© APR 2026 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 10 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I10-1715983

Geotechnical Risk Management: Engineering Approaches for Uncertainty in Large-Scale Construction

OGUZ KAHRAMAN

Abstract- Geotechnical uncertainty remains one of the most critical challenges in large-scale construction and infrastructure development. Unlike many engineering systems that can be defined with relatively predictable parameters, subsurface conditions are inherently variable and only partially understood prior to construction. Variations in stratigraphy, groundwater behavior, material properties, and environmental influences introduce uncertainties that directly affect design reliability, construction sequencing, project safety, and long-term infrastructure performance. This paper examines engineering approaches for managing geotechnical risk within complex construction environments. The study argues that geotechnical risk management should not be treated as a static assessment performed during early project phases, but as a continuous and adaptive process extending throughout investigation, design, construction, and monitoring activities. Particular attention is given to uncertainty prioritization, observational design methods, iterative decision-making, field monitoring integration, and interdisciplinary coordination within large-scale infrastructure systems. Drawing from practical engineering perspectives, the paper evaluates how geotechnical uncertainty influences project execution, resource allocation, construction risk exposure, and infrastructure resilience. The study further explores the limitations of conventional deterministic approaches that rely heavily on predefined assumptions and static safety factors without adequately accounting for evolving field conditions during construction. The paper ultimately proposes that effective geotechnical risk management depends not on eliminating uncertainty entirely, but on developing adaptive engineering frameworks capable of integrating technical analysis, field observations, monitoring systems, and structured decision-making throughout the project lifecycle. Through this approach, infrastructure projects can achieve improved reliability, operational stability, and long-term performance under inherently uncertain ground conditions.

Keywords - Geotechnical Risk, Uncertainty Management, Large-Scale Construction, Observational Method, Infrastructure Engineering

I. INTRODUCTION

Large-scale construction projects are inherently influenced by uncertainty, yet few areas of engineering encounter uncertainty as persistently and directly as geotechnical engineering. Unlike structural systems that can often be defined using relatively controlled material properties and predictable loading assumptions, subsurface environments remain only partially visible prior to construction.

Even extensive investigation programs provide an incomplete understanding of actual ground behavior because geological variability, groundwater conditions, environmental influences, and localized stratigraphic changes cannot be captured fully through pre-construction exploration alone. As a result, geotechnical engineering operates within conditions where design assumptions and construction realities frequently evolve simultaneously throughout project execution.

Geotechnical risk is one of the most significant sources of uncertainty in large-scale construction projects. Unlike many other engineering disciplines, geotechnical conditions cannot be fully defined in advance. Subsurface variability, incomplete site investigation data, and changing environmental conditions introduce uncertainties that directly impact design assumptions and construction execution.

This characteristic fundamentally distinguishes geotechnical risk from many other forms of engineering risk. In structural or mechanical systems, uncertainties are often managed through relatively stable material properties, established design parameters, and controlled manufacturing environments. Geotechnical systems, however, are directly shaped by natural conditions that remain spatially variable and only partially observable throughout the project lifecycle. Consequently, geotechnical engineering requires not only technical analysis, but also continuous interpretation, reassessment, and adaptation as new field information emerges during construction activities.

One of the most important limitations in conventional project environments is the tendency to treat subsurface conditions as fixed engineering inputs rather than evolving operational realities. Site investigations are frequently interpreted as definitive representations of ground conditions even though they provide only sampled insight into complex geological systems extending across highly variable spatial environments.

In my experience, one of the most common challenges in geotechnical engineering is the tendency to treat ground conditions as fixed inputs rather than evolving parameters. While site investigations provide valuable information, they represent only a partial understanding of actual conditions. As construction progresses, new information often emerges, requiring continuous reassessment of initial assumptions.

This evolving nature of subsurface information creates a project environment where uncertainty cannot simply be identified during early planning phases and then managed through static mitigation measures alone. Ground conditions continue influencing project behavior throughout excavation, foundation installation, slope stabilization, tunneling, dewatering operations, earth retention activities, and long-term infrastructure performance.

As construction advances, previously unidentified stratigraphic variations, groundwater responses, settlement behavior, or load transfer mechanisms may emerge unexpectedly, requiring rapid engineering reassessment and operational adaptation.

This inherent uncertainty makes geotechnical risk management fundamentally different from other types of risk. It is not sufficient to identify risks at the beginning of a project and assume they remain constant. Instead, geotechnical risk must be actively monitored, reassessed, and managed throughout the entire project lifecycle.

The implications of this uncertainty become particularly significant in large-scale infrastructure systems where geotechnical conditions influence not only structural performance, but also project schedule, construction sequencing, equipment selection, safety exposure, environmental impact, and operational continuity simultaneously.

Transportation systems, underground infrastructure, retaining structures, dams, ports, tunnels, and urban excavations all depend heavily on assumptions regarding soil and rock behavior that may evolve as field conditions become more fully exposed during construction.

This interconnected relationship between ground behavior and project delivery means that geotechnical risk management cannot function effectively as an isolated technical discipline operating independently from broader project coordination and decision-making systems.

Another important challenge concerns the allocation of investigative and engineering resources. Because complete elimination of subsurface uncertainty is neither technically feasible nor economically practical, infrastructure projects must prioritize which uncertainties carry the greatest potential impact on safety, operational stability, schedule reliability, and long-term infrastructure performance.

A key approach in managing geotechnical uncertainty is prioritization. Not all uncertainties carry the same level of impact. In large-scale projects, attempting to address every possible variation in ground conditions is neither practical nor efficient. Instead, focusing on critical zones—such as areas with complex stratigraphy, high water tables, or significant load transfer—is essential.

This prioritization process represents one of the central strategic elements of modern geotechnical risk management because it allows engineering efforts to focus on the conditions most likely to influence project success significantly rather than dispersing resources uniformly across all possible uncertainties.

The paper therefore examines geotechnical risk management not simply as a technical calculation process, but as an adaptive engineering framework integrating investigation, design, construction monitoring, field interpretation, and operational decision-making throughout the entire infrastructure lifecycle. Particular attention is given to observational methods, iterative design strategies, monitoring integration, interdisciplinary coordination, and the role of engineering judgment under uncertain subsurface conditions.

Ultimately, the study argues that successful geotechnical risk management depends less on attempting to eliminate uncertainty entirely and more on developing engineering systems capable of responding intelligently and adaptively as new information emerges during project execution.

II. THE NATURE OF UNCERTAINTY IN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING

Uncertainty in geotechnical engineering originates from the fundamental complexity and variability of natural ground systems. Unlike manufactured materials whose properties can be controlled within relatively narrow tolerances, subsurface conditions are shaped by geological, hydrological, environmental, and historical processes that evolve over extended timescales and often vary significantly even within short spatial distances.

Soil stratification, groundwater conditions, weathering patterns, discontinuities in rock formations, buried obstructions, and localized material inconsistencies create environments where complete characterization is practically impossible prior to construction. Consequently, geotechnical engineering operates within a context where uncertainty is not an occasional exception, but a permanent condition influencing every stage of infrastructure development.

This characteristic distinguishes geotechnical systems from many other engineering domains because uncertainty is embedded directly into the physical medium supporting the project itself. Even highly detailed site investigations provide only sampled representations of broader subsurface behavior. Boreholes, laboratory tests, geophysical surveys, and in situ investigations improve understanding substantially, yet they still capture only partial information regarding actual field conditions. Between investigation points, significant variations may remain undetected until excavation, drilling, or foundation construction exposes previously unknown conditions during execution phases.

For this reason, geotechnical investigation should not be interpreted as a process intended to eliminate uncertainty entirely. Rather, its primary purpose is to reduce uncertainty sufficiently to support informed engineering judgment and adaptive project planning.

An important issue in many large-scale projects is the misconception that increasing the quantity of investigation data automatically removes uncertainty from the project environment. While additional investigation improves understanding, uncertainty remains because ground behavior is influenced not only by material properties themselves, but also by interaction between stress conditions, groundwater response, construction methods, environmental exposure, and sequencing effects during execution.

This means that geotechnical uncertainty is not purely informational; it is also behavioral. The way ground conditions respond during construction may differ from pre-construction assumptions even when investigation programs are technically extensive.

From a practical perspective, this requires aligning investigation efforts, design decisions, and construction strategies around the most critical uncertainties. In my experience, projects that adopt this focused approach are better able to allocate resources effectively and reduce unexpected disruptions during execution.

This perspective is especially important because attempting to investigate every possible subsurface variation may create diminishing practical value while consuming substantial project resources and time. Effective geotechnical risk management therefore depends on identifying which uncertainties have the greatest potential influence on project stability, operational continuity, safety exposure, and infrastructure performance rather than pursuing exhaustive characterization of all subsurface conditions equally.

Another defining feature of geotechnical uncertainty involves temporal variability. Ground conditions are not always static throughout the lifecycle of a project. Groundwater levels may fluctuate seasonally, excavation activities may alter stress distributions, adjacent construction may influence settlement behavior, and environmental conditions may affect soil strength or stability over time. Consequently, assumptions established during early project phases may gradually become less reliable as site conditions evolve during construction and operation. This dynamic behavior creates an engineering environment where continuous reassessment becomes essential.

The uncertainty associated with groundwater conditions illustrates this challenge particularly clearly. Groundwater behavior is often difficult to predict accurately because it depends on permeability variations, recharge conditions, hydraulic connectivity, seasonal fluctuation, and interaction with surrounding geological formations. Small deviations in groundwater assumptions may significantly influence excavation stability, dewatering requirements, uplift pressure, seepage behavior, and long-term infrastructure performance.

In urban infrastructure systems, groundwater uncertainty may also affect adjacent buildings, underground utilities, transportation systems, and environmental conditions simultaneously, increasing the broader operational consequences of geotechnical misjudgment.

Another important source of uncertainty arises from scale effects. Laboratory testing provides valuable information regarding soil and rock properties under controlled conditions, yet actual field behavior often differs because large-scale ground systems contain heterogeneity, discontinuities, stress redistribution mechanisms, and environmental influences difficult to replicate experimentally. As a result, engineering models developed from laboratory data must always be interpreted within the broader context of field behavior rather than treated as exact predictions of subsurface performance. This limitation reinforces the importance of combining analytical methods with field observations and engineering experience throughout project execution.

Construction activities themselves also contribute to uncertainty because geotechnical systems respond directly to excavation, loading, vibration, groundwater modification, and sequencing operations introduced during project delivery. Excavation geometry, support installation timing, temporary loading conditions, and equipment interaction may all influence ground behavior dynamically as construction progresses. Consequently, geotechnical risk cannot be evaluated solely through pre-construction analysis without considering how execution methods alter subsurface response during the project lifecycle.

This interaction between construction and ground behavior is one of the reasons why geotechnical engineering requires particularly close coordination between design teams and field operations.

Another critical aspect of uncertainty involves model limitations. Geotechnical analysis frequently relies on simplifying assumptions necessary to make complex ground behavior computationally manageable. Soil models, constitutive relationships, seepage analyses, and stability calculations all involve assumptions regarding material homogeneity, drainage conditions, boundary behavior, or stress distribution that may only approximate actual field conditions partially.

While these analytical tools remain essential, their results must always be interpreted probabilistically rather than deterministically because actual ground response may deviate from modeled behavior under changing field conditions.

This issue becomes especially important in large infrastructure projects where decisions carry substantial operational and financial consequences. Excessive confidence in analytical precision may create a false perception of certainty that weakens adaptive risk management capability during construction. Effective geotechnical practice therefore requires maintaining awareness of model limitations and preserving flexibility within project decision frameworks.

At a broader level, the nature of uncertainty in geotechnical engineering ultimately demonstrates that infrastructure systems interact continuously with natural environments that remain only partially predictable. Unlike highly controlled industrial systems, geotechnical projects operate within evolving geological conditions shaped by variability rather than uniformity. The objective of geotechnical risk management is therefore not to eliminate uncertainty entirely, but to develop engineering strategies capable of functioning reliably despite the presence of incomplete information and changing field conditions.

This perspective forms the foundation for modern adaptive geotechnical engineering approaches where investigation, design, monitoring, and construction are treated as interconnected processes continuously informing one another throughout the lifecycle of the project.

III. RISK PRIORITIZATION AND CRITICAL GROUND CONDITIONS

One of the most important principles in geotechnical risk management is recognizing that not all uncertainties carry the same level of consequence for project performance, construction safety, or long-term infrastructure reliability. Large-scale construction projects often involve highly variable subsurface conditions distributed across broad geographical areas and multiple structural zones. Attempting to investigate, model, and mitigate every possible ground variation with equal intensity is rarely practical from either a technical or economic standpoint.

Effective geotechnical engineering therefore depends heavily on prioritization — specifically, the ability to distinguish between uncertainties that may generate manageable operational variation and those capable of producing major structural, safety, environmental, or schedule-related consequences.

This prioritization process is particularly important because geotechnical resources, including investigation budgets, monitoring systems, field testing programs, and engineering analysis capacity, are always finite. Projects that distribute these resources uniformly without considering relative risk exposure often create inefficient investigation strategies where critical uncertainties receive insufficient attention while lower-impact conditions consume disproportionate engineering effort.

A key approach in managing geotechnical uncertainty is prioritization. Not all uncertainties carry the same level of impact. In large-scale projects, attempting to address every possible variation in ground conditions is neither practical nor efficient. Instead, focusing on critical zones—such as areas with complex stratigraphy, high water tables, or significant load transfer—is essential.

The concept of “critical ground conditions” extends beyond simply identifying weak soils or difficult geological formations. In practice, geotechnical criticality depends on the interaction between subsurface behavior and project-specific operational demands. Ground conditions that may be relatively manageable in one infrastructure context can become highly critical in another depending on excavation depth, structural loading, groundwater sensitivity, adjacent infrastructure exposure, construction sequencing, or environmental constraints.

For example, relatively minor settlement behavior may create limited consequences in open-field construction environments but become highly critical in dense urban projects where adjacent structures, underground utilities, transportation systems, or operational facilities are sensitive to ground movement.

This context-dependent nature of geotechnical risk means that prioritization cannot rely solely on geological classification alone. Instead, it requires integrated evaluation of how subsurface variability interacts with project systems, construction methods, operational constraints, and long-term infrastructure performance objectives simultaneously.

One of the most common areas requiring elevated geotechnical attention involves zones characterized by complex stratigraphy. Rapid transitions between soil layers, variable rock quality, buried channels, heterogeneous fill materials, or interbedded weak and strong formations often produce highly unpredictable ground response during excavation and foundation activities. These environments complicate both analytical modeling and construction execution because small changes in local conditions may significantly alter stability behavior, groundwater interaction, or load transfer mechanisms.

Similarly, groundwater conditions frequently represent one of the highest-priority uncertainty categories within large infrastructure projects. High groundwater tables, artesian pressures, permeable strata, seepage pathways, and fluctuating hydrogeological conditions may influence excavation stability, dewatering performance, uplift resistance, and long-term settlement behavior simultaneously. In many projects, groundwater-related risks ultimately generate greater operational disruption than the strength properties of the soil itself.

This is particularly true in urban excavation environments where groundwater drawdown may affect surrounding foundations, utilities, pavement systems, or environmental conditions beyond the immediate construction zone.

Another important category of critical ground conditions involves interfaces between natural and man-made systems. Existing retaining structures, buried utilities, historical fills, abandoned underground works, tunnels, and adjacent foundations frequently create localized uncertainty zones where conventional geotechnical assumptions become less reliable. In such areas, subsurface behavior is influenced not only by natural geology, but also by previous construction activity, undocumented modifications, and historical loading conditions that may not be fully represented within available site records.

These interface conditions often require more adaptive investigation and monitoring strategies because unexpected interactions may emerge only after construction activities begin.

The prioritization process also plays a major role in determining investigation strategy itself. In many conventional projects, site investigation programs are distributed according to geometric spacing criteria rather than risk-based engineering priorities. While systematic coverage provides baseline consistency, it may fail to concentrate sufficient investigative effort within areas carrying the highest uncertainty exposure.

Risk-informed investigation strategies instead allocate more intensive investigation, laboratory testing, instrumentation, and analysis toward zones where uncertainty has the greatest potential operational consequence.

This targeted approach improves efficiency because engineering resources are aligned with project vulnerability rather than distributed uniformly regardless of relative impact.

Another important consideration is the relationship between uncertainty prioritization and construction sequencing. Certain geotechnical risks may become more critical during specific project stages even if they appear relatively manageable during early planning phases. Temporary excavation stability, staged loading conditions, dewatering transitions, or sequential support installation may all introduce short-duration but high-consequence vulnerability periods during construction.

As a result, geotechnical prioritization must remain dynamic rather than static throughout the project lifecycle.

Projects that manage this process effectively often integrate geotechnical review directly into construction planning and field coordination activities rather than limiting risk evaluation to isolated design stages. Continuous communication between geotechnical engineers, construction managers, and field personnel allows emerging conditions to be reassessed rapidly as new information becomes available during execution.

This adaptability is essential because some of the most significant geotechnical risks only become fully visible after excavation or foundation activities expose actual subsurface behavior directly.

Prioritization also influences decision-making under uncertainty. Conservative mitigation strategies applied uniformly across all project conditions may reduce uncertainty theoretically, yet they often introduce substantial cost, schedule, and constructability burdens without proportional improvement in actual project reliability. Conversely, excessive optimization in high-risk zones may expose projects to unacceptable operational vulnerability if uncertainty is underestimated.

Effective prioritization therefore supports balanced engineering judgment by allowing project teams to focus conservative measures where risk exposure is highest while maintaining practical efficiency elsewhere within the infrastructure system.

At a broader level, risk prioritization reflects a fundamental shift in geotechnical engineering philosophy away from attempting to eliminate all uncertainty equally and toward managing uncertainty strategically according to its potential impact on infrastructure performance. This perspective acknowledges that uncertainty is unavoidable within subsurface systems, but also recognizes that not all uncertainty requires identical engineering response.

The most effective geotechnical risk management frameworks are therefore not those attempting to control every possible variation simultaneously, but those capable of identifying where uncertainty matters most and concentrating technical, operational, and organizational attention accordingly.

IV. OBSERVATIONAL METHODS AND ITERATIVE GEOTECHNICAL DESIGN

One of the most effective engineering responses to geotechnical uncertainty is the adoption of observational and iterative design approaches that allow infrastructure systems to adapt as field conditions become more fully understood during construction. Traditional project delivery models often assume that geotechnical design can be finalized largely before execution begins, with construction functioning primarily as the implementation stage of previously established engineering decisions. While this sequential structure may be suitable for highly predictable systems, it becomes increasingly limited in geotechnical environments where subsurface behavior cannot be defined completely in advance.

Ground conditions frequently reveal new characteristics only after excavation, loading, drilling, dewatering, or support installation activities expose actual field behavior directly. Under such circumstances, rigid design frameworks based exclusively on pre-construction assumptions may struggle to respond effectively when observed conditions differ from predicted models.

Another important aspect is the integration of design and construction processes. In many projects, geotechnical design is completed before construction begins, with limited feedback from field conditions. However, given the variability of ground conditions, this separation can lead to misalignment between design intent and actual site behavior.

The observational method addresses this limitation by treating design not as a fixed endpoint, but as a controlled and continuously informed engineering process. Rather than attempting to predict every aspect of ground behavior with absolute certainty prior to construction, observational approaches establish initial design assumptions together with monitoring systems, predefined response criteria, and adaptive decision mechanisms capable of responding to actual field conditions as they emerge.

This creates a more realistic framework for managing uncertainty because engineering decisions evolve in parallel with improving understanding of site behavior during execution.

A more effective approach is to treat geotechnical design as an iterative process. Observational methods, where design assumptions are continuously validated and adjusted based on field data, provide a more realistic framework for managing uncertainty. This approach allows engineers to respond to actual conditions rather than relying solely on pre-construction assumptions.

One of the most important strengths of the observational method is that it recognizes uncertainty explicitly rather than attempting to conceal it within overly deterministic analytical models.

Conventional geotechnical design often relies on assumed material parameters, groundwater conditions, or deformation limits that may appear precise mathematically while still containing substantial uncertainty regarding actual field response. Observational approaches instead acknowledge that uncertainty remains present throughout construction and therefore establish systems capable of detecting and responding to deviations before they develop into critical failures.

This distinction is especially important in large infrastructure projects where geotechnical behavior evolves progressively during staged construction activities. Excavation-induced stress redistribution, groundwater fluctuation, support installation timing, surcharge loading, and interaction with adjacent infrastructure may all influence field conditions dynamically over time. As a result, the actual behavior of the system often becomes more understandable during construction than during earlier design phases.

Iterative design frameworks take advantage of this evolving information environment by incorporating field observations directly into engineering reassessment processes.

A key component of observational geotechnical engineering is the establishment of trigger-based decision systems. Monitoring data alone has limited value unless it is connected to predefined operational thresholds and response protocols. Effective observational frameworks therefore define acceptable performance ranges, warning criteria, and intervention procedures before construction activities begin.

For example, settlement monitoring, inclinometer movement, piezometric response, or support loading data may be linked to predetermined engineering actions depending on observed trends during execution. This allows project teams to react systematically rather than improvisationally when field conditions evolve beyond expected parameters.

Another important aspect of iterative geotechnical design involves reducing the disconnect between analytical prediction and construction reality. In many conventional project environments, geotechnical analysis is performed within highly controlled assumptions that simplify actual field conditions for computational manageability. While such simplifications are necessary, they may not capture fully the influence of construction sequencing, temporary loading conditions, groundwater interaction, equipment vibration, or operational constraints on real ground behavior.

Observational methods compensate for these limitations by continuously comparing predicted performance against actual measured response during execution phases.

This comparison significantly improves engineering reliability because assumptions are validated progressively through field evidence rather than remaining purely theoretical throughout the project lifecycle.

The value of observational approaches becomes particularly clear in deep excavation projects, tunneling operations, embankment construction, slope stabilization systems, and large foundation works where subsurface response is highly sensitive to construction sequence and local geological variation. In these environments, small deviations in soil stiffness, groundwater conditions, or support timing may significantly alter overall system behavior.

Projects operating under rigid fixed-design assumptions may struggle to adapt efficiently when such deviations emerge, whereas iterative systems maintain greater operational flexibility while preserving engineering control.

Another important advantage of iterative geotechnical design is improved communication between engineering disciplines and construction teams. Observational systems require continuous interaction between field observations, instrumentation specialists, geotechnical engineers, structural designers, and construction managers.

This interdisciplinary coordination strengthens overall project awareness because emerging conditions are interpreted collaboratively rather than through isolated technical silos.

In practice, many successful geotechnical projects rely heavily on this integration between analytical engineering and field-based operational interpretation.

However, observational approaches also require disciplined governance structures. Adaptive design does not imply uncontrolled modification or informal decision-making during construction. On the contrary, successful iterative systems depend on clearly defined monitoring procedures, reporting frameworks, response thresholds, technical authority structures, and communication protocols established before execution begins.

Without such discipline, adaptive approaches may create confusion regarding responsibility, intervention criteria, or design intent during rapidly evolving project conditions.

Another challenge concerns organizational acceptance. Some project environments remain strongly oriented toward fixed-scope delivery models where modifications during construction are viewed negatively regardless of whether evolving field conditions justify reassessment. In such contexts, observational methods may encounter resistance because they require acknowledging uncertainty openly and preserving flexibility within design frameworks.

Yet in reality, refusing to adapt when new subsurface information emerges often increases project vulnerability rather than reducing it.

At a broader level, iterative geotechnical design reflects a more mature understanding of uncertainty within infrastructure engineering. Instead of assuming that subsurface systems can be predicted perfectly before construction begins, observational methods recognize that engineering reliability often depends more on the ability to detect, interpret, and respond to evolving conditions effectively during execution.

This perspective transforms geotechnical engineering from a purely predictive discipline into a continuously adaptive process integrating analysis, monitoring, field observation, and structured decision-making throughout the lifecycle of the project.

V. DECISION-MAKING UNDER GEOTECHNICAL UNCERTAINTY

Decision-making in geotechnical engineering rarely occurs under conditions of complete information. Unlike disciplines where material properties and operational parameters can be controlled with relatively high precision, geotechnical projects require engineers to make critical judgments while significant uncertainty regarding subsurface behavior still remains.

Excavation stability, foundation performance, groundwater response, settlement behavior, and slope reliability are often influenced by variables that become fully visible only after construction progresses. Consequently, geotechnical decision-making is fundamentally an exercise in managing incomplete knowledge while balancing technical, operational, financial, and safety-related consequences simultaneously.

This characteristic makes geotechnical decision processes especially sensitive because engineering choices frequently involve trade-offs rather than clearly optimal solutions. Conservative approaches may reduce uncertainty exposure but significantly increase cost, construction duration, or operational complexity. More optimized solutions may improve efficiency and resource allocation while introducing narrower safety margins or greater sensitivity to unexpected field conditions.

Decision-making under uncertainty is another critical component. In geotechnical engineering, decisions often involve balancing competing objectives such as safety, cost, and schedule. For example, adopting a conservative design may reduce risk but increase cost, while a more optimized design may introduce additional uncertainty.

One of the central challenges in such environments is avoiding simplistic binary thinking where decisions are framed purely as either “safe” or “unsafe.” In practice, geotechnical engineering operates within varying levels of uncertainty and risk tolerance rather than absolute certainty. Effective decision-making therefore depends not only on technical calculations, but also on evaluating consequence severity, likelihood of adverse behavior, monitoring capability, construction adaptability, and available contingency measures.

Projects that recognize this multidimensional nature of risk are generally better equipped to maintain operational stability when field conditions evolve unexpectedly.

A common limitation in conventional project environments is the tendency to rely heavily on deterministic outputs while underestimating the uncertainty embedded within the assumptions supporting those outputs. Numerical analyses, stability calculations, settlement models, and seepage simulations often produce precise-looking results that may unintentionally create a false sense of certainty regarding actual field behavior. However, small changes in groundwater assumptions, material stiffness, stratigraphic continuity, or construction sequence may substantially alter real performance conditions.

For this reason, geotechnical decisions should rarely be interpreted as conclusions derived solely from analytical outputs. Instead, analysis should function as one component within a broader framework combining engineering judgment, field observations, operational constraints, and probabilistic thinking.

In my view, the effectiveness of geotechnical risk management depends on how well these trade-offs are evaluated. Structured decision-making frameworks, where options are assessed based on their potential impact and likelihood, can support more informed choices. This approach ensures that decisions are not driven solely by immediate constraints but consider long-term performance and risk exposure.

Structured decision frameworks are particularly valuable because they introduce transparency into how competing priorities are evaluated. In large-scale infrastructure projects, technical decisions often influence multiple project systems simultaneously. A retaining system modification may improve excavation stability while delaying sequencing activities. A more conservative foundation approach may increase reliability but introduce logistical complications or budget pressure. Dewatering strategies may reduce uplift risk while increasing environmental exposure or affecting nearby infrastructure systems.

Without structured evaluation methods, decisions may become overly influenced by short-term project pressures rather than broader infrastructure performance objectives.

Another important aspect of geotechnical decision-making involves timing. Decisions made early in the project lifecycle often occur under the highest levels of uncertainty because field information remains limited before construction activities begin. Yet these early decisions frequently establish the framework for investigation scope, construction methodology, support systems, procurement strategies, and sequencing logic throughout the project.

This creates a paradox within geotechnical engineering: some of the most consequential decisions must be made precisely when the least information is available.

Adaptive decision-making frameworks attempt to address this challenge by preserving flexibility within project systems rather than locking projects into rigid assumptions prematurely. Instead of attempting to eliminate all uncertainty before execution begins, adaptive frameworks establish mechanisms for reassessment as new field information becomes available during construction. This approach allows projects to maintain strategic direction while still responding intelligently to evolving subsurface conditions.

The role of communication is also critically important in geotechnical decision processes. Many infrastructure failures associated with geotechnical conditions do not result solely from analytical error, but from delayed interpretation of field data, unclear escalation procedures, fragmented communication between disciplines, or slow organizational response to emerging warning signs.

In rapidly evolving construction environments, even technically accurate information may lose operational value if it is not communicated and acted upon efficiently.

This issue becomes particularly important when monitoring systems detect behavior deviating from expected performance trends. Settlement increases, groundwater fluctuations, support deformation, or instrumentation anomalies often require rapid interpretation and coordinated engineering response. Projects lacking clear decision authority structures or communication protocols may struggle to implement timely corrective action even when monitoring data itself is technically adequate.

Effective geotechnical risk management therefore depends heavily on organizational responsiveness as much as on analytical capability.

Another critical consideration concerns the psychological dimension of engineering judgment under uncertainty. Infrastructure projects frequently operate under schedule pressure, financial constraints, contractual expectations, and stakeholder scrutiny. These conditions may unintentionally encourage optimistic interpretation of ambiguous field behavior or reluctance to revise earlier assumptions due to concerns regarding project disruption.

However, geotechnical systems often penalize delayed response because small early-stage anomalies may escalate into much larger operational problems if corrective measures are postponed.

Experienced geotechnical engineers therefore tend to place significant emphasis on recognizing trends and weak signals before they become critical failures. This interpretive capability is difficult to formalize completely through analytical procedures because it relies partly on practical understanding of how subsurface systems behave under real construction conditions.

For this reason, engineering experience remains a central component of geotechnical decision-making even as analytical tools and digital monitoring technologies continue advancing.

At a broader level, decision-making under geotechnical uncertainty ultimately reflects a balance between prediction and adaptability. Analytical models provide essential guidance, but field conditions continuously test the assumptions underlying those models during project execution.

The most reliable geotechnical strategies are therefore not those claiming absolute predictive certainty, but those capable of integrating technical analysis with flexible operational response mechanisms as uncertainty evolves over time.

This perspective positions geotechnical engineering not as a discipline attempting to remove uncertainty entirely, but as one focused on managing uncertainty intelligently through continuous evaluation, structured judgment, and adaptive infrastructure decision-making.

VI. MONITORING SYSTEMS, INSTRUMENTATION, AND FIELD VALIDATION

Monitoring and instrumentation systems play a central role in modern geotechnical risk management because they provide the operational link between theoretical design assumptions and actual field behavior during construction. In geotechnical engineering, uncertainty cannot be addressed effectively through analysis alone.

Regardless of how detailed investigation programs or numerical models may be, subsurface behavior ultimately reveals itself most clearly during excavation, loading, groundwater modification, and structural interaction throughout execution phases. Monitoring systems therefore function not merely as observational tools, but as critical components of adaptive engineering control capable of validating assumptions, identifying emerging risks, and supporting informed decision-making under evolving field conditions.

One of the most important functions of instrumentation is reducing the gap between predicted and observed performance. Geotechnical analyses are inherently dependent on assumptions regarding soil stiffness, groundwater behavior, stress redistribution, deformation response, and boundary conditions. While these assumptions are based on investigation data and engineering interpretation, actual field response frequently differs due to localized variability, sequencing effects, construction methods, or environmental influences not fully captured within analytical models.

Monitoring systems allow engineers to evaluate whether the infrastructure system is behaving within acceptable performance ranges or whether reassessment becomes necessary as construction progresses.

Construction execution also plays a significant role in managing geotechnical risk. Field observations, instrumentation, and monitoring systems provide critical data that can be used to validate design assumptions. However, the value of this data depends on how quickly and effectively it is integrated into decision-making processes.

This point is particularly important because instrumentation alone does not automatically improve project safety or reliability. The effectiveness of monitoring depends heavily on interpretation speed, communication quality, and organizational responsiveness. In some projects, substantial quantities of field data are collected continuously without establishing clear frameworks for evaluating operational significance or triggering engineering response. Under such conditions, monitoring systems may create a false sense of security while important behavioral trends remain insufficiently addressed.

Effective monitoring environments therefore require not only technical instrumentation, but also structured interpretation and decision protocols integrated directly into project management systems.

A wide range of instrumentation technologies are commonly used within large-scale geotechnical projects depending on project type, risk exposure, and anticipated ground behavior.

Settlement markers, inclinometers, piezometers, extensometers, load cells, strain gauges, and vibration monitoring systems each provide insight into different aspects of subsurface response during construction and operation. In deep excavation systems, inclinometer readings may reveal lateral ground movement trends before visible distress develops. Piezometers may indicate unexpected groundwater response influencing stability conditions. Settlement monitoring may identify early deformation affecting nearby structures or infrastructure systems.

The strategic value of these systems lies not simply in measuring movement, but in identifying trends early enough to allow controlled intervention before conditions become critical.

This capability is especially important because geotechnical failures rarely occur instantaneously without warning. In many cases, subsurface systems exhibit progressive behavioral changes before major instability develops. Increasing deformation rates, accelerating settlement patterns, rising pore pressures, or evolving support loads often provide measurable indicators that project conditions are diverging from expected performance assumptions.

Monitoring systems create the opportunity to detect these warning signs while corrective action remains feasible and operational disruption can still be minimized.

The relationship between monitoring and construction sequencing is another critical aspect of geotechnical field validation. Ground behavior frequently depends not only on final structural conditions, but also on temporary states created during staged excavation, support installation, loading transitions, or groundwater modification. Monitoring systems therefore help evaluate how construction activities themselves influence geotechnical performance throughout different project phases.

This is particularly relevant in urban excavation projects where temporary deformation during construction may influence adjacent buildings, underground utilities, transportation infrastructure, or public services long before permanent structural systems are completed.

Another important consideration is the interpretation of monitoring data within uncertain environments. Instrumentation rarely provides perfectly clear answers regarding subsurface behavior. Data may fluctuate due to environmental conditions, equipment sensitivity, installation effects, or localized variation unrelated to systemic instability. As a result, effective interpretation requires distinguishing between acceptable operational variability and meaningful indicators of emerging risk.

This process depends heavily on engineering judgment because identical monitoring values may carry very different implications depending on project context, sequencing stage, geological conditions, and surrounding infrastructure sensitivity. For this reason, monitoring systems should always be interpreted within the broader operational framework of the project rather than through isolated numerical thresholds alone.

In many cases, delays in interpreting or acting on field data reduce its effectiveness. Therefore, establishing clear communication channels and decision protocols is essential. This ensures that emerging risks are addressed in a timely manner and that necessary adjustments can be implemented without significant disruption.

Communication structure is therefore just as important as instrumentation quality itself. Monitoring data must move efficiently between field teams, geotechnical engineers, construction managers, structural designers, and project leadership without excessive delay or fragmentation. In large infrastructure environments, slow escalation processes or unclear reporting responsibilities may significantly reduce the operational value of even highly sophisticated instrumentation systems.

Projects that manage monitoring effectively typically establish predefined trigger levels together with corresponding response actions before construction begins. These frameworks clarify how different levels of observed behavior should be interpreted and which engineering interventions are required under varying conditions. Such systems improve consistency and reduce ambiguity during rapidly evolving field situations.

Another important dimension of monitoring involves public and operational risk management within urban environments. Large-scale excavations and underground infrastructure projects often occur near occupied buildings, transportation corridors, utilities, and sensitive operational systems. In these contexts, instrumentation serves not only internal engineering purposes but also broader risk management and stakeholder assurance functions.

Continuous monitoring allows project teams to demonstrate that infrastructure systems remain within acceptable performance ranges while providing early warning capability if surrounding assets become affected by geotechnical behavior during construction.

The integration of digital technologies has also expanded the role of geotechnical monitoring in recent years.

Automated monitoring systems, wireless instrumentation, remote sensing technologies, drone-based surveying, and real-time data platforms increasingly allow infrastructure projects to evaluate field behavior continuously rather than through periodic manual measurements alone. These developments significantly improve responsiveness because project teams can identify changing trends much earlier and coordinate intervention more efficiently under rapidly evolving conditions.

However, digitalization also increases the importance of disciplined data management because excessive information without clear interpretive frameworks may overwhelm operational decision systems rather than strengthen them.

At a broader level, monitoring and field validation represent one of the clearest expressions of adaptive geotechnical engineering philosophy. Instead of assuming that analytical predictions alone can fully define subsurface behavior, modern geotechnical practice increasingly recognizes that infrastructure reliability depends on continuous interaction between prediction, observation, interpretation, and response throughout the project lifecycle.

Monitoring systems therefore do not simply confirm whether designs are functioning correctly; they create the operational intelligence necessary for infrastructure systems to remain safe, stable, and adaptable under inherently uncertain ground conditions.

VII. URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE AND GEOTECHNICAL RISK EXPOSURE

Geotechnical risk becomes significantly more complex in urban infrastructure environments because subsurface uncertainty no longer affects only the project itself, but also the dense network of surrounding structures, utilities, transportation systems, and public operations interconnected with the construction zone.

In open or isolated construction environments, unexpected ground behavior may remain relatively localized and manageable. In densely developed urban areas, however, even moderate geotechnical disturbances can propagate outward and generate substantial operational, structural, financial, and social consequences beyond the immediate project boundary.

This interconnected exposure fundamentally changes the nature of geotechnical risk management in cities. Excavation-induced settlement, groundwater drawdown, vibration, stress redistribution, or retaining system deformation may influence adjacent buildings, underground infrastructure, utility corridors, rail systems, pavements, or buried services simultaneously. As a result, urban geotechnical engineering requires a broader systems perspective where surrounding infrastructure sensitivity becomes just as important as the behavior of the primary structure itself.

Geotechnical risk management is particularly critical in urban infrastructure projects. In densely populated areas, uncertainties related to ground conditions can have broader implications, including impacts on adjacent structures, utilities, and public safety. For example, unexpected ground movements during excavation can affect nearby buildings or underground services, leading to significant operational and financial consequences.

One of the defining characteristics of urban geotechnical projects is the limited tolerance for deformation and disruption. Infrastructure systems in dense metropolitan environments often operate continuously with little redundancy available for service interruption.

Transportation corridors, utility networks, communication systems, and occupied structures may remain highly sensitive to even small ground movements during construction. Consequently, geotechnical risk management in cities is not solely about preventing catastrophic failure, but also about controlling incremental behavior within very narrow operational limits.

This requirement significantly increases both the technical and organizational complexity of urban construction projects.

Deep excavations illustrate this challenge particularly clearly. In urban development's involving underground transportation systems, basements, utility structures, or tunnel construction, excavation activities frequently occur only a short distance from existing buildings and buried infrastructure. Ground movements that might be considered acceptable in less constrained environments may become highly problematic when adjacent foundations or utility systems are vulnerable to settlement, lateral displacement, or vibration-induced stress.

Under these conditions, geotechnical design cannot focus exclusively on the stability of the excavation itself. Engineers must also evaluate how construction activities influence the broader urban system surrounding the project.

Groundwater management presents another major source of urban geotechnical exposure. Dewatering operations intended to stabilize excavations may alter hydrogeological conditions across a wider area than initially anticipated. Reduced pore water pressures can increase effective stress in compressible soils, potentially triggering settlement beneath neighboring buildings or infrastructure systems. In some cases, groundwater modification may also affect buried utilities, environmental conditions, or existing underground structures operating nearby.

Because groundwater systems rarely conform to project boundaries, urban geotechnical risk frequently extends beyond the limits of the immediate construction site.

Another important urban challenge involves the presence of undocumented or historically modified subsurface conditions. Many metropolitan environments contain buried infrastructure, historical foundations, abandoned tunnels, uncontrolled fill materials, or utility networks installed over long periods with incomplete documentation. These conditions increase uncertainty because actual field behavior may differ substantially from available records or investigation assumptions.

Projects operating in mature urban centers therefore often encounter localized subsurface variability that becomes visible only after excavation or construction activities begin.

This reality reinforces the importance of adaptive engineering strategies capable of responding rapidly when field conditions differ from anticipated models.

Urban infrastructure systems also amplify the consequences of schedule disruption associated with geotechnical uncertainty. Delays caused by unexpected ground conditions may influence not only project cost and sequencing, but also traffic management systems, commercial activity, utility operations, and public service continuity. In transportation projects, for example, excavation instability or groundwater problems may disrupt adjacent rail lines, roads, or pedestrian systems whose operational interruption carries substantial economic and social implications.

As a result, urban geotechnical risk management must account for both direct engineering consequences and indirect operational impacts affecting the broader city environment.

In such environments, a proactive approach to risk management is essential. This includes detailed pre-construction investigations, continuous monitoring during execution, and contingency planning for potential scenarios. More importantly, it requires coordination between geotechnical engineers, structural designers, and construction teams to ensure that decisions are aligned across disciplines.

This interdisciplinary coordination becomes particularly important because urban geotechnical risks often emerge through interaction between multiple project systems rather than isolated technical failures. Structural support design, excavation sequencing, groundwater control, traffic staging, utility relocation, and construction logistics may all influence one another simultaneously. Decisions made within one discipline may unintentionally alter risk exposure elsewhere within the project environment.

Projects that manage urban geotechnical conditions effectively therefore tend to maintain continuous communication between engineering, operational, and construction teams throughout execution rather than treating disciplines as separate technical silos.

Another defining feature of urban geotechnical engineering is the importance of public confidence and stakeholder management. In densely populated areas, construction activities occur under continuous observation from regulatory agencies, nearby property owners, infrastructure operators, and the general public. Visible deformation, vibration concerns, utility interruptions, or perceived instability may quickly escalate into political or operational challenges even when technical risk remains controlled.

Monitoring systems, transparent reporting procedures, and clearly defined response frameworks therefore serve not only engineering purposes, but also broader stakeholder assurance functions within urban environments.

The increasing density and vertical complexity of modern cities further intensify geotechnical exposure. High-rise developments, underground transit systems, deep basements, utility corridors, and mixed-use infrastructure networks increasingly occupy overlapping subsurface zones where multiple structures interact within confined spatial conditions. These environments create cumulative geotechnical effects where settlement, stress redistribution, and groundwater behavior may influence several infrastructure systems simultaneously.

Consequently, future urban geotechnical engineering will likely require even greater integration between digital modeling, monitoring systems, and adaptive decision frameworks capable of managing highly interconnected underground environments.

At a broader level, urban infrastructure projects demonstrate that geotechnical uncertainty is not solely a subsurface engineering issue, but a city-scale operational challenge affecting infrastructure resilience, public safety, economic continuity, and long-term urban functionality. Effective geotechnical risk management in these environments therefore depends not only on technical calculations, but also on systems thinking, interdisciplinary coordination, adaptive monitoring, and proactive infrastructure governance throughout the lifecycle of the project.

VIII. ENGINEERING JUDGMENT, ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT, AND PROJECT COORDINATION

Despite major advances in analytical modeling, digital monitoring systems, and numerical simulation tools, geotechnical engineering still depends heavily on professional judgment and field-based interpretation. Ground behavior is influenced by numerous interacting variables that cannot always be represented fully through calculations alone. As a result, practical engineering experience remains essential when evaluating uncertain conditions, interpreting monitoring data, and selecting appropriate mitigation strategies during construction.

Another important consideration is the role of experience and engineering judgment. While analytical tools and models are essential, they cannot fully capture the complexity of real ground behavior. In my experience, practical insights gained from field conditions play a critical role in identifying potential risks and selecting appropriate mitigation measures.

One of the most common weaknesses in conventional geotechnical practice is excessive reliance on predefined safety factors without continuously reassessing whether the assumptions behind those factors remain valid as construction progresses. Although safety factors provide important protection against uncertainty, they are not substitutes for active observation, monitoring, and adaptive decision-making during execution.

A common limitation in conventional practice is the reliance on predefined safety factors without fully addressing uncertainty. While safety factors provide a level of protection, they do not replace the need for active risk management. Geotechnical risk requires a dynamic approach that combines analysis, monitoring, and adaptive decision-making.

Adaptive management approaches improve project reliability because they allow engineering teams to respond systematically when field conditions differ from initial expectations. Instead of treating design assumptions as permanently fixed, adaptive frameworks integrate monitoring results, construction feedback, and updated site observations into ongoing engineering evaluation throughout the project lifecycle. This process becomes particularly important in large-scale infrastructure projects were excavation behavior, groundwater conditions, settlement response, or temporary loading effects may evolve rapidly during construction.

Project coordination is equally critical. Geotechnical risks rarely remain isolated within a single discipline. Excavation methods influence structural behavior, groundwater management affects adjacent infrastructure, and sequencing decisions may alter temporary stability conditions. For this reason, successful geotechnical risk management depends heavily on continuous coordination between geotechnical engineers, structural designers, construction managers, and field teams. Projects that maintain strong interdisciplinary communication are generally more capable of identifying emerging risks early and implementing corrective measures before operational disruption escalates.

Another important aspect involves decision speed. In many projects, technical data is available, yet delays in communication or organizational approval reduce the effectiveness of corrective actions. Geotechnical conditions may change quickly during excavation or foundation work, and delayed intervention can significantly increase both risk exposure and recovery cost. Clear reporting structures and predefined escalation procedures therefore play an essential role in maintaining project stability under uncertain conditions.

Ultimately, engineering judgment remains one of the most valuable components of geotechnical risk management because uncertainty cannot be removed entirely from subsurface systems. Analytical tools provide critical guidance, but successful infrastructure delivery depends equally on the ability to interpret evolving field conditions realistically and adapt project decisions accordingly.

IX. FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN GEOTECHNICAL RISK MANAGEMENT

Future developments in geotechnical risk management will likely focus increasingly on integration between monitoring technologies, predictive analytics, digital modeling environments, and adaptive construction management systems. As infrastructure projects become larger and more complex, traditional static approaches based solely on pre-construction investigations will become less sufficient for managing evolving subsurface conditions during execution.

One important trend is the growing use of real-time monitoring systems integrated with digital project platforms. Automated instrumentation, remote sensing technologies, drone-based surveying, and wireless monitoring networks now allow engineers to evaluate settlement, deformation, groundwater response, and structural interaction continuously during construction. This improves responsiveness because emerging issues can be identified earlier and assessed more efficiently.

Digital integration is also strengthening the relationship between geotechnical engineering and broader project management systems. Monitoring data, sequencing information, BIM environments, and construction progress tracking are increasingly being connected within shared decision platforms. This allows geotechnical risks to be evaluated not only as isolated technical problems, but as factors influencing schedule reliability, operational continuity, and infrastructure performance across the entire project system.

Another important direction involves predictive risk analysis. Historical project databases, probabilistic models, and machine-learning-supported forecasting tools may eventually improve the ability to identify patterns associated with settlement behavior, excavation performance, groundwater instability, or slope movement before critical conditions develop. Although these technologies cannot eliminate uncertainty, they can support more informed and proactive engineering decisions.

At the same time, future geotechnical engineering will continue to require strong professional judgment. Ground behavior remains highly dependent on local geological conditions, construction methods, and environmental interaction that cannot always be represented fully through automated systems alone. For this reason, technological advancement is likely to strengthen engineering interpretation rather than replace it.

Urbanization will also increase the importance of adaptive geotechnical management. Future infrastructure projects will increasingly operate within highly constrained underground environments containing dense utility systems, transportation networks, and existing foundations. In such conditions, even small geotechnical disturbances may create broader operational consequences, making integrated monitoring and interdisciplinary coordination even more critical.

Overall, the future of geotechnical risk management will depend on combining analytical tools, digital technologies, monitoring systems, and field-based engineering judgment within flexible decision frameworks capable of adapting to continuously evolving ground conditions.

CONCLUSION

Geotechnical uncertainty remains one of the defining challenges in large-scale construction and infrastructure development because subsurface conditions can never be understood with complete certainty before construction begins. Variability in geology, groundwater behavior, material properties, and environmental conditions continuously influences project performance throughout investigation, design, execution, and long-term operation. For this reason, geotechnical risk management cannot be treated as a static engineering exercise based solely on pre-construction assumptions.

This paper emphasized that effective geotechnical risk management depends on adopting adaptive and continuously informed engineering approaches rather than relying exclusively on deterministic design frameworks. Prioritizing critical uncertainties, integrating investigation with construction feedback, applying observational methods, and maintaining strong monitoring systems all contribute to improving infrastructure reliability under uncertain ground conditions.

The study also highlighted the importance of structured decision-making and interdisciplinary coordination. Geotechnical risks frequently affect structural systems, construction sequencing, operational continuity, and surrounding infrastructure simultaneously. Projects that maintain clear communication between geotechnical engineers, designers, contractors, and field teams are generally more capable of responding effectively when conditions evolve during execution.

Another major conclusion is that monitoring and field validation are essential components of modern geotechnical engineering. Instrumentation systems provide valuable insight into actual ground behavior, but their effectiveness depends on timely interpretation and integration into project decisions. Adaptive management frameworks supported by monitoring allow infrastructure systems to respond proactively rather than reactively to changing conditions.

Urban infrastructure environments further increase the importance of geotechnical risk management because subsurface uncertainty may influence adjacent buildings, utilities, transportation systems, and public safety. In these settings, risk management must extend beyond the project boundary and consider the broader operational impact of ground behavior throughout the surrounding infrastructure network.

Ultimately, successful geotechnical engineering does not depend on eliminating uncertainty entirely, since complete certainty is rarely achievable in subsurface systems. Instead, the most effective projects are those that acknowledge uncertainty openly and develop engineering strategies capable of adapting intelligently as new information emerges.

From my perspective, the most effective geotechnical risk management strategies are those that acknowledge uncertainty rather than attempting to eliminate it. By integrating technical analysis with practical field insights and structured decision frameworks, infrastructure projects can achieve higher levels of safety, reliability, and performance.

REFERENCES

[1] Burland, J. B., Standing, J. R., & Jardine, F. M. (2001). Building response to tunnelling: Case studies from construction of the Jubilee Line Extension, London. CIRIA & Thomas Telford.

[2] Duncan, J. M. (2000). Factors of safety and reliability in geotechnical engineering. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 126(4), 307–316. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1090-0241(2000)126:4(307)

[3] Fell, R., MacGregor, P., Stapledon, D., Bell, G., & Foster, M. (2005). Geotechnical engineering of dams. CRC Press.

[4] Golder Associates. (2017). Guidelines for geotechnical monitoring during construction. Industry Practice Reference Document.

[5] Holtz, R. D., Kovacs, W. D., & Sheahan, T. C. (2011). An introduction to geotechnical engineering (2nd ed.). Pearson.

[6] Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE). (2012). Specification for piling and embedded retaining walls (3rd ed.). ICE Publishing.

[7] Lambe, T. W. (1973). Predictions in soil engineering. Géotechnique, 23(2), 151–202. https://doi.org/10.1680/geot.1973.23.2.151

[8] Mair, R. J., Taylor, R. N., & Burland, J. B. (1996). Prediction of ground movements and assessment of risk of building damage due to bored tunnelling. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Geotechnical Aspects of Underground Construction in Soft Ground, 713–718.

[9] Peck, R. B. (1969). Advantages and limitations of the observational method in applied soil mechanics. Géotechnique, 19(2), 171–187. https://doi.org/10.1680/geot.1969.19.2.171

[10] Powrie, W. (2014). Soil mechanics: Concepts and applications (3rd ed.). CRC Press.

[11] Terzaghi, K., Peck, R. B., & Mesri, G. (1996). Soil mechanics in engineering practice (3rd ed.). Wiley.

[12] Vaughan, P. R. (1994). Assumption, prediction, and reality in geotechnical engineering. Géotechnique, 44(4), 573–609. https://doi.org/10.1680/geot.1994.44.4.573

[13] Wahls, H. E. (1981). Tolerable movements of buildings. Journal of the Geotechnical Engineering Division, 107(11), 1489–1504.

[14] Wood, D. M. (2004). Geotechnical modelling. CRC Press.

[15] Xu, Y., & Li, J. (2019). Monitoring and risk management of deep excavations in urban environments. Automation in Construction, 104, 12–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2019.04.005