



**Table of Contents**

11.1 General .....4

    11.1.1 Overall Design Process.....4

    11.1.2 Foundation Type Selection.....4

    11.1.3 Cofferdams.....6

    11.1.4 Vibration Concerns.....6

11.2 Shallow Foundations.....7

    11.2.1 General .....7

    11.2.2 Footing Design Considerations .....7

        11.2.2.1 Minimum Footing Depth .....7

            11.2.2.1.1 Scour Vulnerability .....8

            11.2.2.1.2 Frost Protection.....8

            11.2.2.1.3 Unsuitable Ground Conditions .....9

        11.2.2.2 Tolerable Movement of Substructures Founded on Shallow foundations .....9

        11.2.2.3 Location of Ground Water Table .....10

        11.2.2.4 Sloping Ground Surface .....10

    11.2.3 Settlement Analysis.....10

    11.2.4 Overall Stability .....11

    11.2.5 Footings on Engineered Fills.....12

    11.2.6 Construction Considerations .....13

11.3 Deep Foundations.....14

    11.3.1 Driven Piles .....14

        11.3.1.1 Conditions Involving Short Pile Lengths .....14

        11.3.1.2 Pile Spacing.....15

        11.3.1.3 Battered Piles .....15

        11.3.1.4 Corrosion Loss .....16

        11.3.1.5 Pile Points.....16

        11.3.1.6 Preboring.....17

        11.3.1.7 Seating .....17

        11.3.1.8 Pile Embedment in Footings.....17

        11.3.1.9 Pile-Supported Footing Depth .....18

        11.3.1.10 Splices.....18

        11.3.1.11 Painting.....18



11.3.1.12 Selection of Pile Types ..... 18

    11.3.1.12.1 Timber Piles ..... 19

    11.3.1.12.2 Concrete Piles ..... 19

        11.3.1.12.2.1 Driven Cast-In-Place Concrete Piles..... 20

        11.3.1.12.2.2 Precast Concrete Piles..... 22

    11.3.1.12.3 Steel Piles ..... 22

        11.3.1.12.3.1 H-Piles..... 23

        11.3.1.12.3.2 Pipe Piles ..... 24

        11.3.1.12.3.3 Oil Field Piles ..... 24

    11.3.1.12.4 Pile Bents..... 25

11.3.1.13 Tolerable Movement of Substructures Founded on Driven Piles ..... 25

11.3.1.14 Resistance Factors ..... 25

11.3.1.15 Bearing Resistance ..... 27

    11.3.1.15.1 Shaft Resistance..... 29

    11.3.1.15.2 Point Resistance ..... 32

    11.3.1.15.3 Group Capacity ..... 33

11.3.1.16 Lateral Load Resistance ..... 33

11.3.1.17 Other Design Considerations ..... 34

    11.3.1.17.1 Downdrag Load ..... 34

    11.3.1.17.2 Uplift Resistance ..... 35

    11.3.1.17.3 Pile Setup and Relaxation..... 35

    11.3.1.17.4 Drivability Analysis ..... 36

    11.3.1.17.5 Scour ..... 39

    11.3.1.17.6 Typical Pile Resistance Values..... 39

11.3.1.18 Construction Considerations ..... 41

    11.3.1.18.1 Pile Hammers ..... 41

    11.3.1.18.2 Driving Formulas..... 42

    11.3.1.18.3 Field Testing ..... 44

        11.3.1.18.3.1 Installation of Test Piles ..... 44

        11.3.1.18.3.2 Static Load Tests ..... 44

11.3.2 Drilled Shafts ..... 45

    11.3.2.1 General..... 45

    11.3.2.2 Resistance Factors ..... 46

    11.3.2.3 Bearing Resistance ..... 48



11.3.2.3.1 Shaft Resistance .....48

11.3.2.3.2 Point Resistance .....49

11.3.2.3.3 Group Capacity .....49

11.3.2.4 Lateral Load Resistance .....49

11.3.2.5 Other Considerations.....49

11.3.3 Micropiles .....50

11.3.3.1 General.....50

11.3.3.2 Design Guidance .....50

11.3.4 Augered Cast-In-Place Piles .....50

11.3.4.1 General.....50

11.3.4.2 Design Guidance .....51

11.4 References.....52

11.5 Design Examples .....54



## **11.1 General**

### **11.1.1 Overall Design Process**

The overall foundation support design process requires an iterative collaboration to provide cost-effective constructible substructures. Input is required from multiple disciplines including, but not limited to, structural and geotechnical design. For a typical bridge design, the following four steps are required (see 6.2):

1. Structure Survey Report (SSR) – This design step results in a very preliminary evaluation of the structure type and approximate location of substructure units, including a preliminary layout plan.
2. Site Investigation Report – Based on the Structure Survey Report, a site investigation is required, including test borings to determine foundation requirements. A hydraulic analysis is also performed at this time, if required, to assess scour potential and maximum scour depth. The Site Investigation Report and Subsurface Exploration Drawing are used to identify known constraints that would affect the foundations in regard to type, location or size and includes foundation recommendations to support detailed structural design. Certain structure sites/types may require the preliminary structure plans (Step 3) prior to initiating the geotechnical site investigation. One example of this is a multi-span structure over water. See 6.2 for more information.
3. Preliminary Structure Plans – This design step involves preparation of a general plan, elevation, span arrangement, typical section and cost estimate for the new bridge structure. The Site Investigation Report is used to identify possible poor foundation conditions and may require modification of the structure geometry and span arrangement. This step may require additional geotechnical input, especially if substructure locations must be changed.
4. Final Contract Plans for Structures – This design step culminates in final plans, details, special provisions and cost estimates for construction. The Subsurface Exploration sheets are part of the Final Contract Plans. Unless design changes are required at this step, additional geotechnical input is not typically required to prepare foundation details for the Final Contract Plans.

### **11.1.2 Foundation Type Selection**

The following items need to be assessed to select site-specific foundation types:

- Magnitude and direction of loading.
- Depth to suitable bearing material.
- Potential for liquefaction, undermining or scour.
- Frost potential.



- Performance requirements, including deformation (settlement), global stability and resistance to bearing, uplift, lateral, sliding and overturning forces.
- Ease and cost of construction.
- Environmental impact of construction.
- Site constraints, including restricted right-of-way, overhead and lateral clearance, construction access, utilities and vibration-sensitive structures.

Based on the items listed above, an assessment is made to determine if shallow or deep foundations are suitable to satisfy site-specific needs. A shallow foundation, as defined in this manual, is one in which the depth to the bottom of the footing is generally less than or equal to twice the smallest dimension of the footing. Shallow foundations generally consist of spread footings but may also include rafts that support multiple columns.

Shallow foundations are typically initially considered to determine if this type of foundation is technically and economically viable. Often foundation settlement and lateral loading constraints govern over bearing capacity. Other significant considerations for selection of shallow foundations include requirements for cofferdams, bottom seals, dewatering, temporary excavation support, overexcavation of unsuitable material, slope stability, available time to dissipate consolidation settlement prior to final construction, scour susceptibility, environmental impacts and water quality impacts. Shallow foundations may not be economically viable when footing excavations exceed 10 to 15 feet below the final ground surface elevation.

When shallow foundations are not satisfactory, deep foundations are considered. Deep foundations can transfer foundation loads through shallow deposits to underlying deposits of more competent deeper bearing material. Deep foundations are generally considered to mitigate concerns about scour, lateral spreading, excessive settlement and satisfy other site constraints.

Common types of deep foundations for bridges include driven piling, drilled shafts, micropiles and augercast piles. Driven piling is the most frequently-used type of deep foundation in Wisconsin. Drilled shafts may be advantageous where a very dense stratum must be penetrated to obtain required bearing, uplift or lateral resistance are concerns, or where obstructions may result in premature driving refusal or where piers need to be founded in areas of shallow bedrock and deep water. A drilled shaft may be more cost effective than driven piling when a monoshaft can be used to eliminate the need for a pile footing, pile casing or cofferdams.

Micropiles may be the best foundation alternatives where headroom is restricted or foundation retrofits are required at existing substructures.

Augercast piles are a potentially cost-effective foundation alternative, especially where lateral loads are minimal. However, restrictions on construction quality control including pile integrity and capacity need to be considered when augercast piles are being investigated.



### 11.1.3 Cofferdams

At stream crossings, tremie-sealed cofferdams are frequently used when footing concrete is required to be placed below the surrounding water level. The tremie-seal typically consists of a plain-cement concrete slab that is placed neat and underwater within a closed-sided cofferdam to aid in the removal of water from within the footing excavation for concrete placement in-the-dry. The tremie-seal serves as a counterweight to offset buoyancy, and it protects the footing subgrade against deterioration due to potential piping and bottom heave. Concrete for tremie-seals is permitted to be placed with a tremie pipe underwater (in-the-wet). Footing concrete is typically required to be placed in-the-dry. In the event that footing concrete must be placed in-the-wet, a special provision for underwater inspection of the footing subgrade is required.

When bedrock is exposed in the bottom of any excavation and prior to placement of tremie concrete, the bedrock surface must be cleaned and inspected to assure removal of loose debris. This will assure good contact between the bedrock and eliminate the potential consolidation of loose material as the footing is loaded.

Cofferdams need to be designed to determine the required sheetpile embedment to provide lateral support, control piping and prevent bottom heave. The construction sequence must be considered to provide adequate temporary support, especially when each row of ring struts is installed. Overexcavation may be required to remove unacceptable materials at the base of the footing. Piles may be required within cofferdams to achieve adequate nominal bearing resistance. WisDOT has experienced a limited number of problems achieving adequate penetration of displacement piles within cofferdams when sheetpiling is excessively deep in granular material. Cofferdams are designed by the Contractor.

Refer to 13.9.4 for further guidance to determine the required thickness of cofferdam seals and to determine when combined seals and footings are acceptable.

### 11.1.4 Vibration Concerns

Vibration damage is a concern during construction, especially during pile driving operations. The selection process for the type of pile and hammer must consider the presence of surrounding structures that may be damaged due to high vibration levels. Pile driving operations can cause ground displacement, soil densification and other factors that can damage nearby buildings, structures and/or utilities. Whenever pile-driving operations pose the potential for damage to adjacent facilities (usually when they are located within approximately 100 feet), a vibration-monitoring program should be implemented. This program consists of requiring and reviewing a pile-driving plan submittal, conducting pre-driving and post-driving condition surveys and conducting the actual vibration monitoring with an approved seismograph. A special provision for implementing a vibration monitoring program is available and should be used on projects whenever pile-driving operations pose a potential threat to nearby facilities. Contact the geotechnical engineer for further discussion and assistance if vibrations appear to be a concern.



## **11.2 Shallow Foundations**

### 11.2.1 General

Design of a shallow foundation, also known as a spread footing, must provide adequate resistance against geotechnical and structural failure. The design must also limit deformations to within tolerable values. This is true for designs using ASD or LRFD. In many cases, a shallow foundation is the most economical foundation type, provided suitable soil conditions exist within a depth of approximately 0 to 15 feet below the base of the shallow foundation.

#### **WisDOT policy item:**

It is WisDOT's current policy to design shallow foundations in accordance with the 4<sup>th</sup> Edition of the AASHTO *LRFD Bridge Design Specifications for Highway Bridges*. No additional guidance is available at this time.

Discussion is provided in 12.8 and 13.1 about design loads at abutments and piers, respectively. Live load surcharges at bridge abutments are described in 12.8.

### 11.2.2 Footing Design Considerations

The following design considerations apply to shallow foundations:

- Scour must not result in the loss of bearing or stability.
- Frost must not cause unacceptable movements.
- External or surcharge loads must be adequately supported.
- Deformation (settlement) and angular distortion must be within tolerable limits.
- Bearing resistance must be sufficient.
- Overturning requirements must be satisfied.
- Sliding resistance must be sufficient.
- Overall (global) stability must be satisfied.
- Uplift resistance must be sufficient.
- The effects of ground water must be mitigated and/or considered in the design.

#### 11.2.2.1 Minimum Footing Depth

Foundation type selection and the preliminary design process require input from the geotechnical and hydraulic disciplines. The geotechnical engineer should provide guidance



on the minimum embedment for shallow foundations that takes into consideration frost protection and the possible presence of unsuitable foundation materials. The hydraulic engineer should be consulted to assess scour potential and maximum scour depth.

At shallow foundations bearing on rock, it is essential to obtain a proper connection to sound rock. Sometimes it is not possible to obtain deep footing embedment in granite or similar hard rock, due to the difficulty of rock removal.

#### 11.2.2.1.1 Scour Vulnerability

Scour is a hydraulic erosion process caused by flowing water that lowers the grade of a water channel or riverbed. For this reason, scour vulnerability is an essential design consideration for shallow foundations. Scour can undermine shallow foundations or remove sufficient overburden to redistribute foundation forces, causing foundation displacement and detrimental stresses to structural elements. Excessive undermining of a shallow foundation leads to gross deformation and can lead to structure collapse.

Scour assessment will require streambed sampling and gradation analysis to define the median diameter of the bed material,  $D_{50}$ . Specific techniques for scour assessment, along with a detailed discussion of scour analysis and scour countermeasure design, are presented in the following publications:

- HEC 18 – *Evaluating Scour at Bridges*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition
- HEC 20 – *Stream Stability at Highway Structures*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition
- HEC 23 – *Bridge Scour and Stream Instability Countermeasures - Experience, Selection and Design Guidance*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition

Foundations for new bridges and structures located within a stream or river floodplain should be located at an elevation below the maximum scour depth that is identified by the hydraulics engineer. In addition, the foundation should be designed deep enough such that scour protection is not required. If the maximum calculated scour depth elevation is below the practical limits for a shallow foundation, consideration should be given to selection of a deep foundation system for support of the structure.

#### 11.2.2.1.2 Frost Protection

Shallow foundation footings must be embedded below the maximum depth of frost potential (frost depth) whenever frost heave is anticipated to occur in frost-susceptible soil and adequate moisture is available. This embedment is required to prevent foundation heave due to volumetric expansion of the foundation subgrade from freezing and/or to prevent settling due to loss of shear strength from thawing.

Frost susceptible material includes inorganic soil that contains at least 3 percent, dry weight, which is finer in size than 0.02 millimeters ( $7.9 \times 10^{-4}$  inches, including fines, silt and clay). Gravel that contains between 3 and 20 percent fines is least susceptible to frost heave. Bedrock is not considered frost susceptible if the bedrock formation is massive, dense and intact below the footing.



Foundation design is usually not governed by frost heave for foundations bearing on clean gravel and sand or very dense till. Frost heave is a concern whenever the water table, static or perched, is located within 5 feet of the freezing plane.

In Wisconsin, the maximum depth of frost potential generally ranges from approximately 4 feet in the southeastern part of the state to 6 feet in the northwestern corner of the state.

**WisDOT policy item:**

It is WisDOT’s policy to place the bottom of shallow foundations at embedment depths of 4 feet unless founded on competent bedrock.

Further discussion about frost protection in the design of bridge abutments and piers is presented in 12.5 and 13.6, respectively.

**11.2.2.1.3 Unsuitable Ground Conditions**

Footings should bear below weak, compressible or loose soil. In addition, some soil exhibits the potential for changes in volume due to the introduction or expulsion of water. These volumetric changes can be large enough to exceed the performance limits of a structure, even to the point of structural damage. Both expansive and collapsible soil is regional in occurrence. Neither soil type is well suited for shallow foundation support without a mitigation plan to address the potential of large soil volume changes in this soil due to changes in moisture content. Expansive and collapsible soils seldom cause problems in Wisconsin.

It should be noted that the procedures presented herein for computing bearing resistance and settlement are applicable to naturally occurring soil and are not necessarily valid for conditions of modified ground such as uncontrolled fills, dumps, mines and waste areas. Due to the unpredictable behavior of shallow foundations in these types of random materials, deep foundations which penetrate through the random material, overexcavation to remove the random material or subgrade improvement to improve material behavior is required at each substructure unit.

**11.2.2.2 Tolerable Movement of Substructures Founded on Shallow foundations**

The bridge designer shall account for any differential settlement (angular distortion) in the design.

**WisDOT policy item:**

For design of new bridge structures founded on shallow foundations, it is WisDOT’s policy to permit a maximum of 1 inch of horizontal movement at top of substructure units and 1.5 inches of total estimated settlement of each substructure unit at the Service Limit State.

The sequence of construction can be important when evaluating total settlement and angular distortion. The effects of embankment settlement, as well as settlement due to structure loads, should be considered when the magnitude of total settlement is estimated. It may be possible to manage the settlements after movements have stabilized, by monitoring



movements and delaying critical structural connections such as closure pours or casting of decks that are continuous. Generally project timelines may restrict the time available for soil consolidation. Any project delays for geotechnical reasons must be thoroughly transmitted to and analyzed by design personnel.

### 11.2.2.3 Location of Ground Water Table

The location of the ground water table will impact both the stability and constructability of shallow foundations. A rise in the ground water table will cause a reduction in the effective vertical stress in soil below the footing and a subsequent reduction in the allowable bearing capacity. A fluctuation in the ground water table is not usually a bearing concern at depths greater than 1.5 times the footing width below the bottom of footing.

**WisDOT policy item:**

The highest anticipated groundwater table should be used to determine the nominal bearing capacity of footings. The Geotechnical Engineer should select this elevation based on the borings and knowledge of the specific site.

### 11.2.2.4 Sloping Ground Surface

The influence of a sloping ground surface must be considered for design of shallow foundations. The nominal bearing capacity of the footing will be impacted when the horizontal distance is less than three times the footing width between the edge of sloping surface and edge of footing. Shallow foundations constructed in proximity to a sloping ground surface must be checked for overall stability. Procedures for incorporating sloping ground influence can be found in FHWA Publication SH-02-054, *Geotechnical Engineering Circular No. 6 Shallow Foundations*.

### 11.2.3 Settlement Analysis

Settlement should be computed using Service I Limit State loads. Transient loads may be omitted to compute time-dependent consolidation settlement. Two aspects of settlement are important to structural designers: total settlement and differential settlement (ie relative displacement between adjacent substructure units). In addition to the amount of settlement, the designer also needs to determine the time rate for it to occur.

Vertical settlement can be a combination of elastic, consolidation and secondary compression movement. In general, the settlement of footings on cohesionless soil, very stiff to hard cohesive soil and rock with tight, unfilled joints will be elastic and will occur as load is applied. For footings on very soft to stiff cohesive soil, the potential for consolidation and secondary compression settlement components should be evaluated in addition to elastic settlement.

The design of shallow foundations on cohesionless soil (sand, gravel and non-plastic silt), either as found in-situ or as engineered fill, is often controlled by settlement potential rather than bearing resistance, or strength, considerations. The method used to estimate settlement of footings on cohesionless soil should therefore be reliable so that the predicted settlement



is rarely less than the observed settlement, yet still reasonably accurate so that designs are efficient.

Elastic settlement is estimated using elastic theory and a value of elastic modulus based on the results of in-situ or laboratory testing. Elastic deformation occurs quickly and is usually small. Elastic deformation is typically neglected for movement that occurs prior to placement of girders and final bridge connections.

Semi-empirical methods are the predominant techniques used to estimate settlement of shallow foundations on cohesionless soil. These methods have been correlated to large databases of simple and inexpensive tests such as the Standard Penetration Test (SPT) and the Cone Penetrometer Test (CPT).

Consolidation of clays or clayey deposits may result in substantial settlement when the structure is founded on saturated cohesive soil. Settlement may be instantaneous or may take weeks to years to complete. Furthermore, because soil properties may vary beneath the foundation, the duration of the consolidation and the amount of settlement may also vary with the location of the footing, resulting in differential settlement between footing locations. The consolidation characteristics of a given soil are a function of its past history. The reader is directed to FHWA Publication SA-02-054, *Geotechnical Engineering Circular No. 6 Shallow Foundations* for a detailed discussion on consolidation theory and principles.


The rate of consolidation is usually of lesser concern for foundations, because superstructure damage will occur once the differential settlements become excessive. Shallow foundations are designed to withstand the settlement that will ultimately occur during the life of the structure, regardless of the time that it takes for the settlement to occur.

The design of footings bearing on intermediate geomaterials (IGM) or rock is generally controlled by considerations other than settlement. Intermediate geomaterial is defined as a material that is transitional between soil and rock in terms of strength and compressibility, such as residual soil, glacial till, or very weak rock. If a settlement estimate is necessary for shallow foundations supported on IGM or rock, a method based on elasticity theory will generally be the best approach. As with any of the methods for estimating settlement that use elastic theory, a major limitation is the engineer's ability to accurately estimate the modulus parameter(s) required by the method.

#### 11.2.4 Overall Stability

Overall stability of shallow foundations that are located on or near slopes is evaluated using a limiting equilibrium slope stability analysis. Both circular arc and sliding-block type failures are considered using a Modified Bishop, simplified Janbu, Spencers or simplified wedge analysis, as applicable.. The Service I load combination is used to analyze overall stability. A free body diagram for overall stability is presented in [Figure 11.2-1](#).

Detailed guidance to complete a limiting equilibrium analysis is presented in FHWA Publication NHI-00-045, *Soils and Foundation Workshop Reference Manual* and **LRFD [11.6.2.3]**.



**Figure 11.2-1**  
Free Body Diagram for Overall Stability

### 11.2.5 Footings on Engineered Fills

When shallow foundations are considered for placement on fill, further consideration is required. It is essential to satisfy the design tolerance with regard to total settlement, angular distortion and horizontal movement, including lateral squeeze of the embankment subgrade. The designer must consider the range of probable estimated movement and the impact that this range has on the overall structure performance. The anticipated movement of both new embankment fill and existing embankment materials must be assessed. If shallow foundations are considered, WisDOT requires a thorough subsurface investigation to evaluate settlement of the existing subgrade, including but not limited to continuous soil sampling. WisDOT does not typically place shallow foundations on general embankment fill. WisDOT may consider shallow foundations that are placed on engineered fill, such as that within MSE walls. WisDOT has placed a limited number of shallow foundations on MSE walls for single span bridges. Engineered fill typically consists of high-quality free-draining granular material that is not prone to behavior change due to moisture change, freeze-thaw action, long-term consolidation or shear failure. On occasion, engineered fill is used in combination with geotextile and/or geogrid to improve shear resistance and overall performance at approach embankments.

If it is not feasible to use a footing to support a sill abutment at the top of slope, it may be feasible to consider a shallow foundation at the bottom of abutment slope to support a full



retaining abutment as discussed in 12.2. The increase in stem height will be offset by a reduction in required bridge span length.

### 11.2.6 Construction Considerations

Shallow foundations require field inspection to confirm that the actual footing subgrade material is equivalent to, or better than, that considered for design. The prepared subgrade should be checked to confirm that the type and condition of the exposed subgrade will provide uniform bearing over the full length or width of footing. The exposed subgrade should be probed to identify possible underlying pockets of soft material that are covered by a thin crust of more competent material. Underlying pockets of soft material and unsuitable material should be over-excavated and replaced with competent material. The structural/geotechnical designer should be contacted if the revised field footing elevations vary by more than one foot lower or three feet higher than the plan elevations, due to differing conditions.

The exposed footing subgrade should be level and stepped, as needed. Stepped shallow foundations may be appropriate when the subsurface conditions vary over the length of substructure unit (footing). For simplicity, planned footing steps should be designated in maximum 4-foot increments. The number and spacing of footing steps is dependent on several factors including, but not limited to, temporary excavation support and dewatering requirements, frost and scour depth limitations, constructability, and construction sequence. In general, it is preferred to build uniform step-increments, to simplify construction. Typically the footing with the lowest elevation is constructed first to avoid excavation disturbance of other portions of the footing, as construction continues.



### **11.3 Deep Foundations**

When competent bearing soil is not present near the ground surface, structure loads must be transferred to a deeper stratum by using deep foundations such as piles or drilled shafts (caissons). Deep foundations can be composed of piles, drilled shafts, micropiles or augered cast-in-place piles.

The primary functions of a deep foundation are:

- To transmit the load of the structure through a stratum of poor bearing capacity to one of adequate bearing capacity.
- To eliminate objectionable settlement.
- To transfer loads from a structure through easily erodible soil in a scour zone to stable underlying strata.
- To anchor structures subjected to hydrostatic uplift or overturning forces.
- To resist lateral loads from earth pressures, as well as external forces.

#### **11.3.1 Driven Piles**

Deep foundation support systems have been in existence for many years. The first known pile foundations consisted of rows of timber stakes driven into the ground. Timber piles have been found in good condition after several centuries in a submerged environment. Several types of concrete piles were devised at the turn of the twentieth century. The earliest concrete piles were cast-in-place, followed by reinforced, precast and prestressed concrete piling. The requirement for longer piles with higher bearing capacity led to the use of concrete-filled steel pipe piles in about 1925. More recently, steel H-piles have also been specified due to ease of fabrication, higher bearing capacity, greater durability during driving and the ability to easily increase or decrease driven lengths.

##### **11.3.1.1 Conditions Involving Short Pile Lengths**

WisDOT policy generally requires piles to be driven a distance of 10 feet or greater below the original ground surface. Concern exists that short pile penetration in foundation materials of variable consistency may not adequately restrain lateral movements of substructure units. Pile penetrations of less than 10 feet are allowed if prebored at least 3 feet into solid rock. If conditions detailed in the Site Investigation Report clearly indicate that minimum pile penetration cannot be achieved, preboring should be included as a pay quantity. If there is a potential that preboring may not be necessary, do not include it in the plan documents. Piles which are not prebored into rock must not only meet the 10-foot minimum pile penetration criteria but must also have at least 5 feet of penetration through material with a blow count of at least 7 blows per foot. Piling should be “firmly seated” on rock after placement in prebored holes. The annular space between the cored holes in bedrock and piling should then be filled with concrete. Some sites may require casing during the preboring operation. If casing is required, it should be clearly indicated in the plan documents.



Foundations without piles (spread footings) should be given consideration at sites where pile penetrations of less than 10 feet are anticipated. The economics of the following two alternatives should be investigated:

5. Design for a shallow foundation founded at a depth where the foundation material is adequate. Embed the footing 6 inches into sound rock for lateral stability.
6. Excavate to an elevation where foundation material is adequate, and backfill to the bottom of footing elevation with suitable granular material or concrete.

If a substructure unit is located in a stream, consideration should be given to the effects of the anticipated stream bed scour when selecting the footing type. Pile length computations should not incorporate pile resistance developed within the scour zone. The pile cross section should also be checked to ensure it can withstand the driving necessary to penetrate through the anticipated scour depth and reach design capacity plus the frictional capacity within the scour zone.

### 11.3.1.2 Pile Spacing

Arbitrary pile spacing rules specifying maximums and minimums are extensively used in foundation design. Proper spacing is dependent upon length, size, shape and surface texture of piles, as well as soil characteristics. A wide spacing of piles reduces heaving and possible uplifting of the pile, damage by tension due to heaving and the possibility of crushing from soil compression. Wider spacing more readily permits the tips of later-driven piles in the group to reach the same depths as the first piles and result in more even bearing and settlement. Large horizontal pressures are created when driving in relatively incompressible strata, and damage may occur to piles already driven if piles are too closely spaced. In order to account for this, a minimum center-to-center spacing of 2.5 times the pile diameter is often required. LRFD [10.7.1.2] calls for a center-to-center pile spacing of not less than 2'-6" or 2.5 pile diameters (widths).

**WisDOT policy item:**

WisDOT's minimum pile spacing is 2'-6" or 2.5 pile diameters, whichever is greater. For displacement piles located within cofferdams, the minimum pile spacing is 3.0 pile diameters. WisDOT's maximum pile spacing is 8'-0", based on abutment or pier structural designs.

See Chapter 13 – Piers for criteria on battered piles in cofferdams. The distance from the side of any pile to the nearest edge of footing shall not be less than 9". Piles shall project at least 6" into the footings.

### 11.3.1.3 Battered Piles

Battered piles are used to resist large lateral loads or when there is insufficient lateral soil resistance within the initial 4 to 5 pile diameters of embedment. Battered piles are frequently used in combination with vertical piles. The lateral resistance of battered piling is a function of the vertical load applied to the pile group. Since the sum of the forces at the pile head must equal zero, increasing the number of battered piles does not necessarily increase the lateral load capacity of the pile group. Both the lateral passive resistance of the soil above



the footing as well as the sliding resistance developed at the base of footing are generally neglected in design. See the standard details for further guidance when battered piles are used.

Piles are typically battered at 1 horizontal to 4 vertical. Hammer efficiencies must be reduced when piles are battered. Where negative skin friction loads are anticipated, battered piles should not be considered.

#### 11.3.1.4 Corrosion Loss

Piling should be designed with sufficient corrosion resistance to assure a minimum design life of 75 years. Experience indicates that corrosion is not a practical problem for steel piles driven in natural soil, due primarily to the absence of oxygen in the soil. However, in fill material at or above the water table, moderate corrosion may occur and protection may be required. Concrete piles are prone to deterioration from exposure to excess concentrations of sulfate and/or chloride. Special consideration (including thicker pile shells, heavier pile sections, painting and concrete encasement) should be given to permanent steel piling that is used in areas of northern Wisconsin which are inhabited by corrosion causing bacteria (see FDM Procedure 13-1-15). Typically, WisDOT does not increase pile sections or heavier pile sections to provide corrosion protection outside of these areas.

At potentially corrosive sites, encasement by cast-in-place concrete can provide the required protection for piles extending above the ground surface. All exposed piling should be painted.

#### 11.3.1.5 Pile Points

A study was conducted on the value of pile tips (pile points) on steel piles when driving into rock. The results indicated that there was very little penetration difference between the piles driven with pile points and those without. The primary advantages for specifying pile points are for penetrating or displacing boulders, or driving through dense granular materials and hardpan layers. Piling can generally be driven faster and in straighter alignment when points are used.

Conical pile points have also been used for round, steel piling (friction and point-bearing) in certain situations. These points can also be flush-welded if deemed necessary.

Standard details for pile points are available from the approved suppliers that are listed in WisDOT's current Product Acceptability List (PAL).

Pile points and preboring are sometimes confused. They are not interchangeable. Pile points can be used to help drive piles through soil that has gravel and/or cobbles or presents other difficult driving conditions. They can also be used to get a good 'bite' when ending piles on sloping bedrock surfaces. Points cannot be used to ensure that piles penetrate into competent bedrock. They may assist in driving through weathered zones of rock or soft rock but will generally not be effective when penetration into hard rock is desired.



**11.3.1.6 Preboring**

If embedment into rock is required or minimum pile penetration is doubtful, preboring should be considered. Preboring is required for displacement piles driven into new embankment that are over 10 feet in height. The WisDOT has developed special provisions to provide preboring requirements.

Except for point resistance piles, preboring should be terminated at least 5 feet above the scheduled pile tip elevation. When the pile is planned to be point resistance on rock, preboring may be advanced to plan pile tip elevation. Restrike is not performed when point-bearing piles are founded in rock within prebored holes. Preboring should only be used when appropriate, since many bridge contractors do not own the required construction equipment necessary for this work.

The annular space between the wall of the prebored hole and the pile is required to be backfilled. The annulus in bedrock should be filled with concrete or cement grout after the pile has been installed. Clean sand may be used to backfill the annulus over the depth of soil overburden. Backfill material should be deposited with either a tremie pipe or concrete pump to reduce potential arching (bridging) and assure that the complete depth of hole is filled.

**11.3.1.7 Seating**

Care must be taken when seating point resistance (end bearing) piles, especially when seating on bedrock with little to no weathered zone. When a pile is firmly seated on rock in prebored holes, pile driving to refusal is not required nor recommended to avoid driving overstress. After reaching the predetermined bearing elevation in the intended bearing stratum, piles founded in soil are seated to achieve the specified average penetration or set per blow for the final ten blows of driving.

**11.3.1.8 Pile Embedment in Footings**

The length of pile embedment in footings is determined based on the type and function of substructure unit and the magnitude of any uplift load.

**WisDOT policy item:**

It is WisDOT's policy to use a minimum 6-inch pile embedment in footings. This embedment depth is considered to result in a free (pinned) head connection for analysis. When the pile embedment depth is 2.0 feet or greater, the designer can assume a fixed head connection for analysis.

Additional embedment length is required at some wing walls and at pile-encased substructures, especially where moment connections are required and where cofferdams are not used at stream crossings. Further guidance is provided in 13.6 and in the standard substructure details.



11.3.1.9 Pile-Supported Footing Depth

**WisDOT policy item:**

It is WisDOT’s policy to place the bottom of pile-supported footings below the final ground surface at a minimum depth of 2.5 feet for sill abutments and at a minimum depth of 4 feet for piers and other types of abutments.

11.3.1.10 Splices

Full-length piles should be used whenever practical. In no case should timber piles be spliced. Where splices are unavoidable, their number, location and details must be approved by WisDOT prior to pile splicing.

Splice details are shown on Wisconsin bridge plan standards for Pile Details. Splices are designed to develop the full strength of the pile section. Splices should be watertight for CIP concrete piles. Mechanical splice sleeves can be used to join sections of H-pile and pipe pile at greater depth where flexural resistance is not critical. Steel piling 20 feet or less in length is to be furnished in one unwelded piece. Piling from 20 to 50 feet in length can have two shop or field splices, and piling over 50 feet in length can be furnished with up to a maximum of four splices, unless otherwise stated in the project plan documents.

11.3.1.11 Painting

Normally, WisDOT paints all exposed sections of piling. This typically occurs at exposed pier bents.

11.3.1.12 Selection of Pile Types

The selection of a pile type for a given foundation application is made on the basis of soil type, stability under vertical and horizontal loading, long-term settlement, required method of pile installation, substructure type, cost comparison and length of pile. Frequently more than one type of pile meets the physical and technical requirements for a given site. The performance of the entire structure controls the selection of the foundation. Primary considerations in choosing a pile type are the evaluation of the foundation materials and the selection of the substratum that provides the best foundation support.

Piling is generally used at piers where scour is possible, even though the streambed may provide adequate support without piling. In some cases, it is advisable to place footings at greater depths than minimum and specify a minimum pile penetration to guard against excessive scour beneath the footing and piling. Shaft resistance (skin friction) within the maximum depth of scour is assumed to be zero. When a large scour depth is estimated, this area of lost frictional support must be taken into account in the pile driving operations and capacities.

Subsurface conditions at the structure site also affect pile selection and details. The presence of artesian water pressure, soft compressible soil, cobbles and/or boulders, loose/firm uniform sands or deep water all influence the selection of the optimum type of pile



for deep foundation support. For instance, WisDOT has experienced ‘running’ of displacement piling in certain areas that are composed of uniform, loose sands. The Department has also experienced difficulty driving displacement piles in denser sands within cofferdams, as consecutive piles are driven, due to compaction of the in-situ sand during pile installation within the cofferdam footprint.

If boulders or cobbles are anticipated within the estimated length of the pile, consideration should be given to increasing the cast-in-place (CIP) pile shell thickness to reduce the potential of pile damage due to high driving stresses. Another alternative is to investigate the use of HP piles at the site.

Environmental factors may be significant in the selection of the pile type. Environmental factors include areas subject to high corrosion, bacterial corrosion, abrasion due to moving debris or ice, wave action, deterioration due to cyclic wetting and drying, strong current and gradual erosion of riverbed due to scour. Concrete piles are susceptible to corrosion when exposed to alkaline soil or strong chemicals, especially in rivers and streams. Steel piles can suffer serious electrolysis deterioration if placed in an environment near stray electrical currents. Cast-in-place concrete piling is generally the preferred pile type on structure widenings where displacement piles are required. Timber pile is not to be used, even if timber pile was used on the original structure.

Displacement pile consisting of tapered steel is proprietary and can be an efficient type of friction pile for bearing in loose to medium-dense granular soil. Tapered friction piles may need to be installed with the aid of water jetting in dense granular soil. Straight-sided friction piles are recommended for placement in cohesive soil underlain by a granular stratum to develop the greatest combined shaft and point resistance. Steel HP or open-end pipe piles are best suited for driving through obstructions or fairly competent layers to bedrock. Foundations such as pier bents which may be subject to large lateral forces when located in deep and/or swiftly moving water require piles that can sustain large bending forces. Precast, prestressed concrete pile is best suited for high lateral loading conditions but is seldom used on Wisconsin transportation projects.

#### 11.3.1.12.1 Timber Piles

Current design practice is not to use timber piles.

#### 11.3.1.12.2 Concrete Piles

The three principal types of concrete pile are cast-in-place (CIP), precast reinforced and prestressed reinforced. CIP concrete pile types include piles cast in driven steel shells that remain in-place and piles cast in unlined drilled holes or shafts. Driven-type concrete pile is discussed below in this section. Concrete pile cast in drilled holes is discussed later in this chapter and include drilled shafts (11.3.2), micropiles (11.3.3), and augered cast-in-place piles (11.3.4).

Depending on the type of concrete pile selected and the foundation conditions, the load-carrying capacity of the pile can be developed by shaft resistance, point resistance or a combination of both. Generally, driven concrete pile is employed as a displacement type pile.



When embedded in the earth, plain or reinforced concrete pile is generally not vulnerable to deterioration. The water table does not affect pile durability provided the concentration level is not excessive for acidity, alkalinity or chemical salt. Concrete pile that extends above the water surface is subject to abrasion damage from floating objects, ice debris and suspended solids. Deterioration can also result from frost action, particularly in the splash zone and from concrete spalling due to internal corrosion of the reinforcement steel. Generally, concrete spalls are a concern for reinforced concrete pile more than prestressed pile because of micro-cracks due to shrinkage, handling, placement and loading. Prestressing reduces crack width. Concrete durability increases with a corresponding reduction in aggregate porosity and water/cement ratio. WisDOT does not currently use prestressed reinforced concrete pile.

### 11.3.1.12.2.1 Driven Cast-In-Place Concrete Piles

Driven cast-in-place (CIP) concrete pile is formed by pouring concrete into a thin-walled closed-end steel shell which has been previously driven into the ground. A flat, oversize plate is typically welded to the bottom of the steel shell. Steel shells are driven either with or without a mandrel, depending on the wall thickness of the steel shell and the shell strength that is required to resist driving stress. Piling in Wisconsin is typically driven without the use of a mandrel. The minimum thickness of the steel shell should be that required for pile reinforcement and to resist driving stress. The Contractor may elect to furnish steel shells with greater thickness to permit his choice of driving equipment. A thin-walled shell must be carefully evaluated so that it does not collapse from soil pressure or deform from adjacent pile driving. Deformities or distortions in the pile shell could constrict the flow of concrete into the pile and produce voids or necking that reduce pile capacity. It is standard construction practice to inspect the open shell prior to concrete placement. Care must be exercised to avoid intermittent voids over the pile length during concrete placement.

Driven CIP concrete pile is considered a displacement-type pile, because the majority of the applied load is usually supported by shaft resistance. Driven CIP pile is frequently employed in slow flowing streams and areas requiring pile lengths of 50 to 120 feet. Driven CIP pile is generally selected over timber pile because of the availability of different diameters and wall thicknesses, the ability to adjust driven lengths and the ability to achieve greater resistances.

Driven CIP concrete piles may have a uniform cross section or may be tapered. The minimum cross-sectional area is required to be 100 and 50 square inches at the pile butt and tip, respectively. The Department has only used a limited number of tapered CIP piles and has experienced some driving problems.

Driven CIP concrete piles are designed as reinforced concrete beam-columns, as described in **LRFD [5.7.4.4 and 6.9.5.2]**, when the cross-sectional area of the steel shell is less than 4 percent of the total cross-sectional area of the pile. When the effective cross-sectional area of the steel shell is at least 4 percent of the total area of the pile, the pile is classified as a composite section and is designed as a steel pipe pile filled with concrete (see **LRFD [6.9.2, 6.9.5 and 6.15.3]**).

For consistency with WisDOT design practice, the steel shell is ignored when computing the axial structural resistance of driven CIP concrete pile that is symmetrical about both principal axes. This nominal (ultimate) axial structural resistance capacity is computed using the



following equation, neglecting the contribution of the steel shell to resist compression: **LRFD [Equation 5.7.4.4-3]**.

$$P_u \leq P_r = \phi P_n$$

Where:

$$P_n = 0.80(0.85f'_c (A_g - A_{st}) + f_y A_{st})$$

Where:

$P_u$  = Factored axial force effect (kips)

$P_r$  = Factored axial resistance without flexure (kips)

$\phi$  = Resistance factor

$P_n$  = Nominal axial resistance without flexure (kips)

$A_g$  = Gross area of concrete pile section (inches<sup>2</sup>)

$A_{st}$  = Total area of longitudinal reinforcement (inches<sup>2</sup>)

$f_y$  = Specified yield strength of reinforcement (ksi)

$f'_c$  = Concrete compressive strength (ksi)

For cast-in-place concrete piles with steel shell and no steel reinforcement bars,  $A_{st}$  equals zero and the above equation reduces to the following.

$$P_n = 0.68f'_c A_g$$

A resistance factor,  $\phi$ , of 0.75 is used to compute the factored structural axial resistance capacity, as specified in **LRFD [5.5.4.2.1]**. For CIP piling there are no reinforcing ties, however the steel shell acts to confine concrete similar to ties.

$$P_r = 0.51f'_c A_g$$

For piles subject to large lateral loads, the structural pile capacity must also be checked for shear and combined stress against flexure and compression.

Piles subject to uplift must also be checked for tension resistance.

A value of 4 ksi is the minimum value required by specification, while the 3.5 ksi plan value used for bridge substructures helps to ensure adequate substructure massiveness. Pile capacities are maximums, based on an assumed concrete compressive strength of 3.5 ksi. The allowable concrete design strength of 3.5 ksi is based on construction difficulties and



unknowns of placement, as well as consistency with plan value. The Geotechnical Site Investigation Report must be used as a guide in determining the actual nominal geotechnical resistance capacity of the pile.

Any structural strength contribution associated with the steel shell is neglected in driven CIP concrete pile design. Therefore, environmentally corrosive sites do not affect driven CIP concrete pile designs. An exception is that CIP should not be used for exposed pile bents in corrosive environments as shown in the *Facilities Development Manual*, Procedure 13-1-15.

Based on the above equation, current WisDOT practice is to design driven cast-in-place concrete pile for a factored (ultimate) structural axial resistance capacity of 75 tons per pile on 10-3/4 inch diameter pile with 0.219-inch thick wall, 105 tons per pile on 12-3/4 inch diameter pile with 0.25-inch thick wall, and 125 tons on 14 inch diameter pile with 0.25-inch thick wall. If less than the maximum axial resistance is required by design, state only the required corresponding driving resistance on the plans. The minimum shell thickness is 0.219 inches for straight steel tube and 0.1793 inches for fluted steel shells, unless otherwise noted in the Geotechnical Site Investigation Report and stated in the project plans. Trestle piling should not be less than 12 inches in diameter. See 6.3.2.1 for the typical style of plan notes showing axial resistance as well as required driving resistance on plans.

The minimum allowable wall thickness of steel shells is 0.219 inches for driven cast-in-place concrete pile. Where cobbles or other difficult driving conditions are present, the minimum wall thickness should be increased to 0.25 inches or thicker to facilitate driving without damaging the pile. When difficult driving conditions are anticipated, a drivability analysis should be completed.

Driven cast-in-place concrete pile is generally the most favorable displacement pile type since inspection of the steel shell is possible prior to concrete placement and more reliable control of concrete placement is attainable.

### 11.3.1.12.2.2 Precast Concrete Piles

Precast concrete pile can be divided into two primary types – reinforced concrete piles and prestressed concrete piles. These piles have parallel or tapered sides and are usually of rectangular or round cross section. Since the piles are usually cast in a horizontal position, the round cross section is not common because of the difficulty involved in filling a horizontal cylindrical form. Because of the somewhat variable subsurface conditions in Wisconsin and the need for variable length piles, these piles are currently not used in Wisconsin.

### 11.3.1.12.3 Steel Piles

Steel pile generally consists of either H-pile or pipe pile types. Both open-end and closed-end pipe pile are used. Pipe pile may be left open or filled with concrete, and can also have a structural shape inserted into the concrete. Open-end pipe pile can be socketed into bedrock with preboring.

Steel pile is typically top driven at the pile butt. However, closed-end pipe pile can also be bottom driven with a mandrel. Mandrels are generally not used in Wisconsin.



Steel pile can be used in friction, point-bearing, a combination of both or rock-socketed piles. One advantage of steel pile is the ease of splicing or cutting to accommodate differing final constructed lengths.

Steel pile should not be used for exposed pile bents in corrosive environments as show in the *Facilities Development Manual, Procedure 13.1.15*.

The nominal (ultimate) structural compressive resistance of steel piles is designed in accordance with **LRFD [10.7.3.13.1]** as either noncomposite or composite sections. Composite sections include concrete-filled pipe pile and steel pile that is encased in concrete. The nominal structural compressive resistance for noncomposite and composite steel pile is further specified in **LRFD [6.9.4 and 6.9.5]**, respectively. The effective length of horizontally unsupported steel pile is determined in accordance with **LRFD [10.7.3.13.4]**. Resistance factors for the structural compression limit state are specified in **LRFD [6.5.4.2]**.

**WisDOT policy item:**

It is WisDOT policy to specify a yield strength of 50 ksi for steel H-piles. Although 50 ksi is specified, the structural pile design shall use a yield strength of 36 ksi. The specified yield strength of 50 ksi may be used when performing drivability analyses. For steel pipe piles, 36 ksi shall be used for pile design and drivability analyses.

11.3.1.12.3.1 H-Piles

Steel piles are generally used for point-bearing piles and typically employ what is known as the HP-section (often called H-piles for brevity). Steel H-piles are rolled sections with wide flanges such that the depth of the section and the width of the flanges are approximately equal. The cross-sectional area and volume displacement are relatively small and as a result, H-piles can be driven through compact granular materials and slightly into soft rock. Also, steel piles have little or no effect in causing ground swelling or raising of adjacent piles. Because of the small volume of H-piles, they are considered “non-displacement” piling.

H-piles are available in many sizes and lengths. Unspliced pile lengths up to 140 feet and spliced pile lengths up to 230 feet have been driven. Typical pile lengths range from 40 to 120 feet. Common H-pile sizes vary between 10 and 14 inches.

The current WisDOT practice is to design driven H-piles for a factored (ultimate) structural axial resistance capacity of 110 tons per pile on 10 x 42 pile, 140 tons per pile on 12 x 53 pile, and 190 tons on 14 x 73 pile. These values are based on  $\phi_c = 0.5$  **LRFD [6.5.5.2]**. See 6.3.2.1 for the typical style of plan notes showing axial resistance as well as required driving resistance on plans. If less than the maximum axial resistance is required by design, state only the required corresponding driving resistance on the plans.

Since granular soil is largely incompressible, the principal action at the tip of the pile is lateral displacement of soil particles. Although it is an accepted fact that steel piles develop extremely high loads per pile when driven to point-bearing on rock, some misconceptions still remain that H-piles cannot function as friction piles. Load tests indicate that steel H-piles can function quite satisfactorily as friction piles in sand, sand-clay, silt-and-sand or hard clay. However, they will typically drive to greater depths than displacement piles. The surface area



for pile frictional computations is considered to be the projected “box area” of the H-pile and not the actual steel surface area.

In compact sand, there is not significant reduction in intergranular space and no increase in free water; thus, shaft resistance is not decreased by water lubrication during driving. The pressure of the sand grains against the pile is approximately the same during driving as it is after driving is stopped. The resulting shaft resistance may be an important source of load-carrying capacity.

Clay is compressible to a far greater degree than sand or gravel. As the solid particles are pressed into closer contact with each other and water is squeezed out of the voids, only small frictional resistance to driving is generated because of the lubricating action of the free water. However, after driving is completed, the lateral pressure against the pile increases due to dissipation of the pore water pressures. This causes the fine clay particles to increase adherence to the comparatively rough surface of the pile. Load is transferred from the pile to the soil by the resulting strong adhesive bond. In many types of clay, this bond is stronger than the shearing resistance of the soil.

In hard, stiff clays containing a low percentage of voids and pore water, the compressibility is small. As a result, the amount of displacement and compression required to develop the pile’s full capacity are correspondingly small. As an H-pile is driven into stiff clay, the soil trapped between the flanges and web usually becomes very hard due to the compression and is carried down with it. This trapped soil acts as a plug and the pile also acts as a displacement pile.

In cases where loose soil is encountered, considerably longer point-bearing steel piles are required to carry the same load as relatively short displacement-type piles. This is because a displacement-type pile, with its larger cross section, produces more compaction as it is driven through materials such as soft clays or loose organic silt.

**WisDOT policy item:**

To estimate required non-displacement pile lengths in design, WisDOT reduces the static geotechnical point resistance by 33 percent.

**11.3.1.12.3.2 Pipe Piles**

Pipe piles consist of seamless, welded or spiral welded steel pipes in diameters ranging from 7-3/4 to 24 inches. Other sizes are available, but they are not commonly used. Typical wall thicknesses range from 0.375-inch to 0.75-inch, with wall thicknesses of up to 1.5 inches possible. Pipe piles should be specified by grade with reference to ASTM A 252.

Pipe piles may be driven either open or closed end. If the end bearing capacity from the full pile toe area is required, the pile toe should be closed with a flat plate or a conical tip.

**11.3.1.12.3.3 Oil Field Piles**

The oil industry uses a very high quality pipe in their drilling operations. Every piece is tested for conformance to their standards. Oil field pipe is accepted as a point-bearing alternative to



HP piling, provided the material in the pipe meets the requirements of ASTM A 252, Grade 3, with a minimum tensile strength of 120 ksi or a Brinell Hardness Number (BHN) of 240, a minimum outside diameter of 7-3/4 inches and a minimum wall thickness of 0.375-inch. The weight and area of the pipe shall be approximately the same as the HP piling it replaces. Sufficient bending strength shall be provided if the oil field pipe is replacing HP piling in a pile bent. Oil field pipe is driven open-ended and not filled with concrete. The availability of this pile type varies and is subject to changes in the oil industry.

#### 11.3.1.12.4 Pile Bents

See 13.1 for criteria to use pile bents at stream crossings. When pile bents fail to meet these criteria, pile-encased pier bents should be considered. To improve debris flow, round piles are generally selected for exposed bents. Round or H-piles can be used for encased bents.

#### 11.3.1.13 Tolerable Movement of Substructures Founded on Driven Piles

**WisDOT policy item:**

For design of new bridge structures founded on driven piles at the LRFD Service Limit State, it is WisDOT's policy to limit the horizontal movement at top of the foundation unit to 0.5 inch or less at the service limit state.

#### 11.3.1.14 Resistance Factors

The nominal (ultimate) geotechnical resistance capacity of the pile should be based on the type, depth and condition of subsurface material and ground water conditions, reported in the Geotechnical Site Investigation Report, as well as the method of analysis used to determine pile resistance capacity. Resistance factors to compute the factored geotechnical resistance are presented in **LRFD [Table 10.5.5.2.3-1]** and are selected based on the method used to determine the nominal (ultimate) axial pile capacity. The design intent is to adjust the resistance factor based on the reliability of the method used to determine the nominal pile resistance. When construction controls, such as pile driving analyzers or load tests, are used to improve the reliability of the capacity prediction, the resistance factors used during final design should be increased in accordance with **LRFD [Table 10.5.5.2.3-1]** to reflect planned construction monitoring.

**WisDOT exception to AASHTO:**

WisDOT requires at least four (4) piles per group to support each substructure unit, including each column for multi-column bents. WisDOT does not reduce geotechnical resistance factors to satisfy redundancy requirements to determine axial pile resistance. Hence, redundancy resistance factors in **LRFD [10.5.5.2.3]** are not applicable to WisDOT structures. This exception applies to typical CIP and H-pile foundations. Non-typical foundations (such as drilled shafts) shall be investigated individually.

No guidance regarding the structural design of non-redundant driven pile groups is currently included in *AASHTO LRFD*. Since WisDOT requires a minimum of 4 piles per substructure



unit, structural design should be based on a load modifier,  $\eta$ , of 1.0. Further description of load modifiers is presented in **LRFD [1.3.4]**.

The following geotechnical resistance factors apply to the majority of the bridges in Wisconsin that are founded on driven pile. On the majority of WisDOT projects, wave equation analysis and dynamic monitoring are not used to set driving criteria. This equates to typical resistance factors of 0.35 to 0.45 for pile design. A summary of resistance factors is presented in [Table 11.3-1](#), which are generally used for geotechnical design on WisDOT projects.



Condition/Resistance Determination Method			Resistance Factor
Static Analysis – Used in Design Phase	Nominal Resistance of Single Pile in Axial Compression, $\phi_{stat}$	Skin Friction and End Bearing in Clay and Mixed Soil Alpha Method	0.35
		Skin Friction and End Bearing in Sand Nordlund/Thurman Method	0.45
		Point Bearing in Rock	0.45
	Block Failure, $\phi_{bl}$	Clay	0.60
	Uplift Resistance of Single Pile, $\phi_{up}$	Clay and Mixed Soil Alpha Method	0.25
		Sand Nordlund Method	0.35
	Horizontal Resistance of Single Pile or Pile Group	All Soil Types and Rock	1.0
Nominal Resistance of Single Pile in Axial Compression – Dynamic Analysis – for the Hammer and Pile Driving System Actually - used During Construction for Pile Installation, $\phi_{dyn}$	FHWA-modified Gates dynamic pile driving formula (end of drive condition only)	0.40	
	Wave equation analysis, without pile dynamic measurements or load test, at end of drive condition only	0.40	
	Driving criteria established by dynamic test with signal matching at beginning of redrive conditions only of at least one production pile per substructure, but no less than the number of tests per site provided in <b>LRFD [Table 10.5.5.2.3-3]</b> ; quality control of remaining piles by calibrated wave equation and/or dynamic testing	0.65	

**Table 11.3-1**  
Geotechnical Resistance Factors for Driven Pile

Resistance factors for structural design of piles are based on the material used and are presented in the following sections of *AASHTO LRFD*:

- Concrete piles – **LRFD [5.5.4.2.1]**
- Steel piles – **LRFD [6.5.4.2]**

### 11.3.1.15 Bearing Resistance

A pile foundation transfers load into the underlying strata by either shaft resistance, point resistance or a combination of both. Any driven pile will develop some amount of both shaft



and point resistance. However, a pile that receives the majority of its support capacity by friction or adhesion from the soil along its shaft is referred to as a friction pile, whereas a pile that receives the majority of its support from the resistance of the soil near its tip is a point resistance (end bearing) pile.

The design pile capacity is the maximum load the pile can support without exceeding the allowable movement. When considering design capacity, one of two items may govern the design – the nominal (ultimate) geotechnical resistance capacity or the structural resistance capacity of the pile section. This section focuses primarily on the geotechnical resistance capacity of a pile.


The factored load that is applied to a single pile is carried jointly by the soil beneath the tip of the pile and by the soil around the shaft. The factored load is not permitted to exceed the factored resistance of the pile foundation for each limit state in accordance with **LRFD [1.3.2.1 and 10.7.3.8.6]**. The factored bearing resistance, or pile capacity, of a pile is computed as follows:

$$\sum \eta_i \gamma_i Q_i \leq R_r = \phi R_n = \phi_{stat} R_p + \phi_{stat} R_s$$

Where:

- $\eta_i$  = Load modifier
- $\gamma_i$  = Load factor
- $Q_i$  = Force effect (tons)
- $R_r$  = Factored bearing resistance of pile (tons)
- $R_n$  = Nominal resistance (tons)
- $R_p$  = Nominal point resistance of pile (tons)
- $R_s$  = Nominal shaft resistance of pile (tons)
- $\phi$  = Resistance factor
- $\phi_{stat}$  = Resistance factor for driven pile, static analysis method

This equation is illustrated in [Figure 11.3-1](#).



**Figure 11.3-1**  
Resistance Distribution for Axially-Loaded Pile

#### 11.3.1.15.1 Shaft Resistance

The shaft resistance of a pile is estimated by summing the frictional resistance developed in each of the different soil strata.

For non-cohesive (granular) soil, the total shaft resistance can be calculated using the following equation (based on the Nordlund/Thurman Method):



$$R_s = \sum C_d D K_\delta C_F \sigma_v' \frac{\sin(\delta + \omega)}{\cos(\omega)}$$

Where:

- $R_s$  = Total shaft resistance capacity (tons)
- $C_d$  = Pile perimeter (feet)
- $D$  = Pile segment length (feet)
- $K_\delta$  = Coefficient of lateral earth pressure at mid-point of soil layer under consideration from **LRFD [Figures 10.7.3.8.6f-1 through 10.7.3.8.6f-4]**
- $C_F$  = Correction factor for  $K_\delta$  when  $\delta \neq \phi_f$ , from **LRFD [Figure 10.7.3.8.6f-5]**, whereby  $\phi_f$  = angle of internal friction for drained soil
- $\sigma_v'$  = Effective overburden pressure at midpoint of soil layer under consideration (tsf)
- $\delta$  = Friction angle between the pile and soil obtained from **LRFD [Figure 10.7.3.8.6f-6]** (degrees)
- $\omega$  = Angle of pile taper from vertical (degrees)

For cohesive (fine-grained) soil, the total shaft resistance can be calculated using the following equation (based on the alpha method):

$$R_s = \sum \alpha S_u C_d D$$

Where:

- $R_s$  = Total (nominal) shaft resistance capacity (tons)
- $\alpha$  = Adhesion factor applied to undrained shear strength from **LRFD [Figure 10.7.3.8.6b-1]**
- $S_u$  = Undrained shear strength (tsf)
- $C_d$  = Pile perimeter (feet)
- $D$  = Pile segment length (feet)

Average values of shaft friction for various soils are presented in [Table 11.3-2](#) and [Table 11.3-3](#). The values presented are average ranges and are intended to provide orders of magnitude only. Other conditions such as layering sequences, drilling information, ground water, thixotropy and clay sensitivity must be evaluated by experienced geotechnical engineers and analyzed using principles of soil mechanics.



Shaft resistance values are dependent upon soil texture, overburden pressure and soil cohesion but tend to increase with depth. However, experience in Wisconsin has shown that shaft resistance values in non-cohesive materials reach constant final values at depths of 15 to 25 pile diameters in loose sands and 25 to 35 pile diameters in firm sands.

Soil Type	$q_u^{(1)}$ (tsf)	Nominal Shaft Resistance (psf)
Very soft clay	0 to 0.25	---
Soft clay	0.25 to 0.5	200 to 450
Medium clay	0.5 to 1.0	450 to 800
Stiff clay	1.0 to 2.0	800 to 1,500
Very stiff clay	2.0 to 4.0	1,500 to 2,500
Hard clay	4.0	2,500 to 3,500
Silt	---	100 to 400
Silty clay	---	400 to 700
Sandy clay	---	400 to 700
Sandy silt	---	600 to 1,000
Dense silty clay	---	900 to 1,500

(1) Unconfined Compression Strength

**Table 11.3-2**  
Average Shaft Friction Values for Cohesive Material

Soil Type	$N_{160}^{(1)}$	Nominal Shaft Resistance (psf)
Very loose sand and silt or clay	0 to 6	50 to 150
Medium sand and silt or clay	6 to 30	400 to 600
Dense sand and silt or clay	30 to 50	600 to 800
Very dense sand and silt or clay	over 50	800 to 1,000
Very loose sand	0 to 4	700 to 1,700
Loose sand	4 to 10	700 to 1,700
Firm sand	10 to 30	700 to 1,700
Dense sand	30 to 50	700 to 1,700
Very dense sand	over 50	700 to 1,700



Sand and gravel	---	1,000 to 3,000
Gravel	---	1,500 to 3,500

(1) Standard Penetration Value (AASHTO T206) corrected for both overburden and hammer efficiency effects (blows per foot).

**Table 11.3-3**  
Average Shaft Friction Values for Granular Material

In computing shaft resistance, the method of installation must be considered as well as the soil type. The method of installation significantly affects the degree of soil disturbance, the lateral stress acting on the pile, the friction angle and the area of contact. Shafts of prebored piles do not always fully contact the soil; therefore, the effective contact area is less than the shaft area. Driving a pile in granular material densifies the soil and increases the friction angle. Driving also displaces the soil laterally and increases the horizontal stress acting on the pile. Disturbance of clay soil from driving can break down soil structure and increase pore pressures, which greatly decreases soil strength. However, some or all of the strength recovers following reconsolidation of the soil due to a decrease in excess pore pressure over time. Use the initial soil strength values for design purposes. The type and shape of a pile also affects the amount of shaft resistance developed, as described in 11.3.1.12.

11.3.1.15.2 Point Resistance

The point resistance, or end bearing capacity, of a pile is estimated from modifications to the bearing capacity formulas developed for shallow footings.

For non-cohesive soils, point resistance can be calculated using the following equation (based on the Nordlund/Thurman Method):

$$R_p = A_p \alpha_t N'_q \sigma'_v \leq q_L A_p$$

Where:

- $R_p$  = Point resistance capacity (tons)
- $A_p$  = Pile end area (feet<sup>2</sup>)
- $\alpha_t$  = Dimensionless factor dependent on depth-width relationship from **LRFD [Figure 10.7.3.8.6f-7]**
- $N'_q$  = Bearing capacity factor from **LRFD [Figure 10.7.3.8.6f-8]**
- $\sigma'_v$  = Effective overburden pressure at the pile point  $\leq 1.6$  (tsf)
- $q_L$  = Limiting unit point resistance from **LRFD [Figure 10.7.3.8.6f-9]** (tsf)

For cohesive soils, point resistance can be calculated using the following equation:



$$R_p = 9S_u A_p$$

Where:

- $R_p$  = Point resistance capacity (tons)
- $S_u$  = Undrained shear strength of the cohesive soil near the pile base (tsf)
- $A_p$  = Pile end area (feet<sup>2</sup>)

This equation represents the maximum value of point resistance for cohesive soil. This value is often assumed to be zero because substantial movement of the pile tip (1/10 of the pile diameter) is needed to mobilize point resistance capacity. This amount of tip movement seldom occurs after installation.

A point resistance (or end bearing) pile surrounded by soil is not a structural member like a column. Both experience and theory demonstrate that there is no danger of a point resistance pile buckling due to inadequate lateral support if it is surrounded by even the very softest soil. Therefore, pile stresses can exceed column stresses. Exposed pile bent piles may act as structural columns.

### 11.3.1.15.3 Group Capacity

The nominal resistance capacity of pile groups may be less than the sum of the individual nominal resistances of each pile in the group for friction piles founded in cohesive soil. For pile groups founded in cohesive soil, the pile group must be analyzed as an equivalent pier for block failure in accordance with **LRFD [10.7.3.9]**. WisDOT no longer accepts the Converse-Labarre method of analysis to account for group action. If the pile group is tipped in a firm stratum overlying a weak layer, the weak layer should be checked for possible punching failure in accordance with **LRFD [10.6.3.1.2a]**. Experience in Wisconsin indicates that in most thixotropic clays where piles are driven to a hammer bearing as determined by dynamic formulas, pile group action is not the controlling factor to determine pile resistance capacity. For pile groups in sand, the sum of the nominal resistance of the individual piles always controls the group resistance.

### 11.3.1.16 Lateral Load Resistance

Structures supported by single piles or pile groups are frequently subjected to lateral forces from lateral earth pressure, live load forces, wave action, ice loads and wind forces. Piles subjected to lateral forces must be designed to meet combined stress and deflection criteria to prevent impairment or premature failure of the foundation or superstructure. To solve the soil-structure interaction problems, the designer must consider the following:

- Pile group configuration.
- Pile stiffness.



- Degree of fixity at the pile connection with the pile footing.
- Maximum bending moment induced on the pile from the superstructure load and moment distribution along the pile length.
- Probable points of fixity near the pile tip.
- Soil response (P-y method) for both the strength and service limit states.
- Pile deflection permitted by the superstructure at the service limit state.

If a more detailed lateral load investigation is desired, a P-y analysis is typically performed using commercially available software such as COM624P, FB Multi-Pier or L-Pile. A resistance factor is not applied to the soil response when performing a P-y analysis using factored loads since the soil response represents a nominal (ultimate) condition. For a more detailed analysis of lateral loads and displacements, refer to the listed FHWA design references or a geotechnical engineering book.

**WisDOT policy item:**

A detailed analysis is required for the lateral resistance of piles used in A3 and A4 abutments.

**11.3.1.17 Other Design Considerations**

Several other topics should be considered during design, as presented below.

**11.3.1.17.1 Downdrag Load**

Negative shaft resistance (down drag) results in the soil adhesion forces pulling down the pile instead of the soil adhesion forces resisting the applied load. This can occur when settlement of the soil through which the piling is driven takes place. It has been found that only a small amount of settlement is necessary to mobilize these additional pile (drag) loads. This settlement occurs due to consolidation of softer soil strata caused by such items as increased embankment loads (due to earth fill) or a lowering of the existing ground water elevation. The nominal pile resistance available to support structure loads plus downdrag shall be estimated by considering only the positive skin and tip resistance below the lowest layer acting to produce negative skin resistance. When this condition is present, the designer may provide time to allow consolidation to occur before driving piling or **LRFD [10.7.3.8.6]** may be used to estimate the available pile resistance to withstand the downdrag plus structure loads. Other alternatives are to preauger the piling, drive the pile to bearing within a permanent pipe sleeve that is placed from the base of the substructure unit to the bottom of the soft soil layer(s), coat the pile with bitumen above the compressible soil strata or use proprietary materials to encase the piles (within fill constructed after the piling is installed). The Department has experienced problems with bitumen coatings.



### 11.3.1.17.2 Uplift Resistance

Uplift forces may also be present, both permanently and intermittently, on a pile system. Such forces may occur from hydrostatic uplift or cofferdam seals, ice uplift resulting from ice grip on piles and rising water, wind uplift due to pressures against high structures or frost uplift. In the absence of pulling test data, the resistance factors from [Table 11.3-1](#) should be used to determine static uplift resistance. Generally, the type of pile with the largest perimeter is the most efficient in resisting uplift forces.

### 11.3.1.17.3 Pile Setup and Relaxation

The nominal resistance of a deep foundation may change over time, particularly for driven piles. The nominal resistance may increase (setup) during dissipation of excess pore pressure, which developed during pile driving, as soil particles reconsolidate after the soil has been remolded during driving. The shaft resistance may decrease (relaxation) during dissipation of negative pore pressure, which was induced by physical displacement of soil during driving. If the potential for soil relaxation is significant, a non-displacement pile is preferred over a displacement type pile. Relaxation may also occur as a result of a deterioration of the bearing stratum following driving-induced fracturing, especially for point-bearing piles founded on non-durable bedrock. Relaxation is generally associated with densely compacted granular material.

Pile setup has been found to occur in some fine-grained soil in Wisconsin. Pile setup should not be included in pile design unless pre-construction load tests are conducted to determine site-specific setup parameters. The benefits of obtaining site-specific setup parameters could include shortening friction piles and reducing the overall foundation cost. Pile driving resistance would need to be determined at the end of driving and again later after pore pressure dissipation. Restrike tests involve additional taps on a pile after the pile has been driven and a waiting period (generally 24 to 72 hours) has elapsed. The dynamic monitoring analysis are used to predict resistance capacity and distribution over the pile length.

CAPWAP(CAse Pile Wave Analysis Program) is a signal matching software. CAPWAP uses dynamic pile force and velocity data to discern static and dynamic soil resistance, and then estimate static shaft and point resistance for driven pile. Pile top force and velocity are calculated based on strain and acceleration measurements during pile driving, with a pile driving analyzer (PDA). CAPWAP is based on the wave equation model which characterizes the pile as a series of elastic beam elements, and the surrounding soil as plastic elements with damping (dynamic resistance) and stiffness (static resistance) properties.

Typically, a test boring is drilled and a static load test is performed at test piles where pile setup properties are to be determined. Typical special provisions have been developed for use on projects incorporating aspects of pile setup. Pile setup is discussed in greater detail in FHWA Publication NHI-05-042, *Design and Construction of Driven Pile Foundations*.

Restrike tests with an impact hammer can be used to identify change in pile resistance due to pile setup or relaxation. Restrike is typically performed by measuring pile penetration during the first 10 blows by a warm hammer. Due to setup, it is possible that the hammer used for initial driving may not be adequate to induce pile penetration and a larger hammer



may be required to impart sufficient energy for restrrike tests. Only warm hammers should be used for restrikes by first applying at least 20 blows to another pile.

Restrike tests with an impact hammer must be used to substantiate the resistance capacity and integrity of pile that is initially driven with a vibratory hammer. Vibratory hammers may be used with approval of the engineer. Other than restrikes with an impact hammer, no formula exists to reliably predict the resistance capacity of a friction pile that is driven with a vibratory hammer.

#### 11.3.1.17.4 Drivability Analysis

In order for a driven pile to develop its design geotechnical resistance, it must be driven into the ground without damage. Stresses developed during driving often exceed those developed under even the most extreme loading conditions. The critical driving stress may be either compression, as in the case of a steel H-pile, or tension, as in the case of a concrete pile.

Drivability is treated as a strength limit state. The geotechnical engineer will perform the evaluation of this limit state during design based on a preliminary dynamic analysis using wave equation techniques. These techniques are used to document that the assumed pile driving hammers are capable of mobilizing the required nominal (ultimate) resistance of the pile at driving stress levels less than the factored driving resistance of the pile. Drivability can often be the controlling strength limit state check for a pile foundation. This is especially true for high capacity piles driven to refusal on rock.

Drivability analysis is required by **LRFD [10.7.8]**. A drivability evaluation is needed because the highest pile stresses are usually developed during driving to facilitate penetration of the pile to the required resistance. However, the high strain rate and temporary nature of the loading during pile driving allow a substantially higher stress level to be used during installation than for service. The drivability of candidate pile-hammer-system combinations can be evaluated using wave equation analyses.

As stated in the 2004 FHWA Design and Construction of Driven Pile Foundations Manual:

“The wave equation does not determine the capacity of the pile based on soil boring data. The wave equation calculates a penetration resistance for an assumed ultimate capacity, or conversely it assigns estimated ultimate capacity to a pile based upon a field observed penetration resistance.”

“The accuracy of the wave equation analysis will be poor when either soil model or soil parameters inaccurately reflect the actual soil behavior, and when the driving system parameters do not represent the state of maintenance of hammer or cushions.”

The following presents potential sources of wave equation errors.

- Hammer Data Input, Diesel Hammers
- Cushion Input



- Soil Parameter Selection

**LRFD [C10.7.8]** states that the local pile driving results from previous drivability analyses and historical pile driving experience can be used to refine current drivability analyses. WisDOT recommends using previous pile driving records and experience when performing and evaluating drivability analyses. These correlations with past pile driving experience allow modifications of the input values used in the drivability analysis, so that results agree with past construction findings.

Driving stress criteria are specified in the individual LRFD material design sections and include limitations of unfactored driving stresses in piles based on the following:

- Yield strength in steel piles, as specified in **LRFD [6.4.1]**
- Ultimate compressive strength of the gross concrete section, accounting for the effective prestress after losses for prestressed concrete piles loaded in tension or compression, as specified in **LRFD [5.7.4.4]**

Though there are a number of ways to assess the drivability of a pile, the steps necessary to perform a drivability analysis are typically as follows:

1. Estimate the total resistance of all soil layers. This may include layers that are not counted on to support the completed pile due to scour or potential downdrag, but will have to be driven through. WisDOT recommends using the values for quake and damping provided in the FHWA Design and Construction of Driven Pile Foundations Manual.

In addition, the soil resistance parameters should be reduced by an appropriate value to account for the loss of soil strength during driving. The following table provides some guidelines based on Table 9-19 of the FHWA Design and Construction of Driven Pile Foundations Manual:



Soil Type	Recommended Soil Set Up Factor <sup>1</sup>	Percentage Loss of Soil Strength during Driving
Clay	2.0	50 percent
Silt – Clay	1.5 <sup>2</sup>	33 percent
Silt	1.5	33 percent
Sand – Clay	1.5	33 percent
Sand – Silt	1.2	17 percent
Fine Sand	1.2	17 percent
Sand	1.0	0 percent
Sand - Gravel	1.0	0 percent

Notes:

1. Confirmation with local experience recommended
2. The value of 1.5 is higher than the FHWA Table 9-19 value of 1.0 based upon WisDOT experience.

**Table 11.3-4**  
Soil Resistance Factors

Incorporation of loss of soil strength and soil set-up should only be accounted for in the pile drivability analyses. Typically, WisDOT does not include set-up in static pile design analyses.

2. Select a readily available hammer. The following hammers have been used by Wisconsin Bridge Contractors: Delmag D-12-42, Delmag D-12-32, Delmag D-12, Delmag D-15, Delmag D-16-32, Delmag D-19, Delmag D-19-32, Delmag D-19-42, Delmag D-25, Delmag D-30-32, Delmag D-30, Delmag D-36, MKT-7, Kobe K-13, Gravity Hammer 5K.
3. Model the driving system, soil and pile using a wave equation program. The driving system generally includes the pile-driving hammer, and elements that are placed between the hammer and the top of pile, which include the helmet, hammer cushion, and pile cushion (concrete piles only). Pile splices are also modeled. Compute the driving stress using the drivability option for the wave equation, which shows the pile compressive stress and blow counts versus depth for the given soil profile.
4. Determine the permissible driving stress in the pile. During the design stage, it is often desirable to select a lower driving stress than the maximum permitted. This will allow the contractors greater flexibility in hammer selection. WisDOT generally limits driving stress to 90 percent of the steel yield strength
5. Evaluate the results of the drivability analysis to determine a reasonable blow count (that is, ranges from 25 blows per foot to 120 blows per foot) associated with the permissible driving stress.



The goal of the drivability study is to evaluate the potential for excessive driving stresses and to determine that the pile/soil system during driving will result in reasonable blow counts. The drivability study is not intended to evaluate the ultimate pile capacity or establish plan lengths. If the wave equation is used to set driving criteria, then contact the Bureau of Technical Services, Foundation and Pavement Unit to discuss the proper procedures.

### 11.3.1.17.5 Scour

During design, estimated pile lengths are increased to compensate for scour loss. The scour depth is estimated and used to compute the estimated shaft resistance that is lost over the scour depth (exposed pile length). The required pile length is then increased to compensate for the resistance capacity that is lost due to scour. The pile length is increased based on the following equation:

$$R_n = R_{n-stat} + R_{n-scour}$$

Where:

- $R_n$  = Nominal shaft resistance capacity, adjusted for scour effect (tons)
- $R_{n-stat}$  = Nominal shaft resistance based on static analysis, without scour consideration (tons)
- $R_{n-scour}$  = Nominal shaft resistance lost (negative value) over the exposed pile length due to scour (tons)

**WisDOT policy item:**

If there is potential for scour at a site, it is WisDOT policy to account for the loss of pile resistance from the material within the scour depth. The designer must not include any resistance provided by this material when determining the nominal pile resistance. Since the material within the scour depth may be present during pile driving operations, the additional resistance provided by this material shall be included when determining the required driving resistance. The designer should also consider minimum pile tip elevation requirements.

### 11.3.1.17.6 Typical Pile Resistance Values

Table 11.3-5 shows the typical pile resistance values for several pile types utilized by the Department. The table shows the Nominal Axial Compression Resistance ( $P_n$ ), which is a function of the pile materials, the Factored Axial Compression Resistance ( $P_r$ ), which is a function of the construction procedures, and the Required Driving Resistance, which is a function of the method used to measure pile capacity during installation. The bridge designer uses the Factored Axial Compression Resistance to determine the number and spacing of the piles. The Required Driving Resistance is placed on the plans. See 6.3.2.1-7 for details regarding plan notes.



Pile Size	Shell Thickness (inches)	Concrete or Steel Area (A <sub>g</sub> or A <sub>s</sub> ) (in <sup>2</sup> )	Nominal Axial Compression Resistance (P <sub>n</sub> ) (tons) (2)(3)(6)	Resistance Factor (φ)	Factored Axial Compression Resistance (P <sub>r</sub> ) (tons) (4)	Resistance Factor (φ <sub>dyn</sub> )	Required Driving Resistance (R <sub>n<sub>dyn</sub></sub> ) (tons) (5)
Cast in Place Piles							
10 3/4"	0.219	83.5	99.4	0.75	75	0.4	190
12 3/4"	0.250	118.0	140.4	0.75	105	0.4	265
14"	0.250	143.0	170.2	0.75	125	0.4	315
H-Piles							
10 x 42	NA(1)	12.4	223.2	0.50	110	0.4	275
12 x 53	NA	15.5	279.0	0.50	140	0.4	350
14 x 73	NA	21.4	385.2	0.50	190	0.4	475

**Table 11.3-5**  
Typical Pile Resistance Values

Notes

1. NA – not applicable
2.  $P_n = 0.8 (0.85 * f'_c * A_g + f_y * A_s)$  for CIP LRFD [5.5.4.2.1]  
 neglecting the steel shell, equation reduces to  $0.68 * f'_c * A_g$   
 $f'_c$  = compressive strength of concrete = 3,500 psi
3.  $P_n = 0.66\lambda * F_y * A_s$  for H-piles ( $\lambda = 0$  for piles embedded below the substructure)  
 $f_y$  = yield strength of steel = 36,000 psi
4.  $P_r = \phi * P_n$   
 $\phi = 0.75$  (LRFD [5.5.4.2.1] for axial compression concrete)  
 $\phi = 0.50$  (LRFD [6.5.4.2] for axial steel, for difficult driving conditions)
5.  $R_{n_{dyn}} = P_r / \phi_{dyn}$   
 $\phi_{dyn} = 0.4$  (LRFD [Table 10.5.5.2.3-1] for construction driving criteria using modified Gates dynamic formula)



6. Values for Axial Compression Resistance are calculated assuming the pile is fully supported. If the top of the pile is located above the scour elevation, consideration should be given to the effects of the unsupported pile length on its axial compression resistance.
7. If less than the maximum axial resistance,  $P_r$ , is required by design, state only the required corresponding driving resistance on the plans.

### 11.3.1.18 Construction Considerations

Construction considerations generally include selection of pile hammers, use of driving formulas and installation of test piles, when appropriate, as described below.

#### 11.3.1.18.1 Pile Hammers

Pile driving hammers are generally powered by compressed air, steam pressure or diesel units. The diesel hammer, a self-contained unit, is the most popular due to its compactness and adoption in most construction codes. Also, the need for auxiliary power is eliminated and the operation cost is nominal. Vibratory and sonic type hammers are employed in special cases where speed of installation is important and/or noise from impact is prohibited. The vibrating hammers convert instantly from a pile driver to a pile extractor by merely tensioning the lift line.

Pile hammers are raised and allowed to fall either by gravity or with the assistance of power. If the fall is due to gravity alone, the hammer is referred to as single-acting. The single-acting hammer is suitable for all types of soil but is most effective in penetrating heavy clays. The major disadvantage is the slow rate of driving due to the relatively slow rate of blows from 50 to 70 per minute. Wisconsin construction specifications call for a minimum hammer weight depending on the required final bearing value of the pile being driven. In order to avoid damage to the pile, the fall of the gravity hammer is limited to 10 feet.

If power is added to the downward falling hammer, the hammer is referred to as double-acting. This type of hammer works best in sandy soil but also performs well in clay. Double-acting hammers deliver 100 to 250 blows per minute, which increases the rate of driving considerably over the single-acting hammers. Wisconsin construction specifications call for a rated minimum energy of 15 percent of the required bearing of the pile. A rapid succession of blows at a high velocity can be extremely inefficient, as the hammer bounces on heavy piles.

Differential-acting hammers overcome the deficiencies found with both single- and double-acting hammers by incorporating higher frequency of blows and more efficient transfer of energy. The steam cycle, which is different from that of any other hammer, makes the lifting area under the piston independent of the downward thrusting area above the piston. Sufficient force can be applied for lifting and accelerating these parts without affecting the dead weight needed to resist the reaction of the downward acceleration force. The maximum delivered energy per blow is the total weight of the hammer plus the weight of the downward steam force times the length of the stroke.

The contractor's selection of the pile hammer is generally dependent on the following:



- The hammer weight and rated energy are selected on the basis of supplying the maximum driving force without damaging the piles.
- The hammer types dictated by the construction specification for the given pile type.
- The hammer types available to the contractor.
- Special situations, such as sites adjacent to existing buildings, that require consideration of vibrations generated from the driving impact or noise levels. In these instances, reducing the hammer size or choosing a double-acting hammer may be preferred over a single-acting hammer. Impact hammers typically cause less ground vibration than vibratory hammers.
- The subsurface conditions at the site.
- The required final resistance capacity of the pile.

WisDOT specifications require the heads of all piling to be protected by caps during driving. The pile cap serves to protect the pile, as well as modulate the blows from the hammer which helps eliminate large inefficient hammer forces. When penetration-per-blow is used as the driving criteria, constant cap-block material characteristics are required. The cap-block characteristics are also assumed to be constant for all empirical formula computations to determine the rate of penetration equivalent to a particular dynamic resistance.

### 11.3.1.18.2 Driving Formulas

Formulas used to estimate the bearing capacity of piles are of four general types – empirical, static, dynamic and wave equation.

Empirical formulas are based upon tests under limited conditions and are not suggested for general use.

Static formulas are based on soil stresses and try to equate shaft resistance and point resistance to the load-bearing capacity of the piles.

Dynamic pile driving formulas assume that the kinetic energy imparted by the pile hammer is equal to the nominal pile resistance plus the energy lost during driving, starting with the following relationship:

$$\text{Energy input} = \text{Energy used} + \text{Energy lost}$$

The energy used equals the driving resistance multiplied by the pile movement. Thus, by knowing the energy input and estimating energy losses, driving resistance can be calculated from observed pile movement. Numerous dynamic formulas have been proposed. They range from the simpler Engineering News Record (ENR) Formula to the more complex Hiley Formula. A modified Engineering News Formula was previously used by WisDOT to determine pile resistance capacity during installation. All new designs shall use the modified Gates or WAVE equation for determining the required driving resistance.



The following modified FHWA-Gates Formula is used by WisDOT:

$$R_R = \phi R_{ndr} = \phi(0.875(E_d)^{0.5} \log_{10}(10/s) - 50)$$

Where:

- R<sub>R</sub> = Factored pile resistance (tons)
- φ = Resistance factor = 0.4 **LRFD [Table 10.5.5.2.3-1]**
- R<sub>ndr</sub> = Nominal pile resistance measured during pile driving (tons)
- E<sub>d</sub> = Energy delivered by the hammer per blow (lb-foot)
- s = Average penetration in inches per blow for the final 10 blows (inches/blow)

Because of the difficulty of evaluating the many energy losses involved with pile driving, these dynamic formulas can only approximate pile driving resistance. These approximate results can be used as a safe means of determining pile length and bearing requirements. Despite the obvious limitations, the dynamic pile formulas take into account the best information available and have considerable utility to the engineer in securing reasonably safe and uniform results over the entire project.

The wave equation can be used to set driving criteria to achieve a specified pile bearing capacity (contact the Bureau of Technical Services, Geotechnical Unit prior to using the wave equation to set the driving criteria). The wave equation is based upon the theory of longitudinal wave transmission. This theory, proposed by Saint Venant a century ago, did not receive widespread use until the advent of computers due to its complexity. The wave equation can predict impact stresses in a pile during driving and estimate static soil resistance at the time of driving by solving a series of simultaneous equations. An advantage of this method is that it can accommodate any pile shape, as well as any distribution of pile shaft resistance and point resistance. The effect of the hammer and cushion block can be included in the computations.

Dynamic monitoring is performed by a Pile Driving Analyzer (PDA). WisDOT uses the PDA to evaluate the driving criteria, which is set by a wave equation analysis, and in an advisory capacity for evaluating if sufficient pile penetration is achieved, if pile damage has occurred or if the driving system is performing satisfactorily.

The PDA provides a method of dynamic pile testing both for pile design and construction control. Testing is accomplished during pile installation by attaching reusable strain transducers and accelerometers directly on the pile. Piles can be tested while being driven or during restrike. The instrumentation mounted on the pile allows the measurement of force and acceleration signals for each hammer blow. This data is transmitted to a small field computer for processing and recording on a magnetic data tape for a permanent record. Data is also fed into an oscilloscope to observe the dynamic response of the pile to driving. Calculations made by the computer based upon one-dimensional wave mechanics provide an immediate printout of maximum stresses in the pile, energy transmitted to the pile and a



prediction of the nominal axial resistance of the pile for each hammer impact. Monitoring of the force and velocity wave traces with the oscilloscope during driving also enables detection of any structural pile damage that may have occurred. Printouts of selected force and velocity wave traces are also made to provide additional testing documentation. The PDA can be used on all types of driven piles with any impact type of pile-driving hammer but is most often used for displacement piles.

### 11.3.1.18.3 Field Testing

Test piles are employed at a project site for two purposes:

- For test driving, to determine the length of pile required prior to placing purchasing orders.
- For load testing, to verify actual pile capacity versus design capacity for nominal axial resistance.

#### 11.3.1.18.3.1 Installation of Test Piles

Test piles are not required for spliceable types of piles. Previous experience indicates that contractors typically order total plan quantities for cast-in-place or steel H-piling in 60-foot lengths. The contractor uses one of the driven structure piles as a test pile at each designated location.

Test piling should be driven near the location of a soil boring where the soil characteristics are known and representative of the most unfavorable conditions at the site. The test pile must be exactly the same type and dimension as the piles to be used in the construction and installed by the same equipment and manner of driving. A penetration record is kept for every 1 foot of penetration for the entire length of pile. This record may be used as a guide for future pile driving on the project. Any subsequent pile encountering a smaller resistance is considered as having a smaller nominal resistance capacity than the test pile.

#### 11.3.1.18.3.2 Static Load Tests

A pile load test is usually conducted to furnish information to the geotechnical engineer to develop design criteria or to obtain test data to substantiate nominal resistance capacity for piles. A load test is the only reliable method of determining the nominal bearing resistance of a single pile, but it is expensive and can be quite time consuming. The decision to embark on an advance test program is based upon the scope of the project and the complexities of the foundation conditions. Such test programs on projects with large numbers of displacement piling often result in substantial savings in foundation costs, which can more than offset the test program cost. WisDOT has only performed a limited number of pile load tests on similar type projects.

Pile load testing generally involves the application of a direct axial load to a single vertical pile. However, load testing can involve uplift or axial tension tests, lateral tests applied horizontally, group tests or a combination of these applied to battered piles. Most static test loads are applied with hydraulic jacks reacting against either a stable loaded platform or a test frame anchored to reaction piles.



The basic information to be developed from the pile load test is usually the deflection of the pile head under the test load. Movement of the head is caused by elastic deformation of the piles and the soil. Soil deformation may cause undue settlement and must be guarded against. The amount of deformation is the significant value to be obtained from load tests, rather than the total downward movement of the pile head. Load tests are typically performed by loading to a given deflection value.

It is impractical to test every pile on a project. Therefore, test results can be applied to other piles or pile groups providing that the following conditions exist:

- The other piles are of the same type, material and size as the test piles.
- Subsoil conditions are comparable to those at the test pile locations.
- Installation methods and equipment used are the same as, or comparable to, those used for the test piles.
- Piles are driven to the same penetration depth or resistance or both as the test piles to compensate for variations in the vertical position and density of the bearing strata.

### 11.3.2 Drilled Shafts

#### 11.3.2.1 General

Drilled shafts are generally large diameter, cast-in-place, open ended, cased concrete piles which are designed to carry extremely heavy loads. Drilled shafts can be the most economical foundation alternative at sites where foundation loads are carried to bearing on dense strata or bedrock. They are also cost effective in water crossings with very shallow bedrock, where cofferdams are difficult or expensive to construct, and where high overturning moments must be resisted.

Drilled shafts are installed by removing soil and rock using drilling methods or other excavation techniques and constructing the foundation element in the excavated hole. The excavated hole may be supported using temporary or permanent casing, drilling slurry or other methods. The hole is then filled with a reinforcement cage and cast-in-place concrete. Drilled shafts are non-displacement elements since the soil volume required for the element is physically removed prior to installation. Thus the effective normal stress adjacent to the pile remains unchanged or is reduced (due to expansion of the soil into the hole before insertion/construction of the load bearing element), and the soil properties and pore water pressure adjacent to the foundation elements are not significantly impacted.

Because drilled shafts do not require a hammer for installation and do not displace the soil, they typically have much less impact on adjacent structures. Depending on the excavation technique used, they can penetrate significant obstructions. Because the method of construction often allows a decrease in the effective stress immediately adjacent to and beneath the tip of the foundation element, the resistance developed will often be less than an equivalently sized driven pile.



Drilled shafts are generally considered fixed to the substructure unit if the reinforcing steel from the shaft is fully developed within the substructure unit.

Drilled shafts vary in diameter from approximately 2.5 to 10 feet. Drilled shafts with diameters greater than 6 feet are generally referred to as piers. Shafts may be designed to transfer load to the bearing stratum through side friction, point-bearing or a combination of both. The drilled shaft may be cased or uncased, depending on the subsurface conditions and depth of bearing.

Drilled shafts have been used on only a small number of structures in Wisconsin. For unusual site conditions, the use of drilled shafts may be advantageous. Design methodologies for drilled shafts can be found in FHWA Publication IF-99-025, *Drilled Shafts: Construction Procedures and Design Methods*.

Strength limit states for drilled shafts are evaluated in the same way as for driven piles. Drivability is not required to be evaluated. The structural resistance of drilled shafts is evaluated in accordance with **LRFD [5.7 and 5.8]**. This includes evaluation of axial resistance, combined axial and flexure, shear and buckling. It is noted that the critical load case for combined axial and flexure may be a load case that results in the minimum axial load or tension.

### 11.3.2.2 Resistance Factors

Resistance factors for drilled shafts are presented in [Table 11.3-6](#) and are selected based on the method used to determine the nominal (ultimate) resistance capacity of the drilled shaft. The design intent is to adjust the resistance factor based on the reliability of the method used to determine the nominal shaft resistance. As with driven piles, the selection of a geotechnical resistance factor should be based on the intended method of resistance verification in the field. Because of the cost and difficulty associated with testing drilled shafts, much more reliance is placed on static analysis methods.



Condition/Resistance Determination Method				Resistance Factor
Static Analysis – Used in Design Phase	Nominal Resistance of Single-Drilled Shaft in Axial Compression, $\phi_{stat}$	Shaft Resistance in Clay	Alpha Method	0.45
		Point Resistance in Clay	Total Stress	0.40
		Shaft Resistance in Sand	Beta Method	0.55
		Point Resistance in Sand	O'Neill and Reese	0.50
		Shaft Resistance in IGMs	O'Neill and Reese	0.60
		Point Resistance in IGMs	O'Neill and Reese	0.55
		Shaft Resistance in Rock	Horvath and Kenney O'Neill and Reese	0.55
			Carter and Kulhawy	0.50
	Point Resistance in Rock	Canadian Geotech. Soc. Pressuremeter Method O'Neill and Reese	0.50	
	Block Failure, $\phi_{bl}$	Clay		0.55
	Uplift Resistance of Single-Drilled Shaft, $\phi_{up}$	Clay	Alpha Method	0.35
		Sand	Beta Method	0.45
		Rock	Horvath and Kenney Carter and Kulhawy	0.40
	Group Uplift Resistance, $\phi_{ug}$	Sand and Clay		0.45
	Horizontal Geotechnical Resistance of Single Shaft or Pile Group	All Soil Types and Rock		1.0

**Table 11.3-6**

Geotechnical Resistance Factors for Drilled Shafts LRFD [Table 10.5.5.2.4-1]

For drilled shafts, the base geotechnical resistance factors in Table 11.3-6 assume groups containing two to four shafts, which are slightly redundant. For groups containing at least four elements, the base geotechnical resistance factors in Table 11.3-6 should be increased by 20%. WisDOT generally uses 4 or more shafts per substructure unit.



**WisDOT policy item:**

WisDOT policy requires a multi-column bent to be designed as a redundant rigid frame. Hence when a bent contains at least 4 columns then the resistance factors in [Table 11.3-6](#) should be increased by 20 percent.

Resistance factors for structural design of drilled shafts are obtained from **LRFD [5.5.4.2.1]**.

### 11.3.2.3 Bearing Resistance

Most drilled shafts provide geotechnical resistance in both end bearing and side friction. Because the rate at which side friction mobilizes is usually much higher than the rate at which end bearing mobilizes, past design practice has been to ignore either end bearing for shafts with significant sockets into the bearing stratum or to ignore skin friction for shafts that do not penetrate significantly into the bearing stratum. This makes evaluation of the geotechnical resistance slightly more complex, because in most cases it is not suitable to simply add the nominal (ultimate) end bearing resistance and the nominal side friction resistance in order to obtain the nominal axial geotechnical resistance.

When computing the nominal geotechnical resistance, consideration must be given to the anticipated construction technique and the level of construction control. If it is anticipated to be difficult to adequately clean out the bottom of the shafts due to the construction technique or subsurface conditions, the end bearing resistance may not be mobilized until very large deflections have occurred. Similarly, if construction techniques or subsurface conditions result in shaft walls that are very smooth or smeared with drill cuttings, side friction may be far less than anticipated.

Because these resistances mobilize at different rates, it may be more appropriate to add the ultimate end bearing to that portion of the side resistance remaining at the end of bearing failure. Or it may be more appropriate to add the ultimate side resistance to that portion of the end bearing mobilized at side resistance failure. Note that consideration of deflection, which is a service limit state, may control over the axial geotechnical resistance since displacements required to mobilize the ultimate end bearing can be excessive. More detailed discussion of design parameters is provided in Appendices C and D of FHWA Publication IF-99-025, *Drilled Shafts: Construction Procedures and Design Methods*.

#### 11.3.2.3.1 Shaft Resistance

The shaft resistance is estimated by summing the friction developed in each stratum. When drilled shafts are socketed in rock, the shaft resistance that is developed in soil is generally ignored to satisfy strain compatibility. The following analysis methods are typically used to compute the static shaft resistance in soil and rock:

- Alpha method for cohesive soil, as specified in **LRFD [10.8.3.5.1]**
- Beta method ( $\beta$ -method) for cohesionless soil, as specified in **LRFD [10.8.3.5.2]**
- Horvath and Kenny method for rock, as specified in **LRFD [10.8.3.5.4]**



### 11.3.2.3.2 Point Resistance

The following analysis methods are typically used to compute the static shaft resistance in soil:

- Alpha method for cohesive soil, as specified in **LRFD [10.8.3.5.1]**
- Beta method ( $\beta$ -method) for cohesionless soil, as specified in **LRFD [10.8.3.5.2]**

The ultimate unit point resistance of a drilled shaft in intact or tightly jointed rock is computed as 2.5 times the unconfined compressive strength of the rock. For rock containing open or filled joints, the geomechanics RMR system is used to characterize the rock, and the ultimate point resistance in rock can be computed as specified in **LRFD [10.8.3.5.4c]**.

### 11.3.2.3.3 Group Capacity

For drilled shaft groups bearing in cohesive soils or ending in a strong layer overlying a weaker layer, the axial resistance is determined using the same approach as used for driven piles. For drilled shaft groups in cohesionless soil, a group efficiency factor is applied to the ultimate resistance of a single drilled shaft. The group efficiency factor is a function of the center-to-center shaft spacing and is linearly interpolated between a value of 0.65 at a center-to-center spacing of 2.5 shaft diameters and a value of 1.0 at a center-to-center spacing of 6.0 shaft diameters. This reduction is more than for driven piles at similar spacing, because construction of drilled shafts tends to loosen the soil between the shafts rather than densify it as with driven piles.

### 11.3.2.4 Lateral Load Resistance

Because drilled shafts are made of reinforced concrete, the lateral analysis should consider the nonlinear variation of bending stiffness with respect to applied bending moment. At small applied moments, the reinforced concrete section performs elastically based on the size of the section and the modulus of elasticity of the concrete. At larger moments, the concrete cracks in tension and the stiffness drops significantly.

### 11.3.2.5 Other Considerations

Detailing of the reinforcing steel in a drilled shaft must consider the constructability of the shaft. The reinforcing cages must be stiff enough to resist bending during handling and concrete placement. In addition, the spaces between reinforcement bars must be kept large enough to permit easy flow of the concrete from the center of shaft to the outside of shaft. These two requirements will generally force the use of larger, more widely spaced longitudinal and transverse reinforcement bars than would be used in the design of an above-grade column. In addition, when using hooked bars to tie the shaft to the foundation, consideration must also be given to concrete placement requirements and temporary casing removal requirements.



### 11.3.3 Micropiles

#### 11.3.3.1 General

In areas of restricted access, close proximity to settlement sensitive existing structures or difficult geology, micropiles may be considered when determining the recommended foundation type. Although typically more expensive than driven pile, constructability considerations may warrant selection of micropiles as the preferred foundation type. A micropile is constructed by drilling a borehole with drill casing, placing reinforcement and grouting the hole. Micropiles are installed by methods that cause minimal disturbance to adjacent structures, soil and the environment. They can be installed in areas with restricted access and vertical clearance. Drill casing permits installation in poor ground conditions. Micropiles are installed with the same type of equipment that is used for ground anchor and grouting projects. Micropiles can be either vertical or battered.

Micropiles are used for structural support of new structures, underpinning existing structures, scour protection and seismic retrofit at existing structures. Micropiles are also used to create a reinforced soil mass for ground stabilization.

With a micropile's smaller cross-sectional area, the pile design is more frequently governed by structural and stiffness considerations. Due to the small pile diameter, point resistance is usually disregarded for design. Steel casing for micropiles is commonly delivered in 5 to 20 foot long flush-joint threaded sections. The casing is typically 5.5 to 12 inches in diameter, with yield strength of 80 ksi. Grout is mixed neat with a water/cement ratio on the order of 0.45 and an unconfined compressive strength of 4 to 6 ksi. Grade 60, 90 and 150 single reinforcement bars are generally used with centralizers.

Grout/ground bond capacity varies directly with the method of placement and pressure used to place the grout. Common methods include grout placement under gravity head, grout placement under low pressure as temporary drill steel is removed and grout placement under high pressure using a packer and regrout tube. Some regrout tubes are equipped to allow regrouting multiple times to increase pile capacity.

#### 11.3.3.2 Design Guidance

Micropiles shall be designed using an Allowable Stress Design approach until an LRFD approach has been developed and approved by the AASHTO Bridge Subcommittee. The design of micropiles shall be done in accordance with FHWA Publication SA-97-070, *Micropile Design and Construction Guidelines Implementation Manual*. When site-specific load tests are performed, the factor of safety can be reduced from 2.5 to 2.0 to determine the allowable axial compressive load capacity of the micropile. The reduction in factor of safety is consistent with the 2005 update to the FHWA guidelines for micropile design.

### 11.3.4 Augered Cast-In-Place Piles

#### 11.3.4.1 General

Augered cast-in-place (ACIP) piles are installed by drilling a hole with a hollow stem auger. When the auger reaches a design depth (elevation) or given torque, sand-cement grout or



concrete is pumped through the hollow-stem auger while the auger is withdrawn from the ground. Reinforcement steel can be placed while the grout is still fluid. A single reinforcement bar can also be installed inside the hollow stem auger before the auger is extracted. ACIP piles are installed by methods that cause minimal disturbance to adjacent structures, soil and the environment. They can also be installed in areas with restricted access and vertical clearance. Temporary casing is not required. In many situations, these foundation systems can be constructed more quickly and less expensively than other deep foundation alternatives.

ACIP piles are generally available in 12- to 36-inch diameters and typically extend to depths of 60 to 70 feet. In some cases, ACIP piles have been installed to depths of more than 100 feet. The torque capacity of the drilling equipment may limit the available penetration depth of ACIP piles, especially in stiff to hard cohesive soil. Typical Wisconsin bridge contractors do not own the necessary equipment to install this type of pile.

ACIP piles may be more economical; however, there is a greater inherent risk in their installation from the quality control standpoint. There is currently no method available to determine pile capacity during construction of ACIP piles. WisDOT does not generally use this pile type unless there are very unusual design/site requirements.

#### 11.3.4.2 Design Guidance

In the future, the FHWA will distribute a Geotechnical Engineering Circular that will provide design and construction guidance for ACIP piles. WisDOT plans to reassess the use of ACIP piles at that time.



**11.4 References**

1. State of Wisconsin, Department of Transportation. *Standard Specifications for Highway and Structure Construction*.
2. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. *Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges*.
3. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. *AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications*.
4. Armour, T., P. Groneck, J. Keeley and S. Sharma. *Micropile Design and Construction Guidelines, Implementation Manual*. FHWA Publication SA-97-070. June 2000.
5. Chellis, R.D. *Pile Foundations*. McGraw Hill. 1961.
6. Hannigan, P.J., G.G. Goble, G. E. Likins and F. Rausche. *Design and Construction of Driven Pile Foundations – Volumes 1 and 2*. FHWA Publication NHI-05-042. 2006.
7. Kimmerling, R.E., R.C. Bachus, P.W. Mayne, J.A. Scheider and T.E. Zettler. *Geotechnical Engineering Circular No. 6: Shallow Foundations*. FHWA Publication SA-02-054. September 2002.
8. Lagrasse, P.F., J.D. Schall and E.V. Richardson. *Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 20: Stream Stability at Highway Structures*, 3rd Edition. FHWA Publication NHI 01-002. March 2001.
9. Lagrasse, P.F., L.W. Zevenbergen, J.D. Schall and P.E. Clopper. *Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 23: Bridge Scour and Stream Instability Countermeasures, Experience, Selection, and Design Guidance*, 2nd Edition. FHWA Publication NHI 01-003. March 2001.
10. Leonards, G.A. *Foundation Engineering*. McGraw Hill. 1962.
11. Michael Baker Jr., Inc. *LRFD for Highway Bridge Substructures and Earth Retaining Structures*. FHWA Publication NHI-05-095. Revised October 2006.
12. *Micropile Design and Construction Reference Manual*. FHWA Publication NHI-05-039. 2005.
13. O’Neil, M.W. and L.C. Reese. *Drilled Shafts: Construction Procedures and Design Methods*. FHWA Publication IF-99-025. August 1999.
14. O’Neil, M.W., F.C. Townsend, K.M. Hassan, A. Butler and P.S. Chan. *Load Transfer for Drilled Shafts in Intermediate Geomaterials*. FHWA Publication RD-95-172. November 1996.
15. Richardson, E.V. and S.R. Davis. *Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 18: Evaluating Scour at Bridges*, 4th Edition. FHWA Publication NHI 01-001. May 2001.



16. Sabatini, P.J. et al. *Geotechnical Engineering Circular No. 5: Evaluation of Soil and Rock Properties*. FHWA Publication IF-02-034. April 2002.
17. Terzaghi, K. and R.B. Peck. *Soil Mechanics in Engineering Practice*, 2nd Edition. Wiley. 1967.
18. Tschebotrarioff, G.P. *Foundations, Retaining and Earth Structures*, 2nd Edition. McGraw Hill. 1973.



### **11.5 Design Examples**

WisDOT will provide design examples.

This section will be expanded later when the design examples are available.