

Bearing-capacity prediction of spatially random $c - \phi$ soils

Gordon A. Fenton and D.V. Griffiths

Abstract: Soils with spatially varying shear strengths are modeled using random field theory and elasto-plastic finite element analysis to evaluate the extent to which spatial variability and cross-correlation in soil properties (c and ϕ) affect bearing capacity. The analysis is two dimensional, corresponding to a strip footing with infinite correlation length in the out-of-plane direction, and the soil is assumed to be weightless with footing placed on the soil surface. Theoretical predictions of the mean and standard deviation of bearing capacity, for the case where c and ϕ are independent, are derived using a geometric averaging model and then verified via Monte Carlo simulation. The standard deviation prediction is found to be quite accurate, while the mean prediction is found to require some additional semi-empirical adjustment to give accurate results for "worst case" correlation lengths. Combined, the theory can be used to estimate the probability of bearing-capacity failure, but also sheds light on the stochastic behaviour of foundation bearing failure.

Key words: bearing capacity, probability, random fields, geometric averaging, $c-\phi$ soil, Monte Carlo simulation.

Résumé: Les sols ayant des résistances au cisaillement variables dans l'espace sont modélisés au moyen de la théorie de champ aléatoire et d'une analyse élasto-plastique en éléments finis pour évaluer jusqu'à quel point la variabilité spatiale et la corrélation en travers dans les propriétés des sols (c et ϕ) influence la capacité portante. L'analyse est bidimensionnelle, correspondant à une semelle filante avec une longueur infinie de corrélation dans la direction sortant du plan, et le sol est supposé être sans poids avec la semelle placée sur la surface du sol. On dérive les prédictions théoriques des déviations moyenne et standard de la capacité portante, pour le cas où c et ϕ sont indépendants, en utilisant un modèle de moyenne géométrique, et elles sont ensuite vérifiées par la simulation de Monte Carlo. On trouve que la prédiction de la déviation standard est très précise, alors que la prédiction de la moyenne requiert des ajustements semi-empiriques additionnels pour donner des résultats précis pour le « pire cas » de longueurs corrélées. En combinaison, la théorie peut être utilisée pour estimer la probabilité de rupture en capacité portante, mais elle éclaire aussi le comportement stochastique de la rupture en portance des fondations.

Mots clés: capacité portante, probabilité, champs aléatoires, moyenne géométrique de $c-\phi$ du sol, simulation de Monte Carlo.

[Traduit par la Rédaction]

Introduction

The design of a footing involves two limit states: a serviceability limit state, which generally translates into a maximum settlement or differential settlement, and an ultimate limit state. The latter is concerned with the maximum load that can be placed on the footing just prior to a bearing-capacity failure. This paper looks at the ultimate bearing capacity of a smooth strip footing founded on a soil having spatially random properties.

Most modern bearing-capacity predictions involve a relationship of the form (Terzaghi 1943)

$$[1] \quad q_f = cN_c + \bar{q}N_q + \frac{1}{2}\gamma BN_\gamma$$

where q_f is the ultimate bearing stress, c is the cohesion, \bar{q} is

the overburden stress, γ is the unit soil weight, B is the footing width, and N_c , N_q , and N_γ are the bearing-capacity factors. To simplify the analysis in this paper, and to concentrate on the stochastic behaviour of the most important term (at least as far as spatial variation is concerned), the soil is assumed to be weightless. Under this assumption, the bearing-capacity equation simplifies to

$$[2] \quad q_f = cN_c$$

Bearing-capacity predictions, involving specification of the N factors, are often based on plasticity theory (see, e.g., Prandtl 1921; Terzaghi 1943; Sokolovski 1965) of a rigid base punching into a softer material. These theories assume a homogeneous soil underlying the footing, that is, the soil is assumed to have properties that are spatially constant. Under this assumption, most bearing-capacity theories (e.g., Prandtl 1921; Meyerhof 1951, 1963) assume that the failure slip surface takes on a logarithmic spiral shape to give

$$[3] \quad N_c = \frac{e^{\pi \tan \phi} \tan^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\phi}{2} \right) - 1}{\tan \phi}$$

This relationship has been found to give reasonable agreement with test results (Bowles 1996) under ideal conditions.

Received 6 February 2002. Accepted 11 July 2002. Published on the NRC Research Press Web site at <http://cgj.nrc.ca/> on 16 January 2003.

G.A. Fenton.¹ Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS B3J 2X4, Canada.
D.V. Griffiths. Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO 80401, U.S.A.

¹Corresponding author (e-mail: Gordon.Fenton@dal.ca).

In practice, however, it is well known that the actual failure conditions will be somewhat more complicated than a simple logarithmic spiral. Because of spatial variation in soil properties the failure surface under the footing will follow the weakest path through the soil, constrained by the stress field. For example, Fig. 1 illustrates the bearing failure of a realistic soil with spatially varying properties. It can be seen that the failure surface only approximately follows a log spiral on the right side and is certainly not symmetric. In this plot lighter regions represent stronger soil and darker regions indicate weaker soil. The weak (dark) region near the ground surface to the right of the footing has triggered a nonsymmetric failure mechanism that is typically at a lower bearing load than that predicted by traditional homogeneous and symmetric failure analysis.

The problem of finding the minimum strength failure slip surface through a soil mass is very similar in nature to the slope stability problem, and one that currently lacks a closed form stochastic solution, so far as the authors are aware. In this paper the traditional relationships shown above will be used as a starting point to this problem.

For a realistic soil, both c and ϕ are random, so that both quantities in the right hand side of eq. [2] are random. This equation can be nondimensionalized by dividing through by the cohesion mean,

$$[4] \quad M_c = \frac{q_f}{\mu_c} = \frac{c}{\mu_c} N_c$$

where μ_c is the mean cohesion and M_c is the stochastic equivalent of N_c , i.e., $q_f = \mu_c M_c$. The stochastic problem is now boiled down to finding the distribution of M_c . A theoretical model for the first two moments (mean and variance) of M_c , based on geometric averaging, are given in the next section. Monte Carlo simulations are then performed to assess the quality of the predictions and determine the approximate form of the distribution of M_c . This is followed by an example illustrating how the results can be used to compute the probability of a bearing-capacity failure. Finally, an overview of the results is given, including their limitations.

The random soil model

In this study, the soil cohesion, c , is assumed to be lognormally distributed with mean μ_c , standard deviation σ_c , and spatial correlation length $\theta_{\ln c}$. The lognormal distribution is selected because it is commonly used to represent non-negative soil properties and has a simple relationship with the normal. A lognormally distributed random field is obtained from a normally distributed random field, $G_{\ln c}(\underline{x})$, having zero mean, unit variance, and spatial correlation length $\theta_{\ln c}$ through the transformation

$$[5] \quad c(\underline{x}) = \exp[\mu_{\ln c} + \sigma_{\ln c} G_{\ln c}(\underline{x})]$$

where \underline{x} is the spatial position at which c is desired. The parameters $\mu_{\ln c}$ and $\sigma_{\ln c}$ are obtained from the specified cohesion

mean and variance using the lognormal distribution transformations,

$$[6a] \quad \sigma_{\ln c}^2 = \ln \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_c^2}{\mu_c^2} \right)$$

$$[6b] \quad \mu_{\ln c} = \ln \mu_c - \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\ln c}^2$$

The correlation coefficient between the log cohesion at a point \underline{x}_1 and a second point \underline{x}_2 is specified by a correlation function, $\rho_{\ln c}(\tau)$, where $\tau = |\underline{x}_1 - \underline{x}_2|$ is the absolute distance between the two points. In this paper, a simple exponentially decaying (Markovian) correlation function will be assumed, having the form

$$[7] \quad \rho_{\ln c}(\tau) = \exp \left(-\frac{2|\tau|}{\theta_{\ln c}} \right)$$


The spatial correlation length, $\theta_{\ln c}$, is loosely defined as the separation distance within which two values of $\ln c$ are significantly correlated. Mathematically, $\theta_{\ln c}$ is defined as the area under the correlation function, $\rho_{\ln c}(\tau)$ (Vanmarcke 1984). (Note that geostatisticians often define the correlation length as the area under the non-negative half of the correlation function so that there is a factor of two difference between the two lengths; under their definition, the factor of 2 appearing in eq. [7] is absent. The more general definition is retained here since it can be used also in higher dimensions where the correlation function is not necessarily symmetric in all directions about the origin.)

It should also be noted that the correlation function selected above acts between values of $\ln c$. This is because $\ln c$ is normally distributed, and a normally distributed random field is simply defined by its mean and covariance structure. In practice, the correlation length $\theta_{\ln c}$ can be estimated by evaluating spatial statistics of the log-cohesion data directly (see, e.g., Fenton 1999). Unfortunately, such studies are scarce, so that little is currently known about the spatial correlation structure of natural soils. For the problem considered here, it turns out that a worst case correlation length exists that should be assumed in the absence of improved information.

The random field is also assumed here to be statistically isotropic (the same correlation length in any direction through the soil). Although the horizontal correlation length is often greater than the vertical, because of soil layering, taking this into account was deemed to be a refinement beyond the scope of this study. The main aspects of the stochastic behaviour of bearing capacity needs to be understood for the simplest case first, and more complex variations on the theme, such as site specific anisotropy, left for later work.

The friction angle, ϕ , is assumed to be bounded both above and below, so that neither normal nor lognormal distributions are appropriate. A beta distribution is often used for bounded random variables. Unfortunately, a beta-distributed random field has a very complex joint distribution, and simulation is cumbersome and numerically difficult. To keep things simple, a bounded distribution is selected that resembles a beta distribution but that arises as a simple transformation of a standard normal random field, $G_\phi(\underline{x})$, according to

Fig. 1. Typical deformed mesh at failure, where the darker regions indicate weaker soil.



$$[8] \quad \phi(\tilde{x}) = \phi_{\min} + \frac{1}{2}(\phi_{\max} - \phi_{\min}) \left[1 + \tanh \left(\frac{s G_{\phi}(\tilde{x})}{2\pi} \right) \right]$$

where ϕ_{\min} and ϕ_{\max} are the minimum and maximum friction angles, respectively, and s is a scale factor that governs the friction angle variability between its two bounds. Figure 2 shows how the distribution of ϕ (normalized to the interval [0, 1]) changes as s changes, going from an almost uniform distribution at $s = 5$ to a very normal looking distribution for smaller values of s . In all cases, the distribution is symmetric, so that the midpoint between ϕ_{\min} and ϕ_{\max} is the mean. Values of s greater than about 5 lead to a U-shaped distribution (higher at the boundaries), which is not deemed realistic. Thus, varying s between about 0.1 and 5.0 leads to a wide range in the stochastic behaviour of ϕ .

The random field, $G_{\phi}(\tilde{x})$, has zero mean and unit variance, as does $G_{\ln c}(\tilde{x})$. Conceivably, $G_{\phi}(\tilde{x})$ could also have its own correlation length θ_{ϕ} distinct from $\theta_{\ln c}$. However, it seems reasonable to assume that if the spatial correlation structure is caused by changes in the constitutive nature of the soil over space, then both cohesion and friction angle would have similar correlation lengths. Thus, θ_{ϕ} is taken to be equal to $\theta_{\ln c}$ in this study. Both lengths will be referred to generically from now on simply as θ , remembering that this length reflects correlation between points in the underlying normally distributed random fields, $G_{\ln c}(\tilde{x})$ and $G_{\phi}(\tilde{x})$, and not directly between points in the cohesion and friction fields. As mentioned above, both lengths can be estimated from data sets obtained over some spatial domain by statistically analyzing the suitably transformed data (inverses of eqs. [5] and [8]). After transforming to the c and ϕ fields, the transformed correlation lengths will no longer be the same, but since both transformations are monotonic (i.e., larger values of $G_{\ln c}$ give larger values of c , etc.), the correlation lengths will be similar (for $s = 1.0$, the difference is less than 15% from each other and from the original correlation length). In that all engineering soil properties are derived through various transformations of the physical soil behaviour (e.g., cohesion is a complex function of electrostatic forces between soil particles), the final correlation lengths between engineering properties can-

not be expected to be identical, only similar. For the purposes of a generic non-site specific study, the above assumptions are believed reasonable.

The question as to whether the two parameters c and ϕ are correlated is still not clearly decided in the literature, and no doubt depends very much on the soil being studied. Cherubini (2000) quotes values of ρ ranging from -0.24 to -0.70 , as does Wolff (1985) (see also Yuceman et al. 1973; Lumb 1970; Cherubini 2000). As stated by Wolff (T.H. Wolff, private correspondence, 2000): "The practical meaning of this [negative correlation] is that we are more certain of the undrained strength at a certain confining pressure than the values of the two parameters we use to define it." This observation arises from the fact that the variance of the shear strength is reduced if there is a negative correlation between c and ϕ .


In that the correlation between c and ϕ is not certain, this paper investigates the correlation extremes to determine if cross-correlation makes a significant difference. As will be seen, under the given assumptions regarding the distributions of c (lognormal) and ϕ (bounded), varying the cross-correlation ρ from -1 to 1 was found to have only a minor influence on the stochastic behaviour of the bearing capacity.

Bearing-capacity mean and variance

The determination of the first two moments of the bearing capacity (mean and variance) requires first a failure model. Equations [2] and [3] assume that the soil properties are spatially uniform. When the soil properties are spatially varying, the slip surface no longer follows a smooth log spiral, and the failure becomes unsymmetric. The problem of finding the constrained path having the lowest total shear strength through the soil is mathematically difficult, especially since the constraints are supplied by the stress field. A simpler approximate model will be considered here wherein geometric averages of c and ϕ , over some region under the footing, are used in eqs. [2] and [3]. The geometric average is proposed because it is dominated more by low strengths than is the arithmetic average. This is deemed reasonable since the failure slip surface preferentially travels through lower strength areas.

Consider a soil region of some size D discretized into a sequence of non-overlapping rectangles, each centered on $\tilde{x}_i, i =$

Fig. 2. Bounded distribution of friction angle normalized to the interval [0, 1].



1, 2, ..., n. The geometric average of the cohesion, c , over the domain D may then be defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
 [9] \quad \bar{c} &= \left[\prod_{i=1}^n c(x_i) \right]^{1/n} \\
 &= \exp \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln c(x_i) \right] \\
 &= \exp (\mu_{\ln c} + \sigma_{\ln c} \bar{G}_{\ln c})
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{G}_{\ln c}$ is the arithmetic average of $G_{\ln c}$ over the domain D . Note that an assumption is made in the above concerning $c(x_i)$ being constant over each rectangle. In that cohesion is generally measured using some representative volume (e.g., a laboratory sample), the values of $c(x_i)$ used above are deemed to be such measures.

In a similar way, the exact expression for the geometric average of ϕ over the domain D is

$$[10] \quad \bar{\phi} = \exp \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln \phi(x_i) \right]$$

where $\phi(x_i)$ is evaluated using eq. [8]. A close approximation to the above geometric average, accurate for $s \leq 2.0$, is

$$[11] \quad \bar{\phi} \simeq \phi_{\min} + \frac{1}{2}(\phi_{\max} - \phi_{\min}) \left[1 + \tanh \left(\frac{s \bar{G}_{\phi}}{2\pi} \right) \right]$$

where \bar{G}_{ϕ} is the arithmetic average of G_{ϕ} over the domain D . For $\phi_{\min} = 5^\circ$ and $\phi_{\max} = 45^\circ$, this expression has relative error of less than 5% for $n = 20$ independent samples. While the relative error rises to about 12%, on average, for $s = 5.0$, this is an extreme case, corresponding to a uniformly distributed ϕ between the minimum and maximum values, which is felt to be unlikely to occur very often in practice. Thus, the above approximation is believed reasonable in most cases.

Using the latter result in eq. [3] gives the "effective" value of N_c , \bar{N}_c , where the log-spiral model is assumed to be valid using a geometric average of soil properties within the failed region,

$$[12] \quad \bar{N}_c = \frac{e^{\pi \tan \bar{\phi}} \tan^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\bar{\phi}}{2} \right) - 1}{\tan \bar{\phi}}$$

so that, now

$$[13] \quad M_c = \frac{\bar{c}}{\mu_c} \bar{N}_c$$

If c is lognormally distributed, an inspection of eq. [9] indicates that \bar{c} is also lognormally distributed. If we can assume that \bar{N}_c is at least approximately lognormally distributed, then M_c will also be at least approximately lognormally distributed (the central limit theorem helps out somewhat here). In this case, taking logarithms of eq. [13] gives

$$[14] \quad \ln M_c = \ln \bar{c} + \ln \bar{N}_c - \ln \mu_c$$

so that, under the given assumptions, $\ln M_c$ is at least approximately normally distributed.

The task now is to find the mean and variance of $\ln M_c$. The mean is obtained by taking expectations of eq. [14],

$$[15] \quad \mu_{\ln M_c} = \mu_{\ln \bar{c}} + \mu_{\ln \bar{N}_c} - \ln \mu_c$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 [16] \quad \mu_{\ln \bar{c}} &= E [\mu_{\ln c} + \sigma_{\ln c} \bar{G}_{\ln c}] \\
 &= \mu_{\ln c} + \sigma_{\ln c} E [\bar{G}_{\ln c}] \\
 &= \mu_{\ln c} \\
 &= \ln \mu_c - \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_c^2}{\mu_c^2} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

which used the fact that since $\bar{G}_{\ln c}$ is normally distributed, its arithmetic average has the same mean as $G_{\ln c}$, that is $E [\bar{G}_{\ln c}] =$

$E[G_{\ln c}] = 0$. The above result is as expected since the geometric average of a lognormally distributed random variable preserves the mean of the logarithm of the variable. Also eq. [6b] was used to express the mean in terms of the prescribed statistics of c .

A second-order approximation to the mean of the logarithm of eq. [12], $\mu_{\ln \bar{N}_c}$, is

$$[17] \quad \mu_{\ln \bar{N}_c} \simeq \ln \bar{N}_c(\mu_{\bar{\phi}}) + \sigma_{\bar{\phi}}^2 \left(\frac{d^2 \ln \bar{N}_c}{d\bar{\phi}^2} \Big|_{\mu_{\bar{\phi}}} \right)$$

where $\mu_{\bar{\phi}}$ is the mean of the geometric average of ϕ . Since \bar{G}_{ϕ} is an arithmetic average, its mean is equal to the mean of G_{ϕ} , which is zero. Thus, since the assumed distribution of ϕ is symmetric about its mean, $\mu_{\bar{\phi}} = \mu_{\phi}$ so that $\ln \bar{N}_c(\mu_{\bar{\phi}}) = \ln N_c(\mu_{\phi})$.

A first-order approximation to $\sigma_{\bar{\phi}}^2$ is

$$[18] \quad \sigma_{\bar{\phi}}^2 = \left[\frac{s}{4\pi} (\phi_{\max} - \phi_{\min}) \sigma_{\bar{G}_{\phi}} \right]^2$$

where, from local averaging theory (Vanmarcke 1984), the variance of a local average over the domain D is given by (recalling that G_{ϕ} is normally distributed with zero mean and unit variance),

$$[19] \quad \sigma_{\bar{G}_{\phi}}^2 = \sigma_{G_{\phi}}^2 \gamma(D) = \gamma(D)$$

where $\gamma(D)$ is the "variance function" that reflects the amount by which the variance is reduced as a result of local arithmetic averaging. It can be obtained directly from the correlation function (see Appendix A).

The derivative in eq. [17] is most easily obtained numerically using any reasonably accurate (N_c is quite smooth) approximation to the second derivative (see, e.g., Press et al. 1997). If $\mu_{\bar{\phi}} = \mu_{\phi} = 25^\circ = 0.436$ rad (note that in all mathematical expressions, ϕ is assumed to be in radians), then

$$[20] \quad \frac{d^2 \ln \bar{N}_c}{d\bar{\phi}^2} \Big|_{\mu_{\bar{\phi}}} = 5.2984 \text{ rad}^{-2}$$

Using these results with $\phi_{\max} = 45^\circ$ and $\phi_{\min} = 5^\circ$, so that $\mu_{\phi} = 25^\circ$ gives

$$[21] \quad \mu_{\ln \bar{N}_c} = \ln(20.72) + 0.0164s^2\gamma(D)$$

Some comments need to be made about this result: first of all it increases with increasing variability in ϕ (increasing s). It seems doubtful that this increase would occur since increasing variability in ϕ would likely lead to more lower strength paths through the soil mass for moderate θ . Aside from ignoring the weakest path issue, some other sources of error in the above analysis are

- (1) The geometric average of ϕ given by eq. [10] actually shows a slight decrease with s (about 12% less, relatively, when $s = 5$). Although the decrease is only slight, it at least is in the direction expected.

- (2) An error analysis of the second-order approximation in eq. [17] and the first-order approximation in eq. [18] has not been carried out. Given the rather arbitrary nature of the assumed distribution on ϕ , and the fact that this paper is primarily aimed at establishing the approximate stochastic behaviour, such refinements have been left for later work.

In light of these observations, a first-order approximation to $\mu_{\ln \bar{N}_c}$ may actually be more accurate. Namely

$$[22] \quad \mu_{\ln \bar{N}_c} \simeq \ln \bar{N}_c(\mu_{\bar{\phi}}) \simeq \ln N_c(\mu_{\phi})$$

Finally, combining eqs. [16] and [22] into eq. [15] gives

$$[23] \quad \mu_{\ln M_c} \simeq \ln N_c(\mu_{\phi}) - \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_c^2}{\mu_c^2} \right)$$

For independent c and ϕ , the variance of $\ln M_c$ is

$$[24] \quad \sigma_{\ln M_c}^2 = \sigma_{\ln c}^2 + \sigma_{\ln \bar{N}_c}^2$$

where

$$[25] \quad \sigma_{\ln c}^2 = \gamma(D) \sigma_{\ln c}^2 = \gamma(D) \ln \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_c^2}{\mu_c^2} \right)$$

and, to first order,

$$[26] \quad \sigma_{\ln \bar{N}_c}^2 \simeq \sigma_{\bar{\phi}}^2 \left(\frac{d \ln \bar{N}_c}{d\bar{\phi}} \Big|_{\mu_{\bar{\phi}}} \right)^2$$

The derivative appearing in eq. [26], which will be denoted as $\beta(\phi)$, is

$$[27] \quad \beta(\phi) = \frac{d \ln \bar{N}_c}{d\bar{\phi}} = \frac{d \ln N_c}{d\phi} = \frac{bd}{bd^2 - 1} \left[\pi(1 + a^2)d + 1 + d^2 \right] - \frac{1 + a^2}{a}$$

where $a = \tan(\phi)$, $b = e^{\pi a}$, and $d = \tan\left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\phi}{2}\right)$.

The variance of $\ln M_c$ is thus

$$[28] \quad \sigma_{\ln M_c}^2 \simeq \gamma(D) \times \left\{ \ln \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_c^2}{\mu_c^2} \right) + \left[\left(\frac{s}{4\pi} \right) (\phi_{\max} - \phi_{\min}) \beta(\mu_{\phi}) \right]^2 \right\}$$

where ϕ is measured in radians.

Monte Carlo simulation

A finite-element computer program was written to compute the bearing capacity of a smooth rigid strip footing (plane strain) founded on a weightless soil with shear strength parameters c and ϕ represented by spatially varying and cross-correlated (point-wise) random fields, as discussed above. The bearing-capacity analysis uses an elastic-perfectly plastic stress-strain law with a classical Mohr-Coulomb failure criterion. Plastic

Table 1. Random field parameters used in the study.

Parameter	Value
θ	0.5, 1.0, 2.0, 4.0, 8.0, 50
COV	0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1.0, 2.0, 5.0
ρ	-1.0, 0.0, 1.0

stress redistribution is accomplished using a viscoplastic algorithm. The program uses eight-node quadrilateral elements and reduced integration in both the stiffness and stress redistribution parts of the algorithm. The theoretical basis of the method is described more fully in Chap. 6 of the text by Smith and Griffiths (1998). The finite-element model incorporates five parameters: Young's modulus (E), Poisson's ratio (ν), dilation angle (ψ), shear strength (c), and friction angle (ϕ). The program allows for random distributions of all five parameters; however, in the present study, E , ν , and ψ are held constant (at 100 000 kN/m², 0.3, and 0, respectively) while c and ϕ are randomized. The Young's modulus governs the initial elastic response of the soil, but does not affect bearing capacity. Setting the dilation angle to zero means that there is no plastic dilation during yield of the soil. The finite element mesh consists of 1000 elements, 50 elements wide by 20 elements deep. Each element is a 0.1 × 0.1 m square, and the strip footing occupies 10 elements, giving it a width of $B = 1$ m.

The random fields used in this study are generated using the local average subdivision method (Fenton 1994; Fenton and Vanmarcke 1990). Cross-correlation between the two soil property fields (c and ϕ) is implemented via covariance matrix decomposition (Fenton 1994). The algorithm is given in Appendix B.

In the parametric studies that follow, the mean cohesion (μ_c) and mean friction angle (μ_ϕ) have been held constant at 100 kN/m² and 25° (with $\phi_{\min} = 5^\circ$ and $\phi_{\max} = 45^\circ$), respectively, while the COV ($= \sigma_c/\mu_c$), spatial correlation length (θ), and correlation coefficient, ρ , between $G_{\ln c}$ and G_ϕ are varied systematically according to Table 1.

It will be noticed that COVs up to 5.0 are considered in this study, which is an order of magnitude higher than generally reported in the literature (see, e.g., Phoon and Kulhawy 1999). There are two considerations that complicate the problem of defining typical COVs for soils that have not yet been clearly considered in the literature (although Fenton (1999) does introduce these issues). The first has to do with the level of information known about a site. Prior to any site investigation, there will be plenty of uncertainty about soil properties, and an appropriate COV comes by using a COV obtained from regional data over a much larger scale. Such a COV will typically be much greater than that found when soil properties are estimated over a much smaller scale, such as a specific site. As investigation proceeds at the site of interest, the COV drops. For example, a single sample at the site will reduce the COV slightly, but as the investigation intensifies, the COV drops towards zero, reaching zero when the entire site has been sampled (which, of course, is clearly impractical). The second consideration, which is actually closely tied to the first, has to do with scale. If one were to take soil samples every 10 km over 5000 km (macroscale), one will find that the COV of those samples will be very large. A COV of 5.0 would not be unreasonable. Alternatively, suppose

one were to concentrate one's attention on a single cubic metre of soil. If several 50 mm² samples were taken and sent to the laboratory, one would expect a fairly small COV. On the other hand, if samples of size 0.1 μm³ were taken and tested (assuming this was possible), the resulting COV could be very large, since some samples might consist of very hard rock particles, others of water, and others just of air (i.e., the sample location falls in a void). In such a situation, a COV of 5.0 could easily be on the low side. While the last scenario is only conceptual, it does serve to illustrate that COV is highly dependent on the ratio between sample volume and sampling domain volume. This dependence is certainly pertinent to the study of bearing capacity, since it is currently not known at what scale bearing-capacity failure operates. Is the weakest path through a soil dependent on property variations at the microscale (having a large COV) or does the weakest path "smear" the small-scale variations and depend primarily on local average properties over, say, laboratory scales (small COV)? Since laboratory scales are merely convenient for us, it is unlikely that nature has selected that particular scale to accommodate us. From the point of view of reliability estimates, where the failure mechanism might depend on microscale variations for failure initiation, the small COVs reported in the literature might very well be dangerously unconservative. Much work is still required to establish the relationship between COV, site investigation intensity, and scale. In the meantime, this paper considers COVs over a fairly wide range, since it is entirely possible that the higher values more truly reflect failure variability.

In addition, it is assumed that when the variability in the cohesion is large, the variability in the friction angle will also be large. Under this reasoning, the scale factor, s , used in eq. [8] is set to $s = \sigma_c/\mu_c = \text{COV}$. This choice is arbitrary, but results in the friction angle varying from quite narrowly (when COV = 0.1 and $s = 0.1$) to very widely (when COV = 5.0 and $s = 5$) between its lower and upper bounds, 5° and 45°, as illustrated in Fig. 2.


For each set of assumed statistical properties given by Table 1, Monte Carlo simulations have been performed. These involve 1000 realizations of the soil property random fields and the subsequent finite-element analysis of bearing capacity. Each realization, therefore, has a different value of the bearing capacity and, after normalization by the mean cohesion, a different value of the bearing-capacity factor,

$$[29] \quad M_{c_i} = \frac{q f_i}{\mu_c}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, 1000$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{\mu}_{\ln M_c} = \frac{1}{1000} \sum_{i=1}^{1000} \ln M_{c_i}$$

where $\hat{\mu}_{\ln M_c}$ is the sample mean of $\ln M_c$ estimated over the ensemble of realizations. Because of the non-linear nature of the analysis, the computations are quite intensive. One run of 1000 realizations typically takes about 2 days on a dedicated 800-MHz Pentium® III computer (which, by the time of printing, is likely obsolete). For the 108 cases considered in Table 1, the total single CPU time required is about 220 days (run time varies with the number of iterations required to analyze various realizations).

Fig. 3. (a) Sample mean of log bearing-capacity factor, $\ln M_c$, and (b) its sample standard deviation.



Simulation results

Figure 3a shows how the sample mean log bearing-capacity factor, taken as the average over the 1000 realizations of $\ln M_{c_i}$ and referred to as $\hat{\mu}_{\ln M_c}$ in Fig. 3, varies with correlation length, soil variability, and cross-correlation between c and ϕ . For small soil variability, $\hat{\mu}_{\ln M_c}$ tends towards the deterministic value of $\ln(20.72) = 3.03$, which is found when the soil takes on its mean properties everywhere. For increasing soil variability, the mean bearing-capacity factor becomes quite significantly reduced from the traditional case. What this implies from a design standpoint is that the bearing capacity of a spatially variable soil will, on average, be less than the Prandtl solution based on the mean values alone. The greatest reduction from the Prandtl solution is observed for perfectly correlated c and ϕ ($\rho = 1$), the least reduction when c and ϕ are negatively correlated ($\rho = -1$), and the independent case ($\rho = 0$) lies between these two extremes. However, the effect of cross-correlation is seen to be not particularly large. If the negative cross-correlation indicated by both Cherubini (2000) and Wolff (1985) is correct, then the independent, $\rho = 0$, case is conservative, having mean bearing capacities consistently somewhat less than the $\rho = -1$ case.

The cross-correlation between c and ϕ is seen to have minimal effect on the sample standard deviation, $\hat{\sigma}_{\ln M_c}$, as shown in Fig. 3b. The sample standard deviation is most strongly affected by the correlation length and somewhat less so by the soil property variability. A decreasing correlation length results in a decreasing $\hat{\sigma}_{\ln M_c}$. As suggested by eq. [28], the function $\gamma(D)$ decays approximately with θ/D and so decreases with decreasing θ . This means that $\hat{\sigma}_{\ln M_c}$ should decrease as the correlation length decreases, which is as seen in Fig. 3b.

Figure 3a also seems to show that the correlation length, θ , does not have a significant influence in that the $\theta = 0.1$ and $\theta = 8$ curves for $\rho = 0$ are virtually identical. However, the $\theta = 0.1$ and $\theta = 8$ curves are significantly lower than that predicted by eq. [23] implying that the plot is somewhat misleading with respect to the dependence on θ . For example,


when the correlation length goes to infinity, the soil properties become spatially constant, albeit still random from realization to realization. In this case, because the soil properties are spatially constant, the weakest path returns to the log spiral and $\mu_{\ln M_c}$ will rise towards that given by eq. [23], namely $\mu_{\ln M_c} = \ln(20.72) - \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 + \sigma_c^2 / \mu_c^2)$, which is also shown on the plot. This limiting value holds because $\mu_{\ln N_c} \approx \ln N_c(\mu_\phi)$, as discussed for eq. [22], where for spatially constant properties $\hat{\phi} = \phi$.

Similarly, when $\theta \rightarrow 0$, the soil property field becomes infinitely "rough", in that all points in the field become independent. Any point at which the soil is weak will be surrounded by points where the soil is strong. A path through the weakest points in the soil might have very low average strength, but at the same time will become infinitely tortuous and thus infinitely long. This, combined with shear interlocking dictated by the stress field, implies that the weakest path should return to the traditional log spiral with average shear strength along the spiral given by μ_c and μ_ϕ . Again, in this case, $\mu_{\ln M_c}$ should rise to that given by eq. [23].

The variation of $\mu_{\ln M_c}$ with respect to θ is more clearly seen in Fig. 4. Over a range of values of σ_c / μ_c , the value of $\mu_{\ln M_c}$ rises towards that predicted by eq. [23] at both high and low correlation lengths. At intermediate correlation lengths, the weakest path issue is seen to result in $\mu_{\ln M_c}$ being less than that predicted by eq. [23] (see Fig. 3a), the greatest reduction in $\mu_{\ln M_c}$ occurring when θ is of the same order as the footing width, B . It is hypothesized that $\theta \approx B$ leads to the greatest reduction in $\mu_{\ln M_c}$ because it allows enough spatial variability for a failure surface that deviates somewhat from the log spiral but that is not too long (as occurs when θ is too small) yet has significantly lower average strength than the $\theta \rightarrow \infty$ case. The apparent agreement between the $\theta = 0.1$ and $\theta = 8$ curves in Fig. 3a is only because they are approximately equispaced on either side of the minimum at $\theta \approx 1$.

As noted above, in the case where c and ϕ are independent ($\rho = 0$) the predicted mean, $\mu_{\ln M_c}$, given by eq. [23] does

Fig. 4. Sample mean of log bearing-capacity factor, $\ln M_c$, versus normalized correlation length.



not decrease as fast as observed in Fig. 3a for intermediate correlation lengths. Nor does eq. [23] account for changes in θ . Although an analytic prediction for the mean strength of the constrained weakest path through a spatially random soil has not yet been determined, eq. [23] can be improved by making the following empirical corrections for the worst case ($\theta \approx B$):

$$[30] \quad \mu_{\ln M_c} \approx 0.92 \ln N_c(\mu_\phi) - 0.7 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_c^2}{\mu_c^2} \right)$$

where the overall reduction with σ_c/μ_c is assumed to follow the same form as that predicted in eq. [23]. Some portion of the above correction may be due to finite element model error (for example, the finite element model slightly underestimates the deterministic value of N_c , giving $N_c = 19.6$ instead of 20.7, a 2% relative error in $\ln N_c$), but most is attributed to the weakest path issue and model errors arising by relating a spatial geometric average to a failure that is actually taking place along a curve through the two-dimensional soil mass.

Figure 5 illustrates the agreement between the sample mean of $\ln M_c$ and that predicted by eq. [30] and between the sample standard deviation of $\ln M_c$ and eq. [28] for $\rho = 0$. The estimated mean is seen to be in quite good agreement with the sample mean for all θ when $\sigma_c/\mu_c < 2$, and with the worst case ($\theta = B$) for $\sigma_c/\mu_c > 2$.

The predicted standard deviation was obtained by assuming a geometric average over a region under the footing of depth equal to the mean wedge zone depth,

$$[31] \quad w \approx \frac{1}{2} B \tan \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\mu_\phi}{2} \right)$$

and width of about $5w$. This is a rough approximation to the area of the failure region within the mean log-spiral curve on either side of the footing. Thus, D used in the variance function of eq. [28] is a region of size $5w \times w$.

Although eq. [23] fails to reflect the effect of θ on the the reduction in the mean log bearing-capacity factor with increasing

soil variability, the sample standard deviation is extremely well predicted by eq. [28], being only somewhat underpredicted for very small correlation lengths. To some extent the overall agreement in variance is as expected, since the variability along the weakest path will be similar to the variability along any nearby path through a statistically homogeneous medium.

The Monte Carlo simulation also allows the estimation of the probability density function of M_c . A chi-square goodness-of-fit test performed across all σ_c/μ_c , θ , and ρ parameter variations yields an average p value of 33%. This is encouraging, since large p values indicate good agreement between the hypothesized distribution (lognormal) and the data. However, approximately 30% of the simulations had p values of less than 5%, indicating that a fair proportion of the runs had distributions that deviated from the lognormal to some extent. Some 10% of runs had p values of less than 0.01%. Figure 6a illustrates one of the better fits, with a p value of 43% ($\sigma_c/\mu_c = 0.1$, $\theta = 4$, and $\rho = 0$), while Fig. 6b illustrates one of the poorer fits, with a p value of 0.01% ($\sigma_c/\mu_c = 5$, $\theta = 1$, and $\rho = 0$). It can be seen that even when the p value is as low as 0.01%, the fit is still reasonable. There was no particular trend in degree of fit as far as the three parameters σ_c/μ_c , θ , and ρ were concerned. It appears, then, that M_c at least approximately follows a lognormal distribution. Note that if M_c does indeed arise from a geometric average of the underlying soil properties, c and N_c , then M_c will tend towards a lognormal distribution by the central limit theorem. It is also worth pointing out that this may be exactly why so many soil properties tend to follow a lognormal distribution.

Probabilistic interpretation

The results of the previous section indicated that Prandtl's bearing-capacity formula is still largely applicable in the case of spatially varying soil properties if geometrically averaged soil properties are used in the formula. The theoretical results presented above, combined with the empirical correction to the mean proposed in the last section, allows the approximate computation of probabilities associated with bearing capacity of a smooth strip footing. To illustrate this, consider an example strip footing of width $B = 2$ m founded on a weightless soil having $\mu_c = 75$ kPa, $\sigma_c = 50$ kPa, and $\theta = B = 2$ m (assuming the worst case correlation length). Assume also that the friction angle ϕ is independent of c (conservative assumption) and ranges from 5° to 35° , with mean 20° and $s = 1$. In this case, the deterministic value of N_c , based purely on μ_ϕ is

$$[32] \quad N_c(\mu_\phi) = \frac{e^{\pi \tan \mu_\phi} \tan^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\mu_\phi}{2} \right) - 1}{\tan \mu_\phi} = 14.835$$

so that, by eq. [30],

$$[33] \quad \mu_{\ln \bar{M}_c} = 0.92 \ln(14.835) - 0.7 \ln \left(1 + \frac{50^2}{75^2} \right) = 2.2238$$

For a footing width of $B = 2$, the wedge zone depth is

$$[34] \quad w = \frac{1}{2} B \tan \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\mu_\phi}{2} \right) = \tan \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{20\pi}{360} \right) = 1.428$$

Fig. 5. (a) Sample and estimated mean (via eq. [30]) of $\ln M_c$, and (b) its sample and estimated standard deviation (via eq. [28]).





Fig. 6. (a) Fitted lognormal distribution for $s = \sigma_c/\mu_c = 0.1$, $\theta = 4$, and $\rho = 0$ where the p value is large (0.43) and (b) fitted lognormal distribution for $s = \sigma_c/\mu_c = 5$, $\theta = 1$, and $\rho = 0$ where the p value is quite small (0.0001).



Averaging over depth w by width $5w$ results in the variance reduction

$$\gamma(D) = \gamma(5w, w) = 0.1987$$

using the algorithm given in Appendix A for the Markov correlation function.

The slope of $\ln N_c$ at $\mu_\phi = 20^\circ$ is 3.62779 rad^{-1} , using eq. [27]. These results applied to eq. [28] give

$$[35] \quad \sigma_{\ln \bar{M}_c}^2 = 0.1987 \times \left\{ \ln \left(1 + \frac{50^2}{75^2} \right) + \left[\frac{s}{4\pi} (\phi_{\max} - \phi_{\min}) \beta(\mu_\phi) \right]^2 \right\} = 0.07762$$

so that $\sigma_{\ln \bar{M}_c} = 0.2778$.

The probability that M_c is less than half the deterministic value of N_c , based on μ_ϕ , is then

$$[36] \quad P \left[M_c \leq \frac{14.835}{2} \right] = \Phi \left(\frac{\ln(14.835/2) - \mu_{\ln M_c}}{\sigma_{\ln M_c}} \right) = \Phi(-0.79) = 0.215$$

where Φ is the cumulative distribution function for the standard normal and where M_c is assumed lognormally distributed, as was found to be reasonable above. A simulation of the above problem yields $P \left[M_c \leq \frac{14.835}{2} \right] = 0.2155$. Although this amazing agreement seems too good to be true, this is, in fact, the first example problem that the authors considered. The caveat, however, is that predictions derived from the results of a finite

element program are being compared with the results of the same finite element program, albeit at different parameter values. Nevertheless, the fact that the agreement here is so good is encouraging, since it indicates that the theoretical results given above may have some overall generality, namely that Prandtl's bearing-capacity solution is applicable to spatially variable soils if the soil properties are taken from geometric averages, suitably modified to reflect weakest path issues. Inasmuch as the finite element method represents the actual soil behaviour, this observation seems reasonable.

Concluding remarks

Most soil properties are local averages of some sort and are derived from measurements of properties over some finite volume. In the case of the shear resistance of a soil sample, tests involve determining the average shear resistance over some surface through the soil sample. Since this surface will tend to avoid the high strength areas in favour of low strength areas, the average will be less than a strictly arithmetic mean over a flat plane. Of the various common types of averages, arithmetic, geometric, and harmonic, the one that generally shows the best agreement with "block" soil properties is the geometric average. The geometric average favours low strength areas, although not as drastically as does a harmonic average, lying between the arithmetic and harmonic averages.

The bearing-capacity factor of Prandtl (1921) has been observed in practice to give reasonable agreement with test results, particularly under controlled conditions. When soil properties become spatially random, the failure surface migrates from the log-spiral surface to some nearby surface that is weaker. The results presented in this paper indicate that the statistics of the resulting surface are well represented by geometrically averaging the soil properties over a domain of about the size of the plastically deformed bearing failure region (taken to be $5w \times w$ in this study). That is, the results indicate that Prandtl's formula can be used to predict the statistics of bearing capacity if the soil properties used in the formula are based on geometric averages, with some empirical adjustment for the mean.

In this sense, the weakest path through the soil is what governs the stochastic bearing-capacity behaviour. This means that the details of the distributions selected for c and ϕ are not particularly important, so long as they are physically reasonable, unimodal, and continuous. Although the lognormal distribution, for example, is mathematically convenient when dealing with geometric averages, very similar bearing-capacity results are expected using other distributions, such as the normal distribution (suitably truncated to avoid negative strengths). The distribution selected for the friction angle basically resembles a truncated normal distribution over most values of s , but, for example, it is believed that a beta distribution could also have been used here without significantly affecting the results.

In the event that the soil is statistically anisotropic, that is, the correlation lengths differ in the vertical and horizontal directions, it is felt that the above results can still be used with some accuracy by using the algorithm of Appendix A with differing vertical and horizontal correlation lengths. However, some additional study is necessary to establish whether the mean bearing capacity in the anisotropic case is at least conservatively

represented by eq. [30].

Some limitations to this study are noted as follows;

- (1) The simulations were performed using a finite-element analysis in which the values of the underlying normally distributed soil properties assigned to the elements are derived from arithmetic averages of the soil properties over each element domain. While this is believed to be a very realistic approach, intimately related to the soil property measurement process, it is nevertheless an approach where geometric averaging is being performed at the element scale (at least for the cohesion, note that arithmetic averaging of a normally distributed field corresponds to geometric averaging of the associated lognormally distributed random field) in a method that is demonstrating that geometric averaging is applicable over the site scale. Although it is felt that the fine scale averaging assumptions should not significantly effect the large-scale results through the finite-element method, there is some possibility that there are effects that are not reflected in reality.
- (2) Model error has been entirely neglected in this analysis. That is, the ability of the finite element method to reflect the actual behaviour of an ideal soil and the ability of eq. [3] to do likewise have not been considered. It has been assumed that the finite-element method and eq. [3] are sufficiently reasonable approximations to the behaviour of soils to allow the investigation of the major features of stochastic soil behaviour under loading from a smooth strip footing. Note that the model error associated with traditional usage of eq. [3] may be due in large part precisely to spatial variation of soil properties, so that this study may effectively be reducing, or at least quantifying, model error (although whether this is really true or not will have to wait until sufficient experimental evidence has been gathered).

The geometric averaging model has been shown to be a reasonable approach to estimating the statistics of bearing capacity. This is particularly true of the standard deviation. Some adjustment was required to the mean, since the geometric average was not able to completely account for the weakest path at intermediate correlation lengths. The proposed relationships for the mean and standard deviation, along with the simulation results indicating that the bearing capacity factor, M_c , is lognormally distributed, allow reasonably accurate calculations of probabilities associated with the bearing capacity. In the event that little is known about the cross-correlation of c and ϕ at a particular site, assuming that these properties are independent is deemed to be conservative (as long as the actual correlation is negative). In any case, the cross-correlation was not found to be a significant factor in the stochastic behaviour of bearing capacity.

Perhaps more importantly, since little is generally known about the correlation length at a site, the results of this study indicate that there exists a worst case correlation length of $\theta \simeq B$. Using this value, in the absence of improved information, allows conservative estimates of the probability of bearing failure. The estimate of the mean log bearing-capacity factor (eq. [30]) is based on this conservative case.

- (2) Form the correlation matrix between $G_{\ln c}(x)$ and $G_\phi(x)$, assumed to be stationary, i.e., the same at all points \tilde{x} in the field:

$$\rho \approx \begin{bmatrix} 1.0 & \rho \\ \rho & 1.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- (3) Compute the Cholesky decomposition of ρ . That is, find a lower triangular matrix L such that $L L^T \approx \rho$. This is sometimes referred to as the square root of ρ . Note that when $\rho = \pm 1$, L has the special form

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0 & 0.0 \\ \pm 1.0 & 0.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- (4) Generate two independent standard normally distributed random fields, $G_1(x)$ and $G_2(x)$, each having spatial correlation length θ (see eq. [7]).
- (5) At each spatial point, \tilde{x}_i , form the underlying point-wise correlated random fields:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} G_{\ln c}(\tilde{x}_i) \\ G_\phi(\tilde{x}_i) \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} L_{11} & 0.0 \\ L_{21} & L_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} G_1(\tilde{x}_i) \\ G_2(\tilde{x}_i) \end{Bmatrix}$$

- (6) Use eqs. [5] and [8] to form the final c and ϕ random fields which are then mapped to the finite element mesh to specify the properties of each element.

List of symbols

- a $\tan \phi$ in eq. [27]
- b $e^{\pi \tan \phi}$ in eq. [27]
- B footing width
- c cohesion
- \bar{c} geometric average of cohesion field over domain D
- d $\tan(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\phi}{2})$ in eq. [27]
- D averaging domain ($5w \times w$)
- E elastic modulus
- $E[.]$ expectation operator
- $G_1(x)$ standard normal random field
- $G_2(x)$ standard normal random field
- $G_{\ln c}$ standard normal random field (log cohesion)
- G_ϕ standard normal random field (underlying friction angle)
- $\bar{G}_{\ln c}$ arithmetic average of $G_{\ln c}$ over domain D
- \bar{G}_ϕ arithmetic average of G_ϕ over domain D
- L lower triangular matrix, square root of covariance matrix

- M_c stochastic equivalent of the N_c factor
- M_{ci} i th realization of M_c
- N_c N factor associated with cohesion
- \bar{N}_c cohesion N factor based on a geometric average of cohesion
- N_q N factor associated with overburden
- N_γ N factor associated with the base width and unit weight
- q_f ultimate bearing stress
- \bar{q} overburden stress
- s scale factor in distribution of ϕ
- \tilde{x} spatial coordinate, (x_1, x_2) in two dimensions
- \tilde{x}_i spatial coordinate of the center of the i th element
- $\beta(\phi)$ derivated of N_c , with respect to ϕ , at ϕ
- ϕ friction angle (radians unless otherwise stated)
- $\bar{\phi}$ geometric average of ϕ over domain D
- ϕ_{\min} minimum friction angle
- ϕ_{\max} maximum friction angle
- Φ standard normal cumulative distribution function
- $\gamma(D)$ variance function giving variance reduction due to averaging over domain D
- μ_c cohesion mean
- $\mu_{\ln c}$ log-cohesion mean
- $\mu_{\ln M_c}$ mean of $\ln M_c$
- $\hat{\mu}_{\ln M_c}$ sample mean of $\ln M_c$ (from simulations)
- $\mu_{\ln \bar{c}}$ mean of the logarithm of \bar{c}
- $\mu_{\ln \bar{N}_c}$ mean of the logarithm of \bar{N}_c
- μ_ϕ mean friction angle
- $\mu_{\bar{\phi}}$ mean of $\bar{\phi}$
- ν Poisson's ratio
- θ correlation length of the random fields
- $\theta_{\ln c}$ correlation length of the log-cohesion field
- θ_ϕ correlation length of the G_ϕ field
- ρ correlation coefficient
- $\rho_{\ln c}(\tau)$ correlation function giving correlation between two points in the log-cohesion field
- ρ correlation matrix
- \approx cohesion standard deviation
- σ_c cohesion standard deviation
- $\sigma_{\ln c}$ log-cohesion standard deviation
- $\sigma_{\ln \bar{c}}$ standard deviation of $\ln \bar{c}$
- $\sigma_{\bar{\phi}}$ standard deviation of $\bar{\phi}$
- σ_{G_ϕ} standard deviation of G_ϕ (which is 1.0)
- $\sigma_{\bar{G}_\phi}$ standard deviation of \bar{G}_ϕ
- $\sigma_{\ln M_c}$ standard deviation of $\ln M_c$
- $\hat{\sigma}_{\ln M_c}$ sample standard deviation of $\ln M_c$ (from simulations)
- τ distance between two points in the soil domain
- ψ dilation angle