

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research

STEMWALL FOUNDATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

STEMWALL FOUNDATIONS FOR **RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION**

I

o

O

o

o

a

o

o

o

o

o

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research

Prepared by:

NAHB Research Center Upper Marlboro, MD

lnstrument No. DU1 00K000005897

March 1993

Notice

o

a

a

o

o

a

o

o

 \bullet

o

o

The U.S. Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the object of this report.

The contens of this report are the views of the contractor and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development or the U.S. Government.

Acknowledgements

o

o

a

o

o

 $\dot{\bullet}$

o

o

o

a

a

This report was prepared by the NAHB Research Center under funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The principal authors were Albert van Overeem and Mark S. Nowak with review and assistance provided by Michael Bruen, Ed Laasch, and Carol Soble.

Special appreciation is extended to William Freeborne of HUD for review and guidance and to the following builders who constructed demonstration homes and assisted with cost comparisons: Housing America through Training, Inc. of Baltimore, Maryland, Masonry Contractors, Inc. of Eldersburg, Maryland and Lund & Sweeny Construction of Acton, Massachusetts.

Contents

o

 \bullet

o

o

o

o

o

a

o

o

v

List of Tables and Figures

Tables

Figures

 \bar{z}

o

 \bullet

o

a

a

 $\ddot{}$

a

a

o

a

o

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report addresses the design and demonstration of monolithic stemwall foundations for basement, split-level, and crawl space homes. The objectives of this study are:

- \mathbf{I} . To develop prescriptive design methods for stemwalls that will enable builders to use stemwall foundations without a special design.
- 2. To demonstrate the technology as well as the potential cost savings and practical problems associated with stemwall foundations.
- 3. To provide recommended design information for consideration by the U.S. model code bodies.

BACKGROUND

o

o

o

o

a

a

o

t

a

a

o

Stemwall foundations are foundations whose walls are supported directly on the soil without ^a separate spread footing. The base of the wall is constructed to distribute the dead and live design loads safely to the soil. Stemwall foundations save the material and labor costs associated with a footing, and can accelerate the construction schedule by up to two days.

As early as the 1970s, the Optimum Value Engineered home construction manual, α product of HUD's Operation Breakthrough, suggested the use of stemwalls for basement and crawl space houses as a cost-saving construction method. However, for various reasons, the residential market has not adopted stemwall construction on a broad scale. Barriers to the use of stemwalls include the lack of prescriptive design methods for stemwalls in building codes, and a lack of data on the costs and benefis of the system.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

The initial designs produced under this project apply to single-story, split-level, one-and-one-halfstory and two-story homes built over crawl space and basement foundations. Three loading configurations were considered for the one- and two-story designs: conventional stick-built construction on all floors and ceilings, conventional stick-built floor construction with a trussed (free-span) roof, and trussed construction for floors and roofs. All one-and-one-half-story homes were considered to be stick-built conventional construction with either an 8/12, 10/12, or 12/12 roof pitch.

The design tables in the Appendix provide the required allowable soil bearing capacity for ^a given house type and loading configuration for 8- and l0-inch foundation wall thicknesses. The building design loads per foot of wall reflect rounded values (e.g., $2151 = 2200$). The designs do not account for differential settlement, which is rarely a problem with light-weight buildings. For similar reasons, the designs do not consider overturning due to high winds. (In high wind or seismic areas, a qualified professional should conduct further evaluation.)

The construction of a stemwall foundation is similar to that of a conventional wall built on ^a spread footing. Local experience or presumptive bearing capacity tables should be used to assess

whether the soil condition is acceptable at a given site for stemwall construction. Currently, the design tables in this report are limited to cast-in-place or prefabricated concrete walls. Most concrete contractors should be fully capable of forming and building stemwalls without special labor skills or equipment.

DEMONSTRATIONS OF THE STEMWALL FOUNDATION

Two builders were recruited by the NAHB Research Center to construct demonstration homes with stemwall foundations. The homes completed included a duplex in Baltimore and one detached home in Eldersburg, Maryland. It was also discovered during the project that builders in certain areas of Massachusetts were using the stemwall technology because of its cost effectiveness.

a

o

a

o

o

o

t

o

a

DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

There are five possible approaches to gaining model code acceptance of stemwalls.

- $1.$ lncorporate all the design tables produced in this repoft either as direct text in the codes or as a reference document.
- Distill the design tables into a single recommendation or series of recommendations that would apply to a wide variety of homes. $2.$
- 3. Introduce permissive language that recognizes stemwalls but does not include specific \bullet designs.
- 4. Develop a consensus standard.
- 5. Use a combination of approaches 2 and 3 above.

Each of the five approaches have problems associated with them. However, it appears that ^a combination of the second and third approaches could be successful. The permissive language could simply indicate that stemwalls are an acceptable construction method, while the design tables would provide the specific requirements for various conditions and house types.

CONCLUSIONS

A stemwall foundation consists of a foundation wall that transfers building design loads directly to the soil without a sepuate spread footing. Elimination of the footing is one less step which lowers costs by an amount equivalent to the materials and labor for the footing and can accelerate the construction schedule by up to two days. The cost differential to the builders of the demonstration homes varied from a loss of approximately \$238 to a gain of \$500 per unit when compared to conventional foundations. If building codes recognized stemwall foundations directly, then engineering costs could be eliminated or significantly reduced, resulting in additional savings of up to \$500 per unit. To achieve wide acceptance of stemwalls, it will be necessary to introduce specific language into the model building codes.

INTRODUCTION

,

o

a

o

 \bullet

a

a

o

o

a

o

This project is part of a program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to research and evaluate cost-saving methods and materials for residential construction. The purpose is to investigate innovative methods and materials that preserve or improve on existing eonstruction practices while lowering costs.

Specifically, this project focused on the development of design tables for monolithic stemwall foundations for basement, split-level, and crawl space homes (Figures l, 2, and 3). Stemwall foundations rely on the base of the wall to transfer building loads directly to the soil without ^a separate footing. Stemwall foundations save the costs of forming or trenching the footing, eliminate the material and labor costs associated with casting the footing, and can cut one to two days from the construction cycle.

1

The objectives of this study are:

ⁱ To develop prescriptive design methods for stemwalls that will enable builders to use stemwall foundations without a special design.

o

a

a

 \bullet

a

o

a

a

C

o

- To demonstrate the technology as well as the potential cost savings and practical problems associated with stemwall foundations. $2.$
- 3. To provide recommended design information for consideration by the U.S. model code bodies.

BACKGROUND

o

o

o

o

o

e

a

a

o

o

t

Stemwall foundations are foundations whose walls are supported directly on the soil without ^a separate spread footing (Figure 4). The base of the wall is constructed to distribute the dead and live design loads safely to the soil. The stemwall technique has been used extensively with slabon-grade construction' (Figure 5).

Figure 4. Eldersberg Demonstration House with Formwork Bearing Directly on the Ground.

Figure 5. Slab-on-Grade Construction.

Using a stemwall foundation tor other than slab-on-grade foundations is not new. For example. as early as the $1970s$, the Optimum Value Engineered home construction manual,¹ a product of HUD's Operation Breakthrough, suggested the use of stemwalls for basement and crawl space houses as a cost-saving construction method. In addition this technique has been used in some areas of Massachusetts. The American Concrete [nstitute building code requirements also recognize that walls .can be placed directly on soils that offer sufficient bearing capacity.2 However, for various reasons, the residential market has not adopted stemwall construction on a broad scale. One barrier to the use of stemwalls is that prescriptive design methods for stemwalls do not appear in building codes. Given that building officials are often reluctant to approve new methods without specific code recognition, each house typically requires its own foundation design. Another barrier is the lack of data on the costs and benefits of the sysrem versus a conventional spread footing. These data are necessary before a builder can decide whether the technology is appropriate for a given home.

o

o

la

o

o

o

t

,

a

a

4

TASKS

The following tasks were conducted under this project:

Development of Design Tables and Construction Details; Task 1.

ti.

Demonstrations of the Stemwall Foundation; and Task 2.

्रदेखे ।
सम्राट

5

Task 3. Preparation of Design Recommendations.

RESULTS

TASK I: DEVELOPMENT OF DESIGN TABLES AND CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

The development of design tables included a review of building design loads and soil properties; the determination of appropriate design configurations (e.g., number of stories, foundation wall height, etc.), and appropriate structural analysis to determine the wall dimensions that provide adequate bearing for common house configurations. The results are discussed below.

Design Configurations

 \blacksquare

a

a

o

o

o

a

a

a

o

a

The initial designs considered under this project apply primarily to single-story and one-and-onehalf-story detached homes built over crawl space and basement foundations. Split-level homes may also be designed with stemwalls if certain assumptions, as described later, are made. After initial results showed that design loads for one- and one-and-one-half-story homes were lower than expected, the project was expanded to include two-story homes.

The following three loading configurations were considered for the one- and two-story designs: conventional stick-built construction on all floors and ceilings (Figure 6), conventional stick-built floor construction with a trussed (free-span) roof (Figure 7), and trussed construction for floors and roofs (Figure 8). All one-and-one-half-story homes were considered to be stick-built conventional construction with either an $8/12$, $10/12$, or $12/12$ roof pitch. In all three house types, the project team examined a variety of building depths and basement wall heights.

Figure 6. Typical House Sections: Stick-Built Floors & Roof

7

a

 \bullet

o

a

o

o

o

a

t

o

Figure 8. Typical House Sections: Trussed Floors and Roof.

8

Design Method

a

a

O

o

a

o

o

a

a

o

o

The design tables are based on the required allowable soil bearing capacity for a desired wall thickness. The designs did not account for differential settlement, which is rarely a problem with lightweight buildings. For similar reasons, the designs did not consider overturning due to high winds (in high wind or seismic areas, a qualified professional should conduet further evaluation). Additionally. it should be recognized that lateral loading on the wall due to hydrostatic or unbaianced fill is unaffected by the presence of a footing. Therefore, minimum wall width and reinforcing requirements for lateral loads can be determined in accordance with local codes.

The design table values demonstrate the required allowable soil bearing capacity for a given house type and loading configuration for 8- and l0-inch foundation wall thicknesses. The building design load per foot of wall was divided by the foundation wall width and rounded to the next highest increment of 50 (e.g., $2151 = 2200$). The bearing capacities in the design tables reflect the allowable soil bearing capacity. In accordance with common engineering practice for determining the base area of a footing, unfactored forces were used.²

Design Assumptions

The design tables generated under this project are based on the assumption that all homes were symmetrical; that is, the joist spans on each half of the building were of equal length. The tables are also applicable to asymmetrical homes by multiplying the largest joist span supported by an exterior foundation wall by two and using the result as the house depth. Although specific tables were not developed for splitlevel homes, the tables can be applied conservatively by assuming that a split-level home is equivalent to a one-story home on a full basement. Examples that demonstrate how to use the design tables are provided later in this report.

The design dead and live load assumptions applicable to homes were obtained from both ASCE $7-88³$ and the NFPA Permanent Wood Foundation Design Manual⁴ as shown in Table 1.

DESIGN LOADS						
Description	Loading Used	Reference				
First-Floor Live Load	40 psf	ASCE 7-88				
First-Floor Dead Load	10 psf	NFPA				
Second-Floor Live Load	30 psf	ASCE 7-88				
Second-Floor Dead Load	10 psf	NFPA				
First-Floor Ceiling Dead Load	10 psf	NFPA				
Second-Floor Ceiling Dead Load	10 psf	NFPA				
First-Floor Wall Dead Load	88 lbs/ft	ASCE 7-88				
Second-Floor Wall Dead Load	88 lbs/ft	ASCE 7-88				
Attic Live Load	20 _{psf}	ASCE 7-88				
Roof Dead Load	10 _{psf}	NFPA				
Roof Live Load	Ground snow load	ASCE 7-88				
Foundation Dead Load	150 lbs/cf	ASCE 7-88				

Table I

Additional assumptions and design loads for each house type and loading configuration follow:

o

o

 \bullet

o

a

o

o

o

a

a

a

- A 2-foot overhang was assumed on roof surfaces.
- Attic live loads for low- and medium-sloped roofs (less than 8:12) were applied ro onehalf of the total span. a
- Storage areas behind living areas in one-and-one-half-story homes were considered attic space. a
- Ground snow loads were reduced per ASCE 7-88 as follows: a

For one- and two-story homes,

$$
Pf = 0.7 \text{ Ce Ct I pg},
$$

where

 $Pf = flat-root snow load in pounds per square foot;$

 $Ce = exposure factor (Ce = 1.1);$

Ct = thermal factor (Ct = 1.0);

 $I =$ importance factor $(I = 1.0)$; and

 $pg =$ ground snow load in pounds per square foot.

ASCE 7-88 provides a procedure for reducing snow loads on sloped roofs. However, the reductions were insignificant for roof slopes less than 30 degrees. Thus, the flat roof snow load was used for all one- and two-story homes. The sloped-roof snow load Ps was computed for one-and-one-half-story homes as follows:

$$
Ps = Cs \text{ Pf (Note: } Ps \ge 20 \text{ PSF}),
$$

where

 $Cs =$ roof slope factor $(Cs = 1.0 - (slope - 30)/40)$; and

 $Pf = flat-root snow load in pounds per square foot.$

ASCE 7-88 also provides a procedure to reduce floor live loads when designing supporting members. However, the reduction is based on an influence area approach that is more appropriate for larger commercial buildings than for typically-sized homes. The floor live load reductions were insignificant and were not applied.

Soil Bearing Capacity

Local officials sometimes require a soils report to substantiate soil bearing capacities if the needed capacity is above an assumed minimum available capacity. For example, the prescriptive foundation details in one widely used one- and two-family dwelling code⁵ are based on a soil bearing capacity of 2,000 pounds per square foot. Where the soil has less than 2,000 psf of bearing capacity, local officials sometimes require a special design, even though the code does not clearly specify the need for such a design.

For this project, the design tables that require less than 2,000 psf bearing capacity can be used without special study of most soils. Where local conditions are well documented, it is also possible to use the design tables directly for designs requiring more than 2,000 psf of bearing capacity. Local experience can often be relied on to determine the bearing capacity of a soil without engineering analysis. If the earth is firm, solid, well drained, and comprises a mixture of gravel, rock, sand, or clayey sands, it will likely support a stemwall foundation. In addition, tables published throughout the literature can be used to estimate bearing capacity to the level of accuracy needed for a one- or two-family structure. Table 2 provides presumptive bearing capacities from one widely used model building code.6

Design Tables

a

a

a

a

o

o

o

o

t

a

a

The appendix contains the design tables developed for this project from a computer program based on the design assumptions stated earlier. The examples below describe how to use the tables.

- *Example 1*: A one-story crawl space house with symmetrical loads is stick-built with no engineered products (trusses). The house is 28-feet-wide x 32-feet-long with a 4 foot x 8-inch stemwall. A 30 psf local snow load is rcquired. Floor spans run parallel to the 28-foot direction.
- Solution: Using the table below (see also page A-7 of the Appendix) with a 28-foot width and a 30 psf ground snow load, a 2,250 psf allowable soil bearing capacity is required to support the structure. The foundation could be built on all soil types except those in Class 5 from Table 2.

o

 \bullet

o

a

 \bullet

o

o

I

a

I

- Example 2: A two-story house on a full basement with asymmetrical loads is stick-built. The house is 22- x 30-feet with the longest span equal to 12 feet. An 8-foot x 10-inch stemwall is desired, and a 40 psf local snow load is required.
- Solution: Given that the home is asymmetrical, the span used in the design table should equal twice the longest span or, in this case, 24 feet. Using the table below (see also page A-40 of the Appendix), with a Z4-foot width and 40 psf ground snow load, a 2,900 psf allowable soil bearing capacity is required.

Construction Details

The construction of a stemwall foundation is similar to that of a conventional wall built on ^a spread footing (Figure 9). Currently, the design tables in this report are limited to cast-in-place or prefabricated concrete walls. Most concrete contractors should be fully capable of forming and building stemwalls without special labor skills or equipment. Local experience or

presumptive bearing capacity tables can usually be used to assess whether a stemwall is acceptable at a given site.

t

a

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

Steel reinforcement similar to that typically used in footings is recommended for placement in the bottom of the stemwall to bridge weak or soft spots. The use of two No. 4 bars continuous at all perimeter walls'allows the stemwall to act like a stiffer grade beam capable of bridging 3 to 4-foot distances. The steel should be placed a minimum of 3 inches from the bottom of the wall.

Stemwalls may be formed or trenched. The formed wall is set directly on the soil or on a gravel base. Formed walls offer the simplest construction method, but typically require the slight overexcavation of crawl space foundations to allow room for setting forms. Nonetheless, overexcavation is common practice for basement walls and for split-level homes to accommodate form-setting and installation of foundation drains, and therefore does not represent a departure from conventional construction. When foundation drains are required, it is recommended the system be located outside the foundation wall.

Trenched walls are what their name implies--walls that are trenched to the desired thickness and depth. However, additional work is required to obtain a clearance between final grade and the top of the foundation wall. One method, though probably not a practical approach in most situations, is to trench the wall and then lower the grade to expose the upper portion of the wall. The second and preferred alternative is to form a short section to extend the wall above the top of the trench. In any event, the trenched system may not be as practical or cost-effective as the formed system.

Concrete quantity estimations are straightforward with the stemwall system.- The volume of the forms and/or trench is equal to the required concrete quantity. It is usually cost-effective to cast interior pier footings at the same time as the walls.

TASK 2: DEMONSTRATION OF THE STEMWALL FOUNDATION

Two builders were recruited by the Research Center to construct demonstration homes with stemwall foundations (Figures 10, 11, and 12). The homes included a duplex in Baltimore and one detached home in Eldersburg, Maryland. It was also discovered during the project that builders in certain areas of Massachusetts were making extensive use of stemwalls. Information from the demonstration sites and from one Massachusetts builder is discussed below. The Research Center reviewed the builders' plans and conducted a preliminary soils test at each site. Construction was closely monitored at each site to record problems specific to the installation of the stemwalls and to note any additional costs incurred due to a lack of familiarity with the system. Cost estimates were obtained from the demonstration builders to determine the installed costs of the stemwall foundations. Builders also provided cost estimates for their standard foundation system for comparison with the stemwall foundations.

o

a

a

o

o

a

a

I

o

a

o

Neither of the jurisdictions' codes recognized stemwall construction as an acceptable method of foundation construction. Therefore, it was necessary to submit designs verified by a licensed professional engineer.

Figure 10. Formwork at the Eldersberg Site.

a

a

o

a

o

o

o

a

o

o

o

Figure 11. Foundation Walls Being Cast at the Eldersberg Site.

Figure 12. Completed Stemwall Foundation at the Eldersberg Site.

Baltimore, Maryland

Descripion and Design

The demonstration house in Baltimore is insured under the HUD EXTECH 233 program for experimental housing: The house is a modular duplex with exterior perimeter walls supported on a l0-inch-wide stemwall foundation. The party wall between the duplex unis is supported on a conventional footing designed for the increased loading associated with the construction type. The building is symmetrical with a l4-foot clear joist span between the outside wall and an interior beam. Figure 13 shows the building's foundation plan.

o

o

o

a

o

o

o

o

a

a

The design load for the demonstration house is 2,391 lbs/ft. The required bearing capacity tor the t0-inch stemwall is 2,900 psf. Site measurements showed that the soil's minimum bearing capacity was 3,200 psf.

Observations

The center party wall is supported by a spread footing that was formed on top of the grade rather than trenched into the ground. This resulted in an 8-inch difference in grade between the top of the party wall and the top of the stemwalls. The builder elected to raise the stemwalls by supporting them on an 8-inch gravel base. The building inspector voiced concern over the additional gravel and required a sealed letter certifying the gravel layer's bearing capacity.

Costs versus Conventional Spread Footing

Table 3 presents the cost breakdown for the demonstration house. Costs for the foundation construction of the demonstration home are comparcd to the costs for the foundation of an adjacent duplex constructed by the same builder on a traditional footing with block walls.

Demonstration Duplex						
Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Total		
Excavation			Lump sum	\$1,750		
Foundation Wall	153	If	Lump sum	\$2,123		
Foundation Wall Concrete	38	CV	\$56.00	\$2,128		
Party Wall Footing Concrete	1.5	cy	\$56.00	\$84		
Subtotal				\$6,085		
Soils Evaluation/Engineering			Lump sum	\$986		
Total				\$7,071		
Adjacent Duplex with Block Walls and Concrete Footings						
Excavation			Lump sum	\$1,750		
Foundation and Footings	153	łf	Lump sum	\$6,277		
If $=$ lineal feet Notes: $cy = cubic$ yards			Total	\$8,072		

Table 3 COSTS AT BALTIMORE SITE

Figure 13. Foundation Plan: Baltimore Duplex.

 \mathcal{A}

 17

 \sim

The demonstration resulted in a savings of \$1,001 to the builder or approximately \$500 per unit. If the stemwall method were specifically recognized in the local building, code then engineering costs for the wall design could be eliminated and savings increased even turther.

Eldersburg, Maryland

The demonstration house in Eldersburg is a two-story home with a full basement. A one-story family room is located off the back. The house is supported on an 8-inch nominal cast-in-place concrete stemwall. Figure 14 shows the home's floor plan.

Observations

A six-person crew set the forms and cast the wall in one nine-hour day; forms were stripped the next day. A day and a half is usually required for casting a separate footing and foundation wall. The start of construction was repeatedly delayed due to rain and a very clayey subgrade that retained water. The labor crews elected not to set forms on the wet soils. One possible method suggested for handling wet sites is to stabilize the ground with gravel and to set the forms on the gravel base. The contractor believed that the stemwall method may be more practical during drier periods when weather does not play a limiting role. Costs versus a Conventional Spread Footing

o

o

o

o

a

a

a

a

o

o

o

Tables 4 and 5 present the cost breakdowns for the Eldersburg demonstration site. Costs for the demonstration home are compared to the costs for a similar home constructed earlier by the same builder.

Table 4 DEMONSTRATION HOME

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$

19

Description	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Excavation	5.5	Hours	\$70.00	\$385.00
8-Foot Wall				
Foundation Wall + Footing	131	lf	\$26.50	\$3,471.50
Waterproofing	834	sf	\$0.12	\$100.08
Backfill	6	hours	\$70.00	\$420.00
4-Foot Wall				
Excavation	1/2	hour	\$70.00	\$35.00
Foundation Wall	44	lf	\$15.95	\$701.80
Backfill	1.5	hours	\$70.00	\$105.00
Other				
Basement Columns	5		Lump sum	\$163.01
Basement Stairs	13	risers	Lump sum	\$136.50
If $=$ lineal feet Notes:				
$sf = square$ feet			Total	\$5,517.89

Table 5 COMPARISON HOME WITH FOOTING

o

a

o

a

o

a

o

a

a

a

a

The demonstration home cost approximately \$240 more at this site than the comparison home. However, with time, the site preparation costs will come down as the builder becomes more experienced with the stemwall technique. Also, engineering costs of nearly \$500 could be eliminated if stemwall construction were recognized by the local building code.

Plymouth, Massachusetts

Description and Design

The Massachusetts state building code permits foundation walls to be supported on virgin soil without footings. One builder in the Plymouth area has routinely used 10- and 12-inch cast-inplace concrete stemwalls. When spread footings arc required due to poor local soil conditions, an 8-inch foundation wall is typically used. Although no new homes were built specifically for this project in Plymouth, information gathercd on recently completed homes provided an assessment of the potential cost savings associated with the stemwall foundation from the perspective of a builder already familiar with the system. The experience in Plymouth also illustrates the impact of earlier code approval, which eliminates special engineering requirements.

The development in Plymouth contains 230 single-family homes built over the past six years. The builder used four model homes with the same 24- x 32-foot foundation plan (Figure l5). All homes were started at the beginning of the week to take advantage of Plymouth's inspection schedule. The builder was able to save up to two days by not using a separate footing.

Figure 15. Massachusetts Foundation Plan

Construction specifications include

- . l0- or l2-inch-wide cast-in-place concrete walls;
- . 2,500 psi concrete (wintertime 3,000 psi high early-strength concrete);
- . no reinforcing steel:
- . walls dampproofed with asphalt before backfill;
- . ail foundation or frost walls set on virgin soil; and
- . basement windows flush with the tops of the foundarion walls.

Costs versus Conventional Spread Footing

Costs for a 24- x 32-foot full basement two-story house are shown in Tables 6 and 7 for an 8 inch conventional wall and a l0-inch stemwall, respectively.

o

o

o

o

a

o

a

o

a

a

Table 6 8-INCH FOUNDATION WITH A FOOTING

Observations

 \bullet

a

o

o

a

o

o

o

a

o

o

An efficient form crew of four to five workers can set forms and cast the foundation walls in the 24- x 32-foot home in five hours. The forms are stripped the following day and the floor slab cast before backfilling the building. One interesting note is that the contractor felt it was more difficult to erect and straighten the wall forms on top of a footing than on soil. The erection time was not significantly different with either method.

TASK 3: PREPARATIONS OF DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for proposed code changes were prepared under this task. Since most codes do not directly recognize stemwalls, it is recommended that stemwalls be introduced into the model codes to enable builders to use them without an engineered design.

Recommendations

There are five possible approaches to gaining model code acceptance of stemwalls.

- 1. Incorporate all of the design tables from the Appendix either as direct text in the codes or as an Appendix.
- 2. Distill the tables in the Appendix into simplified recommendations that would apply to ^a wide variety of homes and incorporate as above.
- 3. [ntroduce enabling language that recognizes the concept of stemwalls but does not include specific designs.
- 4. Use a combination of approaches 2 and 3 above.
- 5. Develop a consensus standard that could be adopted by reference.

Any attempt to introduce the complete set of design tables would probably meet with limited success simply because the model code bodies are likely to resist the addition of a significant amount of text to their codes. Further, the trend among the major code groups is to consider for adoption by reference only those documents developed under the auspices of a recognized consensus organization.

A review of the tables in the Appendix generated by a computer program suggests that no clearly economical set of prescriptive requirements could be developed to cover stemwall construction for all housing types. Any distilled set of tables that could accommodate all relevant variables would be driven by two-story homes. Results would be too restrictive for one-story homes and would lead to high allowable bearing pressures that would, in turn, require expensive soils testing for verification.

The introduction of enabling language into the model codes would allow construction of most typical one- and two-story light-frame buildings with stemwall foundations. However, enabling language in itself would not give builders and code officials adequate information on the design and construction of stemwalls.

o

o

o

o

o

a

a

a

o

o

o

It appears that a combination of the above mentioned second and third approaches could be successful in gaining code adoption. The enabling language could simply indicate that stemwalls are an acceptable construction method, while the design tables would provide the specific requirements for various conditions and house types.

Incorporating a gravel layer to spread the building load across the subgrade greatly reduces the required soil bearing capacity. A 6-inch gravel layer would reduce the required bearing capacity to less than 2,000 psf for one-and-one-half- and two-story structures, which is acceptable with any of the soils shown previously in Table 2. The following detail with accompanying notes (Figure 16) is recommended for the design of one-and-one-half and two-story homes.

Figure 16. Two- and One-and-One-Half-Story Stemwall Recommendations

Notes:

- Gravel shall extend 12 inches minimum beyond the edge of each side of the wall and be confined at minimum by \bullet either a 4 inch concrete slab or 2 feet of fill.
- Unusual features or greater than 50 psf ground snow loads require a special design.
- Where local codes or conditions necessitate a foundation drainage system, the system shall be located outside the \bullet foundation wall.
- The gravel layer is assumed to have an allowable bearing capacity of 4,000 psf and shall be tamped in place.
- Design assumes that loads are distributed through the gravel at an angle of 33 degrees from the vertical.
- Walls may be cast-in-place or prefab concrete, 8 to 10 inches thick.
- Clear-span trusses on all floors and roofs require a special design for buildings greater than 24 feet or ground snow \bullet loads that exceed 30 psf.

25

Table 8 is recommended for use with one-story homes. It is distilled from the appropriate design tables in the Appendix. It is conservative for most cases since the values are based on the worstcase Ioading configurations and the longest spans in the tables.

o

o

o

o

o

a

o

a

a

a

a

Table 8 ONE.STORY STEMWALL RECOMMENDATIONS

Developing a consensus standard is another possible altemative. However, this is not a very practical approach in the short term given the time and effort typically required to develop such a standard. In addition, the consensus would probably eliminate the cost effectiveness of the stemwall technique.

CONCLUSIONS

o

o

a

o

o

 \bullet

o

a

o

o

o

A stemwall is defined as a foundation wall that transfers building design loads directly to the soil without a separate spread footing. Elimination of the footing is one less step which lowers costs by an amount equivalent to the materials and labor for the footing and can accelerate the construction schedule by up to two days. The cost differential to the builders of the demonstration homes varied from a loss of approximately \$238 (including \$493 engineering cost) to a gain of \$500 per unit when compared to conventional foundations. If building codes recognized stemwall foundations directly, then engineering costs could be eliminated or significantly reduced, resulting in additional savings of up to \$500 per unit. To achieve wide acceptance of stemwalls, it will be necessary to introduce specific language into the model building codes.

REFERENCES

- 1. NAHB Research Foundation, Inc. Reducing Home Building Costs with OVE Design and Construction. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, DC (November 1977).
- 2. American Concrete Institute. Building Code Requirements for Structural Plain Concrete. ACI 318.1-89 and Commentary. ACI318.1R-89. Detroit, MI (1989).
- 3. American Society of Civil Engineers. Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures. ANSI/ASCE 7-88. New York, NY (1990).
- 4. National Forest Products Association. Permanent Wood Foundation System, Design Fabrication, Installation Manual. Washington, DC (1987).
- 5. Council of American Building Officials. CABO One and Two Family Dwelling Code. Falls Church, VA (1992).
- 6. Building Officials and Code Administrators International, Inc. BOCA National Building Code. Country Club Hills, IL (1990).

Appendix DESIGN TABLES FOR STEMWALL FOUNDATIONS

This Appendix contains tables to simplify the design process for monolithic stemwall foundations. The tables were generated from a computer program based on the design assumptions given in the report. The tables are reference for cast-in-place or prefabricated concrete walls, and give the required allowable soil bearing capacity necessary at the site. Two examples of using the tables to design a stemwall foundation are given on pages ^ll and 12 of the report.

The tables are organized to allow a designer to match the appropriate loading condition. foundation height, house type, and wall width of a proposed house to a required soil bearing capacity. Different loading conditions include conventional floor and roof, conventional floor and truss roof, and truss floor and truss roof construction. Conventional construction refers to stick-built while truss construction refers to the use of free span products (trusses or l-joists). A range of foundation heighs, 3- to 8-feet, covers those most commonly encountered in design. House types are divided by one-story, two-story and one-and-one-half-story. The tables address 8- and lO-inch stemwalls with 8-inch walls providing more economical construction while, l0 inch walls lower the required allowable soil bearing capacity.

The Appendix is divided into two sections: Group A and Group B for stemwall widths of 8- and ^I0-inches, respectively.

APPENDX CONTENTS

)

D

t

,

o

a

a

o

o

o

a

GROUP A: FOUNDATIONS WITH 8-INCH WIDTH STEMWALLS

Foundation Height

D

D

,

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

a

To find the allowable soil bearing capacity, follow these steps.

- 1. Select the desired foundation height from the pages listed above.
- Choose from that page, or the following two pages, the appropriate house type: one-story, two-story, or one-and-one-half-story. 2.
- Choose the table which reflects the proposed type of construction for the floors and roof; either conventional, truss, or a combination. $3.$
- Match the proposed building width row with the local ground snow load column to find the required allowable soil bearing capacity at your site. 4

D

D

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

a

a

o

o

o

o

a

e

 \bullet

a

a

o

o

a

a

o

o

a

f

a

O

o

o

o

o

a

a

 \bullet

a

o

o

a

o

a

a

a

o

o

o

o

o

a

o

o

o

a

o

o

o

o

o

a

o

a

a

a

e

e

¢

o

o

o

a

o

a

a

o

a

o

o

a

O

e

a

I

o

a

 \bullet

 \bullet

o

o

o

a

o

a

a

o

a

o

O

o

e

a

o

o

a

o

a

o

o

o

O

a

o

o

o

a

o

o

o

a

a

e

o

a

o

o

o

o

a

a

o

GROUP B: FOUNDATIONS WITH l0-INCH WIDTH STEMWALLS

Foundation Height

I

o

O

o

o

o

o

o

o

a

o

To find the allowable soil bearing capacity, follow these steps.

- l. Select the desired foundation height from the pages listed above
- 2 Choose from that page, or the following two pages, the appropriate house type: one-story, two-story, or one-and-one-half-story.
- Choose the table which reflects the proposed type of construction for the floors and roof; either conventional, truss, or a combination. 3.
- Match the proposed building width row with the local ground snow load column to find the required allowable soil bearing capacity at your site. 4.

o

o

o

o

o

o

e

a

I

o

A-24

o

o

o

o

o

o

a

a

a

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

a

a

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

a

a

o

o

o

o

o

o

a

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

a

a

O

o

o

a

a

o

o

a

o

o

 \bullet

o

o

o

o

a

a

a

a

o

o

o

o

a

o

o

o

o

o

o

A-35

o

o

o

o

o

o

a

e

a

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

a

A-39
Appendix: DESIGN TABLES FOR STEMWALL FOUNDATIONS, GROUP B

Appendix: DESIGN TABLES FOR STEMWALL FOUNDATIONS, GROUP ^B

D

,

a

O

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

