**Example 2.2 Pad foundation with inclined eccentric load on boulder clay** Note: this is a persistent design situation; for simplicity, accidental design situations do NOT need to be checked.

Question		Instruction	Answer				
		GE					
1	n case we need to clarify your submission*	strictly confidential	Name Dariusz Kiziewicz Affiliation Department of Geotechnical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Environmental Science, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Poland Email address dariusz kiziewicz@o2.pl				
2	How many structures of this kind have you previously designed?	Tick one	□ None 🗵 1-2 □ 3-6 □ More than 6				
3	Having completed your design to Eurocode 7, how confident are you that the design is sound?	Tick one	□ Very unsure   Unsure □ Confident □ Very confident				
4	How did you account for the location of boreholes relative to the foundation?	Tick one	<ul> <li>Did not consider the Considered neared</li> <li>Considered 'averation Considered trend</li> <li>Considered trend</li> <li>Other (specify)</li> </ul>	porehole location est borehole only age' of all boreholes of all boreholes, bias	sed towards nearest		
5	Please explain the reasons for your answer to Q4	Free text	I've taken into account all boreholes but using weights depending on distance between the borehole and the centre of foundation.				
		SERVICEABI	ILITY LIMIT STATE				
6	Which parameters did you use for the SLS design of the spread foundation?	Tick all that apply	<ul> <li>□ Water content w</li> <li>☑ SPT blow count N</li> <li>☑ Undrained Young</li> <li>☑ Drained Young's</li> <li>☑ Poisson's ratio v</li> <li>□ Shear modulus of</li> <li>□ Other (specify)</li> </ul>	E Plasticity index I <sub>P</sub> □ Corrected SPT     's modulus of elastic     modulus of elasticity     elasticity G □ Perm	□ Liquidity index I <sub>L</sub> blow count (N <sub>1</sub> ) <sub>60</sub> ity E <sub>u</sub> E´ neability k		
7	What correlations did you use to derive soil parameter values (if used) for the SLS verification? If more than one, please list others below	Free text	Description: $m_v=1/f_2 \cdot N \ [m^2/MN]$ Author: Stroud M. A. Title: The standard penetration test in insensitive clays and soft rock. Proceedings of the 1 <sup>st</sup> European Symposium on Penetration Testing, Stockholm, Sweden, vol. 2(2) (1974) Pages: 367-375				
7a	Any other correlations? (please give same info as above)	Free text	<b>Description:</b> $E_{u}/N_{60}=1,0\pm1,2$ (MPa) <b>Author:</b> Butler F.G. <b>Title:</b> Heavily overconsolidated clays. General report and state-of- the-art review for session. Proc. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Conf. on Settlement of Structures. Pentech Press, London 1975 <b>Pages:</b>				
8	What assumptions did you make in choosing these correlations?	Free text					
9	How did you account for any variation in parameters with depth?	Tick one	□ Ignored variation □ Assumed bi-linea □ Other (specify)	with depth □ Assu r variation  ☑ Assu	med linear variation med stepped variation		
10	Please explain the reasons for your answer to Q9	Free text	Relationship $S_e = \mu_0 \cdot \mu_1 \cdot q \cdot B/E$ which was used to obtain instant settlements assumes that the soil is a homogeneous elastic material so, to obtain representative value of undrained elastic modulus, statistical method of getting mean value of used geotechnical parameters, at 95% confidence level with V unknown, was adopted, using tests results from depths to 2B below foundation. To obtain representative values of drained elastic modules, needed to calculate settlements resulting from consolidation, soil below foundation was divided into calculation layers to whom were attributed SPT results from proper depths leading to stepped variation of this parameter.				
11	What is the characteristic value of N at these depths?	Provide uncorrected values	At 1 m, N = 32	At 2 m, N = 31	At 4 m, N = 45		
12	What is the characteristic value of $E_u$ for a linear elastic calculation at these depths?	Provide values in units of MPa	At 1 m, E <sub>u</sub> = 29	At 2 m, E <sub>u</sub> = 28	At 4 m, E <sub>u</sub> = 41		
13	How did you assess these values?	TICK all that apply	□ By eye □ By lin □ From an existing	ear regression 🛛 🗷 E standard (specify)	By statistical analysis		

			From a public	ished o	correlation	(specify)			
			Comparison with a previous design						
			□ From the soil description, not using the data						
14	Which coloulation model did you	Tick one	Other (specily)						
14	use to determine settlement?	TICK ONE	□ Annex F.1 from EN 1997-1   Annex F.2 from EN 1997-1				1 EN 1997-1		
	use to determine settlement:		□ Alternative fr	om na	tional ann	ex (snecify)			
			Alternative f	rom na	itional star	ndard (snec	ifv) PN	I_81/R_03020	
			□ Finite eleme	nt anal	vsis 🗆 Fi	nite differer	ice an	alvsis	
			□ Other (speci	fy)	,				
15	What limiting values of settlement	Provide	<b>C</b> <sub>d</sub> = 50mm (acc	ording	to Annex H	from EN 19	97-1)		
	and tilt are appropriate for this	values in	$C_{d} = 1/150$ (acco	ording t	to Annex H	from EN 199	97-1)		
	foundation?	mm and 1/x							
16	What width does the foundation	Provide	B <sub>SLS</sub> =						
	need to avoid a serviceability limit	value in m							
17	ULTIMATE LIMIT STATE					dity index l			
17	the LILS design of the spread	apply	SPT blow co	nunt N		orted SPT h	low co	$(N_4)_{aa}$	
	foundation?	apply							
			■ Ondrained shear strength $c_u$ □ Angle of shearing resistance $\phi'$ □ Effective cohesion c' □ Angle of interface friction $\delta$ □ Permeability k				phesion c'		
							(		
			□ Other (speci	fy)			.,		
18	What correlations did you use to	Free text	Description: $c_u = 4,75N_{field}$ Author: O. Sivrikaya, E. Togrol						
	derive soil parameter values (if								
	used) for the ULS verification? If		Title: Determina	tion of	undrained	strength of f	ine-gra	ained silos by	
	more than one, please list others		means of SPT an	d its ap	plication In	n Turkey. Eng	ineerir	ng Geology 86	
	DEIOW		(2006)						
		_	Pages: 52 - 69						
18a	Any other correlations? (please	Free text							
10	What assumptions did you make in	Free text							
19	choosing these correlations?	FIEE lext							
20	What is the characteristic value of	Provide	At 1 m, $c_u = 152$	2	At 2 m, c	= 147	At 4	m, c <sub>u</sub> = 214	
	c <sub>u</sub> at these depths?	values in							
21	Which calculation model did you	Tick one			1007 1				
21	use to determine bearing	TICK ONE		iiven in	a nationa	l annex (sn	ecify)		
	resistance?		□ Alternative g	iven in	a nationa	l standard (	specif	v)	
			🗆 Terzaghi 🗖	Meyer	hof 🗆 Bri	nch-Hanser	1	<i>,</i>	
			□ Finite element analysis □ Finite difference analysis			alysis			
			□ Other (specify) …						
22	Which country's National Annex did you use to interpret EN 1997-1?	Free text							
23	Which Design Approach did you	Tick one	Design Approach 1 Combinations 1 and 2						
	use for verification of the Ultimate		Design Appr	oach 1	Combina	tion 1 only			
	Limit State (ULS)?		Design Appr	oach 1	Combina	tion 2 only	- O+		
			□ Design Approach 2						
			□ Design Approach 3 □ Other (specify)						
24	What values of partial factors did	Provide	1 <sup>st</sup> combination 2 <sup>nd</sup> combination (if used)			(if used)			
24a	you use for this ULS verification?	values	$y_0 = 1.35$	Vo- 1	5	20		20	
			19-192	γQ−⊥		γG		rQ	
			$\gamma_{\varphi}$	γc		$\gamma_{\phi}$		γς	
			$\gamma_{cu} = 1$	γRv		γcu		γRv	
			γRh	$\gamma Rd^{=}$	1,4	γRh		γRd	
25	What width does the foundation	Provide	B <sub>ULS</sub> =3,10m						
	need to avoid an ultimate limit state?	value in m	in m						
26	What are the structural forces (at its	the structural forces (at its Provide Design bending moment $M_{Ed}$ De		Design sh	Design shear force V <sub>Ed</sub>				
	centreline) that the foundation must	values in	1 =1500kNm =2735kN						
	be designed for according to	kNm and kN							
	Eurocode 2?								
27	What other assumptions did you	Free text							
L			1						

	need to make to complete your design?					
28	Please specify any other data that you would have liked to have had to design this type of foundation	Free text				
29	How conservative do you consider your previous national practice to be for this design example?	Tick one	□ Very conservative ☑ Conservative □ About right □ Unconservative □ Very unconservative			
30	How conservative do you consider Eurocode 7 (with your National Annex) to be for this example?	Tick one	□ Very conservative □ Conservative ☑ About right □ Unconservative □ Very unconservative			
31	How does your Eurocode 7 design compare with your previous national practice?	Tick one	<ul> <li>Much more conservative</li> <li>More conservative</li> <li>About the same I Less conservative</li> <li>Much less conservative</li> </ul>			
32	Please provide any other relevant information needed to understand your solution to this design exercise	Free text				
	PLEASE SUBMIT YOUR ANSWERS AT <u>www.eurocode7.com/etc10/Example 2.2</u> THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION!					