

**A COMPARISON BETWEEN STATIC LOAD TEST AND HIGH STRAIN
DYNAMIC TEST ON BORED PILES**

MICHAEL ANGELO A/L MURUGAN @ AROKIASAMY

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

**A COMPARISON BETWEEN STATIC LOAD TEST AND HIGH STRAIN
DYNAMIC TEST ON BORED PILES**

MICHAEL ANGELO A/L MURUGAN @ AROKIASAMY

**A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the
Requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Engineering (Civil – Geotechnic)**

**Faculty of Civil Engineering
University Technology Malaysia**

MAY 2006

ABSTRACT

Piles are both statically and dynamically tested to obtain the capacity and to verify design. Both the test will provide results that may vary base on the method applied in conducting the test. It is therefore, necessary to compare the results of a static load test with dynamic load test. Many comparison studies are conducted worldwide, but most of it is for displacement pile. Therefore, the results of the test are compared for replacement piles. The piles are tested statically prior to dynamic test. The test results shows that a good agreement have achieved between both the test with plus minus 2mm at working load in terms of settlement. Comparatively the settlement predicted in dynamic load test is smaller compared to static load test. In terms of total capacity, the Davisson's method gives the lowest value compared to other methods. The Davisson's method is used to compare the results because it is more conservative. The comparison shows that the piles are within 20% relative to the capacity obtained through Davisson's method. Since the static test was conducted prior to dynamic test, the capacity obtained from dynamic test is higher due to the pile undergone elastic compression during static load test and also due to soil setup. The shaft distribution show that large shaft distribution obtained on long piles. They are comparable with the dynamic test taking into account the time factor.

ABSTRAK

Cerucuk biasanya diuji secara static dan dinamik untuk menentukan beban tanggungan dan juga untuk mengesahkan rekabentuk. Kedua-dua ujian akan menghasilkan keputusan yang berlainan berdasarkan kaedah yang digunakan untuk melaksanakan ujian. Oleh demikian, ia adalah penting untuk memperoleh suatu hubungan diantara ujian static dan ujian dinamik beban cerucuk. Banyak kajian yang dijalankan di merata dunia, tetapi kajian-kajian ini tertumpu pada 'driven pile'. Oleh yang demikian, kajian ini adalah tertumpu terhadap 'bored pile'. Cerucuk-cerucuk ini diuji secara static terdahulu sebelum menjalankan ujian dinamik. Keputusan adalah memuaskan bagi bebanan kerja dengan $\pm 2\text{mm}$. Secara ringkas boleh dikatakan bahawa keputusan yang diperolehi pada bebanan ujian adalah lebih rendah bagi ujian dinamik berbanding ujian statik. Dari sudut bebanan muktamad pula, kaedah Davisson memberi nilai yang paling minima berbanding kaedah-kaedah yang lain. Nilai ini adalah pada had yang rendah, oleh itu ia digunakan bagi tujuan kajian. Keputusan menggunakan kaedah ini memberikan keputusan bahawa nilai ujian dinamik adalah dalam 20% nilai yang diperolehi. Ini adalah kerana ujian static dijalankan dahulu sebelum ujian dinamik dan ini mengakibatkan cerucuk mengalami terikan mampatan dan jukan masa perantaraan mengakibatkan tanah pulih semula keadaan asalnya. Dari segi bebanan sisi cerucuk, didapati bebanan sisi menguasai nisbah yang lebih banyak bagi cerucuk panjang. Keputusannya dapat dipersamakan dengan ujian dinamik jika masa perantaraan diambil kira.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iv
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
	ABSTRACT	vi
	ABSTRAK	vii
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
	LIST OF TABLES	xi
	LIST OF FIGURES	xii
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xiv
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xvi
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Background	1

	1.2 Problem Statement	3
	1.3 Objectives	4
	1.4 Scope	4
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	5
	2.1 Bored Pile	5
	2.1.1 Types of Bored Pile	7
	2.1.2 Construction Procedures	7
	2.1.2.1 Dry Method	7
	2.1.2.2 Casing Method	8
	2.1.2.3 Wet Method	11
	2.1.3 Techniques and Equipment	12
	2.1.3.1 Boring by Mechanical Auger	13
	2.1.3.2 Boring by Percussion or Grab-type Rig	15
	2.1.3.3 Boring by Continuous Flight Auger Drilling	16
	2.1.3.4 Under-reamed Bored Piles	17
	2.2 Load Test	19
	2.2.1 Static Load Test (Maintain Load Test)	20
	2.2.1.1 Test Equipment and Instruments	20
	2.2.1.2 Test Procedures	24
	2.2.2 High Strain Dynamic Test	25
	2.2.3 Correlation Studies	28
3	METHODOLOGY	30
	3.1 Introduction	31
	3.2 Data Collection	31
	3.3 Data Analysis and Results	32
	3.4 Summary	33
4	DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	35
	4.1 Data Description	35

4.2 Analysis of field data	37
4.3 Analysis of Static Load Test Data	43
4.4 Analysis of PDA test data	47
4.5 Comparison between Static Load Test and Pile Driving Analyzer	49
5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE STUDY	53
5.1 Conclusion	53
5.2 Recommendations for Future Study	54
REFERENCES	55
Appendices A-E	58 – 97

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
4.1	Relationship between SPT, N value and weathering grade	38
4.2	Subsoil classification (Komoo and Morgana, 1988)	40
4.3	Pile details	41
4.4	Date and time interval between tests	42
4.5	Maximum load implied during static load test	42
4.6	Pile settlement	43
4.7	Pile capacity for static load test using various methods	45
4.8	Pile capacity	50
4.9	Shaft and end bearing contributions	51

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Bore hole created by dry method of construction	8
2.2	Process of dry method	9
2.3	Bore hole created by casing method	9
2.4	Process of casing method	10
2.5	Bore hole created by wet method	11
2.6	Process of wet method	12
2.7	Auger a) spiral auger b) bucket auger c) rock auger d) earth auger	14
2.8	Percussion drilling equipment	15
2.9	Continuous flight auger machinery	17
2.10	Belling tool	18
2.11	Under reamed bored pile	19

2.12	Static load test in progress	21
2.13	Test equipments a) 30 tonne steel ram with hydraulic release b) pile driving analyzer c) accelerometer d) transducer	27
3.1	Flow chart of the study	32
4.1	Instrumented bore pile schematic diagram	36
4.2	Typical comparison of methods for Pile 3	46
4.3	Pile – soil model	48
4.4	CAPWAP method – iteration program	49

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A	-	Cross section Area of the pile
c	-	Wavespeed
E	-	Modulus of Elasticity of the pile material or strain gauge reading
F_m	-	Force measured
F_c	-	Force calculated
j_c	-	Empirical correlation factor (Case method damping factor)
L	-	Distance along the pile between two telltale anchor plates
ΔL	-	Difference in movement between two telltale rods
Q	-	Quake
Q_{ra}	-	Load in the pile midway between two anchor plates or load in the pile at the location of the strain gauge

R_{shaft}	-	Shaft Resistance
R_{toe}	-	Toe Resistance
R_u	-	Ultimate resistance in the soil ‘springs’
Δt	-	Travel time
v_m	-	Velocity measured
Z	-	Pile impedance
P	-	Mass density

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	Results of Analysis Pile 1	58
B	Results of Analysis Pile 2	66
C	Results of Analysis Pile 3	74
D	Results of Analysis Pile 4	82
E	Results of Analysis Pile 5	90

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Foundation is an essential part of a structure because it transmit load from the structure to the soil below it. The foundation can be classified into shallow foundation and deep foundation. Shallow foundations such as individual footings, combined footings, and raft foundation are used when the supporting soil is found at shallow depth. While, deep foundations such as caissons and piles are required when the depth of supporting soil is significant or building is placed on soft compressible soil. Deep foundation is also required if construction is subjected to horizontal load or moment.

Piles are mainly classified into two categories; displacement piles and replacement piles. Displacement piles consist of reinforced piles, pre-stressed piles, steel-H piles, whereas replacement piles consist of bored piles, and cast in-place-piles. All these piles are designated to a particular situation or site based on location and type of structure, ground condition and durability.

Piles are designed based on the load that is transferred from the structure to the piles; thus the type, size and length of piles are determined accordingly. However, load test should be conducted to verify the design capacity. Piles that are not properly designed, would pose danger to the structure. Inadequate load or large settlement would cause severe damage to the structure and its occupants.

There are several alternatives to load test, i.e.: maintained load test (MLT), high strain dynamic test (PDA), static test and Osterberg Cell load testing. All the mentioned tests are rigorously being carried out in Malaysia. These tests would provide the engineer with the load and the corresponding settlement. It actually enables the engineer in decision making as to resume work or to make changes to the selected design criteria. Of the four, the most viable and the most common as being practiced in the industry are the Static Load Test and the High Strain Dynamic Testing.

Maintained load test or static load test is commonly known in construction industry. It uses hydraulic jacking system against a kentledge or against a beam restraint by anchor piles. The load is measured by the reading of pressure gauge on the hydraulic jack. At present the load is measured directly by a load cell interposed between the pile head and jack or between the jack and platform to get an accurate and reliable measurement. This test is also known as conventional test. It requires proper setup, manpower, machinery and longer duration to maintain the load.

High strain dynamic test or dynamic pile testing is conducted using two to four sets of sensors known as accelerometer and transducer attached to the pile. The basis for this testing is wave mechanics. The test requires sensors, pile driving analyzer and the pile driving system. On every impact of the driving system/ram, the sensors capture the impact force and velocity. The captured signals of strain and acceleration were conditioned and processed by the pile driving analyzer to produce plots of force and velocity versus time. The ability to accurately predict static capacity for dynamic pile testing has resulted in many studies and has been the focus

of dynamic pile tests on many project sites. Standard practice requires performing signal matching on the data to more accurately determine capacity from the dynamic tests. CAPWAP (Case Pile Wave Analysis Program) analysis is the most used program to evaluation capacity from high strain dynamic testing data. Previous studies have demonstrated generally good correlation of CAPWAP signal matching results on dynamically re-struck tests with that of static load tests.

Since, the usage of static load test and high strain dynamic test is rapid and almost conducted in every site, comparisons between the two tests for bored pile is attempted in this project paper.

1.2 Problem Statement

There are many studies conducted on the comparison between high strain dynamic testing and CAPWAP analysis, and static load test in Malaysia, but most of it was made for the displacement piles. I, in this project study however, will focus on replacement piles (bored piles). Comparison is made between the static load test results and the CAPWAP signal matching result on dynamic re-strike test. Furthermore, an attempt is made to compare the results obtained from the maintain load test and the high strain dynamic test and CAPWAP analysis.

1.3 Objectives

The objective of conducting this study is to compare the results obtained in static load tests with that of high strain dynamic tests and CAPWAP analysis in terms of:

- 1) The load transfer mechanism through pile;
- 2) The load and the corresponding settlement of the pile; and
- 3) The total bearing capacity of the pile.

1.4 Scope

In this project paper special attention is provided to the bored piles. The bored piles are vertically tested with both static load test and high strain dynamic test.

The data for this paper is obtained from real time projects conducted in construction industry. In this case, the piles are fully instrumented for measurements of stress and displacement. Static load test are conducted prior to the dynamic test. The static load test is conducted using kentledge with load cell, whereas; the dynamic test is conducted using a drop hammer.

The subject of this study is not the accuracy, but relative comparison between static load test and high strain dynamic test to evaluate the capacity and load transfer mechanisms within the piles.

REFERENCES

- Barends, Frans B. J., (1992). *Application of Stress Wave Theory to Piles*. A. A. Balkema, Netherlands.
- Bengt. H. Fellenius (1980). *The Analysis of Results from Routine Pile Load Test*. Ground Engineering, Geotechnical News Magazine, September 1980.
- Bengt. H. Fellenius (1990). *Static or Dynamic Test – Which To Trust?* Geotechnical News Magazines, December 1990, Vol. 8, No.4.
- Bengt. H. Fellenius (2001). *From Strain Measurements to Load in an Instrumented Pile*. Geotechnical News Magazine, Vol. 19, No. 1.
- Canadian Foundation Engineering Manual, (1993). Third edition Canadian Geotechnical Society, Technical Committee on Foundations, Canada.
- Chin Y.K., Tan S.L. and Tan S.B. (1985). *Ultimate Load Tests on Instrumented Bored Piles in Singapore Old Alluvium*. Eight Southeast Asian Geotechnical Conference, Kuala Lumpur.
- Coduto, Donald P., (1994). *Foundation Design: Principles and Practices*. Prentice Hall, United States of America.

Das, Braja M. (2004). *Principles of Foundation Engineering*. Fifth edition Brooks/Cole, United States of America.

Frank Rausche, Fred Moses, George G. Goblen (1972). *Soil Resistance Predictions from Pile Dynamics*. Journal of the Soil Mechanics and Foundation Division ASCE, September 1972.

Garland Likins, Frank Rausche (2004). *Correlation of CAPWAP with Static Load Test*. Proceedings of The Seventh International Conference on the Application of Stresswave Theory to Piles 2004, The Institute of Engineers Malaysia.

Goble Rausche Likins and Associates (1996). *CAPWAP Introduction to Dynamic Pile Testing Methods*. Pile Dynamic Inc.

Institute of Engineers Malaysia, (2004). *The Seventh International Conference on the Application of Stresswave Theory to Piles*. Geotechnical Engineering Technical Division, Malaysia.

Jean Authier, Bengt. H. Fellenius (1981). *Pile Integrity, Soil Setup and Relaxation. Second Seminar on the Dynamics of Pile Driving*. Pile Research Laboratory, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Colorado, Boulder.

Jorge William Beim, Reynaldo Luiz De Rosa (2004). *Comparison of Static and Dynamic Load Tests Results*. Proceedings of The Seventh International Conference on the Application of Stresswave Theory to Piles, The Institute of Engineers Malaysia.

Paul Hewitt, Dr. Wong K.Y. and Gue S.S. (1995). *Properties of Kenny Hill Formation for Piled Raft Foundation Design, Kuala Lumpur*. Forum on Soil and Rock Properties, Geotechnical Society of Malaysia.

Pile Driving Analyser (1995). *PAK User Manual*. Pile Dynamic Inc.

Sharma, Hari D. and Prakash, Shamsheer, (1990). *Pile Foundation in Engineering Practice*. Wiley-Interscience Publication, New York.

Tomlinson, M. J., (2001). *Foundation Design and Construction*. Seventh edition Pearson Education, England.