formation after Ravve (2000).....	4
Figure 2.2: Stress-Strain curve of 20 kg/m <sup>3</sup> EPS at 10% strain per minute copied from Stark et al. (2004) .....	7
Figure 2.3: Initial tangent modulus for EPS copied from AWOL (2012).....	7
Figure 2.4. EPS creep behavior for different stress levels (Elragi, 2006) .....	10
Figure 2.5: Various applications of EPS [after EPS Industry Alliance (2012)] .....	11
Figure 2.6. Typical construction detail for road [EPS Modified after EPS Industry Alliance (2012)].....	12
Figure 2.7. Typical construction detail for EPS backfilled earth retention [after EPS Industry Alliance (2012)] .....	13
Figure 2.8. Procedure to determine design value after Orr et al. (1999).....	14
Figure 2.9. Definition of characteristic value [after G.Yoon (2007)] .....	15
Figure 3.1: Prototype model.....	17
Figure 4.1: Set-up of EPS inside a triaxial cell .....	18
Figure 4.2: UC test on EPS: a) during test; and b) after test. ....	19
Figure 4.3: Stress-strain behavior of EPS .....	19
Figure 4.4: Set-up of direct shear test (DST): a) EPS specimen in direct shear box; b) DST machine; and c) failure shape.....	20
Figure 4.5: DST for unit block in dry and submerged conditions: a) shear stress vs. displacement; and b) the shear parameters. ....	20
Figure 4.6: The mDST between blocks: a) EPS specimen; and b) failure shape.....	21
Figure 4.7: The mDST for two block in dry and wet conditions: a) shear stress vs. displacement; and b) shear strength parameters .....	22
Figure 4.8: a) EPS specimen with sand in direct shear box; and b) failure shape.....	22
Figure 4.9: The mDST between block and coarse sand in dry and wet conditions: a) shear stress vs. displacement; and b) the shear strength parameters. ....	22
Figure 4.10. a) Concrete plate; b) EPS and smooth concrete; and c) EPS and rough concrete..	23
Figure 4.11: mDST results for EPS and smooth concrete in dry and wet conditions: a) shear stress vs. displacement; and b) shear strength parameters .....	24
Figure 4.12: mDST results for EPS and rough concrete surface in dry and wet conditions: a) shear stress vs. displacement; and b) shear strength parameters .....	24
Figure 4.13. Series of unconfined compression tests .....	25
Figure 4.14. a) Histogram for young's modulus; and b) histogram for yield stress .....	26

Figure 5.1: Axisymmetric model for EPS: a) vertical displacement; b) unstructured mesh; and c) effective mean stress. ....	27
Figure 5.2: Stress-strain behavior of FE model vs. lab .....	28
Figure 5.3: FE model for EPS and other material; a) unite EPS block; b) EPS block & block, c) EPS and concrete; and d) EPS and sand.....	29
Figure 5.4: EPS Direct Shear model: a) horizontal displacement; b) unstructured mesh; and c) mean effective shear stress; and d) effective relative shear .....	30
Figure 5.5: FE model versus DST measurements for unite EPS block: a) Shear displacement curve; and b) the shear parameters.....	30
Figure 5.6: Plane strain model for EPS blocks: a) initial model; b) unstructured mesh; and c) effective mean stress .....	31
Figure 5.7: FE model versus DST measurements for EPS blocks: a) shear displacement curve; and b) the shear parameters.....	32
Figure 5.8: Plane strain model for EPS blocks& concrete: a) initial model; b) unstructured mesh; and c) effective mean stress. ....	32
Figure 5.9: FE model versus DST measurements for EPS block & the concrete: a) shear displacement curve; b) the shear parameters.....	33
Figure 5.10: Plane strain model for EPS blocks& concrete: a) initial model; b) unstructured mesh; and c) effective mean stress .....	34
Figure 5.11: FE model versus DST measurements for EPS block & coarse sand: a) Shear displacement curve; b) the shear parameters.....	35
Figure 5.12: Design chart to determine Rinter of EPS.....	35
Figure 6.2. Pressure profiles for rigid wall with different EPS thickness .....	37
Figure 6.3. Percentage of reduction in $\sigma_x$ at the wall toe with EPS thickness .....	37
Figure 6.4. Lateral earth pressure coefficient with respect to EPS thickness.....	38
Figure 6.5. Plain strain model for flexible wall: - a) model definition, b) Deformed mesh, c) $\sigma_x$ on wall, and d) lateral deformation in EPS .....	39
Figure 6.6. Pressure profiles for flexible wall with different EPS thickness .....	39
Figure 6.7. Percentage of reduction in $\sigma_x$ at the wall toe with EPS thickness .....	40
Figure 6.8. Lateral earth pressure coefficient with respect to EPS thickness.....	41
Figure 6.9. Laboratory prototype test layout and setup [Ertugrul and Trandafir (2013)] .....	41
Figure 6.10. Laboratory prototype results by Ertugrul & Trandafir, E&T: a) pressure values for a rigid wall; and b) pressure values for a flexible wall .....	42
Figure 6.11. Comparison between E&T prototype and the FE model .....	42
Figure 7.1: 3D model: a) model geometry; and b) deformed mesh .....	43
Figure 7.2: 3D model: a) lateral disp., $u_x$ ; and b) Cartesian stress, $\sigma_{xx}$ .....	44
Figure 7.3: Side view and sec. A-A: a) no buffer; and b) EPS $t/h = 0.2$ .....	45

Figure 7.4. Reduction in lateral pressure from the 2D and 3D models .....	45
Figure 7.5. For $t/h = 0.30$ : a) deformed mesh; b) horizontal displacement; and c) Cartesian stresses .....	46
Figure 7.6. Normalized factor of safety versus EPS thickness .....	46
Figure 8.1: Laboratory prototype: a) prototype boundaries, and b) retaining wall and wall base .....	47
Figure 8.2: TY-350 Strain type Earth pressure cell shape and size.....	48
Figure 8.3: a) pressure cells installed between wall and EPS buffer; and b) pressure cells installed between EPS buffer and backfill sand.....	48
Figure 8.4: MS6R data logger with sensor.....	49
Figure 8.5: Displacement dial gauge.....	49
Figure 8.6: using EPS thickness ( $t/h=0.1$ ).....	50
Figure 8.7: Stress distribution on wall with EPS ( $t/h=0.1$ ) .....	50
Figure 8.8: using EPS thickness ( $t/h=0.25$ ).....	51
Figure 8.9: Stress distribution on wall with EPS ( $t/h=0.25$ ) .....	51
Figure 8.10 : using EPS thickness ( $t/h=0.4$ ).....	52
Figure 8.11: Stress distribution on wall with EPS ( $t/h=0.40$ ) .....	52
Figure 8.12: using EPS thickness ( $t/h=0.5$ ).....	53
Figure 8.13: Stress distribution on wall with EPS ( $t/h=0.50$ ) .....	53
Figure 8.14: Stress distribution on wall with various EPS thickness: a) from FEM; and b) from prototype .....	53

# NOMENCLATURE

$X_k$	characteristic value	$c'$	effective cohesion of EPS beads
$K_n$	statistical probability distribution factor	$E_{50}^{ref}$	secant stiffness
$\gamma_E$	Partial factor of young's modulus for EPS	$E_{oed}^{ref}$	tangent stiffness
$\gamma_{ys}$	Partial factor of yield stress for EPS	$E_{ur}^{ref}$	unloading/reloading stiffness
ABBREVIATIONS		$\sigma_y$	yield stress
UC	unconfined compression test	$h$	wall height
DST	Direct Shear Test	$K_a$	active coefficient of lateral earth pressure
mDST	modified direct shear test	$K_o$	coefficient of lateral earth pressure at rest
FEM	finite element method	$R_{inter}$	strength reduction factor for interfaces
EPS	Expanded polystyrene Geofoam	$t$	thickness of EPS buffer
D	dry interface	$Z$	depth from ground surface
HS	Hardening soil	$\alpha'$	effective adhesion at foam-foam interface
W	wet interface	$\gamma$	unit weight
CR	rough concrete	$\delta'$	effective friction angle at foam-foam interface
CS	smooth concrete	$\nu$	Poisson's ratio
S	coarse sand soil	$\rho$	density
F	EPS Geofoam	$\sigma_{xx}$	lateral relative effective stress
REP	reduction earth pressure	$\sigma_{yy}$	vertical relative effective stress
ZEP	Zero earth pressure	$\phi'$	effective angle of internal friction of EPS beads
MCS	Monte Carlo simulation	$\psi$	dilatancy angle
E&T	Ertugrul and Trandafir stress reduction curves	$E_{ti}$	Tangent Young's modulus
K&B	Karpurapu and Bathurst stress reduction curves	$E$	Young's modulus
P.Cell	earth pressure cells	COV	coefficient of variation

## **ABSTRACT**

Expanded Polystyrene (EPS) or EPS Geofoam has long been used as a compressible lightweight alternative for soil backfills to reduce lateral pressure behind retaining walls. Uncertainty in material properties and lack of design parameters are the main constraints to using local EPS in geotechnical applications. In this research, the main goal was to characterize the EPS properties and to calibrate a standard numerical model to capture the behavior of rigid and flexible walls with EPS inclusion. A laboratory-testing program was conducted to measure the shear strength parameters of EPS as well as the interface properties between EPS and other materials such as soil and concrete. A reliability analysis was considered to develop the partial resistance factors required for the EPS main properties. The EPS reliable properties were then utilized in the hardening soil constitutive model of the Finite Element (FE) program Plaxis to accurately assess the material and the interface behaviors. Accordingly, rigid and flexible retaining walls with EPS inclusions with variable thicknesses were modeled using Plaxis 2D and 3D, whereas models outcomes were verified against results from the literature as well as measurements from an instrumented physical prototype that was assembled as part of this research. From the major outcomes, an EPS inclusion with a relatively thin thickness to wall height ratio is sufficient to change the behavior of the backfill soil behind rigid walls from at-rest to active conditions. Also it was found that the lateral pressure on flexible walls can be significantly reduced by up to 25% using a relatively thin EPS inclusion due to soil arching mechanism. Correlations to calculate the expected amount of reduction in the lateral pressure were presented depending on EPS density, thickness, and wall type.

# CHAPTER.1 INTRODUCTION

Design of earth retaining structures involves a complex balance between loads and resistances, while stability must be approached systematically in order to achieve the desired safety factors against internal (structural capacity) and external (geotechnical or soil shear resistance) failures. The main components of a wall geotechnical stability are adequate soil shear strength to support the required bearing pressures, adequate soil friction to prevent excessive sliding at the foundation level, and adequate geometry and soil backfill weights to resist wall overturning. For typical cantilever retaining walls, the overall geotechnical stability requires adequate resistance against lateral earth pressures that are mainly exerted due to soil backfills or embankments behind the wall.

A classical approach to achieve the desired geotechnical stability against external failure is to base the design upon load combinations that exceed the predicted maximum loads. One of the most commonly used earth retaining system is the gravity and cantilever reinforced concrete walls, which are one of the most economic systems compared with other complex systems such as the diaphragm walls with multi-anchors. However, several projects such as underground metro stations, multi-story underground public garages, bridges, highways, pipe lines, and other types of infrastructure require the use of large retaining walls with exposed free heights that could exceed the design code limits. Using soil backfill behind such walls shall exert large lateral pressures leading to wall outsized dimensions. Eventually, a considerable increase in the amount of construction materials such as cement, steel, and quality aggregates is expected.

A new approach to achieve the wall geotechnical stability against failure can be achieved by using of a lightweight backfill material as a replacement for the soil backfill. Hence, the geotechnical safety factor can be achieved by reducing the actual loads instead of increasing the stiffness of the concrete wall. Durable polymer materials can be used for that purpose in several geotechnical applications, and Expanded Polystyrene (EPS) is considered as one of the most durable Geosynthetic materials. EPS has long been used globally as a lightweight alternative for soil backfill because its approximate weight represents less than 1% of the soil bulk density, at the mean time its porosity is very low.

As a lightweight alternative, EPS can significantly reduce the lateral loads imposed on retaining walls and underlying soils, and is not just a soil backfill replacement material but is intended to solve engineering challenges. Adapting EPS does not only translate into savings in the overall construction cost, but also the sustainability of construction materials, in addition to reducing the demand for polluting components such as cement which have a positive impact on the environment and the energy consumption.

Internationally, the main problem of using the EPS as an alternative for soil backfill behind walls is the non-availability of various geotechnical design parameters. There is also a shortage in the research outcomes that contain information from verified full-scale prototypes that model the interaction between the concrete wall and the EPS backfill (either using EPS blocks or a thin EPS inclusion or buffer). Locally, there are no reliable information about the EPS mechanical properties and characteristics, Even in the literature there is no partial resistance factors available for the EPS shear strength parameters. Although there is a progressive dependency on EPS in various geotechnical and infrastructure projects, there is still insufficient researches conducted on this topic.

Two main concepts of EPS backfill behind retaining walls can be adopted, the Zero Earth Pressure (ZEP) and the Reduced Earth Pressure (REP) concepts. The ZEP concept is simply by replacing the entire volume of the soil backfill behind the wall by Geofoam blocks, which will eventually lead to almost no lateral pressure on the wall but will be an expensive solution because EPS blocks are costly compared to soil backfill. The other concept is the REP which depends on using a thin EPS inclusion or buffer behind the wall (act as a thin buffer between the wall and the soil backfill) to reduce the lateral pressure by a certain percentage, and at the mean time to avoid using large volumes of such an expensive material. It is worth noting that in the literature there is no clear design approach especially for the REP concept.

In this research, a full-scale pilot study intended to evaluate the performance of the locally manufactured EPS was planned, starting with EPS shear strength characterization using a series of laboratory unconfined axial compression load tests, then the interface properties of EPS and other materials such as soil and concrete were determined using a series of direct shear tests, and finally modeling the entire problem (retaining wall with EPS backfill or inclusion) by the fabrication of a fully-instrumented large-scale laboratory prototype. The prototype instrumentation included displacement gauges and pressure cells, all connected with a digital data logger, to accurately measure the lateral stresses acting on the wall surface while using an EPS buffer with a certain density and thickness. The measurements acquired from the prototype were used to verify a Finite Element (FE) model using Plaxis 2D and 3D, which was needed for replication purposes and application on rigid and flexible retaining walls with Geofoam inclusion. All the material properties inserted in the FE models were measured in the laboratory during the initial material testing stage, and also the reliability of these properties was assured using partial resistance factors that were calibrated as part of this research using the reliability-theory. The FE model was successfully calibrated and verified against the prototype measurements as well as results from the literature.

Under static loading conditions, and from the verified FE model results, design charts were released for the values of the active and the at-rest lateral pressure coefficients when EPS inclusion is used as a buffer behind rigid and flexible retaining walls. A parametric study was conducted considering the EPS thickness normalized to the wall height, and that in order to provide a correlation to calculate the expected amount of reduction in the lateral pressure for any EPS thickness used. Finally, a design problem for a retaining wall was considered to sense the amount of reduction that can be achieved in the lateral pressure and translated to smaller reinforced concrete wall sections. This thesis are subdivided into nine chapters as follows:

Chapter 1: Includes a brief introduction about the research topic, problem statement, research purpose, and thesis contents.

Chapter 2: Includes a comprehensive literature review about different types of retaining walls and design methods, EPS Geofoam physical and mechanical characteristics, EPS general in various geotechnical applications, and EPS inclusion behind retaining walls to reduce lateral earth pressure.

Chapter 3: Includes the research main objectives, the exploited research methodology including the experimental testing program, the numerical modeling, and the verification technique used.