GeoStruktur Sistem Solusindo

Your Trusted Partner for Digital Transformation



Deep Excavation using PLAXIS 2D



1.Design Criteria
2.Soil Model in Deep Excavation
3.Structural Elements
4.PLAXIS 2D Simulation
5.Results



Part 1: Design Criteria



Deep Excavation

• Definition: An excavation with depth of 3 m or more (SNI 8460 Sect. 11.1).





Types of Embedded Wall





Design Criteria (1/2) – Stability Criteria





Design Criteria (2/2) – Other Criteria





Vertical Stability

Vertical stability criteria : 1. Against sliding.



Schematic of forces contributing to vertical stability

$$SF = \frac{F_act}{F_pas} \ge 1.5$$

2. Against overturning.

$$SF = \frac{M_mob}{M_sta} \ge 2.0$$

Approaches for checking vertical stability:

- Plastic yield strength: Rankine/Coulomb method.
- Beam on elastic foundation.
- Finite element / finite difference software.

When struts and/or ground anchors are required \rightarrow Difficult to be solved with hand calculation.

 \rightarrow PLAXIS2D will be used for simulation.



Global Stability



Slip surface in global stability

Global stability criteria : 1. Static condition.

$$SF = \frac{F_mob}{F_sta} \ge 1.5$$

2. Seismic condition.

$$SF = \frac{F_mob}{F_sta} \ge 1.1$$

Approaches for checking global stability:

- Limit equilibrium analysis.
- Finite element / finite difference software.

Both vertical stability and global stability can be checked in PLAXIS2D using safety analysis (a.k.a phi-c reduction analysis in older version).

 \rightarrow PLAXIS2D does not separate vertical stability check and global stability check, safety analysis will yield only the SF for governing mechanism.



Hydraulic Heave Stability



Hydraulic Heave Stability

Heave stability criteria (SNI 8460 Sect. 10.3.6.7):

- 1. Basal heave stability \rightarrow SF \geq 1.25.
- 2. Blow-in SF \rightarrow SF \geq 1.25.
- 3. Piping SF \rightarrow SF \geq 1.5.

Basal heave failure is the heaving of soil at the bottom of excavation due to uplift pressure.

Blow-in failure is the "puncture" of aquifer due to high head pressure at the aquifer which is situated below an aquitard layer.

Piping failure materialize as an internal erosion process which depletes the fine soils or in an extreme case unfolds as sand boiling case; it is caused by high exit gradient flow.

 \rightarrow PLAXIS2D may simulate the pore water pressure using either phreatic, steady-state, or transient condition.



Plastic Limit (Structural Elements)



Embedded Wall

Criteria: The exerted moment force shall not be greater than the embedded wall moment capacity.

Struts

Criteria: The exerted axial force shall not be greater than the strut axial compressive capacity (usually governed by strut buckling capacity).

Anchors

Criteria: The axial tensile force shall not be greater than the steel bar axial tensile capacity and the grout frictional resistance.

 \rightarrow Using PLAXIS2D, internal forces in structural elements can be checked after each step of staged-construction simulations.



Deflection Limit (Embedded Wall)



Deflection Limit (Embedded Wall) Criteria: Within allowable wall lateral deflection $\delta h \rightarrow 0.5\%$ H (SNI 8460 Sect. 10.3.8.2) and between 0.5% to 1.0% H depending on the proximity of excavation with other buildings/infrastructures (SNI 8460 Table 51).

Sometimes stricter criteria should apply, especially if there are existing facilities/buildings in the vicinity of pit excavation).

 \rightarrow In PLAXIS2D, deflection of some selected points can be tracked during the staged-construction simulations.



Settlement Limit



Settlement Limit (Upstream Face) Criteria: Settlement δv shall be within allowable limit, the limiting value usually depends on the facilities/buildings in the vicinity of pit excavation.

Settlements are contributed by:

- 1. Settlement due to wall lateral movement.
- 2. Settlement due to a reduction of ground water level (e.g. seepage, dewatering).

As per SNI 8460 Sect. 10.3.8.1, in order to avoid adverse effect of settlement caused by GWL reduction; the decrease of GWL shall be no greater than 2.0 m (unless it can be proven otherwise is safe).

→ The performance of displacement prediction largely depends on the selected soil model; MC model is typically inaccurate for predicting displacement.



Summary of Design Criteria

Criteria	Criteria	Remarks for PLAXIS Simulation
Vertical Stability	Sliding: SF ≥ 1.5 Overturning: SF ≥ 2.0	Checked through safety analysis.
Global Stability	Static: SF \ge 1.5 Seismic: SF \ge 1.1	Checked through safety analysis.
Hydraulic Heave Stability	Basal Heave → SF ≥ 1.25 Blow-in SF → SF ≥ 1.25 Piping SF → SF ≥ 1.5	 Basal heave → Checked through safety analysis; certain deflection criterion may also be used. Blow-in shall be checked for confined aquifer with high hydraulic head. Piping shall be checked for seepage through loose cohesionless soil.
Plastic Limit	Load < Plastic Limit	Verified in staged-CST phases.
Deflection Limit	δh < Deflection Limit	Verified in staged-CST phases.
Settlement Limit	δv < Settlement Limit	Verified in staged-CST phases.



Part 2: Soil Model in Deep Excavation



Soil Model

- Key limitations of Mohr-Coulomb model:
 - Soil is linear-elastic before failure, without compression/shear hardening.
 - Non stress-dependent stiffness.
 - Elastic modulus is typically taken as E_{50} , which will produce lots of unrealistic heave in unloading case.
- Considering that the deflection limit will be checked; soil layers that are expected to be part of global stability failure mode; they will be modeled with Hardening Soil (HS) Model (Duncan-Chang hyperbolic model).
 - HS model provides both isotropic hardening and shear hardening, as well as stress-dependent stiffness.
 - HS model has two extra plastic parameters for simulating isotropic and shear hardening: E_{oed}^{ref} and E_{50}^{ref} .
 - Dominant failure mode in excavation case: Shear failure $\rightarrow E_{50}^{ref}$ in HS model is important !
- For simplicity, the deep underlying soil (deeper than 23.8m), they will simply be modeled with Mohr-Coulomb (MC) Model.



MC and HS: Key Differences





MC and HS: Key Differences





Boring Log (1/3)

		١٢	S			METER m [*])	STAI	NDARD	PENET	RATIC	ON TEST	very
SAMPL	DEPTH (m)	USCS	GRAPH LOG	ROCK / SOIL DESCRIPTION	DEPTH (m)	PENETROI qu (kg/c	DEPTH (m)	Blows/ Penetr.	SP Blo 10	T Gro ws/3 20 3	phic 0 cm 30 40	00 00 40 80
3.00	0.00	СН		FAT CLAY, reddish brown colored 5YR 4/4, high plasticity, high dry strength, none dilatancy, high toughness, moist trace sand with medium to coarse grained, fill material, soft. Fill Soil	1.00 1.55 2.00 3.00	0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50	1.70	4/30				-
3.70	3.70	SP		POORLY GRADED SAND, dark gray colored 5YR 4/1, fine sand grained moist, loose to medium dense.	4.15 5.00 5.40 6.00 6.45 7.00	0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 1.50 1.50	3.85 6.15	2/30 13/30				
9.00 M 10.00	8.00	СН		FAT CLAY, gray colored 5YR 5/1, medium plasticity, medium dry strength, slow dilatancy, medium tougness, moist, very soft.	8.00 8.45 9.00 10.00 11.00 11.45 12.00	1.50 < 0.25 < 0.25 < 0.25 < 0.25 < 0.25 < 0.25	8.00	1/45	• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			-
14.00	16.30	C11		FAT CLAY, gray colored 5YR 5/1, medium plasticity, medium day	13.00 13.45 14.00 15.00 15.45 16.00 16.40	< 0.25 < 0.25 < 0.25 < 0.25 < 0.25 < 0.25 < 0.25 < 0.25	13.00 15.15	1/45				-
	10.50	CH		FAT CLAY, gray colored 5YR 5/1, medium plasticity, medium dry	16.40	< 0.25						



Boring Log (2/3)

ш		۲.	Q			METER m [*])	STA	STANDARD PENETRATION TEST			
SAMPL	DEPTH (m)	USCS	GRAPH	ROCK / SOIL DESCRIPTION	DEPTH (m)	PENETROI qu (kg/c)	DEPTH (m)	Blows/ Penetr.	SPT Blov 10 2	Graphic ws/30 cm 20 30 40	ວວອ 40 80
	16.30	СН	1////	FAT CLAY, gray colored 5YR 5/1, medium plasticity, medium dry	16.40	< 0.25					
	17.00			strength, slow dilatancy, medium toughness, slighty shell fragmen,	17.00	1.25	17.15	10/30			-
	18.00	Сн		FAT CLAY, olive brown colored 2.5 4/4, high plasticity, high dry	18.00	1.25					-
		CL		SANDY CLAY, dark yellowish brown colored 10YR 4/4, medium plasticity, medium dry strength, slow dilatancy, medium toughness, moist, soft. Medium Stiff Clay	19.00 19.45 20.00	1.25 1.25 1.25	19.15	4/30			-
21.00	20.40	CII		FAT CLAY, light yellowish brown colored 2.5Y 6/3 streak with light red colored 10YR 6/6, high plasticity, high dry strength, none dilatancy, high toughness, stiff.	21.00	1.25 1.50	21.85	12/30			-
		Сн			22.15 23.00 23.45	1.50 1.50 1.25	23.15	10/30			-
	23.80			TUFFACEOUS SAND WITH SILT, vellowish brown colored 10YR 5/6, fine sand grained, moist, v Very Loose Sand	24.00 25.00	1.50	25.00	1/45			
26.00	25.45			FAT CLAY, brownish yellow colored 10YR 6/6, high plasticity, high dry	26.00	< 0.25					
26.70	27.50	СН		arengin, none dicidicy, nigri loughness, ann.	26.70 27.15	< 0.25 1.25	26.85	11/30			-
	27.50	CL		SANDY SILT, yellow of the strength, slow rap Medium Stiff Silt/Clay	28.00 28.55	1.25	28.70	9/30			-
	29.00	CH		FAT CLAY, pale yellow colored 5Y 7/4, high plasticity, high dry	29.00	1.00					
	21.00	SM		SILTY SAND, olive yellow colored 2.5Y 6/6, fine sand grained, moist, medium dense.	30.00 30.55	1.00	30.70	15/30			
	31.00	ML		SILT, strong brown colored 7.5YR 4/6, low plasticity, low dry strength, slow dilatancy, low toughness, some cemented silt, very stiff.	31.00	1.75					



Boring Log (3/3)

		ŗ	₽			METER m²)	STAI	NDARD	PENETRATION TEST	very
SAMPL	(m) DEPTH	USCS SYMBO	GRAPH LOG	ROCK / SOIL DESCRIPTION	DEPTH (m)	PENETROI qu (kg/ci	(m) DEPTH	Blows/ Penetr.	SPT Graphic Blows/30 cm 10 20 30 40	00 92 40 80
	32.55			SILT, very dark gray colored 5YR 5/1, low plasticity, low dry strength, slow dilatancy, low toughness, some cemented silt, moist, hard.	32.55 33.00	1.75 4.50	32.70	45/30		
	25.00	ML			34.00 34.55	4.50 4.50	34.70	14/30		
	35.00	СН		FAT CLAY, dark gray colored 5YR, high plasticity, high sry strength, none dilatancy, high	33.00	1.75				
	36.00			LEAN CLAY, dark gra Very Stift Sift/Clay ticity, medium dry strength, none dilatancy, high toughness,few silt, stiff to hard.	36.00 36.55 37.00	1.75 3.00 4.50	36.70	47/30		
		CL			38.00 38.55	4.50 1.25	38.70	10/30		
	39.50				39.00	1.25	50.70	10/30		
				FAT CLAY, dark gray colored 5YR 4/1, high plasticy, high dry strength, none dilatancy, high toughness, stiff to very stiff.	40.00 40.55 41.00	1.25 1.25 1.00	40.70	9/30		
					42.00 42.55 43.00	1.00 1.00 1.25	42.70	11/30		
		СН		Stiff Silt/Clay	44.00 44.55 45.00	1.25 1.25 1.25	44.70	10/30		
					46.00 46.55 47.00	1.50 1.50 2.00	46.70	16/30		
					48.00 48.55 49.00	2.00 1.75 1.75	48.70	14/30		
	50.00 50.45	SP		POORLY GRADED SAND, dark gray colored 4/1, fine sand grained, moist, very dense.	50.00 50.45	4.50 4.50	50.15	64/30	N > 5	

GS) GeoStruktur





Index Property Tests

		کٹ Der		nsity	Atterberg limits			nits	xə					
Depth in meter	Sample Type	Description	S CHART	Specific Gra	Wet	Dry	Water Conte	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index	Liquidity Ind	Void Ratio	Porosity	Degree of Saturation
			nsc	Gs	ρ _m	Ρd	Wn	LL	PL	PI	LI	е	n	Sr
-	-	-		-	t/m ³	t/m ³	%	%	%	%	-	-	%	%
3.00-3.70	UDS	Fat Clay	СН	2.64	1.76	1.23	43.1	77.9	33.1	44.9	0.22	1.14	53	100
9.00-10.00	UDS	Fat Clay	СН	2.40	1.48	0.81	82.1	97.0	38.9	58.1	0.74	1.96	66	100
14.00-15.00	UDS	Fat Clay	СН	2.38	1.41	0.71	99.6	135.0	43.1	92.0	0.62	2.38	70	100
21.00-21.70	UDS	Fat Clay	СН	2.40	1.62	1.06	52.8	102.0	37.2	64.8	0.24	1.32	57	98
26.00-26.70	UDS	Fat Clay	СН	2.44	1.52	0.90	68.5	104.5	41.6	63.0	0.43	1.70	63	98
Low SG)							
	L]				High	PI	-					



Overview of Soil Properties

Depth	Soil	SPT	Soil Model	Analysis*
0.0 - 3.7	Fill soil	4	Hardening Soil	Undrained A
3.7 – 8.0	Loose-to-medium dense sand	2-13	Hardening Soil	Drained
8.0 - 16.3	Very soft clay	1	Hardening Soil	Undrained A
16.3 – 23.8	Medium stiff clay	4-12	Hardening Soil	Undrained A
23.8 – 25.5	Very loose sand	1	Mohr-Coulomb	Drained
25.5 – 31.0	Medium stiff clay	9-15	Mohr-Coulomb	Undrained B
31.0 – 39.5	Very stiff silt/clay	10-47	Mohr-Coulomb	Undrained B
39.5 – 50.0	Stiff silt/clay	9-16	Mohr-Coulomb	Undrained B

* Only short-term condition is shown in current example.



Layer 1: Soil Data Fill Soil (0.0 – 3.7)

- Soil Model: Hardening Soil Model.
- Soil data:
 - SPT \rightarrow N-value = 4.
 - Atterberg limits $\rightarrow I_p = 45\%$.
 - Degree of saturation \rightarrow SR = 100%
 - Triaxial UU $\rightarrow c_u = 20$ kPa.
 - Consolidation test $\rightarrow OCR \approx 3$.
- Plastic parameters:
 - $E_u^{50} \approx 250 c_u = 5000$ kPa (see chart).
 - $E_{50} \approx 0.7 E_u^{50} = 3500 \text{ kPa}.$

•
$$E_{50}^{ref} = E_{50} \left(\frac{p_{ref}}{\sigma'_3}\right)^1 = 3500 \left(\frac{100}{(2)(7)+17}\right) = 11290 \text{ kPa}$$

• $E_{oed}^{ref} \approx \frac{50000}{I_p\%} = 1111 \text{ kPa}.$

- For soft clay: $E_{ur}^{ref} \approx 20 E_{oed}^{ref} = 22220$ kPa.
- Assume $\varphi' = 25^{\circ}$ (to be adjusted).





Layer 1: Soil Parameter Fill Soil (0.0 – 3.7)

Var	Unit	Value
E_{50}^{ref}	kPa	11290
E_{oed}^{ref}	kPa	6938
$E_{ur,oed}^{ref}$	kPa	23000
p_{ref}	kPa	100
v'_{ur}	-	0.2
c_{ref}'	kPa	0
arphi'	0	20
ψ	0	0
m	-	1
K_0^{NC}	-	0.6580



PLAXIS SoilTest, undrained TX, PQ-plane, p' = 31 kPa



Layer 2: Soil Data Loose-Medium Sand (3.7 – 8.0)

- Soil Model: Hardening Soil Model.
- Soil data:
 - SPT \rightarrow N-value = 2-13.
 - CPT \rightarrow Avg $q_c = 27 \text{ kg/cm}^2$.
- Plastic parameters:
 - $E_{oed} \approx 4q_c = 10800 \text{ kPa} \rightarrow [\text{Lunne and Christoffersen, 1983}].$

•
$$E_{oed}^{ref} = E_{oed} \left(\frac{p_{ref}}{\sigma'_3}\right)^{0.5} = 10800 \left(\frac{100}{17 + (2.5)(7) + (1.5)(17)}\right)^{0.5} = 13943 \text{ kPa.}$$

• $E_{50}^{ref} \approx E_{oed}^{ref}.$

- For sand: $E_{ur}^{ref} \approx 5E_{oed}^{ref} = 69714$ kPa.
- Assume: $\varphi' = 30^{\circ}$ (low relative density)



Layer 2: Soil Parameter Loose-Medium Sand (3.7 – 8.0)

Var	Unit	Value
E_{50}^{ref}	kPa	13943
E_{oed}^{ref}	kPa	13943
$E_{ur,oed}^{ref}$	kPa	69714
p_{ref}	kPa	100
v'_{ur}	-	0.2
c'_{ref}	kPa	0
arphi'	0	30
ψ	0	0
m	-	0.5
K_0^{NC}	-	0.5



PLAXIS SoilTest, drained TX, p' = 60 kPa Contraction during shearing



Layer 3: Soil Data Very Soft Clay (8.0 – 16.3)

- Soil Model: Hardening Soil Model.
- Soil data:
 - SPT N-value \rightarrow 1.
 - Multistage Triaxial CU $\rightarrow \varphi' = 22.8$.
 - Atterberg limits $\rightarrow I_p = 58\%$.
 - Vane shear $\rightarrow S_u(16m) = 88$ kPa.
- Plastic parameters:
 - $E_{u,lab}^{50} = (90/2)/0.02 = 2250$ kPa.
 - $E_{50} \approx 0.7 E_u^{50} = 1575$ kPa.

•
$$E_{50}^{ref} = E_{50} \left(\frac{p_{ref}}{\sigma'_3}\right)^1 = 1575 \left(\frac{100}{120}\right) = 1313 \text{ kPa}$$

• $E_{oed}^{ref} \approx \frac{50000}{I_p\%} = 862 \text{ kPa}.$

• For soft clay: $E_{ur}^{ref} \approx 15 E_{oed}^{ref} = 12930$ kPa.



Deviatoric-axial strain curve of multistage CU-TX using confinement stress of 30, 60 and 120 kPa



Layer 3: Soil Parameter Very Soft Clay (8.0 – 16.3)

Var	Unit	Value		
E_{50}^{ref}	kPa	1313		
E_{oed}^{ref}	kPa	862		
$E_{ur,oed}^{ref}$	kPa	12930		
p_{ref}	kPa	100		
υ'_{ur}	-	0.2		
c'_{ref}	kPa	0		
φ'	0	22.8		
ψ	0	0		
m	-	1		
K_0^{NC}	-	0.6125		



PLAXIS SoilTest (blue), undrained TX, p' = 120 kPa in deviatoric stress vs axial strain

- For axial strain less than 5%, blue curve fits quite well with red curve.
- At large strain, the deviatoric stress of blue curve is smaller than red curve → Conservative.



Layer 3: Comparison with Vane Shear





Layer 3: Soil Data Medium Stiff Clay (16.3 – 2<u>3.8)</u>

- Soil Model: Hardening Soil Model.
- Soil data:
 - SPT N-value \rightarrow 4-12.
 - Multistage Triaxial CU $\rightarrow \varphi' = 17.7$.
 - Atterberg limits $\rightarrow I_p = 51\%$.
- Plastic parameters:
 - $E_{u,lab}^{50} = (125/2)/0.025 = 2500$ kPa.
 - $E_{50} \approx 0.7 E_u^{50} = 1750$ kPa.

•
$$E_{50}^{ref} = E_{50} \left(\frac{p_{ref}}{\sigma'_3}\right)^1 = 1750 \left(\frac{100}{200}\right) = 875 \text{ kPa}.$$

• $E_{oed}^{ref} \approx \frac{50000}{I_p\%} = 980 \text{ kPa}.$

• For stiff clay: $E_{ur}^{ref} \approx 5E_{oed}^{ref} = 4900$ kPa.



Deviatoric-axial strain curve of multistage CU-TX using confinement stress of 50, 100 and 200 kPa



Layer 4: Soil Data Medium Stiff Clay (16.3 – 23.8)

Var	Unit	Value		
E_{50}^{ref}	kPa	875		
E_{oed}^{ref}	kPa	1704		
$E_{ur,oed}^{ref}$	kPa	4900		
p_{ref}	kPa	100		
υ'_{ur}	-	0.2		
c_{ref}'	kPa	0		
arphi'	0	17.7		
ψ	0	0		
m	-	1		
K_0^{NC}	-	0.6960		



PLAXIS SoilTest (blue), undrained TX, p' = 200 kPa in deviatoric stress vs axial strain



Layer 5-8: Soil Parameter (Mohr-Coulomb) Deep Underlaying Layer

Var	Unit	Layer 5	Layer 6	Layer 7	Layer 8
Soil	-	Loose Sand	Medium stiff clay	Very stiff silt/clay	Stiff silt/clay
SPT	-	1	9-15	10-47	9-16
E'	kPa	15000	18000	42000	20000
υ′	-	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
c_{ref}'	kPa	1	72	168	78
arphi'	0	25	0	0	0
ψ	0	0	0	0	0



Part 3: Structural Elements: Plate, Anchor, EBR



Structural Elements in PLAXIS

Structural Element	Common Application in Deep Excavation Simulation	Features
Plate	Embedded wall	Axial and flexural rigidity
Node-to-Node Anchor	Unbonded length of anchor	Axial rigidity
Fixed-End Anchor	Strut	Axial rigidity
Embedded Beam Row	Bonded length of anchor	Axial and flexural rigidity with user-defined skin and toe resistance



Schematic of deep excavations



Structure: Embedded Wall (Plate)



Young Modulus (Concrete) $E = 4700\sqrt{f_c'} = 25743$ MPa. Area of secant pile $A = 0.703648 \text{ m}^2/\text{m}$

Inertia of secant pile $I = 0.047578 \text{ m}^4/\text{m}$

Model: Plate Element Material: Elastoplastic

Plate Properties:

- $EA = 22.642.10^6 \text{ kN/m}$
- $EI = 1.531.10^6 \text{ kN-m}^2/\text{m}$
- v = 0.15
- w = 21 kN/m/m
- $M_p = 750 \text{ kN-m/m}$



Ground Anchor: Pullout Capacity

- Ground anchor pullout capacity (SNI 8460 Sect. 10.6.4.4) is calculated as follows :
 - Cohesive soil: $P_u = \alpha A_s L_s S_u$
 - Non-cohesive soil: $P_u = \sigma'_v A_s L_s K_s$
- Where:
 - P_u = Pull-out resistance.
 - A_s = Unit shaft area of anchor fixed length.
 - L_s = Anchor effective length.
 - α = Adhesion factor.
 - S_u = Avg und. shear strength along fixed length.
 - σ'_{v} = Eff. ver. stress at the midpoint of fixed length.
 - K_s = Anchorage coefficient.





Structure: Anchor UL (Node-to-Node Anchor)

- Prestressing bar properties:
 - Diameter 36 mm.
 - ASTM A722 Grade 150.
- Prestressing bar capacity:
 - Ultimate Capacity $\rightarrow F_u = f_{pu}A_s = (1035MPa)(1018mm^2) = 1053 \text{ kN}.$
 - Prestressed to 80% of capacity \rightarrow 80% x 1053 kN = 843 kN.
 - Allowable capacity, SF = 1.4 (Table 49 SNI 8460) \rightarrow 843 kN / 1.4 = 602 kN.

Model: Node-to-Node Anchors. Material: Elastoplastic

Input for PLAXIS2D:

- $EA = 214.10^3 \text{ kN}$
- *Spacing* = 1.5 m
- $F_{max,tens} = 602 \text{ kN}$



Structure: Anchor BL (EBR)

- Anchor properties:
 - Anchor diameter = 150 mm.
 - Undrained shear strength = 180 kPa.
 - Adhesion factor = 0.4.
- Anchor pullout capacity:
 - Ultimate capacity (cohesive soil) $\rightarrow P_u = \alpha A_s L_s S_u = 34$ kN/m.
 - Allowable capacity SF = 2.0 (Table 49 SNI 8460) $\rightarrow P_a = 17$ kN/m.



Model: Embedded beam rows. Input for PLAXIS2D:

• Material: Elastic

•
$$E = 2.1.10^8 \text{ kN/m}^2$$

- Dia = 36 mm
- $\gamma = 50 \text{ kN/m}^3$

•
$$T_{skin} = \frac{127}{6} = 17 \text{ kN/m}$$

•
$$F_{max} = 0 \text{ kN}$$



Ground Anchor: Other Requirements

- Minimum free length shall be 3 m for tendon bar and 4.5 m for strand (SNI 8460 Sect. 10.6.4.3).
- Minimum fixed length shall be 3 m with a maximum fixed length of 13 m; a length > 13 m can be used if it can be proven through pullout test (SNI 8460 Sect. 10.6.4.3).
- Ground anchor fixed length shall be installed at least 5 m from ground elevation (SNI 8460 Sect. 10.6.4.2a).
- Anchor fixed-length shall be embedded in a competent soil layer: (1) Sand with SPT N-value ≥ 25; (2) Clay with SPT N-value ≥ 20 elevation (SNI 8460 Sect. 10.6.3.1).
- Horizontal spacing shall be at least 1.5 m for anchor with diameter ≤ 0.2 m (SNI 8460 Sect. 10.6.4.2c).



Structure: Slab/Strut (Fixed-End Anchor)

- Slab properties:
 - Concrete strength = 30 MPa.
 - Slab thickness = 200 mm.

Model: Fixed-end anchor. Input for PLAXIS2D:

- Material: Elastic
- $EA = 5.15.10^6 \text{ kN/m}^2$



Other Design Requirements

- Additional load (1 ton/m²) of 10 m width shall be given in the upstream face of embedded wall (SNI 8460 Sect. 10.3.5.4.1 and 10.3.6.4).
- Over-excavation shall be considered \rightarrow 10% H_{unbraced} \leq 0.5 m (SNI 8460 Sect. 10.3.5.3.2(a-b)).
- In principle, analysis has to be performed using soil parameters that will produce the most critical condition. If it is not known, either undrained condition or drained condition, is the most critical condition; analysis has to be performed for both conditions (SNI 8460 Sect. 10.3.6.5).



Part 4: PLAXIS 2D Simulation Short-Term Condition



Stress Path: Drained vs Undrained



45

Set Borehole Data

🛃 Modify soil layers								
Borehole_1 x 0,000 Set Set Set								
Head -2,000 Soil layers Water Initial conditions Preconsolidation Field data								
			Layers	Bore	ole_1			
		#	Material	Тор	Bottom			
0,000		1	1 Fill Clay HS	0,000	-3,700			
_ =		2	2 Loose Sand HS	-3,700	-8,000			
_		3	3 VSoft Clay HS	-8,000	-16,30			
	-	4	4 MStiff Clay HS	-16,30	-23,80			
_		5	5 LSand MC	-23,80	-25,50			
-20,00		6	6 MStiff Clay MC	-25,50	-31,00			
		7	7 Stiff Clay MC	-31,00	-39,50			
_		8	8 VStiff Clay MC	-39,50	-50,00			
-30,00								
_								
-50,00		Во	ttom cut-off 0,000	m				
Site response ▲ Boreholes ▲ Materials OK								



Set Material Data

OK

Material sets	Soil - Hardening soil - 1 Fill Clay	HS			-	_		
Show global								
Project materials	General Parameters Groundwater Interfaces Initial							
Set type Soil and interfaces -	Property	Unit	Value					
	Material set							
Group order	Identification		1 Fill Clay HS					
0 Gravel Subbase	Material model		Hardening soil 🔹					
1 Fill Clay HS	Drainage type		Undrained (A)					
2 Loose Sand HS	Colour		RGB 182, 226, 190					
3 VSoft Clay HS	Comments							
4 MStiff Clay HS								
5 LSand MC	General properties							
6 MStiff Clay MC	Y unsat	kN/m³	17,00					
7 Stiff Clay MC	Y _{sat}	kN/m³	17,00					
8 VStiff Clay MC								
	Void ratio							
	Dilatancy cut-off		0.5000					
	⊂ init		0,000					
	⊂ min		999.0					
New Edit I SoiTest	∽ max		55570					
<u>C</u> opy <u>D</u> elete						Next	OK	Cancel
						INEXL	OK	Cancer



Assign Soil Data





Create Structural Element





Generate Mesh





Initial Flow Condition





Initial Cond: Gravity Loading





Phase 1: Embedded Wall + CST Load





Phase 2: Excavation (1)





Phase 2: Excavation (1) – Flow Condition





Phase 3: Ground Anchor (1)





Final Phase





Part 5: Results Short-Term Condition



Results: Heave Displacement





Results: Settlement at Upstream Face





Point Tracking: Lat. Displacement





Embedded Wall: Lateral Displacement





Embedded Wall: Shear Force





Embedded Wall: Moment Force





Safety Analysis

	MAXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	ΛΛΛΛΛΛΛ				
Reached values						
	Reached total time	12,00 day				
	CSP - Relative stiffness	6,494E-9				
	ForceX - Reached total force X	0,000 kN				
	ForceY - Reached total force Y	0,000 kN				
	Pmax - Reached max pp	408,7 kN/m²				
	ΣM _{stage} - Reached phase propo	0,000				
	ΣM weight - Reached weight pro	1,000				
XXXXXXXXXXXX	ΣM _{sf} - Reached safety factor	1,434				
x						



Results: Deformed Mesh





GeoStruktur Sistem Solusindo

Your Trusted Partner for Digital Transformation



Thank you for your attention!

