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ANALYSIS OF THE PILE LOAD TESTS AT THE US 68/KY 80 BRIDGE OVER KENTUCKY LAKE

Large diameter piles are widely used as foundations to support buildings, bridges, and other structures. As a result, it is critical for the field to have an optimized approach for quality control and efficiency purposes to measure the suggested number of load tests and the required measured capacities driven piles. In this thesis, an analysis of a load test program designed for proposed bridge replacements at Kentucky Lake is performed. It includes a detailed site exploration study with in-situ and laboratory testing. The pile load test program included monitoring of a steel H-pile and steel open ended pipe pile during driving and static loading. The pile load test program included static and dynamic testing at both pile testing locations. Predictions of both pile capacities were estimated using commonly applied failure criterion, and a load transfer analysis was carried out on the dynamic and static test data for both piles. The dynamic tests were then compared to the measured data from the static test to examine the accuracy. This thesis concludes by constructing t-z and q-z curves and comparing the load transfer analyses of the static and dynamic tests.
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CHAPTER 1

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The improvement in engineering technology and construction equipment has forced the design of bridge foundations to evolve to account for issues of extreme loading such as scour, ice, boat collisions, seismic events, and liquefaction. The improvements have led to an increase in the use of large diameter piles because of their substantial strength and durability. Large diameter H-piles and steel pipe piles are popular choices for structural supports in bridge designs because they can provide significant axial and lateral resistance in relatively poor soil conditions.

Pile capacity failure occurs when either the structural or load-carrying capacity gives way. The structural capacity of a pile is a function of the material properties of the pile, while the load-carrying capacity is a function of the soil-pile interaction. Pile analysis assumes that the bearing capacity failure of the pile will occur (shear failure along the shaft, followed by punching shear failure under the tip) before the pile buckles. As a result of this assumption, the load carrying capacity is the limiting failure criteria in most driven pile designs.

In large diameter pile design, considering the degree of plugging and existing internal friction is imperative. Plugging behavior can vary in different geomaterials. If the soil does not plug during driving, the soil inside a pipe pile or between H-pile flanges slips and produces internal shaft resistance. Slippage results in the limited toe resistance being the controlling variable in the capacity equation and the end bearing resistances being inaccurate. If the pile develops a plug and the soil moves with the pile, the test may yield higher estimates than the actual capacity.

The resistance of a pile typically changes over time. The capacity may increase from compaction or decrease from relaxation. Consequently, the dynamic analysis should be done at the end of the first drive and again after the restrike to accurately quantify time-dependent changes in the capacity. The load required for toe mobilization of large diameter steel piles may not be practical to achieve. The current correlation between large diameter piles, and small diameter test piles is not proportional. The use of different pile types,
geometries, and soil mixtures creates uncertainty in the dynamic model of the soil-pile interface because of the variations that can occur to the active forces.

The methods for predicting the load-settlement behavior of deep foundations are based on the load transfer model, where the foundation is modeled as a beam supported by non-linear springs. The t-z curve analysis defines the load transfer relationship along the shaft of the foundation, and q-z curve analysis defines the relationship at the toe where t is the mobilized unit shaft resistance, q is the mobilized unit toe resistance, and z is the vertical movement of a point on the pile. The construction of t-z curves identifies the soil-pile interaction with depth, as well as quantifies the stresses brought forth with each load increment.

The rapid evolution in engineering technology and the continuous expansion of offshore projects will increase the demand for large diameter piles. There is an agreement in the literature that the pile diameter influences the capacity and load transfer behavior of test piles. However, there is currently no consensus about the suitability of applying criteria designed for small diameter piles to large diameter piles or no available t-z curve database developed for large diameter piles. This study provides capacity and load transfer analyses of a steel H-Pile and steel closed-ended Pipe Pile in mixed soils.

1.2 Objectives
The objectives of the load test program analysis are as follows:

1) Determine how accurately dynamic methods predict the ultimate capacities of the large diameter Pipe Pile and large diameter H-Pile.

- This investigation will quantify the accuracy of the dynamic capacity analysis in this case study and determine if the theories and assumptions at the core of dynamic analysis formulated from research considering small diameter piles and idealized soil conditions are applicable to large diameter piles driven in mixed soils. The results may provide insight into the limitations of dynamic testing as well as how the degree of plugging and existing internal friction affects capacity predictions of large diameter piles.

- Assess the dynamic reports generated by CAPWAP and GRLWEAP.
Predict the static and dynamic capacities of the piles using load-settlement data and multiple applicable failure criteria.

Identify which failure criteria are the most appropriate for each set of data.

Estimate the ultimate capacity using the bearing capacity equations.

Quantify the effects that the lateral earth (at rest) coefficient (\( K_o \)) and soil-pile friction angle (\( \delta \)) have on the ultimate bearing capacity through parametric analyses of the bearing capacity equations.

Compare the static capacity to the capacities predicted by GRLWEAP, CAPWAP, and the bearing capacity equations.

Observe how close the dynamic capacities were to the static capacities and explore the probable factors that may have caused the dissimilarities.

2) Determine how accurately dynamic methods predict the load transfer behavior of the large diameter Pipe Pile and large diameter H-Pile.

This investigation will evaluate the accuracy of the dynamic load transfer analyses completed by the CAPWAP software and determine if the assumed idealized general conditions in the wave equation can produce load transfer data that accounts for the variations that can occur to the active forces at the soil-pile interface due to different pile geometries and soil types. The results may provide insight about the soil-pile interaction of in silty gravel and lean clays. The results may also provide insight into the capabilities and limitations of dynamic testing.

- Determine the unit end bearing and unit side friction resistances from the static load-settlement data.

- Calculate the ultimate load along the entire length of the test piles.

- Calculate the mobilized tip resistance of the test piles using calculated load transfer data.

- Identify if pile mobilization occurred during testing.

- Calculate the elastic shortening.
• Construct t-z curves to represent the load transfer relationship along the shaft of the piles, and q-z curves to represent the soil-pile relationship at the pile toes.

• Compare the static and dynamic load transfer data for both piles.

• Observe how close the static t-z curves compare to theoretical curves derived from idealized soil conditions (perfectly elastic, or undrained clay) considering small diameter piles.

• Discuss the probable causes for differences in the static and dynamic load transfer analyses.

1.3 Relevance of Research

A complete load test program with both dynamic and static testing is the standard procedure to determine the capacity and settlement parameters for large diameter piles in Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD). However, static load testing is expensive and takes time. Static tests are generally not performed until the construction phase for most large projects and are rarely ever performed on small projects. There is an agreement in the literature that the pile diameter influences the capacity and load transfer behavior of test piles. The rapid evolution in engineering technology and the continuous expansion of offshore projects will increase the demand for large diameter piles and the importance of large diameter pile research. The focus of this paper is to conduct a load transfer analysis on the data from the large diameter piles and compare how accurate the more cost-efficient dynamic methods are for predicting the capacity and load transfer behavior of large diameter piles.

1.4 Contents of Thesis

The contents of this thesis are as follows:

- Chapter 2 presents the analyses of the dynamic and static capacities from the load-settlement data of a pile load test program designed for a bridge replacement at Kentucky Lake. This chapter provides descriptions of the project site, development of the soil parameters, in-situ testing, lab testing, drivability analysis, pile instrumentation, and load test procedures. The paper concludes by calculating the bearing capacity for
both tests using different failure criteria and comparing the results of the dynamic and static methods.

The contents of the analysis portion of chapter 2 are as follows:

- Capacity predictions using all applicable failure criteria for static and dynamic tests.
- Capacity predictions using the bearing capacity equations.
- Parametric study of bearing capacity equation capacity predictions.
- Discussion of results
- Conclusion

Chapter 3 presents the load transfer analyses of the load-settlement data from the load test program designed for a bridge replacement at Kentucky. This chapter provides descriptions of the project site, soil profiles, GRLWEAP drivability results, pile instrumentation, and load test procedures. The chapter concludes with the calculation of the load transfer data and the construction of t-z, and q-z curves along with a discussion of the results.

The contents of the analysis portion of chapter 3 are as follows:

- Load transfer curves
- Unit side friction and unit end bearing results for static and dynamic testing
- Ultimate load determinations for static load-settlement data.
- T-z curves derived from static load-settlement data
- T-z curves plotted with theoretical curves
- Q-z curves derived from static load-settlement data
- Discussion of results
- Conclusion
Chapter 4 compares the capacity and load transfer calculation from Chapter 2 and Chapter 3. This chapter provides summaries of the project site details, development of the soil parameters, soil profiles, pile instrumentations, and test methods. A driveability study, pile instrumentation description, and load test methodology are also explained in this chapter. The chapter concludes with the presentation of the capacity predictions and the load transfer data for the load tests of both piles.

The contents of the information presented in chapter 4 are as follows:

- Bearing capacity predictions from the load test program for static and dynamic tests
- Unit side friction and unit end bearing calculations for static and dynamic test

Appendix A presents the soil data used to generate the soil parameters. This encompasses grain size distribution tables, specific gravity data, CPT soundings, bore logs, and the results from shear strength test (UU & CU).

Appendix B presents the maps used for site descriptions. This encompasses boring locations, test locations, strain gage placements, and topographic maps.

Appendix C presents the dynamic testing results. This encompasses CAPWAP reports, Driven Analyses, and GRLWEAP results.

Appendix D presents the static testing results. This encompasses the load-settlement data, and the failure criteria plots used to predict the capacity

Appendix E contains the t-z curves at various elevations
CHAPTER 2

2 Load Test Program with Large Diameter Bridge Piles

2.1 Introduction

Deep foundational system designs rely on load test programs to provide reliable geotechnical data for soils and reinforcement materials. Load test programs are the most accurate method of predicting capacity and settlement parameters for piles. Many factors can affect the accuracy of pile capacity estimations. Some of these factors include load testing method, hammer selection, pile geometry, and failure criteria used in the analysis. Design decisions should consider the influence of diameter, pile wall thickness, the degree of soil plugging, and scalability because they can affect the driving resistance of the pile and govern equipment demands. Load test programs with static testing measure the capacity and settlement directly.

Dynamic load tests are economical testing procedures that improve construction control and pile installation. Dynamic tests use signal matching software to generate capacity predictions and model hammer-soil-pile systems from strain and acceleration measurements. The theories and assumptions used in dynamic analyses were formulated assuming idealized general conditions in the wave equation. As a result, the theories and assumptions at the core of dynamic analysis were derived from research based on small diameter piles, homogenous soils, and ideal installation techniques. The use of different pile types, geometries, and soil mixtures creates uncertainty in dynamic results because of the active force variations that can occur at the soil-pile interface when the soil/pile behavior does not fit an idealized soil/pile interaction model.

In large diameter piles, considering the degree of plugging and existing internal friction is imperative. Plugging behavior can vary in different geomaterials. If the soil does not plug during driving, the soil inside a pipe pile or between H-pile flanges slips and produces internal shaft resistance. Slippage results in the limited toe resistance being the controlling variable in the capacity equation and the end bearing resistances being inaccurate. If the pile develops a plug and the soil moves with the pile, the test may yield higher estimates than the actual capacity. The resistance of a pile typically changes over time. The capacity may increase from compaction or decrease from relaxation. Consequently, dynamic
analyses should be done at the end of the first drive and again after the restrike to accurately quantify time-dependent changes in the capacity.

The load required movement for toe mobilization of large diameter steel piles may not be practical to achieve. The correlation between high capacity, large diameter piles, and small diameter test piles is not proportional using current dynamic modeling methods. In high profile pile foundation designs, static tests subsequently commence after dynamic tests conclude to provide reference data used for back calculations and corrections. The existing literature indicated that the uncertainties associated with dynamic capacity predictions for large diameter piles are likely to result in overly conservative designs or structural failures if not supplemented by static load tests.

This paper presents the analysis of pile load test data from a bridge replacement project in western Kentucky. First, a description of the site and soil conditions are provided. Next, the dynamic and static load test methodologies are defined. The paper concludes by calculating the bearing capacity of the results for both tests using different failure criteria and comparing the results of the dynamic and static tests.

2.2 Literature Review

Failure criteria determine the maximum load a pile can support without failure from an applied load. Often in the literature, piles used to verify design criteria considered small-diameter driven piles. There is currently no consensus about the suitability of applying criteria designed for small diameter piles to large diameter piles.

2.2.1 Davvison Failure Criterion

The Davvison method (1972) assumes elastic pile compression. The Davvison Offset Limit was developed based on comparisons between the results of wave equation analyses of driven steel piles and load transfer research. The Davvison Offset Limit is the most commonly accepted failure criterion for driven piles. The criterion is applied by drawing a parallel line to the elastic compression line ($\Delta$) offset by a specified amount of displacement. The geometry of the pile controls the amount of displacement. The point of intersection between the offset line and the load-settlement curve represents the ultimate capacity. The elastic compression line ($\Delta$) is plotted by applying Equation 1 where $P$ is the
axial load, \( L \) is the pile length, \( A \) is the pile cross-sectional area, and \( E \) is the elastic modulus of the pile material.

\[
\Delta = \frac{PL}{AE}
\]  

(1)

The elastic compression line makes an approximately 20-degree angle with the load axis. The recommended offset \( (x) \) in the Davvison method (1972) is based on the pile diameter and calculated is determined using Equation 2, where \( x \) is the offset, \( B \) is the pile diameter in millimeters, \( A \) is the pile cross-sectional area, and \( E \) is the elastic modulus of the pile material.

\[
x = \Delta + (4.0 + 0.008B)
\]  

(2)

For large diameter piles \( (B > 60.6 \text{ cm}) \), Equation 3 is often used. The offset calculations presented in this study where determined using Equation 3.

\[
x = \Delta + \left( \frac{B}{30} \right)
\]  

(3)

The Davvison method (1972) provides conservative estimations and has the advantage of drawing the limit line on the load-settlement plot before testing has begun. The Davisson method (1972) provides conservative estimations and has the advantage of drawing the limit line on the load-settlement plot before testing has begun. Figure 1 provides an example of a plot of the Davvison method (1972).

Figure 1. Davvison Failure Criterion
2.2.2 Butler and Hoy Failure Criterion
The Butler and Hoy method (1977) identifies the ultimate capacity as the point in which the tangents to the elastic and plastic portions of the load-settlement curve intersect. The Butler and Hoy method (1977) defines the failure load as the maximum slope of the load movement curve or the load where the load-displacement curve exceeds 0.12 mm/kN. The limiting capacity is the tangent line on the maximum slope of the load-settlement curve. The load location is generally located slightly above the load value that plastic behavior becomes observed. This location is known as the point of plunging failure. Figure 2 is a graphical representation of the Butler and Hoy method (1977).

![Figure 2. Butler and Hoy Failure Criterion](image)

2.2.3 De Beer Failure Criterion
The De Beer method (1967) identifies the failure capacity as the intersection of the elastic and plastic portions of the load-settlement curves on a log-log scale. The interpreted failure load is where the two straight lines intersect on double logarithmic scale. This point is shown in Figure 3. The effectiveness of this method depends on the lognormal distribution of load-settlement data.

![Figure 3. De Beer Failure Criterion](image)
2.2.4 Hanson (80%) Failure Criterion

The Hanson (80%) method (1963) is an extrapolation method for defining capacity failure. This method is most commonly applied when load tests do not get carried out till failure or the applied load approached the failure load so closely that the other failure criteria produce unreliable data. The Hanson (80%) method (1963) states failure occurs when the gives four times the movement of the pile head as obtained for 80 % of the load. The Hanson (80%) method (1963) states the capacity can be determined by graphing the square root of each movement value divided by its load value and plotted against the movement. Figure 4 is a graphical representation of the Hanson (80%) method (1963).

![Graphical representation of Hanson Failure Criterion](image)

**Figure 4. Hanson Failure Criterion**

Once the data is plotted, a line can be fitted to the data, and the constants can be determined. The slope of the best fit line = $C_1$, and $y$-intercept = $C_2$. The ultimate capacity and settlement can then be calculated using Equation 4 and Equation 5, respectively.

$$Q_u = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{C_1 C_2}}$$

$$\Delta u = \frac{C_1}{C_2}$$

The Hanson (80%) method (1963) is most commonly applied to situations where the load-settlement data is skewed and the data is unreliable at loads near failure. This method was empirically generated by Hanson considering bored shafts, so it is necessary to check if the calculated 0.8 $Q_u$ intersects the best fit line. It often does not with drilled piles, however when the failure load is so high that toe mobilization is difficult.
Equation 6 is the equation used to plot the Hanson (80%) method (1963).

\[ Q = \frac{\sqrt{\Delta}}{\Delta C_1 + C_2} \]  

(6)

### 2.2.5 Hanson (90%) Failure Criterion

The Hanson (90%) method (1963) defines failure load as the load that gives twice the movement of the pile head as obtained for 90% of that load. The stress at failure is equal to two times the strain 10% smaller stress. The International Building Codes incorporated the Hanson (90%) method (1963) in 2000 as an extrapolation method for defining capacity failure. The Hanson (90%) method (1963) is a slightly more conservative linear approximation estimation than the Hansen 80% failure criterion (failure stress occurs when the strain is equal to four times the strain at a 20% smaller stress). Dotson (2013) purposed a direct solution to approximate the Hanson (90%) method (1963) using a system of equations. Dotson (2013) used Equation 7 to represent the load and deflection at 90% of the ultimate capacity.

\[ \frac{9}{10} Q_u - \frac{\sqrt{\Delta}}{\frac{\Delta}{2} C_1 + C_2} = 0 \]  

(7)

After solving by substitution and re-arranging the equation, the approximate solution is expressed by Equation 8.

\[ Q_u = \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{7\sqrt{C_1 C_2}} \]  

(8)

The deflection corresponding to the 90% failure load is given by Equation 9.

\[ \Delta_u = \frac{3C_1}{4C_2} \]  

(9)

### 2.2.6 Bearing Capacity Equations

The API (1993) method is a semi-empirical approach of calculating the pile skin friction, based on the total stresses induced in the soil and calculated using the soil’s undrained shear strength \( (c_u) \). This method works well for cohesive or clay soils. It has been used for many years and has proven to provide reasonable design capacities for displacement and non-displacement piles. This method depends on the alpha factor \( (\alpha) \), which is indirectly
related to the soil’s undrained shear strength \( (c_u) \). The element was back-calculated from several pile load tests.

### 2.2.7 Skin Friction and End Bearing Resistance in Cohesive Soils
Driving piles into cohesive soils create a reduction in the effective stress because it increases the pore water pressure. Drilling large diameter piles into clays can potentially lead to strain softening. This happens when large strains in the clay build up as the pile driven and a significant reduction in skin friction occurs. The adhesion factor \( \alpha \) was developed empirically to address these concerns with clay.

The API (1993) adhesion factor \( \alpha \) can be calculated using Equation 10 where \( \sigma'_v \) is the effective vertical stress calculated at the midpoint of each segment, and \( c_u \) is the undrained shear strength of the segments.

\[
\psi = \frac{c_u}{\sigma'_v} 
\]

\[
\alpha = 0.5\psi^{-0.5}, \quad \psi \leq 1.0, \quad \alpha \leq 1.0
\]

\[
\alpha = 0.5\psi^{-2.5}, \quad \psi > 1.0, \quad \alpha \leq 1.0
\]

The API (1993) method to determine the ultimate unit skin friction for driven piles in clay is provided by Equation 11:

\[
\tau_{ult} = \alpha \times c_u
\]

The API (1993) method to determine the ultimate unit end-bearing resistance for clay in units of force per area is calculated using Equation 12:

\[
q_p = 9c_u
\]

### 2.2.8 Skin Friction and End Bearing Resistance in Non-Cohesive Soils
Driving a pile has different effects on the soil surrounding it depending on the relative density of the soil. In loose soils, the soil is compacted, forming a depression in the ground around the pile. In dense soils, any further compaction is small, and the soil is displaced upward causing ground heave. In loose soils, driving is preferable to boring since compaction increases the end-bearing capacity.
The API (1993) method to determine the unit skin friction for driven piles in cohesionless soil can be calculated using Equation 13 where $K_o$ is the lateral earth (at rest) coefficient and $(\delta)$ is soil-pile friction angle.

$$q_s = K_o \sigma'_v \tan \delta$$

(13)

The API (1993) method to determine the ultimate end-bearing resistance in cohesionless soils is given by Equation 14.

$$q_p = \sigma'_v N_q$$

(14)

The bearing capacity factor ($N_q$) in cohesionless soils is given by Equation 15 where $\phi'$ is the effective friction angle.

$$N_q = \tan^2(45 + \frac{\pi}{2}) e^{\pi \tan \phi'}$$

(15)

The bearing capacity factor ($N_q$) can also be estimated based on the density soil and anticipated soil-pile friction angle $(\delta)$ using API (1993) recommendations for cohesionless soils. The API (1993) bearing capacity factor ($N_q$) recommendations for cohesionless soils is listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Density</th>
<th>Soil-Pile Friction Angle $(\delta)$</th>
<th>Bearing ($N_q$) Capacity Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Loose - Loose to Medium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loose Medium - Dense</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Dense</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dense - Very Dense</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dense</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Project Description of Kentucky Lake Bridge

The proposed Lagoon Bridge was part of the Kentucky Lake Bridge Advance Contract (CID 131305) in Marshall and Trigg Counties, Kentucky. The Kentucky Transportation
Cabinet (KYTC) has proposed a bridge replacement for an existing crossing at Kentucky Lake. The crossing follows the existing US 68/KY 80 highway corridor. The bridge is a multi-span structure that is served by causeways on the east and west banks of Kentucky Lake that extend into the lake and serve as approaches. The project site was located within the perimeter of the red square depicted in Figure 5.

![Figure 5. Project Location](image1)

The purposed bridge replacement is approximately 30.48 m north of the centerline of the existing bridge. The new structure is designed to have a length of 176.80 m and a width of 19.6 m. The causeways to the east and west of the bridge extend into the lake and will serve as approaches. The steel girder bridge will be supported on integral end bents and two interior piers. The interior piers are in turn supported on three columns that are connected to a single beam support. The plan view of the purposed bridge replacement is pictured in Figure 6.

![Figure 6. Proposed Bridge Replacement](image2)
2.4 Site Conditions

The geology of the site is influenced by the Mississippi Embayment to the west and is composed primarily of a cherty Mississippian-age residuum within the Ft. Payne Formation. This formation is described as a residual chert interbedded with residual clay. Existing grades currently slope from south to north over much of the site from the existing highway embankment to the existing lagoon. At the west end of the site, near L-1, grades slope from southwest to northeast toward the lagoon. Grades at the site range from approximately 7H:1V near the lagoon to as steep as 3H:1V near the west end of the site. The summer pool elevation is 109.42 m, and the winter pool elevation is 107.90 m.

The effective strength parameters of the granular soils for Test Pile Location L-1 were estimated using the SPT N-value data from test borings using published AASHTO correlations. Data from SPT testing supplemented with data from CPT soundings was also used to estimate the unit weight parameters of the fine-grained soils at the site. Corrected N-values were used to estimate the compression and recompression indices.

The bulk and split tube samples collected during SPT testing, boring logs, and CPT soundings provided the data and intact samples for testing in the upper lean clay soils at L-2. The results of consolidated-undrained (CU) and unconsolidated undrained (UU) triaxial shear tests were used to estimate the effective and total soil shear strength parameters. The compression/recompression indices and over-consolidation ratios (OCR) were estimated from CPT data.

2.5 In Situ Testing Program

The borings were extended to depths of 13.89 m or 49 m. The bedded chert was extremely difficult to penetrate using the rotary drill equipment. A split-barrel sampler was used to collect a sample at depths 12.83 m to 25.3 m below existing grades. An observation well was installed at B5 with a screen depth of 10.97 m.

Bulk samples were collected at 0 to 7.31 m depth in boring B4, 2.34 m to 9.87 m in depth in boring B2, 9.87 m to 7.31 m in boring B2, and 7.31 m to 11.5 m in boring B2. Due to the introduction of drilling fluid to facilitate casing advancement in all borings, groundwater levels were not obtained while drilling, or after the completion of drilling in these borings. Considering the low permeability of some of the soils encountered in the borings, a
A relatively long period may be necessary for a groundwater level to develop and stabilize in a borehole in these materials. When the observation well B5 was checked, the elevation of the water was 103.97 m. Groundwater level fluctuations in the soils surrounding the lagoon bridge site occur due to seasonal variations in the amount of rainfall, runoff, and the varying pool levels of the immediately adjacent lagoon and Kentucky Lake. Based on this, long-term groundwater monitoring was determined to be unnecessary.

The soil profiles at the pile test locations were developed based on the subsurface conditions encountered in nearby test borings logged during the field exploration phase of the project. The in-situ testing program consisted of five penetration test borings. The five test borings were advanced at the locations shown in Figure 7.

Test boring B1 encountered cohesive hard silt (ML) from ground surface to a depth of 2.1 m. Between depths of 2.1 m to 8.5 m test boring B1 encountered cohesionless dense gravel with silt (GM). Between depths of 8.5 m to 10.05 m test boring B1 encountered cohesive hard silt (ML). From the depth of 10.05 m to the bottom of the boring (14 m), test boring B1 encountered cohesionless silty gravel with chert and bedded chert (GM-ML). The subsurface profile at the H-Pile (L-1) load test site is shown in Figure 8.
The test borings B2, B3, B4, and B5, encountered alluvial clay (CL) and silt soils (ML) with some chert pieces from the muddy ground surface at a depth of 11.2 m. Within this depth test, boring B2 encountered a layer of loose gravel with silt (GC) from a depth of 2.7 m to 4.2 m. Between the depths of 4.2 m to 20.4 m test borings B2, B3, and B4 encountered silty gravel with chert (GP-GM). From the depth of 20.4 m to 24.56 m at the bottom of the boring test, borings B3 and B4 encountered silty gravel with chert and chert layers (GC-GM). The subsurface profile at the Pipe Pile (L-2) load test site is shown in Figure 9.

The moisture contents of all tested soils ranged from 16.6% to 28.2% (average = 23.44%), and the dry unit weights ranged from 1490 kN/m³ to 1794 kN/m³ (median = 1582 kN/
Atterberg limits tests (per ASTM D4318) indicated the liquid limits (LL) ranging from 21 to 47 percent (average = 31%) , plastic limits (PL) ranging from 13 to 28 percent (average = 20.9%), and plasticity indices (PI) ranging from 3 to 26 (average = 10.7%) percent.

### 2.6 Laboratory Testing Program

The boring tests from the field study provided sound samples for geotechnical laboratory testing. The high-quality samples provided site-specific soil parameters under dynamic loading. The shear strength parameters of the granular soils were determined using the SPT N-values data from the test borings and were supplemented with CPT soundings data. In locations where the N-values were skewed, the estimated internal angle of friction ranged between 36 and 38 degrees. In specific locations when the SPT data appeared to be accurate, the shear strength parameters of the granular soils were estimated using AASHTO correlations.

The bulk and split tube samples collected during SPT testing, boring logs, and CPT soundings provided the data and intact samples for testing in the upper lean clay soils at L-2. The CPT data from B2 and results of the consolidated-undrained (CU) and unconsolidated undrained triaxial (UU) shear tests of the split tube samples collected in nearby boring locations were used to estimate the strength properties and unit weight parameters of the clay soils near L-2. Moisture content (MC) tests (ASTM D2216) performed on selected penetrations indicated that the upper layers of soil in the area were generally lean clays. The classification and properties of the upper lean clay layers encountered in this study are shown in Figure 10.

---

**Figure 10. Classification and Properties of Encountered Clays.**
2.7 Pile Driveability Analyses
Wave equation analyses indicated that the wall thickness of the pile needs to be a minimum of 2.54 cm to avoid overstressing the piles during driving. The analyses assume that a pile plug condition will begin at 15.24 m the pile cap for the pipe pile and at 4.6 m and 7.62 m below the pile cap for the H-pile, respectively. The GRLWEAP analyses indicated the proposed pile types could be driven to the anticipated bearing depths, assuming the allowable compressive and tensile stresses are 85% of the steel yield stress for the pipe piles and the H-Piles. The results showed that hammer blows in the final 4.6 to 6.1 m might exceed 150 blows per foot for the hammers selected, which will increase the installation time of the piles. The GRLWEAP results indicate that a hammer with a rated energy of 112.5 kN-m to 122 kN-m will be required to drive the unplugged pipe piles and a hammer with a rated energy of 206 kN-m to 217 kN-m. The results indicated a hammer with a rated energy of 37 kN-m to 66 kN-m will be required to drive unplugged H-piles and a hammer with a rated energy of 206 kN-m to 217 kN-m. The nominal resistance for the H-Pile and Pipe Pile were 2,668 kN and 10,675, respectively. The ultimate capacities estimated by the GRLWEAP software during the driveability study are shown in Figure 11.

![Figure 11. GRLWEAP Nominal Geotechnical Resistance](image)

2.8 Pile Load Test Program
2.8.1 Test Piles Description
The pile load test program tested two test piles designated as L-1 and L-2. Test pile L-1 was an HP18x204, ASTM A572, Grade 50 steel H-Pile with a length of 18.3 m. Test pile L-2 was a 762 mm (O.D.) steel pipe pile with a wall thickness of 25.4 mm and had an
overall length of 32 m. The prescribed lengths assumed a water level elevation of 11.3 m plus an additional 6.1 m for instrumentation gages, leads/sleeves, and to provide sufficient stickup to perform pile testing. The analyses assumed all pipe piles would consist of ASTM A252 steel having a yield strength of at least 310 MPa, whereas the assumed yield strength is 344.7 MPa for the H-piles.

2.8.2 H-Pile Instrumentation

The H-Pile arrived in one 18.3 m piece (area = 387 cm²). A pile driving point was placed at the tip of the H-pile by KYTC standard specifications. The shape of the recommended pile point is designed explicitly for sloping rock surfaces. It was used to help penetrate the encountered bedded chert zones and chert boulders in the foundation soil during pile installation. A schematic depicting the instrumentation of the H-Pile is presented in Figure 12.

![Figure 12. H-Pile Schematic](image)

Strain gages were placed at ten different locations along the pile length. The strain gages were protected during driving with a welded steel angle over the gages and associated wires. The strain gage instrumentation is pictured in Figure 13.

![Figure 13. Strain Gage Instrumentation](image)
The test pile was instrumented using vibrating wire strain gages at ten depth intervals along two vertical lines along the centerline of each side of the H-Pile web. The depths and elevations of the strain gages are listed in Table 2.

**Table 2. Strange Gage Locations for H-Pile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth Below Pile Top (m)</th>
<th>Elevation (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile Top</td>
<td>Synchronous Lift</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121.3104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System Four Top Displacement Transducers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Displacement Transducers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manual Survey Measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Level</td>
<td>Two Strain Gages</td>
<td>0.1524</td>
<td>121.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 1</td>
<td>Two Strain Gages</td>
<td>1.6764</td>
<td>119.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 2</td>
<td>Two Strain Gages</td>
<td>1.92024</td>
<td>119.3902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 3</td>
<td>Two Strain Gages</td>
<td>3.2004</td>
<td>118.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 4</td>
<td>Two Strain Gages</td>
<td>4.7244</td>
<td>116.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 5</td>
<td>Two Strain Gages</td>
<td>6.2484</td>
<td>115.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 6</td>
<td>Two Strain Gages</td>
<td>7.7724</td>
<td>113.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 7</td>
<td>Two Strain Gages</td>
<td>9.2964</td>
<td>112.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 8</td>
<td>Two Strain Gages</td>
<td>10.8204</td>
<td>110.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 9</td>
<td>Two Strain Gages</td>
<td>12.31392</td>
<td>108.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 10</td>
<td>Two Strain Gages, End of Tell-Tale Housing</td>
<td>13.8684</td>
<td>107.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Tip</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.6304</td>
<td>106.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.8.3 Pipe Pile Instrumentation**

The pipe pile was manufactured in two sections. The bottom part of the test pile was 4.65 m in length, and the top part was 5.11 m feet in length. The two pile sections were joined together with a field welded splice on the project site during installation. The upper section of the test pile was then raised and set into place for the field splicing process. After the
two sections of the test pile were spliced together in the field, the cabling for the strain gages on the bottom section of the test pile was run through the upper part of the test pile within the preinstalled protection angle. The cabling was then subsequently closed by splicing the top and bottom section of the protection angle together. The pile splicing instrumentation procedure is pictured in Figure 13 (a).

Once the splicing process was complete, a pile driving shoe was placed at the end of the pipe to improve driveability and durability. Driving shoes for the pipe piles are flush with the exterior surface of the pile and to fit inside of the pile. The driving shoe was used to help maintain the exterior skin friction on the pile and aid in the driving of the piles in the bedded chert and chert boulders. Figure 13 (b) depicts the driving shoe that was placed on the end of the pile to improve driveability.

Figure 14. Pipe Pile Instrumentation: (a) Pile Splicing; (b) Driving Shoe
The test pile was instrumented using vibrating wire strain gages at ten depth intervals along four vertical lines located 90 degrees to one another along the exterior of the pipe pile. A schematic depicting the instrumentation of the Pipe Pile is presented in Figure 14.

Figure 15. Pipe Pile Schematic
Strain gages were placed at ten different locations along the pile length. The depth and elevation of the strain gages are listed in Table 3.

### Table 3. Strange Gage Locations for Steel Pile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth Below Pile Top (m)</th>
<th>Elevation (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile Top</td>
<td>Synchronous Lift System Four Top Displacement Transducers Two Displacement Transducers Digital Survey Manual Survey Measurement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111.8616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Surface</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.1816</td>
<td>106.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 1</td>
<td>Four Strain Gages</td>
<td>7.04088</td>
<td>104.82072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 2</td>
<td>Four Strain Gages</td>
<td>9.47928</td>
<td>102.38232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 3</td>
<td>Four Strain Gages</td>
<td>11.91768</td>
<td>99.94392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 4</td>
<td>Four Strain Gages</td>
<td>14.56944</td>
<td>97.29216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 5</td>
<td>Four Strain Gages</td>
<td>16.67256</td>
<td>95.18904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 6</td>
<td>Four Strain Gages</td>
<td>19.11096</td>
<td>92.75064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 7</td>
<td>Four Strain Gages</td>
<td>21.54936</td>
<td>90.31224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 8</td>
<td>Four Strain Gages</td>
<td>23.98776</td>
<td>87.87384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 9</td>
<td>Four Strain Gages</td>
<td>26.42616</td>
<td>85.46592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Level 10</td>
<td>Four-Strain Gages, End of Tell-Tale Housing</td>
<td>28.86456</td>
<td>83.02752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Tip</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.59608</td>
<td>82.26552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.9 Pile Installation Methods and Dynamic Testing Procedure**

**2.9.1 H-Pile Installation Procedures**

Before installing the test pile, a pre-probing program was implemented to determine if predrilling was required. This program determined that pre-drilling should be done due to the limited number of test borings at the site, and because of the presence of bedded chert. The predrilled hole extended to an elevation of 102.108 m. The pile was driven with an
ICE I-30v2 open-ended diesel hammer. After completion of the initial drive, a restrike was performed 72 hours later. Dynamic testing data was recorded using pile driving monitoring equipment manufactured by Pile Dynamics Inc. (Model PAX, strain and accelerometer calibrations attached) and analyzed with the CAPWAP software during the initial drive and subsequent restrike.

Upon completion of the 72-hour restrike, the pile was cut down to 14.60 m. The head of the pile was at an elevation of +121.31 m, and the final pile tip elevation was +106.68 m. The ground surface was at the height of +119.39 m, giving the pile an embedment length of 12.71 m within the soil.

2.9.2 Pipe Pile Installation Procedures
Before installing the test pile, predrilling was performed using a 60.96 cm diameter auger to Elevation 108.204 m. The decision to pre-drill made as a result of the presence of chert in the encountered soils during field exploration. Predrilling at the testing location was performed down to an elevation 108.204 m.

The test pile was driven using an ICE I-100v2 open-ended diesel hammer to a tip elevation of 84.7 m on the initial drive. Additional PDA restrikes were performed on August 19, 2013, and September 10, 2013. This corresponded to 72 hours after the completion of the redrive and four days after the completion of the static load test. Dynamic pile testing (PDA) was recorded during the initial drive, redrive, and subsequent restrikes.

After the completion of the 72-hour restrike on August 19, 2013, the test pile was cut-off to bring the pile top to the required load testing elevation. The final tip elevation was +25.07 m and the top of pile elevation at the time of testing was +34.10 m, giving the tested pile a length of 9.02 m. The ground surface was at an elevation of +32.52 m, giving the pile an embedment length of 7.44 m within the soil. The surface was at an altitude of +32.52 m, which led to a pile embedment length of 7.44 m within the ground.

2.10 Static Load Test Procedure
The load was applied using three 3558.56 kN hydraulic jacks equipped with a common manifold and single electric hydraulic pump. The hydraulic jacks had an effective area of 0.056 m² hydraulic jack (0.168 m² total). The load test frame was designed by Genesis Structures, a sub-consultant to Jim Smith Contracting. The hydraulic jacks acted against
an engineered reaction frame with a total of 8 reactions placed in-line with the cylinders. The static load applying equipment used in this study are pictured in Figure 16.

![Figure 16. Static Load Test Equipment: (a) Hydraulic Jacks; (b) Load Test Frame](image)

The top of pile movement was measured using four displacement transducers mounted on a reference beam. Two telltales were installed along the exterior of the pile and terminated near the toe of the H-Pile. Backup pile head measurements and measurements of reaction pile movements were measured using survey methods. The instruments used to measure the top of pile movement are shown in Figure 17.

![Figure 17. Head Movement Measurement: (a) Pressure Transducers; (b) Reference Beam](image)

The applied load was measured with an Enerpac ESS Synchronous Lift System that records the applied load and hydraulic jack elongation data in real time. The test load was applied
in increments of 5% of the maximum applied test load. During each load interval, the load was maintained for a time interval of 10 minutes, using the same time interval for all loading increments except at 50% and 100% on the applied test load. At 50% of the applied test load, the load was maintained for 30 minutes, and at 100% of the applied test load, the load was maintained for 1 hour. The applied test load was removed in ten, approximately equal, decrements. The load at each decrement was maintained for 15 minutes. The same time interval was utilized for all unloading decrements. Readings continued to be taken for 30 minutes after complete unloading of the test pile. The pile stiffness multiplied the average strain at each gage level. The Enerpac ESS Synchronous Lift System used to measure the applied load, and hydraulic jack elongation data is depicted in Figure 18.

Figure 18. Enerpac ESS Synchronous Lift System

2.11 Dynamic Test Results

2.11.1 H-Pile Dynamic Testing Results

The subject pile was monitored with dynamic pile testing equipment during initial drive, all subsequent re-strikes, and extended drive. The CAPWAP software was used to generate load-settlement curves from the data collected during testing. Compression and tension pile driving stresses were below the acceptable limit of 279237 kPa. The acceptable limit of compression and tension driving stresses is defined as 90 percent of the applied load. The load-settlement curves produced by CAPWAP are plotted in Figure 19.
The ultimate capacities predictions CAPWAP produced were made using the case method. The ultimate capacities ranged from approximately 1,160 kips (5160 kN) at the end of the initial drive to approximately 1,250 kips (5560 kN) during the 72-hour re-strike. The ultimate capacities determined by various commonly applied failure criteria using the load-settlement data produced by CAPWAP is shown in Figure 20.

The 72-hour re-strike capacity showed an increase of approximately 90 kips (400 kN). However, the subsequent final re-strike (after the static load test) showed a slight decrease
in capacity with respect to the initial drive. This was most likely caused by the lower hammer energy utilized during the final re-strike not fully mobilizing the pile capacity. The ultimate capacities predicted during the initial drive, and final re-strike of the pipe pile dynamic test are listed in Table 4.

Table 4. H-Pile Dynamic Capacity Estimations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failure Criterion</th>
<th>Initial Drive Ultimate Capacity</th>
<th>Final Drive Ultimate Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Beer</td>
<td>3,638 kN</td>
<td>5,361 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Method</td>
<td>5,160 kN</td>
<td>5,560 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler &amp; Hoy</td>
<td>5,198 kN</td>
<td>5,557.5 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson 80%</td>
<td>5,590 kN</td>
<td>5,270 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson 90%</td>
<td>5,533 kN</td>
<td>5,216 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Davvison 5,782 kN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The GRLWEAP software estimated the unit side shear resistances in the dense to very dense gravel ranged from approximately 95.76 kPa to 191 kPa and generally increased with depth (Figure 21 (a)). Unit end bearings at the pile tip (plugged condition) ranged from approximately 636 to 911 kPa. However, the end bearings are likely much higher due to the pile likely only being partially plugged. The low hammer energy utilized during the final restrike did not mobilize the pile. This is graphically represented in Figure 21 (b).
2.11.2 Pipe Pile Dynamic Testing Results

The pile was monitored with dynamic pile testing equipment during initial drive, all subsequent re-strikes, and extended drive. Compression and tension pile driving stresses were below the acceptable limit of 279237 kPa. The match qualities (MQ) for the signal matching results were less than 4. Lower match qualities may be achievable; however, to achieve lower match qualities the ultimate capacity of the pile may be unrealistic given the soil conditions, transferred hammer energy, and the measured sets. The acceptable limit for compression and tension driving stresses is defined as 90 percent of Fy. The load-settlement curves produced by CAPWAP are plotted in Figure 22.
The ultimate capacities predicted by CAPWAP ranged from approximately 5947.27 kN at the end of the initial drive to approximately 10675.73 kN during the final re-strike. The re-strike capacities for the first (48 hour) and second (72 hour) re-strike showed an increase in capacity of approximately 1120.95 kN and 271.34 kN, respectively. The capacity predictions from the dynamic load test of the pipe pile are graphically represented in Figure 23.

Figure 23. Pipe Pile Dynamic Testing Capacity Estimations

It should be noted the driving shoe located at the pile tip was not included as part of the pile model within the CAPWAP software. The signal matching results would only be marginally affected even if the pile shoe was included, given the size and depth of the driving shoe relative to the pile. The impedance changes in the bottom few inches would have been very small. The ultimate capacities predicted during the initial drive, and final re-strike of the pipe pile dynamic test are listed in Table 5.
Table 5. Pipe Pile Dynamic Capacity Estimations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failure Criterion</th>
<th>Ultimate Capacity</th>
<th>Failure Criterion</th>
<th>Ultimate Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Beer</td>
<td>3,749 kN</td>
<td>De Beer</td>
<td>10,000 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Method</td>
<td>5,947 kN</td>
<td>Case Method</td>
<td>7,068 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler &amp; Hoy</td>
<td>5,772 kN</td>
<td>Butler &amp; Hoy</td>
<td>10,683 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hanson 80%</td>
<td>9,128 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hanson 90%</td>
<td>9,035 kN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The GRLWEAP software estimated the unit side shear resistances in the dense to very dense gravel ranged from approximately 47.8 kPa to 311 kPa and increased with depth. Figure 24 plots the shear resistance against depth. The end bearing resistance (using an end area based on a plugged condition) ranged from approximately 5314 kPa to 5793.5 kPa. However, unit end bearings are likely much higher due to the pile likely only being partially plugged.

![Figure 24. Pipe Pile Unit Side Friction](image-url)
### 2.12 Static Load Test

#### 2.12.1 H-Pile Static Load Testing Results

The Maximum Test Load (MTL) applied to the H-Pile was 5417.93 kN and exhibited a downward deflection of 0.7394 cm. The permanent displacement after unloading was 0.09144 cm. The load-settlement curve for the H-Pile static load test is presented in Figure 25.

![H-Pile Static Load-Settlement Curve](image)

**Figure 25. H-Pile Static Load-Settlement Curve**

The H-Pile did not achieve geotechnical failure 100% of the design test load. Therefore, three additional load increments were added up to the maximum test load. The deflection measured at the pile head during the pile load test never exceeded the calculated elastic shortening of the test pile. Thus, the FHWA failure criteria for an HP18x204 pile was not achieved. Table 6 lists the ultimate capacity predictions from the H-Pile static load test.

#### Table 6. H-Pile Static Test Ultimate Capacities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failure Criterion</th>
<th>Ultimate Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanson 90%</td>
<td>2,130 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson 80%</td>
<td>2,152 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Beer</td>
<td>3,755 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davvison</td>
<td>5,438 kN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.12.2 Pipe Pile Static Load Testing Results

The Maximum Test Load (MTL) applied to the pile was 6418.78 kN and exhibited a downward deflection of 1.05156 cm. The permanent displacement after unloading was 0.127 cm. The load-settlement curve for the Pipe Pile static load test is presented in Figure 26.

![Figure 26. Pipe Pile Load-Settlement Curve](image)

The load readings from the Enerpac ESS Synchronous Lift System and the calculated load from the pressure transducers were 2032.84 kN apart, indicating that the pile failed before it reached the design test load. When piles are loaded near failure, load-settlement data can become skewed. Table 7 lists the ultimate capacity predictions from the pipe pile static load test.

**Table 7. Pipe Pile Static Test Ultimate Capacities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failure Criterion</th>
<th>Ultimate Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanson 90%</td>
<td>2,213 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson 80%</td>
<td>2,236 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Beer</td>
<td>6,309.6 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davvison</td>
<td>6,410 kN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Hanson failure criteria are extrapolation methods. The Hansen method assumes that when the failure load is approached, the load-settlement curve is hyperbolic in shape. The 90% (more conservative) Hanson failure method is the correct criteria for this load test because linear graphical derived failure criterion requires accurate load settlement readings. The deflection measured at the pile head during the pile load test never exceeded the calculated elastic shortening of the test pile. Thus, the FHWA failure criteria for a 30-inch-diameter steel pipe having a 1-inch wall thickness was not achieved at the maximum applied test load of 6418.78 kN.

2.13 Bearing Capacity Equations

2.13.1 H-Pile Bearing Capacity Equations Results

The bearing capacity equations prediction of the ultimate capacity of the H-Pile is 3,641 kN. In the bearing capacity calculation, the effective earth coefficient (K) was assumed to be 1, and the soil/pile friction angle (δ) was assumed to be 0.65 φ (φ = effective internal angle of friction). The ultimate capacity predictions varied linearly over a range of assumed effective earth coefficients (δ=constant = 0.65 φ) and soil/pile friction angles (K=constant=1). This linear change is graphically demonstrated in Figure 27.

![Figure 27. H-Pile Ultimate Capacity: (a) K= 1-1.5; (b) δ=0.3φ-0.9φ](image-url)

The ultimate capacity ranged from 3,641 kN to 3,756 kN as the effective earth coefficient ranged from 1 to 1.5 (K=1-K=1.5) and ranged from 3,513 kN to 3,746 kN as the soil/pile friction angle ranged from 0.3φ to 0.9φ (δ=0.3φ- δ=0.9φ).
2.13.2 Pipe Pile Bearing Capacity Equation Results

The bearing capacity equations prediction of the ultimate capacity of the Pipe Pile is 12,045 kN. In the bearing capacity calculation, the effective earth coefficient (K) was assumed to be 1, and the soil/pile friction angle (δ) was assumed to be 0.65 φ (φ = effective internal angle of friction). The ultimate capacity predictions varied linearly over a range of assumed effective earth coefficients (δ=constant = 0.65 φ) and soil/pile friction angles (K=constant=1). This variation is shown in Figure 28.

The ultimate capacity ranged from 12,405 kN to 12,732 kN as the effective earth coefficient ranged from 1 to 1.5 (K=1-K=1.5) and ranged from 11,278 kN to 12,679 kN as the soil/pile friction angle ranged from 0.3φ to 0.9φ (δ=0.3φ- δ=0.9φ).

2.14 Discussion of Pile Load Test Results

2.14.1 H-Pile Discussion

The Maximum Test Load (MTL) applied to the H-Pile was 5417.93 kN and exhibited a downward deflection of 0.7394 cm. The permanent displacement after unloading was 0.09144 cm. The H-Pile did not achieve geotechnical failure at 100% of the design test load, or the three additional load increments that were added up to the maximum test load. The GRLWEAP and Bearing Capacity Equations capacity calculations underestimated the ultimate capacities estimated by the load tests. The actual capacity for the H-Pile cannot be determined with certainty because failure did not occur during testing. This most likely due to partial soil plugging. If the soil does not plug during driving, the soil inside a pipe pile
or between H-pile flanges slips and produces internal shaft resistance. Slippage results in the limited toe resistance being the controlling variable in the capacity equation and the end bearing resistances being inaccurate. When the soil does not plug during driving, the soil inside a pipe pile or between H-pile flanges slips and produces internal shaft resistance. H-Piles can get soil trapped between the flange and affect the soil-pile interaction by changing the interface with additional sticking. This can have a significant impact on the accuracy of the predicted end-bearing capacity accuracy. The ultimate capacities estimations predicted in this study are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. H-Pile Ultimate Capacity Summary

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Load Test</td>
<td>5,560 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Load Test</td>
<td>3,755 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearing Capacity Equations</td>
<td>3,641 kN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRLWEAP</td>
<td>2,668 kN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.14.2 Pipe Pile Discussion

The Maximum Test Load (MTL) applied to the pile was 6418.78 kN and exhibited a downward deflection of 1.05156 cm. The permanent displacement after unloading was .127 cm. The load readings were performed on the Enerpac ESS Synchronous Lift System, and the calculated load from the pressure transducers were 2032.84 kN apart, indicating that the pile failed before it reached the design test load. When a pile is loaded near failure, the load-settlement data can become skewed and make capacity estimations unreliable. Extrapolation methods assume that when the failure load is approached, the load-settlement curve is hyperbolic in shape. Extrapolation methods are practical solutions for capacity estimations when linear load-settlement data are not available. The Hanson 90% failure criterion provided the most accurate capacity corresponding to the applied load. The Davvison and De Beer failure criteria provided the most misleading capacity predictions. This is probably because the Davvison and De Beer failure criterion are derived from graphical methods that rely on linear relationships. The ultimate capacities estimations predicted in this study are summarized in Table 9.
### Table 9. Pipe Pile Ultimate Capacity Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Capacity (kN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Load Test</td>
<td>7,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Load Test</td>
<td>2,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearing Capacity Equations</td>
<td>12,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRLWEAP</td>
<td>10,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.15 Conclusions

The results of this study show that the dynamic methods for predicting the capacity of the pile do not match the measured results from the static load test. The study in the cases of both test piles show the dynamic test methods overpredicted the capacity pile. This study provides further support to the argument that further investigation and adjustment to dynamic methods are required before load test programs consisting of both static and dynamic load tests are not necessary to accurately predict the capacities of deep foundations using large diameter piles.
CHAPTER 3

3 Load Transfer Analysis of Load Test Program with Large Diameter Bridge Piles

3.1 Introduction
The method for predicting the load transfer behavior of driven piles is based on finite element analysis. The load transfer method treats the pile as a beam supported by non-linear springs. The active stresses at the soil-pile interface are represented by three loading mechanisms that are related by the internal angle of friction. The stress acting at the soil-pile interface can be represented with $t-z$ and $q-z$ curves. $T-z$ and $q-z$ curves define the soil-pile interaction with depth by quantifying the stresses brought forth with each load increment. $T-z$ curves represent the load transfer relationship along the shaft of the pile, and $q-z$ curves represent the soil-pile relationship at the pile toe.

The load-settlement data provided by dynamic load tests are generated by signal matching software that runs multiple iterations of the wave equation with measured strain and acceleration data. The theories and assumptions at the core of dynamic analysis were derived from research based on small diameter piles, homogenous soils, and ideal installation techniques. The use of different pile types, geometries, and soil mixtures creates uncertainty in the dynamic model of the soil-pile interface because of the variations that can occur to the active forces.

In high profile pile foundation designs, static tests subsequently performed after dynamic tests to supplement the dynamic results. A $t-z$ analysis of the static load test data describes the soil-pile behavior over the entire length of the pile. The uncertainties reported in the literature associated with dynamic load transfer data for large diameter piles indicate that design failure is likely to occur unless back calculations and adjustments are made using static tests to account for soil plugging and elastic shortening.

This paper presents a load transfer analysis of static and dynamic load data from a load test program conducted on a bridge replacement project in western Kentucky. First, the site and soil conditions are described along with the dynamic and static load test procedures. The paper concludes by calculating and describing the approach used to develop the load transfer data, $t-z$, and $q-z$ curves along with a discussion of the results.
3.2 Project Description
The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) has proposed bridge a replacement for an existing crossing at Kentucky Lake. The crossing follows the existing US 68/KY 80 highway corridor. The bridge is a multi-span structure that is served by causeways on the east and west banks of Kentucky Lake that extend into the lake and serve as approaches. The steel girder bridge will be supported on integral end bents and two interior piers. The interior piers are in turn supported on three columns that are connected to a single beam support. The proposed Bridge has a length of 176.80 m and a width of 19.6 m.

3.3 Site Conditions
A load test program is being conducted at two locations. The load test locations are designated L-1 and L-2. Several test borings and cone penetration tests (CPT) were performed in 2011 near the test pile locations. The geology of the site is influenced by the Mississippi Embayment to the west and is composed primarily of a cherty Mississippian age residuum within the Ft. Payne Formation. This formation is described as a residual chert interbedded with residual clay. Existing grades currently slope from south to north over much of the site from the existing highway embankment to the existing lagoon. The load test locations are illustrated in Figure 29.

Figure 29. Project Site Test Locations
At the west end of the site, near the L-1 load test location, grades slope from southwest to northeast toward the lagoon. Grades at the site range from approximately 7H:1V near the lagoon to as steep as 3H:1V near the west end of the site (Figure 30). The groundwater has a summer pool elevation of 109.42 m and a winter pool elevation of 107.90 m.

The subsurface soil conditions at the L-1 test site are cohesive hard silt (ML) from ground surface to a depth of 2.1 m. Between depths of 2.1 m to 8.5 m boring logs documented cohesionless dense gravel with silt (GM). Between depths of 8.5 m to 10.05 m cohesive hard silt (ML) exists. From the depth of 10.05 m to the bottom of the boring (14 m), the test boring encountered cohesionless silty gravel with chert and bedded chert (GM-ML). The estimated soil properties from boring data for the L-1 test site are provided in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Depth Interval (m)</th>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Natural Moisture Content</th>
<th>Dry Unit Weight</th>
<th>Friction Angle (°)</th>
<th>qu/qp (kPa)</th>
<th>Average su (kPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-2.13</td>
<td>Silt (ML)</td>
<td>46.54</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>861/58</td>
<td>95.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>2.13-8.53</td>
<td>Silty/Gravel (GM)</td>
<td>34.98</td>
<td>1842.12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6464/110</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>8.53-10.06</td>
<td>Silt (ML)</td>
<td>33.37</td>
<td>2002.307</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>862/67</td>
<td>95.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>10.6-20.00</td>
<td>Silty/Gravel (GP-GM)</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>2002.307</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7182/220</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$q_u = \text{unconfined compression strength}; q_p = \text{pocket penetrometer strength}; s_u = \text{undrained shear strength}$.

At the L-2 load test site borings encountered alluvial clay (CL) and silt soils (ML) with some chert pieces from the muddy ground surface at a depth of 11.2 m. Within this depth test, a test boring encountered a layer of loose gravel with silt (GC) from a depth of 2.7 m to 4.2 m. Between the depths of 4.2 m to 20.4 m test borings encountered silty gravel with chert (GP-GM). From the depth of 20.4 m to 24.56 m at the bottom of the boring test,
borings encountered silty gravel with chert and chert layers (GC-GM). The estimated soil properties from boring data for the L-2 test site are provided in Table 11.

**Table 11. Estimated Soil Properties for L-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Depth Interval (m)</th>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Natural Moisture Content</th>
<th>Dry Unit Weight</th>
<th>Friction Angle (°)</th>
<th>Qu/qp (kPa)</th>
<th>Average Su (kPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0-11.28</td>
<td>Clay/Silt (CL-ML)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>172/15</td>
<td>28.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>11.28-20.42</td>
<td>Silty Sand/Silty Gravel (GM)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3519/48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>20.42-26.21</td>
<td>Silty Gravel (GM)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7182/110</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$q_u =$ unconfined compression strength; $q_p =$ pocket penetrometer strength; $s_u =$ undrained shear strength.

3.4 GRLWEAP Drive-Ability Results

The GRLWEAP results indicated a hammer with a rated energy of 37 kN-m to 66 kN-m will be required to drive unplugged H-piles, and a hammer with a rated energy of 206 kN-m to 217 kN-m will be required to drive unplugged H-Piles. The H-Pile GRLWEAP results are shown in Figure 30.

![Figure 30. H-Pile GRLWEAP Hammer Information](image)
The GRLWEAP results indicate that a hammer with a rated energy of 112.5 kN-m to 122 kN-m will be required to drive the unplugged pipe piles, and a hammer with a rated energy of 206 kN-m to 217 kN-m will be required to drive the plugged pipe piles to the necessary tip elevations without overstressing the piles. The Pipe Pile GRLWEAP results are shown in Figure 31.

Figure 31. Pipe Pile GRLWEAP Hammer Information

3.5 Test Piles

3.5.1 Pile Selection

The pile load test program consisted of static and dynamic testing on two test piles designated as L-1 and L-2. Test pile L-1 was an HP18x204, ASTM A572, Grade 50 steel H-Pile with a length of 18.3 meters. Test pile L-2 was a 762 mm (O.D.) steel pipe pile with a wall thickness of 25.4 mm and had an overall length of 32 meters. The prescribed lengths assumed a water level elevation of 11.3 m plus an additional 6.1 m for instrumentation gages, leads/sleeves, and to provide sufficient stickup to perform pile testing. The analyses assumed all pipe piles would consist of ASTM A252 steel having a yield strength of at least 310 MPa, whereas the assumed yield strength is 344.7 MPa for the H-piles.

3.5.2 H-Pile Pile Instrumentation

The H-Pile arrived in one 18.3 m piece (area = 387 cm2). Strain gages were placed at ten different locations along the pile length. The strain gages were protected during driving with a welded steel angle over the gages and associated wires. The test pile was instrumented using vibrating wire strain gages at ten depth intervals along two vertical lines
located along the centerline of each side of the H-Pile web. A schematic depicting the instrumentation of the H-Pile is presented in Figure 32.

![Figure 32. H-Pile Schematic](image)

Before installing the test pile, a pre-probing program was implemented to determine if predrilling was extended to an elevation of 102.108 m. The pile was driven with an ICE I-30v2 open-ended diesel hammer to 350 ft before static testing proceeded.

### 3.5.3 Pipe Pile Instrumentation

The pipe pile was manufactured in two sections. The bottom part of the test pile was 4.65 m in length, and the top part was 5.11 m in length. The two pile sections were joined together with a field welded splice on the project site during installation. Strain gages placed at ten different locations along the pile length. A pile driving shoe was placed at the end of the pipe to improve driveability and durability. A schematic depicting the instrumentation of the Pipe Pile is presented in Figure 33.
3.6 Dynamic Load Testing

3.6.1 H-Pile Dynamic Test Procedure

Before installing the test pile, a pre-probing program was implemented to determine if predrilling was required. This program determined that pre-drilling should be done due to the limited number of test borings at the site, and because of the presence of bedded chert. The predrilled hole extended to an elevation of 102.108 m. The pile was driven with an ICE I-30v2 open-ended diesel hammer. After completion of the initial drive, a restrike was performed 72 hours later. Dynamic testing data was recorded using pile driving monitoring equipment manufactured by Pile Dynamics Inc. (Model PAX, strain and accelerometer calibrations attached) and analyzed with the CAPWAP software during the initial drive and subsequent restrike.

Upon completion of dynamic testing (72-hour restrike), preparation for the axial static load test commenced. After preparation for the axial static load test, the tested pile length was...
14.6304 m and had embedment length of 12.71 m within the soil. After the completion of the 72-hour restrike, the head of the pile elevation was +121.31 m, and the final pile tip elevation was +106.68 m; the final tested pile length was 14.60 m. The ground surface was at the height of +119.39 m, giving the pile an embedment length of 12.71 m within the soil.

3.6.2 Pipe Pile Dynamic Test Procedure
Before installing the test pile, predrilling was performed using a 60.96 cm-diameter auger to Elevation 108.204 meters. The decision to pre-drill made as a result of the presence of chert in the encountered soils during field exploration. Predrilling at the testing location was performed using a 60.96 cm-diameter auger to down to an elevation 108.204 m.

The test pile was driven using an ICE I-100v2 open-ended diesel hammer to a tip elevation of 84.7 m on the initial drive. Additional PDA restrikes were performed on August 19, 2013, and September 10, 2013. This corresponded to 72 hours after the completion of the redrive and four days after the completion of the static load test. Dynamic pile testing (PDA) was recorded during the initial drive, redrive, and subsequent restrikes. After the completion of the 72-hour restrike on August 19, 2013, the test pile was cut-off to bring the pile top to the required load testing elevation. The final tip elevation was +25.07 m and the top of pile elevation at the time of testing was +34.10 m, giving the tested pile a length of 9.02 m. The ground surface was at an elevation of +32.52 m, giving the pile an embedment length of 7.44 m within the soil. The surface was at an altitude of +32.52 m, which led to a pile embedment length of 7.44 m within the ground.

3.6.3 H-Pile Dynamic Test Results
The subject pile was monitored with dynamic pile testing equipment during initial drive, all subsequent re-strikes, and extended drive. The CAPWAP software was used to generate the load transfer information from the data collected during testing. Compression and tension pile driving stresses were below the acceptable limit of 279237 kPa. The acceptable limit of compression and tension driving stresses was defined as 90 percent of the applied load.

The GRLWEAP software determined estimated the unit side shear resistances in the dense to very dense gravel ranged from approximately 95.76 kPa to 191 kPa and generally increased with depth. The estimated unit end bearings at the pile tip (plugged condition)
ranged from approximately 636 to 911 kPa. The low hammer energy utilized during the final restrike did not mobilize the pile.

3.6.4 Pipe Pile Dynamic Test Results
The pile was monitored with dynamic pile testing equipment during initial drive, all subsequent re-strikes, and extended drive. Compression and tension pile driving stresses were below the acceptable limit of 279237 kPa. The match qualities (MQ) for the signal matching results were less than 4. Lower match qualities may be achievable; however, to achieve lower match qualities the ultimate capacity of the pile may be unrealistic given the soil conditions, transferred hammer energy, and the measured sets. The acceptable limit for compression and tension driving stresses was defined as 90 percent of Fy.

The CAPWAP software was used to generate the load transfer information from the data collected during testing. The unit side shear resistances in the dense to very dense gravel ranged from approximately 47.8 kPa to 311 kPa and increased with depth. The end bearing resistance ranged from approximately 5314 kPa to 5793.5 kPa. However, unit end bearings are likely much higher due to the pile likely only being partially plugged.

3.7 Static Load Testing
The load was applied using three hydraulic jacks equipped with a common manifold and single electric hydraulic pump. The hydraulic jacks had an effective area of 0.056 square meters. The hydraulic jacks acted against an engineered reaction frame with a total of 8 reactions placed in-line with the cylinders, then positioned adjacent to the pressure transducer supplied as part of the Synchronous Lift System. A sketch of the load test frame is shown in Figure 34.

![Figure 34. Load Test Frame](image-url)
The applied load was measured with an Enerpac ESS Synchronous Lift System that records the applied load and hydraulic jack elongation data in real time. The top of the pile movement was measured using four displacement transducers mounted on a reference beam. Backup pile head measurements and measurements of reaction pile movements were measured using survey methods. Two telltales were installed along the exterior of the pile and terminated near the toe of the H-Pile. The H-Pile telltales housing is shown in Figure 35.

![Figure 35. H-Pile Load Tell Tale Housing](image)

The test load was applied in increments of 5% of the maximum applied test load. During each load interval, the load was maintained for a time interval of 10 minutes, using the same time interval for all loading increments except at 50% and 100% on the applied test load. At 50% of the applied test load, the load was maintained for 30 minutes, and at 100% of the applied test load, the load was maintained for 1 hour. The applied test load was removed in ten, approximately equal, decrements. The load at each decrement was maintained for 15 minutes. The same time interval was utilized for all unloading decrements. Readings continued to be taken for 30 minutes after complete unloading of the test pile. The pile stiffness multiplied the average strain at each gage level.

### 3.8 Load Transfer Curves

Load transfer curves are derived from strain gage data using Hooke’s Law. Hooke’s Law states that stress can be interrupted as strain after multiplied by a modulus that correlates the two. Hooke’s Law can be applied mathematically with Equation 16 where $E$ is the modulus, $\varepsilon$ is the strain, and $\sigma$ is the stress.

$$\varepsilon = \frac{\sigma}{E} = \frac{F}{AE}$$
The data that strain gages provide during a load test can be easily converted into stress that when multiplied by the cross-sectional area of the pile outputs the desired axial force at the specified depth. Pile shortening is observed settlement and was calculated using tell-tale data in this study. Equation 17 mathematically represents this correlation with a variation of Hooke’s Law where \( F \) is the force, and \( A \) is the area.

\[
F = \sigma A
\]

The load transfer curves presented in this study were constructed for each load increment at various depths by matching the strain gage reading at various depths to their respective load increment. The load transfer curves for the H-Pile and Pipe Pile are presented in Figure 36 (a) and Figure 36 (b), respectively. The load at a specified point in the pile was determined from the strain gage data using Equation 18 where \( P = \) applied load at the pile head; \( \varepsilon = \) strain at the gage level; \( A_p = \) cross-sectional area of the pile; \( E_p = \) composite elastic modulus of the pile.

\[
P = \varepsilon A_p E_p \quad (18)
\]

![Figure 36. Load Transfer Curves: (a) H-Pile; (b) Pipe Pile](image)

3.9 Unit Side Friction

The measured unit side shear resistance was calculated using the peak computed loads recorded by the strain gages at each depth interval and dividing the corresponding stress by the respective segment surface area. Equation 19 was used to calculate the unit side
shear resistance \( T \) where \( \tau = \) soil unit skin friction (kPa) and \( A_S = \) surface area of the pile segment exterior in contact with soil in shear. It is important to note that the skin resistance was calculated at the mid-point of each interval between the strain gages in this calculation.

\[
T = \tau \times A_S
\]  

(19)

3.9.1 H-Pile Unit Side Friction

The unit side shear was measured to range from 62.24 in the predrilled zone to 287.3 kPa. The maximum unit shear resistance occurred a depth of 4.2 m. After the unit side shear resistance peaks, the shear resistance steadily decreases over the remaining length of the pile. The unit side shear resistance over the entire length of the H-Pile is plotted in Figure 37.

![Figure 37. H-Pile Unit Side Friction](image)

3.9.2 Pipe Pile Unit Side Friction

The measured unit side shear was measured to range from 105.34 to 167.58 kPa in the lower segments. The Pipe Pile unit shear resistance steadily increased with depth through the clay layers of soil to a depth of 14 m where very dense gravel and silt were present. The shear resistance at this point rapidly increased until it peaked at a depth of 16 m. The post-peak unit side shear resistance fluctuated over the remaining length of the pile. The unit side friction over the entire length of the Pipe Pile is plotted in Figure 38.
3.10 End Bearing Resistance

The potential to accumulate compacted soil must be considered in every subsurface profile. Piles that are hollow or have the potential to entrap soil can provide misleading test data because it can change the cross-sectional area of piles and expose them to additional resistive forces. This is often referred to as soil plugging and can potentially have a significant impact on the accuracy of the end-bearing capacity readings. In H-Piles it is possible that soil becomes trapped and compacted between the flange and web resulting in a larger surface area than the initially expected. This can also affect surface the soil-pile interaction by changing the interface that causes additional sticking or slipping. The plugged condition was assumed for both piles in all calculations. Equation 20 was used to calculate the unit side shear resistance ($Q_{plug}$).

$$Q_{plug} = q \ast A_{plug}$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

$Q_{plug}$ = unit end bearing resistance (kPa)

$A_{plug}$ = full cross-sectional area of pile toe

3.10.1 H-Pile End Bearing Resistance

The measured unit end bearing resistance ranged from 361 to 2275 kPa decreasing with depth. The mobilized toe resistance represents the load developed in side shear on the toe segment (bottom) coupled with the tip resistance component. The estimated mobilized toe

![Figure 38. Pipe Pile Unit Side Friction](image-url)
resistance represents the load developed in side shear on the toe segment coupled with the tip resistance component. The mobilized toe resistance accounted for the 2.3 m bottom of pile segment shear and assumed plugged pile end area of 387 cm$^2$. The toe segment resistance was estimated to be approximately 23,106.71 kPa. The H-Pile load transfer information that describes the loads at other depths are charted in Table 12.

### Table 12. H-Pile Static Load Transfer Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Zone</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Load Transfer (kN)</th>
<th>Surface Area (m$^2$)</th>
<th>Unit Side Shear (kPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment 1</td>
<td>0-1.3</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 2</td>
<td>1.3-2.8</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2.814</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 3</td>
<td>2.8-4.3</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>2.814</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 4</td>
<td>4.3-5.9</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>2.814</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 5</td>
<td>5.9-7.4</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>2.814</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 6</td>
<td>7.4-10.4</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toe Segment</td>
<td>10.4-12.7</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>6349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ultimate load in a pile is the sum of the unit skin friction and unit end bearing resistance in a pile at a specific depth. The ultimate load drops to zero when a pile fully mobilizes. The load test data suggests the lower four segments and tip resistance did not fully mobilize during the load test. The calculated ultimate loads measured over the entire length of the H-Pile are plotted in Figure 39.
3.10.2 Pipe Pile End Bearing Resistance
The measured unit end bearing resistance ranged from 130 kPa in the predrilled zone to 606 kPa. The maximum unit end bearing resistance occurred at a depth of 16 meters and steadily decreased over the remaining length of the pile embedded in the very dense gravel and silt. The calculated ultimate loads measured over the entire length of the Pipe Pile are plotted in Figure 40.
The toe segment resistance represents the load developed from the side shear on the toe segment (bottom) coupled with the tip resistance component. The mobilized toe resistance accounted for the bottom of pile segment shear and assumed plugged pile end area. The estimated mobilized toe resistance is 2183.34 kPa. The Pipe Pile load transfer information that describes the loads at other depths are charted in Table 13.

### Table 13. Pipe Pile Static Load Transfer Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Zone</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Load Transfer (kN)</th>
<th>Surface Area (m²)</th>
<th>Unit Side Shear (kPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment 1</td>
<td>0-13.93</td>
<td>2032.837271</td>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>62.24433656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 2</td>
<td>13.93-16.37</td>
<td>943.0229792</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>167.5809061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 3</td>
<td>16.37-18.81</td>
<td>622.751024</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>105.3365696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 4</td>
<td>18.81-21.214</td>
<td>934.126536</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>162.7928802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 5</td>
<td>21.214-23.65</td>
<td>680.5779048</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>114.9126213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toe Segment</td>
<td>23.65-24.41</td>
<td>1205.468054</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2183.339805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.11 Development of t-z and q-z Curves

The formulation of t-z and q-z curves require the implementation of finite element analysis. Finite element analysis models the stress-strain relationship of a loaded pile using three loading mechanisms. The three mechanisms considered in the model are skin friction along the shaft of the pile, the resistance provided at the end of the pile, and deformation the pile undergoes as it is pressed down. To mathematically model the mechanisms acting on the pile the assumption that force created by the unit weight of the pile is negligible to the forces acting upon it. It is also assumed for analysis purposes that the integrity of the structural load-carrying capacity of the pile was preserved, and the materials properties of the pile are sufficient enough that failure will occur at the soil-pile interface due to slippage and not due to compression failure of the pile material.

The active forces transmitted on a pile subjected to axial loading can be conceptualized by sectionalizing the pile into manageable segments. It is generally assumed for derivation
purposes that the section is small and the forces acting on it are homogenous. A free-body diagram of a pile segment subjected to an axial load labeled with the active forces considered during finite element analysis is provided in Figure 41.

![Free-body diagram of a pile segment](image)

**Figure 41. Pile Section Free Body Diagram.**

\[ Q_z = \frac{dQ_z}{dz} + \tau \cdot C \cdot dz \]  

(21)

If the unit skin friction and circumference of the pile segment are assumed constant over the pile segment, and the equilibrium equation is differentiated with respect to depth, Equation 22 is formed. Equation 22 is a particular solution to the governing differential equation that represents the load transfer of the applied loads to pile deformation, and skin friction.

\[ \frac{dQ_z}{dz} = \tau \cdot C \]  

(22)

If the material properties are assumed to remain constant, the only entity that fluctuates with depth is the displacement of the pile segment due to applied loads. The mathematical
A representation of how the internal forces change with depth in t-z and q-z analysis is Equation 23, where $E$ = pile segment modulus of elasticity, $A$ = the cross-sectional area of the pile segment, and $\frac{du_x}{dz}$ = pile segment displacement due to applied loads.

$$Q_z = -EA \frac{du_x}{dz}$$  

(23)

The method of substitution can be applied to solve this set of differential equations. When Equation 23 is plugged back into the equations above, the general solution that governs the load transfer mechanism can be obtained. Consequently, it governs t-z and q-z curve construction as well. The first order general solution of the differential equation that governs the pile-soil interaction during load transfer analysis is Equation 24.

$$-EA \frac{d^2u_x}{dz^2} + \tau \cdot \kappa = 0$$  

(24)

T-z curves represent the shear stress ($t$) and corresponding pile displacement ($z$) at locations along the pile shaft. The shear stress ($t$) is computed by taking the recorded axial force and dividing it by the pile sectional area. Various soil and pile parameters influence t-z behavior. The distribution of stiffness of both the pile and soil, pile geometry, and soil distribution are all influential factors. The load transfer information summarized in Table 11 and Table 12 of the previous section provided the data used to construct the t-z curves presented in this study. The average unit shaft resistance $t$ was estimated between successive strain gages using Equation 25 where $P_{i+1}$ and $P_i$ are the axial loads in a pile at depths $d_{i+1}$ and $d_i$, respectively; $B$ = diameter of the pile.

$$t = \frac{P_{i+1} - P_i}{\pi \cdot B \cdot (d_{i+1} - d_i)}$$  

(25)

3.12 Measured and Derived t-z Curves

The measured t-z curves presented in this study were plotted beside theoretical t-z curves for comparative analysis. The theoretically derived curves were formulated from load test data of small piles (< 30 m long) with small diameters (< 0.5 m). The empirical t-z curves used in this study were generated using the API (1993) and Coyle and Reese (1966) methods. The API method (1993) uses the Davison offset limit as its failure criterion.
Both methods consider plunging failure settlement cutoff equal to 5% of the shaft diameter first, but if this does not occur the methods yield different results. The Davvison offset limit defines the cutoff settlement as the elastic compression of the soil as well as the limiting plastic compression of the soil at the pile tip. The Coyle and Reese method (1966) uses the cutoff settlement as the ultimate axial capacity of undrained clays. Typically, the API (1993) method yields more conservative values than the Coyle and Reese (1966) method. The t-z curves generated by both methods tend to be softer when compared to measured data. For this reason, t-z analysis typically overpredicts the ultimate capacity of the pile. The t-z curves constructed for the H-Pile and Pipe Pile are presented in Figure 42 and Figure 44, respectively.

3.12.1 H-Pile t-z Curves

The t-z curves presented in Figure 42 were constructed from the data collected by strain gages instrumented on the H-Pile. The initial slope (stiffness) of the measured t-z curves is not represented well by the API (1993) or Coyle and Reese (1966) theoretical curves. The measured t-z curves reach their peak values at a greater shaft movement than both theoretical curves. This is probably due to insufficient loading resulting in geotechnical failure not being achieved. The actual yield resistance for the H-Pile is unknown because the load required for the pile to mobilize is uncertain. The t-z curves were constructed from the data recorded at each strain gage elevation to model the soil-pile interaction at the soil-pile interface over the entire length of the H-Pile. The t-z curves constructed for each strain gage elevation are shown in Figure 42: (a) Elevation 119 m; (b) Elevation 116 m.

The t-z curves presented in Figure 42 were constructed from the data collected by strain gages instrumented on the H-Pile. The initial slope (stiffness) of the measured t-z curves is not represented well by the API (1993) or Coyle and Reese (1966) theoretical curves. The measured t-z curves reach their peak values at a greater shaft movement than both theoretical curves. This is probably due to insufficient loading resulting in geotechnical failure not being achieved. The actual yield resistance for the H-Pile is unknown because the load required for the pile to mobilize is uncertain. The t-z curves were constructed from the data recorded at each strain gage elevation to model the soil-pile interaction at the soil-pile interface over the entire length of the H-Pile. The t-z curves constructed for each strain gage elevation are shown in Figure 42: (a) Elevation 119 m; (b) Elevation 116 m.
location can be found in APPENDIX E. The frictional resistive force measured along the entire length of the H-Pile is plotted in Figure 43.

![Figure 43. H-Pile Side Friction Force vs. Depth](image)

3.12.2 Pipe Pile t-z Curves

The t-z curves shown in Figure 44 were constructed from the data collected by strain gages instrumented on the Pipe Pile. The measured t-z curves reach their peak values at greater shaft movements than the Coyle and Reese (1966) theoretical curves and smaller shaft movements than the API (1993) theoretical curves. The initial slope (stiffness) of the measured t-z curves are well represented by both theoretical curves. The measure t-z curves

![Figure 44. Pipe Pile t-z Curves: (a) Elevation 107 m.; (b) Elevation 90 m.](image)
correlate better to the Coyle and Reese (1966) theoretical curves. This is probably due to the clay layers present in the upper segments of the Pipe Pile subsurface profile. The API (1993) theoretical curves assume the elastic compression of soil. The t-z curves presented in Figure 46 illustrate that the soil response stiffens as the shear stress increases. The elastic shortening that occurs when the slope of the curve is increased contributes to the measured t-z curve correlating better with the Coyle and Reese (1966) method. T-z curves were constructed from data recorded at all strain gage elevations to model the interaction at the soil-pile interface over the entire length of the Pipe Pile. The t-z curves constructed for each strain location can be found in Appendix E. The frictional resistive force measured along the entire length of the Pipe Pile is plotted in Figure 45.

![Figure 45. Pipe Pile Side Friction Force vs. Depth](image)

**3.13 Measured q-z Curves**

For q-z curves, the q value is obtained from the axial load at the pile tip divided by the pile cross-section area, and the z is obtained from the pile tip movement measured using tell-tale data. The q-z plots for the H-Pile and Pipe Pile indicate that their respective corresponding t-z analyses are accurate. The q-z data for both piles demonstrate increasing q values with increasing axial loads. The H-Pile and Pipe Pile q-z curves plotted in Figure 46 illustrate the positive trend in the q-z data and support the t-z analyses for both piles.
3.14 Discussion of Load Transfer Analyses

3.14.1 H-Pile Load Transfer Discussion

The measured unit side shear resistances were calculated using the peak computed loads recorded by the vibrating wire strain gages at each depth interval and dividing the corresponding stress by the respective segment surface area. The measured unit end bearing resistance ranged from 391 to 2274 kPa along the exterior of the embedded test pile. The measured unit end bearing resistance ranged from 60 to 290 kPa. The estimated mobilized toe resistance represents the load developed in side shear on the toe segment coupled with the tip resistance component. The toe segment resistance was estimated to be approximately 23,106.71 kPa. The static test data suggests the lower four segments and tip resistance did not fully mobilize during the load test.

The dynamically determined unit side shear resistances in the dense to very dense gravel ranged from approximately 95.76 kPa to 191 kPa and generally increased with depth. The dynamic test unit end bearing resistances ranged from approximately 636 to 911 kPa. The low hammer energy utilized during the final restrike did not mobilize the pile. The ultimate load in a pile did not wholly transfer before it reached the end of the pile.

The t-z analysis of the static load test data supports the load transfer analysis of the dynamic load test data performed with the CAPWAP software. The dynamic testing unit end bearing resistances predictions are smaller but still fall within the lower range of the measured unit end bearing resistances. This most likely due to the pile only being partially plugged.
Piles can get soil trapped between the flange and web that results in an additional sticking force acting on the pile. This can have a significant impact on the accuracy of the end-bearing capacity readings because the additional resistance behaves as a wedging force that supports the pile. The H-Pile load transfer results are summarized in Table 14.

Table 14. H-Pile Static and Dynamic Load Transfer Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resistance</th>
<th>Dynamic Load test</th>
<th>Static Load Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Side Friction</td>
<td>95.76 - 191 kPa</td>
<td>62.24-167 kPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit End Bearing</td>
<td>630 – 911 kPa</td>
<td>361- 2274 kPa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.14.2 Pipe Pile Load Transfer Discussion

The measured unit end bearing resistance ranged from 105.34 to 167 kPa along the exterior of the embedded test pile. The measured unit end bearing resistance ranged from 130 kPa in the predrilled zone to 606 kPa. The maximum unit end bearing resistance occurred at a depth of 16 meters and steadily decreased over the remaining length of the pile. The estimated mobilized toe resistance is 2183.34 kPa.

The dynamically determined unit side shear resistances in the dense to very dense gravel ranged from approximately 47.8 – 311 kPa and generally increased with depth. The dynamic test unit end bearing resistances ranged from approximately 5314-5793 kPa.

The t-z analysis does not support the CAPWAP load transfer analysis. The dynamic unit end bearing resistances are significantly larger than the measured static data. This is probably due to the soft to firm clay layers present in the upper segments of the Pipe Pile subsurface profile. When piles are driven into soft to firm clay, the pore water pressure increases causing the effective stress to decrease. This results in a reduction of the unit bearing stress and is often accompanied by ground heave. If the clay is very stiff, small amounts of consolidation will occur. The H-Pile load transfer results are summarized in Table 15.

Table 15. Pipe Pile Static and Dynamic Load Transfer Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resistance</th>
<th>Dynamic Load test</th>
<th>Static Load Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Side Friction</td>
<td>47.8 – 311 kPa</td>
<td>105.34-167 kPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit End Bearing</td>
<td>5314-5793 kPa</td>
<td>130-606 kPa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.15 Conclusion of The Load Transfer Analyses

The results of this study show that the dynamic testing methods for predicting the load transfer characteristics should be supplemented with static testing for large diameter piles driven in mixed soils. The dynamic load transfer analyses provided very accurate unit side friction values for both piles. However; the dynamic unit bearing results were not as satisfactory. The dynamic analysis was not able to accurately model the plugging the plunging behavior of the H-Pile or account for the elastic shortening in the Pipe Pile. This study concludes that further research needs to be done on this topic to better model large diameter in cohesive soils using dynamic methods.
CHAPTER 4

4 Comparison of Static and Dynamic Test Results

4.1 Introduction

This case study reviews a pile load test program completed for the proposed Lagoon Bridge as part of the Kentucky Lake Bridge Advance Contract (CID 131305) in Marshall and Trigg Counties, Kentucky. The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) has proposed bridge replacements for existing crossings of Kentucky Lake and Lake Barkley. These crossings follow the existing US 68/KY 80 highway corridor. The existing bridge is multi-span structures served by causeways on both ends of each structure. The design load test program was intended to gather information through dynamic pile load testing and static load testing methods to use in the design of the proposed Kentucky Lake Bridge pile foundations.

4.2 Project Information

The pile load test program consisted of static and dynamic testing on two test piles designated as L-1 and L-2. Test pile L-1 was an HP18x204, ASTM A572, Grade 50 steel H-Pile with a length of 18.3 meters. Test pile L-2 was a 762 mm (O.D.) steel pipe pile with a wall thickness of 25.4 mm and had an overall length of 32 meters. Inserts were placed in the interior of the piles to force a plugged condition to occur in the test piles. This was done to take advantage of higher axial pile resistances in the piles. The test piles that were used in the load test program are shown in Figure 47.

![Figure 47. Test Piles](image)

Initially, test piles for the Design Load Test Program will be driven to tip elevations that achieve the target nominal axial resistances that represent the estimated axial resistances.
The test piles subjected to dynamic and static axial load testing were instrumented to estimate the unit skin resistance and end bearing resistance components of the pile resistance and to develop t-z and q-z data for the foundation analyses.

4.3 Subsurface Conditions

The generalized soil conditions at the pile test locations were based on subsurface conditions encountered in nearby test borings. Several test borings and cone penetration tests (CPT) were performed in 2011 near the test pile locations. The soil borings and CPT soundings provided the data and intact samples for testing in the upper lean clay soils.

The effective strength parameters of the granular soils for Test Pile Location L-1 were estimated using the SPT N-value data from the test borings. Where SPT N-values was obtained that did not appear to be skewed by the chert gravel, the shear strength parameters of the granular soils were estimated using published AASHTO correlations. Unit weights of some of the granular soils were based upon previous triaxial consolidated-undrained shear test results performed by F&H consulting. Compression and recompression indices and over-consolidation ratios (OCR) were estimated from CPT data. Where laboratory data or CPT data were not available, corrected N-values from SPT borings were used to estimate compression and recompression indices.

At testing location L-2, the results of consolidated-undrained (CU) triaxial shear tests and unconsolidated undrained triaxial (UU) shear tests were used to estimate the effective and total soil shear strength parameters in the fine-grained soil samples collected in the test borings. Data from these tests supplemented with data from CPT soundings were also used to estimate the unit weight parameters of the fine-grained soils at the site.

4.3.1 Test Pile L-1 Area

The geology of the Test Pile L-1 site is influenced by the Mississippi Embayment to the west and is composed primarily of a cherty Mississippian-age residuum within the Ft. Payne Formation. This formation is described as a residual chert interbedded with residual clay. Test borings in the area of the Test Pile L-1 indicate that the soils in the area beginning at the ground surface (119.48 m elevation at the test pile) generally consist of approximately 5.18 m of alluvial clay (CL) and silt soils (ML) with some chert pieces to an elevation of approximately 114.3 m. The clay and silt are underlain by about 4.57 m of
silty gravel (GM) to an elevation of approximately 109.73 m. Beginning around an
elevation of 109.73 m there is a 1.5 m thick layer of silt (ML). Around 11.23 m below the
ground surface, silty gravel with chert layers (GM or GP-GM soils) exists, and it extends
all the way down to the bottom of the boring. The subsurface profile for Test Pile L-1 is
shown in Figure 48.

Figure 48. L-1 Subsurface Profile

4.3.2 Test Pile L-2 Area
The geology of the western part of the site is influenced by the Mississippi Embayment to
the west and is composed primarily of a cherty Mississippian-age residuum within the Ft.
Payne Formation. This formation is described as a residual chert interbedded with residual
clay. The geology of the eastern part of the site transitions to a cap of Cretaceous-age
materials over the Ft. Payne Formation. The foundation soil under the existing causeways
and bridge are composed of river alluvium as influenced by the Tennessee River before
being dammed to form Kentucky Lake in 1944. The alluvium is described as sand and
gravel, which grades coarser and denser with depth. At the L-2 load test site borings
encountered alluvial clay (CL) and silt soils (ML) with some chert pieces from the muddy
ground surface at a depth of 11.2 m. Within this depth test, a test boring encountered a
layer of loose gravel with silt (GC) from a depth of 2.7 m to 4.2 m. Between the depths of 4.2 m to 20.4 m test borings encountered silty gravel with chert (GP-GM). From the depth of 20.4 m to 24.56 m at the bottom of the boring test, borings encountered silty gravel with chert and chert layers (GC-GM). The subsurface profile for Test Pile L-1 is shown in Figure 49.

![Figure 49. L-2 Subsurface Profile](image)

4.4 Load Test Program

The pile load test program consisted of dynamic and axial static load testing. Dynamic load testing was performed by Applied Foundation Testing between August 12, 2013, and September 27, 2013, on each test pile during the initial drive, restrike, and extended drive. The test pile was driven using an ICE I-100v2 open-ended diesel hammer. Static load testing was also performed on both test piles. Due to the different pile types and local geology of the two sites, the testing procedure varied at each testing location. The load test frame was designed by Genesis Structures, a subconsultant to Jim Smith Contracting. The top of pile movement was measured using four displacement transducers mounted on a reference beam. Backup pile head measurements and measurements of reaction pile movements were measured using survey methods. An Enerpac Synchronous Lift System provided the applied load and hydraulic jack elongation using three – 800-kip hydraulic jacks.
4.4.1 Test Pile L-1 Load Test Results

The H-Pile ultimate capacity prediction for the static load test data was 3,755 kN. The Maximum Test Load (MTL) applied to the H-Pile was 5417.93 kN and exhibited a downward deflection of 0.7394 cm. The permanent displacement after unloading was 0.09144 cm. The static capacity of the H-Pile exceeded the nominal resistance of 2,668 kN. The deflection measured at the pile head during the pile load test never exceeded the calculated elastic shortening of the test pile. Thus, the FHWA failure criteria for an HP18x204 pile was not achieved.

The ultimate capacities predictions CAPWAP produced were made using the case method. The ultimate capacities ranged from approximately 5160 kN at the end of the initial drive to approximately 5560 kN during the 72-hour re-strike. The ultimate capacity or the H-Pile exceeded the nominal resistance of 2,668 kN. The H-Pile load-settlement curves from the dynamic and static load tests are plotted in Figure 50.

The measured unit side shear resistance was calculated using the peak computed loads recorded by the vibrating wire strain gages at each depth interval and dividing the corresponding stress by the respective segment surface area. The measured unit end bearing resistance ranged from 60 to 290 kPa along the exterior of the embedded test pile. The

---

**Figure 50. H-Pile Load-Settlement Curves**

The measured unit side shear resistance was calculated using the peak computed loads recorded by the vibrating wire strain gages at each depth interval and dividing the corresponding stress by the respective segment surface area. The measured unit end bearing resistance ranged from 60 to 290 kPa along the exterior of the embedded test pile. The
measured unit end bearing resistance ranged from 60 to 290 kPa. The unit end bearing resistance rapidly increased from the top of the pile through cohesionless gravel and silt until it peaked at a depth of 4.3 m. The unit end bearing resistances steadily decreased over the remaining length of the pile. The estimated mobilized toe resistance represents the load developed in side shear on the toe segment coupled with the tip resistance component. The toe segment resistance was estimated to be approximately 23,106.71 kPa. The static test data suggests the lower four segments and tip resistance did not fully mobilize during the load test.

The dynamically determined unit side shear resistances in the dense to very dense gravel ranged from approximately 95.76 kPa to 191 kPa and generally increased with depth. Unit end bearing resistances (using an end area based on a plugged condition) ranged from approximately 636 to 911 kPa. The low hammer energy utilized during the final restrike did not mobilize the pile. The ultimate load in the pile did not completely transfer before it reached the end of the pile. The H-Pile load transfer analysis data from the dynamic and static load tests are plotted in Figure 51.

![Figure 51. H-Pile Load Transfer: (a) Unit Side Friction; (b) Ultimate Load](image)

**4.4.2 Test Pile L-2 Load Test Results**

The Pipe Pile ultimate capacity estimation for the static load test data was 2,213 kN. The ultimate capacity prediction applied Hanson’s 90% failure criterion. The Hanson’s 90% failure criterion selected because the load–settlement data was hyperbolic due to the loading of the pile. The Maximum Test Load (MTL) applied to the pile was 6418.78 kN.
and exhibited a downward deflection of 1.05156 cm. The permanent displacement after unloading was .127 cm. The static capacity of the Pipe Pile failed to exceed the nominal resistance of 10,675 kN. The deflection measured at the pile head during the pile load test never exceeded the calculated elastic shortening of the test pile. Thus, the FHWA failure criteria for a 30-inch-diameter steel pipe having a 1-inch wall thickness was not achieved. The ultimate capacities predicted by CAPWAP ranged from approximately 5947.27 kN at the end of the initial drive to approximately 10675.73 kN during the final re-strike. The re-strike capacities for the first (48 hour) and second (72 hour) re-strike showed an increase in capacity of approximately 1120.95 kN and 271.34 kN, respectively. The dynamic capacity of the H-Pile exceeded the nominal resistance of 10,675 kN. The H-Pile load-settlement curves from the dynamic and static load tests are plotted in Figure 52.

![Figure 52. Pipe Pile Load-Settlement Curves](image)

The measured unit side shear resistance was calculated using the peak computed loads recorded by the vibrating wire strain gages at each depth interval and dividing the corresponding stress by the respective segment surface area. The unit side shear was measured to range from 62.24 in the predrilled zone to 287.3 kPa. The maximum unit shear resistance occurred a depth of 4.2 m. After the unit side shear resistance peaks, the shear resistance steadily decreases over the remaining length of the pile. The measured unit end
bearing resistance ranged from 130 kPa in the predrilled zone to 606 kPa. The maximum unit end bearing resistance occurred at a depth of 16 meters and steadily decreased over the remaining length of the pile embedded in the very dense gravel and silt.

The GRLWEAP software estimated the unit side shear resistances in the dense to very dense gravel ranged from approximately 47.8 kPa to 311 kPa and increased with depth. Figure 24 plots the shear resistance against depth. The end bearing resistance (using an end area based on a plugged condition) ranged from approximately 5314 kPa to 5793.5 kPa. The Pipe Pile load transfer analysis data from the dynamic and static load tests are plotted in Figure 53.

![Figure 53. Pipe Pile Load Transfer: (a) Unit Side Friction; (b) Ultimate Load](image)
APPENDIX A
Soil Data
Figure A.1. H-Pile CPT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (ft)</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>SPT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 - 12.0</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0 - 17.0</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.0 - 18.5</td>
<td>SPT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0 - 21.5</td>
<td>SPT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0 - 27.0</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.2 - 30.7</td>
<td>SPT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.2 - 40.7</td>
<td>SPT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.2 - 45.7</td>
<td>SPT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Remarks

- **Sand with gravel.**
- **Brown, gravel with clay.**
- **Very soft, gray, clay.**
- **Gray and brown, clay with gravel.**
- **Gray, sandy clay with gravel.**
### A.3 H-Pile Soil Classification and Gradation Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>969+03 45.0' LT</th>
<th>Hole #</th>
<th>3001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab ID#:</td>
<td>SS-1</td>
<td>Depth (ft):</td>
<td>5.1-5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve Size</th>
<th>% Passing</th>
<th>Sieve Size</th>
<th>% Passing</th>
<th>Sieve Size</th>
<th>% Passing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 10</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>No. 40</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>No. 200</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.002 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gravel (3' + No. 10) | 23.6 |
| Fine Sand (No. 40 =No. 200) | 3.5 |
| Coarse Sand (No. 10 + No. 40) | 2.3 |
| Clay (0.002mm) |  |
| Silts (No. 200 + 0.002mm) |  |
| Colloids (0.001mm) |  |

| Liquid Limit: | 0 |
| Plastic Limit: | 0 |
| Activity: | 0.00 |

| AASHTO Classification: | A-4 (0) |
| Unified Classification: | ML |

| D 10 (mm): | 0.003 |
| D 30 (mm): | 0.009 |
| D 50 (mm): | 0.026 |
| D 60 (mm): | 0.043 |
| D 90 (mm): | 0.481 |
| D 95 (mm): | 13.423 |

| Cu = | 13.01060 |
| Cc = | 0.59861 |

**Sieve Type:** Wash Grad

**Notes:** Silts + Clays + Colloids: 70.6

**Remarks:**

Figure A.3. H-Pile Soil Classification and Gradation Test Results
A.4 Pipe Pile CPT

Figure A.4. Pipe Pile CPT

A.5 Driller’s Subsurface Log
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (ft)</th>
<th>Lithology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Overburden</th>
<th>SPT Blows</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>(CONE PENETRATION TEST - Refer to CPT log C3051 - Test terminated due to bending rods).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Brown SILTY GRAVEL, with sand, loose, moist, water noted between 18-19.5').</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(CONE PENETRATION TEST - Refer to CPT log C3051 - Test terminated due to bending rods).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Gray LEAN CLAY, stiff, moist).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>(CONE PENETRATION TEST - Refer to CPT log C3051 - Test terminated due to bending rods).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Light brown SILTY CHERT GRAVEL, with sand, very dense, moist, grades wet at 40').</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drilling Firm:**

For: Division of Structural Design
Geotechnical Branch

**DRILLER’S SUBSURFACE LOG**

Printed: 7/20/12
Page 1 of 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID:</th>
<th>Marshall</th>
<th>Project Type: Structure Addendum State Bridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Number:</td>
<td>1-180.70</td>
<td>Project Manager:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hole Number</th>
<th>C3051</th>
<th>Surface Elevation</th>
<th>360.2'</th>
<th>Total Depth</th>
<th>31.4'</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>973+15.12 1.7' RL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Water Depth</td>
<td>(19/10/11)</td>
<td>Static Water Depth</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Driller</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Latitude(83)</td>
<td>36.771034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
<td>Rig Number</td>
<td>HCN 7253</td>
<td>Longitude(83)</td>
<td>-88.131746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elevation Depth</th>
<th>Lithology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Overburden</th>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Depth (ft)</th>
<th>Rec (ft)</th>
<th>SPT Blows</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>(CONE PENETRATION TEST - Refer to CPT log C3051 - Test terminated due to bending rods).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Brown SILTY GRAVEL, with sand, loose, moist, water noted between 18-19.5').</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(CONE PENETRATION TEST - Refer to CPT log C3051 - Test terminated due to bending rods).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Gray LEAN CLAY, stiff, moist).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>(CONE PENETRATION TEST - Refer to CPT log C3051 - Test terminated due to bending rods).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Light brown SILTY CHERT GRAVEL, with sand, very dense, moist, grades wet at 40').</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hole Type:** CPT/Sample

**Remarks:**

- 18.0-19.5
- 23.0-24.5
- 30.0-31.5
- 40.0-41.5
- 45.0-45.9
- 3-2-3
- 7-4-5
- 3-6-8
- 17-20-34
- 22-50/0.40'
### A.6 Pipe Pile Soil Classification and Gradation Test Results

**Soil Classification and Gradation Test Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Lab ID</th>
<th>Hole</th>
<th>Depth (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>973+50 CL</td>
<td>SS-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve Size</th>
<th>% Passing</th>
<th>Sieve Size</th>
<th>% Passing</th>
<th>Sieve Size</th>
<th>% Passing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3/8&quot;</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>No. 4</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 10</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>No. 40</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>No. 200</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.002 mm</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gravel (-3&quot; + No. 10)</th>
<th>46.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine Sand (-No. 40 + No. 200)</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay (0.002mm)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coarse Sand (-No. 10 + No. 40)</th>
<th>2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silts (-No. 200 + 0.002mm)</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloids (-0.001mm)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liquid Limit</th>
<th>Plastic Limit</th>
<th>Plasticity Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Spec. Gravity</th>
<th>1.05</th>
<th>2.731</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**AASHTO Classification:** A-6 (3)

**Unified Classification:** SC

**Notes:**

- With Gravel
- Silts + Clays + Colloids: N/A

**Remarks:**

| D 10 (mm): | 0.000 |
| D 30 (mm): | 0.015 |
| D 50 (mm): | 0.311 |
| D 60 (mm): | 2.695 |
| D 90 (mm): | 9.082 |
| D 95 (mm): | 12.793 |

**Cu =**

**Cc =**

Figure A.6. Pipe Pile Soil Classification and Gradation Test Results

### A.7 CU Test Results
Figure A.7. CU Test Results
## TRIAXIAL COMPRESSION TEST

**Project Name:** US 68/KY 80 Over Lake Bridges  
**Project No.:** 10153-01  
**Project County:** Marshall  
**Project State:** Kentucky  
**Laboratory No.:** 10153-01  
**Submitted By:** Florence & Hutcheson

**Soil Type:** Gray & Brown Lean Clay  
**Wet Density:** 126.8 pcf  
**Dry Density:** 101.5 pcf  
**Moisture:** 25.0%  
**Chamber Pressure:** 270 psi

### RESULTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>$\Delta$</th>
<th>$\sigma_3$ (psi)</th>
<th>$\sigma_1$ (psi)</th>
<th>$\sigma_1 / \sigma_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>31.40</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>32.67</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>33.49</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>34.28</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>34.86</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>37.64</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>40.01</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>41.85</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>43.03</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>43.56</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>43.73</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>43.27</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>40.03</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.71</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>32.27</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.71</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>29.98</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>25.98</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.92</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>45.48</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>55.03</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>65.59</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>75.15</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>179.71</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>188.26</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>-10.29</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>198.82</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>-14.29</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Point No.:** 1  
**Sample Loc.:** B-351 ST-3  
**Sample Depth:** 25.1 to 26.0'  
**Date Tested:** 9-16-11  
**Date Reported:** 10-8-11

**Initial Height:** 14.14 cm  
**Initial Diameter:** 7.17 cm  
**Init. Pure Pres.:** NA

---

Figure A.8. UU Test Results
## A.9 H-Pile Geotechnical Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Layer</th>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Layer 1</th>
<th>Layer 2</th>
<th>Layer 3</th>
<th>Layer 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moist Unit Weight (pcf)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturated Unit Weight (pcf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elevation @ top of layer (ft.)*</td>
<td>21.51(391.51)**</td>
<td>21(380)</td>
<td>1 (360)</td>
<td>4 (355)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elevation @ bottom of layer (ft.)*</td>
<td>21(380)</td>
<td>1 (360)</td>
<td>4 (355)</td>
<td>100 (259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Table (Normal Pool) (ft.)*</td>
<td>0 (359)</td>
<td>0 (359)</td>
<td>0 (359)</td>
<td>0 (359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lateral Soil Layer Model</td>
<td>Clay, Stiff w/o water</td>
<td>Sand (Reese)</td>
<td>Clay, Stiff w/water</td>
<td>Sand (Reese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal Friction Angle (degree)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undrained Shear Strength (psf)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k (p-y) static (pci)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top of Layer Ultimate Unit End Bearing (ksf)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top of Layer Ultimate Unit Skin Friction (ksf)</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Depth Ultimate Unit End Bearing (ksf)**</td>
<td>18 @ 375</td>
<td>150 @ 365</td>
<td>18 @ 355</td>
<td>150 @ 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Depth Ultimate Unit Skin Friction (ksf)**</td>
<td>1.21 @ 375</td>
<td>3.79 @ 360</td>
<td>1.41 @ 355</td>
<td>5.0 @ 340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *First number is relative to 0 = Normal Pool Elevation = 359 ft. MSL. Second number in parentheses is Mean Sea Elevation.

** Bottom of Pile Cap Elevation


*** Second number is elevation in MSL at which the unit end bearing or unit skin friction occurs. If the elevation is not the bottom of the layer, the unit bearing or unit skin friction is constant for the remaining portion of the layer below the MSL elevation.

---

Table A.1 H-Pile Geotechnical Parameters
A.10 Pipe Piles Geotechnical Parameters

Project: Kentucky Lake Lagoon Bridge - Pier 2
Borings: B-3051 and C-3051

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Layer</th>
<th>Layer 1</th>
<th>Layer 2</th>
<th>Layer 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil Type</td>
<td>Cohesive</td>
<td>Cohesionless</td>
<td>Cohesionless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated Unit Weight (pcf)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation @ top of layer (ft.)*</td>
<td>-10.03 (349.97)**</td>
<td>-36 (323)</td>
<td>-66 (293)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation @ bottom of layer (ft.)*</td>
<td>-36 (323)</td>
<td>-66 (293)</td>
<td>-119 (240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Table (Normal Pool) (ft.)*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Soil Layer Model</td>
<td>Clay, soft w/water</td>
<td>Sand (Reese)</td>
<td>Sand (Reese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Friction Angle (degree)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undrained Shear Strength (psf)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k (p-y) static (pci)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε50</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top of Layer Ultimate End Bearing (ksf)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top of Layer Ultimate Unit Skin Friction (ksf)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Depth Ultimate Unit End Bearing (ksf)**</td>
<td>3.6 @ 323</td>
<td>73.5 @ 293</td>
<td>150 @ 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Depth Ultimate Unit Skin Friction (ksf)**</td>
<td>0.32 @ 323</td>
<td>2.3 @ 293</td>
<td>5.5 @ 275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *First number is relative to 0 = Normal Pool Elevation = 359 ft. MSL. Second number in parentheses is Mean Sea Elevation.
**Bottom of pile cap elevation.
***Second number is elevation in MSL at which the unit end bearing or unit skin friction occurs. If the elevation is not the bottom of the layer, the unit bearing or unit skin friction is constant for the remaining portion of the layer below the MSL elevation.
APPENDIX B

Maps
B.1 Project Maps

Figure B.1. Quadrangle Topo Map

B.2 Cross Sectional Profile
Figure B.2. H-Pile Cross Sectional Profile
Figure B.3. Pipe Pile Cross Sectional Profile
B.3 H-Pile Instrumentation

Figure B.4. H-Pile Instrumentation Scheme

Table B.1. B-3 H-Pile Manufacturer Sizing Information
B.4 Pipe Pile Instrumentation Scheme
Figure B.5. Pipe Pile Instrumentation Scheme
Figure B.6. B-4 Additional
B.5 H-Pile Final Schematic

Figure B.7. H-Pile Final Schematic

B.6 Pipe Pile Final Schematic
Final 30" Test Pile L-2 Schematic

*See Static Report for Gage Elevations

Pile L-2 Elevations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Flag Elev</th>
<th>Tip Elev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOD</td>
<td>8/13/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>277.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Restive</td>
<td>6/14/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>277.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Restive</td>
<td>6/16/2013</td>
<td>354.3</td>
<td>277.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext. Uire</td>
<td>6/16/2013</td>
<td>354.3</td>
<td>275.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext. Uire H2</td>
<td>6/18/2013</td>
<td>354.3</td>
<td>289.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After H2</td>
<td>6/19/2013</td>
<td>354.3</td>
<td>289.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Rest</td>
<td>9/10/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>280.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vibrating Wire Strain Gages (TYP)

Soft to Firm Clay

Loose Gravel with Stt

Firm Clay

Very Dense Gravel with Stt

Cross Section View

30" Outside Diameter
1" Wall Thickness

Notes:
1. All Steel is Grade 3 (Minimum yield strength of 45KSI)
APPENDIX C
Dynamic Testing
C.1 H-Pile CAPWAP Results

The subject pile was monitored with dynamic pile testing equipment during initial drive, all subsequent re-strikes, and extended drive. Compression and tension pile driving stresses were below the acceptable limit of 40.5 ksi. The acceptable limit for compression and tension driving stresses is defined as 90 percent of $F_y$. The ultimate capacities ranged from approximately 1,160 kips at the end of initial drive to approximately 1,250 kips during the 72 hour re-strike. The 72 hour re-strike capacity showed an increase of approximately 90 kips. However, the subsequent final restrike (after the static load test) showed a slight decrease in capacity with respect to the initial drive. This was most likely caused by the lower hammer energy utilized during the final re-strike not fully mobilizing the pile capacity.

The unit side shear resistances in the dense to very dense gravel ranged from approximately 2 to 4 ksf and generally increased with depth. Unit end bearings at the pile tip (using an end area based on a plugged condition) ranged from approximately 133 to 207 ksf. However the end bearings are likely much higher due to the pile likely only being partially plugged.

Figure C.1. H-Pile CAPWAP Results


C.2 Pipe Pile CAPWAP Results

The pile was monitored with dynamic pile testing equipment during initial drive, all subsequent re-strikes, and extended drive. Compression and tension pile driving stresses were below the acceptable limit of 40.5 ksi. The acceptable limit for compression and tension driving stresses is defined as 90 percent of $F_y$. It should be noted the driving shoe located at the pile tip was not included as part of the pile model within the CAPWAP software. The signal matching results would only be marginally affected even if the pile shoe was included, given the size and depth of the driving shoe relative to the pile. The impedance changes in the bottom few inches would have been very small.

The match qualities (MQ) for the signal matching results were less than 4. Lower match qualities may be achievable; however, to achieve lower match qualities the ultimate capacity of the pile may be unrealistic given the soil conditions, transferred hammer energy, and the measured sets.

The ultimate capacities ranged from approximately 1,337 kips at the end of initial drive to approximately 2,400 kips during the final re-strike. The re-strike capacities for the first (48 hour) and second (72 hour) re-strikes showed an increase in capacity of approximately 252 and 61 kips, respectively.

The unit side shear resistances in the dense to very dense gravel ranged from approximately 1 to 6.5 ksf and increased with depth. The end bearing resistance (using an end area based on a plugged condition) ranged from approximately 111 to 121 ksf. However, unit end bearings are likely much higher due to the pile likely only being partially plugged.

Figure C.2. Pipe Pile CAPWAP Results
C.3 H-Pile Signal Matching Analysis

The RMX (maximum case method) data indicated that the ultimate capacities dropped from a capacity of approximately 5530 kN during the first re-strike to 5066.524 kN during the final re-strike. This was most likely caused by the lower hammer energy utilized during the final re-strike not fully mobilizing the pile capacity.

The unit side shears ranged from 95.6 to 191 kPa and generally increased with depth as the pile proceeded through dense to very dense gravel. The unit end bearing at the pile tip assumed plugged conditions. The unit end bearings ranged from approximately 6368.07 to 9911.21 kPa. The maximum compression stress at the gage level ranged from 169611.03 kPa to 215116.43 kPa, and the maximum compression stress at the toe reached 111005.59 kPa to 102731.88 kPa. The maximum energy transferred to a gage location was 548.723 kPa. The amount of energy transferred lost during the final re-strike was 20.3 kPa.

Figure C.3. H-Pile Signal Matching Analysis
C.4. Pipe Pile Signal Matching Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blow Location</th>
<th>R_{ix} (kN)</th>
<th>R_{ax} (kN)</th>
<th>Approx. Blows per foot</th>
<th>EMX (kN/ft)</th>
<th>QS (in)</th>
<th>QT (in)</th>
<th>SS (sec/ft)</th>
<th>ST (sec/ft)</th>
<th>Match Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of Initial Drive (BN 975)</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/14/13 RS (BN 1)</td>
<td>1.569</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>124.5</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/15/13 RS (BN 3)</td>
<td>1.650</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>144.3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/16/13 ED (BN 235)</td>
<td>1.660</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/13 RS (BN 2)</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/23/13 RS (BN 2)</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ultimate capacities ranged from approximately 7148.3 kN first re-strike to 10675.7 kN during the final re-strike. The capacities showed an increase of roughly 3527 kN.

The subsurface conditions consisting of dense to very dense gravel resulted in the unit shear ranging from 47.88 kPa to 311.22 kPa as the depth. The unit end bearings at the pile tip were calculated considering plugged condition even though they are likely only to be partially plugged. The pile only being partially plugged will yield much higher end bearings in the field. With the assumed conditions, the end bearing pressures ranged from approximately 5314.71 to 5793.51 kPa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RMX (kN)</th>
<th>EMX (kN/m)</th>
<th>CSX (kPa)</th>
<th>CSB (kPa)</th>
<th>Match Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7148.3</td>
<td>1816.915748</td>
<td>247521.79</td>
<td>124795.12</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10675</td>
<td>1329.486142</td>
<td>235110.7985</td>
<td>177884.4165</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The signal matching results provide quality information about the state of the pile at the time of the final restrike. The compression stress acting at the toe of the pile has significantly increased, the energy transferred to the gage location has decreased considerably, and the maximum compression stress at that gage location has been relieved by approximately 1200 kPa. This indicates that the pile has mobilized.

Figure C.4. Pipe Pile Signal Matching Analysis
### C.5 H-Pile Dynamic Testing Results Summary

Table C.1. H-Pile Dynamic Testing Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drive</th>
<th>Maximum Case Method (kips)</th>
<th>Max. Comp. Stress (ksi)</th>
<th>Average Comp. Stress (ksi)</th>
<th>Max. Comp. Stress at Bottom (ksi)</th>
<th>Average Comp. Stress at Bottom (ksi)</th>
<th>Average Transferred Energy (k-ft)</th>
<th>Average Hammer Stroke (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>@ End</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/13 RS</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/27/13 RS</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>8.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C.6 Pipe Pile Dynamic Testing Results Summary

Table C.2. Pipe Pile Dynamic Testing Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drive</th>
<th>Maximum Case Method (kips)</th>
<th>Max. Comp. Stress (ksi)</th>
<th>Average Comp. Stress (ksi)</th>
<th>Max. Comp. Stress at Bottom (ksi)</th>
<th>Average Comp. Stress at Bottom (ksi)</th>
<th>Average Transferred Energy (k-ft)</th>
<th>Average Hammer Stroke (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>@ End</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>104.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/13 RS</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>122.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/13 RS</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/13 ED</td>
<td>@ Start, @ End 1,598, 1,643</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/19/13 RS</td>
<td>2,141</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/13 RS</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.7 GRLWEAP

Lagoon Bridge End Bent 1
Compressive Unplugged Driven Pile NOMINAL (φ=1.0) Geotechnical Resistance

Nominal Geotechnical Resistance (kips)

Depth (ft.)

Depth 0 ft. = Elev. 402 ft.

14 hp

18 hp

Exhibit E-1

Figure C.5. GRLWEAP Plots
C.8 Hammer Information

**Model I-30 v2**

Single-Acting Diesel Hammer

- Simple and reliable low-pressure impact-atomization fuel injection system ensures maximum uptime.
- Excellent cylinder scavenging ensures cooler operation.
- Automatic oil lubrication to both the upper and lower cylinders eliminates greasing and increases productivity.
- Remote hydraulic fuel control system available.
- Electronic energy output monitoring system available.

### Working Specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ram weight</td>
<td>6615 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum geometric stroke</td>
<td>13.73 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy at maximum stroke</td>
<td>90824 ft-lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated continuous stroke</td>
<td>10.84 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy at rated stroke</td>
<td>71700 ft-lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow rate</td>
<td>33-53 bpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hammer with box-lead guides</td>
<td>14250 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical helmet weight</td>
<td>1785 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical operating weight</td>
<td>16035 lbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capacities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diesel fuel tank</td>
<td>16.8 gal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lube oil tank</td>
<td>4.6 gal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ether tank</td>
<td>0.5 gal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>177 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length with trip guides</td>
<td>20.8 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall width</td>
<td>25.3 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard box leads</td>
<td>26 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall depth</td>
<td>32.7 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerline to rear</td>
<td>17.7 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerline to front</td>
<td>15.0 in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C.6. Hammer Information
D.1 Pile Load Test Profile Schematic

Figure D.1. Pile Load Test Profile Schematic

D.2 H-Pile Bearing Capacity Using Various Failure Criterion
Figure D.2. H-Pile Bearing Capacity Using Davisson Method Failure Criterion

Davvison Method

Hoy
Qu = 5367.8

Figure D.2. H-Pile Bearing Capacity Using Davisson Method Failure Criterion
To find the x coordinate where the lines intersect equation (1) and (2) are set equal to each other. To the y coordinate of the intersection point, the x coordinate solved for in last step was plugged into equation (2).

\[ x = 0.67564649 \]
\[ y = 3.586186665 \]

\[ 10^{3.58612} \]

**Figure D.3. D-2 H-Pile Bearing Capacity Using De Bear Failure Criterion**
Figure D.3. D-2 H-Pile Bearing Capacity Using Various Failure Criterion

Figure D.4. D-2 H-Pile Bearing Capacity Using Various Failure Criterion

\[
y = 6E-05x + 0.0009
\]
D.3 Pipe Pile Bearing Capacity Using Various Failure Criterion

\[ y = 0.0002x \]
Figure D.5. Pipe Pile Bearing Capacity Using Davisson Failure Criterion

Figure D.6. Pipe Pile Bearing Capacity Using Various Failure Criterion
To find the x coordinate where the lines intersect equation (1) and (2) are set equal to each other. To the y coordinate of the intersection point, the x coordinate solved for in last step was plugged into equation (2)

\[
x = 0.824650017, \quad y \approx 3.567188579
\]

10^{3.567}

Qu = 3691.379

To find the x coordinate where the lines intersect equation (1) and (2) are set equal to each other. To the y coordinate of the intersection point, the x coordinate solved for in last step was plugged into equation (2)

\[
x = 0.824650017, \quad y = 3.567188579
\]

10\times 3.567

Qu = 3691.379

Figure D.7 Pipe Pile Bearing Capacity Using Various Failure Criterion
$y = -5E-05x + 0.001$
\[ y = -4 \times 10^{-5}x + 0.0021 \]
APPENDIX E

t-z curves
E.1  H-Pile t-z curves

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figures/figureE1.pdf}
\caption{H-Pile t-z curves at different elevations.}
\end{figure}
E.2 Pipe Pile t-z curves

![Graphs showing q/s max vs z/B for different elevations (845, 833, 801, and 812 ft)]
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