


Calculation of Piled Rafts by the program *ELPLA*

Baugrund-Bauwerk-Pfahl-Interaktionen 44.03/1. Sauf



Calculation of Deep Foundations

Preface

Today, nearly every engineering office has its own computer programs for the analysis and design of piled rafts. Furthermore, most of the available programs under Windows are user-friendly and give very excellent output graphics with colors. Consequently, theoretically a secretary not an engineer can use them. But the problem here is, how can man control the data and check the results.

The purpose of this book is to present methods, equations, procedures and techniques used in the formulation of the computer analysis of piled rafts. These items are coded in the program *ELPLA*.

This book contains many practical problems which are analyzed in details by using the program *ELPLA*. It is important for the engineer to be familiar with these information when carrying out computer analysis of piled rafts. An understanding of these concepts will be of great benefit in carrying out the computer analysis, resolving difficulties and judging the acceptability of the results. Three familiar types of subsoil models (standard models) for piled raft analyses are considered. The models are Simple Assumption Model, *Winkler's* Model and Continuum Model. In the analysis, rafts are treated as elastic or rigid. In this book the Finite Element-Method was used to analyze the raft. In which plate bending elements represent the raft according to the two-dimensional nature of foundation. The development of the finite element equations for plate elements is well documented in standard textbooks such as *Schwarz* (1984) and *Zienkiewicz/ Cheung* (1970). Therefore, it is not duplicated in this book.

Chapter 1

Models for analyzing piled raft

Content	Page
1 Models for analyzing piled raft.....	4
1.1 Introduction.....	4
1.2 Description of the numerical calculation methods.....	5
1.2.1 Linear contact pressure - Simple assumption model (method 1).....	7
1.2.2 Modulus of subgrade reaction-Winkler's model (methods 2 and 3).....	9
1.2.3 Modulus of compressibility method - Continuum model (methods 4 to 9).....	12
1.3 Numerical Example:	14
1.3.1 Test example: Verifying forces in piles of a pile group.....	14
1.4 References.....	19

Chapter 1

1 Models for analyzing piled raft

1.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the most common practical models used in the analysis of foundations. Piled raft is a raft on piles that transmits its loads to the soil. It must include often considerable moments and forces. In times, when there no computers were available, simplified methods were used considering as low as possible computation effort to receive the results with acceptable accuracy. The computers whose programming and memory possibilities are developed increasingly caused a revolution of the calculation practice. Now the programming and extensive computation effort can expand considerably to achieve the results as perfect as possible to the reality. These methods are considered particularly for the analysis of mostly deformation-sensitive large structures.

The subsoil models for analysis of pile foundation (standard models) can be divided into three main groups:

- A. Simple assumption model,
- B. *Winkler's* model,
- C. Continuum model.

Simple assumption model does not consider the interaction between the foundation and the soil. The model assumes a linear distribution of contact pressures beneath the foundation. *Winkler's* model is the oldest and simplest one that considers the interaction between the foundation and the soil. The model represents the soil or piles as elastic springs. Continuum model is the complicated one. The model considers also the interaction between all foundation elements and soil. It represents the soil as a layered continuum medium or isotropic elastic half-space soil medium.

Although Continuum model provides a better physical representation of the supporting soil, it has remained unfamiliar, because of its mathematical difficulties where an application of this model requires extensive calculations. Practical application for this model is only possible if a computer program or appropriate tables or charts are available. These tables and charts are limited to certain problems.

For this purpose, a general computerized mathematical solution based on Finite elements-method was developed to represent an analysis for pile foundations on the real subsoil model. The solution can analyze foundations of any shape considering holes within the foundation and the interaction of external foundations. This mathematical solution is coded in the program *ELPLA*. The developed computer program *ELPLA* also can analyze different types of subsoil models, especially the three-dimensional Continuum model that considers any number of irregular layers.

In this book, the three standard soil models are described through 9 different numerical calculation methods. The methods graduated from the simplest one to the more complicated one covering the analysis of most common pile foundation problems that may be found in the practice.

1.2 Description of the numerical calculation methods

According to the three standard soil models (simple assumption model - *Winkler's* model - Continuum model), nine numerical calculation methods are considered to analyze the raft as shown in Figure 1-1 und Table 1-1.

Table 1-1 Numerical calculation methods

Method No.	Method
1	Linear contact pressure (Simple assumption model)
2	Constant modulus of subgrade reaction (<i>Winkler's</i> model)
3	Variable modulus of subgrade reaction (<i>Winkler's</i> model)
4	Modification of modulus of subgrade reaction by iteration (<i>Winkler's</i> model/ Continuum model)
5	Modulus of compressibility method for elastic raft on half-space soil medium (Isotropic elastic half-space soil medium - Continuum model)
6	Modulus of compressibility method for elastic raft on layered soil medium (Solving system of linear equations by iteration) (Layered soil medium - Continuum model)
7	Modulus of compressibility method for elastic raft on layered soil medium (Solving system of linear equations by elimination) (Layered soil medium - Continuum model)
8	Modulus of compressibility method for rigid piled raft on layered soil medium (Layered soil medium - Continuum model)
9	Modulus of compressibility method for rigid free-standing piled raft on layered soil medium (Layered soil medium - Continuum model) (elastische Schichten - Kontinuummodell)




Figure 1-1 Numerical calculation methods of rafts (methods 1 to 9) in program *ELPLA*

Today, The Finite elements-method is the most powerful procedure available in many complex problems. It can be applied to nearly all engineering problems, especially in structure analysis problems. In this book, the Finite elements-method is used to analyze the raft for all numerical calculation methods except Modulus of compressibility method for rigid piled raft on layered soil medium (method (8)), which does not obey the elasticity rules. In the Finite elements-analysis, the raft is represented by rectangular plate bending elements according to the two dimensional nature of foundation. Each node of plate or grid elements has three degrees of freedom, vertical displacement w and two rotations θ_x and θ_y about x - and y -axis, respectively. The development of the finite element equations is well documented in standard textbooks. Therefore, it is not duplicated in this book. The reader can see as an example that of *Zienkiewicz/ Cheung* (1970) or *Schwarz* (1984) for further information on the development of finite element equations.

To formulate the equations of the numerical calculation methods both the raft and the contact area of the supporting medium are divided into rectangular or triangular elements. Compatibility between the raft, piles and the soil medium in vertical direction is considered for all methods except Linear contact pressure method (method 1). The fundamental formulation of equilibrium equation for the raft can be described in general form through the following Eq. (1.1):

$$[k_p]\{\delta\} = \{F\} \quad (1.1)$$

where the vector of forces $\{F\}$ contains the action and reaction forces acting on the raft. In principle for all calculation methods, the action forces are known and equal to the applied forces on the raft, while the reaction forces (contact forces) are required to be found according to each soil model.

According to subsoil models (Simple assumption model - *Winkler's model* - Continuum model), 9 numerical calculation methods are considered to find the contact pressures, and hence to analyze the raft. The next pages describe the interaction between the raft and subsoil medium in these methods.

1.2.1 Linear contact pressure - Simple assumption model (method 1)

This method is the simplest one for determination of the pile forces. The assumption of this method is that there is no compatibility between the pile foundation deflection and the soil settlement. In the method, it is assumed that pile forces are distributed linearly on the bottom of the raft (statically determined) as shown in Figure 1-1. In which the resultant of soil reactions coincides with the resultant of applied loads.




Figure 1-2 Pile force distribution for Simple assumption model

In the general case of a foundation with an arbitrary unsymmetrical shape and loading with M_x and M_y , based on *Navier's* solution the pile force P_i at any point i from the geometry centroid on the bottom of the foundation is given by:

$$P_i = \frac{N}{n} + \frac{M_y I_x - M_x I_{xy}}{I_x I_y - I_{xy}^2} x_i + \frac{M_x I_y - M_y I_{xy}}{I_x I_y - I_{xy}^2} y_i \quad (1.2)$$

where $I_x = \sum_1^n y_i^2$, $I_y = \sum_1^n x_i^2$ und $I_{xy} = \sum_1^n x_i y_i$

and:

- P_i Force in pile i , [kN].
- N Sum of all vertical applied loads on the pile cap, [kN].
- x_i Coordinate of pile i from the centroidal axis x , [m].
- y_i Coordinate of pile i from the centroidal axis y , [m].
- M_x Moment due to N about the x -axis, $M_x = N e_y$, [kN.m].
- M_y Moment due to N about the y -axis, $M_y = N e_x$, [kN.m].
- e_x Eccentricity measured from the centroidal axis x , [m].
- e_y Eccentricity measured from the centroidal axis y , [m].
- n Number of piles under the pile cap, [-].

For a foundation of rectangular shape, there are two axes of symmetry and $I_{xy} = 0$. Therefore, the pile force P_i of Eq. (1.2) reduces to:

$$P_i = \frac{N}{n} + \frac{M_y}{I_y} x_i + \frac{M_x}{I_x} y_i \quad (1.3)$$

For strip pile foundation, the pile forces can be obtained from:

$$P_i = \frac{N}{n} + \frac{M_y}{I_y} x_i \quad (1.4)$$

while for a foundation without moments or without eccentricity about both axes the pile force P_i will be uniform under the foundation and is given by:

$$P_i = \frac{N}{n} \quad (1.5)$$

1.2.1.1 System of equations of Linear contact pressure method

The foundation can be analyzed by working out the soil reactions at the different nodal points of the Finite elements-mesh. This is done by obtaining the pile force P_i from Eq. (1.2).

Considering the entire foundation, the foundation will deflect under the action of the total external forces $\{F\}$ due to known applied loads $\{P\}$ and the known soil reactions $\{Q\}$, where:

$$\{F\} = \{P\} - \{Q\} \quad (1.6)$$

The equilibrium of the system is expressed by the following matrix equation:

$$[k_p] \{\delta\} = \{P\} - \{Q\} \quad (1.7)$$

where:

- $\{Q\}$ Vector of pile forces.
- $\{P\}$ Load vector from applied forces and moments on the foundation.
- $\{\delta\}$ Deformation vector.
- $[k_p]$ Plate stiffness matrix.

1.2.1.2 Equation solver of Linear contact pressure method

As the plate stiffness matrix $[k_p]$ in Equation (1.7) is a diagonal matrix, the system of linear equations (1.7) is solved by Banded coefficients-technique. The unknown variables are the nodal displacements w_i and the nodal rotations θ_{xi} and θ_{yi} about the x- and y-directions.

1.2.2 Modulus of subgrade reaction-Winkler's model (methods 2 and 3)

The oldest method for the analysis of foundation on elastic medium is the modulus of subgrade reaction, which was proposed by *Winkler* (1867). The assumption of this method is that the soil model or piles are represented by elastic springs as shown in Figure 1-3 according to *Poulos* (1994).

The settlement s_i of the soil medium or the pile at any point i on the surface is directly proportional to the contact force or pile reaction Q_i .




Figure 1-3 Simplified representation of pile for *Winkler's model* after *Poulos* (1994)

1.2.2.1 System of equations of Modulus of subgrade reaction

For a node i on the Finite elements-mesh, the contact force or the pile reaction Q_i is given by:

$$Q_i = k_i s_i \quad (1.8)$$

where:

Q_i Contact force or the pile reaction on a node i , [kN].

k_i Soil stiffness or pile stiffness at node i , [kN/m].

Considering the entire foundation, Eq. (1.8) can be rewritten in matrix form as:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} Q_1 \\ Q_2 \\ Q_3 \\ \dots \\ \dots \\ Q_n \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & k_2 & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_3 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \dots & k_n \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} s_1 \\ s_2 \\ s_3 \\ \dots \\ \dots \\ s_n \end{Bmatrix} \quad (1.9)$$

Eq. (1.9) is rewritten in a simple form as:

$$\{Q\} = [k_s]\{s\} \quad (1.10)$$

where:

$\{Q\}$ Vector of contact forces and pile reactions

$\{s\}$ Settlement vector.

$[k_s]$ Stiffness matrix of the soil and piles.

The foundation will deflect under the action of the total external forces $\{F\}$ due to known applied loads $\{P\}$ and the unknown soil reactions $\{Q\}$, where:

$$\{F\} = \{P\} - \{Q\} \quad (1.11)$$

The equilibrium of the raft-pile-soil system is expressed by the following matrix equation:

$$[k_p]\{\delta\} = \{P\} - \{Q\} \quad (1.12)$$

Eq. (1.10) for *Winkler's* model can be substituted into Eq. (1.12) as:

$$[k_p]\{\delta\} = \{P\} - [k_s]\{s\} \quad (1.13)$$

Considering the compatibility of deformation between the plate and the soil medium, where the soil settlement s_i equal to the plate deflection w_i , Eq. (1.13) becomes:

$$[[k_p] + [k_s]]\{\delta\} = \{P\} \quad (1.14)$$

Equation (1.14) shows that the stiffness matrix of the whole raft-pile-soil system is the sum of the plate and the soil stiffness matrices, $[k_p] + [k_s]$.

1.2.2.2 Equation solver of Modulus of subgrade reaction

It should be noticed that the soil stiffness matrix $[k_s]$ is a purely diagonal matrix for *Winkler's* model (methods 2 and 3). Therefore, the total stiffness matrix for the plate and the soil is a banded matrix. Then, the system of linear equations (1.14) is solved by Banded coefficients-technique. Since the

total stiffness matrix is a banded matrix, the equation solver (1.14) takes short computation time by applying these methods (2) and (3).

The unknown variables in Eq. (1.14) are the nodal displacements w_i ($w_i = s_i$) and the nodal rotations θ_{xi} and θ_{yi} about x - and y -directions. After solving the system of linear equation (1.14), substituting the obtained settlements s_i in Eq. (1.10), gives the unknown contact forces and pile reactions Q_i .

1.2.3 Modulus of compressibility method - Continuum model (methods 4 to 9)

Continuum model was first proposed by *Ohde* (1942), which based on the settlement will occur not only under the loaded area but also outside. Otherwise, the settlement at any nodal point is affected by the forces at all the other nodal points. Figure 1-4 shows Continuum model applied for pile foundation according to *Liang/ Chen* (2004).

Continuum model assumes continuum behavior of the soil, where the soil is represented as isotropic elastic half-space medium or layered medium. Consequently, this model overcomes the assumption of *Winkler's* model, which does not take into account the interaction between the different points of the soil medium. Representation of soil as a continuum medium is more accurate as it realized the interaction among the different points of the continuum medium. However, it needs mathematical analysis that is more complex.




Figure 1-4 Continuum model after *Liang/ Chen* (2004)

1.2.3.1 Methods for analyzing piled raft for Continuum model

The behavior of the pile-soil system can be examined by considering linearly or nonlinearly analysis according to the following three different methods

- Linear analysis of piled raft, termed LPR

- Nonlinear analysis of **piled raft** using **hyperbolic** function, termed NPRH.
- Nonlinear analysis of **piled raft** using **DIN 4014**, termed NPRD.

The next chapters describe methods for analyzing piled raft for Continuum model.

1.3 Numerical Example:

The numerical modeling described in this chapter was implemented in the program *ELPLA*. To verify and evaluate the numerical modeling, a comparison was carried out in which results from *ELPLA* were compared with those from existing methods of analysis.

1.3.1 Test example: Verifying forces in piles of a pile group

1.3.1.1 Description of the problem

To verify the mathematical model of *ELPLA* for determining pile forces of pile groups under a pile cap, results of a pile group obtained by *Bakhoun* (1992) (Example 5.19, page 592) are compared with those obtained by *ELPLA*.

A pile cap on 24 vertical piles is considered as shown in Figure 1-5. It is required to determine the force in each pile of the group due to a vertical load of $N = 8000$ [kN] acting on the pile cap with eccentricities $e_x = 1.4$ [m] and $e_y = 1.8$ [m] in both x - and y -directions.




Figure 1-5 Pile cap dimensions and pile arrangements

1.3.1.2 Hand calculation of pile forces

According to *Bakhoun* (1992), the force in each pile in the pile group can be obtained by hand calculation as follows:

Step 1: Compute moments:

$$M_x = 8000 * 1.8 = 14400 [\text{kN.m}] \quad (1.15)$$

$$M_y = 8000 * 1.4 = 11200 [\text{kN.m}]$$

Step 2: Compute properties I_x , I_y and I_{xy} :

Determining properties of I_x , I_y and I_{xy} are listed in Table 1-2.

Table 1-2 Properties I_x , I_y and I_{xy}

Pile number	x_i [m]	y_i [m]	x_i^2 [m ²]	y_i^2 [m ²]	$x_i y_i$ [m ²]
1	-3.8	-3.4	14.44	11.56	12.92
2	-2.2	-3.4	4.84	11.56	7.48
3	-0.6	-3.4	0.36	11.56	2.04
4	1.0	-3.4	1.00	11.56	-3.40
5	2.6	-3.4	6.76	11.56	-8.84
6	-3.8	-1.8	14.44	3.24	6.84
7	-2.2	-1.8	4.84	3.24	3.96
8	-0.6	-1.8	0.36	3.24	1.08
9	1.0	-1.8	1.00	3.24	-1.08
10	2.6	-1.8	6.76	3.24	-4.68
11	-3.8	-0.2	14.44	0.04	0.76
12	-2.2	-0.2	4.84	0.04	0.44
13	-0.6	-0.2	0.36	0.04	0.12
14	1.0	-0.2	1.00	0.04	-0.20
15	2.6	-0.2	6.76	0.04	-0.52
16	-0.6	1.4	0.36	1.96	-0.84
17	1.0	1.4	1.00	1.96	1.40
18	2.6	1.4	6.76	1.96	3.64
19	-0.6	3.0	0.36	9.00	-1.80
20	1.0	3.0	1.00	9.00	3.00
21	2.6	3.0	6.76	9.00	7.80
22	-0.6	4.6	0.36	21.16	-2.76
23	1.0	4.6	1.00	21.16	4.60
24	2.6	4.6	6.76	21.16	11.96
			$I_y = 106.56$	$I_x = 170.56$	$I_{xy} = 43.2$

Step 3: Compute pile force:

The force P_i in any pile i at location (x_i, y_i) from the geometry centroid is obtained from:

$$P_i = \frac{N}{n} + \frac{M_y I_x - M_x I_{xy}}{I_x I_y - I_{xy}^2} x_i + \frac{M_x I_y - M_y I_{xy}}{I_x I_y - I_{xy}^2} y_i$$

$$P_i = \frac{8000}{24} + \frac{(11200)(170.56) - (14400)(43.2)}{(170.56)(106.56) - (43.2)^2} x_i + \frac{(14400)(106.56) - (11200)(43.2)}{(170.56)(106.56) - (43.2)^2} y_i \quad (1.16)$$

$$P_i = 333.333 + 78.988 x_i + 64.421 y_i$$

3 Pile forces by *ELPLA*

The available method “Linear Contact pressure (1)” in *ELPLA* is used to determine the force in each pile in the pile group. A net of equal square elements is chosen. Each element has a side of 1.6 [m]. The pile forces obtained by *ELPLA* are compared with those obtained by *Bakhoun* (1992) in Table 1-3. It is obviously from this table that pile forces obtained by *ELPLA* are equal to those obtained by hand calculation.

Table 1-3 Comparison of pile forces obtained by *ELPLA* and those of *Bakhoun* (1992)

Pile number	<i>Bakhoun</i> (1992)						<i>ELPLA</i> P_i [kN]
	x_i [m]	y_i [m]	N/n [kN]	$78.988 x_i$ [kN]	$64.421 y_i$ [kN]	P_i [kN]	
1	-3.8	-3.4	333.33	-300.16	-219.03	-185.86	-185.85
2	-2.2	-3.4	333.33	-173.77	-219.03	-59.47	-59.47
3	-0.6	-3.4	333.33	-47.39	-219.03	66.91	66.91
4	1.0	-3.4	333.33	78.99	-219.03	193.29	193.29
5	2.6	-3.4	333.33	205.37	-219.03	319.67	319.67
6	-3.8	-1.8	333.33	-300.16	-115.96	-82.79	-82.78
7	-2.2	-1.8	333.33	-173.77	-115.96	43.50	43.60
8	-0.6	-1.8	333.33	-47.39	-115.96	169.98	169.98
9	1.0	-1.8	333.33	78.99	-115.96	296.36	296.36
10	2.6	-1.8	333.33	205.37	-115.96	422.74	422.72
11	-3.8	-0.2	333.33	-300.16	-12.88	20.29	20.29
12	-2.2	-0.2	333.33	-173.77	-12.88	146.68	146.67
13	-0.6	-0.2	333.33	-47.39	-12.88	273.06	273.06
14	1.0	-0.2	333.33	78.99	-12.88	399.44	399.44
15	2.6	-0.2	333.33	205.37	-12.88	525.82	525.82
16	-0.6	1.4	333.33	-47.39	90.19	376.13	376.13
17	1.0	1.4	333.33	78.99	90.19	502.51	502.51
18	2.6	1.4	333.33	205.37	90.19	628.89	628.89
19	-0.6	3.0	333.33	-47.39	193.26	479.20	479.20
20	1.0	3.0	333.33	78.99	193.26	605.58	605.59
21	2.6	3.0	333.33	205.37	193.26	731.96	731.97
22	-0.6	4.6	333.33	-47.39	296.34	582.28	582.28
23	1.0	4.6	333.33	78.99	296.34	708.66	708.66
24	2.6	4.6	333.33	205.37	296.34	835.04	835.04

1.4 References

- [1] *Bakhoun, M.* (1992): Structural Mechanics.
Cairo, Egypt.
- [2] *Liang, F./ Chen, L.* (2004): A modified variational approach for the analysis of piled raft foundation.
Mechanics Research Communications 31, 593-604
- [3] *Ohde, J.* (1942): Die Berechnung der Sohldruckverteilung unter Gründungskörpern.
Der Bauingenieur, Heft 14/16, S. 99 bis 107 - Heft 17/18 S. 122 bis 127.
- [4] *Schwarz, H.* (1984): Methode der finiten Elemente.
Teubner-Verlag, Stuttgart.
- [5] *Poulos, H.* (1994): An Approximation numerical analysis of pile-raft interaction.
Int. J. Numer. Anal. Meth. Geomech., 18, 73-92
- [6] *Zienkiewicz, O./ Cheung, Y.* (1970): The Finite Element Method in Structural and Continuum Mechanics.
McGraw-Hill, England.
- [7] *Winkler, E.* (1867): Die Lehre von der Elastizität und Festigkeit.
Dominicus, Prag.

Chapter 2

Numerical modeling single pile, pile groups and piled raft

Table of Contents

	Page
2 Numerical modeling single pile, pile groups and piled raft.....	4
2.1 Introduction	4
2.2 Modeling single pile	6
2.2.1 Soil flexibility for single pile	6
2.2.2 Determining flexibility coefficients	8
2.2.3 Elastic analysis of single pile	13
2.2.4 Rigid analysis of single pile	15
2.3 Modeling pile groups (freestanding rigid raft)	17
2.3.1 Soil stiffness for pile groups.....	17
2.3.2 Analysis of pile groups.....	20
2.4 Modeling piled raft.....	25
2.4.1 Soil stiffness for piled raft.....	25
2.4.2 Analysis of piled flexible raft.....	28
2.4.3 Analysis of piled rigid raft	29
2.4.4 Analysis of piled elastic raft.....	30
2.5 Nonlinear analysis	31
2.5.1 Nonlinear rigid analysis of single pile.....	31
2.5.2 Nonlinear analysis of pile groups, elastic piled raft and rigid piled raft	33
2.5.3 Iterative Procedure	33
2.6 Numerical Examples	36
2.6.1 Test Example: Evaluation of settlement influence factor I_l for a single pile.....	36
2.6.2 Case study: Piled raft of <i>Torhaus</i>	39
2.7 References	49

Chapter 2

2 Numerical modeling single pile, pile groups and piled raft

2.1 Introduction

Analyzing piled raft is a complex task because it is a three-dimensional problem including many capabilities. The main capabilities that must be considered in the analysis are: the interaction between all piled raft and soil elements; taking into account the actual loading and geometry of the piled raft; representing the soil by a real model and treating the problem as nonlinear analysis. Considering all these capabilities requires great experience and effort. Besides, such a problem requires long computational time where huge size soil matrix is required for a large piled raft due to discretized nodes along piles and under the raft. For these reasons many authors suggested simplified methods in recent years to reduce the size of analysis.

Clancy & Randolph (1993) and (1994) developed the hybrid layer method to reduce the computing effort. *Ta & Small* (1997) approximated the surface displacement of the soil by a polynomial instead of generating flexibility factors, but the raft have to be square and of equal size. *Russo* (1998) presented an approximate numerical method for the analysis of piled raft where piles were modeled as interactive linear or non-linear springs. He used the interaction factor method and a preliminary BEM to model pile to pile interaction. *Poulos* (1999) described an approximate analysis for the response of a pile group. The analysis uses a simplified form of boundary element analysis to obtain single pile responses and interaction factors, and employs various simplifying assumptions to facilitate the computational process. *Lee & Xiao* (2001) presented a simplified analytical method for nonlinear analysis of the behavior of pile groups using a hyperbolic approach to describe the nonlinear relation between the shaft stress and displacement. They developed the method for pile groups under both rigid and flexible pile cap based on the load-transfer function. *Kitiyodom & Matsumoto* (2002) and (2003) developed a simplified method of numerical analysis of piled raft using a hybrid mode. Raft is modeled as thin plate, the piles as elastic beams and the soil as springs. *Mendonça & Paiva* (2003) presented BEM/ FEM formulation for the analysis of piled raft in which each pile is represented by a single element with three nodal points and the shear force along the shaft is approximated by a quadratic function. The soil is considered as half-space medium. *Jeong et al.* (2003) proposed a simple algorithm to analyze laterally loaded three-dimensional pile groups using beam column method. *Liang & Chen* (2004) presented a modified variational approach for analyzing piled raft by a simplified analytical solution to evaluate the pile-soil interaction. They applied the approach on piled rigid and flexible rafts resting on homogeneous soil. *Wong & Poulos* (2005) developed approximations for the settlement interaction factors between dissimilar piles via an extensive parametric study. *Lutz et al.* (2006) presented a simple method to estimate the load settlement behavior of piled raft based on the theory of elasticity and solutions for calculation of ultimate limit state. Most of the simplified analyses carried out by the methods mentioned previously approximated the soil model. However, several methods are available for analyzing this complex problem by a full three-dimensional analysis but they are time consuming even for fast computers of today.

In standard methods of analyzing piled raft based on elasticity theory, the entire soil stiffness matrix of the piled raft is assembled due to all elements of piles and raft. Then, settlements of piled raft elements are obtained directly by solving the global equations. Based on elasticity theory *El Gendy* (2007) presented more efficient analysis of single pile, pile group and piled raft by using composed coefficient technique to reduce the size of entire soil stiffness matrix. In the technique, the pile is treated as a rigid member having a uniform settlement on its nodes. This assumption enables to assemble pile coefficients in composed coefficients. It can be easily modeling the nonlinear response of single pile, pile groups or piled raft. The composed coefficient technique makes the size of the soil stiffness matrix of the piled raft equivalent to that of the raft alone without piles. The proposed analysis reduces considerably the number of equations that need to be solved. Raft can be analyzed as flexible, rigid or elastic on continuum soil medium. The advantage of the analysis is that there is no approximation when generating the flexibility coefficients of the soil. In the analysis a full interaction among piled raft elements is taken into account by generating the entire flexibility matrix of the piled raft. Using the composed coefficient technique enables to apply the nonlinear response of the pile by a hyperbolic relation between the load and settlement of the pile. *El Gendy* (2007) introduced also a direct hyperbolic function for nonlinear analysis of a single pile. Besides, an iteration method is developed to solve the system of nonlinear equations of pile groups or piled raft. This chapter presents numerical modeling single pile, pile groups and piled raft according to *El Gendy* (2007).

2.2 Modeling single pile

To carry out the analysis, a composed coefficient or modulus ks [kN/m] representing the linear soil stiffness of the pile is determined. The modulus ks is a parameter used in both linear and nonlinear analysis of the pile. It is defined as the ratio between the applied force on the pile head Ph [kN] and the pile settlement wo [m]. The modulus ks is not a soil constant, it depends on pile load, pile geometry and stratification of the soil. It is analogous to the modulus of subgrade reaction of the raft on *Winkler's* soil medium (*Winkler* (1867)), which is the ratio between the average contact pressure and the settlement under the characteristic point on the raft. This section describes a method to obtain the modulus ks from the rigid analysis of the pile.

2.2.1 Soil flexibility for single pile

In the analysis, the pile is divided into a number of shaft elements with m nodes, each acted upon by a uniform shear stress qs_j [kN/m²] and a circular base having a uniform stress qb [kN/m²] as shown in Figure 2-1a. To carry out the analysis, pile shaft elements are represented by line elements as indicated in Figure 2-1b. All stresses acting on shaft elements are replaced by a series of concentrated forces acting on line nodes. The shear force on node j may be expressed as:

$$Qs_j = 2\pi r_o \frac{l_{j-1} + l_j}{2} qs_j \quad (2.1)$$

while the force on the pile base may be expressed as:

$$Qb = \pi r_o^2 qb \quad (2.2)$$

where:

$j-1$ and j	Node number of element j .
Qs_j	Shear force on node j , [kN].
Qb	Force on the base, [kN].
r_o	Radius of the pile, [m].
l_j	Length of the element j , [m].

To consider the interaction between the pile and soil, the soil is represented as layered medium or isotropic elastic half-space medium. Considering a typical node i as shown in Figure 2-1b, the settlement s_i of the soil adjacent to the node i due to shear forces Qs_j on all m nodes and due to the base force Qb is expressed as:

$$s_i = \sum_{j=1}^m f_{i,j} Qs_j + f_{i,b} Qb \quad (2.3)$$

where:

$f_{i,j}$	Flexibility coefficient of node i due to a unit shear force on a node shaft j , [m/kN].
$f_{i,b}$	Flexibility coefficient of node i due to a unit force on the base b , [m/kN].




Figure 2-1 Pile geometry and elements

As a special case of Eq. (2.3) and by changing the index i to b , the settlement of the base s_b may be expressed as:

$$s_b = \sum_{j=1}^m f_{b,j} Qs_j + f_{b,b} Qb \quad (2.4)$$

where:

- $f_{b,j}$ Flexibility coefficient of the base b due to a unit shear force on a node shaft j , [m/kN].
 $f_{b,b}$ Flexibility coefficient of the base b due to a unit force on the base b , [m/kN].

Equations (2.3) and (2.4) for the settlement of the soil adjacent to all nodes of the pile may be rewritten in general form as:

$$w_i = \sum_{j=1}^n I_{i,j} Q_j \quad (2.5)$$

where:

- Q_j Contact force on node j , [kN]. Q_j represents the shear forces Qs_j on the shaft nodes or a base force Qb .
 w_i Settlement on node i , [m]. w_i represents the settlement s_j on a shaft node j or

- settlement s_b on the base.
- n Total number of contact nodes, $n = m+1$.
- $I_{i,j}$ Flexibility coefficient of node i due to a unit force on node j , [m/kN]. $I_{i,j}$ represents the coefficient $f_{i,j}$, $f_{i,b}$, $f_{b,j}$ or $f_{b,b}$. These coefficients can be evaluated from elastic theory using *Mindlin's* solution. Closed form equations for these coefficients are described in the next paragraph.

2.2.2 Determining flexibility coefficients

In 1936 *Raymond Mindlin* presented a mathematical solution for determining stresses and displacements in soil due to a point load acting beneath the surface of semi-infinite mass. The solution is often employed in the numerical analysis of piled foundations and may have other applications in geotechnical Engineering such as study the interaction between foundations and ground anchors or buried structures.

The pioneer authors of piled raft such as *Poulos & Davis* (1968) and *Butterfield & Banerjee* (1971) integrated numerically coefficients of flexibility using *Mindlin's* solution (*Mindlin* (1936)). Analysis of piled raft using integrated numerical coefficients leads to significant computations, especially in large pile group problems. An analytical derivation of coefficients of flexibility using *Mindlin's* solution is presented.

2.2.2.1 Flexibility coefficient $f_{i,b}$ of a node i due to a unit force on the base b

To avoid the significant computations when applying *Mindlin's* solution to determine the flexibility coefficients for nodes located outside the base, circular load at the base is replaced by an equivalent point load. In this case the flexibility coefficient can be obtained directly from *Mindlin's* solution for determining the displacement w_{ij} [m] at point i due to a point load Q_j [kN] acting at point j beneath the surface of a semi-infinite mass (Figure 2-2). According to *Mindlin's* solution the displacement w_{ij} can be expressed as:

$$w_{ij} = f_{ij} Q_j \quad (2.6)$$

where f_{ij} is given by *Mindlin's* solution as:

$$f_{ij} = \frac{1}{16 \pi G_s (1 - \nu_s)} \left(\frac{3 - 4 \nu_s}{R_1} + \frac{8 (1 - \nu_s)^2 - (3 - 4 \nu_s)}{R_2} + \frac{(z - c)^2}{R_1^3} + \frac{(3 - 4 \nu_s) (z + c)^2 - 2cz}{R_2^3} + \frac{6 c z (z + c)^2}{R_2^5} \right) \quad (2.7)$$

where:

- $R_1 = \sqrt{r^2 + (z - c)^2}$, $R_2 = \sqrt{r^2 + (z + c)^2}$ and
- c Depth of the point load Q_j [kN] from the surface, [m].
- z Depth of the studied point i from the surface, [m].
- r Radial distance between points i and j , [m].
- $z-c$ Vertical distance between points i and j , [m].

- $z+c$ Vertical distance between points i and k , [m].
 f_{ij} Displacement factor of point i due to a unit load at point j , [m/kN].
 G_s Shear modulus of the soil, [kN/m²].

$$G_s = \frac{E_s}{2(1+\nu_s)}$$
 E_s Modulus of elasticity of the soil, [kN/m²].
 ν_s Poisson's ratio of the soil, [-].




Figure 2-2 Geometry of *Mindlin's* problem

Now, the flexibility coefficient $f_{i,b}$ [m/kN] of node i due to a unit force $Q_b = 1$ [kN] acting on the base b is equal to the displacement factor f_{ij} . In Eq (2.7), r is the radial distance between the pile of points i and the pile of the base b . For the pile of the studied base b , r is equal to the radius of the base r_o .

2.2.2.2 Flexibility coefficient $f_{b,b}$ of the base b due to a unit force on the base itself

The base b of the pile has a circular loaded area of radius r_o [m] and a uniform load $q = Q_b / \pi r_o^2$ [kN/m²] as shown in Figure 2-3. The flexibility coefficient $f_{b,b}$ [m/kN] at the base center b due to a unit load $Q_b = 1$ [kN] at the base itself can be obtained from:

$$f_{b,b} = \frac{1}{\pi r_o^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{r_o} f_{ij} r dr d\theta \quad (2.8)$$

The integration of the flexibility coefficient can be obtained analytically as:

$$f_{b,b} = \frac{1}{8\pi r_o^2 G_s (1-\nu_s)} \left((3-4\nu_s) r_o + \left[8(1-\nu_s)^2 - (3-4\nu_s) \right] \left[\sqrt{r_o^2 + 4c^2} - 2c \right] \right. \\ \left. + \left[4c^2(3-4\nu_s) - 2c^2 \right] \left[\frac{1}{2c} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_o^2 + 4c^2}} \right] + \left[1 - \frac{8c^4}{(r_o^2 + 4c^2)^{3/2}} \right] \right) \quad (2.9)$$

The flexibility coefficient $f_{b,b}$ may be multiplied by a factor $\pi/4$ to take the effect of base rigidity. This factor is the ratio of the surface displacement of a rigid circle on the surface of a half-space to the center displacement of a corresponding uniformly loaded circle.




Figure 2-3 Geometry of circular loaded area for finding displacement at center

2.2.2.3 Flexibility coefficient $f_{i,j}$ of node i due to a unit shear force on a node shaft j

To avoid the significant computations when applying *Mindlin's* solution to determine the flexibility coefficients due to shaft stress, the shaft stress is replaced by an equivalent line load. The shaft element j of the pile has a length l [m] and a line load $T = Q_j / l$ [kN/m] as

shown in Figure 2-4. The flexibility coefficient $f_{i,j}$ [m/kN] at the point i due to a unit load $Q_j = 1$ [kN] at a shaft element j can be obtained from:

$$f_{i,j} = \frac{1}{l} \int_{l_1}^{l_2} f_{ij} dc \quad (2.10)$$

The integration yields to:

$$f_{i,j} = \frac{1}{16 \pi l G_s (1 - \nu_s)} (I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5) \quad (2.11)$$

where terms I_1 to I_5 are given by:

$$I_1 = (3 - 4 \nu_s) \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z - l_2)^2} - (z - l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z - l_1)^2} - (z - l_1)} \right] \quad (2.12)$$

$$I_2 = [8(1 - \nu_s)^2 - (3 - 4 \nu_s)] \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z + l_2)^2} + (z + l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z + l_1)^2} + (z + l_1)} \right] \quad (2.13)$$

$$I_3 = \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z - l_2)^2} - (z - l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z - l_1)^2} - (z - l_1)} \right] + \frac{z - l_2}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z - l_2)^2}} - \frac{z - l_1}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z - l_1)^2}} \quad (2.14)$$

$$I_4 = (3 - 4 \nu_s) \left(\ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z + l_2)^2} + (z + l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z + l_1)^2} + (z + l_1)} \right] - \frac{(z + l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z + l_2)^2}} + \frac{(z + l_1)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z + l_1)^2}} \right) - 2z \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z + l_1)^2}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z + l_2)^2}} + \frac{z(z + l_1)}{r_1^2 \sqrt{r_1^2 + (z + l_1)^2}} - \frac{z(z + l_2)}{r_1^2 \sqrt{r_1^2 + (z + l_2)^2}} \right) \quad (2.15)$$

$$I_5 = \frac{6z}{3r_1^2} \left[\frac{r_1^4 - z(z + l_2)^3}{[r_1^2 + (z + l_2)^2]^{3/2}} \right] - \frac{6z}{3r_1^2} \left[\frac{r_1^4 + z(z + l_1)^3}{[r_1^2 + (z + l_1)^2]^{3/2}} \right] - \frac{6z}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z + l_2)^2}} + \frac{6z}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z + l_1)^2}} \quad (2.16)$$

where:

- l_1 Start depth of the line load T or the shear stress τ from the surface, [m].
- l_2 End depth of the line load T or the shear stress τ from the surface, [m].
- l Length of the line load T or the shear stress τ , [m].



The base b of the pile has a radius r_o [m], while the shaft element j has a length l [m] and a shear stress $\tau = Q_j / 2 \pi r_o l$ [kN/m²] as shown in Figure 2-5. The flexibility coefficient $f_{b,j}$ [m/kN] at the base center b due to a unit load $Q_j = 1$ [kN] at a shaft element j can be obtained from:

The integration yields to:

Replacing r_1 by r_o in Eqns (2.12) to (2.16) gives terms J_1 to J_5 .




Figure 2-5 Geometry of cylindrical surface stress for finding the displacement at center

2.2.2.5 Multi-layered soil

Flexibility coefficients described previously can be applied only for isotropic elastic half-space soil medium. For finite layer, flexibility coefficients may be obtained as described by *Poulos & Davis* (1968). As an example, for a point k in a layer of depth h , the flexibility coefficient is then:

$$f_{k,j}(h) = f_{k,j}(\infty) - f_{h,j}(\infty) \quad (2.19)$$

where:

$f_{k,j}(h)$ Flexibility coefficient for a point k in a layer of depth h due to a unit load on point j , [m/kN].

$f_{k,j}(\infty)$ Flexibility coefficient for a point k due to a unit load on point j , in a semi-infinite mass, [m/kN].

$f_{h,j}(\infty)$ Flexibility coefficient for a point within the semi-infinite mass directly beneath k , at a depth h below the surface due to a unit load on point j , [m/kN].

2.2.3 Elastic analysis of single pile

2.2.3.1 Soil settlement

Equation (2.5) for settlements of the soil adjacent to all nodes of the pile may be written in a matrix form as:

$$\{w\} = [Is]\{Q\} \quad (2.20)$$

where:

$\{w\}$ n settlement vector.
 $\{Q\}$ n contact force vector.
 $[Is]$ $n*n$ soil flexibility matrix.

Inverting the soil flexibility matrix in Eq. (2.20), leads to:

$$\{Q\} = [ks]\{w\} \quad (2.21)$$

where $[ks]$ is $n*n$ soil stiffness matrix, $[ks] = [Is]^{-1}$.

Equation (2.21) may be modified as:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} 0 \\ Qs_1 \\ Qs_2 \\ Qs_3 \\ \dots \\ Qb \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & k_{1,1} & k_{1,2} & k_{1,3} & \dots & k_{1,n} \\ 0 & k_{2,1} & k_{2,2} & k_{2,3} & \dots & k_{2,n} \\ 0 & k_{3,1} & k_{3,2} & k_{3,3} & \dots & k_{3,n} \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & k_{n,1} & k_{n,2} & k_{n,3} & \dots & k_{n,n} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} 0 \\ s_1 \\ s_2 \\ s_3 \\ \dots \\ sb \end{Bmatrix} \quad (2.22)$$

Equation (2.22) is rewritten in a compacted matrix form as:

$$\{Qs\} = [ke]\{s\} \quad (2.23)$$

where:

$\{s\}$ $n+1$ settlement vector, $\{s\} = \{0, s_1, s_2, s_3, \dots, s_n, sb\}^T$.
 $\{Qs\}$ $n+1$ vector of contact forces on the pile, $\{Qs\} = \{0, Qs_1, Qs_2, Qs_3, \dots, Qs_n, Qb\}^T$.
 $[ke]$ $n+1 * n+1$ soil stiffness matrix.

2.2.3.2 Pile displacement

The finite element method is used for analyzing the pile. Only the axial compression of the pile is considered in determining displacements of pile elements. The beam stiffness matrix of the pile element i can be expressed as:

$$[kp]_i = \frac{Ep \cdot Ap_i}{l_i} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.24)$$

where:

Ep Modulus of Elasticity of the pile material, $[kN/m^2]$.
 Ap_i Cross-section area of the pile element i , $[m^2]$.
 l_i Length of the pile element i , $[m]$.

According to the principal of the finite element method, the assembled axial stiffness matrix equation for the pile can be written as:

$$[kp]\{\delta\} = \{P\} - \{Qs\} \quad (2.25)$$

where:

- $\{\delta\}$ $n+1$ Displacement vector.
- $\{P\}$ $n+1$ vector of applied load on the pile, $\{P\} = \{Ph, 0, 0, 0, \dots, 0\}^T$.
- $[kp]$ $n+1 \times n+1$ beam stiffness matrix.

Substituting Eq. (2.23) in Eq (2.25), leads to:

$$[kp]\{\delta\} = \{P\} - [ke]\{s\} \quad (2.26)$$

Assuming full compatibility between pile displacement δ_i and soil settlement s_i , the following equation can be obtained:

$$[[kp] + [ke]]\{\delta\} = \{P\} \quad (2.27)$$

Solving the above system of linear equations, gives the displacement at each node, which equal to the soil settlement at that node. Substituting soil settlements from Eq. (2.27) in Eq. (2.23), gives contact forces on the pile.

2.2.4 Rigid analysis of single pile

For a rigid pile, the settlement will be uniform. Therefore, the unknowns of the problem are n contact forces Q_j and the rigid body translation w_o . The derivation of the uniform settlement for the rigid pile can be carried out by equating the settlement w_i in Eq. (2.5) by a uniform translation w_o at all nodes on the pile. Expanding Eq. (2.5) for all nodes yields to:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} w_1 &= w_o = I_{1,1}Q_1 + I_{1,2}Q_2 + I_{1,3}Q_3 + \dots + I_{1,n}Q_n \\ w_2 &= w_o = I_{2,1}Q_1 + I_{2,2}Q_2 + I_{2,3}Q_3 + \dots + I_{2,n}Q_n \\ w_3 &= w_o = I_{3,1}Q_1 + I_{3,2}Q_2 + I_{3,3}Q_3 + \dots + I_{3,n}Q_n \\ &\dots \\ w_n &= w_o = I_{n,1}Q_1 + I_{n,2}Q_2 + I_{n,3}Q_3 + \dots + I_{n,n}Q_n \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.28)$$

Contact forces can be written as a function in terms $k_{i,j}$ of the soil stiffness matrix $[ks]$ as:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} Q_1 &= k_{1,1}wo + k_{1,2}wo + k_{1,3}wo + \dots + k_{1,n}wo \\ Q_2 &= k_{2,1}wo + k_{2,2}wo + k_{2,3}wo + \dots + k_{2,n}wo \\ Q_3 &= k_{3,1}wo + k_{3,2}wo + k_{3,3}wo + \dots + k_{3,n}wo \\ &\dots \\ Q_n &= k_{n,1}wo + k_{n,2}wo + k_{n,3}wo + \dots + k_{n,n}wo \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.29)$$

Carrying out the summation of all contact forces leads to:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n Q_i = wo \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n k_{i,j} \quad (2.30)$$

Equation (2.30) may be rewritten as:

$$Ph = ks wo \quad (2.31)$$

where the applied force Ph [kN] is the sum of all contact forces Q_i :

$$Ph = \sum_{i=1}^n Q_i \quad (2.32)$$

while the composed coefficient ks [kN/m] is the sum of all coefficients of the soil stiffness matrix $[ks]$:

$$ks = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n k_{i,j} \quad (2.33)$$

Equation (2.31) gives the linear relation between the applied load on the pile head and the uniform settlement wo , which is analogous to *Hook's* law. Therefore, the composed coefficient ks may be used to determine the total soil stiffness adjacent to the pile. In case of analysis of a single pile, it is easy to determine the contact forces Q_i . Substituting the value of wo from Eq. (2.31) in Eq. (2.29) gives Eq. (2.34) in n unknown contact forces Q_i as:

$$Q_i = \frac{Ph \sum_{j=1}^n k_{i,j}}{ks} \quad (2.34)$$

Equation (2.34) of contact forces on the rigid pile is found to be independent on the Modulus of elasticity of the soil E_s in case of isotropic elastic half-space soil medium.

2.3 Modeling pile groups (freestanding rigid raft)

The composed coefficient technique is first used to perform a linear analysis of pile groups. Then it is extended to include the nonlinearity effect. The next paragraphs present the formulation of composed coefficients for pile groups to generate a soil stiffness matrix of composed coefficients.

2.3.1 Soil stiffness for pile groups

Deriving equations for freestanding raft on piles requires taking into account the interaction effect among the pile groups. For doing that, the simple freestanding raft on pile groups shown in Figure 2-6 as an example is considered, which having $n_p = 4$ piles and total nodes of $n = 23$.

The relation between pile settlement and contact force on pile groups shown in Figure 2-6 can be expressed in matrix form as:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} Q_1 \\ \vdots \\ Q_6 \end{Bmatrix}_1 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} Q_7 \\ \vdots \\ Q_{12} \end{Bmatrix}_2 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} Q_{13} \\ \vdots \\ Q_{17} \end{Bmatrix}_3 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} Q_{18} \\ \vdots \\ Q_{23} \end{Bmatrix}_4 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{1,1} & \cdots & I_{1,6} & I_{1,7} & \cdots & I_{1,12} & I_{1,13} & \cdots & I_{1,17} & I_{1,18} & \cdots & I_{1,23} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ I_{6,1} & \cdots & I_{6,6} & I_{6,7} & \cdots & I_{6,12} & I_{6,13} & \cdots & I_{6,17} & I_{6,18} & \cdots & I_{6,23} \\ I_{7,1} & \cdots & I_{7,6} & I_{7,7} & \cdots & I_{7,12} & I_{7,13} & \cdots & I_{7,17} & I_{7,18} & \cdots & I_{7,23} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ I_{12,1} & \cdots & I_{12,6} & I_{12,7} & \cdots & I_{12,12} & I_{12,13} & \cdots & I_{12,17} & I_{12,18} & \cdots & I_{12,23} \\ I_{13,1} & \cdots & I_{13,6} & I_{13,7} & \cdots & I_{13,12} & I_{13,13} & \cdots & I_{13,17} & I_{13,18} & \cdots & I_{13,23} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ I_{17,1} & \cdots & I_{17,6} & I_{17,7} & \cdots & I_{17,12} & I_{17,13} & \cdots & I_{17,17} & I_{17,18} & \cdots & I_{17,23} \\ I_{18,1} & \cdots & I_{18,6} & I_{18,7} & \cdots & I_{18,12} & I_{18,13} & \cdots & I_{18,17} & I_{18,18} & \cdots & I_{18,23} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ I_{23,1} & \cdots & I_{23,6} & I_{23,7} & \cdots & I_{23,12} & I_{23,13} & \cdots & I_{23,17} & I_{23,18} & \cdots & I_{23,23} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} w_1 \\ \vdots \\ w_6 \end{Bmatrix}_1 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} w_7 \\ \vdots \\ w_{12} \end{Bmatrix}_2 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} w_{13} \\ \vdots \\ w_{17} \end{Bmatrix}_3 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} w_{18} \\ \vdots \\ w_{23} \end{Bmatrix}_4 \end{Bmatrix} \quad (2.35)$$

Inverting the total flexibility matrix in Eq. (2.35), gives the total soil stiffness matrix of the system of the pile groups as:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} w_1 \\ \dots \\ w_6 \end{Bmatrix}_1 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} w_7 \\ \dots \\ w_{12} \end{Bmatrix}_2 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} w_{13} \\ \dots \\ w_{17} \end{Bmatrix}_3 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} w_{18} \\ \dots \\ w_{23} \end{Bmatrix}_4 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k_{1,1} & \dots & k_{1,6} & k_{1,7} & \dots & k_{1,12} & k_{1,13} & \dots & k_{1,17} & k_{1,18} & \dots & k_{1,23} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ k_{6,1} & \dots & k_{6,6} & k_{6,7} & \dots & k_{6,12} & k_{6,13} & \dots & k_{6,17} & k_{6,18} & \dots & k_{6,23} \\ k_{7,1} & \dots & k_{7,6} & k_{7,7} & \dots & k_{7,12} & k_{7,13} & \dots & I_{7,17} & k_{7,18} & \dots & k_{7,23} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ k_{12,1} & \dots & k_{12,6} & k_{12,7} & \dots & k_{12,12} & k_{12,13} & \dots & k_{12,17} & k_{12,18} & \dots & k_{12,23} \\ k_{13,1} & \dots & k_{13,6} & k_{13,7} & \dots & k_{13,12} & k_{13,13} & \dots & k_{13,17} & k_{13,18} & \dots & k_{13,23} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ k_{17,1} & \dots & k_{17,6} & k_{17,7} & \dots & k_{17,12} & k_{17,13} & \dots & k_{17,17} & k_{17,18} & \dots & k_{17,23} \\ k_{18,1} & \dots & k_{18,6} & k_{18,7} & \dots & k_{18,12} & k_{18,13} & \dots & k_{18,17} & k_{18,18} & \dots & k_{18,23} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ k_{23,1} & \dots & k_{23,6} & k_{23,7} & \dots & k_{23,12} & k_{23,13} & \dots & k_{23,17} & k_{23,18} & \dots & k_{23,23} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} Q_1 \\ \dots \\ Q_6 \end{Bmatrix}_1 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} Q_7 \\ \dots \\ Q_{12} \end{Bmatrix}_2 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} Q_{13} \\ \dots \\ Q_{17} \end{Bmatrix}_3 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} Q_{18} \\ \dots \\ Q_{23} \end{Bmatrix}_4 \end{Bmatrix} \quad (2.36)$$

where $k_{i,j}$ is stiffness coefficient of the soil stiffness matrix, [kN/ m].

Due to the high rigidity of the pile in its length direction, the settlement in every pile itself is considered as a uniform. This assumption can establish the relationship between the uniform pile settlement and the force on the pile head in the pile groups. It can be done by equating all settlements in each pile by a uniform settlement.

Carrying out the summation of rows and columns corresponding to the pile i in Eq. (2.36) leads to:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^6 Q_i \end{Bmatrix}_1 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} \sum_{i=7}^{12} Q_i \end{Bmatrix}_2 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} \sum_{i=13}^{17} Q_i \end{Bmatrix}_3 \\ \begin{Bmatrix} \sum_{i=18}^{23} Q_i \end{Bmatrix}_4 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^6 \sum_{j=1}^6 k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=1}^6 \sum_{j=7}^{12} k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=1}^6 \sum_{j=13}^{17} k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=1}^6 \sum_{j=18}^{23} k_{i,j} \\ \sum_{i=7}^{12} \sum_{j=1}^6 k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=7}^{12} \sum_{j=7}^{12} k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=7}^{12} \sum_{j=13}^{17} k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=7}^{12} \sum_{j=18}^{23} k_{i,j} \\ \sum_{i=13}^{17} \sum_{j=1}^6 k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=13}^{17} \sum_{j=7}^{12} k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=13}^{17} \sum_{j=13}^{17} k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=13}^{17} \sum_{j=18}^{23} k_{i,j} \\ \sum_{i=18}^{23} \sum_{j=1}^6 k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=18}^{23} \sum_{j=7}^{12} k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=18}^{23} \sum_{j=13}^{17} k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=18}^{23} \sum_{j=18}^{23} k_{i,j} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \{wo_1\}_1 \\ \{wo_2\}_2 \\ \{wo_3\}_3 \\ \{wo_4\}_4 \end{Bmatrix} \quad (2.37)$$




Figure 2-6 Modeling freestanding raft on pile groups

Accordingly, Eq. (2.37) can be rewritten for the simple pile groups in Figure 2-6 in composed coefficients as:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} Ph_1 \\ Ph_2 \\ Ph_3 \\ Ph_4 \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} K_{1,1} & K_{1,2} & K_{1,3} & K_{1,4} \\ K_{2,1} & K_{2,2} & K_{2,3} & K_{2,4} \\ K_{3,1} & K_{3,2} & K_{3,3} & K_{3,4} \\ K_{4,1} & K_{4,2} & K_{4,3} & K_{4,4} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} wo_1 \\ wo_2 \\ wo_3 \\ wo_4 \end{Bmatrix} \quad (2.38)$$

where:

wo_i Settlement in pile i , [m].

$K_{i,j}$ Composed coefficient, [kN/m]. In general $K_{i,j} = \sum_{n=n1}^{n2} \sum_{m=m1}^{m2} k_{n,m}$

Ph_i Force on the head of pile i , which is equal to the summation of all contact forces in that pile, [kN]. In general $Ph_i = \sum_{n=n1}^{n2} Q_n$

$n1 = 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} nn(l)$, $n2 = i + \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} nn(l)$, $m1 = 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} nn(l)$ and $m2 = j + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} nn(l)$

$nn(l)$ Number of nodes in pile l .

2.3.2 Analysis of pile groups

In general case of a completely rigid raft, the linear settlement of the raft at any point is defined by the vertical displacement w_c of the center and by two rotations θ_x and θ_y about x - and y -axes, respectively. The settlement of the pile i , having coordinates x_i and y_i referred to the center, must be compatible with the raft settlement at that point. Determining values of displacement w_c and rotations θ_x and θ_y , allows to find the unknown pile head forces and settlements.

2.3.2.1 Case of uniform settlement ($e_x = 0$ and $e_y = 0$)

For a free-standing raft with a centric load, the settlement will be uniform. Therefore, unknowns of the problem are reduced to n_p pile head forces Ph_i and the rigid body translation w_c on all piles. The derivation of the uniform settlement for the rigid free-standing raft can be carried out by equating the settlement wo_i by a uniform translation w_c at all piles in the pile groups. Expanding Eq. (2.38) for all piles, yields to:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} Ph_1 &= K_{1,1}w_c + K_{1,2}w_c + K_{1,3}w_c + \dots + K_{1,n_p}w_c \\ Ph_2 &= K_{2,1}w_c + K_{2,2}w_c + K_{2,3}w_c + \dots + K_{2,n_p}w_c \\ Ph_3 &= K_{3,1}w_c + K_{3,2}w_c + K_{3,3}w_c + \dots + K_{3,n_p}w_c \\ &\dots \\ Ph_{n_p} &= K_{n_p,1}w_c + K_{n_p,2}w_c + K_{n_p,3}w_c + \dots + K_{n_p,n_p}w_c \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.39)$$

Carrying out the summation of all forces on pile heads, leads to:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} Ph_i = wc \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j} \quad (2.40)$$

Equation (2.40) may be rewritten in a simple form as:

$$N = K_s wc \quad (2.41)$$

where the resultant force N is the sum of all forces Ph_i on pile heads:

$$N = \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} Ph_i \quad (2.42)$$

while the modulus K_s is the sum of all terms $K_{i,j}$:

$$K_s = \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j} \quad (2.43)$$

Equation (2.41) gives the linear relation between the applied resultant force N on the pile groups and the uniform settlement wc , which is analogous to *Hook's law*. The modulus K_s is the total soil stiffness of the pile groups.

Substituting the value of wc in Eq. (2.39), gives Eq. (2.44) in n_p unknown pile head forces Ph_i .

$$Ph_i = wc \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j} \quad (2.44)$$

Equation (2.44) represents the linear relation between the force on the pile head and its settlement in the pile groups, it can be rewritten in a simplified form as:

$$Ph_i = ks_i wc \quad (2.45)$$

where ks_i is the Modulus of soil stiffness adjacent to the pile i in the pile groups, [kN/m]. It is given by:

$$ks_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j} \quad (2.46)$$

2.3.2.2 Case of single eccentric load ($e_x \neq 0$)

Due to the raft rigidity, the following linear relation expresses the settlement w_{oi} at a pile i that has a distance x_i from the geometry centroid in the case of single eccentric load in x -axis:

$$wo_i = wc + x_i \tan \theta_y \quad (2.47)$$

where θ_y [Rad] is the rotation angle of the raft about y-axis.

Similarly to the procedures of derivation wo , the expansion of forces on pile heads in Eq. (2.39) becomes:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} Ph_1 &= K_{1,1} wo_1 + K_{1,2} wo_2 + K_{1,3} wo_3 + \dots + K_{1,n_p} wo_{n_p} \\ Ph_2 &= K_{2,1} wo_1 + K_{2,2} wo_2 + K_{2,3} wo_3 + \dots + K_{2,n_p} wo_{n_p} \\ Ph_3 &= K_{3,1} wo_1 + K_{3,2} wo_2 + K_{3,3} wo_3 + \dots + K_{3,n_p} wo_{n_p} \\ &\dots \\ Ph_{n_p} &= K_{n_p,1} wo_1 + K_{n_p,2} wo_2 + K_{n_p,3} wo_3 + \dots + K_{n_p,n_p} wo_{n_p} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.48)$$

Multiplying both sides of a row i in Eq. (2.48) by x_i , gives the following system of linear equations:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} Ph_1 x_1 &= x_1 K_{1,1} wo_1 + x_1 K_{1,2} wo_2 + x_1 K_{1,3} wo_3 + \dots + x_1 K_{1,n_p} wo_{n_p} \\ Ph_2 x_2 &= x_2 K_{2,1} wo_1 + x_2 K_{2,2} wo_2 + x_2 K_{2,3} wo_3 + \dots + x_2 K_{2,n_p} wo_{n_p} \\ Ph_3 x_3 &= x_3 K_{3,1} wo_1 + x_3 K_{3,2} wo_2 + x_3 K_{3,3} wo_3 + \dots + x_3 K_{3,n_p} wo_{n_p} \\ &\dots \\ Ph_{n_p} x_{n_p} &= x_{n_p} K_{n_p,1} wo_1 + x_{n_p} K_{n_p,2} wo_2 + x_{n_p} K_{n_p,3} wo_3 + \dots + x_{n_p} K_{n_p,n_p} wo_{n_p} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.49)$$

To eliminate the contact forces from Eq. (2.49), carrying out the summation of all $Ph_i x_i$ as follows:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} Ph_i x_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} x_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j} wo_j \quad (2.50)$$

Substituting Eq. (2.47) in Eq. (2.50), gives:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} Ph_i x_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} x_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j} (wc + x_j \tan \theta_y) \quad (2.51)$$

But the moment due to resultant N about the y-axis must be equal to the sum of moments due to forces on pile heads Ph_i about that axis:

$$N e_x = Ph_1 x_1 + Ph_2 x_2 + Ph_3 x_3 + \dots + Ph_{n_p} x_{n_p} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} Ph_i x_i \quad (2.52)$$

Substituting Eq. (2.51) in Eq. (2.52), eliminates the forces on pile heads from Eq. (2.52) and gives the rigid rotation θ_y about y-axis from:

$$\tan \theta_y = \frac{N e_x - wc \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} x_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} x_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j} x_j} \quad (2.53)$$

Substituting the value of $\tan \theta_y$ in Eq. (2.47), gives the n_p unknown settlements wo_i . Then, substituting the value of wo_i in Eq. (2.48), gives the n_p unknown forces on pile heads Ph_i :

$$Ph_i = wc \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j} + \tan \theta_y \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} x_i K_{i,j} \quad (2.54)$$

The stiffness ks_i of the soil adjacent to the pile i in the pile groups is given by:

$$ks_i = \frac{Ph_i}{wc + x_i \tan \theta_y} \quad (2.55)$$

2.3.2.3 Case of single eccentric load ($e_y \neq 0$)

The settlement wo_i at pile i that has a distance y_i from the geometry centroid in the case of single eccentric load in y-axis is given by:

$$wo_i = wc + y_i \tan \theta_x \quad (2.56)$$

The derivation of the free-standing rigid raft in the case of an eccentric load in y-axis can be carried out in a similar manner to the above procedures, which leads to the following Eq. (2.57) in the rotation θ_x about x-axis:

$$\tan \theta_x = \frac{N e_y - wc \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} y_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n_p} y_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j} y_j} \quad (2.57)$$

while the force on the pile head is given by:

$$Ph_i = wc \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j} + \tan \theta_x \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} y_i K_{i,j} \quad (2.58)$$

and the soil stiffness ks_i adjacent to the pile i in the pile groups is given by:

$$ks_i = \frac{Ph_i}{wc + y_i \tan \theta_x} \quad (2.59)$$

General case of double eccentric load ($e_x \neq 0$ and $e_y \neq 0$)

The settlement wo_i in the general case of an eccentric load at any pile i that has coordinates x_i and y_i from the geometry centroid is given by:

$$wo_i = wc + x_i \tan \theta_y + y_i \tan \theta_x \quad (2.60)$$

while the force on the pile head is given by:

$$Ph_i = wc \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} K_{i,j} + \tan \theta_y \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} x_i K_{i,j} + \tan \theta_x \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} y_i K_{i,j} \quad (2.61)$$

and the soil stiffness ks_i adjacent to the pile i in the pile groups is given by:

$$ks_i = \frac{Ph_i}{wc + x_i \tan \theta_y + y_i \tan \theta_x} \quad (2.62)$$

Once settlements wo_i on piles are determined, the contact forces along the pile shaft and on the pile base can be obtained from Eq. (2.35).

2.4 Modeling piled raft

2.4.1 Soil stiffness for piled raft

For a complete analysis of piled raft foundation, pile-soil-raft and raft-soil-raft interactions must be taken into account in addition to pile-soil-pile interaction. To illustrate how to formulate the composed coefficient technique for piled raft, the simple piled raft shown in Figure 2-7 is considered, which having $n_p = 4$ piles and a total $n_{pr} = 33$ contact nodes of raft and piles with the soil. If the raft is analyzed alone without piles, the number of its nodes will be $n_r = 14$. In the analysis, the contact area is divided for the raft into triangular and/or rectangular elements, while that for pile shafts into cylindrical elements and that for pile bases into circular elements. The contact pressure under the raft, on pile shafts or on pile bases is represented by a series of contact forces on nodes. For the set of 33 nodes of the piled raft, the relation between soil settlements and contact forces is expressed as:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ \left\{ \begin{matrix} w_3 \\ \dots \\ w_8 \end{matrix} \right\}_{p1} \\ w_9 \\ w_{10} \\ \left\{ \begin{matrix} w_{11} \\ \dots \\ w_{16} \end{matrix} \right\}_{p2} \\ \dots \\ w_{33} \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{1,1} & I_{1,2} & I_{1,3} & \dots & I_{1,8} & I_{1,9} & I_{1,10} & I_{1,11} & \dots & I_{1,16} & \dots & I_{1,33} \\ I_{2,1} & I_{2,2} & I_{2,3} & \dots & I_{2,8} & I_{2,9} & I_{2,10} & I_{2,11} & \dots & I_{2,16} & \dots & I_{2,33} \\ I_{3,1} & I_{3,2} & I_{3,3} & \dots & I_{3,8} & I_{3,9} & I_{3,10} & I_{3,11} & \dots & I_{3,16} & \dots & I_{3,33} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ I_{8,1} & I_{8,2} & I_{8,3} & \dots & I_{8,8} & I_{8,9} & I_{8,10} & I_{8,11} & \dots & I_{8,16} & \dots & I_{8,33} \\ I_{9,1} & I_{9,2} & I_{9,3} & \dots & I_{9,8} & I_{9,9} & I_{9,10} & I_{9,11} & \dots & I_{9,16} & \dots & I_{9,33} \\ I_{10,1} & I_{10,2} & I_{10,3} & \dots & I_{10,8} & I_{10,9} & I_{10,10} & I_{10,11} & \dots & I_{10,16} & \dots & I_{10,33} \\ I_{11,1} & I_{11,2} & I_{11,3} & \dots & I_{11,8} & I_{11,9} & I_{11,10} & I_{11,11} & \dots & I_{11,16} & \dots & I_{11,33} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ I_{16,1} & I_{16,2} & I_{16,3} & \dots & I_{16,8} & I_{16,9} & I_{16,10} & I_{16,11} & \dots & I_{16,16} & \dots & I_{16,33} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ I_{33,1} & I_{33,2} & I_{33,3} & \dots & I_{33,8} & I_{33,9} & I_{33,10} & I_{33,11} & \dots & I_{33,16} & \dots & I_{33,33} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} Q_1 \\ Q_2 \\ \left\{ \begin{matrix} Q_3 \\ \dots \\ Q_8 \end{matrix} \right\}_{p1} \\ Q_9 \\ Q_{10} \\ \left\{ \begin{matrix} Q_{11} \\ \dots \\ Q_{16} \end{matrix} \right\}_{p2} \\ \dots \\ Q_{33} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (2.63)$$


where $p1, p2, \dots$ are number of the piles.

The total flexibility matrix in Eq. (2.63) can be inverted to give the relationship between contact forces and nodal settlements as follows:


$$\begin{Bmatrix} Q_1 \\ Q_2 \\ \left\{ \begin{matrix} Q_3 \\ \dots \\ Q_8 \end{matrix} \right\}_{p1} \\ Q_9 \\ Q_{10} \\ \left\{ \begin{matrix} Q_{11} \\ \dots \\ Q_{16} \end{matrix} \right\}_{p2} \\ \dots \\ Q_{33} \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k_{1,1} & k_{1,2} & k_{1,3} & \dots & k_{1,8} & k_{1,9} & k_{1,10} & k_{1,11} & \dots & k_{1,16} & \dots & k_{1,33} \\ k_{2,1} & k_{2,2} & k_{2,3} & \dots & k_{2,8} & k_{2,9} & k_{2,10} & k_{2,11} & \dots & k_{2,16} & \dots & k_{2,33} \\ k_{3,1} & k_{3,2} & k_{3,3} & \dots & k_{3,8} & k_{3,9} & k_{3,10} & k_{3,11} & \dots & k_{3,16} & \dots & k_{3,33} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ k_{8,1} & k_{8,2} & k_{8,3} & \dots & k_{8,8} & k_{8,9} & k_{8,10} & k_{8,11} & \dots & k_{8,16} & \dots & k_{8,33} \\ k_{9,1} & k_{9,2} & k_{9,3} & \dots & k_{9,8} & k_{9,9} & k_{9,10} & k_{9,11} & \dots & k_{9,16} & \dots & k_{9,33} \\ k_{10,1} & k_{10,2} & k_{10,3} & \dots & k_{10,8} & k_{10,9} & k_{10,10} & k_{10,11} & \dots & k_{10,16} & \dots & k_{10,33} \\ k_{11,1} & k_{11,2} & k_{11,3} & \dots & k_{11,8} & k_{11,9} & k_{11,10} & k_{11,11} & \dots & k_{11,16} & \dots & k_{11,33} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ k_{16,1} & k_{16,2} & k_{16,3} & \dots & k_{16,8} & k_{16,9} & k_{16,10} & k_{16,11} & \dots & k_{16,16} & \dots & k_{16,33} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ k_{33,1} & k_{33,2} & k_{33,3} & \dots & k_{33,8} & k_{33,9} & k_{33,10} & k_{33,11} & \dots & k_{33,16} & \dots & k_{33,33} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ \left\{ \begin{matrix} w_3 \\ \dots \\ w_8 \end{matrix} \right\}_{p1} \\ w_9 \\ w_{10} \\ \left\{ \begin{matrix} w_{11} \\ \dots \\ w_{16} \end{matrix} \right\}_{p2} \\ \dots \\ w_{33} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (2.64)$$

As indicated before, equating settlements of all nodes on each pile by a uniform settlement and carrying out the summation of rows and columns related to that pile in Eq. (2.64), gives the composed coefficients with the force on the pile head Ph_i and its corresponding settlement wo_i as follows:


$$\begin{Bmatrix} Q_1 \\ Q_2 \\ \left\{ \sum_{i=3}^8 Q_i \right\}_{p1} \\ Q_9 \\ Q_{10} \\ \left\{ \sum_{i=11}^{16} Q_i \right\}_{p2} \\ \dots \\ Q_{33} \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k_{1,1} & k_{1,2} & \sum_{j=3}^8 k_{1,j} & k_{1,9} & k_{1,10} & \sum_{j=11}^{16} k_{1,j} & \dots & k_{1,33} \\ k_{2,1} & k_{2,2} & \sum_{j=3}^8 k_{2,j} & k_{2,9} & k_{2,10} & \sum_{j=11}^{16} k_{2,j} & \dots & k_{2,33} \\ \sum_{i=3}^8 k_{i,1} & \sum_{i=3}^8 k_{i,2} & \sum_{i=3}^8 \sum_{j=3}^8 k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=3}^8 k_{i,9} & \sum_{i=3}^8 k_{i,10} & \sum_{i=3}^8 \sum_{j=11}^{16} k_{i,j} & \dots & \sum_{i=3}^8 k_{i,33} \\ k_{9,1} & k_{9,2} & \sum_{j=3}^8 k_{9,j} & k_{9,9} & k_{9,10} & \sum_{j=11}^{16} k_{9,j} & \dots & k_{9,33} \\ k_{10,1} & k_{10,2} & \sum_{j=3}^8 k_{10,j} & k_{10,9} & k_{10,10} & \sum_{j=11}^{16} k_{10,j} & \dots & k_{10,33} \\ \sum_{i=11}^{16} k_{i,1} & \sum_{i=11}^{16} k_{i,2} & \sum_{i=11}^{16} \sum_{j=3}^8 k_{i,j} & \sum_{i=11}^{16} k_{i,9} & \sum_{i=11}^{16} k_{i,10} & \sum_{i=11}^{16} \sum_{j=11}^{16} k_{i,j} & \dots & \sum_{i=11}^{16} k_{i,33} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ k_{33,1} & k_{33,2} & \sum_{j=3}^8 k_{33,j} & k_{33,9} & k_{33,10} & \sum_{j=11}^{16} k_{33,j} & \dots & k_{33,33} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ \{wo_1\}_{p1} \\ w_9 \\ w_{10} \\ \{wo_2\}_{p2} \\ \dots \\ w_{33} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (2.65)$$



a) Piled raft with node numbering of piled raft



b) Equivalent statical system with node numbering of raft alone



c) Soil settlement

Figure 2-7 Modeling piled raft

Accordingly, the total stiffness matrix of the piled raft of size $[n_{pr} * n_{pr}]$ is reduced to the size $[n_r * n_r]$. It means that the composed coefficient technique makes the size of the soil stiffness matrix of the piled raft problem equivalent to that of the raft problem alone without piles.

Now, Eq. (2.65) can be rewritten in composed coefficients as:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} Q_1 \\ Q_2 \\ Ph_1 \\ Q_9 \\ Q_{10} \\ Ph_2 \\ \dots \\ Q_{33} \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k_{1,1} & k_{1,2} & K_{1,p1} & k_{1,9} & k_{1,10} & K_{1,p2} & \dots & k_{1,33} \\ k_{2,1} & k_{2,2} & K_{2,p1} & k_{2,9} & k_{2,10} & K_{2,p2} & \dots & k_{2,33} \\ K_{p1,1} & K_{p1,2} & K_{p1,p1} & K_{p1,9} & K_{p1,10} & K_{p1,p2} & \dots & K_{p2,33} \\ k_{9,1} & k_{9,2} & K_{9,p1} & k_{9,9} & k_{9,10} & K_{9,p2} & \dots & k_{9,33} \\ k_{10,1} & k_{10,2} & K_{10,p1} & k_{10,9} & k_{10,10} & K_{10,p2} & \dots & k_{10,33} \\ K_{p2,1} & K_{p2,2} & K_{p2,p1} & K_{p2,9} & K_{p2,10} & K_{p2,p2} & \dots & K_{p2,33} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ k_{33,1} & k_{33,2} & K_{33,p1} & k_{33,9} & k_{33,10} & K_{33,p2} & \dots & k_{33,33} \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ wo_1 \\ w_9 \\ w_{10} \\ wo_2 \\ \dots \\ w_{33} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (2.66)$$

where $K_{pi, pj}$, $K_{i, pj}$ and $K_{pi, j}$ are composed coefficients of the piled raft, [kN/m].

Based on Eq. (2.66), the relationship between settlements and contact forces of the piled raft can be written in general compacted matrix form as:

$$\{Q\} = [kb]\{w\} \quad (2.67)$$

where:

- $\{w\}$ n_r settlement vector.
- $\{Q\}$ n_r contact force vector.
- $[kb]$ $n_r * n_r$ soil stiffness matrix of the piled raft.

For simplicity of the formulation, in next paragraphs the settlement on either raft node or pile head is donated by w_i , while the contact force on either raft node or pile head is donated by Q_i .

2.4.2 Analysis of piled flexible raft

In case of analyzing full flexible raft, the contact force vector $\{Q\}$ on raft nodes is known. Only settlements are required. The advantage of the composed coefficient technique is that the composed soil stiffness matrix can be inverted to get a composed flexibility matrix.

Accordingly, a relationship between contact forces under the flexible raft besides forces on pile heads and nodal settlements is expressed as:

$$\{w\} = [Cb]\{Q\} \quad (2.68)$$

where $[Cb]$ is $n_r * n_r$ flexibility matrix of the piled raft, $[Cb] = [kb]^{-1}$.

2.4.3 Analysis of piled rigid raft

For piled rigid raft, unknowns of the interaction problem are n_r contact forces Q_i , the rigid body translation of the piled raft w_c , and the rigid body rotations θ_x and θ_y of the piled raft about axes of geometry centroid. These are determined by considering n_r compatibility equations of rigid piled raft deflection and the displacement of subsoil at n_r nodal points in addition to the three equations of overall equilibrium.

Due to the piled raft rigidity, the following linear relation (plane translation) expresses the settlement w_i at either a node in the raft or a pile that has coordinates (x_i, y_i) from the geometry centroid:

$$w_i = w_c + x_i \tan \theta_y + y_i \tan \theta_x \quad (2.69)$$

Equation (2.69) is rewritten in matrix form for the entire piled raft system as:

$$\{w\} = [X]^T \{\Delta\} \quad (2.70)$$

where:

$\{\Delta\}$ 3 vector of translation w_c and rotations $\tan \theta_y$ and $\tan \theta_x$
 $[X]^T$ $3 \times n_r$ matrix of $\{1, x_i, y_i\}$. x_i, y_i are coordinates of node i .

For equilibrium the following conditions must be satisfied:

- The resultant due to external vertical forces acting on the raft must be equal to the sum of contact forces and pile loads.
- The moment due to that resultant about either x -axis or y -axis must be equal to the sum of moments due to contact forces and pile loads about that axis.

Assuming Q_i is a symbol represents either pile load Ph_i or contact force Q_i on the mesh, gives:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} N &= Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3 + \dots + Q_n \\ N \cdot e_x &= Q_1 \cdot x_1 + Q_2 \cdot x_2 + Q_3 \cdot x_3 + \dots + Q_n \cdot x_n \\ N \cdot e_y &= Q_1 \cdot y_1 + Q_2 \cdot y_2 + Q_3 \cdot y_3 + \dots + Q_n \cdot y_n \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.71)$$

where:

N Resultant of applied loads acting on the raft, [kN].
 $N e_x$ Moment due to resultant about x -axis, $M_x = N e_x$, [kN.m].
 $N e_y$ Moment due to resultant about y -axis, $M_y = N e_y$, [kN.m].
 e_x, e_y Eccentricities of the resultant about x - and y -axes, [m].
 x_i, y_i Coordinates of the load Q_i , [m].

Equation (2.71) is rewritten for the entire piled raft foundation in matrix form as:

$$\{N\} = [X] \{Q\} \quad (2.72)$$

where:

$\{N\}$ 3 vector of resultant and moments of applied loads acting on the piled raft.

Substituting Eqns (2.67) and (2.70) in Eq. (2.72), gives the following linear system of equations of the piled rigid raft:

$$\{N\} = [X][kb][X]^T \{\Delta\} \quad (2.73)$$

Solving the above system of linear equations, gives w_c , $\tan \theta_x$, and $\tan \theta_y$. Substituting these values in Eq. (2.70), gives the n settlements.

Substituting Eq. (2.70) in Eq. (2.67), gives the following equation to find the n unknown pile loads and contact forces.

$$\{Q\} = [kb][X]^T \{\Delta\} \quad (2.74)$$

2.4.4 Analysis of piled elastic raft

It is possible to treat the raft as an elastic plate on rigid piles. From the finite element analysis of the plate, the equilibrium of the raft is expressed as:

$$[kr] \{\delta\} = \{P\} - \{Q\} \quad (2.75)$$

where:

$\{p\}$ $3 \times n_r$ vector of applied loads and moments on the raft nodes.

$[kr]$ $3 \times n_r \times 3 \times n_r$ plate stiffness matrix.

$\{\delta\}$ $3 \times n_r$ deformation vector of the raft.

In the case of analyzing an elastic raft on pile groups, the elastic shortening of the pile may be added to the pile settlement in Eq. (2.68). The elastic shortening of the pile i is expressed as:

$$\Delta_i = \frac{Ph_i l_i}{Ep_i Ap_i} \quad (2.76)$$

where:

Δ_i Elastic shortening of pile i , [m].

l_i Length of pile i , [m].

Ap_i Cross-section area of pile i , [m²].

Ep_i Modulus of elasticity of the material of pile i , [kN/m²].

Equation (2.76) is written for the entire piled raft in matrix form as:

$$\{wp\} = [Cp]\{Ph\} \quad (2.77)$$

where:

- $\{wp\}$ Elastic shortening vector.
 $[Cp]$ Elastic pile matrix, which is a diagonal matrix.
 $\{Ph\}$ Vector of forces on pile heads.

To take the effect of pile shortening into account, the elastic coefficient of the pile i in the matrix $[Cp]$ is added to the flexibility coefficient of that pile in the matrix $[Cb]$ in Eq. (2.68) as follows:

$$\{w\} = [[Cb] + [Cp]]\{Q\} \quad (2.78)$$

Inverting the total flexibility matrix $[[Cb] + [Cp]]$ gives also the total stiffness matrix of piled raft $[kp]$ with the effect of pile stiffness due to its elastic material.

$$\{Q\} = [kp]\{w\} \quad (2.79)$$

where $[kp]$ is $n_r * n_r$ stiffness matrix of the piled raft with the effect of pile elastic material, $[kp] = [[Cb] + [Cp]]^{-1}$.

Substituting Eq. (2.79) in Eq (2.75), leads to:

$$[kr]\{\delta\} = \{P\} - [kp]\{w\} \quad (2.80)$$

Considering compatibility between piled raft displacement δ_i and soil settlement s_i , the following linear system of equations of the piled elastic raft can be obtained:

$$[[kp] + [kr]]\{\delta\} = \{P\} \quad (2.81)$$

Solving the above system of linear equations, gives the displacement at each node of the raft, which equal to the soil settlement at that node. Substituting soil settlements from Eq. (2.81) in Eq. (2.66), gives contact forces on the raft and forces on pile heads.

Once settlements on piles w_{oi} are determined in the above three cases of piled rafts, the individual forces along the pile shaft and on the pile base can be obtained from Eq. (2.64).

2.5 Nonlinear analysis

2.5.1 Nonlinear rigid analysis of single pile

Nonlinear analysis is an important consideration since piles may be loaded close to their full capacity, even under working condition. The nonlinear relation between the load and settlement of pile may be determined by considering a hyperbolic relation between load and settlement. Figure 2-8 shows a typical nonlinear curve of load-settlement for a wide range of soils. The curve can be approximated through a hyperbolic interpolation formula where several equation forms are available to verify this curve.




Figure 2-8 Load-settlement curve of a single pile (hyperbolic relation)

Many methods were developed to study pile-soil systems with nonlinear response using a hyperbolic relation between the load and settlement. *Fleming* (1992) developed a method to analyze and predict load-deformation behavior of a single pile using two hyperbolic functions describing the shaft and base performance individually under applied load. Analyzing nonlinear behavior by hyperbolic function was used by *Mandolini & Viggiani* (1997) for pile groups and was used by *Russo* (1998) for piled raft. They considered piles as nonlinear interacting springs based on the method of interaction factors. *Basile* (1999) assumed soil *Young's* modulus varies with the stress level at the pile-soil interface using a hyperbolic stress-strain relationship.

Available nonlinear analysis of foundation on *Winkler's* soil medium was presented by *Baz* (1987) for grid and *Hasnien* (1993) for raft. *El Gendy* (1999) extended this analysis to be applicable for raft on continuum soil medium. The composed coefficient technique described in the previous sections enables to apply this analysis on pile problems.

The nonlinear behavior of the pile head force-settlement at the piled raft-soil interface may be represented as:

$$Ph = \frac{wn}{\frac{1}{ks} + \frac{wn}{Ql}} \quad (2.82)$$

where:

wn Nonlinear settlement of the pile, [m].

Ql Limit pile load, [kN].

In Figure 2-8 and Eq. (2.82), the initial tangent modulus for single pile is easily obtained from linear analysis of the pile, which is equal to the modulus of soil stiffness ks . The limit pile load Ql is a geometrical parameter of the hyperbolic relation. In some cases the value of Ql is different from the actual ultimate pile load. For a single pile, the force on the pile head Ph is known. Therefore, Eq. (2.82) gives directly the nonlinear settlement of the pile wn .

2.5.2 Nonlinear analysis of pile groups, elastic piled raft and rigid piled raft

The nonlinear analysis of the piled raft is also based on the hyperbolic relation presented in section 2.5.1. The initial tangent modulus of the hyperbolic relation may be obtained from the linear analysis of the piled raft as:

$$ks_i = \frac{Ph_i^o}{wo_i^o} \quad (2.83)$$

where:

Ph_i^o Force on the pile head obtained from the linear analysis, [kN].

wo_i^o Pile settlement obtained from the linear analysis, [m].

i Pile number.

o Index denotes to the first analysis in the iteration (linear analysis).

2.5.3 Iterative Procedure

An iteration method is presented to solve the system of nonlinear equations of the piled raft. The main idea of this method is that the stiffness matrix $[kb]$ for rigid raft or $[kp]$ for elastic raft is converted to a diagonal stiffness matrix $[ke]$. Stiffness coefficients of this matrix, which represent nodal raft stiffness and pile stiffness coefficients, are determined from the contact force and its corresponding settlement. Only the pile stiffness is modified at each cycle from the iteration process. Using the equivalent diagonal matrix, equations of the piled raft are solved for each iteration cycle until the compatibility between raft, piles and soil is achieved.

Figure 2-9 shows the iteration cycle and the flow chart of the iteration process. The iteration process can be described in the following steps:

- 1- Carry out the linear analysis of the piled raft by solving system of linear Eqns (2.73) or (2.81) whichever is applicable, to get the settlements $\{w\}$.
- 2- Find the nodal contact forces $\{Q\}$ due to the computed settlements from Eq. (2.74) for rigid raft and from Eq. (2.79) for elastic raft.
- 3- From the computed settlements and contact forces, determine the nodal stiffness at all nodes on the raft and on pile heads from:

$$ke_i = \frac{Q_i}{w_i} \quad (2.84)$$

- 4- Modify the pile stiffness by:

$$ke_i = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{ks_i} + \frac{w_i}{Ql_i}} \quad (2.85)$$

- 5- Convert the soil stiffness matrix (matrix $[kb]$ or matrix $[kp]$) to equivalent diagonal stiffness matrix $[ke]$. This matrix can be generated from nodal raft stiffness computed in step 3 and pile stiffness computed in step 4.
- 6- Replace the full matrix by diagonal matrix $[ke]$. Then, carry out the nonlinear analysis of the piled raft to get the settlements $\{w\}$.
- 7- Compute the contact force under the raft and force on pile head by:

$$Q_i = ke_i w_i \quad (2.86)$$

- 8 - Compare the settlement from cycle i with that of cycle $i-1$ to find the accuracy of the solution.

The steps 3 to 8 are repeated until the accuracy reaches a specified tolerance ϵ , which means that a sufficient compatibility between settlements of piles, raft and soil are achieved at the piles-raft-soil interface. However, in this analysis the nonlinear response is applied only on piles, it can be easily added the nonlinear response of the raft as indicated by *El Gendy* (1999) to the piled raft system.




Figure 2-9 Flow chart of the iteration process

2.6 Numerical Examples

The numerical modeling single pile, pile groups and piled raft described in this chapter was implemented in the program *ELPLA*. To verify and evaluate the numerical modeling, a series of comparison were carried out in which results from *ELPLA* were compared with those from existing methods of analysis.

2.6.1 Test Example: Evaluation of settlement influence factor I_1 for a single pile

Most of piled raft analyses apply a numerical integration using *Mindlin's* solution to determine flexibility coefficients of piles. Applying a numerical integration in the piled raft analysis, leads to significant computations, especially in large piled raft problems. In the next case study closed form equations derived from *Mindlin's* solution are used in all computations. To verify these equations for determining flexibility coefficients, the settlement influence factors I_1 for a single pile obtained by *Poulos* (1968) and *Poulos/ Davis* (1968) are compared with those obtained by closed form equations listed in chapter 1.

From the analysis of a single pile carried out by *Poulos/ Davis* (1968), the settlement s_1 [m] of a single piles is expressed as:

$$s_1 = \frac{P}{L E_s} I_1 \quad (2.87)$$

where:

- P Load on the pile head, [kN].
- L Pile length, [m].
- E_s *Young's* modulus of the surrounding soil mass, [kN/m²].
- I_1 Settlement influence factor for a single pile, [-].

A pile of length $L=12.5$ [m] is chosen . Pile is divided into 10 elements, each 1.25 [m]. Load on the pile head P and *Young's* modulus of the surrounding soil mass E_s are chosen to make the term P/E_s of Eq. (2.87) equal to unit. Thus, load on the pile head is chosen to be $P=5000$ [kN], while *Young's* modulus of the surrounding soil mass is chosen to be $E_s=5000$ [kN/m²]. The settlement influence factors I_1 is determined at different values of h/L and L/d , where h [m] is the thickness of the soil layer and d [m] is the pile diameter.

The settlement influence factors I_1 of a single pile published by *Poulos* (1968) in Table 1 in his paper are compared with those obtained from the closed form equations. The factors are tabulated in Table 2-1 and Table 2-2 for two different values of *Poisson's* ratio of the soil ν_s . From these tables, it can be observed that the settlement influence factors obtained by closed form equations in chapter 1 at different soil layers and pile diameters are nearly equal to those obtained by *Poulos* (1968) with maximum difference of $\Delta = 2.78$ [%].

Flexibility coefficients determined from numerical integration are also available in *ELPLA*. Table 2-3 and Table 2-4 listed the settlement influence factors I_1 when using numerical integration. The tables show that settlement influence factors determined from closed form equation and those determined from numerical integration are nearly the same.

Table 2-1 Settlement influence factors I_l [-] for a single pile (using closed from equations)
(Poisson's ratio of the soil $\nu_s = 0.5$ [-])

h/L	<i>Poulos</i> (1968)			<i>ELPLA</i>			Max. Diff. Δ [%]
	L/d			L/d			
	10	25	100	10	25	100	
4	1.41	1.86	2.54	1.44	1.88	2.56	2.13
5	1.31	1.76	2.44	1.34	1.77	2.47	1.23
2.5	1.20	1.64	2.31	1.22	1.65	2.33	1.67
1.5	0.98	1.42	2.11	0.99	1.43	2.12	1.02
1.2	0.72	1.18	1.89	0.74	1.19	1.90	2.78

Table 2-2 Settlement influence factors I_l [-] for a single pile (using closed from equations)
(Poisson's ratio of the soil $\nu_s = 0.0$ [-])

h/L	<i>Poulos</i> (1968)			<i>ELPLA</i>			Max. Diff. Δ [%]
	L/d			L/d			
	10	25	100	10	25	100	
4	1.16	1.47	1.95	1.17	1.48	1.94	0.86
5	1.07	1.37	1.86	1.08	1.38	1.86	0.93
2.5	0.96	1.27	1.75	0.98	1.28	1.74	2.08
1.5	0.80	1.11	1.58	0.81	1.12	1.59	1.25
1.2	0.62	0.94	1.44	0.62	0.94	1.42	1.39

Table 2-3 Settlement influence factors I_I [-] for a single pile (using numerical integration)
(Poisson's ratio of the soil $\nu_s = 0.5$ [-])

h/L	<i>Poulos</i> (1968)			<i>ELPLA</i>			Max. Diff. Δ [%]
	L/d			L/d			
	10	25	100	10	25	100	
4	1.41	1.86	2.54	1.42	1.84	2.51	1.18
5	1.31	1.76	2.44	1.31	1.74	2.42	0.82
2.5	1.20	1.64	2.31	1.19	1.62	2.30	1.22
1.5	0.98	1.42	2.11	0.97	1.40	2.08	1.42
1.2	0.72	1.18	1.89	0.72	1.16	1.86	1.59

Table 2-4 Settlement influence factors I_I [-] for a single pile (using numerical integration)
(Poisson's ratio of the soil $\nu_s = 0.0$ [-])

h/L	<i>Poulos</i> (1968)			<i>ELPLA</i>			Max. Diff. Δ [%]
	L/d			L/d			
	10	25	100	10	25	100	
4	1.16	1.47	1.95	1.15	1.45	1.91	2.09
5	1.07	1.37	1.86	1.06	1.36	1.82	2.15
2.5	0.96	1.27	1.75	0.96	1.26	1.72	1.71
1.5	0.80	1.11	1.58	0.79	1.09	1.55	1.90
1.2	0.62	0.94	1.44	0.61	0.92	1.40	2.78

2.6.2 Case study: Piled raft of *Torhaus*

Torhaus is the first building in Germany with a foundation designed as a piled raft, Figure 2-10. The building lies in Frankfurt city in Germany. It is 130 [m] high and rests on two separate piled rafts, where a street passes under the building. Measured instruments were installed inside the foundation to record piled raft settlement and stress. Many authors studied the foundation of the *Torhaus* and applied their analysis methods on piled raft. Some of them are *Sommer et al.* (1985), *Sommer* (1989) and *Reul & Randolph* (2003).



Figure 2-10 *Torhaus* nach http://www.fussballportal.de/images/wm/fra_torhaus.jpg

Figure 2-12 shows a layout of *Torhaus* with piled rafts. The building has no underground floors. The foundation is two separate equal piled rafts with rectangular shape areas, each of 17.5 [m] * 24.5 [m] sides. The distance between the two rafts is 10 [m]. Rafts are founded at a depth 3.0 [m] under the ground surface. The estimated total load on each raft is 200 [MN]. Raft thickness is 2.5 [m]. A total of 42 bored piles with a length of $l = 20$ [m] and diameter of $D = 0.9$ [m] are located under each raft. The pile spacing varies from $3.5 D$ to $3.0 D$. The subsoil at the location of the building consists of gravel and sand up to 5.5 [m] below the ground surface, followed by layers of Frankfurt clay extending to great depth. The groundwater level lies below rafts.

The building is constructed between 1983 and 1986, the recorded maximum settlement at the raft middle in 1988 was about 12 [cm] according to *Sommer* (1989). If *Torhaus* stands on a raft only, the expected settlement would be about 26 [cm] based on geotechnical studies according to *Sommer et al.* (1985). Therefore, to reduce the settlement, piled rafts were

considered. Using available data and results of *Torhaus* piled rafts, which have been discussed in details in the previous references, the present piled raft analysis is evaluated and verified for analyzing a piled raft.

2.6.2.1 Soil properties

Young's modulus:

According to *Reul & Randolph* (2003), *Young's* modulus of the sand with gravel layer under the rafts is $E = 75000$ [kN/m²]. The *Young's* modulus for reloading is taken to be $W = 3 E$. Based on the back analysis after *Amann et al.* (1975), the distribution of modulus of compressibility for loading of Frankfurt clay with depth is defined by the following empirical formula:

$$E_s = E_{so} (1 + 0.35 z) \quad (2.88)$$

while that for reloading is:

$$W_s = 70 [\text{MN/m}^2] \quad (2.89)$$

where:

- E_s Modulus of compressibility for loading, [MN/m²].
- W_s Modulus of compressibility for reloading, [MN/m²].
- E_{so} Initial modulus of compressibility, $E_{so}=7$ [MN/m²].
- z Depth measured from the clay surface, [m].

Undrained cohesion and limit pile load:

The undrained cohesion c_u of Frankfurt clay increases with depth from $c_u=100$ [kN/m²] to $c_u=400$ [kN/m²] in 70 [m] depth under the clay surface according to *Sommer & Katzenbach* (1990). *Russo* (1998) suggested a limiting shaft friction not less than 180 [kN/m²] meeting undrained shear strength of 200 [kN/m²]. To carry out the present analysis a limit shaft friction of $ql = 180$ [kN/m²] is assumed, which gives a limit pile load of $Ql = 10$ [MN] where it is calculated from:

$$Ql = \tau * \pi * D * l = 180 * \pi * 0.9 * 20 = 10179 [\text{kN}] = 10 [\text{MN}] \quad (2.90)$$

Poisson's ratio:

Poisson's ratio of the soil is taken to be $\nu_s=0.25$ [-].

To carry out the analysis, the subsoil under the raft is considered as indicated in the boring log of Figure 2-11 that consists of 13 soil layers. The total depth under the ground surface is taken to be 113 [m].




Figure 2-11 Boring log

2.6.2.2 Raft and pile material

Raft has the following material parameters:

Young's modulus $E_b = 3.4 * 10^7$ [kN/m²]

Poisson's ratio $\nu_b = 0.2$ [-]

Unit weight $\gamma_b = 25$ [kN/m³]

while piles have the following material parameters:



Young's modulus $E_b = 2.35 * 10^7$ [kN/m²]

Unit weight $\gamma_b = 25$ [kN/m³]

2.6.2.3 Analysis of the piled raft

Comparisons are carried out to evaluate the nonlinear analysis of piled elastic raft using composed coefficient technique. In which, results of three-dimensional finite element analysis and field measurements are compared with those obtained by the present analysis. In the comparisons the present analysis is termed *NPRH*.

The raft is divided into rectangular elements as shown in Figure 2-13. Element sizes in x -direction for a single raft are $1.75+10*1.4+1.75= 17.5$ [m], while those in y -direction are $14*1.75=24.5$ [m]. Piles are divided into line elements with 2.0 [m] in length. The raft is considered to be elastic plate supported on rigid piles. The effective depth of the soil layers under the raft is taken to be $H = 110$ [m] as assumed by three-dimensional finite element analysis.

Figure 2-12 Layout of *Torhaus* with piled raftsFigure 2-13 Mesh of *Torhaus* piled rafts with piles

2.6.2.4 Comparison with three-dimensional finite element analysis and field measurements

Reul & Randolph (2003) analyzed *Torhaus* piled rafts using three dimensional finite element model and compared their results with those obtained by field measurements according to *Sommer* (1989). For reducing the computational effort and time, they took the advantage of the symmetry in shape, soil and load geometry about both x - and y -axes to carry out the analysis for a quarter of a piled raft. In *NPRH* the two piled rafts are analyzed together to take the interaction among all elements of piled rafts. A linear analysis is carried out first to obtain the initial modulus of subgrade reaction. In this primary analysis the effect of reloading is taken into account. For the nonlinear analysis, the accuracy number is chosen to be 0.0002 [m]. Seven cycles in few minutes are required to obtain the nonlinear analysis of the piled rafts together. This is related to that using composed coefficient technique reduced the size of soil stiffness matrix from [1314*1314] to [390*390]. Accordingly, the total number of equations was reduced to 1170, where $n_{pr} = 1314$, $n_r = 390$ and number of unknown per node is 3 ($3 n_r = 1170$).

Table 2-5 lists results of central settlement and bearing factor of piled raft obtained by *NPRH* and those obtained by *Reul & Randolph* (2003) using three-dimensional finite element analysis. Also, the table includes the measured results presented by *Sommer* (1989). Figure 2-14 and Figure 2-15 compare loads on piles 1 to 6 (Figure 2-13) obtained by *NPRH* with those obtained by *Reul & Randolph* (2003) using three-dimensional finite element analysis and with measured pile loads presented by *Sommer* (1989).

Table 2-5 Comparison between results obtained by 3D FE-Analysis and field measurements with those obtained by *NPRH*

Type of analysis	Measurement	3D FE-Analysis	<i>NPRH</i>
Central settlement s_{center} [cm]	12.4	9.6	11.2
Bearing factor α_{kpp} [%]	67	76	64

Table 2-5 shows that settlement and bearing factor of piled raft for *NPRH* is in good agreement with field measurements. Results of pile loads in Figure 2-14 and Figure 2-15 are in good agreement with both those of three-dimensional finite element analysis and field measurements. Three-dimensional finite element analysis gave a relatively big difference in the bearing factor compared with that of field measurement and *NPRH*.

This case study shows that *NPRH* is not only an acceptable method to analyze piled raft but also a practical one for analyzing large piled raft problems. Besides the analysis gives good agreement with measured results, it takes less computational time and less effort for generating input data compared with other complicated models using three dimensional finite element analysis.

2.6.2.5 Comparing among different analysis types

To show the difference between results when analyzing piled raft of *Torhous* linearly and nonlinearly as piled elastic raft or piled rigid raft, piled raft of *Torhous* is analyzed four times as follows:

- Linear piled rigid raft.
- Nonlinear piled rigid raft.
- Linear piled elastic raft.
- Nonlinear piled elastic raft.

For the four analysis types, Table 2-6 shows central settlement and bearing factor of piled raft, while Figure 2-16 and Figure 2-17 show loads on piles 1 to 6. In general, it can be noticed from Table 2-6 and these figures that:

a) Settlement

- Settlement from nonlinear analysis for piled rigid raft or piled elastic raft is greater than that obtained from linear analysis.
- The nonlinear settlement exceeds linear settlement by 48% for piled rigid raft and by 29% for piled elastic raft.
- For a single analysis, either linear or nonlinear, the difference in settlement obtained from analyzing piled rigid raft or piled elastic raft is small. This means any of the analysis can be used for estimating the settlement.

b) Bearing factor of piled raft

- Bearing factor of piled raft from nonlinear analysis is less than that obtained from linear analysis.
- Bearing factor of piled raft from nonlinear analysis decreases by 13% for analyzing piled rigid raft and by 15% for piled elastic raft.

c) Force on pile head

- Using nonlinear analysis redistributes pile loads by increasing values of inner piles (piles 1 and 6) and decreasing values of edge piles (piles 2, 3, 4 and 5).
- Total pile loads of piled rigid raft are greater than those of piled elastic raft.
- Pile loads for edge piles of piled rigid raft are greater than those of piled elastic raft and vice versa for inner piles.

Table 2-6 Comparison between results of different analysis types

Type of analysis	Piled rigid raft		Piled elastic raft	
	Linear	Nonlinear	Linear	Nonlinear
Central settlement s_{center} [cm]	7.0	13.4	8.0	11.2
Bearing factor α_{kpp} [%]	88	77	75	64

Applying different analysis types on piled raft of *Torhous* shows that the nonlinear analysis of piled elastic raft is the acceptable analysis type, which its results are agreement with measured values.




Figure 2-14 Comparison between pile loads obtained by 3D FE-Analysis and field measurements with those obtained by *NPRH* (Piles 3, 4 and 5)




Figure 2-15 Comparison between pile loads obtained by 3D FE-Analysis and field measurements with those obtained by *NPRH* (Piles 1, 2 and 6)




Figure 2-16 Comparison between pile loads of different analysis types (Piles 3, 4 and 5)




Figure 2-17 Comparison between pile loads of different analysis types (Piles 1, 2 and 6)

2.7 References

- [1] *Amann, P./ Breth, H./ Stroh, D.* (1975): Verformungsverhalten des Baugrundes beim Baugrubenaushub und anschließendem Hochhausbau am Beispiel des Frankfurter Ton. Mitteilungen der Versuchsanstalt für Bodenmechanik und Grundbau der Technischen Hochschule Darmstadt, Heft 15.
- [2] *Basile, F.* (1999): Non-linear analysis of pile groups. *Proc. Instn Civ. Engrs Geotech. Engng*, 137, 105-115.
- [3] *Baz, O.* (1987): Plates on nonlinear subgrade. Master Thesis, Mansoura University, Egypt.
- [4] *Butterfield, R./ Banerjee, K.* (1971): The elastic analysis of compressible piles and pile group. *Géotechnique*, 21, No. 1, 43-60.
- [5] *Clancy, P./ Randolph, M.* (1993): An approximate analysis procedure for piled raft foundation. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Meth. Geomech.*, 17 (12), 849-869.
- [6] *Clancy, P./ Randolph, M.* (1994): Simple design tools for piled raft foundation. *Géotechnique*, Vol. 46, No. 2, pp. 313-328.
- [7] *El Gendy, M.* (1999): An iterative procedure for foundation-superstructure interaction problem. *Port-Said Engineering Research journal*, Vol. 3, No. I, pp. 1-19, Egypt.
- [8] *El Gendy, M.* (2007): Formulation of a composed coefficient technique for analyzing large piled raft. *Scientific Bulletin, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt*. Vol. 42, No. 1, March 2007, pp. 29-56.
- [9] *Fleming, W.* (1992): A new method for single pile settlement predication and analysis. *Géotechnique*, Vol. 42, No. 3, 411-425.
- [10] *Hasnien, M.* (1993): Finite element analysis of mat resting on nonlinear elastic medium. M. Sc. Thesis, Ain Shams University, Faculty of Engineering, Egypt.
- [11] *Jeong, S./ Won, J./ Lee, J.* (2003): Simplified 3D analysis of laterally loaded Pile Groups. *TRB Annual Meeting*.
- [12] *Kany, M./ El Gendy, M./ El Gendy, A.:* Analysis and design of foundations by the Program ELPLA. GEOTEC Software, Zirndorf (2007)
- [13] *Kitiyodom, P./ Matsumoto, T.* (2002): A simplified analysis method for piled raft and pile group foundation with batter Piles. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Meth. Geomech.*, 26, 1349-1369.
- [14] *Kitiyodom, P./ Matsumoto, T.* (2003): A simplified analysis method for piled raft foundations in non-homogeneous soils. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Meth. Geomech.*, 27, 85-109.
- [15] *Lee, K./ Xiao, Z.* (2001): A simplified nonlinear approach for pile group settlement analysis in multilayered soils. *Can. Geotech. J.*, 38, 1063-1080.
- [16] *Liang, F./ Chen, L.* (2004): A modified variational approach for the analysis of piled raft foundation. *Mechanics Research Communications* 31, 593-604.

- [17] *Lutz, B./ El-Mossallamy, Y./ Richter, Th.* (2006): Ein einfaches, für die Handberechnung geeignetes Berechnungsverfahren zur Abschätzung des globalen Last-Setzungsverhalten von Kombinierten Pfahl-Plattengründungen. *Bauingenieur*, Band 81, 61-66.
- [18] *Mandolini, A./ Viggiani, C.* (1997): Settlement of piled foundations. *Géotechnique*, Vol. 47, No. 4, 791-816.
- [19] *Mendonça, A./ Paiva, J.* (2003): An elasostatic FEM/BEM analysis of vertically loaded raft and piled raft foundation. *Engineering Analysis with Boundary Elements*, 27, 919-933.
- [20] *Mindlin, R. D.* (1936): Force at a Point in the interior of a semi-infinite solid. *Physic* 8, 195.
- [21] *Poulos, H./ Davis, E.* (1968): The settlement behaviour of single axially loaded incompressible piles and piers. *Géotechnique*, Vol. 18, 351-371.
- [22] *Poulos, H.* (1968): Analysis of the settlement of pile groups. *Géotechnique*, Vol. 18, 449-471.
- [23] *Poulos, H.* (1999): Approximate computer analysis of pile groups subjected to loads and ground movements. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Meth. Geomech.*, 23, 1021-1041.
- [24] *Reul, O./ Randolph, M.* (2003): Piled rafts in overconsolidated clay: comparison of in situ measurements and numerical analyses. *Géotechnique* Vol. 53, No. 3, 301-315
- [25] *Russo, G.* (1998): Numerical analysis of piled rafts. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Meth. Geomech.*, 22, 477-493.
- [26] *Sommer, H./ Wittmann, P./ Ripper, P.* (1985): Piled raft foundation of a tall building in Frankfurt clay. *Proc. 11th Int. Conf. Soil Mech. Found. Engng*, San Francisco 4, 2253-2257.
- [27] *Sommer, H.* (1989): Entwicklung der Hochhausgründungen in Frankfurt/ Main. *Festkolloquium 20 Jahre Grundbauinstitut*, 47-62, Darmstadt.
- [28] *Sommer, H./ Katzenbach, R.* (1990): Last-Verformungsverhalten des Messeturmes Frankfurt/ Main. *Vorträge der Baugrundtagung 1990 in Karlsruhe*, Seite 371-380.
- [29] *Ta, L./ Small, J.* (1997): An approximation for analysis of raft and piled raft foundation. *Computer and Geotechnics*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 105-123.
- [30] *Wong, S./ Poulos, H.* (2005): Approximate pile-to-pile interaction factors between two dissimilar piles. *Computer and Geotechnics* 32, 613-618.
- [31] *Winkler, E.* (1867): *Die Lehre von der Elastizität und Festigkeit*. Dominicus, Prag.

Chapter 3

**Empirical with numerical modeling pile
group and piled raft**

Table of Contents

	Page
3 Empirical with numerical modeling pile group and piled raft	4
3.1 Introduction	4
3.2 Numerical Modeling	5
3.2.1 Pile-pile interaction	5
3.2.2 Pile-raft interaction.....	13
3.2.3 Raft-pile interaction.....	14
3.2.4 Raft-soil interaction.....	16
3.2.5 Formulation of soil equations.....	18
3.2.6 Analysis of rigid piled raft	20
3.2.7 Analysis of rigid pile group or flexible raft on rigid pile group.....	23
3.2.8 Analysis of elastic piled raft.....	23
3.2.9 Iteration method	24
3.3 Case study: Messeturm piled raft for the tallest building in Europe	26
3.3.1 Description of the problem.....	26
3.3.2 Analysis of the piled raft	28
3.3.3 Soil properties	30
3.4 References	35

Chapter 3

3 Empirical with numerical modeling pile group and piled raft

3.1 Introduction

Many authors have studied pile-soil system with nonlinear response using theoretical relations between the load and settlement. *Mandolini & Viggiani* (1997), (1998) and *Russo* (1998) considered piles as nonlinear interacting springs based on the method of interaction factors. In their analysis, the non-linearity is essentially concentrated at the pile-soil interface, while the interaction between other elements (pile-pile, pile-raft and raft-pile-interactions) may be represented by a linear model. The nonlinear soil-pile response is represented by an expression corresponding to a hyperbolic load-settlement relationship for the single pile. The hyperbolic relation based on a function having a maximum value for the pile capacity. The maximum value is intended only as a geometrical parameter of the hyperbola fitting the load-settlement curve in the load range of interest. In some cases, this value may significantly differ from the actual failure load (*Mandolini & Viggiani* (1997)).

Basile (1999), (2003) had used a nonlinear model follows the well-established hyperbolic relationship between soil stress and strain. This model was proposed by *Duncan & Chang* (1970), which assumes that soil modulus of elasticity varies with the stress level at the pile-soil interface. The hyperbolic curve fitting for this model depends on some constants, which are difficult to be evaluated. The best way to determine these constants is by fitting the load-deformation curve with the data from the full-scale pile load test.

Witzel & Kempfert (2005) presented empirical relations to predict load-settlement behavior for precast driven piles using field test data. Also, most national codes such as German standard DIN 4014 [5] and Egyptian standard ECP [7] present empirical relations for load-settlement of piles based on situ statistical results. Therefore, *El Gendy et al.* (2006) developed a mixed technique contains empirical and mathematical models for analyzing pile group and piled raft. The technique depends on load-settlement curve obtained from field measurements or empirical relations, a nonlinear analysis of combined piled-raft to take into account the actual response of subsoil behavior. In the analysis, each pile is treated as two units, shaft and base, having a uniform settlement along the pile shaft and in the pile base. This assumption enables modeling the nonlinear behavior of combined piled-raft. The nonlinear response of the pile is based on the DIN 4014 empirical relation of load-settlement curve. Connecting between empirical and theoretical procedures, a method termed *NPRD* for nonlinear analysis of combined piled-raft using DIN 4014 is developed. The procedure meets the requirements of the KPP-guideline [23], section 6, to a computation model. The efficiency of *NPRD* is demonstrated in a comparison computation of Frankfurt Messturm with the results of different authors. The method was implemented in the program *ELPLA* [8].

3.2 Numerical Modeling

In the analysis of the numerical model, the self-settlement of pile is determined from DIN 4014 [5] load-settlement relationship while the settlement due to pile-pile, pile-raft and raft-soil interactions are determined numerically using flexibility coefficients. Full compatibility between settlements of piles, raft and soil is achieved at pile-raft-soil interface.

3.2.1 Pile-pile interaction

DIN 4014 presents pile load in two components; tip force on the base of the pile and skin friction force acting along the pile shaft. Therefore, two flexibility matrices for pile-pile interaction without the effect of pile itself are determined. The first matrix represents the influence of unit tip forces, while the other represents the influence of unit skin forces.

3.2.1.1 Settlement along the pile shaft $Sbs_{i,j}$ [m] due to a tip force Qb_j [kN]

To formulate equations of the method, a system of two piles of different lengths is considered as shown in Figure 3-1. The actual tip stress qb_j [kN/m²] on the base of the pile j is replaced by an equivalent tip force Qb_j [kN]. The pile i of a length l_i [m] is subdivided into m elements of equal length Δl [m]. First, the settlement in a shaft element k of the pile i that is influenced by a tip force Qb_j acting on the base of the pile j is determined. Then, a uniform settlement along the pile shaft due to this tip force can be calculated numerically by integrating settlements for the individual elements.

According to *Mindlin's* solution (1936), the settlement $Sbs_{k,j}$ in a point k at a depth z from the surface due to a tip force Qb_j on the base of pile j is given by:

$$Sbs_{k,j} = f_{k,j} Qb_j \quad (3.1)$$

where $f_{k,j}$ is given by *Mindlin's* solution as:

$$f_{k,j} = \frac{1}{16 \pi G_s (1 - \nu_s)} \left(\frac{3 - 4 \nu_s}{R_1} + \frac{8 (1 - \nu_s)^2 - (3 - 4 \nu_s)}{R_2} + \frac{(z - c)^2}{R_1^3} + \frac{(3 - 4 \nu_s)(z + c)^2 - 2cz}{R_2^3} + \frac{6cz(z + c)^2}{R_2^5} \right) \quad (3.2)$$

where:

$$R_1 = \sqrt{r^2 + (z - c)^2}, R_2 = \sqrt{r^2 + (z + c)^2} \text{ and}$$

c Depth of the point load Qb_j from the surface, [m].

z Depth of the studied point k from the surface, [m].

r Radial distance between points k and j , [m].

$f_{k,j}$ Flexibility coefficient of point k due to a unit load at point j , [m/kN].

G_s Shear modulus of the soil, [kN/m²]. $G_s = 0.5 E_s / (1 + \nu_s)$

E_s Elasticity modulus of the soil, [kN/m²].

$$F_{i,j} = \frac{\Delta l}{l_i} (f_{1,j} + f_{2,j} + f_{3,j} + f_{4,j} + \dots + f_{m,j}) \quad (3.6)$$

3.2.1.2 Settlement in the pile base $Sbb_{i,j}$ [m] due to a tip force Qb_j [kN]

The settlement $Sbb_{i,j}$ in the base of the pile i due to a tip force Qb_j on the base of pile j is expressed as:

$$Sbb_{i,j} = F_{b,j} Qb_j \quad (3.7)$$

where $F_{b,j}$ [m/kN] is the base flexibility coefficient of pile i due to a tip force Qb_j on the base of pile j . The base flexibility coefficient is determined from Eq. (3.2) by putting $z = z_2$, where z_2 [m] is the base depth of pile i from the ground surface.

3.2.1.3 Settlement in the pile $Sb_{i,j}$ [m] due to a tip force Qb_j [kN]

From the assumption that the pile has a uniform settlement in all its nodes, settlement along the shaft is the same as that in the base. Now, the settlement in the pile i can be represented by one value $Sb_{i,j}$, which is the average of shaft and base settlements of the pile due to the tip force Qb_j on the base of the pile j . Taking the average of settlements in Eqns (3.5) and (3.7), gives the settlement in the pile by:

$$Sb_{i,j} = Fb_{i,j} Qb_j \quad (3.8)$$

where $Fb_{i,j} = 0.5 (F_{i,j} + F_{b,j})$ is the flexibility coefficient of pile i due to a tip force Qb_j on the base of pile j , [m/kN].

3.2.1.4 Settlement in the pile Sb_i [m] due to all tip forces

For a group of n_p piles, the settlement Sb_i in a pile i is attributed to settlements caused by all tip forces acting on n_p piles except pile i . Then, settlement Sb_i is given by:

$$Sb_i = Sb_{i,1} + Sb_{i,2} + Sb_{i,3} + \dots + Sb_{i,n} = \sum_{j=1}^n Fb_{i,j} Qb_j, i \neq j \quad (3.9)$$

For a pile group of n_p piles, Eq. (3.9) can be written in matrix form as:

$$\{Sb\} = [Fb]\{Qb\} \quad (3.10)$$

where:

$\{Sb\}$ n_p vector of settlements in piles due to tip forces on pile bases.

$\{Qb\}$ n_p vector of tip forces on pile bases.

$[Fb]$ $n_p * n_p$ matrix of pile flexibility coefficients due to unit tip forces on piles, $Fb_{i,i} = 0$.

3.2.1.5 Settlement along the pile shaft $Sss_{i,j}$ [m] due to a skin friction force Qs_j [kN]

Figure 3-2 shows a system of two piles where a shaft element k of a pile i is influenced by a skin friction τ_{sj} [kN/m²] acting on the shaft perimeter of a pile j with a diameter d_j [m] and a length l_j [m]. Using DIN 4014, the skin friction along the shaft perimeter of pile j is represented by a total skin friction force Qs_j [kN] = $\pi d_j l_j \tau_{sj}$. To avoid extensive computations when applying *Mindlin's* solution to determine flexibility coefficients due to shaft stress along the pile shaft, the shaft stress τ_{sj} is replaced by an equivalent line load T [kN/m] = Qs_j / l_j acting on the axis of the pile. The settlement $Sss_{k,j}$ in a point k at a depth z from the surface due to a total skin force Qs_j on a pile j is expressed as:

$$Sss_{k,j} = I_{k,j} Qs_j \quad (3.11)$$

where $I_{k,j}$ [m/kN] is the flexibility coefficient of point k due to the total skin friction force Qs_j on pile j . This flexibility coefficient is determined from Eq. (3.2) by integrating the coefficient of point load $dQs_j = T dc$ over the length of pile j . The flexibility coefficient $I_{k,j}$ of the point k due to a unit skin force on pile j can be obtained from:

$$I_{k,j} = \frac{1}{l_j} \int_{c_1}^{c_2} f_{k,j} dc \quad (3.12)$$

The integration yields to:

$$I_{k,j} = \frac{1}{16 \pi l_j G_s (1 - \nu_s)} (I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5) \quad (3.13)$$


$$I_1 = (3 - 4 v_s) \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r^2 + (z - c_2)^2} - (z - c_2)}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z - c_1)^2} - (z - c_1)} \right] \quad (3.14)$$

$$I_2 = \left[8(1 - v_s)^2 - (3 - 4v_s) \right] \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r^2 + (z + c_2)^2} + (z + c_2)}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z + c_1)^2} + (z + c_1)} \right] \quad (3.15)$$

3-9

$$I_4 = (3 - 4 \nu_s) \left(\ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r^2 + (z + c_2)^2} + (z + c_2)}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z + c_1)^2} + (z + c_1)} \right] - \frac{(z + c_2)}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z + c_2)^2}} + \frac{(z + c_1)}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z + c_1)^2}} \right) - 2z \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z + c_1)^2}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z + c_2)^2}} \right. \quad (3.17)$$

$$\left. + \frac{z(z + c_1)}{r^2 \sqrt{r^2 + (z + c_1)^2}} - \frac{z(z + c_2)}{r^2 \sqrt{r^2 + (z + c_2)^2}} \right) \\ I_5 = \frac{6z[r^4 - z(z + c_2)^3]}{3r^2[r^2 + (z + c_2)^2]^{3/2}} - \frac{6z[r^4 + z(z + c_1)^3]}{3r^2[r^2 + (z + c_2)^2]^{3/2}} \\ - \frac{6z}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z + c_2)^2}} + \frac{6z}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z + c_1)^2}} \quad (3.18)$$

where:

- c_1 Start depth of the line load T from the surface, [m].
- c_2 End depth of the line load T from the surface, [m].
- l_j Length of the line load T , [m].
- r Radial distance between point k and j [m].

The uniform settlement $S_{ss_{i,j}}$ along the shaft of pile i due to a skin force Q_{s_j} on pile j can be obtained by using the same approach used for determining the uniform settlement due to a tip force on the base. Similarly to Eq. (3.5), the uniform settlement $S_{ss_{i,j}}$ is given by:

$$S_{ss_{i,j}} = L_{i,j} Q_{s_j} \quad (3.19)$$

where $L_{i,j}$ [m/kN] is the shaft flexibility coefficient of pile i due to a skin force Q_{s_j} on pile j . The shaft flexibility coefficient $L_{i,j}$ is expressed as:

$$L_{i,j} = \frac{\Delta l}{l_i} (I_{1,j} + I_{2,j} + I_{3,j} + I_{4,j} + \dots + I_{m,j}) \quad (3.20)$$

3.2.1.6 Settlement in the pile base $Ssb_{i,j}$ [m] due to a skin force Qs_j [kN]

The settlement $Ssb_{i,j}$ in the base of the pile i due to a skin force Qs_j on pile j is expressed as:

$$Ssb_{i,j} = L_{b,j} Qs_j \quad (3.21)$$

where $L_{b,j}$ [m/kN] is the base flexibility coefficient of pile i due to a skin force Qs_j on pile j . The base flexibility coefficient is determined from Eq. (3.11) by putting $z = z_2$.

3.2.1.7 Settlement in the pile $Ss_{i,j}$ [m] due to a skin force Qs_j [kN]

Similarly to Eq. (3.8), the settlement in the pile is obtained from:

$$Ss_{i,j} = Is_{i,j} Qs_j \quad (3.22)$$

where $Is_{i,j} = 0.5 (L_{i,j} + L_{b,j})$ is the flexibility coefficient of pile i due to a skin force Qs_j on pile j , [m/kN].

3.2.1.8 Settlement in the pile Ss_i [m] due to all skin forces

Again and similar to Eq. (3.10), the settlement Ss_i for a pile group of n_p piles is given in matrix form by:

$$\{Ss\} = [Is] \{Qs\} \quad (3.23)$$

where:

- $\{Ss\}$ n_p vector of settlements in piles due to skin forces on piles.
- $[Is]$ $n_p * n_p$ matrix of pile flexibility coefficients due to unit skin forces on piles, $Is_{i,i} = 0$.
- $\{Qs\}$ n_p vector of skin forces on piles.

3.2.1.9 Self-settlement of the pile Sv_i [m]

According to DIN 4014 [5], the self-settlement of the pile is determined from the empirical nonlinear relation between the load and settlement of a single pile as indicated in Figure 3-3. From this figure, the relation between the self-settlement in the pile and its load can be expressed as:

$$Sv_i = \frac{1}{\tan k_i} Qp_i = Cp_i Qp_i \quad (3.24)$$

where:

Sv_i Self-settlement of pile i , [m].

Qp_i Load on pile i , $Qp_i = Qb_i + Qs_i$, [kN].

$\tan k_i$ Ratio between the load on pile and the settlement, [kN/m].

Cp_i Flexibility coefficient of pile i due to a unit load on it, $Cp_i = 1/\tan k_i$, [m/kN].




Figure 3-3 Load-settlement curve of a single pile according to DIN 4014 [5]

For a pile group of n_p piles, Eq. (3.24) can be written in matrix form as:

$$\{Sv\} = [Cp] \{Qp\} \quad (3.25)$$

where:

$\{Sv\}$ n_p vector of self-settlements in piles.

$[Cp]$ $n_p * n_p$ diagonal matrix of flexibility coefficients due to unit pile loads.

$\{Qp\}$ n_p vector of pile loads.

Equation (3.25) may be written in another form as:

$$\{Qp\} = [Kp] \{Sv\} \quad (3.26)$$

where $[Kp] = [Cp]^{-1}$ is a diagonal matrix of dimension $[n_p * n_p]$ represents soil stiffness due to pile self-settlements. The matrix coefficients are obtained from $(\tan k_i)$.

In the nonlinear analysis of pile group or piled raft, it is required to assess an initial value for the flexibility coefficient Cp_i to start the computation. This value may be estimated from the ratio between pile load Qt and settlement Srg as indicated in Figure 3-3 and Eq. (3.27). It is clear from Figure 3 that for a relative light applied load on the raft, i.e. $Qp \leq Qt$, the analysis can be carried out by this initial value without modification.

where:	
$\tan k_i^{(o)}$	Ratio between Q_t and Srg , [kN/m].
$Cp_i^{(o)}$	Initial flexibility coefficient of pile i due to a unit load on it, [m/kN].
Srg	Settlement at ultimate skin friction, [m].
Q_t	Pile load corresponding to Srg , [kN].

In the analysis, both the raft and the contact area of the supporting medium are divided into elements. For each node in the elements, the contact pressure area around this node may take different shapes according to the natural geometry of the elements around the node. The contact pressure qr_j [kN/m²] at the area around a node j on the raft is replaced by an equivalent contact force Qr_j [kN]. Figure 3-4 shows a shaft element k of a pile i that is influenced by a contact force Qr_j acting on the raft at node j .




Figure 3-4 Settlement $Srs_{k,j}$ in a pile element k due to a contact force Qr_j

Using the same approach described in section 3.2.1 with the same equations, a settlement $Srs_{k,j}$ in a pile element k due to a contact force Qr_j is determined. Then, a uniform settlement $Srs_{i,j}$ along the shaft of pile i can be obtained using numerical integration as the same manner in Eqns (3.3) to (3.5). Finally, settlement $Srb_{i,j}$ in the base of the pile i due to contact force Qr_j is obtained as the same manner in Eq. (3.7). Taking the average of settlements $Srs_{i,j}$ and $Srb_{i,j}$,

gives the settlement in the pile by:

$$Sr_{i,j} = Jr_{i,j} Qr_j \quad (3.28)$$

where Jr_i is the flexibility coefficient of pile i due to a contact force Qr_j on node j on the raft, [m/kN].

For a pile group of n_p piles, settlements in piles due to contact forces is expressed as:

$$\{Sr\} = [Jr] \{Qr\} \quad (3.29)$$

where:

- $\{Sr\}$ n_p vector of settlements in piles due to contact forces on the raft.
- $[Jr]$ $n_p * n_r$ matrix of pile flexibility coefficients due to unit contact forces.
- $\{Qr\}$ n_r vector of contact forces on the raft.

Now the total settlement in a pile i due to all forces in the system of piled raft foundation is given by:

$$\{Sp\} = \{Sb\} + \{Ss\} + \{Sv\} + \{Sr\} \quad (3.30)$$

Substituting Eqns (3.10), (3.23), (3.25) and (3.29) in Eq. (3.30), gives:

$$\{Sp\} = [Fb] \{Qb\} + [Is] \{Qs\} + [Cp] \{Qp\} + [Jr] \{Qr\} \quad (3.31)$$

where:

- $\{Sp\}$ n_p vector of total settlements in piles due to all forces in the system of piled raft foundation.

3.2.3 Raft-pile interaction

Figure 3-5 and Figure 3-6 show the raft-pile interaction for both pile base and shaft. Referring to Figure 5, the settlement $Wb_{i,j}$ [m] in a node i on the raft due to a tip force Qb_j on the base of pile j is given by:

$$Wb_{i,j} = Cb_{i,j} Qb_j \quad (3.32)$$

while the settlement $Ws_{i,j}$ [m] in a node i on the raft due to a skin force Qs_j on pile j as shown in Figure 3-6 is given by:

$$Ws_{i,j} = Cs_{i,j} Qs_j \quad (3.33)$$

where $Cb_{i,j}$ [m/kN] is the flexibility coefficient of node i due to a tip force Qb_j on the base of pile j and $Cs_{i,j}$ [m/kN] is the flexibility coefficient of node i due to a skin force Qs_j on pile j . The flexibility coefficients $Cb_{i,j}$ and $Cs_{i,j}$ are obtained directly from Eq. (3.2) and Eq. (3.13), respectively.

For a raft of n_r nodes Eq. (3.32) can be written in matrix form as:

$$\{Wb\} = [Cb]\{Qb\} \quad (3.34)$$

where:

$\{Wb\}$ n_r vector of settlements in raft nodes due to base forces.

$[Cb]$ $n_r * n_p$ matrix of raft flexibility coefficients due to unit tip forces on piles.

Similarly, Eq. (3.33) for the raft is written as:

$$\{Ws\} = [Cs]\{Qs\} \quad (3.35)$$

where:

$\{Ws\}$ n_r vector of settlements in raft nodes due to skin forces.

$[Cs]$ $n_r * n_p$ matrix of raft flexibility coefficients due to unit skin forces on piles.





Figure 3-5 Settlement $Wb_{i,j}$ in a node i due to a tip force Qb_j on the base of pile j



Mindlin's solution is used to evaluate the settlement in a point within the soil mass due to load acting beneath the surface. Therefore, the solution is applied for pile problems. Also, *Mindlin's* solution is particularly convenient for analyzing raft in piled raft problems where the foundation level in most cases is relatively deep making contact forces acting deeply beneath the surface. In the present analysis, settlements in raft nodes due to contact forces on the raft may be determined from *Mindlin's* solution. In which, flexibility coefficients for a contact force on the raft are obtained from Eq. (3.2). This can be carried out directly for all nodes except the loaded node. The reason is that, at the loaded node $c = z$. Consequently, the first term in the Eq. (3.2) becomes singular when $r = 0$. In this case, Eq. (3.2) can be used but with replacing only the first term by another applicable for the loaded node. The replacement term in Eq. (3.2) is derived by converting the point load to an equivalent uniform load and carrying out the integration over the loaded area. The replacement term in Eq. (3.2) at the corner of a rectangular loaded area when $z = c \neq 0$ after integration becomes:

where:
 a, b Sides of the loaded area, [m].
 and $m = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$

As *Mindlin's* solution with $c = 0$ is equivalent to *Boussinesq's* solution (1885), flexibility coefficient $C_{i,i}$ due to a rectangular uniform loaded area when $z = c = 0$ is obtained from *Boussinesq's* solution as follows:

$$C_{i,i} = \frac{1 - \nu_s^2}{2 \pi E_s} \left(\frac{1}{a} \ln \frac{(m+a)}{(m-a)} + \frac{1}{b} \ln \frac{(m+b)}{(m-b)} \right) \quad (3.37)$$

When calculating the raft-soil flexibility coefficients, Eq. (3.37), Eq. (3.2) or Eq. (3.2) with the modified term in Eq. (3.36) is used. The settlement $W_{r,i}$ [m] in a node i on the raft due to a contact force $Q_{r,j}$ on node j is given by:

$$W_{r,i} = C_{r,i,j} Q_{r,j} \quad (3.38)$$

where:

- $C_{r,i,j}$ Flexibility coefficient of node i due to a contact force $Q_{r,j}$ on node j , [m/kN].
 $C_{r,i,j} = f_{i,j}$ for $i \neq j$
 $C_{r,i,j} = C_{i,i}$ for $i = j$ and $z = c = 0$
 $C_{r,i,j} = f_{i,j}$ with modified term C_I for $i = j$ and $z = c \neq 0$

For a raft of n_r nodes, the settlement in matrix form is expressed as:

$$\{W_r\} = [C_r] \{Q_r\} \quad (3.39)$$

where:

- $\{W_r\}$ n_r vector of settlements in raft nodes due to contact forces on the raft.
 $[C_r]$ $n_r \times n_r$ square matrix of raft flexibility coefficients due to unit contact forces on the raft.
 $\{Q_r\}$ n_r vector of contact forces on the raft.

Equation (3.39) is rewritten as:

$$\{Q_r\} = [K_s] \{W_r\} \quad (3.40)$$

where:

- $[K_s]$ Soil stiffness matrix of the raft, $[K_s] = [C_r]^{-1}$.

The total settlement in the raft due to all forces in the system of piled raft foundation is given by:

$$\{W_t\} = \{W_b\} + \{W_s\} + \{W_r\} \quad (3.41)$$

Substituting Eqns (3.34), (3.35) and (3.39) in Eq. (3.41), gives:

$$\{W_t\} = [C_b] \{Q_b\} + [C_s] \{Q_s\} + [C_r] \{Q_r\} \quad (3.42)$$

where:

$\{W_t\}$ n_r vector of total settlements in the raft due to all forces in the system of piled raft foundation.

3.2.5 Formulation of soil equations

Let the vector $\{S\}$ represents the entire settlements in the raft mesh due to all forces in the system of piled raft foundation. This vector must have the dimension $n=n_p+n_r$ to include settlements in raft nodes and piles together. The vector of entire settlements can be obtained from:

$$\{S\} = \begin{Bmatrix} \{Sp\} \\ \{W_t\} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (3.43)$$

Substituting Eqns (3.31) and (3.42) in Eq. (3.43), gives:

$$\{S\} = \begin{Bmatrix} [Fb]\{Qb\} + [Is]\{Qs\} + [Cp]\{Qp\} + [Jr]\{Qr\} \\ [Cb]\{Qb\} + [Cs]\{Qs\} + [Cr]\{Qr\} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (3.44)$$

or

$$\{S\} = \begin{bmatrix} [Cp] & [0] \\ [0] & [Cr] \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \{Qp\} \\ \{Qr\} \end{Bmatrix} + \begin{Bmatrix} [Fb]\{Qb\} + [Is]\{Qs\} + [Jr]\{Qr\} \\ [Cb]\{Qb\} + [Cs]\{Qs\} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (3.45)$$

Equation (3.45) is written in a simplified form as:

$$\{S\} = [C]\{Q\} + \{Pr\} \quad (3.46)$$

where $\{Pr\}$ is given by:

$$\{Pr\} = \begin{Bmatrix} [Fb]\{Qb\} + [Is]\{Qs\} + [Jr]\{Qr\} \\ [Cb]\{Qb\} + [Cs]\{Qs\} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (3.47)$$

and the term $[C]\{Q\}$ is given by:

$$[C]\{Q\} = \begin{bmatrix} [Cp] & [0] \\ [0] & [Cr] \end{bmatrix} \begin{Bmatrix} \{Qp\} \\ \{Qr\} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (3.48)$$

where:

- $\{Q\}$ n vector of pile loads and contact forces.
 $[C]$ $n*n$ matrix of flexibility coefficients of piles and raft.

Inverting the matrix of flexibility coefficients of piles and raft, Eq. (3.45) becomes:

$$\{Q\} = [K_s]\{S\} - [K_s]\{Pr\} \quad (3.49)$$

or

$$\{Q\} = [K_s]\{S\} - \{Pe\} \quad (3.50)$$

where $[K_s] = [C]^{-1}$ is the soil stiffness matrix of piles and raft and is given by:

$$[K_s] = \begin{bmatrix} [K_p] & [0] \\ [0] & [K_r] \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.51)$$

while the vector $\{Pe\}$ is given by:

$$\{Pe\} = [K_s]\{Pr\} \quad (3.52)$$

where $[K_r]$ represents soil stiffness of the raft alone.

3.2.5.1 Multi-layered soil

Flexibility coefficients described previously can be applied only for isotropic elastic half-space soil medium. For finite layer, flexibility coefficients may be obtained as described by *Poulos & Davis* (1980). As an example, for a point k in a layer of depth h , the flexibility coefficient is then:

$$f_{k,j}(h) = f_{k,j}(\infty) - f_{h,j}(\infty) \quad (3.53)$$

where:

- $f_{k,j}(h)$ Flexibility coefficient for a point k in a layer of depth h due to a unit load on point j , [m/kN].
- $f_{k,j}(\infty)$ Flexibility coefficient for a point k due to a unit load on point j , in a semi-infinite mass, [m/kN].
- $f_{h,j}(\infty)$ Flexibility coefficient for a point within the semi-infinite mass directly beneath k , at a depth h below the surface due to a unit load on point j , [m/kN].

3.2.5.2 Reloading pressure effect

To improve the deformation behavior of the soil, the total settlement of the piled raft is divided into two parts. In the first part the ground will settle according to the reloading modulus of compressibility W_s [kN/m²] until the soil pressure reaches an overburden pressure q_v [kN/m²]. In the second part after reaching the load q_v [kN/m²] the ground will settle more under pressure q_e according to the loading modulus of compressibility E_s [kN/m²] until reaching the average applied pressure q_o [kN/m²]. The reloading pressure effect may be taken into consideration by dividing the flexibility coefficient into two terms (Figure 3-7) such that:

$$f_{k,j} = \frac{q_v}{q_o} f_{k,j}(W_s) + \frac{q_e}{q_o} f_{k,j}(E_s) \quad (3.54)$$

where:

$f_{k,j}(W_s)$ Flexibility coefficient calculated with W_s for a point k due to a unit load on point j , [m/kN].

$f_{k,j}(E_s)$ Flexibility coefficient calculated with E_s for a point k due to a unit load on point j , [m/kN].




Figure 3-7 Loading-settlement diagram

3.2.6 Analysis of rigid piled raft

Figure 3-8 shows a rigid piled raft where in this case the settlement is defined by rigid body translation w_o at the center of the raft and by two rotations θ_x and θ_y about x - and y -axes, respectively.




Figure 3-8 Modeling rigid piled raft

Due to the piled raft rigidity, the following linear relation (plane translation) expresses the settlement S_i at either a node in the raft or a pile that has coordinates (x_i, y_i) from the geometry centroid:

$$S_i = w_o + x_i \tan \theta_y + y_i \tan \theta_x \quad (3.55)$$

Equation (3.55) is rewritten in matrix form for the entire piled raft system as:

$$\{S\} = [X]^T \{\Delta\} \quad (3.56)$$

where:

$\{\Delta\}$ 3 vector of translation w_o and rotations $\tan \theta_y$ and $\tan \theta_x$
 $[X]^T$ $3 \times n$ vector of coordinates x and y .

For equilibrium the following conditions must be satisfied:

- The resultant due to external vertical forces acting on the raft must be equal to the sum of contact forces and pile loads.
- The moment due to that resultant about either x -axis or y -axis must be equal to the sum of moments due to contact forces and pile loads about that axis.

Assuming Q_i is a symbol represents either pile load Q_p or contact force Q_r on the mesh, gives:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} N &= Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3 + \dots + Q_n \\ N \cdot e_x &= Q_1 \cdot x_1 + Q_2 \cdot x_2 + Q_3 \cdot x_3 + \dots + Q_n \cdot x_n \\ N \cdot e_y &= Q_1 \cdot y_1 + Q_2 \cdot y_2 + Q_3 \cdot y_3 + \dots + Q_n \cdot y_n \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.57)$$

where:

N Resultant of applied loads acting on the raft, [kN].
 $N e_x$ Moment due to resultant about x -axis, $M_x = N e_x$, [kN.m].
 $N e_y$ Moment due to resultant about y -axis, $M_y = N e_y$, [kN.m].
 e_x, e_y Eccentricities of the resultant about x - and y -axes, [m].
 x_i, y_i Coordinates of the load Q_i , [m].

Equation (3.57) is rewritten for the entire piled raft foundation in matrix form as:

$$\{N\} = [X] \{Q\} \quad (3.58)$$

where $\{N\}$ is the vector of resultant and moments.

Substituting Eqns (3.50) and (3.56) in Eq. (3.58), gives the following linear system of equations:

$$\{N\} = [X][Ks][X]^T \{\Delta\} - [X]\{Pe\} \quad (3.59)$$

Solving the above system of linear equations, gives w_o , $\tan \theta_x$, and $\tan \theta_y$. Then, substituting these values in Eq. (3.56), after that in Eq. (3.60), gives the following equation to find the n unknown pile loads and contact forces.

$$\{Q\} = [Ks][X]^T \{\Delta\} - \{Pe\} \quad (3.60)$$

Substituting also the values w_o , $\tan \theta_x$ and $\tan \theta_y$ in Eq. (3.56), gives the n settlements.

3.2.7 Analysis of rigid pile group or flexible raft on rigid pile group

Analysis of a rigid pile group of n_p piles using the described nonlinear relation is easier than that of rigid piled raft. In this case the contact forces $\{Qr\}$ and settlements on raft nodes $\{Wt\}$ are omitted from above equations. In this case, the vector $\{Pr\}$ of Eq. (3.47) is given by:

$$\{Pr\} = \{[Fb]\{Qb\} + [Is]\{Qs\}\} \quad (3.61)$$

and the term $[C]\{Q\}$ in Eq. (3.48) is given by:

$$[C]\{Q\} = [Cp]\{Qp\} \quad (3.62)$$

In the case of a flexible raft in which the group of piles acted on by known loads $\{Qp\}$ and $\{Qr\}$, Eq. (3.45) may be used directly to evaluate the settlement of each pile in the group.

3.2.8 Analysis of elastic piled raft

It is possible to treat the raft as an elastic plate on rigid piles. From the finite element analysis of the plate, the equilibrium of the raft is expressed as:

$$[Kg]\{\delta\} = \{P\} - \{Q\} \quad (3.63)$$

where:

- $\{p\}$ $3*n_r$ vector of applied loads and moments on the raft nodes.
- $[Kg]$ $3 n_r*3 n_r$ plate stiffness matrix.
- $\{\delta\}$ $3*n_r$ deformation vector of the raft.

Substituting Eq. (3.50) in Eq (3.63), leads to:

$$[Kg]\{\delta\} = \{P\} - [Ks]\{S\} + \{Pe\} \quad (3.64)$$

Considering compatibility between piled raft displacement δ_i and soil settlement s_i , the

following linear system of equations of the piled elastic raft can be obtained:


$$[[K_s] + [K_g]]\{\delta\} = \{P\} + \{P_e\} \quad (3.65)$$

3.2.9 Iteration method

In this paper, a proposed iteration method is developed to solve the system of linear equations, Eq. (3.59), of piled raft. The main idea of this method is that pile stiffness is determined from load-settlement relation due to self-settlement of pile. This pile stiffness is simply added to that of the raft. The piled raft is solved for each iteration cycle until the compatibility between settlements of raft, piles and soil is achieved. The iteration process of the method can be described in the following steps:

- 1 Generate the flexibility matrices due to pile-pile, pile-raft and raft-soil interactions, $[Fb]$, $[Is]$, $[Cb]$, $[Cs]$, $[Jr]$ and $[Cr]$.
- 2 Find the soil stiffness matrix of the raft due to raft-soil interaction, $[Kr] = [Cr]^{-1}$.
- 3 Using applied load on the raft, assume an average stress on raft nodes and piles then find the initial loads on piles $\{Qp\}$ and the initial forces on raft nodes $\{Qr\}$.
- 4 From the load-settlement curve according to DIN 4014 [5], find the values of:
 - Soil stiffness matrix of the pile $[Kp]$,
 - Tip forces on piles $\{Qb\}$ due to pile loads $\{Qp\}$, and
 - Skin forces on piles $\{Qs\}$ due to pile loads $\{Qp\}$.
- 5 Generate the entire stiffness matrix of piles and raft $[Ks]$ by adding the soil stiffness of the pile $[Kp]$ computed in step 4 to the soil stiffness of the raft $[Kr]$.
- 6 Determine the vector $\{Pr\}$ in Eq. (3.47) due to the contact forces and the computed tip and skin forces on piles in step 4. Then, find the vector $\{Pe\}$ from Eq. (3.52).
- 7 Carry out the analysis of piled raft, Eq. (3.59) for rigid piled raft or Eq. (3.65) for elastic piled raft, to get the pile settlements $\{Sv\}$ and contact forces $\{Qr\}$.
- 8 Compare the settlement from cycle i with that of cycle $i+1$ to find the accuracy of the solution.
- 9 If the accuracy from step 8 is less than a specified tolerance ϵ then from the load-settlement curve according to DIN 4014 [5], determine the new pile loads $\{Qp\}$ due to computed settlements $\{Sv\}$ and go to step 4.

The steps 4 to 9 are repeated until the accuracy reaches to a specified tolerance ϵ , which means that a sufficient compatibility between settlements of piles, raft and soil are achieved in the piles-raft-soil interface.

Figure 3-9 Flowchart of the iteration process in the program *ELPLA*

3.3 Case study: *Messturm* piled raft for the tallest building in Europe

3.3.1 Description of the problem

Messturm was the tallest high-rise building in Europe until 1997, Figure 3-10. The building lies in Frankfurt city in Germany. It is 256 [m] high and standing on a piled raft foundation.



Figure 3-10 *Messturm*¹

¹ [http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Messturm_\(Frankfurt\)](http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Messturm_(Frankfurt))

Using instruments installed inside this foundation, an extensive measuring program was established to monitor the behavior of the building. Because these instruments record raft settlements, raft contact pressures and loads on pile heads and along pile shafts, the building was a good chance for many authors to verify their analysis methods for piled raft. Since *Messturm* was built many authors had studied its behavior. Some of them are *Sommer* (1989), *Sommer & Katzenbach* (1990), *Thaher* (1991), *Sommer et al.* (1991), *EL-Mossallamy* (1996), *Katzenbach et al.* (2000), *Reul & Randolph* (2003) and *Chow & Small* (2005).

Figure 3-11 shows a layout of *Messturm* with the piled raft according to *Chow & Small* (2005). The building has a basement with two underground floors and 60 stories with a total estimated load of 1880 [MN]. The foundation is a square piled raft of 58.8 [m] side founded on Frankfurt clay at a depth 14 [m] under the ground surface. Raft thickness varies from 6 [m] at the middle to 3 [m] at the edge. A total of 64 bored piles with equal diameters of 1.3 [m], are arranged under the raft in 3 rings. Pile lengths vary from 26.9 [m] for the 28 piles in the outer ring to 30.9 [m] for the 20 piles in the middle ring and to 34.9 [m] for the 16 piles in the inner ring. The subsoil at the location of the building consists of gravels and sands up to 8 [m] below the ground surface underlay by layers of Frankfurt clay extending to great depth of more than 100 [m] below the ground surface. The groundwater level lies at 4.75 [m] under the ground surface.

The construction of *Messturm* started in 1988 and finished in 1991. According to *Katzenbach et al.* (2000), the recorded settlement at the center of the raft in March 1990 was 8.5 [cm], while the last recorded settlement in December 1998 was 14.4 [cm] according to *Reul & Randolph* (2003). If *Messturm* stands on a raft only, the expected settlement would be between 35 [cm] and 40 [cm] based on geotechnical studies according to *Sommer* (1989). Therefore, to reduce the settlement, a piled raft was considered where the expected final settlement in this case would be between 15 [cm] and 20 [cm] according to *Sommer & Katzenbach* (1990). Using the available data and results of the *Messturm* piled raft, which have been discussed in details in the previous references, the present piled raft analysis is evaluated and verified. Thus by dealing the piled raft as a rigid foundation where the rigid analysis of piled raft is considered as an easy method to check results of any other complicated models.




Figure 3-11 Layout of Messeturm with piled raft after *Chow & Small* (2005)

3.3.2 Analysis of the piled raft

A series of comparisons are carried out to evaluate the nonlinear analysis of piled raft using DIN 4014 [5] for load-settlement relation. In which, results of other analytical solutions and measurements are compared with those obtained by the present analysis. In the comparisons the present analysis is termed *NPRD*.

Taking advantage of the symmetry in shape, soil and load geometry about both x - and y -axes, the analysis is carried out for a quarter of the piled raft. The raft is divided into elements with maximum length of 2.0 [m] as shown in Figure 3-12. Element sizes in x - and y -directions for a quarter of the raft are:

$$2*2.2+2.69+2*1.74+0.89+3*2.35+2.06+2.65+1.76+2*2.2=29.4 \text{ [m]}.$$

Similarly, piles are divided into elements with 2.0 [m] in maximum length.




Figure 3-12 Mesh of *Messeturm* piled raft with piles (Max. element length = 2.0 [m])

3.3.2.1 Comparison with Randolph's analysis

To examine *NPRD* for the *Messeturm* piled raft, results are compared with those using *Randolph's* analysis, which was carried out by *EL-Mossallamy* (1996). The raft is considered to be rigidly supported on equal rigid piles with an average length equal to 30.15 [m]. A soil layer of $H=90$ [m] with a constant elastic modulus is considered. Two cases of analyses are carried out with two different soil parameters as indicated in Table 3-1. For *NPRD*, the load-settlement relation is determined using an average undrained cohesion of $c_u = 300$ [kN/m²] in both cases. The uplift pressure on the raft due to groundwater is considered to be $P_w=275$ [kN/m²]. Consequently, the total effective applied load on the raft including own weight of the raft and piles is assumed to be $N=1600$ [MN].

Table 3-2 summarizes the results of the immediate and total settlements for *Randolph's* analysis (1994) and *NPRD* while Table 3-3 summarizes the results of the bearing factors of piled raft for both of the analyses. Although the principles of both of the analyses are different, the results indicate a good agreement in settlement and a difference in bearing factor of piled raft ranges from 3.4 [%] to 7.7 [%].

Table 3-1 Soil properties used in *Randolph's* analysis and *NPRD*

Case No.	Undrained conditions		Drained conditions	
	E_s [MN/m ²]	ν_s [-]	E'_s [MN/m ²]	ν'_s [-]
Case 1	70.4	0.5	62.4	0.33
Case 2	91.4	0.5	81.0	0.33

Table 3-2 Settlements s [cm] (*Randolph's* analysis vs. *NPRD*)

Case No.	Immediate		Total	
	<i>Randolph's</i> analysis	<i>NPRD</i>	<i>Randolph's</i> analysis	<i>NPRD</i>
Case 1	13.0	12.9	17.1	18.1
Case 2	10.0	10.1	13.7	14.0

Table 3-3 Bearing factors of piled raft α_{kpp} [%] (*Randolph's* analysis vs. *NPRD*)

Case No.	Immediate		Total	
	<i>Randolph's</i> analysis	<i>NPRD</i>	<i>Randolph's</i> analysis	<i>NPRD</i>
Case 1	35.2	31.8	44	39
Case 2	35.2	27.5	44	38

3.3.2.2 Comparison with *Thaher's* analysis

To analyze piled raft, *Thaher* (1991) had presented an analytical model using equivalent raft method, which was checked by the centrifuge model test results. He applied his model to the *Messeturm* piled raft to assess the rigid settlement.

3.3.3 Soil properties

The average clay properties used in *Thaher's* analysis, can be described as follows:

Modulus of compressibility:

Based on the back analysis presented by *Amann et al.* (1975), the distribution of modulus of compressibility for loading of Frankfurt clay with depth is defined by the following empirical formula:

$$E_s = E_{so} (1 + 0.35 z) \quad (3.66)$$

while that for reloading is:

$$W_s = 70 \left[\text{MN/ m}^2 \right] \quad (3.67)$$

where:

- E_s Modulus of compressibility for loading, $[\text{MN/m}^2]$.
 E_{so} Initial modulus of compressibility, $E_{so}=7 \text{ } [\text{MN/m}^2]$.
 z Depth measured from the clay surface, $[\text{m}]$.
 W_s Modulus of compressibility for reloading, $[\text{MN/m}^2]$.

Undrained cohesion:

The undrained cohesion c_u of Frankfurt clay increases with depth from $c_u=100 \text{ } [\text{kN/m}^2]$ to $c_u=400 \text{ } [\text{kN/m}^2]$ in 70 $[\text{m}]$ depth under the clay surface according to *Sommer & Katzenbach* (1990). To carry out *NPRD* an average undrained cohesion of $c_u=300 \text{ } [\text{kN/m}^2]$ is considered.

Poisson's ratio:

Poisson's ratio of Frankfurt clay is taken to be $\nu_s=0.25 \text{ } [-]$.

Empirical with numerical modeling pile group and piled raft

To carry out the analysis, the subsoil under the raft is considered as indicated in the boring log of Figure 3-13 that consists of 10 soil layers. The total depth under the ground surface is taken to be 102.83 [m].




Figure 3-13 Boring log

Table 3-4 lists the results of settlement, bearing factor of piled raft and tip resistance obtained by *NPRD* compared with those obtained by *Thaher* (1991). The table shows that settlement and bearing factor of piled raft for the both analyses are nearly the same. Only, a difference of $0.6 \text{ [MN/m}^2\text{]}$ in the maximum tip resistance is found.

In Table 3-5, load on each pile in inner, middle and outer rings obtained by both *NPRD* and the centrifuge model test by *Thaher* (1991) are shown. Also, the table includes the measured total pile loads after the completion of the structural frame, which presented by *Sommer et al.* (1991). The table indicates that results are in a good agreement.

Also, Table 3-5 shows that the piles transfer the load to the soil mainly by skin friction, as observed from the measurements (*Katzenbach et al.* (2000)). The measurements indicated that the load distribution within the pile group is quite homogeneous. This behavior is also noticed in *NPRD* not only for the pile load but also for the pile settlement.

As shown in Table 3-6, *NPRD* can introduce the individual settlement in the pile due to pile load itself or due to pile-pile and pile-raft interactions. Table 3-6 shows that the most of the settlement is due to self settlement of the pile compared with the settlement due to pile-pile and pile-raft interactions for loading or reloading. The self-settlement of the pile ranges between 52 [%] and 55 [%] of the total settlement in the pile.

Table 3-4 Comparison between results obtained by *Thaher's* analysis with those obtained by *NPRD*

Analysis	Settlement s_r [cm]	Bearing factor α_{kpp} [%]	Min. tip resistance [MN/m ²]	Max. tip resistance [MN/m ²]
<i>Thaher's</i> analysis	19.00	40.00	1	1.5
<i>NPRD</i>	18.77	40.44	1	2.1

Table 3-5 Pile load for *NPRD*, centrifuge model test and measured results

Pile ring	<i>NPRD</i>			Total pile load from centrifuge model test [MN]	Measured total pile load [MN]
	Tip force [MN]	Shaft force [MN]	Total pile load [MN]		
Inner ring	2.71	8.55	11.26	14	11
Middle ring	2.74	7.57	10.31	13	13
Outer ring	2.72	6.59	9.31	10	10

Table 3-6 Settlement in piles

Pile ring	Self settlement s_p [cm]	Settlement due to pile-pile and pile-raft interactions		Total settlement s_r [cm]	Self/Total s_p/s_r [%]
		Loading s_e [cm]	Reloading s_w [cm]		
Inner ring	9.75	4.97	4.05	18.77	52
Middle ring	10.29	4.78	3.70	18.77	55
Outer ring	9.86	5.10	3.81	18.77	53

Comments:

The maximum difference between the settlement in step i and next step $i+1$ is considered as an accuracy number. In this case study, the accuracy number was chosen to be 0.0001 [cm].

For a single run of analysis, the results were obtained in relatively short time (17 [Sec] for analysis a and 1.2 [Min] for analysis b using Pentium 4 PC with 512 MB RAM). This is related to the following parameters:

- Flexibility coefficients due to pile-pile interaction are determined only for two forces; shaft and base forces.
- As the settlement due to load on pile itself is determined from DIN 4014 [5], it can be without numerical problems using closed form equations to determine flexibility coefficients instead of equations that must be evaluated by numerical integration.
- There is no need to determine a global stiffness matrix for the soil since the flexibility matrix is generated every step in the iteration cycle.
- Instead of determining flexibility coefficients due to pile-pile interaction from settlement equations, the coefficients are determined from the load-settlement relation according to DIN 4014 [5].

This case study shows that *NPRD* is not only an acceptable method to analyze piled raft but also a practical one for analyzing large piled raft problems. Beside that *NPRD* gives a good agreement with previous theoretical and empirical nonlinear analyses of piled raft, it takes less computational time compared with other complicated models using three dimension finite element analysis. As further comparative example to proof that, an analysis of Messeturm using three dimensional finite element analysis after *Randolf* (1994) and *Reul & Randolf* (2003) gave a settlement of 17.4 [cm] at the center while that of *NPRD* gave 18.77 [cm].

3.4 References

- [1] *Amann, P./ Breth, H./ Stroh, D.*: Verformungsverhalten des Baugrundes beim Baugrubenaushub und anschließendem Hochhausbau am Beispiel des Frankfurter Ton. Mitteilungen der Versuchsanstalt für Bodenmechanik und Grundbau der Technischen Hochschule Darmstadt, Heft 15 (1975)
- [2] *Basile, F.*: Non-Linear analysis of pile groups
Proc. Instn Civ. Engrs Geotech. Engng, 137, (1999) 105-115
- [3] *Basile, F.*: Analysis and design of pile groups
Numerical Analysis and Modelling in Geomechanics,
Spon press (eds J. W. Bull), London, Chapter 10 (2003), pp 278-315
- [4] *Chow, H./ Small J.*: Behaviour of Piled Rafts with Piles of Different Lengths and Diameters under Vertical Loading
GSP 132 Advanced in Deep Foundations, ASCE (2005)
- [5] DIN 4014: Bohrpfähle Herstellung, Bemessung und Tragverhalten
Ausgabe März 1990
- [6] *Duncan, J./ Chang, C.*: Non-linear analysis of stress and strain in soils
Journal of Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering Division, Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, 96, No. SM5 (1970), pp. 1121-1124
- [7] ECP 197: Egyptian Code for Soil Mechanics-Design and Construction of Foundations Part 4, Deep Foundations (in Arabic) (1995)
- [8] *El Gendy, M./ Hanisch, J./ Kany, M.* (2006): Empirische nichtlineare Berechnung von Kombinierten Pfahl-Plattengründungen.
Bautechnik 9/06
- [9] *Kany, M./ El Gendy, M./ El Gendy, A.*: Benutzerhandbuch für das Programm ELPLA (einige Bunden in das Programmsystem GEOTEC), Zirndorf (2006)
- [10] *Katzenbach, R./ Arslan, U./ Moormann, C.*: Piled raft foundation projects in Germany Chapter 13 in: Design application of raft foundations, Edited by Hemsley, Thomas Telford (2000)
- [11] *Mandolini, A./ Viggiani, C.*: Settlement of piled foundations
Géotechnique, 47, No. 4 (1997), 791-816
- [12] *Mindlin, R.*: Force at a point in the interior of a semi-infinite-solid
Physics 7 (1936), S. 195-202
- [13] *EL-Mossallamy, Y.*: Ein Berechnungsmodell zum Tragverhalten der Kombinierten Pfahl-Plattengründung
Dissertation, Technische Hochschule Darmstadt, Darmstadt, D17, (1996)
- [14] *Poulos, H./ Davis, E.*: Pile Foundation Analysis and Design
John Wiley & Sons, Inc., (1980)
- [15] *Randolph, M.F.*: Design methods for pile groups and pile rafts
XXX ICSMFE (1994), New Dehli, India, Rotterdam Balkema Vol. 4, S. 61-82
- [16] *Reul, O./ Randolph, M.*: Piled rafts in overconsolidated clay: comparison of in situ measurements and numerical analyses
Géotechnique 53, No. 3 (2003), 301-315
- [17] *Russo, G.*: Numerical analysis of piled raft
Int. J. Numer. Anal. Meth. Geomech., 22 (1998), 477-493
- [18] *Sommer, H.*: Entwicklung der Hochhausgründungen in Frankfurt/ Main

- Festkolloquium 1989, 20 Jahre Grundbauinstitut, Darmstadt (1989)
- [19] *Sommer, H./ Katzenbach, R.*: Last-Verformungsverhalten des Messeturmes Frankfurt/Main Vorträge der Baugrundtagung 1990 in Karlsruhe (1990), Seite 371-380
- [20] *Sommer, H./ Tamaro, G./ DeBenedittis, C.*: Messe Turm, foundation for the tallest building in Europe 4th International Conference on Piling and Deep Foundations, Italy (1991), 139-145
- [21] *Thaher, M.*: Tragverhalten von Pfahl-Platten-Gründungen im bindigen Baugrund, Berechnungsmodelle und Zentrifugen-Modellversuche
Dissertation, Institut für Grundbau der Ruhr-Universität, Bochum, Heft 15 (1991)
- [22] *Viggiani, C.*: Pile groups and pile raft behaviour
Proc. of the 3rd int. Geot. Sem. on Deep Foundations on Bored and Auger Piles
Ghent, Belgien 19.-21- Oct. 1998. Balkema Rotterdam, S. 77-91
- [23] *Witzel, M./ Kempfert, H. G.*: A simple approach to predict the load settlement behavior of precast driven piles with due consideration of the driving process
GSP 132 Advanced in Deep Foundations, Proceeding of Sessions of the Geo-Frontiers 2005 Congress, Austin, Texas, ASCE (2005)
- [24] Richtlinie für den Entwurf, die Bemessung und den Bau von Kombinierten Pfahl-Plattengründungen (KPP) - (KPP-Richtlinie); Hrg. Arbeitskreis "Pfähle" der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Geotechnik e.V. (DGGT), Juli 2001.
Enthalten in: Kombinierte Pfahl-Plattengründungen; Hrg. Hanisch, J, Katzenbach, R., König, G.; Ernst & Sohn (2002).

Chapter 4

Analyzing friction piles in clay soil

Table of Contents

	Page
4 Analyzing friction piles in clay soil	4
4.1 Introduction	4
4.2 Numerical Modeling	6
4.2.1 Formulation of stress coefficients	6
4.2.2 Modeling single pile	14
4.2.3 Modeling pile groups and piled raft	17
4.3 Numerical Results	20
4.3.1 Test example: Verification of a piled raft on a deeply extended clay layer	20
4.3.2 Case study 1: Piled raft of <i>Stonebridge</i> Tower	22
4.3.3 Case study 2: Piled raft of <i>Dashwood</i> House	26
4.4 References	29

Chapter 4

4 Analyzing friction piles in clay soil

4.1 Introduction

Settlements of a foundation may be calculated using either flexibility or stress coefficients-technique. Analyzing foundation on elastic soil layers may be carried out using flexibility coefficients-technique, while that on consolidated soil is preferred to carry out by stress coefficients-technique. In this case, compression index of the soil is used to define the consolidation characteristics of the clay. It is known that the compression index C_c , which is obtained from the e -log σ (e : void ratio, σ : consolidation pressure) curve of the consolidation test, will be the same for any stress range on the linear part of the curve, while the coefficient of volume change mv (inverse of the modulus of compressibility $E_s=1/mv$) will vary according to the stress range (Figure 4-1). Therefore, to calculate the real consolidation settlement for a thick clay layer and because the stress from the foundation varies with depth, a variable modulus of compressibility must be obtained, even for homogenous layer.




Figure 4-1 Void ratio-stress relationship

The problem when analyzing a foundation on clay layer is that determination of the non-linear increment of the vertical stress on the layer due to the unknown contact pressure at the soil-pile interface. *Griffiths* (1984) presented charts for average vertical stress increment beneath a corner of a uniformly loaded rectangular area based on numerical integration of existing solutions. *Masih* (1993) and (1994) considered the effect of settlement caused by cohesive soil consolidation on the structure. The analysis dealt with elastic spreaded footings using one-point method. *El Gendy* (2003) introduced an analysis of rigid circular raft on a finite clay layer by calculating the stress at mid-depth of soil element. Increment of vertical stress is obtained by numerical integration. *El Gendy* (2006) developed stress coefficients for triangular loaded elements and point load acting on the entire clay sub-layer through closed

form equations. These coefficients can be used for any irregular shape of foundations on multi-clay layers. Analyses carried out by the methods mentioned previously were applied on spaced footings and rafts on clay.

The problem of raft on clay soil taking into account soil-structure interaction is a complicated nonlinear problem as shown by *EL Gendy* (2006). It will be more complicated for piled raft. This is because the increment of stress in soil depends on the unknown contact pressure at the soil-pile-raft interface. In rigid piled raft, the contact pressure distribution at the soil-pile-raft interface on a homogenous soil layer is independent from elastic properties of the soil. This advantage reduces considerably the analysis if the contact pressure is obtained from other available solution. In this case half of the problem is solved. Consequently, using the known contact pressure from other analysis, enables to derive a practical solution for single pile, pile groups, piled raft on clay soil.

El Gendy (2007) presented a numerical procedure to determine the magnitude of consolidation settlement of friction piles in clay soil using stress coefficients-technique. He derived closed form equations for determining the increment of non-linear stress in clay layers caused by contact forces generated at the pile-soil interface. Using these stress coefficients, an analysis for analyzing single pile, pile groups and piled raft on clay soils to predict the consolidation settlement may be carried out. In the analysis, the contact pressure is obtained from the elastic solution of the problem. This enables to determine the nonlinear increment of stress in the soil layers. Consequently, the consolidation settlement can be calculated using the compression index and void ratio parameters. The computation may be carried out only at one point on the raft to get the settlement.

This chapter described stress coefficients developed by *El Gendy* (2007) to determine the magnitude of consolidation settlement of friction piles in clay soil. Friction pile is analyzed as single pile or as a member in pile groups or piled raft. However, these coefficients can be applied on elastic or rigid piled raft, only the rigid piled raft will be used to show the validity of the method. Furthermore, piled rafts is usually used for high structure with high rigidity. Analysis of elastic piled raft may be carried out similar to that of rafts on multi-clay layers proposed by *El Gendy* (2006).

4.2 Numerical Modeling

4.2.1 Formulation of stress coefficients

In the analysis, the pile is divided into a number of shaft elements with m nodes and a circular base as shown in Figure 4-2a. To carry out the analysis, pile shaft elements are represented by line elements as indicated in Figure 4-2b. All stresses acting on shaft elements and on the base are replaced by a series of concentrated forces acting on line nodes.




Figure 4-2 Pile geometry and elements

The pioneer authors of pile analysis such as *Poulos & Davis* (1968) and *Butterfield & Banerjee* (1971) integrated numerically coefficients of flexibility using *Mindlin's* solution for point load within a semi-infinite mass. Analysis of pile using numerical coefficients increases computation time significantly, especially in large pile problems. However, the present analysis depends on stress coefficients determined from elastic theory using *Mindlin's* solution, an analytical derivation of coefficients of stresses is presented. Closed form equations for these coefficients are derived in next paragraphs.

4.2.1.1 Stress coefficient $c_{i,j}(k)$ of layer k at point i due to a unit force on the point j

It is convenient when calculating consolidation settlement to consider the stress occurs on the vertical direction only. In this case *Poisson's* ratio of the soil may be eliminated from stress

equations. Stress coefficient can be derived from *Mindlin's* equation for determining the displacement when omitting *Poisson's* ratio from this equation. The displacement at point i due to a point load acting at point j beneath the surface in a semi-infinite mass (Figure 4-3) is expressed as:

$$w(z)_i = \frac{Q_j}{E_s} I_{i,j}(z) \quad (4.1)$$

where:

- E_s Modulus of elasticity of the soil, [kN/m²].
- Q_j Point load acting at point j in the soil mass, [kN].
- $w(z)_i$ Displacement in point i at depth z under the surface, [m].
- $I_{i,j}(z)$ Displacement factor of a node i at depth z under the surface due to a load at point j , [1/m].




Figure 4-3 Geometry of *Mindlin's* problem

The displacement factor $I_{i,j}(z)$ when eliminating *Poisson's* ratio is given by:

$$I_{i,j}(z) = \frac{1}{8\pi} \left(\frac{3}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z-c)^2}} + \frac{5}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z+c)^2}} + \frac{(z-c)^2}{\left(r^2 + (z-c)^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{3(z+c)^2 - 2cz}{\left(r^2 + (z+c)^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{6cz(z+c)^2}{\left(r^2 + (z+c)^2\right)^{\frac{5}{2}}} \right) \quad (4.2)$$

where:

- c Depth of the point load Q_j from the surface, [m].
- z Depth of the studied point i from the surface, [m].
- r Radial distance between points i and j , [m].

For a finite layer k (Figure 4-4), the displacement in the entire layer may be obtained from:

$$w(k)_i = w(z_1)_i - w(z_2)_i \quad (4.3)$$

where:

- $w(k)_i$ Displacement in a layer k beneath i , [m].
- $w(z_1)_i$ Displacement in semi-infinite mass beneath i , at a depth z_1 under the surface, [m].
- $w(z_2)_i$ Displacement in semi-infinite mass beneath i , at a depth z_2 under the surface, [m].
- z_1 Start depth of the soil layer k from the surface, [m].
- z_2 End depth of the soil layer k from the surface, [m].

Displacement in a soil layer k may be also expressed as:

$$w(k)_i = \frac{1}{E_s} \delta \sigma_{i,j}(k) h \quad (4.4)$$

where:

- $\delta \sigma_{i,j}(k)$ Stress in a soil layer k beneath i due to a load at point j , [kN/m²].
- h Thickness of the soil layer k , [m]




Figure 4-4 Settlement in a soil layer (k)

The stress $\delta\sigma_{i,j}(k)$ in the soil layer can be obtained by Equating Eq. (4.3) to Eq. (4.4), which leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\sigma_{i,j}(k) = \frac{Q_j}{h} \frac{1}{8\pi} & \left(\frac{3}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z_1 - c)^2}} + \frac{5}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z_1 + c)^2}} + \frac{(z_1 - c)^2}{(r^2 + (z_1 - c)^2)^{3/2}} \right. \\ & + \frac{3(z_1 + c)^2 - 2cz_1}{(r^2 + (z_1 + c)^2)^{3/2}} + \frac{6cz_1(z_1 + c)^2}{(r^2 + (z_1 + c)^2)^{5/2}} - \frac{3}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z_2 - c)^2}} - \frac{5}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z_2 + c)^2}} \\ & \left. - \frac{(z_2 - c)^2}{(r^2 + (z_2 - c)^2)^{3/2}} - \frac{3(z_2 + c)^2 - 2cz_2}{(r^2 + (z_2 + c)^2)^{3/2}} - \frac{6cz_2(z_2 + c)^2}{(r^2 + (z_2 + c)^2)^{5/2}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Equation (4.5) is rewritten in a simple form as:

$$\delta\sigma_{i,j}(k) = \frac{1}{h} [I_{i,j}(z_1) - I_{i,j}(z_2)] Q_j \quad (4.6)$$

or

$$\delta\sigma_{i,j}(k) = c_{i,j}(k) Q_j \quad (4.7)$$

where:

$I_{i,j}(z_1)$ Displacement factor due to a load at point j in semi-infinite mass beneath i , at a depth z_1 under the surface, $[1/m^2]$.

$I_{i,j}(z_2)$ Displacement factor due to a load at point j in semi-infinite mass beneath i , at a depth z_2 under the surface, $[1/m^2]$.

$c_{i,j}(k)$ Stress coefficient for a layer k beneath i due to a unit load at point j , $[1/m^2]$.

The stress coefficient $c_{i,j}(k)$ is given by:

$$c_{i,j}(k) = \frac{1}{8\pi h} \left(\frac{3}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z_1 - c)^2}} + \frac{5}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z_1 + c)^2}} + \frac{(z_1 - c)^2}{(r^2 + (z_1 - c)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{3(z_1 + c)^2 - 2cz_1}{(r^2 + (z_1 + c)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{6cz_1(z_1 + c)^2}{(r^2 + (z_1 + c)^2)^{\frac{5}{2}}} - \frac{3}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z_2 - c)^2}} - \frac{5}{\sqrt{r^2 + (z_2 + c)^2}} \right. \\ \left. - \frac{(z_2 - c)^2}{(r^2 + (z_2 - c)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} - \frac{3(z_2 + c)^2 - 2cz_2}{(r^2 + (z_2 + c)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} - \frac{6cz_2(z_2 + c)^2}{(r^2 + (z_2 + c)^2)^{\frac{5}{2}}} \right) \quad (4.8)$$

4.2.1.2 Stress coefficient $f_{i,b}(k)$ of a layer k at node i due to a unit force on the base b

Replacing the radial distance r in Eq. (4.8) by the radius of the base r_o [m], gives the stress coefficient $f_{i,b}(k)$ of a layer k at node i due to a unit force $Q_b = 1$ [kN] acting on the base b .

4.2.1.3 Stress coefficient $f_{b,b}(k)$ of a layer k at the base b due to a unit force on the base itself

The base b of the pile has a circular loaded area of radius r_o [m] and a uniform load $q = Q_b / \pi r_o^2$ [kN/m²] as shown in Figure 4-5. The stress coefficient $f_{b,b}(k)$ of a layer k at the base center b due to a unit load $Q_b = 1$ [kN] at the base itself can be obtained from:

$$f_{b,b}(k) = \frac{1}{\pi r_o^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{r_o} \frac{1}{h} [I_{i,j}(z_1) - I_{i,j}(z_2)] r dr d\theta \quad (4.9)$$

The integration of the stress coefficient can be obtained analytically as:

$$f_{b,b}(k) = \frac{1}{4\pi r_o^2 h} \left(5 \left[\sqrt{r_o^2 + 4c^2} - 2c \right] + 10c^2 \left[\frac{1}{2c} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_o^2 + 4c^2}} \right] - \frac{8c^4}{(r_o^2 + 4c^2)^{3/2}} \right. \\ \left. - 5 \left[\sqrt{r_o^2 + 4h^2} - 2h \right] - 10h^2 \left[\frac{1}{2h} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_o^2 + 4h^2}} \right] + \frac{8h^4}{(r_o^2 + 4h^2)^{3/2}} \right) \quad (4.10)$$




Figure 4-5 Geometry of the base to find the stress coefficient $\delta(k)_{b,b}$ at the center

4.2.1.4 Stress coefficient $f_{i,j}(k)$ of a layer k at node I due to a unit shear force on a node shaft j

To avoid the significant computations when determining the stress coefficients due to shaft stress, the shaft stress τ [kN/m²] is replaced by an equivalent line load. The shaft element j of the pile has a length l [m] and a line load $T = Qs_j / l$ [kN/m] as shown in Figure 4-6. The stress coefficient $f_{i,j}(k)$ for a layer k at a node i due to a unit load $Qs_j = 1$ [kN] at a shaft element j can be obtained from:

$$f_{i,j}(k) = \frac{l}{l} \int_{l_1}^{l_2} \frac{1}{h} [I_{i,j}(z_1) - I_{i,j}(z_2)] dc \quad (4.11)$$

The integration yields to:

$$f_{i,j}(k) = \frac{1}{8\pi l h} (I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5) \quad (4.12)$$

where terms I_1 to I_5 are given by:

$$I_1 = 3 \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 - l_2)^2} - (z_1 - l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 - l_1)^2} - (z_1 - l_1)} \right] - 3 \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 - l_2)^2} - (z_2 - l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 - l_1)^2} - (z_2 - l_1)} \right] \quad (4.13)$$

$$I_2 = 5 \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_2)^2} + (z_1 + l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_1)^2} + (z_1 + l_1)} \right] - 5 \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_2)^2} + (z_2 + l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_1)^2} + (z_2 + l_1)} \right] \quad (4.14)$$

$$I_3 = \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 - l_2)^2} - (z_1 - l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 - l_1)^2} - (z_1 - l_1)} \right] + \frac{z_1 - l_2}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 - l_2)^2}} - \frac{z_1 - l_1}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 - l_1)^2}} \\ - \ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 - l_2)^2} - (z_2 - l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 - l_1)^2} - (z_2 - l_1)} \right] - \frac{z_2 - l_2}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 - l_2)^2}} + \frac{z_2 - l_1}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 - l_1)^2}} \quad (4.15)$$

$$I_4 = 3 \left(\ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_2)^2} + (z_1 + l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_1)^2} + (z_1 + l_1)} \right] - \frac{(z_1 + l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_2)^2}} + \frac{(z_1 + l_1)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_1)^2}} \right) \\ - 2 z_1 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_1)^2}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_2)^2}} + \frac{z_1 (z_1 + l_1)}{r_1^2 \sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_1)^2}} - \frac{z_1 (z_1 + l_2)}{r_1^2 \sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_2)^2}} \right) \\ - 3 \left(\ln \left[\frac{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_2)^2} + (z_2 + l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_1)^2} + (z_2 + l_1)} \right] - \frac{(z_2 + l_2)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_2)^2}} + \frac{(z_2 + l_1)}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_1)^2}} \right) \\ + 2 z_2 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_1)^2}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_2)^2}} + \frac{z_2 (z_2 + l_1)}{r_1^2 \sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_1)^2}} - \frac{z_2 (z_2 + l_2)}{r_1^2 \sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_2)^2}} \right) \\ I_5 = \frac{6 z_1 [r_1^4 - z_1 (z_1 + l_2)^3]}{3 r_1^2 [r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_2)^2]^{3/2}} - \frac{6 z_1 [r_1^4 + z_1 (z_1 + l_1)^3]}{3 r_1^2 [r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_2)^2]^{3/2}} - \frac{6 z_1}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_2)^2}} + \frac{6 z_1}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_1 + l_1)^2}} \\ - \frac{6 z_2 [r_1^4 - z_2 (z_2 + l_2)^3]}{3 r_1^2 [r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_2)^2]^{3/2}} + \frac{6 z_2 [r_1^4 + z_2 (z_2 + l_1)^3]}{3 r_1^2 [r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_2)^2]^{3/2}} + \frac{6 z_2}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_2)^2}} - \frac{6 z_2}{\sqrt{r_1^2 + (z_2 + l_1)^2}} \quad (4.17)$$

where:

l_1 Start depth of the line load T or the shear stress τ from the surface, [m].

l_2 End depth of the line load T or the shear stress τ from the surface, [m].

- l Length of the line load T or the shear stress τ , [m].
 r_1 Radial distance between point i and j [m].




Figure 4-6 Geometry of line load to find the stress coefficient $\delta(k)_{i,j}$ at the center

4.2.1.5 Stress coefficient $f_{b,j}(k)$ of a layer k at the base b due to a unit shear force on a node shaft j

The pile has a radius r_o [m], while the shaft element j has a length l [m] and a shear stress $\tau = Qs_j / 2 \pi r_o l$ [kN/m²] as shown in Figure 4-7. The stress coefficient $f_{b,j}(k)$ of a layer k at the base center b due to a unit load $Qs_j = 1$ [kN] at a shaft element j can be obtained from:

$$f_{b,j}(k) = \frac{l}{2 \pi l} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{l_1}^{l_2} \frac{1}{h} [I_{i,j}(z_1) - I_{i,j}(z_2)] dc d\theta \quad (4.18)$$

The integration yields to:

$$f_{b,j}(k) = \frac{1}{8 \pi l} (J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4 + J_5) \quad (4.19)$$

Replacing r_1 by r_o in Eqns (4.13) to (4.17), gives terms J_1 to J_5 .




Figure 4-7 Geometry of cylindrical surface stress to find the stress coefficient $\delta(k)_{b,j}$ at the center

4.2.2 Modeling single pile

4.2.2.1 Increment of vertical stress

A deeply extended clay layer is considered to simulate the half-space soil medium. The layer is subdivided into l sub-layers of equal thickness as shown in Figure 4-8. The increment of vertical stress in a soil layer k at a point i is attributed to stresses caused by all contact forces on that layer.




Figure 4-8 Pile in a deeply extended clay layer

Considering a point i lies on the pile axis, the increment of vertical stress in a soil layer k due to shear forces on all m nodes and due to the base force is expressed as:

$$\Delta\sigma(k) = \sum_{j=1}^m f_{i,j}(k) Qs_j + f_{i,b}(k) Qb \quad (4.20)$$

where:

$\Delta\sigma(k)$ Increment of vertical stress in a soil layer k at pile i , [kN/m²].

Qs_j Shear force on node j , [kN].

Qb Force on the base b , [kN].

4.2.2.2 Consolidation settlement

Using clay properties C_c and e_o , the consolidation settlement due to all contact forces on a pile is given by:

$$S_c = \frac{C_c h}{1 + e_o} \sum_{k=1}^l \log \left(\frac{\sigma_o(k) + \Delta\sigma(k)}{\sigma_o(k)} \right) \quad (4.21)$$

where:

- S_c Consolidation settlement of the pile i , [m].
- C_c Compression index, [-].
- e_o Initial void ratio, [-].
- $\sigma_o(k)$ Initial overburden pressure in a layer k , [kN/m²].
- l Number of clay layers

4.2.2.3 Contact pressure along the pile

Due to the natural geometry of the pile where the length is much greater than the diameter, the pile in vertical direction can be considered as a rigid body. In rigid body motion, points on the rigid body move downward with a constant displacement. Many authors solved the problem of contact pressure distribution that gives a constant displacement in the half-space medium at all points in a rigid pile, some of them are *Poulos & Davis* (1968) and *Butterfield & Banerjee* (1971). It is found that the contact pressure is independent on the elastic constants of the half-space medium. *El Gendy* (2003) showed that the contact pressure distribution under a rigid raft on a finite clay layer is independent from the soil properties. *El Gendy* (2006) showed also that the distribution of contact pressure for rafts on deeply extended clay layer is quite similar to that on half-space medium of elastic layer. This concept is used to determine the consolidation settlement of an extensive, homogeneous deposit of clay. The stress causes a constant elastic displacement in the half-space medium must also cause a constant consolidation settlement in a deeply extended clay layer. Therefore, the formula used to determine the contact pressure distribution along a rigid pile on elastic medium is also valid for a rigid pile on consolidated medium using the soil properties C_c and e_o . Consequently, the contact pressure becomes known for the problem. In this case, problem unknowns are considerably reduced to only the uniform consolidation settlement. Available formula used to determine the contact pressure along a rigid pile is presented by *El Gendy* (2007). The contact force on a pile of n nodes, Figure 4-2, is given by:

$$Q_i = \frac{Ph \sum_{j=1}^n k_{i,j}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n k_{i,j}} \quad (4.22)$$

where:

- Q_i Contact force on node i , [kN].
- Ph Force on the pile head, [kN].
- $k_{i,j}$ Stiffness matrix coefficient.

The stiffness matrix coefficients in Eq. (4.22) depends only on the geometry of pile elements and soil layers. To get these coefficients, soil flexibility matrix is generated first with omitting soil elastic properties from flexibility equations by replacing modulus of elasticity by 1 and

Poisson's ratio by 0. Then, inverting flexibility matrix, gives the soil stiffness matrix, which contains the required coefficients.

4.2.3 Modeling pile groups and piled raft

Only piled raft analysis is presented. Freestanding raft is a special case of piled raft without contacting between raft and soil. It can be analyzed in the same manner of piled raft. Consider the piled raft of a centric load shown in Figure 4-9 where the settlement in this case is defined by the rigid body translation S_c at the center (x_c, y_c) of the raft.

4.2.3.1 Increment of vertical stress

Equation (4.20) for the increment of vertical stress in a soil layer k under the center (x_c, y_c) of the piled raft may be rewritten in general form as:

$$\Delta \sigma_c(k) = \sum_{j=1}^n I_{i,j}(k) Q_j \quad (4.23)$$

where:


$\Delta \sigma_c(k)$ Increment of vertical stress in a soil layer k under the center of the raft, [kN/m²].

Q_j Contact force on node j , [kN].


n Total number of contact nodes on the piled raft.

$I_{i,j}(k)$ Stress coefficient for layer k under node i on the raft due to a unit force on node j , [1/m²].

For pile-pile interaction or pile-raft interaction the stress coefficients $I_{i,j}(k)$ are determined from Eq. (4.8) to Eq. (4.19), while those for raft-raft interaction or raft-pile interaction are determined according to *El Gendy* (2006).



a) Piled raft on a deeply extended clay layer



b) Soil settlement

Figure 4-9 Modeling piled raft

4.2.3.2 Consolidation settlement

The consolidation settlement due to all contact forces on the pile under the center of the raft is given by:

$$S_c = \frac{C_c h}{1 + e_o} \sum_{k=1}^l \log \left(\frac{\sigma_o(k) + \Delta\sigma_c(k)}{\sigma_o(k)} \right) \quad (4.24)$$

4.2.3.3 Contact pressure on the piled raft nodes

Similar to Eq. (4.22), the contact force on a node i of the piled raft is given by:

$$Q_i = \frac{N \sum_{j=1}^n k_{i,j}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n k_{i,j}} \quad (4.25)$$

where N is the resultant of applied loads acting on the raft, [kN].

4.3 Numerical Results

4.3.1 Test example: Verification of a piled raft on a deeply extended clay layer

A square raft of a side $L = 10.0$ [m] on a deeply extended clay layer is chosen to verify the present analysis of a piled raft on consolidated clay deposits. The raft is supported by 25 piles. Each pile is 10.0 [m] long and 0.5 [m] diameter. Piles are spaced at 2.0 [m] centers on a square grid as shown in Figure 4-10. The raft is subjected to a centric vertical load of $N = 15$ [MN]. To check the accuracy of the analysis, the raft with piles is analyzed for two different cases:

- 1. Freestanding raft (pile groups)
- 2. Piled raft




Figure 4-10 Mesh of raft with piles

4.3.1.1 Clay properties

The clay is assumed to have the following properties:

Term of compression index and initial void ratio	$C_c/(1+e_o)$	= 0.001	[-]
Dry unit weight of the clay	γ_s	= 18.5	[kN/m ³]

4.3.1.2 Analysis of the raft

Raft is subdivided into 100 square elements; each is 1.0 [m] side, while the pile is subdivided into 5 line elements; each is 2.0 [m] length. The contact pressure distribution along piles and under the raft is obtained with the assumption of a semi-infinite soil layer using the elastic analysis. In consolidation settlement calculation, the clay layer is considered as semi-infinite soil layer when the clay has a deep thickness of $z = 100$ [m]. The clay layer is subdivided into sub-layers each of thickness $h = 20.0$ [m]. Definition of rigid body movement can be used to

verify the analysis. For a rigid body subjected to a vertical centric load, the body moves downward with a uniform displacement. Therefore, the consolidation settlement for the freestanding and piled rafts must be uniform on all points on rafts. In the analysis of raft as rigid body, computing the consolidation settlement at the raft centroid is sufficient. But to check the linearity of the consolidation settlement, settlements are determined for all points on raft.

4.3.1.3 Results and discussions

Consolidation settlements at sections *a* to *c* (Figure 4-10) for the freestanding raft are shown in Figure 4-11, while those for piled raft are shown in Figure 4-12. Although the consolidation settlement is determined under all points on the raft, but the consolidation settlement is distributed linearly under the raft with maximum difference 4 [%] in case of a freestanding raft and 3 [%] in case of piled raft in respect to fitting curves. The piled raft bearing factor is found to be $\alpha_{kpp} = 90$ [%], this is related to arranging piles in narrow distances. Consequently, the difference in consolidation settlements for both cases is small.




Figure 4-11 Consolidation settlement at sections *a* to *c* for freestanding raft




Figure 4-12 Consolidation settlement at sections *a* to *c* for piled raft

4.3.2 Case study 1: Piled raft of *Stonebridge* Tower

Stonebridge piled raft analysis and measurements discussed by *Hemsley* (2000) and reported by *Cooke et al.* (1981) are considered to check the accuracy of the present analysis. *Stonebridge* is a tower of 16-storey floors at *Stonebridge* Park in north London, England. The tower is 43 [m] high. The foundation is rectangular piled raft of area 43.3 [m] by 19.2 [m]. The estimated total load on the raft gives an average applied uniform load of 187 [kN/m²]. Raft thickness is 0.9 [m]. A total of 351 bored piles are located under the raft. All piles have a length of $l = 13$ [m] and a diameter of $D = 0.45$ [m]. Piles are arranged on 1.6 [m] by 1.5 [m] grid. Figure 4-13 shows a mesh of *Stonebridge* raft with piles. The tower is founded on a thick layer of London clay which, at this site, extends to the ground surface. As, the building has no underground floors, raft is located close to the ground surface.

The tower is constructed between 1973 and 1975, the recorded average settlement of the raft was about 1.8 [cm] after four years from the end of construction. Later measurements indicate that differential raft settlement is small. Because the stiffness of the cross-wall superstructure is high. *Padfield & Sharrock* (1983) modeled the raft by plate-bending finite elements, with an equivalent raft thickness of 4.5 [m] to take account of the stiffness of the superstructure. The soil is treated as a multi-layered elastic half-space subjected to loads both at the surface and at depth at the pile locations. Raft-pile interaction is neglected and an iterative process is used to match raft and soil settlement. They obtained a good agreement between the observed and computed results. The foundation of *Stonebridge* is an ideal case study to verify the present analysis because conditions of this piled raft coincide with the assumptions of the present analysis. The piled raft is a full rigid on a deeply extended clay layer. Using available data and results of *Stonebridge* piled raft the present analysis is evaluated and verified for analyzing a piled raft on clay soil.




Figure 4-13 Mesh of *Stonebridge* raft with piles

To show the difference between results when analyzing piled raft of *Stonebridge* by methods used variable soil modulus, piled raft of *Stonebridge* is analyzed by the following methods:

- Nonlinear analysis of **piled raft** using **DIN 4014 (NPRD)**.
- Nonlinear analysis of **piled raft** using **hyperbolic function (NPRH)**.
- Linear analysis of **piled raft (LPR)**.

The method *NPRD* was developed by *El Gendy et al.* (2006), while those of *NPRH* and *LPR* were developed by *El Gendy* (2007).

4.3.2.1 Soil properties

The following section describes all soil parameters and constants those used to carry out the present analysis and other selected methods for comparison. London clay is classified as an overconsolidated clay. The undrained cohesion of London clay increases with depth and can be approximated according to *Hong et al.* (1999) by the following linear relation:

$$c_u = 150 + 6.67z \quad (4.26)$$

where:

- c_u Undrained cohesion of London clay, [kN/m²].
 z Depth measured from the clay surface, [m].

Hong et al. (1999) used a ratio of 200 between the shear modulus and the undrained cohesion to get a variable modulus of the soil. Taking a *Poisson's* ratio of the soil $\nu_s=0.25$ [-], leads to:

$$E_s = E_{so} (1 + 0.0445 z) \quad (4.27)$$

where:

E_s Modulus of compressibility of London clay, [kN/m²].
 E_{so} Initial modulus of compressibility, $E_{so}=75000$ [kN/m²].

A relationship between the modulus of compressibility, compression index and initial void ratio for overconsolidated clay ($\sigma_o + \Delta\sigma_{av} > \sigma_c$) may be expressed as (Mayne & Poulos (1999)):

$$E_s = \frac{(1 + e_o)}{C_r} (\sigma_v) \ln(10) \quad (4.28)$$

where:

C_r Recompression index, [-].
 σ_v Stress in soil, $\sigma_v = \sigma_o + \Delta\sigma_{av}$, [kN/m²].
 σ_c Preconsolidation pressure, [kN/m²].
 $\Delta\sigma_{av}$ Average vertical stress increase in the clay, [kN/m²].

The term of recompression index and initial void ratio can be obtained by equating Eq. (4.28) to Eq. (4.27) directly under piles at $z = 15$ [m]. The average vertical stress increase at this depth may be approximated by distributing the raft pressure in the soil with a slope of 1:2.

Term of recompression index and initial void ratio for the whole layer is given by:

$$\frac{C_r}{(1 + e_o)} = 0.0045 \quad (4.29)$$

To carry out the analysis by the *NPRD* method, an average undrained cohesion of $c_u = 200$ [kN/m²] is considered. Russo (1998) suggested a limited shaft friction not less than 180 [kN/m²] meeting undrained shear strength of 200 [kN/m²]. To carry out the analysis by the *LPR* method, a limit shaft friction of $ql = 180$ [kN/m²], which gives a limiting pile load of $Ql = 3817$ [kN] is assumed. Groundwater in typical London clay lies in within 1.0 [m] from the ground surface (Rickard *et al.* (1985)). The groundwater level is assumed to be lie directly below the raft. Dry unit weight of the clay is taken to be $\gamma_s = 18.5$ [kN/m³].

4.3.2.2 Pile material

To take the weight of the piles in the analysis, the unit weight of the pile material is taken to be $\gamma_b = 25$ [kN/m³].

4.3.2.3 Analysis of the piled raft

As piles are narrow to each other, pile-raft interaction may be neglected and the foundation is analyzed as freestanding raft. Comparisons are carried out to evaluate the present analysis. In which, settlements computed from methods used variable soil modulus and field measurements are compared with that obtained by the present analysis. Piles are subdivided into line elements; each is 3.75 [m] length. The effective depth of the soil layers under the raft is taken to be $H = 100$ [m] for all methods. In the analysis by *NPRD*, *NPRH* and *LPR*

methods, the total layer is subdivided into 10 sub-layers to take the variety of the soil modulus with depth. In the present analysis, the average vertical stress increase is determined in sub-layers of the clay, each of 20 [m] thickness.

4.3.2.4 Comparison with measured settlement

To examine the present analysis for *Stonebridge* piled raft, the computed consolidation settlement is compared with the measured settlement in Table 4-1. The computed settlement was determined at the raft centroid. The table shows a small difference between computed and measured settlement.

Table 4-1 Comparison between measured and computed settlements

Item	Measured settlement	Computed settlement	Difference
Consolidation settlement S_c [cm]	1.8	2.1	+0.3

4.3.2.5 Comparison with methods using variable soil modulus

Figure 4-14 shows the consolidation settlement of piled raft obtained by the present analysis and those obtained by methods using variable soil modulus. Also, the figure includes the measured settlement.

LPR gives the smallest settlements among the others. This was expected, because the settlement from nonlinear analysis is greater than that obtained from linear analysis. However, the contact pressures for the present analysis and *LPR* are the same where they are independent from soil properties but settlements of them are not the same. It can be noticed that the consolidation settlement of the present analysis has a good agreement not only with measured settlement but also with computed settlement of nonlinear analyses using variable soil modulus.




Figure 4-14 Comparison between measured and computed settlements (case study 1)

4.3.3 Case study 2: Piled raft of *Dashwood* House

Hong et al. (1999) applied a method for the analysis of large vertically loaded pile groups using load-transfer curves (*NPRLT*) on the piled raft of *Dashwood*. They compared the computed settlement with that of the field measurement reported by *Hooper* (1979). In this case study, the computed and measured settlements of this piled raft is used to verify the present analysis.

Dashwood is a high building of 15-storey floors with a single storey basement located in north London, England. The building is 61 [m] high. The foundation of the *Dashwood* is a rectangular piled raft of area 43 [m] by 31.5 [m]. The building load including the raft weight is 274 [MN]. A total of 462 bored piles are located under the raft. All piles have a length of $l = 15$ [m] and a diameter of $D = 0.485$ [m]. Piles are arranged on a square grid of 1.5 [m] interval. Figure 4-15 shows the mesh of the raft with piles. The subsoil at the building location consists of 8 [m] of fill, sand and gravel, followed by London clay. The raft is founded on gravel about 1 [m] above the upper clay surface. In their analysis for simplicity, *Hong et al.* (1999) considered the raft resets on the London clay directly.

4.3.3.1 Analysis of the piled raft

Dashwood has the same conditions of *Stonebridge* in respect to the soil, statical system of the structure and piled raft. Considering the same properties of London clay presented in case study 1, the piled raft is analyzed by the present analysis and the selected previously methods. Piles are divided into line elements, each is 3.25 [m] length.




Figure 4-15 Mesh of *Dashwood* raft with piles

4.3.3.2 Comparison with measured settlement

The consolidation settlement is compared with the measured settlement in Table 4-2. The table shows a small difference between computed and measured settlements.

Table 4-2 Comparison between measured and computed settlements

Item	Measured settlement	Computed settlement	Difference
Consolidation settlement S_c [cm]	3.3	2.9	-0.4

4.3.3.3 Comparison with methods using variable soil modulus

Figure 4-16 shows the consolidation settlement of piled raft obtained by the present analysis and those obtained by methods using variable soil modulus. Also, the figure includes the measured settlement and the computed settlement by the *NPRLT* method. From figure, the same conclusions, which presented in the case study 1, is achieved.




Figure 4-16 Comparison between measured and computed settlements (case study 2)

4.4 References

- [1] *Butterfield, R./ Banerjee, P.* (1971): The problem of pile group-pile cap interaction. *Géotechnique*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 351-371.
- [2] *Cook, W./ Bryden-Smith, W./ Gooch, N., Sillett, F.* (1981): Some observation of the foundation loading and settlement of a multi-storey building on a piled raft foundation in London Clay. *Proce. Instn. Civ. Engrs. Part1*.
- [3] *El Gendy, M.* (2003): Numerical Modeling of Rigid Circular Rafts on Consolidated Clay Deposits. *Int. Workshop on Geotechnics of Soft Soils-Theory and Practice*. Vermeer, Schweiger, Karstunen & Cudny (eds.).
- [4] *El Gendy, M.* (2006): Developing stress coefficients for raft-deformation on a thick clay layer. *Scientific Bulletin, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt*. Vol. 41, No. 3, September 2006, pp. 73-108.
- [5] *El Gendy, M./ Hanisch, J./ Kany, M.* (2006): Empirische nichtlineare Berechnung von Kombinierten Pfahl-Plattengründungen. *Bautechnik* 9/06.
- [6] *El Gendy, M.* (2007): Formulation of a composed coefficient technique for analyzing large piled raft. *Scientific Bulletin, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt*. Vol. 42, No. 1, March 2007, pp. 29-56.
- [7] *El Gendy, M.* (2007): Deriving equations for analyzing friction piles in clay soil. *Scientific Bulletin, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt*. Vol. 42, No. 1, March 2007, pp. 1-27.
- [8] *Griffiths, D.* (1984): A chart for estimating the average vertical stress increase in an elastic foundation below a uniformly loaded rectangular area. *Can. Geotech. J.* 21, 710-713.
- [9] *Hooper, J.* (1979): "Review of behaviour of piled raft foundation. *CIRIA Report 83*, pp. 45-54.
- [10] *Hemsley J.* (2000): Design application of raft foundations. *Thomas Telford, London*; Section 18.
- [11] *Hong, D./ Chow, Y./ Yong, K.* (1999): A method for analysis of large vertically loaded pile groups. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Meth. Geomech.*, 23, 243-262.
- [12] *Masih R.* (1993): Structural Stiffness Influence on Soil Consolidation. *Journal of Geotechnical Engineering*; 119 (1): pp. 168-172.
- [13] *Masih R.* (1994): Foundation Uniform Pressure and Soil-Structure Interaction. *Journal of Geotechnical Engineering*; 120 (11): pp. 2064-2071.
- [14] *Mayne, P./ Poulos, H.* (1999): Approximate displacement influence factors for elastic shallow foundations. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 453-459.
- [15] *Padfield, J./ Sharrock, J.* (1983): Settlement of structures on clay soils. *Construction Industry Research and Information Associate, London. CIRIA Spec. Publ*n 27.

- [16] *Poulos, H./ Davis, E.* (1968): The settlement behaviour of single axially loaded incompressible piles and piers.
Géotechnique, Vol. 18, 351-371.
- [17] *Rickard, C./ Manie, B./ Price, G./ Simons, N./ Waedel, I./ Clayton, C.* (1985): Interaction of a piled raft foundation at Basildon, UK.
11th Int. Conf. Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, San Francisco, USA.
- [18] *Russo, G.* (1998): Numerical analysis of piled rafts.
Int. J. Numer. Anal. Meth. Geomech., 22, 477-493.