

Demonstration Projects Division

DYNAMIC PILE MONITORING REPORT

EXIT GLACIER BRIDGE KENAI FJORDS NATIONAL PARK, ALASKA

Federal Highway Administration Office of Highway Operations Demonstration Projects Division Washington, D.C.

May 1985

DYNAMIC PILE MONITORING REPORT EXIT GLACIER BRIDGE KENAI FJORDS NATIONAL PARK, ALASKA

.,

Federal Highway Administration Office of Highway Operations Demonstration Projects Division Washington, D.C.

May 1985

DYNAMIC PILE MONITORING REPORT

Exit Glacier Bridge, Alaska

Introduction and Background

Field demonstrations for Demonstration Project 66, "Design and Construction of
Driven Pile Foundations," include (1) dynamic pile monitoring by pile analyzer Driven Pile Foundations," include (1) dynamic pile monitoring by pile analyzer (field computer), and (2) static pile load testing using a mobile pile load testing frame. The equipment and technical assistance are made available to requesting State highway departments and Direct Federal Divisions.

A request for performing dynamic pile tests on some of the production piles for the subject project was received from the Western Direct Federal Division (WDFD) in September 1984. Necessary specifications required for performing dynamic testing were provided to WDFD and were included in the contract documents.

The purpose for the dynamic pile testing was (1) to demonstrate the use of newer and more accurate techniques for determining pile load capacity during driving, (2) to determine the ultimate pile load capacities for the subject
bridge, and (3) to compare load capacities of piles installed partially by
the vibratory hammer and those installed exclusively, by the impact ham The contractor had requested the project engineer for an approval to install piles to a certain depth by using vibratory hammer before using an impact
hammer to drive the piles. It was felt that the use of vibratory hammer may
not allow the piles to develop necessary soil resistance. Therefore, dyn pile testing was used to evaluate the load capacities of piles installed partially by a vibratory hammer and those installed by the impact hammer.

The field work was performed from April 18 to April 20, 1985. The dynamic tests were performed by Mr. H. Clark, Civil Engineering Technician, in the Demonstration Projects Division, and Mr. S. Vanikar, Geotechnical Engineer, in the Geotechnical and Materials Branch. The piling contractor was F. E. Ward Inc.

On April 20, 1985, after the dynamic testing was completed, results of the analysis and preliminary recommendations were discussed with Messrs. Monte Symons, Geotechnical Engineer, and James Crutchen, Project Engineer. A detailed description of the work performed, test results, data analysis, and recommendations follow in this report.

Location and Strugture Information

The structure is located on Exit Glacier Road in the Kenai Fjords National
Park. The two span superstructure will consist of a concrete box girder. Abutment number 1 will be supported on spread footings. The pier will be supported on vertical piles whereas abutment number 2 will be supported on vertical and batter piles.

The dynamic pile testing was perfonned on abutment piles. Originally it was intended to perform tests on the pier foundation piles also but scheduling difficulties made it impossible to test the pier foundation piles.

Pile Data

The foundation report prepared by the WDFD recommended the use of either 10 x 42 Steel H-piles or 10-inch diameter timber piles. The pier and abutment number 2 foundations are designed for 10 x 57 steel H-piles. The piles are to be fitted with proprietary pile points to provide protection against damage.

The piles tested at the abutment number 2 location are part of the foundation pile group. Each pile was driven in two sections. For each pile, a 30-foot long section was installed. Another 60-foot section was welded to the driven section **with a** full penetration butt weld and then driven.

Pile number 12 was installed to a depth of 69 feet by a vibratory hanmer and then driven with an impart hanmer until the pile reached a depth of 79 feet below the existing ground. Pile number 19 was driven with a vibratory hanmer until the pile tip reached a depth of 70 feet below the ground and was then driven with an impact hammer to a depth of 80 feet. Pile numbers 12 and 19 were dynamically monitored during driving with impact hanmer for the last 10 feet. Pile numbers 43 and 55 were installed to a depth of 15 feet with vibratory hanmer. The remaining driving was perfonned with an impact hanmer and was dynamically monitored.

Subsurface Conditions

The site is located in a glaciated valley. Borings were performed only at abutment number 1 and pier locations. The existing topography suggests that the subsurface conditions at abutment number 2 location are similar to those at the pier location. Therefore, the data from boring numbers 1 and 2 drilled at the pier location is used for describing subsurface conditions. These borings show the existence of deep glacial deposits of sand and gravel with traces of silt and many rock fragments. The Standard Penetration Test (SPT) "N" values for this material are variable ("N" values vary from 8 to 53). In general, the soil density is medium to dense.

Impact Hanmer Data

The following is the data for the impact hanmer system selected by the contractor:

Mitsubishi MH 15, open end diesel hammer

Rated Energy at 8.5 foot stroke= 28,100 foot pounds

Ram Weight = $3,310$ pounds

Hammer Cushion = 2" thick ZELKOVA

Pile Cushion - none

Dynamic Monitoring (Pile Analyzer) Results

Four piles (10 x 57 - H) were driven at abutment number 2 location and were dynamically monitored. Monitoring was perfonned for each pile when they were driven by an impact hanmer. Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the Appendix sunmarize the results of dynamic monitoring.

Table 1 shows the summary of the dynamic test results obtained during driving
of pile number 12. A 30-foot long section was driven with a vibratory
hammer. A 60-foot long section was welded to the driven H-section and driv feet below the existing ground. Driving from 69 feet to 79 feet was accomplished by using an impact hanmer and this portion of driving was monitored by using the pile analyzer. The impact hanmer performed well as indicated by transfer efficiencies of up to 35 percent. The average transfer efficiencies for open end diesel hanmers are usually in the range of 25 to 34 percent. Since the hanmer stroke was not measured during driving, transfer efficiencies in Table 1 were computed based on rated hammer energy. Table 1 shows that the ultimate static load capacity did not vary significantly during the last 10 feet of driving. The analyzer predicted an ultimate static capacity of 55 tons at the end of the driving. The maximum measured compressive driving stress was 21.7 KSI and was within the limitation of 32.4 KSI. The maximum measured tensile driving stress was 8.2 KSI and **was well** within the limitation of 32.4 KSI. Since the pile design load indicated on plans is 52 tons, the ultimate pile capacity required is 130 tons (factor of safety = 2.5). The pile failed to develop the required ultimate load when the driving was tenninated.

Table 2 sunmarizes the dynamic test results obtained during driving of pile number 19. Installation procedure similar to that used for pile number 12 was used. Driving from 70 feet to 80 feet below ground was performed by the impact hanmer. The hanmer performed extremely well as indicated by the transfer efficiencies of up to 43 percent. The maximum compressive and tensile driving stresses were well within the limitation of 32.4 KSI. The pile analyzer predicted an ultimate static capacity of 53 tons when driving
was terminated at the pile tip penetration of 80 feet below ground. During driving, pile number 19 behaved very similar to pile number 12. This pile
also failed to develop the required ultimate load of 130 tons when the driving was terminated.

Table 3 shows the dynamic test results for pile number 43. A 30-foot long section was driven first (15 feet) by the vibratory hammer and then by the impact hanmer. A 60-foot long section was welded to the installed section and driving by the impact hammer was continued. The impact hammer performed well
and transfer efficiencies of up to 51 percent were recorded. The pile analyzer predicted ultimate load capacities up to 67 tons until the pile tip reached a depth of 69 feet below ground. The capacity increased significantly to 102 tons at 72 feet penetration. A practical refusal was reached at 72 feet-6 inch penetrations (82 blows for 6 inch penetration). The refusal and high below count were possibly due to pile tip on a boulder or bedrock. The pile analyzer predicted an ultimate pile capacity of 247 tons at the end of driving which is significantly more than the required ultimate capacity of 130

tons. The maximum compressive and driving stresses were within the limitations of 32.4 KSI. A slight damage to the pile tip at the end of driving was detected by the pile analyzer (the wave patterns on the oscilloscope showed the damage).

Table 4 summarizes the dynamic test results for pile number 55. The installation procedure used was identical to the one used for pile number 43. The pile was installed by using a vibratory hammer to a depth of 15 feet. The remaining installation was performed with the impact hammer. The hammer perfonned **well** and the compressive and tensile driving stresses did not exceed the limitation of 32.4 KSI. An ultimate pile capacity equal to 35 tons was predicted when the pile tip reached 26 feet - 5 inches below the ground line. The capacity decreased rapidly to O when the pile tip reached 46 feet below the ground. The reason the for pile not developing any capacity is that the capacity developed for first 45 feet of penetration was probably due to end
bearing only (no skin friction) and when the tip reached a loose soil deposit. bearing only (no skin friction) and when the tip reached a loose soil deposit, there was no resistance at the tip. The analyzer predicted a capacity 62 ton capacity at 73 feet of penetration. An ultimate pile capacity of 90 tons was predicted when the driving was completed with the pile tip at 78 feet - 3 inches below ground. The pile failed to develop the required ultimate load capacity of 130 tons.

Conclusions

- 1. The dynamic monitoring equipment (pile analyzer) performed well in predicting ultimate pile load capacities and driving stresses. The
equipment monitored the hammer performance by measuring the hammer energy transferred to the pile under each hammer below. The pile analyzer detected pile damage at the tip of pile number 43. This demonstrates the tremendous advantages provided by the equipment for construction control.
- 2. The ultimate load capacities of pile numbers 12 and 19 (driven with a vibratory hammer) for about 70 feet and with the impart hammer for the last 10 feet) were 55 and 53 tons, respectively. Significantly higher rast 10 feet) were seen to similar the significant capacity of 90 tons was predicted for the pile number 55 which was driven with an impact hammer (except the first 15 feet of driving). Because the vibratory hammer reduces the skin friction along the pile length by loosening the soil around the pile, most of the developed pile capacity is only due to end bearing. The capacities of the impact driven piles such as pile numbers 55 and 43 are due to end bearing and skin friction and, therefore substantially higher than those predicted for pile numbers 12 and 19.
- 3. Extremely high ultimate pile load capacity for the pile number 43 at the end of driving may be due to the pile tip on a boulder or bedrock.
- 4. Pile numbers 12, 19, and 55 failed to develop the required ultimate load capacity of 130 tons.

Recommendations

1. Piles may be driven with a vibratory hamner to a depth of not more than 50 feet **below** the existing ground. The remaining 30 feet of driving must be perfonned by an impact hamner.

- 2. Three of the four tested failed fails to achieve the reQuired ultimate load capacity of 130 tons. (Specified pile design load on plans = 52 tons. With a factor of safety of 2.5, the ultimate loud required is 130 tons.) Pile numbers 12 and 19 do not provide any safety factor at all. Pile number 55 provides a safety factor of 1.7. Longger piles and deeper penetration to refusal will be needed to achieve a reasonable factor of safety.
- 3. It is recommended that the pile driving criteria be based on the **wave** equation analysis. The information on the pile hammer and the test pile
performance is now available and a wave equation analysis should be performed. The pile driving criteria should be provided for the project engineer's use.
- 4. A steel H-pile is usually a poor choice for use as a friction pile in sands and gravel. It is well known that H-piles have a tendency to "run" in sand and gravel deposits without developing the required resistance. A good choice of pile in such deposits is a displacement pile such as closed-end steel pipe pile. Prestressed concrete piles are also displacement piles and suitable for installations in sands and gravels.

~-yJ.t/~

Suneel N. Vanikar, **P.E.** Geotechnical Engineer

EXIT GLACIER BRIDGE, KENAI FJORDS NATIONAL PARK ALASKA
TABLE 1 SUMMARY OF DYNAMIC MONITORING RESULTS

*Distance from the ground line to pile tip.
RS = Ultimate Static Resistance

Maximum allowable compressive or tensile driving stress =
0.9 Fy = 0.9 X 36 = 32.4 K S I
J = Damping parameter (depends on soil type)

 \bullet

FMAX = Maximum measured force in pile at the transducer location.
CTEN = Maximum computed tensile force anywhere in the pile.

 \mathbf{r}

EXIT GLACIER BRIDGE, KENAL FJORDS NATIONAL PARK ALASKA

 $\sim 10^7$

 \mathbf{v}

 \sim \sim

 \sim

 \bullet

 \mathbf{r}

EXIT GLACIER BRIDGE, KENAI FJORDS NATIONAL PARK ALASKA

 $*$ Distance from the ground line to pile tip.
RS = Ultimate Static Resistance
PMAX = Maximum measured force in pile at the transducer location.
CTEN = Maximum computed tensile force anywhere in the pile.

 \mathbf{I}

Maximum allowable compressive or tensile driving stress =
0.9 Fy = 0.9 X 36 = 32.4 K S I
J = Damping parameter (depends on soil type)

 $\overline{}$

 \mathbf{I}

 60.0 ground $27'$

 $30'$

 $33'$

 $36'$ 40' 43' 46' 48' $50'$ $55'$ $60'$ $65'$

Maximum allowable compressive or tensile driving stress =
0.9 Fy = 0.9 X 36 = 32.4 K S I
J = Damping parameter (depends on soil type)

*Distance from the ground line to pile tip.
RS = Ultimate Static Resistance
PMAX = Maximum measured force in pile at the transducer location.
CTEN = Maximum computed tensile force anywhere in the pile.

EXIT GLACIER BRIDGE, KENAI FJORDS NATIONAL PARK ALASKA
TABLE 3 SUMMARY OF DYNAMIC NONITORING RESULTS
(continued)

 $\sim 10^{11}$ km s $^{-1}$

 \sim

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ are $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$

 \mathbf{v}

 \mathcal{L}

 \mathcal{L}

 \mathcal{A}^{\pm}

RS = UITImate Static Resistance
PMAX = Maximum measured force in pile at the transducer location.
CTEN = Maximum computed tensile force anywhere in the pile.

 $\mathbf{x}=(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$

J = Damping parameter (depends on soil type)

 \sim

 \bullet

EXIT GLACIER BRIDGE, KENAL FJORDS NATIONAL PARK ALASKA

Distance from the ground line to pile tip.

S = Ultimate Static Resistance

MAX = Maximum measured force in pile at the transducer location.

TEN = Maximum computed tensile force anywhere in the pile.

 \mathbf{L}

Maximum allowable compressive or tensile driving stress =
0.9 Fy = 0.9 X 36 = 32.4 K S I
J = Damping parameter (depends on soil type)

 \sim

 \cdot

 \bullet

EXIT GLACIER BRIDGE, KENAL FJORDS NATIONAL PARK ALASKA
TABLE 4 SUMMARY OF DYNAMIC MONITORING RESULTS

 ~ 10

(continued)

 $\overline{1}$

 \mathbf{S}^{in} and \mathbf{S}^{in}

 \sim

Maximum allowable compressive or tensile driving stress =
0.9 Fy = 0.9 X 36 = 32.4 K S I
J = Damping parameter (depends on soil type)

*Distance from the ground line to pile tip.
RS = Ultimate Static Resistance
PMAX = Maximum measured force in pile at the transducer location.
CTEN = Maximum computed tensile force anywhere in the pile.

EXIT GLACIER BRIDGE, KENAL FJORDS NATIONAL PARK ALASKA
TABLE 4 SUMMARY OF DYNAMIC MONITORING RESULTS
(continued)

 $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}$

 $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}$. \mathbf{x}

 $\mathbf{a}^{\dagger}=\mathbf{a}^{\dagger}$.

 \sim

 \mathbf{r}

 $\sim 10^7$

 \mathcal{A}^{\pm}

cress ъ,

reaximum arrowable compressive or tensive of $0.9 \text{ Fy} = 0.9 \text{ X } 36 = 32.4 \text{ K } S$ I
J = Damping parameter (depends on soil type)

 \sim

 \bullet

*Distance from the ground line to pile tip.
RS = Ultimate Static Resistance
RMAX = Maximum measured force in pile at the transducer location.
CTEN = Maximum computed tensile force anywhere in the pile.

$\ddot{\cdot}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{2\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$