Example 2.3 Pile foundation in stiff clay Note: this is a persistent design situation; for simplicity, accidental design situations do NOT need to be checked.

Ques	stion	Instruction	Answer				
				<pre>/</pre>			
1	Please provide your contact details in case we need to clarify your submission*	*Will be kept strictly confidential	Name: Adam Krasiński Affiliation: Gdansk University of Technology Email address: akra@pg.gda.pl				
2	How many structures of this kind have you previously designed?	Tick one	□ None □ 1-2 □ 3-6 M More than 6				
3	Having completed your design to Eurocode 7, how confident are you that the design is sound?	Tick one	□ Very unsure II Unsure □ Confident □ Very confident				
4	How did you account for the location of boreholes/cone tests relative to the foundation?	Tick one	 Did not consider borehole/test location Considered nearest borehole/test only Considered 'average' of all boreholes/tests Considered trend of all b'holes/tests, biased towards nearest Other (specify) 				
5	Please explain the reasons for your answer to Q4	Free text					
		SERVICEABI	LITY LIMIT STATE				
6	Which parameters did you use for the SLS design of the pile foundation?	Tick all that apply	 □ Cone resistance q_c □ Sleeve friction f_s □ SPT blow count N □ Corrected SPT blow count (N₁)₆₀ ☑ UU triaxial test strength c_u □ Pressuremeter limit pressure p_{lim} □ Undrained Young's modulus of elasticity E_u □ Drained Young's modulus of elasticity E´ □ Poisson's ratio v □ Shear modulus of elasticity G □ Other (specify) 				
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: Transform functions Author: Gwizdala K., Jacobsen M. (1992) Title: Bearing capacity and settlements of piles Pages:				
7a	Any other correlations? (please give same info as above)		1 4900.				
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 with depth □ Assumed linear variation □ Assumed bi-linear variation □ Assumed stepped variation □ Other (specify)				
10	Please explain the reasons for your answer to Q9	Free text	Because the distribution of average C_u with depth is rather bi-linear, as it can be seen on fig. 2.3b				
11	What is the characteristic value of N at these levels?	Provide uncorrected values	At +17 m, N =	At +7 m, N =	At –3 m, N =		
12	What is the characteristic value of q_c at these levels?	Provide values in units of MPa	At +17 m, q _c =	At +7 m, q _c =	At –3 m, q _c =		
13	What is the characteristic value of p _{lim} at these levels?	Provide values in units of MPa	At +17 m, p _{lim} =	At +7 m, p _{lim} =	At –3 m, p _{lim} =		
14	What is the characteristic value of triaxial c _u at these levels?	Provide values in units of kPa	At +17 m, c _u = 0	At +7 m, c _u = 150	At –3 m, c _u = 230		
15	How did you assess these values?	Tick all that apply	 ☑ By eye □ By linear regression □ By statistical analysis □ From an existing standard (specify) □ From a published correlation (specify) □ Comparison with a previous design □ From the soil description, not using the data □ Other (specify) 				
16	Which calculation model did you use to determine settlement?	Tick one	 Method from national annex (specify) Method from national standard (specify) Finite element analysis Finite difference analysis Other (specify)Method of transform functions 				
17	What length does the pile need to avoid a serviceability limit state?	Provide value in m	L _{SLS} = 13.0				

		ULTIMAT	E LIMIT STATE					
18	Which parameters did you use for the ULS design of the pile foundation?	Tick all that apply	$\label{eq:stance} \begin{array}{ c c c } \square & \text{Cone resistance } q_c \ \square & \text{Sleeve friction } f_s \\ \square & \text{SPT blow count } N \ \square & \text{Corrected SPT blow count } (N_1)_{60} \\ \hline \square & \text{UU triaxial test strength } c_u \\ \square & \text{Pressuremeter limit pressure } p_{\text{lim}} \\ \square & \text{Other (specify) } \dots \end{array}$					
19	What correlations did you use to derive soil parameter values (if used) for the ULS verification? If more than one, please list others below	Free text	Description: Polish piling code PN-B-02482 Author: Title:					
19a	Any other correlations? (please give		Pages:					
20	same info as above) What assumptions did you make in choosing these correlations?	Free text	$\mathbf{q}_{b} = 9 \cdot \mathbf{C}_{u}, \ \mathbf{q}_{s} = \alpha \cdot \mathbf{C}_{u}$					
21	(If determined) What is the characteristic value of unit shaft resistance q_s at these levels?	Provide values in units of kPa	At +17 m, q _s = 0 At +7 m, q _s = 50		At –3 m, q₅ = 58			
22	(If determined) What is the characteristic value of unit base resistance q_b at these levels?	Provide values in units of kPa	At +17 m, q _b = 0 At +7 m		At +7 m,	q _b = 1350	At −3 m, q _b = 2070	
23	Which calculation model did you use to determine the pile's compressive resistance?	Tick one	 □ Annex D.6 from EN 1997-2 □ Annex D.7 from EN 1997-2 □ Annex E.3 from EN 1997-2 □ Alternative given in a national annex (specify) ☑ Alternative given in a national standard (specify) PN-B-02482 □ Finite element analysis □ Finite difference analysis □ Other (specify) 					
24	Which country's National Annex did you use to interpret EN 1997-1?	Free text	Polish					
25	Which Design Approach did you use for verification of the Ultimate Limit State (ULS)?	Tick one	 Design Approach 1 Combinations 1 and 2 Design Approach 1 Combination 1 only Design Approach 1 Combination 2 only Design Approach 2 Design Approach 2* Design Approach 3 Other (specify) 					
26 26a	What values of partial factors did you use for this ULS verification?	Provide values	1 st combination			2 nd combi	nation (if used)	
200			γ _G = 1.35	γ _Q =	1.5	γ _G = 1.0	γ _Q = 1.3	
			γ_{φ}	γс		γ_{φ}	γс	
			γ _{cu} = 1.0	γs =	1.0	γ _{cu} = 1.0	γ _s = 1.3	
			γ _b = 1.25	γt		γ _b = 1.6	γt	
27	What correlation factors (if any) did you use for this verification?	Provide values	ξ ₃ = 1.28			ξ ₄ = -		
28	What model factor (if any) did you	Provide	γ _{Rd} = 1.0					
29	use for this verification? What length does the pile need to avoid an ultimate limit state?	values Provide value in m	L _{ULS} = 13.0					
30	What is the design compressive force that the pile must be designed for according to Eurocode 2?	Provide values in kN	Design compressive force F _{cd} = 630					
		CONCLUD	ING QUESTION	S				
31	What other assumptions did you need to make to complete your design?	Free text	The $q_{\rm s}$ and $q_{\rm b}$ resistance depend not only on soil parameters, but also on pile diameter D and depth z					
32	Please specify any other data that you would have liked to have had to design this type of foundation	Free text	To determine the settlement of pile foundation it is needed the number of piles under the foundations					
33	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					
34	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					

35	How does your Eurocode 7 design compare with your previous national practice?	Tick one	 ☐ Much more conservative ☐ More conservative ☐ About the same □ Less conservative ☐ Much less conservative 			
36	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 2.3</u> THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION!					