Organization Designed By Date 11/27/2012

3 level strut example

TBWall Report

Project Information		
Designed By		v
Organization		
Date	11/27/2012	
Project	3 level strut example	🖞 x
JUD #		T T T
Client		
or Struts		
Number of Tieback Levels	Three	a
Units System	ft	
		I I I I R1
Geometry		h a
a	3.0 ft	b
b	6.0 ft	
С	6.0 ft	
d	5.0 ft	R2
-		c β
h	20 0 ft	
	22 0 ft	
E	22.0 10	
Properties		R3 ₽
	20000 kai	δ d
E fv	29000 KSI 50 kci	
ly	50 KSI	↓ _↓
Max. Deflection	0.5 in	0.1h
Beam Shape	W14X68	♥ ♥ ■ ⊲ _{R4}
Tieback Data		
Angle1	0	
Angle?	Ũ	
Andle3	0	
Angles	U	

Organization Designed By Date 11/27/2012 Client Project Job #

3 level strut example

Design Philosophy

The analysis is based on "Equivalent Beam Method" first proposed by Blum and explained in detail in "Foundation Design" Teng, 1962, 1st & only edition or in "Foundation Engineering" Jumikis, 1987 2nd ed.

The design is based on classical structural analysis:

* This program uses classic-beam-theory beam elements to solve the multispan tieback design.

* The equivalent nodal loads for each span are determined by numerical integration of the beam equations to allow for the non uniform loads.

* The equivalent nodal loads, the stiffness matrix, and the support conditions are used to solve for the support reactions and the support rotations.

* The support reactions are then used to numerically integrate the entire span for values to display in the plots, and to find the max/min values.

* Steel Shapes only include compact sections, If noncompact sections are desired, additional design checks are required.

* The deflection output is based on structural analysis but an independent check should be made by Finite Element method or by site surveying.

Client Project 3 Job #	level strut example	
Lower St	rut	
2 Reactions -21.19	on 3 Rea kips -2.7	<u>v ground- only for tiebacks.</u> action 4 '0 kips
12.2 kip at 9. 12.3 kip-at 9. -0.0019 in at	00 ft .00 ft 18.82 ft	
0.61 in2 4.94 in3 0%		Adequate for Shear Adequate for Bending Adequate for Deflection
R1 13.1 kips 15.0 ft 17.5 kips	R2 23.4 kips 15.0 ft 31.1 kips	R3 21.2 kips 15.0 ft 28.2 kips
heck in4 1	Axially- P L K A KL/r Fe	Loaded Member Check 6 kips 5 ft 0.8 20.0 in2 19.5 752 ksi
า า -ft	Fcr Pn/Q	49 ksi 582 kips
	12.20 ft Brac 10.60 ft <mark>requ</mark>	ed Excavation will ire less embedment
	5%	
	Client Project 3 Job # Lower St 2 Reactions -21.19 12.2 kip at 9. 12.3 kip-at 9. -0.0019 in at 0.61 in2 4.94 in3 0% R1 13.1 kips 15.0 ft 17.5 kips heck in4 1 -ft	Client Project 3 level strut example Job # Lower Strut @0.1H below @0.1H below 2 2 Reaction 3 8 -21.19 kips -21.19 kips -2.7 12.2 kip at 9.00 ft 12.3 kip-at 9.00 ft -0.0019 in at 18.82 ft 0.61 in2 4.94 in3 0% R1 R2 13.1 kips 15.0 ft 15.0 ft 17.5 kips 31.1 kips neck Axially-1 P in4 A n KL/r 4 Fe Fcr Fcr n 12.20 ft Fe Fcr 10.60 ft Fract 12.20 ft Bract 5% 5%





SoilStructure.com

Organization Designed By

Date

11/27/2012

3 level strut example

Client

Job #

Project

SoilStructure.com

Organization Designed By Date 1

11/27/2012

3 level strut example

Client

Job #

Project



Organization Designed By Date

11/27/2012

3 level strut example

Client

Project

Job #

