

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	viii
List of Figures	xvi
List of Tables	xxvi

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1	GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2	OBJECTIVES	2
1.3	ORGANIZATION OF THESIS	3

Chapter 2 BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	BACKGROUND	5
2.2	COMPOSITE PILE BACKGROUND	5
2.2.1	Types of composite piles	6
2.2.1.1	Steel pipe core pile	6
2.2.1.2	Structurally reinforced plastic matrix pile	8
2.2.1.3	Concrete-filled FRP tube pile	9
2.3	LITERATURE REVIEW FOR THE COMPOSITE PILES SELECTED	10
2.3.1	Structural behavior	10
2.3.1.1	Concrete-filled FRP composite piles	10
2.3.1.1.1	Behavior under axial loading	11
2.3.1.1.2	Flexural behavior	15
2.3.1.1.3	Behavior under combined bending and axial loading	17
2.3.1.2	Steel reinforced recycled plastic composite piles	19
2.3.2	Long-term durability behavior	20
2.3.2.1	Concrete-filled FRP composite piles	20
2.3.2.2	Steel reinforced recycled plastic composite piles	22
2.3.3	Geotechnical behavior	22
2.3.3.1	Pile driveability	22
2.3.3.2	Lateral load capacity	25
2.3.3.3	Axial load capacity	26
2.4	SUMMARY	27

Chapter 3
EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF INTERFACE BEHAVIOR
BETWEEN COMPOSITE PILES AND TWO SANDS

3.1	INTRODUCTION	28
3.2	SOIL MATERIALS	31
	3.2.1 Index properties	31
	3.2.2 Direct shear tests of sands	33
3.3	PILE SURFACES	38
	3.3.1 Introduction	38
	3.3.2 Surface topography characterization	38
	3.3.3 Interface hardness	44
3.4	INTERFACE SHEAR TESTS	45
3.5	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	55
	3.5.1 Multiple linear regression for density sand $\tan d_{\text{peak}}$ values	56
	3.5.2 Multiple linear regression for density sand $\tan d_{\text{cv}}$ values	57
	3.5.3 Multiple linear regression for model sand $\tan d_{\text{peak}}$ values	58
	3.5.4 Multiple linear regression for model sand $\tan d_{\text{cv}}$ values	59
	3.5.5 Observations from the linear regression analyses results	60
	3.5.6 Influence of angularity of sand	61
3.6	SUMMARY	61

Chapter 4
EXPERIMENTAL DURABILITY STUDY OF FRP COMPOSITE PILES

4.1	INTRODUCTION	64
4.2	BACKGROUND ON DEGRADATION OF GLASS FRP COMPOSITES	64
4.3	LABORATORY STUDY OF DURABILITY	66
	4.3.1 Description of test specimens	67
	4.3.1.1 Specimens from Lancaster Composites Inc.	67
	4.3.1.2 Specimens from Hardcore Composites Inc.	69
	4.3.2 Test equipment and procedures	72
	4.3.2.1 Burnoff tests	72
	4.3.2.2 Axial tension tests	73
	4.3.2.3 Hoop tension tests	74
	4.3.2.4 Freeze-thaw testing	75
	4.3.3 Baseline mechanical properties	77
	4.3.3.1 Longitudinal tension	77
	4.3.3.2 Hoop tension	78

4.3.4	Properties as a function of submergence time and moisture	79
4.3.4.1	Moisture absorption tests	79
4.3.4.2	Diffusion properties	82
4.3.4.3	Measured properties as a function of submergence time and moisture	89
4.3.4.3.1	Aged properties for Lancaster 24-inch FRP tube	89
4.3.4.3.2	Aged properties for Lancaster 12-inch FRP tube	91
4.3.4.3.3	Aged properties for Hardcore 24-inch FRP tube	95
4.3.4.3.4	Aged properties for Hardcore 12-inch FRP tube	97
4.3.5	Freeze-thaw degradation of saturated FRP samples	102
4.3.6	SEM imaging	104
4.4	LONG TERM STRUCTURAL CAPACITY OF COMPOSITE PILE.....	106
4.4.1	Long term structural capacity of composite pile	107
4.4.2	Comments related to the axial strain levels in piles	109
4.5	SUMMARY	110

Chapter 5
FIELD LOAD TESTS AT THE ROUTE 40 BRIDGE

5.1	INTRODUCTION	113
5.2	DESCRIPTION OF THE BRIDGE.....	113
5.2.1	The former bridge	113
5.2.2	The new bridge	115
5.3	DESCRIPTION OF TEST PILES	117
5.3.1	Composite test piles	117
5.3.2	Prestressed concrete test pile	119
5.4	SOIL CONDITIONS AT THE TEST SITE.....	120
5.5	PILE FABRICATION AND INSTALLATION	122
5.5.1	Fabrication of the piles	122
5.5.2	Pile installation	124
5.6	STATNAMIC FIELD TESTING OF TEST PILES	128
5.6.1	Instrumentation	129
5.6.2	Axial load tests	130
5.6.3	Lateral load tests	134
5.7	COMPOSITE PILES IN THE NEW ROUTE 40 BRIDGE.....	144

5.7.1	Connection of piles with pile cap beam	144
5.8	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	148

Chapter 6
FIELD LOAD TESTS AT THE ROUTE 351 BRIDGE

6.1	INTRODUCTION	150
6.2	DESCRIPTION OF THE BRIDGE.....	150
6.2.1	The original bridge	150
6.2.2	The new bridge	153
6.3	DESCRIPTION OF TEST PILES	154
6.3.1	Prestressed concrete test pile	155
6.3.2	FRP composite test pile	156
6.3.3	Polyethylene composite test pile	158
6.4	SOIL CONDITIONS AT THE TEST SITE.....	161
6.4.1	Geology	161
6.4.2	Subsurface conditions	162
6.4.3	Hampton River	163
6.5	TEST PILE INSTRUMENTATION AND FABRICATION.....	165
6.5.1	Test pile instrumentation	165
6.5.2	Fabrication of prestressed concrete test pile	170
6.5.3	Fabrication of FRP composite test pile	171
6.5.4	Fabrication of plastic composite test pile	175
6.6	PILE INSTALLATION AND DYNAMIC TESTING.....	177
6.6.1	Pile driving	177
6.6.2	Dynamic testing	181
6.7	PILE INTEGRITY TESTING OF TEST PILES	184
6.8	FIELD TESTING OF TEST PILES	189
6.8.1	Axial load tests	189
6.8.1.1	Residual stresses	192
6.8.1.2	Load transfer	194
6.8.2	Lateral load tests	197
6.9	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	200

Chapter 7
ANALYSES OF THE AXIAL LOAD TESTS AT THE ROUTE 351 BRIDGE SITE

7.1	INTRODUCTION	201
7.2	AXIAL PILE CAPACITY.....	201
7.2.1	Methods to estimate axial load capacity of driven piles in sand	201
7.2.1.1	Nordlund’s method	203
7.2.1.2	API method	204
7.2.1.3	LCPC method	207
7.2.1.4	Imperial College method	208
7.2.2	Predicted axial capacities	212
7.2.2.1	Nordlund method predictions	213
7.2.2.2	API method predictions	215
7.2.2.3	LCPC method predictions	217
7.2.2.4	Imperial College method predictions	218
7.2.3	Summary of axial pile capacity predictions	219
7.3	LOAD SETTLEMENT BEHAVIOR OF AXIALLY LOADED SINGLE PILES	221
7.3.1	Introduction	221
7.3.2	Background of the load transfer method for pile settlement predictions	222
7.3.3	Predictions using empirical load transfer curves	224
7.3.3.1	Predictions using load transfer curves recommended by API (1993)	224
7.3.3.1.1	Load transfer curves recommended by API (1993)	224
7.3.3.1.2	Maximum shaft shear stress distributions recommended by API (1993)	225
7.3.3.1.3	Prediction for the prestressed concrete test pile	226
7.3.3.1.4	Prediction for the FRP test pile	227
7.3.3.1.5	Prediction for plastic test pile	228
7.3.3.2	Predictions using Vijayvergiya (1977) load transfer curves	229
7.3.3.2.1	Load transfer curves recommended by Vijavergiya (1997)	229
7.3.3.2.2	Maximum shaft shear stress distributions	231
7.3.3.2.3	Tip resistances	232
7.3.3.2.4	Prediction for prestressed concrete test pile	233

7.3.3.2.5	Prediction for FRP test pile	234
7.3.3.2.6	Prediction for plastic test pile	234
7.3.3.3	Comments on the predictions obtained using empirical load transfer curves	235
7.3.4	Predictions using theoretical load transfer curves	236
7.3.4.1	Theoretical load transfer curves for a linear elastic soil	236
7.3.4.2	Theoretical load transfer curves for a non-linear soil	242
7.3.4.2.1	Initial shear modulus	242
7.3.4.2.2	Modeling soil nonlinearity using hyperbolic models	244
7.3.4.3	Input parameters used for the Route 351 load transfer curves	250
7.3.4.3.1	Hyperbola parameters	251
7.3.4.3.2	Initial shear modulus	251
7.3.4.3.3	Maximum shear stresses	252
7.3.4.3.4	Ultimate tip resistance	253
7.3.4.4	Prediction for the concrete test pile	253
7.3.4.5	Prediction for the FRP test pile	254
7.3.4.6	Prediction for the plastic test pile	255
7.3.4.7	Comments on the predictions using theoretical load transfer curves	255
7.3.5	Residual stresses	256
7.4	CONCLUSIONS.....	256

Chapter 8

ANALYSES OF THE LATERAL LOAD TESTS AT THE ROUTE 351 BRIDGE

8.1	INTRODUCTION	258
8.2	GOVERNING DIFFERENTIAL EQUATION FOR THE LATERALLY LOADED PILE PROBLEM	258
8.2.1	Assumptions and limitations of the governing differential equation.	263
8.3	METHODOLOGY USED TO ANALYZE THE LATERALLY LOADED TEST PILES	264
8.3.1	P-y curves	265
8.3.1.1	Introduction	265
8.3.1.2	P-y curves for sands based on recommendations by Reese et al. 1974	269
8.3.2	P-y method of analysis	271

8.4	NUMERICAL ANALYSES RESULTS	273
8.4.1	General input information	273
8.4.1.1	Pile information	273
8.4.1.2	Upper soil stratigraphy information for p-y analyses	274
8.4.2	P-y analyses results	276
8.4.2.1	Analyses for the prestressed concrete test pile	276
8.4.2.2	Analyses for the FRP pile	282
8.4.2.3	Analyses for the plastic pile	286
8.4.3	Comparison of the initial p-y modulus curves for the three test piles	291
8.5	LIMITATIONS OF P-Y ANALYSES	292
8.6	SUMMARY	293

Chapter 9 LONG TERM MONITORING

9.1	INTRODUCTION	295
9.2	INSTRUMENTED PRODUCTION PILES	296
9.2.1	Prestressed concrete production pile	297
9.2.2	FRP composite production pile	299
9.3	SOIL CONDITIONS AT THE INSTRUMENTED PRODUCTION PILES	303
9.4	PILE INSTALLATION AND DYNAMIC TESTING.....	306
9.4.1	Pile driving	306
9.4.2	Dynamic testing	307
9.5	PILE INTEGRITY TESTING OF TEST PILES	309
9.6	MONITORING DATA GATHERED TO DATE	312
9.7	SUMMARY	316

Chapter 10 COST COMPARISON

10.1	INTRODUCTION	318
10.2	COST INFORMATION FOR THE ROUTE 40 BRIDGE PROJECT.....	318
10.3	COST INFORMATION FOR THE ROUTE 351 BRIDGE PROJECT.....	319
10.3.1	Hardcore FRP composite pile	319
10.3.2	Plastic pile	319
10.3.3	Prestressed concrete pile	320
10.3.4	Summary of the Route 351 cost information	320
10.4	SUMMARY	320

Chapter 11
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

11.1	INTRODUCTION	322
11.2	SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES AND CONCLUSIONS	324
	11.2.1 Literature review	324
	11.2.2 Interface study	324
	11.2.3 Durability study	326
	11.2.4 Field tests at the Route 40 Bridge	327
	11.2.5 Field tests at the Route 351 Bridge	328
	11.2.6 Axial analyses	329
	11.2.7 Lateral analyses	331
	11.2.8 Long term monitoring	332
	11.2.9 Cost information of composite piles	333
11.3	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK	334
	REFERENCES	337
	APPENDIX A – INTERFACE TEST RESULTS	355
	APPENDIX B – MOISTURE DIFFUSION INTO A CYLINDRICAL FRP COMPOSITE	370
	APPENDIX C – STRUCTURAL TEST RESULTS FROM COMPOSITE PILE CUTOFF SECTIONS FROM THE ROUTE 40 BRIDGE PROJECT	375
	APPENDIX D – GEOTECHNICAL FIELD INVESTIGATIONS AT THE ROUTE 351 BRIDGE TEST SITE	380
	VITA	396

LIST OF FIGURES

Chapter 2

Figure 2.1	Degradation of conventional piles (Iskander and Hassan 1998)	5
Figure 2.2	Common types of composite piles	6
Figure 2.3	Confinement effect of FRP tube on concrete (Fam and Rizkalla 2001)	12
Figure 2.4	Experimental versus predicted load-strain behavior using Fam and Rizkalla model	15
Figure 2.5	Strip elements for sectional analysis (Mirmiran and Shahawy 1996)	16
Figure 2.6	Experimental versus analytical moment-curvature response (adapted from Fam and Rizkalla 2002)	17
Figure 2.7	Interaction diagrams for concrete-filled FRP tubes (Mirmiran 1999)	18
Figure 2.8	Illustration of the moisture absorption related durability model	21
Figure 2.9	Scanning electron microscope image showing evidence of damage in the FRP due to moisture absorption (McBagonluri et al. 2000)	21

Chapter 3

Figure 3.1	Influence of soil-pile interface friction on pile capacity	29
Figure 3.2	Grain size curves of test sands	32
Figure 3.3	Microscopic views of the test sands	32
Figure 3.4	Direct shear test results for Density sand (average $D_r=70\%$)	34
Figure 3.5	Direct shear test results for Density sand (average $D_r=100\%$)	35
Figure 3.6	Direct shear test results for Model sand (average $D_r=75\%$)	36
Figure 3.7	Stylus profilometer sketch (Johnson 2000)	39
Figure 3.8	Graphical representation of roughness parameters R_t , S_m , and R_a	39
Figure 3.9	Surface characteristics of Lancaster FRP composite pile	40
Figure 3.10	Surface characteristics of Hardcore FRP composite pile	41
Figure 3.11	Surface characteristics of Hardcore FRP plate	41
Figure 3.12	Surface characteristics of Hardcore surface treated FRP plate	42
Figure 3.13	Surface characteristics of Plastic Piling plastic composite pile	42
Figure 3.14	Surface characteristics of prestressed concrete pile	43
Figure 3.15	Surface characteristics of steel sheet pile	43
Figure 3.16	Sketch of modified interface shear test setup	46
Figure 3.17	Typical interface shear test results for Density sand ($s_h^? \sim 100$ kPa)	49
Figure 3.18	Typical interface shear test results for Model sand ($s_h^? \sim 100$ kPa)	50

Figure 3.19	Interface shear strength envelopes for Lancaster Composite FRP shell	51
Figure 3.20	Interface shear strength envelopes for Hardcore Composite FRP shell	51
Figure 3.21	Interface shear strength envelopes for untreated Hardcore FRP plate	52
Figure 3.22	Interface shear strength envelopes for treated Hardcore FRP plate	52
Figure 3.23	Interface shear strength envelopes for PPI plastic	53
Figure 3.24	Interface shear strength envelopes for concrete	53
Figure 3.25	Interface shear strength envelopes for steel	54
Figure 3.26	Goodness of fit for multiple linear regression on Density sand $\tan d_{\text{peak}}$ values	56
Figure 3.27	Goodness of fit for multiple linear regression on Density sand $\tan d_{\text{cv}}$ values	57
Figure 3.28	Goodness of fit for multiple linear regression on Model sand $\tan d_{\text{peak}}$ values	58
Figure 3.29	Goodness of fit for multiple linear regression on Model sand $\tan d_{\text{cv}}$ values	59

Chapter 4

Figure 4.1	Burnoff testing	73
Figure 4.2	Typical tension test setup	74
Figure 4.3	Typical split disk test setup	75
Figure 4.4	Freeze-thaw chamber	75
Figure 4.5	Freeze-thaw fixture	76
Figure 4.6	Average freeze-thaw cycle undergone by FRP samples	76
Figure 4.7	Representative baseline longitudinal tension stress-strain curves	78
Figure 4.8	Representative baseline hoop tension stress-strain curves	79
Figure 4.9	Absorption curves for Lancaster 12-inch FRP tube	80
Figure 4.10	Absorption curves for Lancaster 24-inch FRP tube	80
Figure 4.11	Absorption curves for Hardcore 12-inch FRP tube	81
Figure 4.12	Absorption curves for Hardcore 24-inch FRP tube	81
Figure 4.13	Selected diffusion analyses for Lancaster 12-inch FRP samples	84
Figure 4.14	Selected diffusion analyses for Lancaster 24-inch FRP samples	85
Figure 4.15	Selected diffusion analyses for Hardcore 12-inch FRP samples	86
Figure 4.16	Selected diffusion analyses for Hardcore 24-inch FRP samples	87

Figure 4.17	Longitudinal tensile properties versus submergence time for Lancaster 24-inch FRP tube	90
Figure 4.18	Hoop tensile properties versus submergence time for Lancaster 24-inch FRP tube	91
Figure 4.19	Longitudinal tensile properties versus submergence time for Lancaster 12-inch FRP tube	92
Figure 4.20	Hoop tensile properties versus submergence time for Lancaster 12-inch FRP tube	93
Figure 4.21	Longitudinal tensile properties versus moisture content for Lancaster 12-inch FRP tube	94
Figure 4.22	Hoop tensile properties versus moisture content for Lancaster 12-in FRP tube	95
Figure 4.23	Longitudinal tensile properties versus submergence time for Hardcore 24-inch FRP tube	96
Figure 4.24	Longitudinal tensile properties versus moisture content for Hardcore 24-inch FRP tube	97
Figure 4.25	Longitudinal tensile properties versus submergence time for Hardcore 12-inch FRP tube	98
Figure 4.26	Hoop tensile properties versus submergence time for Hardcore 12-inch FRP tube	99
Figure 4.27	Longitudinal tensile properties versus moisture content for Hardcore 12-inch FRP tube	100
Figure 4.28	Hoop tensile properties versus moisture content for Hardcore 12-inch FRP tube	101
Figure 4.29	Influence of freeze-thaw cycles on the longitudinal tensile properties for the Lancaster 24-inch FRP tube	101
Figure 4.30	Influence of freeze-thaw cycles on the longitudinal tensile properties for the Lancaster 12-inch FRP tube	102
Figure 4.31	Influence of freeze-thaw cycles on the longitudinal tensile properties for the Hardcore 24-inch FRP tube	103
Figure 4.32	Influence of freeze-thaw cycles on the longitudinal tensile properties for the Hardcore 12-inch FRP tube	103
Figure 4.33	SEM images for Lancaster 24-inch FRP tube	105
Figure 4.34	SEM images for Lancaster 12-inch FRP tube	105
Figure 4.35	SEM images for Hardcore 24-inch FRP tube	105
Figure 4.36	SEM images for Hardcore 12-inch FRP tube	106

Figure 4.37	Estimated long-term axial capacity of the 12-inch Lancaster pile	108
Figure 4.38	Estimated long-term flexural capacity of the 12-inch Lancaster pile	109

Chapter 5

Figure 5.1	Location map of the Route 40 Bridge Project in Sussex County, Virginia (Fam et al. 2003)	114
Figure 5.2	Former Route 40 bridge	114
Figure 5.3	Signs of deterioration of the former Route 40 bridge (Fam et al. 2003)	115
Figure 5.4	Schematic of the new Route 40 bridge	116
Figure 5.5	Concrete-filled FRP tubular piles	118
Figure 5.6	Stress-strain response of concrete used in the composite pile	119
Figure 5.7	Reinforcement details of prestressed concrete pile	120
Figure 5.8	Simplified soil stratigraphy near test pile area	121
Figure 5.9	Fabrication of prestressed concrete pile	122
Figure 5.10	Fabrication of concrete-filled FRP piles	123
Figure 5.11	Driving of test piles	124
Figure 5.12	Driving records for test piles	125
Figure 5.13	End-of-driving PDA recordings	127
Figure 5.14	Test pile instrumentation	130
Figure 5.15	Axial load test setup using the Statnamic device	131
Figure 5.16	Pile head displacement versus equivalent axial static load	132
Figure 5.17	Axial load – axial strain behavior of test piles	133
Figure 5.18	Variation of axial strain along pile length for 3 Statnamic load cycles	133
Figure 5.19	Lateral Statnamic setup at the Route 40 project	135
Figure 5.20	Displacement time histories at the loading point for both piles (Brown et al. 2003)	136
Figure 5.21	Peak lateral displacement profiles for both test piles at different cycles of Statnamic load	137
Figure 5.22	Calculated static and dynamic (static+damping) resistances for both test piles	141
Figure 5.23	Moment-curvature responses for composite and prestressed concrete piles	143
Figure 5.24	Computed and measure lateral load-displacement response for both test piles (Brown et al. 2002)	144
Figure 5.25	Details of pile head showing the bars used to connect the pile to cap beam	146

Figure 5.26	Connection of composite piles to cap beam at Pier No. 2	146
Figure 5.27	Pier No. 2 including the composite piles and reinforced concrete cap beam	147
Figure 5.28	The new Route 40 bridge over the Nottoway River in Virginia	147

Chapter 6

Figure 6.1	Location map of the Route 351 bridge in Hampton, Virginia	151
Figure 6.2	Aerial view of the Route 351 bridge in Hampton, Virginia	151
Figure 6.3	Wide angle views of the original Route 351 bridge	152
Figure 6.4	Signs of deterioration of the original Route 351 bridge	153
Figure 6.5	Schematic of the new Route 351 bridge	154
Figure 6.6	Test pile cross section details	155
Figure 6.7	Test pile material properties	157
Figure 6.8	Axial load – axial strain behavior of test piles	158
Figure 6.9	Flexural characteristics for the three test piles	160
Figure 6.10	Location of test pile site at the Route 351 bridge	161
Figure 6.11	Simplified soil stratigraphy near test pile area	163
Figure 6.12	Pile load test layout	164
Figure 6.13	Instrumentation layout for prestressed concrete test pile	166
Figure 6.14	Instrumentation layout for FRP composite test pile	168
Figure 6.15	Instrumentation layout for plastic composite test pile	169
Figure 6.16	Fabrication of prestressed concrete test pile	170
Figure 6.17	Fabrication of concrete-filled FRP piles	172
Figure 6.18	Setup used for concrete filling of FRP composite piles	173
Figure 6.19	Concrete filling of FRP composite piles	174
Figure 6.20	Rebar cage of the plastic composite test pile	175
Figure 6.21	Photos of manufacturing process for the plastic composite test pile	176
Figure 6.22	Driving records for test piles	177
Figure 6.23	Installation of prestressed concrete test pile	178
Figure 6.24	Installation of FRP composite test pile	179
Figure 6.25	Installation of plastic composite test pile	180
Figure 6.26	PDA recordings during restrike	182
Figure 6.27	Selected photos of PIT tests on test piles	185
Figure 6.28	PIT sounding on the prestressed concrete test pile before installation	186
Figure 6.29	PIT sounding on the prestressed concrete test pile after installation	186
Figure 6.30	PIT sounding on the FRP composite test pile before installation	187
Figure 6.31	PIT sounding on the FRP composite test pile after installation	187

Figure 6.32	PIT sounding on the plastic composite test pile before installation	188
Figure 6.33	PIT sounding on the plastic composite test pile after installation	188
Figure 6.34	Photos of axial load test of prestressed concrete pile	190
Figure 6.35	Axial load test results	191
Figure 6.36	Distribution of residual loads	193
Figure 6.37	Distribution of residual stresses	193
Figure 6.38	Load distribution for the three test piles at the Davisson failure loads	194
Figure 6.39	Mobilized average unit shaft resistance – toe resistance relationships for the three test piles	196
Figure 6.40	Apparent strength gain with time measured in the three test piles	197
Figure 6.41	Deformed shapes of piles at different lateral loads	198
Figure 6.42	Measured lateral deflections at ground surface for the three test piles	199
Chapter 7		
Figure 7.1	Load transfer in an axially loaded pile	202
Figure 7.2	Interpreted average CPT and SPT design profiles for Route 351 test site	212
Figure 7.3	Accuracy of Nordlund method predictions using d values from Nordlund’s charts	213
Figure 7.4	Accuracy of Nordlund method predictions using d values from interface shear tests	214
Figure 7.5	Accuracy of API method predictions using d values from Table 7.1	215
Figure 7.6	Accuracy of API method predictions using d values from interface shear tests	216
Figure 7.7	Accuracy of LCPC method predictions using “steel pile” assumption	217
Figure 7.8	Accuracy of LCPC method predictions using “concrete pile” assumption	218
Figure 7.9	Accuracy of IC method predictions using d values from interface shear tests	219
Figure 7.10	Idealized model used in T-Z load transfer analyses	223
Figure 7.11	Pile tip load – pile tip displacement curve (Q-Z) (API 1993)	225
Figure 7.12	Maximum shear stress distribution along pile shaft, according to API (1993)	226
Figure 7.13	Settlement predictions for the prestressed concrete pile using API (1993)	227

Figure 7.14	Settlement predictions for the FRP pile using API (1993)	228
Figure 7.15	Settlement predictions for the plastic pile using API (1993)	229
Figure 7.16	Normalized T-Z curves according to API (1993) and Vijayvergiya (1977)	230
Figure 7.17	Normalized Q-Z curves according to Vijayvergiya (1997) and API (1993)	231
Figure 7.18	Maximum shear stress distributions used in predictions using Vijayvergiya (1977)	232
Figure 7.19	Settlement predictions for the concrete pile using Vijayvergiya (1977)	233
Figure 7.20	Settlement predictions for the FRP pile using Vijayvergiya (1977)	234
Figure 7.21	Settlement predictions for the plastic pile using Vijayvergiya (1977)	235
Figure 7.22	Concentric cylinder model for settlement analysis of axially loaded piles (adapted from Randolph and Wroth 1978)	237
Figure 7.23	Linear T-Z curve obtained using Randolph and Wroth (1978)	240
Figure 7.24	Linear Q_b -Z curve obtained using Boussinesq's theory	241
Figure 7.25	Hyperbolic T-Z curve based on Randolph and Wroth (1978)	246
Figure 7.26	Variation of secant shear modulus for different hyperbolic-type models	247
Figure 7.27	Theoretically derived T-Z curve using concentric cylinders and the modified hyperbola from Fahey and Carter (1992)	249
Figure 7.28	Theoretically derived Q-Z curve using Boussinesq's theory and the modified hyperbola from Fahey and Carter (1992)	250
Figure 7.29	Route 351 initial shear modulus profile from CPT correlations	251
Figure 7.30	Settlement predictions for the concrete pile using theoretically derived transfer curves	253
Figure 7.31	Settlement predictions for the FRP pile using theoretically derived transfer curves	254
Figure 7.32	Settlement predictions for the plastic pile using theoretically derived transfer curves	255

Chapter 8

Figure 8.1	Laterally loaded pile problem	260
Figure 8.2	Distribution of stresses against a pile before and after lateral loading (adapted from Reese and Van Impe 2001)	266
Figure 8.3	Typical p-y curve and resulting p-y modulus (Reese and Van Impe 2001)	267
Figure 8.4	Schematic showing the influence of shape of cross section of pile on the soil reaction p (adapted from Reese and Van Impe 2001)	269
Figure 8.5	Elements of a characteristic p-y curve for sand based on recommendations by Reese et al. (1974)	270
Figure 8.6	Schematic showing p-y model used for analysis of laterally loaded piles	272
Figure 8.7	In situ test data for the upper soils in the northern end of the test pile site	275
Figure 8.8	In situ test data for the upper soils in the southern end of the test pile site	275
Figure 8.9	Initial p-y modulus profile used to define default p-y curves for LPILE analyses on the prestressed concrete pile	278
Figure 8.10	Predicted versus measured lateral displacement profile for prestressed concrete pile (Lateral loads 51.2 and 97.3 kN)	278
Figure 8.11	Predicted versus measured lateral displacement profile for prestressed concrete pile (Lateral loads 141.2 and 186.4 kN)	279
Figure 8.12	Predicted versus measured lateral displacement profile for prestressed concrete pile (Lateral loads 228 and 247.7 kN)	279
Figure 8.13	Calculated load-deflection curve for the prestressed concrete pile	280
Figure 8.14	Calculated load-slope curve for the prestressed concrete pile	281
Figure 8.15	Initial p-y modulus profile used to define default p-y curves for LPILE analyses on the FRP pile	283
Figure 8.16	Predicted versus measured lateral displacement profile for FRP pile (Lateral loads 51.6 and 96 kN)	283
Figure 8.17	Predicted versus measured lateral displacement profile for FRP pile (Lateral loads 144.8 and 186.1 kN)	284
Figure 8.18	Predicted versus measured lateral displacement profile for FRP pile (Lateral loads 230.1 and 270.5 kN)	284
Figure 8.19	Calculated load-deflection curve for the FRP pile	285
Figure 8.20	Calculated load-slope curve for the FRP pile	286
Figure 8.21	Initial p-y modulus profile used to define default p-y curves for LPILE analyses on the plastic pile	288
Figure 8.22	Predicted versus measured lateral displacement profile for plastic pile (Lateral loads 48.1 and 102.4 kN)	288
Figure 8.23	Predicted versus measured lateral displacement profile for plastic pile (Lateral loads 140.1 and 183.1 kN)	289
Figure 8.24	Predicted versus measured lateral displacement profile for plastic pile (Lateral loads 230.8 and 275.3 kN)	289
Figure 8.25	Calculated load-deflection curve for the plastic pile	290
Figure 8.26	Calculated load-slope curve for the plastic pile	291

Chapter 9

Figure 9.1	Location of instrumented production piles at the Route 351 bridge	296
Figure 9.2	Load transfer instrumentation layout for prestressed concrete production pile	298
Figure 9.3	Instrumentation layout for FRP composite production pile	301
Figure 9.4	Layout of external durability instrumentation used in the FRP composite production pile	302
Figure 9.5	Simplified stratigraphy along the Route 351 bridge alignment	303
Figure 9.6	Simplified stratigraphy in the vicinity of the instrumented prestressed concrete pile installed at Pier 10	304
Figure 9.7	Simplified stratigraphy in the vicinity of the instrumented FRP composite pile installed at Pier 11	305
Figure 9.8	Driving records for instrumented production piles	306
Figure 9.9	PDA recordings during restrike (Spiro and Pais 2002b)	308
Figure 9.10	PIT sounding on the prestressed concrete production pile before installation	310
Figure 9.11	PIT sounding on the prestressed concrete production pile after installation and restrike	310
Figure 9.12	PIT sounding on the FRP composite production pile before installation	311
Figure 9.13	PIT sounding on the FRP composite production pile before installation	311
Figure 9.14	Photo of Route 351 bridge under construction on December 30, 2002	313
Figure 9.15	Load distributions on November 7, 2002 and December 30, 2002 for the prestressed concrete production pile at Pier 10	314
Figure 9.16	Load distributions on November 7, 2002 and December 30, 2002 for the FRP composite production pile at Pier 11	315

Appendix A

Figure A.1	Interface shear test results Density Sand-to-Lancaster FRP shell interface	356
Figure A.2	Interface shear test results Density Sand-to-Hardcore FRP shell interface	357
Figure A.3	Interface shear test results Density Sand-to-HC FRP plate (untreated) interface	358
Figure A.4	Interface shear test results Density Sand-to-Treated FRP plate interface	359
Figure A.5	Interface shear test results Density Sand-to-Plastic interface	360
Figure A.6	Interface shear test results Density Sand-to-Concrete interface	361
Figure A.7	Interface shear test results Density Sand-to-Steel interface	362
Figure A.8	Interface shear test results Model Sand-to-Lancaster FRP shell interface	363
Figure A.9	Interface shear test results Model Sand-to-Hardcore FRP	

	shell interface	364
Figure A.10	Interface shear test results Model Sand-to-HC FRP plate (untreated) interface	365
Figure A.11	Interface shear test results Model Sand-to-Treated FRP plate interface	366
Figure A.12	Interface shear test results Model Sand-to-Plastic interface	367
Figure A.13	Interface shear test results Model Sand-to-Concrete interface	368
Figure A.14	Interface shear test results Model Sand-to-Steel interface	369

Appendix B

Figure B.1	Moisture concentration profile for the case in which the inner radius of the FRP is dry and the outer radius of the FRP is saturated	374
Figure B.2	Moisture concentration profile for the case in which the inner and outer radii of the FRP are saturated	374

Appendix C

Figure C.1	VTRC pushout test setup	376
Figure C.2	VT pushout test setup	377
Figure C.3	Creep bending test setup	379
Figure C.4	Creep deflection test results	379

Appendix D

Figure D.1	Location of field tests	381
Figure D.2	Boring B-1 (SPT-1)	382
Figure D.3	Boring B-2 (SPT-2)	384
Figure D.4	CPT-1	386
Figure D.5	CPT-2	387
Figure D.6	CPT033	388
Figure D.7	CPT034	392
Figure D.8	DMT	395

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 2

Table 2.1	Selected projects involving installation of composite piles	7
Table 2.2	Expressions for the strength of confined concrete and maximum axial strain (adapted from Shehata et al. 2002)	11
Table 2.3	Available structural information for steel reinforced plastic piles by Plastic Pilings, Inc.	19
Table 2.4	Comparison of pile impedance	24

Chapter 3

Table 3.1	Interface behavior test matrix	30
Table 3.2	Index parameter values of the sands used in this study	31
Table 3.3	Internal friction angles obtained from direct shear tests	33
Table 3.4	Summary of surface roughness measurements	44
Table 3.5	Surface hardness	45
Table 3.6	Summary of interface shear test results on Density sand	47
Table 3.7	Summary of interface shear test results on Model sand	48
Table 3.8	Summary of interface friction angles	54
Table 3.9	Multiple linear regression result for $\tan d_{\text{peak}}$ of Density sand	56
Table 3.10	Multiple linear regression result for $\tan d_{\text{cv}}$ of Density sand	57
Table 3.11	Multiple linear regression result for $\tan d_{\text{peak}}$ of Model sand	58
Table 3.12	Multiple linear regression result for $\tan d_{\text{cv}}$ of Model sand	59

Chapter 4

Table 4.1	Characterization data for Lancaster Composites, Inc. 12-inch FRP tube	68
Table 4.2	Characterization data for Lancaster Composites, Inc. 24-inch FRP tube	68
Table 4.3	Characterization data for Hardcore Composites, Inc. 12-inch FRP tube	70
Table 4.4	Characterization data for Hardcore Composites, Inc. 24-inch FRP tube	71
Table 4.5	As-received longitudinal tensile properties	77
Table 4.6	As-received hoop tensile properties	78
Table 4.7	Fickian diffusion parameters for the Lancaster 12-inch FRP	88
Table 4.8	Fickian diffusion parameters for the Lancaster 24-inch FRP	88
Table 4.9	Fickian diffusion parameters for the Hardcore 12-inch FRP	89
Table 4.10	Fickian diffusion parameters for the Hardcore 24-inch FRP	89

Chapter 5

Table 5.1	Mechanical properties of FRP shell of composite pile	119
Table 5.2	Pile driving measurements for the prestressed and composite pile	127
Table 5.3	Summary of signal matching analyses at end-of-driving (from Muchard et al. 1999)	128

Chapter 6

Table 6.1	Summary of pile driving measurement for the prestressed and composite piles (after Spiro and Pais 2002)	183
Table 6.2	Summary of CASE and CAPWAP analyses results (Spiro and Pais 2002)	184
Table 6.3	Test dates for the test pile program at the Route 351 bridge project	189
Table 6.4	Comparison of failure loads for the three test piles	192
Table 6.5	Load distributions from static load tests at the Davisson failure loads	195
Table 6.6	Unit shaft and toe resistances from static axial load tests	195

Chapter 7

Table 7.1	API recommendations for side friction in siliceous soil (API 1993)	205
Table 7.2	API recommendations for tip resistance in siliceous soil (API 1993)	206
Table 7.3	LCPC friction coefficient a for sands (Bustamente and Gianceselli 1982)	207
Table 7.4	LCPC bearing capacity factors for driven piles in sands (after Bustamente and Gianceselli 1982)	208
Table 7.5	Predicted axial capacities for the test piles at Route 351	220

Chapter 8

Table 8.1	Relationships commonly used for elastic piles in flexion	259
Table 8.2	Recommended criteria for p-y curves in different soils (adapted from Reese and Isenhower, 1997)	268
Table 8.3	Properties of test piles	273
Table 8.4	Parameters used to define default p-y curves in LPILE for the prestressed concrete pile	277
Table 8.5	Parameters used to define default p-y curves in LPILE for the FRP pile	282
Table 8.6	Parameters used to define default p-y curves in LPILE for the plastic pile	287

Chapter 9

Table 9.1	Summary of pile driving measurements for the prestressed and FRP production piles (after Spiro and Pais 2002b)	308
Table 9.2	Summary of CASE and CAPWAP analyses results (Spiro and Pais 2002b)	309
Table 9.3	Test dates for the instrumented production pile program at the Route 351 bridge project	312
Table 9.4	Monitoring dates for prestressed concrete pile at the Route 351 bridge	312
Table 9.5	Monitoring dates for FRP composite pile at the Route 351 bridge	312

Chapter 11

Table 11.1	Project objectives	323
------------	--------------------	-----

Appendix A

Table A.1	Organization of the figures in Appendix A	355
-----------	---	-----

Appendix C

Table C.1	Summary of pushout test results	377
-----------	---------------------------------	-----