Effects of deep excavations in soft clay on the immediate surroundings–

Analysis of the possibility to predict deformations and reactions against the retaining system

ANDERS KULLINGSJÖ

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Errata

Page	Location[1]	Printed	Corrected
iii	s3 r6	stresses.	stresses).
xi	r3	Normalized vertical stress	Normalized effective vertical stress ratio
xi	r5	stress	stress ratio
xii	r7	K_0-vlaue	K_0-value
xiii	s2 r8-r9 new row		ε_{vol} Volumetric strain
xv	s1 r7	Limit Compression Line	Limit Compression Curve
2	s5 r3-r4	limited.kill in using this method and the understanding of it is often limited.	limited.
7	footnote r1	This stress space e,	This stress space,
7	footnote r4	$t_f=(s'+cot\ \phi')\cdot\ sin\ \phi'$	$t_f=(s'+c'\cdot\ cot\ \phi')\cdot\ sin\ \phi'$
12	footnote r5	*CDSS*-Consolidated for a vertical stress	CK_0DSS-Consolidated for a K_0 stress situation
17	s1 r5	Figure 2.9	Figure 2.9 and Figure 2.10
17	s1 r10	2.0.	2.0. Idealized stress paths considering preconsolidation pressure is sketched in Figure 2.10
18	s1 r1	Figure 2.9	Figure 2.10
18	s2 r1	Figure 2.10	Figure 2.11
19	s2 r1	Figure 2.11	Figure 2.11 and Figure 2.12
35	s1 r3	$Y_2= s_u/\sigma'_{vert}$ and $Y_2= E_i/\sigma'_{vert}/1000$.	$Y_2=s_u/\sigma'_{vert}$ and $Y_3=E_i/\sigma'_{vert}/1000$.
39	Figure 2.27, comment to point 1	followd	followed
46	Eq. 2.28 and 2.29	$=\frac{\sin^2(\alpha+\phi')}{\sin^2(\alpha)\sin(\alpha-\delta)\left[1\pm\sqrt{\frac{\sin(\phi'+\delta)\sin(\phi'-\beta)}{\sin(\alpha-\delta)\sin(\alpha+\beta)}}\right]}$	$=\frac{\sin^2(\alpha+\phi')}{\sin^2(\alpha)\sin(\alpha-\delta)\left[1\pm\sqrt{\frac{\sin(\phi'+\delta)\sin(\phi'-\beta)}{\sin(\alpha-\delta)\sin(\alpha+\beta)}}\right]^2}$
46	s2 r2	vertical	horizontal plane
47	s2 r4	cases a and b	cases a and c
48	s1 r1	earth pressure can	earth pressure can, for a cohesive soil under undrained conditions,
56	s1 r5	N	N_{cb}
56	s1 r16	are conservative	are theoretically conservative
62	s1 r1	from direct shear tests	from direct simple shear tests
67	s1 r1	roots of σ.	roots of σ'.
67	Eq. 3.7	$\sigma'_m= p'=...= I_1/3 = I_1/3$	$\sigma'_m= p'=...= I_1/3$
80	Eq. 3.51 row 3	$...+k_2$	$...+k_3$
89	Figure 5.3b	Section 1/430 north: Instrumentering	Section 1/430 north: Instrumentation
114	s2 r2	decreased by 35 kPa	decreased by 30 kPa
130	s2	The section is to be erased, because of typing-error	
140	s3 r6	keeping the in mean	keeping the mean
141	s1 r7	excpected	expected

[1] s=section, r=rows downwards

Effects of deep excavations in soft clay on the immediate surroundings–

Analysis of the possibility to predict deformations and reactions against the retaining system

ANDERS KULLINGSJÖ

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Errata

Page	Location[1]	Printed	Corrected
iii	s3 r6	stresses.	stresses).
xi	r3	Normalized vertical stress	Normalized effective vertical stress ratio
xi	r5	stress	stress ratio
xii	r7	K_0-vlaue	K_0-value
xiii	s2 r8-r9 new row		ε_{vol} Volumetric strain
xv	s1 r7	Limit Compression Line	Limit Compression Curve
2	s5 r3-r4	limited.kill in using this method and the understanding of it is often limited.	limited.
7	footnote r1	This stress space e,	This stress space,
7	footnote r4	$t_f=(s'+cot\ \phi')\cdot\ sin\ \phi'$	$t_f=(s'+c'\cdot\ cot\ \phi')\cdot\ sin\ \phi'$
12	footnote r5	*CDSS*-Consolidated for a vertical stress	CK_0DSS-Consolidated for a K_0 stress situation
17	s1 r5	Figure 2.9	Figure 2.9 and Figure 2.10
17	s1 r10	2.0.	2.0. Idealized stress paths considering preconsolidation pressure is sketched in Figure 2.10
18	s1 r1	Figure 2.9	Figure 2.10
18	s2 r1	Figure 2.10	Figure 2.11
19	s2 r1	Figure 2.11	Figure 2.11 and Figure 2.12
35	s1 r3	$Y_2= s_u/\sigma'_{vert}$ and $Y_2= E_i/\sigma'_{vert}/1000$.	$Y_2=s_u/\sigma'_{vert}$ and $Y_3=E_i/\sigma'_{vert}/1000$.
39	Figure 2.27, comment to point 1	followd	followed
46	Eq. 2.28 and 2.29	$=\frac{\sin^2(\alpha+\phi')}{\sin^2(\alpha)\sin(\alpha-\delta)\left[1\pm\sqrt{\frac{\sin(\phi'+\delta)\sin(\phi'-\beta)}{\sin(\alpha-\delta)\sin(\alpha+\beta)}}\right]}$	$=\frac{\sin^2(\alpha+\phi')}{\sin^2(\alpha)\sin(\alpha-\delta)\left[1\pm\sqrt{\frac{\sin(\phi'+\delta)\sin(\phi'-\beta)}{\sin(\alpha-\delta)\sin(\alpha+\beta)}}\right]^2}$
46	s2 r2	vertical	horizontal plane
47	s2 r4	cases a and b	cases a and c
48	s1 r1	earth pressure can	earth pressure can, for a cohesive soil under undrained conditions,
56	s1 r5	N	N_{cb}
56	s1 r16	are conservative	are theoretically conservative
62	s1 r1	from direct shear tests	from direct simple shear tests
67	s1 r1	roots of σ.	roots of σ'.
67	Eq. 3.7	$\sigma'_m= p'=...= I_1/3 = I_1/3$	$\sigma'_m= p'=...= I_1/3$
80	Eq. 3.51 row 3	$...+k_2$	$...+k_3$
89	Figure 5.3b	Section 1/430 north: Instrumentering	Section 1/430 north: Instrumentation
114	s2 r2	decreased by 35 kPa	decreased by 30 kPa
130	s2	The section is to be erased, because of typing-error	
140	s3 r6	keeping the in mean	keeping the mean
141	s1 r7	excpected	expected

[1] s=section, r=rows downwards

Page	Location[1]	Printed	Corrected
147	Figure 6.14	σ'_c	σ'^{precon}_{vert}
151	Note ** in table 7.1 row 3	and b_2-b_5 =0.	and b_2 to b_5 =0.
153	Eq. 7.14	$KQ_1\dot{\varepsilon} + 2G\boldsymbol{Q}_1 : \dot{\boldsymbol{e}} \begin{cases} \geq 0 \ Loading \\ < 0 \ Unloading \end{cases}$	$KQ_1\dot{\varepsilon}_{vol} + 2G\boldsymbol{Q}_1 : \dot{\boldsymbol{e}} \begin{cases} \geq 0 \ Loading \\ < 0 \ Unloading \end{cases}$
156	s3 r1	Table 7.1 and Table 7.2	Table 7.1 and Table 7.3
158	s1 r5	the red line	the dark grey line
159	s2 r3	the bounding surface.	the bounding surface, which is approximately constant.
160	s2 r8	behaviou	behaviour
162	s3 r2	Table 7.2	Table 7.3
163	Table legend	Table 7.2	Table 7.3
168	Footnote 11 row 2	kepping	keeping
187	Figure 8.8c) and d)	*VCL*	*LCC*
193	s2	The section is to be erased, because of typing-error	
194	s2 r3	model and the empirical	model than by the empirical
198	s1 r10	*VCL*-line	*LCC*-line
206	s2 r7	*m*=2.	*m*=2.5.
220	s2 r1	a_s=0.1	a_s=0.01
223	s2 r3	within this project.	within this project. In Table 8.3 the evaluated parameters are given as well as possible ranges for clays.
223	Table 8.3 heading column 6	Possible range Sweden	Possible range of post glacial clays in Sweden
226	s3 r3	CK_0UC-, CK_0UC- and CK_0UEC- tests	CK_0UPSC-, CK_0UDSS- and CK_0UPSE- tests
228	s2 r1	presente	presented
229	s2 r8-r9	The reason for this is probably the differences in the interpolation functions within these two models.	The differences between *e-ADP* and *NGI-ANI2* is probably due to differences in the interpolation functions used by these two models.
234	s2 r4	4) excavation to level –4.5.	4) excavation to level –4.0.
238	s1 r2	parameter m,	parameter *m*,
252	Note 16 row 3	This gives to no movements	This gives no movements
256	s3 r4	, how much will the retaining system cost. Narrow	, how much will the retaining system cost. As an example the differences in effects on the retaining system is compiled in Table 9.7. Narrow
264	s3 r4	(Bjerrum and Eide, 1956)	the method proposed by Bjerrum and Eide (1956)
269	Figure 9.32	The notation of the different curves is misleading	The notation shall be slightly moved downwards.
273	s4 r4	Andreasson (1979)	Larsson and Mulabdic´ (1991)
290	s2 r5	upper partl of the clay	upper part of the clay
298	Figure 10.18	*Comparison*	*Figure 10.18: Comparison*
313	s2 r11-r12	the stiffness of the props used in the *FE*-design down to 2%	the theoretical stiffness of the props, normally used in the *FE*-design, down to 2%
315	s2 r5	Small strain stiffness	Differences in small strain stiffness

Comments

Figure	5.7	5.8	5.21	5.22	5.23	5.24	10.16	10.17	The notation regarding the name of the bellow hoses is to be changed with one and another
Page	95	97	113	116	118	119	296	297	

Page	Location[1]	Printed	Corrected
147	Figure 6.14	σ'_c	σ'^{precon}_{vert}
151	Note ** in table 7.1 row 3	and b_2-b_5 =0.	and b_2 to b_5 =0.
153	Eq. 7.14	$KQ_1\dot{\varepsilon} + 2G\boldsymbol{Q}_1 : \dot{\boldsymbol{e}} \begin{cases} \geq 0 \ Loading \\ < 0 \ Unloading \end{cases}$	$KQ_1\dot{\varepsilon}_{vol} + 2G\boldsymbol{Q}_1 : \dot{\boldsymbol{e}} \begin{cases} \geq 0 \ Loading \\ < 0 \ Unloading \end{cases}$
156	s3 r1	Table 7.1 and Table 7.2	Table 7.1 and Table 7.3
158	s1 r5	the red line	the dark grey line
159	s2 r3	the bounding surface.	the bounding surface, which is approximately constant.
160	s2 r8	behaviou	behaviour
162	s3 r2	Table 7.2	Table 7.3
163	Table legend	Table 7.2	Table 7.3
168	Footnote 11 row 2	kepping	keeping
187	Figure 8.8c) and d)	*VCL*	*LCC*
193	s2	The section is to be erased, because of typing-error	
194	s2 r3	model and the empirical	model than by the empirical
198	s1 r10	*VCL*-line	*LCC*-line
206	s2 r7	*m*=2.	*m*=2.5.
220	s2 r1	a_s=0.1	a_s=0.01
223	s2 r3	within this project.	within this project. In Table 8.3 the evaluated parameters are given as well as possible ranges for clays.
223	Table 8.3 heading column 6	Possible range Sweden	Possible range of post glacial clays in Sweden
226	s3 r3	CK_0UC-, CK_0UC- and CK_0UEC- tests	CK_0UPSC-, CK_0UDSS- and CK_0UPSE- tests
228	s2 r1	presente	presented
229	s2 r8-r9	The reason for this is probably the differences in the interpolation functions within these two models.	The differences between *e-ADP* and *NGI-ANI2* is probably due to differences in the interpolation functions used by these two models.
234	s2 r4	4) excavation to level –4.5.	4) excavation to level –4.0.
238	s1 r2	parameter m,	parameter *m*,
252	Note 16 row 3	This gives to no movements	This gives no movements
256	s3 r4	, how much will the retaining system cost. Narrow	, how much will the retaining system cost. As an example the differences in effects on the retaining system is compiled in Table 9.7. Narrow
264	s3 r4	(Bjerrum and Eide, 1956)	the method proposed by Bjerrum and Eide (1956)
269	Figure 9.32	The notation of the different curves is misleading	The notation shall be slightly moved downwards.
273	s4 r4	Andreasson (1979)	Larsson and Mulabdic´ (1991)
290	s2 r5	upper partl of the clay	upper part of the clay
298	Figure 10.18	*Comparison*	*Figure 10.18: Comparison*
313	s2 r11-r12	the stiffness of the props used in the *FE*-design down to 2%	the theoretical stiffness of the props, normally used in the *FE*-design, down to 2%
315	s2 r5	Small strain stiffness	Differences in small strain stiffness

Comments

Figure	5.7	5.8	5.21	5.22	5.23	5.24	10.16	10.17	The notation regarding the name of the bellow hoses is to be changed with one and another
Page	95	97	113	116	118	119	296	297	