



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Reliability Based Reassessment of an Existing Pile Foundation

Sørensen, Carsten Steen; Faber, Michael Havbro; Stenstrup, B.

Publication date:
1997

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Sørensen, C. S., Faber, M. H., & Stenstrup, B. (1997). *Reliability Based Reassessment of an Existing Pile Foundation*. Geotechnical Engineering Group. AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers : Foundation Engineering Paper Vol. R 9709 No. 5

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Reliability Based Reassessment of an Existing Pile Foundation

C.S. Sørensen, M.H. Faber, B. Stenstrup

September 1997

Foundation Engineering Paper No 5



**GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING GROUP
AALBORG UNIVERSITY DENMARK**

Sørensen, C.S., Faber, M.H., Stenstrup, B. (1997). Reliability Based Reassessment of an Existing Pile Foundation.

AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers, ISSN 1398-6465 R9709.

Foundation Engineering Paper No 5

The paper has been published in *Proc. XIV Int. Conf. on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Eng., Hamburg*, Sept. 6-12-97, pp. 1197-1200.

© 1997 AAU Geotechnical Engineering Group.

Except for fair copying, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the Geotechnical Engineering Group.

Papers or other contributions in AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers and the statements made or opinions expressed therein are published on the understanding that the author of the contribution is solely responsible for the opinions expressed in it and that its publication does not necessarily imply that such statements or opinions are or reflect the views of the AAU Geotechnical Engineering Group.

The AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers - AGEP - are issued for early dissemination and book keeping of research results from the Geotechnical Engineering Group at Aalborg University (Department of Civil Engineering). Moreover, the papers accommodate proliferation and documentation of field and laboratory test series not directly suited for publication in journals or proceedings.

The papers are numbered ISSN 1398-6465 R<two digit year code><two digit consecutive number>. For internal purposes the papers are, further, submitted with coloured covers in the following series:

Series	Colour
Laboratory testing papers	sand
Field testing papers	grey
Manuals & guides	red
Soil Mechanics papers	blue
Foundation Engineering papers	green
Engineering Geology papers	yellow
Environmental Engineering papers	brown

In general the AGEP papers are submitted to journals, conferences or scientific meetings and hence, whenever possible, reference should be given to the final publication (journal, proceeding etc.) and not to the AGEPPaper.

Reliability Based Reassessment of an Existing Pile Foundation Réévaluation basée sur l'assurance de qualité d'une fondation sur pieu existante

C. S. SÖRENSEN, COWI and the Geotechnical Engineering Group, Aalborg University, Denmark
M. H. FABER, COWI Denmark
B. STENSTRUP, COWI, Denmark

ABSTRACT: A rational framework for reliability based assessment of the capacity of piles with an existing pile foundation is presented. In this case where traditional approaches for reassessment indicated that a strengthening of the pile foundation with an estimated cost of MECU 5 was necessary, the use of the suggested reassessment framework revealed that no strengthening of the pile foundation was necessary at all.

RESUME: Dans un cadre rationnel, l'évaluation basée sur l'assurance de qualité de la capacité des pieux d'une fondation existante est présentée. Dans ce cas, alors que les approches traditionnelles de réévaluation indiquent qu'un renforcement du pont avec un coût estimatif de 5 MECU est nécessaire, l'utilisation de la méthode de réévaluation suggérée révèle qu'aucun renforcement de la fondation sur pieu n'est nécessaire.

1 INTRODUCTION

The bearing capacity of a large concrete motorway bridge, opened in 1969, on the Danish part of the motorway system E45 was reassessed in 1994. The aim was to evaluate the technical and economical consequence of a traffic load increase from load class 40 to 100. The superstructure of the bridge was supported by driven concrete piles with enlarged base. The bearing capacity of these piles was originally determined by a deterministic bearing capacity model, based on the Danish Driving Formula (DDF). This model was calibrated from measured bearing capacities on four insitu pile load tests. As a part of the reassessment, three of the four originally tested piles were loaded with the aim to determine the possible bearing capacity increase of these piles. The load tests showed that the bearing capacity of these piles was increased

by 70, 90 and 150%. Based on this new information and all the other information from 1969, new bearing capacities of all the other piles were assessed using the probabilistic methods. First a probabilistic model was established for the bearing capacity of the piles based on the original pile driving records and for the four pile load tests performed one month after the piles were installed. Using this model, the probability distribution functions of the bearing capacities were established. Secondly, the probabilistic model was applied to incorporate the results of the additional three pile load tests - thus updating the probability distribution functions based on the observed pile capacities. Finally it was shown how the use of reliability methods for utilisation of the available information concerning the state of the bridge resulted in the re-classification of the bridge without strengthening or without other modifications of the bridge.




Figure 1. Bridge elevation and geotechnical conditions

2 GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATIONS

In 1968, before the bridge was built, geotechnical investigations were carried out to determine the ground conditions including the strength parameters of the soil. In 1994, a 30 m deep boring was carried out as a supplement.

The oldest deposits, found during the geotechnical investigations, are lateglacial meltwater sands. Above these, postglacial deposits of gyttja and sand were found. The transition zone between lateglacial and postglacial layers was difficult to determine. A part of the bridge's elevation and the geotechnical conditions in the area are shown in Figure 1.

Field vane tests in the gyttja show almost constant shear strengths down to level -8 to -9 with an average value of 13 kPa. Underneath, the strength increases slightly, but locally up to 60 - 80 kPa. The results of Swedish weight soundings show that the upper 2-4 m sand layers are very loose. Underneath and further down the sand is medium dense. The characteristic internal angle of friction of the sand is estimated to $\phi = 33^\circ$ to level -16 m and $\phi = 36^\circ$ further down. The specific weights of the soil layers is determined to: $\gamma_{\text{gyttja}}=12 \text{ kN/m}^3$, $\gamma_{\text{sand}}=19 \text{ kN/m}^3$ and $\gamma_{\text{silt/clay}}=21 \text{ kN/m}^3$.

3 INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF BEARING CAPACITIES

In 1969 dynamic driving tests with 37 piles were carried out to determine the bearing capacity of the piles. The piles have variable cross sections and lengths. However, all piles were equipped with a 450 x 450 mm base on their lowest 2m. The bearing capacity of the piles was calculated on the basis of the driving tests, in accordance with the DDF. The driving tests showed greater irregularities in the soil conditions than first assumed, and there was hardly any increase with depth in the bearing capacity below level -15 to -20.

As a supplement to the driving tests, four pile loading tests were carried out. The aim was to check that the DDF could be used directly to determine the bearing capacity. The results from the loading tests were in good agreement with geostatic calculations and the DDF. The results of the pile loading tests are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Pile bearing capacities in 1969

Pile no	Load test	DDF	Geostatic calculation
S4b	1400-1500 kN	1440 kN	1500 kN
S13b	1100-1200 kN	760 kN	1360 kN
S16c	1200 kN	1220 kN	
S26a	1500-1600kN	1400 kN	1100 kN

The shaft resistance from the extended base on the piles to the ground was not included in the geostatic calculations. As the loading tests were in good agreement with these calculations it could be concluded that the piles were predominantly point load bearing.

On the basis of these calculations the production piles were carried out as 300 x 300 mm piles with a 450 x 450 mm times 2 m base. The piles had to be driven to a characteristic bearing capacity of 1600 kN, determined according to the DDF. Since a part of the piles did not reach sufficient bearing capacity during driving, six piles were subjected to re-driving, which showed an increase of the bearing capacity between 7 and 14% only four days after the driving. This increase could be caused by several conditions, such as:

- regeneration of the strength of the gyttja
- penetration of the sand around the pile shaft
- dissipation of the excess pore pressure around the pile base.

4 PROBABILISTIC MODEL OF INITIAL CAPACITY

On the basis of these observations it was reasonable to believe that the piles had gained a higher bearing capacity 26 years after the driving. Now the task was to propose and to validate a de-

terministic model for the bearing capacity increase of each pile. The bearing capacity model was based on the base resistance, calculated by use of the DDF, and the shaft resistance which were supposed to have increased since the driving as a consequence of regeneration of the soil around the shaft of the piles. The model was based on well-known bearing capacity models which were related to the actual conditions, such as:

- the shape of the piles
- the displacement of the pile in relation to the number of driving blows
- the effective insitu stresses in the soil
- the strength parameters of the soil.

The model was established on the basis of the geostatic formula for the bearing capacity of the piles in the Danish Code of Practice for Foundation Engineering, DS 415, section 6.2, as it was assumed that the formulas in this code for the shaft resistance for ordinary piles also were valid for piles with enlarged base. The used coefficients were however presumed to be lower. For the actual piles the bearing capacity Q can be expressed as:

$$Q_P = Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3 + Q_4 \quad (1)$$

where $Q_{1,3}$ is the shaft resistances in gyttja, in sand on the shaft part of the pile and in the sand on the base part of the pile, respectively. Q_4 is the pile base resistance. The applied model is illustrated in Figure 3.

The resistances can be expressed as:

$$Q_1 = m r c_u A_{m1} \quad (2)$$

$$Q_2 = q'_m N_m A_{m2} \quad (3)$$

$$Q_3 = q'_m N_m A_{m3} \quad (4)$$

$$Q_4 = q' A_p \quad (5)$$

where:

- m = material factor, characterising the roughness of the pile
- r = regeneration factor
- c_u = undrained shear strength
- A_m = surface area of the pile in the layer
- q'_m = average vertical effective stress in the soil
- N_m = 0.6, skin friction coefficient
- q' = pile toe unit bearing capacity
- A_p = pile toe area

The shaft and the base area of the piles are known, whereas the strength of the soil along the pile and at the pile base is uncertain. The weight of the soil, which enters into formula (3) and (4), can be determined reasonably exact on the basis of results from the original soil investigations, supplemented with the results from the new boring.

It may be assumed that the base resistance at the time of the pile driving can be estimated from the pile driving records and by application of the DDF. However, by comparison of pile load bearing capacities determined by the DDF and static pile capacity tests performed immediately after pile driving, a discrepancy is observed. This discrepancy may appropriately be described by a systematic term (bias) and a random term (noise).

The relation between the capacity of the piles estimated from the pile driving expressions Q_{DDF} and as obtained from static compression tests Q_P can therefore be given by

$$Q_P = Q_4 = K Q_{DDF} + \Sigma \quad (6)$$

where the bias factor K and the noise term Σ are model parameters estimated by the Maximum Likelihood Method.

One month after the piles were installed four static pile compression tests were performed and the results of these tests were used to estimate K and Σ for the present pile capacities. At the time of the pile tests it could be assumed that full resistance is established on the shaft area on the pile base. The relation between the base bearing capacity estimated by DDF and the static test results




Figure 2. Illustration of the probabilistic density function of the bearing capacity for one of the analyzed piles.

could therefore be given by

$$Q_p = Q_3 + Q_4 = Q_3 + K Q_{DDF} + \Sigma \quad (7)$$

During the period following the static pile load tests in 1969 it is assumed that all possible pile shaft resistances have been established and the present pile bearing capacity may therefore be written as

$$Q_p = Q_1 + Q_2 + K Q_{DDF} + \Sigma \quad (8)$$

By modelling m , r , c_u , N_m , q' , K and Σ as random variables and fitting the parameters of K and Σ by use of the Maximum Likelihood Method, the probability distribution function $F_{Q_p}(x)$ for the piles may readily be determined from

$$F_{Q_p}(q_p) = P(q_p \geq Q_p) \quad (9)$$

which represents the probability that the uncertain pile capacity Q_p is lower than a certain value q_p . The probability density function for one of the piles is illustrated in Figure 2.

According to normal practice, the characteristic pile capacities to be used with the deterministic safety formats, in the classification of a bridge foundation shall be assessed as the 50 % percentile value (indicated in Figure 2) i.e. the mean value of the pile capacity. Within this consideration there is no benefit gained by having an estimated pile capacity with a low coefficient of variation in comparison to an estimated pile capacity with a high coefficient of variation.

In order to support and validate the model it was necessary to carry out loading tests on selected piles. Three of the four piles which had been subjected to loading tests in 1969 were selected. This made a direct comparison with the earlier tests possible. Simultaneously, disturbances from driving of new piles could be avoided.

5 UPDATED STATIC PILE CAPACITY

The results of the load tests were planned in order to verify and update the probabilistic model of the bearing capacity of the piles. The updated probability distribution function for the bearing capacity, i.e. the distribution function of the bearing capacity conditional on the outcome of the experiments X may be determined by

$$F_{Q_p}(q_p|x) = P(q_p > Q_p|x_1, x_2, x_3) \quad (10)$$

where the right hand side represents the probability that the uncertain pile capacity Q_p is lower than a certain value q_p conditional on the observed results from the pile compression tests x_1 , x_2 and x_3 .

As the increase in the pile capacity was quite significant it was not possible to reach the ultimate pile capacity of all three piles in the tests. In order to gain as much information as possible, also from the tests where the ultimate pile capacity was not reached, a model was established linking the pile head load displacement curve to the ultimate pile capacity. The principle is illustrated in




Figure 3. Bearing capacity model for the test piles

Figure 3 where it is also seen that a random variable was introduced in order to take into account uncertainties in the proposed model.

Since two of the piles were not loaded to failure, it was necessary to develop a bearing capacity model which could determine the ultimate bearing capacity of the piles on the basis of the incomplete load-displacement curves.

In the model the pile is divided in a number of elements as shown in Figure 3. The model is an iterative calculation model with the following variables: m , r , c_u , N_m and $\delta_{failure}$. The maximum resistance of the piles is calculated from the formulae (2) to (4), inclusive. As shown in Figure 4 it is assumed that the load-displacement curve for the skin friction is linear until yielding occurs at the deformation $\delta_{failure}$.




Figure 4. Load-displacement curve for the skin friction




Figure 5. Load-displacement curve for the toe bearing capacity




Figure 6. Theoretical and measured load-displacement curves for pile S26a.

The measured load-displacement curve from 1969 corrected for elastic deformation in the piles is used as load-displacement curve for the pile toe.

A theoretical load displacement curve for the pile can now be determined. First, suitable values of the three variables are assumed. Then a displacement of the top of the pile is selected. This displacement is distributed on the single elements. The normal force in the pile and the corresponding displacement can now be calculated. The distribution can be controlled by the assumed and calculated displacement which must be the same. Then a new displacement is selected, and the procedure is repeated until the form of the theoretical load-displacement curve can be determined. Then a comparison with the measured curve is carried out. If the theoretical curve does not match the measured one, a new set of values for the three variables must be estimated. Values found by this method are:

$$\begin{aligned} m r c_u &= 20 \text{ kPa} \\ N_m &= 0.45 \\ \delta_{\text{failure}} &= 5 \text{ mm} \end{aligned}$$

In Figure 6 both the theoretical determined and the measured load-displacement curves for pile S 26a are shown.

The above mentioned procedure was repeated for the two other test piles which were not loaded to failure. Their failure capacities were determined to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pile S4b} &= 3600 \text{ kN} \\ \text{Pile S16c} &= 2400 \text{ kN} \\ \text{Pile S26a} &= 2600 \text{ kN} \end{aligned}$$

Ahead of each test the probabilistic model of the bearing capacity of the piles was used in order to predict the result of the next experiment by using the equation and the model illustrated in Figure 3. It is worth noting that all the predicted mean values of the pile strengths were within 10% of the test results.

Based on the updated probabilistic model for the bearing capacity of the piles, updated probability distribution functions were established as illustrated in Figure 7. In general the characteristic mean values of the bearing capacities were increased significantly (10 - 20 %) on the basis of the test results.

Using the updated characteristic values (50 %) for the pile compression capacity in the reassessment of the substructure it was found that only 10 of the piles did not meet the requirements for upgrading the bridge to class 100. For this reason it was decided not to use the deterministic safety format but to use the reliability analysis directly instead.




Figure 7. Illustration of the updated probability density functions for the bearing capacity of the piles.

6 CONCLUSION

Applying reliability analyses and new pile load tests to quantify of the pile foundation revealed that the safety was fully sufficient without strengthening any of the piles. The bridge could thus be requified for use as a class 100 bridge.

AGEP: Foundation Engineering papers

- 1 Sørensen, C.S., Steenfelt, J.S., Mortensen, J.K. (1995). Foundation for the East Bridge for the Storebælt Link. *Proc. 11th Eur. Conf. Soil Mech. & Fndn. Engng. Copenhagen*. Danish Geotechnical Society, Bulletin 11, Vol 5, pp 5.31-5.42. Also in *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9506.
- 2 Steenfelt, J.S., Hansen, H.K. (1995). Key Note Address: The Storebælt Link - a geotechnical view. *Proc. 11th Eur. Conf. Soil Mech. & Fndn. Engng. Copenhagen*. Danish Geotechnical Society, Bulletin 11, Vol 10, pp 10.11-10.40. Also in *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9509.
- 3 Feld, T., Sørensen, C.S. (1996). Structure-Foundation Interaction on the Storebælt Link East Bridge. *Proc. Int. Conf. for Bridge and Struct. Eng., Copenhagen*, pp 809-818. Also in *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9601.
- 4 Sørensen, C.S., Jensen B.S. (1996). Fod-pælens bæreevnetilvækst. *Proc. Nordic Geotechnical Meeting, NGM-96, Reykjavik*, Vol 1, pp 253-258. Also in *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9606.
- 5 Sørensen, C.S., Faber, M.H., Stenstrup, B. (1997). Reliability Based Reassessment of an Existing Pile Foundation. *Proc. XIV Int. Conf. on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Eng., Hamburg*, Sept. 6-12 - 1997, pp 1197-1200. Also in *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9709.
- 6 Steenfelt, J.S. (1997). Type A prediction of settlements for railway box culvert in road embankment on clay till. *Proc. XIVth International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Hamburg*, Vol 2, pp 1037-1044. Also in *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9710.
- 7 Sørensen, C.S., Steenfelt, J.S., Mortensen, J.K., Hansen, Aa., Gluver, H. (1998). Foundation of the East Bridge. In *"East Bridge"*, published by A/S Storebæltsforbindelsen, pp 97-110, ISBN 87-89366-91-3. Also in *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9813.
- 8 Sørensen, C.S., Hededal, O. (1999). Geotechnical design considerations for Storebælt East Bridge and Øresund Bridge. *Proc. IABSE Colloquium, Foundation for Major Bridges-Design and Construction*, New Delhi, India, pp. 25-30 . *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9817.
- 9 Hededal, O., Sørensen, C.S. (1999). Elasto-plastic foundation analysis of ship collision to The Øresund High Bridge. *Proc. IABSE Colloquium, Foundation for Major Bridges-Design and Construction*, New Delhi, India, pp. 175-180. *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9818.
- 10 Sørensen, C.S., Bisgaard, A., Hededal, O. (1999). Foundation of the Øresund Bridge. *Proc. XIIIth Eur. Conf. Soil Mech. Geotechn. Eng.*, 7- 10 June 1999, Vol. 1, pp. 609-616. *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9819.
- 11 Steenfelt, J.S., Jørgensen, M.B., Jørgensen, P.O. (1999). Preloaded motorway embankments - an environmentally sound solution for soft soil areas. *Proc. XIIIth Eur. Conf. Soil Mech. Geotechn. Eng.*, 7- 10 June 1999, Vol. 3, pp. 1583-1592. *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9820.

AGEP: Foundation Engineering papers

- 12 Feld, T., Petersen, S.J. (1999). Establishment of Foundation Design Parameters for Limestone. *Proc. IABSE Colloquium, Foundation for Major Bridges - Design and Construction*, New Delhi, India, 24-26 Feb. 99, pp. 51-56. *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9901.
- 13 Feld, T. (1999). Development of the load-deformation curve for bridge piers subjected to ship impact. Published in *Proc. XIIIth Eur. Conf. Soil Mech. Geotechn. Eng.*, 7- 10 June 1999, Vol. 1, pp. 737-742. *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9902.
- 14 Rasmussen, J.L., Feld, T. (1999). Pile Driving Fatigue Damage. A Case Story. Published in *Proc. XIIIth Eur. Conf. Soil Mech. Geotechn. Eng.*, 7- 10 June 1999, Vol. 2, pp. 577-582. *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9903.
- 15 Feld, T., Rasmussen, J.L., Sørensen, P.H. (1999). Structural and Economic Optimization of Offshore Wind Turbine Support Structure and Foundation. Published in *Proc. OMAE-99, 18th Int. Conf. on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering*, St.Johns Nfld. Canada July 99. Vol ?, pp. ? *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R9904.
- 16 Sørensen, C.S., Jensen, B.S. (2000). Skråningsstabilitet. Accepted for publication in *Proc. Nordic Geotechnical Meeting, NGM-2000*, Helsinki, June 5.-7.2000. *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R2004.
- 17 Jensen, B.S., Sørensen, C.S. (2000). Effektivisering af forbelastning ved anvendelse af vertikaldræn. Accepted for publication in *Proc. Nordic Geotechnical Meeting, NGM-2000*, Helsinki, June 5.-7.2000. *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R2005.
- 18 Feld, T., Leth, C.T., Mikkelsen, H., Steenfelt, J.S. (2000). Nyt laboratorieudstyr til simulering af dynamisk påvirkede sugebøttefundamenter. Accepted for publication in *Proc. Nordic Geotechnical Meeting, NGM-2000*, Helsinki, June 5.-7.2000. *AAU Geotechnical Engineering Papers*, ISSN 1398-6465 R2006.