

# A new interpretation method of rapid pile load testing: verification through comparison with static load test

## Une nouvelle méthode d'interprétation des essais rapides de charge sur pieux: vérification par comparaison avec un essai de charge statique

S. Lin\*, S. Kamei, I. Yamamoto  
*Jibanshikenjo Co. Ltd., Tokyo, Japan*

K. Watanabe  
*Aichi Institute of Technology, Nagoya, Japan*

T. Matsumoto  
*Kanazawa University, Kanazawa, Japan*

N. Shkodrani  
*Polytechnic University of Tirana, Tirana, Albania*

\*[s\\_rin@mail.jibanshikenjo.co.jp](mailto:s_rin@mail.jibanshikenjo.co.jp)

**ABSTRACT:** Hybridnamic Rapid Load Test (Hybridnamic RLT) and Static Load Test (SLT) were carried out on three identical open-ended steel pipe piles (SPPs), named Piles No. 2, No. 4 and No. 5, in the Jibanshikenjo test yard at Sashima, Ibaraki Prefecture, Japan. The test piles had an outer diameter of 318.5 mm, a wall thickness of 6.6 mm and an embedment length of 11.0 m. In the RLTs, the classic UnLoading Point Connection (ULPC) method and a new interpretation method: UnLoading Point Connection method invoking Case Method (ULPC\_CM) proposed by the authors, were used to obtain “static” load-displacement curves. According to the Japanese RLT standards, the relative loading duration  $T_r = t_L/(2L/c)$  ( $t_L$  is loading duration,  $L$  is pile length,  $c$  is bar wave velocity in the pile) shall be greater than 5. In Pile No. 4, RLTs with  $T_r = 5$  were carried out after SLT. In Pile No. 2, RLTs with  $T_r = 3$  were carried out intentionally prior to SLT. In Pile No. 5, RLTs with  $T_r = 3$  were carried out after SLT. In this paper, test conditions and test results are presented in detail. It will be shown that the static load-displacement curves from the ULPC method overestimate the SLT results, while the static load-displacement curves from the ULPC\_CM method conform to the SLT results well even if  $T_r$  decreased to 3.

**RÉSUMÉ:** Des tests de charge rapide Hybridnamic (Hybridnamic RLT) et des tests de charge statique (SLT) ont été réalisés sur trois pieux en acier à extrémité ouverte identiques (SPP), nommés Pieux n°2, n°4 et n°5, dans la cour d'essai de Jibanshikenjo à Sashima, préfecture d'Ibaraki, au Japon. Les pieux d'essai avaient un diamètre extérieur de 318,5 mm, une épaisseur de paroi de 6,6 mm et une longueur d'enfouissement de 11,0 m. Dans les RLT, la méthode classique de Connexion du Point de Déchargement (ULPC) ainsi qu'une nouvelle méthode d'interprétation, la méthode de Connexion du Point de Déchargement invoquant la Méthode de Case (ULPC\_CM) proposée par les auteurs, ont été utilisées pour obtenir des courbes de charge-déplacement "statiques". Conformément aux normes japonaises en matière de RLT, la durée relative de chargement  $T_r$  doit être supérieure à 5. Dans le Pieu n°4, des RLT avec  $T_r = 5$  ont été effectués après le SLT. Dans le Pieu n°2, des RLT avec  $T_r = 3$  ont été intentionnellement réalisés avant le SLT. Dans le Pieu n°5, des RLT avec  $T_r = 3$  ont été effectués après le SLT. Dans cet article, les conditions d'essai et les résultats sont présentés en détail. Il sera démontré que les courbes de charge-déplacement statiques obtenues par la méthode ULPC surestiment les résultats du SLT, tandis que les courbes de charge-déplacement statiques obtenues par la méthode ULPC\_CM sont en bonne concordance avec les résultats du SLT, même lorsque  $T_r$  est réduit à 3.

**Keywords:** Rapid load test; static load test; steel pipe pile; interpretation method; case study.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The first standards for the method for Rapid Load Test (RLT) of single piles were published in 2002 (JGS, 2002). In the standards, load test with relative loading duration  $T_r \geq 5$  is defined as RLT, because it is

thought that the wave propagation phenomena can be negligible. In the conventional interpretation method, UnLoading Point Connection method (ULPC), the pile body is modelled as a rigid single mass.

Aiming at widening the range of application of RLT, a new signal interpretation method, the

UnLoading Point Connection method invoking Case method (ULPC\_CM) was proposed (Lin et al., 2023).

In this study, RLTs were carried out on three steel pipe piles (SPPs) with different relative loading durations,  $T_r = 5$  and 3. Furthermore, Static Load Test (SLT) and RLT were carried out in different order. Load-displacement curves obtained from SLT and RLT using two interpretation methods, ULPC and ULPC\_CM, were compared to examine the advantages and reliability of the new interpretation method over the conventional ULPC method.




Figure 1. Locations of SPT, CPTs and test piles.

## 2 OUTLINE OF PILE LOAD TESTS

### 2.1 Site conditions

Load tests were carried out in Sashima test yard of Jibanshikenjo Co. Ltd., Japan. Figure 1 shows the arrangements of soil investigations and test piles. One Standard Penetration Test (SPT) and Electric Cone Penetration Tests (CPTs) were carried out at just points of test piles.

Figure 2 shows the results of soil investigations, and embedment of the instrumented test piles. SPT  $N$ -values from the ground level to a depth  $z = 5$  m are 1 to 3. Below this depth,  $N$ -value increases with depth. Below  $z = 10$  m, a sand layer with  $N \approx 33$  exists. The test piles were driven to  $z = 11$  m. Groundwater table is at  $z = 3.5$  m. It can be seen from the distributions of SPT- $N$  and CPT  $q_t$  (cone resistance corrected for pore pressure at filter) that ground conditions are similar in each test pile location.

### 2.2 Test piles

Table 1 shows the specifications of 5 test steel pipe piles (SPPs). Channel steels were welded on the outer surface of the test SPPs for protecting strain gages and accelerometers.

Table 1. Specifications of test piles.

Item	Value	
	Original	with protection
Pile length, $L$ (m)	11.8	11.0
Embedment length, $L_d$ (m)	11.0	318.5
Outer diameter, $D_o$ (mm)	318.5	305.3
Inner diameter, $D_i$ (mm)	305.3	6.6
Wall thickness, $t_w$ (mm)	6.6	0.00651
Cross-sectional area, $A$ (m <sup>2</sup> )	0.00651	0.00926
Young's modulus, $E$ (GPa)	205	7.81
Density, $\rho$ (ton/m <sup>3</sup> )	7.81	5123
Bar wave velocity, $c$ (m/s)	5123	0.610
Mass, $m$ (ton)	0.610	0.819




Figure 2. Profiles of soil layers, SPT  $N$ -values and CPT  $q_t$ , together with instrumented test piles.

Table 2. List of test sequence.

Pile No.	Driving date (DLT)	Curing (day)	DLT	Curing (day)	Load test	Curing (day)	Load test
1	2022/05/11	1	2022/05/12	30	RLT ( $T_r = 5$ )	2022/06/11	---
2	2022/05/11	1	2022/05/12	33	RLT ( $T_r = 3$ )	2022/06/14	SLT 2022/12/15
3	2022/05/12	---	---	32	RLT ( $T_r = 4$ )	2022/06/13	---
4	2022/05/12	---	---	25	SLT	2022/06/07	RLT ( $T_r = 5$ ) 2022/06/15
5	2022/05/12	---	---	279	SLT	2023/02/15	RLT ( $T_r = 3$ ) 2023/07/05

### 2.3 Test cases

Table 2 shows the test sequence of each test pile. Dynamic Load Tests (DLTs) were carried out during initial pile driving. After curing period of 1 day, DLTs were carried out again on Pile No. 1 and Pile No. 2 to grasp "set-up" phenomena. RLTs with the relative loading duration  $T_r = t_L/(2L/c) = 5$  ( $t_L$  is the loading duration,  $L$  is pile length,  $c$  is bar wave velocity in the pile) were carried out on Pile No. 1 and Pile No. 4, according to the JGS standards (JGS, 2002) in which  $T_r \geq 5$  is required. RLTs with  $T_r = 3$  were carried out on Piles No. 2 and No. 5 intentionally. If RLT with shorter  $T_r$  is reasonable, it will be possible to apply RLT to piles with longer length and greater bearing capacity using the current RLT devices.

## 3 INTERPRETATION METHODS OF RLT

In this section, interpretation methods of RLT signals used in this research are described.

### 3.1 ULPC method

The ULPC method is an extension method of UnLoading Point (ULP) method. In ULPC, the pile is treated as a rigid single mass. To obtain soil resistance  $R_{soil}$ , the pile inertial force  $R_a = m\alpha$  ( $m$  = the pile mass and  $\alpha$  = acceleration at pile head) is subtracted from the rapid load  $F_{rapid}$ . ULP is the point of  $R_{soil}$  at the maximum pile displacement  $w$ , where pile velocity  $v = 0$ . Hence,  $R_{soil}$  at ULP is equal to the static soil resistance  $R_w$ . By connecting ULPs from multiple blows, static load-displacement relation is easily obtained.

### 3.2 ULPC\_CM method (Lin et al., 2023)

The Case method (Raushe et al., 1985) is a method based on the one-dimensional stress-wave theory, in which the penetration resistance  $R_t (= R_{soil})$  of a pile during driving is estimated.

First, the downward traveling wave  $F_d$  and the upward traveling wave  $F_u$  are calculated from the measured dynamic signals (axial force  $F$  and pile velocity  $v$ ) by means of Eqs. (1) and (2), respectively; then, by using Eq. (3), the time variation of  $R_t (= R_{soil})$  is obtained (Figure 3):

$$F_d(x_m, t) = \frac{F(x_m, t) + Z \cdot v(x_m, t)}{2} \quad (1)$$

$$F_u(x_m, t) = \frac{F(x_m, t) - Z \cdot v(x_m, t)}{2} \quad (2)$$

$$R_t(x_m, t) = F_d\left(x_m, t - \frac{L_m}{c}\right) + F_u\left(x_m, t + \frac{L_m}{c}\right) \quad (3)$$

where,  $x$  = coordinate along the pile axis (pile head = 0),  $x_m$  = measurement position,  $L_m$  = pile length from  $x_m$  to pile tip,  $Z$  = impedance ( $=EA/c$ ).




Figure 3. Case method (Raushe et al. 1985).

The Case method evaluates the penetration resistance of the pile during driving, but the load-displacement relationship of the pile cannot be obtained by this method alone. Since the Case method is based on the one-dimensional wave theory, the penetration resistance of the pile can be evaluated correctly regardless of the pile length.

In the ULPC\_CM method, multiple blows (rapid load tests) are applied to a pile. The time variation of soil resistance  $R_{soil}$  is obtained from the Case method, and the time variation of pile displacement  $w$  is directly measured. Hence,  $R_{soil} - w$  relation is easily obtained.  $R_{soil}$  at the maximum pile displacement can be regarded as the static resistance  $R_w$ . Similar to the ULPC method, static load-displacement curve is constructed by connecting ULPs from the multiple blows.

As the ULPC\_CM method is based on the one-dimensional stress-wave theory, it has the advantage of not requiring correction for pile inertia  $R_a$ . Hence, the ULPC\_CM method would be applied to RLTs on piles with  $T_r < 5$ .

## 4 COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF SLT AND RLT

### 4.1 SLT

SLTs were carried out on Piles No. 4, No. 2 and No. 5. The results of SLT will be shown in comparison with the RLT results later.

### 4.2 RLT (Pile No.4, $T_r = 5$ )

In Pile No. 4, RLTs were carried out after SLT. In RLTs, a hammer mass  $m_h = 3.5$  ton was used and 8 blows (RLTs) were applied to the pile with increasing drop height  $h$  from 0.03 to 0.83 m. Loading duration  $t_L$  was adjusted by changing the stiffness of cushion placed on the pile head to have  $T_r \geq 5$ .

Figure 4 shows the measured dynamic signals, rapid load  $F_{rapid}$ , pile head displacement  $w$ , velocity  $v$  and acceleration  $\alpha$ , in the RLT at  $h = 0.83$  m (8th blow). In the figure, soil resistance  $R_{soil}$  (ULPC) from the ULPC method,  $R_{soil}$  (ULPC\_CM) from the ULPC\_CM method are shown together with  $F_{rapid}$ . Furthermore,  $F_d$  and  $F_u$  are also shown.

$R_{soil}$  (ULPC\_CM) at the maximum  $w$  where  $v = 0$  is defined as the static resistance  $R_w$  ( $R_{ULP}$ ) in a similar way to the ULPC method. Static load-displacement relation can be obtained by connecting  $R_{ULP}$  from ULPC\_CM from multiple blows (RLTs).

Figure 5 shows the static load-displacement relations from ULPC and ULPC\_CM compared with the SLT result. It is seen from the RLT results that the

static soil resistance  $R_w$  from ULPC is larger than that from ULPC\_CM. The load-displacement relation from ULPC\_CM matches with the SLT result very well.




Figure 4. RLT signals (Pile No. 4,  $h = 0.83$  m).




Figure 5. Comparison of load-displacement curves from SLT, RLTs with ULPC and ULPC\_CM (Pile No. 4).

### 4.3 RLT (Pile No.2, $T_r = 3$ )

In Pile No. 2, SLT was carried out after RLTs. In RLTs, a hammer mass  $m_h = 0.95$  ton was used and 12 blows (RLTs) with  $T_r = 3$  were applied to the pile with increasing drop height  $h$  from 0.02 to 3.84 m.

Figure 6 shows the measured  $F_{rapid}$ ,  $w$ ,  $v$  and  $\alpha$  in the RLT in the 8th blow ( $h = 1.35$  m) with  $T_r = 3.2$ . In the figure,  $R_{soil}$  (ULPC) and  $R_{soil}$  (ULPC\_CM) are

shown together with  $F_{\text{rapid}}$ . Furthermore,  $F_d$  and  $F_u$  are also shown.

Figure 7 shows the static load-displacement relations from ULPC and ULPC\_CM compared with SLT result. The load-displacement relation from ULPC\_CM matches with the SLT result very well again, even for a shorter  $T_r \approx 3$ .




Figure 6. RLT signals (Pile No. 2,  $h = 1.35$  m).




Figure 7. Comparison of load-displacement curves from SLT, RLTs with ULPC and ULPC\_CM (Pile No. 2).

#### 4.4 RLT (Pile No.5, $T_r = 3$ )

In Pile No. 5, RLTs were carried out after SLT. In RLTs, a hammer mass  $m_h = 0.95$  ton was used and 13

blows (RLTs) with  $T_r = 3$  were applied to the pile with increasing drop height  $h$  from 0.02 to 3.84 m.

Figure 8 shows the measured  $F_{\text{rapid}}$ ,  $w$ ,  $v$  and  $\alpha$  in the RLT in the 13th blow ( $h = 3.84$  m) with  $T_r = 3.5$ .

Figure 9 shows the static load-displacement relations from ULPC and ULPC\_CM compared with SLT result. The load-displacement relation from ULPC\_CM matches with the SLT result very well again, even for  $T_r \approx 3$ .




Figure 8. RLT signals (Pile No. 5,  $h = 3.84$  m).




Figure 9. Comparison of load-displacement curves from SLT, RLTs with ULPC and ULPC\_CM (Pile No. 5).

#### 4.5 Comparison of results of RLTs having different relative loading durations

Figure 10 shows the comparison of load-displacement curves from SLT and RLTs with ULPC interpretation for the three test piles. ULPC result in case of  $T_r = 5$  is consistent with the SLT result. However, the results in cases of  $T_r = 3$  fluctuate and overestimate the SLT result. This suggests that ULPC is applicable for RLTs with  $T_r \geq 5$  as specified in the JGS standards.




Figure 10. Comparison of load-displacement curves from SLT, RLTs with ULPC.

Figure 11 shows the comparison of load-displacement curves from SLT and RLTs with ULPC\_CM interpretation for the three test piles.

Despite a slight underestimation, the load-displacement curves in both cases of  $T_r = 3$  and 5 are comparable to the SLT results.




Figure 11. Comparison of load-displacement curves from SLT, RLTs with ULPC\_CM.

Figure 12 shows an example of application ranges of RLTs with different  $T_r$  in case of  $m_h = 100$  ton and  $h = 3.00$  m. The stiffness of the cushion is varied so that required  $T_r$  is satisfied.

With the widened range of application of RLT by decreasing  $T_r$  in RLT with ULPC\_CM method, it is possible to apply RLTs to a longer and higher capacity pile with the same loading device. On the other hand,

it is possible to carry out RLT with the same load by using a lighter hammer, providing a more economical and convenient testing option.




Figure 12. Application ranges of RLTs with different  $T_r$ .

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

In this study, comparative RLTs and SLTs were carried out on driven steel pipe piles to examine the validity of the new interpretation methods: ULPC\_CM.

RLTs with  $T_r = 5$  were carried out according to the JGS Standards in which  $T_r$  is required to be equal or greater than 5. Furthermore, RLTs with  $T_r = 3$  were carried out to widen the application of RLT.

The static load-displacement relations from the ULPC\_CM method matched with the SLT results very well even in cases of  $T_r = 3$ , regardless of order of SLT and RLT.

It can be said that it is possible to apply the RLT with ULPC\_CM method to piles with longer length and greater bearing capacity using the current RLT devices.

The authors are planning to conduct similar comparisons between RLTs and SLT for different types of piles to examine the applicability of ULPC\_CM method in the near future.

## REFERENCES

- Japanese Geotechnical Society (JGS) (2002) JGS 1815-2002 Method for Rapid Load Test of Single Piles.
- Lin, S., Kamei, S., Yamamoto, I. and Matsumoto, T. (2023). Hybriddynamic rapid load testing with UnLoading Point Connection method invoking Case method. *Proc. the 17th Asian Regional Conference on Soil Mech. and Geotech. Engineering 2023 (Smart Geotechnics for Smart Societies)*, Nur-Sultan, pp. 1425-1429.
- Raushe, F., Goble, G. and Likins, G. E. Jr. (1985). Dynamic determination of pile capacity. *ASCE Jour. Geotech. Div.*, 111(3), pp. 367-383. DOI:10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9410(1985)111:3(367).

# INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR SOIL MECHANICS AND GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING



*This paper was downloaded from the Online Library of the International Society for Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering (ISSMGE). The library is available here:*

<https://www.issmge.org/publications/online-library>

*This is an open-access database that archives thousands of papers published under the Auspices of the ISSMGE and maintained by the Innovation and Development Committee of ISSMGE.*

*The paper was published in the proceedings of the 18th European Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering and was edited by Nuno Guerra. The conference was held from August 26<sup>th</sup> to August 30<sup>th</sup> 2024 in Lisbon, Portugal.*