

ERRATUM

Goodall, S.J. and Merifield, R. S. (2023). Working Platforms and Bearing Capacity Assessments of Sand Overlying Clay Using Finite Element Limit Analysis, *Australian Geomechanics*, Volume 58, Number 3, pp 117-139. [DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56295/AGJ5835>]

Please replace Tables 2, 3, 4 and 6 on pages 125, 126, 127 and 137 respectively:

Table 2: Values of ultimate bearing capacity ($q_u/B \gamma$) rough rigid footings $\phi' = 35^\circ$

D/B	$s_u/\gamma B$	Ultimate bearing capacity ($q_u/B \gamma$)			
		Square Footing ($L/B = 1.0$)	Rectangular Footing ($L/B = 2.0$)	Rectangular Footing ($L/B = 5.0$)	Strip Footing ($L/B = \infty$)
0.25	0.56	3.43	3.28	3.17	2.90
	1.11	5.78	5.75	5.64	5.31
	1.67	7.68	7.83	7.80	7.51
	2.22	9.48	9.97	9.97	9.60
	2.78	11.10	11.74	11.84	11.59
0.5	0.56	5.24	4.54	4.11	3.53
	1.11	7.71	7.06	6.68	5.96
	1.67	9.50	9.09	8.71	8.04
	2.22	11.03	10.76	10.65	9.87
	2.78	12.41	12.14	12.25	11.57
1.0	0.56	12.21	9.27	7.41	5.61
	1.11	15.43	12.50	10.40	8.46
	1.67	17.53	14.72	12.97	10.72
	2.22	18.73	16.63	14.88	12.55
	2.78	19.46	17.47	16.75	14.22
2.0	0.56	18.93	19.11	18.44	11.84
	1.11	18.53	19.11	19.10	15.99
	1.67	18.64	18.37	18.62	16.67
	2.22	18.67	18.81	19.39	16.57
	2.78	18.65	19.13	20.27	16.55
Uniform Sand	-	18.98	19.06	18.92	16.53

Table 3: Values of ultimate bearing capacity ($q_u/B \gamma$) rough rigid footings $\phi' = 40^\circ$

D/B	$s_u/\gamma B$	Ultimate bearing capacity ($q_u/B \gamma$)			
		Square Footing ($L/B = 1.0$)	Rectangular Footing ($L/B = 2.0$)	Rectangular Footing ($L/B = 5.0$)	Strip Footing ($L/B = \infty$)
0.25	0.56	4.03	3.73	3.44	3.17
	1.11	6.92	6.60	6.28	5.85
	1.67	9.57	9.29	8.88	8.38
	2.22	11.95	11.71	11.55	10.88
	2.78	14.18	14.11	13.91	13.21
0.5	0.56	6.93	5.59	4.82	4.01
	1.11	10.22	8.88	8.03	6.85
	1.67	13.26	11.67	10.62	9.59
	2.22	15.74	14.77	13.01	12.04
	2.78	17.87	16.57	15.69	14.40
1.0	0.56	17.55	12.74	9.28	6.69
	1.11	23.92	17.53	13.61	10.39
	1.67	27.79	21.31	17.27	13.55
	2.22	31.68	24.77	20.60	16.35
	2.78	34.73	27.16	23.35	18.99
2.0	0.56	55.80	39.00	25.58	14.45
	1.11	54.17	51.31	34.55	20.97
	1.67	55.06	50.87	40.84	26.21
	2.22	56.79	52.35	46.20	29.81
	2.78	54.60	52.66	49.93	33.51
Uniform Sand	-	54.81	50.12	49.05	40.91

Table 4: Values of ultimate bearing capacity ($q_u/B\gamma$) rough rigid footings $\phi' = 45^\circ$

D/B	$s_u/\gamma B$	Ultimate bearing capacity ($q_u/B\gamma$)			
		Square Footing ($L/B = 1.0$)	Rectangular Footing ($L/B = 2.0$)	Rectangular Footing ($L/B = 5.0$)	Strip Footing ($L/B = \infty$)
0.25	0.56	4.63	4.12	3.78	3.37
	1.11	8.12	7.36	6.90	6.29
	1.67	11.17	10.55	9.92	9.04
	2.22	14.35	13.48	12.64	11.88
	2.78	17.26	16.35	15.68	14.58
0.5	0.56	8.71	6.66	5.48	4.50
	1.11	13.24	10.73	9.18	7.78
	1.67	17.24	14.49	12.81	10.89
	2.22	20.65	18.08	15.90	13.76
	2.78	24.10	20.90	18.68	16.64
1.0	0.56	24.23	16.56	11.56	7.83
	1.11	33.18	23.66	17.43	12.32
	1.67	40.43	29.34	22.13	16.27
	2.22	46.99	33.88	26.22	19.54
	2.78	52.69	37.76	30.15	23.29
2.0	0.56	88.12	53.79	33.58	17.44
	1.11	119.00	75.77	46.82	25.71
	1.67	138.97	88.43	56.74	32.40
	2.22	154.82	99.95	64.86	38.26
	2.78	164.78	108.82	71.78	43.62
Uniform Sand	-	193.57	160.25	141.75	112.51

Table 6: Summary of input and results for Fundex 3500 piling rig example

Inputs	Input Values	
	Load Case 1	Load Case 2
Applied Pressure	261 kPa	270 kPa
Design Length, L	3.5 m	2.9 m
Width of Load, B	0.9 m track width	1.3 m padfoot width
Thickness of Platform, D from BRE (2004)	First pass check ~ 1 m (based on BRE (2004))	First pass check ~ 1 m (based on BRE (2004))
L/B	3.9 (check $L/B = 2.0$ to 5.0)	2.2 (check $L/B = 2.0$)
D/B	1.1 (check $D/B = 1.0$)	0.77 (check $D/B = 0.5$ to 1.0)
ϕ'	45°	
γ	21 kN/m ³	
s_u	15 kPa	
$s_u/\gamma B$	0.79	0.55
$q_u/B\gamma$	~ 14.2 to 19.8	~ 6.6 to 16.5
q_u	<p>~ 270 kPa to 370 kPa</p> <p>This is noting that L/B is 3.9, using linear interpolation indicates an ultimate bearing capacity of about 330 kPa.</p> <p>This gives a FoS of about 1.26 which would not be considered acceptable for Load Case 1 if using the BRE (2004) loading factors as a guide.</p>	<p>~ 180 kPa to 450 kPa</p> <p>This is noting that $D/B = 0.77$, using linear interpolation indicates an ultimate bearing capacity of about 325 kPa.</p> <p>This gives a FoS of 1.20 which would be considered acceptable for Load Case 2 if using the BRE (2004) loading factors as a guide.</p>
Summary	The proposed thickness of 1 m is not considered suitable for Load Case 1, and consideration should be given to increasing the thickness. By trial and error it can be shown that a working platform of about 1.2 m thickness would satisfy a minimum FoS of 1.6, which would normally be accepted for Load Case 1 (if using BRE (2004) load factors as a guide).	

The online version of the paper accessible from australiangeomechanics.org has been corrected and is available for download.

Please note that this is a typographical error only and the charts and conclusions within the paper based on these tables are not affected.

The authors sincerely apologise to the readers for the error.