Canadian Geotechnical Journal

Evaluation of design methods for side resistance only rock socketed piles

Journal:	<i>Canadian Geotechnical Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	cgj-2021-0249.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Jul-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Johnston, Ian; University of Melbourne, Infrastructure Engineering
Keyword:	side resistance, piles, rock, design methods, load-settlement data
Is the invited manuscript for consideration in a Special Issue? :	Not applicable (regular submission)

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Evaluation of design methods for side resistance only rock socketed piles

Ian W. Johnston

Dept. of Infrastructure Engineering, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Melbourne, VIC 3010, Australia.

Email: ian.w.johnston@outlook.com

Abstract: The ability of three methods to predict the load-settlement response of rock socketed piles was examined in a recent paper. The piles considered were complete piles in which both the side and base of the piles contribute to the total resistance. For a range of reasons, it is sometimes necessary to consider rock socketed piles for which the resistance is provided only by the side of the socket. This paper extends the earlier paper by comparing predictions for side resistance only piles with the load-settlement response of a suite of full-scale side resistance only pile tests. Only two of the methods of the earlier paper are used for this comparison as the third method could not decouple the two components of resistance. It is demonstrated that one of the methods produces reasonable predictions of performance whereas the other appears to underpredict performance.

Key words: side resistance, piles, rock, design methods, load-settlement data.

Introduction

In a recent paper (Johnston 2020), the predictions for load-settlement response made by three methods specifically developed for the design of rock socketed piles were compared with the results of several pile load tests. The methods were developed by Williams, Johnston and Donald (1980), Rowe and Armitage, (1987a) and Carter and Kulhawy (1988). This recent paper considered complete piles for which side and base resistance contribute to the total resistance of the pile. For complete piles in reasonably competent rock, as was argued by Williams et al. (1980) and subsequently supported by others (e.g. Horvath et al. 1980; Rowe and Armitage 1987a,b; Carter and Kulhawy 1988; Seol et al. 2007; Haberfield and Lochaden 2019), where the base resistance develops at a much slower rate than the side resistance, these piles rarely display an ultimate load which is constant but increases with increased displacement. Consequently, it is settlement which usually controls the design of complete piles socketed into rock. For this reason, the three design methods considered by Johnston

(2020) adopt settlement as the primary input parameter, with subsequent checks conducted to ensure that there is adequate geotechnical strength.

For socketed piles, there are situations where there can be doubt about resistance developing at the base of the pile. This could be for several reasons including the inability to confidently remove a compressible debris layer that had formed at the base of the socket during drilling or subsequent to drilling and before casting, or where the base is formed in a much weaker material or indeed where voids are close (or possibly close) to the underside of the base. For piles in tension, side resistance is the only effective component of resistance from the drilled socket. For these situations, it is not uncommon to design the piles as side resistance only piles. For this form of socketed pile, since the base resistance no longer contributes to total resistance, the load-settlement response does not display the slow but increasing load development contributed by the base. Instead, as will be discussed, the load-settlement response of side resistance only socketed piles typically shows load increasing at a decreasing rate to around 10 to 30mm (often more, sometimes less) before showing a marked reduction in the rate of increase of load or in many cases displaying a clearly defined ultimate load. For these piles, design can be controlled by either load or settlement.

Unfortunately, the Rowe and Armitage (1987a) method applies only to complete piles and, therefore, for side resistance only piles, the evaluation could only be conducted with the other two methods.

There are many other methods which relate to the design of side resistance only rock socketed piles. However, most of these methods (e.g. Horvath and Kenney 1979; Williams and Pells 1981; Seidel and Collingwood 2001; Kulhawy et al. 2005; Asem and Gardoni 2019) are concerned with predicting the ultimate side resistance and say little, if anything, about the settlements that might occur. There are methods which do consider settlement but as will be discussed, they involve specialist input knowledge and/or data which limits their applicability.

Reference is made to Johnston (2020) for a more complete description of the design methods. However, because there are subtle differences between side only and complete piles, this paper will provide an overview of the two design methods as applicable to side only piles.

Overview of the design methods

Williams, Johnston and Donald (WJD) method

Full details of the method may be found in Williams (1980) and Williams et al. (1980). The method makes use of the principles of normalisation wherein relationships are expressed in dimensionless terms so that design data becomes independent of dimensions.

The principle for normalising side stress is illustrated in Fig. 1. For any settlement, ρ , the side stress on the pile is given by f_s which is

$$(1) \quad f_s = f_{se} - f_{sp}$$

where f_{se} is the elastic side stress and f_{sp} is the plastic reduction of side stress as defined in Fig. 1. Eq. (1) can be normalised by dividing by the failure or ultimate side stress, f_{su} , to give

$$(2) \quad \frac{f_s}{f_{su}} = \frac{f_{se}}{f_{su}} - \frac{f_{sp}}{f_{su}}$$

This process was applied to all Williams' side resistance tests to produce the normalised design curve shown in Fig. 2.

Figures 1 and 2 about here

A key input parameter in the design process is the ultimate side stress, f_{su} which is determined by

$$(3) \quad f_{su} = \alpha q_a$$

where α is the side stress reduction factor and q_a is the unconfined compressive strength of the rock. The variation of α with q_a from a number of pile loading tests, as was available at the time, is shown in Fig. 3. The value of f_{su} used in developing Fig. 3 was taken as was measured in each load test with no consideration of the degree of roughness developed on the socket side during drilling.

Figure 3 about here

Overall stability is assessed by the application of Allowable Stress Design (ASD) or Limit State Design (LSD) methods, both of which require an assessment of the ultimate side resistance, Q_{su} . For LSD methods (such as specified by Standards Australia 2009, CSA 2019 and AASHTO 2020), this ultimate resistance is given by the general relationship

$$(4) \quad Q_{su} = \frac{\gamma_i Q_d}{\phi_i}$$

where Q_d is a design or serviceability load, γ_i is a relevant load factor and ϕ_i is a relevant resistance factor. For a side resistance only pile, for a selected pile diameter, D , the length of socket, L , required to provide this resistance is given by

$$(5) \quad L = \frac{Q_{su}}{\pi D f_{su}}$$

where f_{su} is defined by eq. (3) and Fig. 3.

It now becomes necessary to check that the pile with an elastic modulus (E_c) of selected dimensions (L , D) supporting a design load (Q_d) in rock with strength and elastic mass modulus (q_a , E_m) does not settle more than the maximum allowable design settlement, ρ_{dmax} .

The starting point with this check using the WJD method is estimating the side load, Q_{se} , that would be required to develop a settlement of ρ_{dmax} with the pile responding elastically (referred to as the elastic load). This is given by

$$(6) \quad Q_{se} = \frac{\rho_{dmax} E_m D}{I_p}$$

where the settlement influence factor I_p is given in Fig. 4 (Donald et al. 1980).

Figure 4 about here

This elastic load can now be relaxed by the corresponding plastic reduction factor defined in Fig. 1. This may be achieved by dividing Q_{se} by the area of the side of the pile to obtain f_{se} , then normalising f_{se} with f_{su} . Using Fig. 2, the corresponding value of f_s/f_{su} can be determined; the difference between the two being the ratio f_s/f_{su} as described in eq. (2). Multiplying f_s/f_{su} by f_{su} then produces f_s which when multiplied by the side area of the socket gives the relaxed load, Q_s , on the side of the socket for the settlement, ρ_{dmax} . If this relaxed load is greater than the design load (Q_d), then the design is controlled by the load and the design length has been assessed. Alternatively, if this relaxed load is less than the design load (Q_d), then the design is controlled by settlement and the length of the socket needs to be increased until the relaxed load (Q_s) becomes at least equal to the design load. A load-settlement curve for the various input data (L , D , q_a , E_m , E_c) can then be generated for the pile selected. This can be achieved with the same steps described above but starting with a small settlement to obtain a relaxed side load and then incrementally increasing the input settlement for corresponding relaxed loads until the required load-settlement curve is generated. Two examples of the above process are given in the Appendix.

By digitising the various design charts, the author has developed spreadsheets to perform the design and produce load-settlement curves for side resistance only piles.

Carter and Kulhawy (CK) method

This method is based on analytical techniques to describe elastic and non-elastic behaviour of a socketed pile. Using the input data with several equations describing elastic, side slip and side shearing mechanisms, the load-settlement response can be developed.

For a side resistance only pile, the response is modelled by the three linear legs shown in Fig. 5. The first leg, with slope S_{1s} , describes the elastic behaviour. The intermediate leg with slope S_{2s} , (and intercept on the load axis of I_s) describes movement with full slip along the side of the socket, and once the ultimate load, $Q_u (= f_{su}\pi DL)$, is generated, the pile settlement will continue to increase but with no increase in load. The parameter f_{su} is estimated from the relationship:

$$(7) \quad \frac{f_{su}}{p_a} = C \sqrt{\frac{q_a}{p_a}}$$

where p_a is atmospheric pressure in the appropriate units and C is a variable which reflects the degree of conservatism required. As with the WJD method, the CK method makes no attempt to differentiate between different degrees of roughness on the socket wall.

The original CK method suggests a conservative $C=0.63$, but according to Kulhawy et al. (2005), a value of 1 reflects a reasonable average of a considerable range of measured data for rock sockets. Therefore, in the application of the CK method, $C=1$ will be adopted.

Figure 5 about here

As was discussed in Johnston (2020), there can be some difficulty with the CK method when evaluating input parameters for the general solution for a compressible pile relative to the surrounding rock. However, this can be overcome by considering a rigid side resistance only pile which is defined by

$$(8) \quad \frac{E_c}{E_m} \left(\frac{D}{2L} \right)^2 \geq 1$$

For values of E_c , E_m , L and D typically encountered with rock socketed piles, eq. (8) often holds, allowing the simpler relationships for rigid piles to be used. A summary of the method's key relationships for the development of a load-settlement curve for a rigid side resistance only rock socketed pile is provided in Tables 1 and 2. A summary of the CK method can be found in Kulhawy and Carter (1992).

Tables 1 and 2 about here

In applying the CK method to design, it would be necessary to establish the ultimate resistance required to be developed on the side of the socket by eq. (4), and the length of the socket required to provide this resistance by eq. (5) with f_{su} defined by eq. (7). It would then be necessary to construct the load-settlement curve with the relevant pile geometry (L , D) and material properties (E_c , E_m , q_a), to check that the settlement criterion is satisfied. An example of the application of the CK method is presented in the Appendix.

Other methods

As was noted above, there are other methods available for the design of rock socketed piles which can predict performance with load-settlement curves. One of these involves the program ROCKET which is based on the work of Seidel (1993) and requires input quantifying the roughness of the socket side. Unfortunately, the considerable specialist knowledge and expertise required to compile this data and the difficulty of obtaining data on roughness at some considerable depth in a drilled shaft limits the applicability of this approach. Another method which can produce a load-settlement curve was proposed by O'Neill et al. (1996) and Hassan et al. (1997). This method is based on the results of finite element modelling of the load-transfer mechanisms along the side of the socket and, along with other detailed input data, it must be decided whether the side of the socket is either rough or smooth. The effect of this decision leads to a smooth socket significantly underpredicting the performance of a rough socket. Regrettably, for the many sockets which have a roughness somewhere between these two extremes, even if this could be quantified, there is no apparent means of developing a prediction of response for this roughness.

Another approach to developing load-settlement curves for rock socketed piles involves the use of load-transfer methods using t - z curves as proposed by Coyle and Reece (1966). However, these methods (e.g. Seol et al. 2007) are dependent on assigning representative t - z curves to the side of a socket and this generally requires an

understanding of the many other factors affecting performance. As noted above, the difficulty with assessing these limits the applicability of this approach.

Another group of methods make use of multipurpose software packages such as PLAXIS and FLAC. However, this software has not been specifically designed for socketed piles and requires considerable expertise and calibration. Therefore, while these methods have undoubted potential, their application will not be considered here.

Comparison of load-settlement predictions with measured data

As discussed above, load-settlement predictions are integral to satisfying load and settlement design criteria. It follows that an assessment of how well the two design methods can predict the load-settlement response of piles is of considerable interest. This section presents a selection of load-settlement results from pile load tests on side resistance only rock socketed piles. The great majority of these piles were constructed with an effective void at their bases so that all applied vertical load was transferred to side resistance. There were a few tests where instrumentation permitted the side resistance component to be identified and evaluated. Using the reported pile geometry (L, D), the properties of the pile (E_c) and of the rock forming the socket (E_m, q_a), an assessment was made of how well the two socketed pile design methods (i.e. the WJD and CK methods) can predict these results. In all these tests, it is only the settlement of the rock socket which is considered, with no allowance for the compression of the pile shaft that may develop above the socket.

While there are many side resistance only pile socket tests reported in the literature, a significant proportion of these results could not be used for the reasons discussed in Johnston (2020). In recent years, mainly for reasons of cost effectiveness, O-Cell tests (Osterberg, 1998) have become popular, particularly for rock socketed piles where the generally large loads involved make conventional load testing very costly. Where, for reasons discussed in Johnston (2020), these results appear reliable, they have been used. For O-Cell tests, the side resistance component was relatively easy to evaluate because of the separation of the downward loading on the base section and the upward loading of the side section.

Table 3 summarises the tests on side resistance only pile sockets (and O-Cell tests) used in this investigation. To be included, in addition to the criteria discussed above, the test data had to include the socket dimensions, (L, D) and reliable estimates of q_a and E_m . There were several reported test results which had all the above

except E_m . To expand the available data base, these tests were included with a reasonable estimate of E_m based on correlations between q_a and E_m . As discussed in Johnston (2020), the relationship proposed by Rowe and Armitage (1987a) was adopted and is given by

$$(9) \quad E_m = 215\sqrt{q_a}$$

Table 3 also presents the value of the relationship used to assess the rigidity of the rock socketed pile as defined in the CK method by eq. (8).

Table 3 about here

As it would be impractical to present all the predicted and measured load-settlement data for the 68 tests results in Table 3, although some are presented herein, these are presented as Figs S1 to S68 in Supplementary Data¹.

Discussion of the measured and predicted load-settlement curves

Before embarking on a detailed statistical assessment of all 68 sets of data, some general qualitative observations will be made. Table 4 gives a range of patterns describing the relationship of the predicted responses to the measured responses along with a qualitative assessment of the frequency of occurrence of these patterns in the data set. Figs. 6 and 7 give examples of tests which display these patterns.

Table 4 about here.

Figures 6 and 7 about here.

As is stated in Table 4, the most common pattern was when both the WJD and CK methods predicted load-settlement curves which underpredicted the measured load-settlement curves with the WJD predictions a little under the measured load-settlement curves and the CK predictions further under the measured load-settlement curves (Fig. 6a). The other commonly encountered patterns were where the WJD method reasonably predicted or overpredicted the measured load-settlement curves with the CK data still underpredicting (Figs 6b and 6c respectively). Fig. 7 shows patterns which were infrequent or unusual.

¹ Supplementary data are available with the article through the journal Web site at (link to be provided).

It may be worth commenting that in Fig 6a, the predicted CK load-settlement curve lies significantly below the predicted WJD load-settlement curve and yet their respective ultimate side stresses, f_{su} , as indicated in Table 3, are much closer at 0.3MPa and 0.41MPa respectively. This is a result of the slow development of side shear resistance according to the CK method which reaches its full mobilisation of 2.36MN at a settlement of about 116mm, well off the scale of the figure shown. The WJD curve reaches full mobilisation of 3.23MN at a settlement of about 19mm. The ratio of these two predicted values of fully mobilised side resistances is 1.37; the same as the ratio of their respective values of f_{su} . The same general comment applies to all other figures showing this apparent anomaly including Fig. 6c where the fully mobilised side resistance according to the CK method is 3.69MN at a settlement of 158mm.

Another general observation is that of the 68 tests considered, 47 showed a clearly defined ultimate load which occurred at settlements of between about 10 and 30 mm settlement. There were only a handful of tests which showed a reduction in load with settlement, and even then, the reduction was relatively minor.

With the considerable number of load test results and predictions of these results, a statistical approach is required to provide a clearer picture of overall performance. As was discussed by Johnston (2020), settlements of socketed piles are generally required to settle less (and sometimes considerably less) than about 20mm under serviceability loads. Therefore, comparisons of performance are undertaken for settlements up to 20 mm. Figs 8 to 11 compare the pile loads measured in the suite of test results with the loads predicted by the WJD and CK methods for settlements of 5, 10, 15 and 20 mm. These settlements do not include compression of the pile shaft above the socket. Each of Figs 8 to 11 have two parts; (a) showing all measured and predicted loads for each settlement and (b) showing the same at the low end of the load range measured to provide greater clarity for these lower range results. Linear trend lines were fitted for each of these data sets. Table 5 presents some statistical parameters related to the data presented in Figs 8 to 11.

Figures 8 to 11 about here

Table 5 about here

The data presented in Figs 8 to 11 and Table 5 confirm the observations made earlier about the pattern of results. Specifically, the mean bias (the mean of the ratios of the measured load to the predicted load for each test) for the WJD method is a little more than 1 for all settlements indicating that the method generally slightly

underpredicts the measured load-settlement curves. The CK method, with a mean bias between 3 and 4, indicates that the method generally considerably underpredicts the measured load-settlement curves. The standard deviation about the mean bias (SDB) and the coefficient of variation of the mean bias (CVB) indicate that variability about the mean bias or trend line are relatively small for the WJD method but significantly greater for the CK method. The root mean squared error (RMSE) and mean absolute error (MAE) indicate that the WJD method produces predictions of load relative to the measured values which are similar for all settlements and of relatively low variability. For the CK method, although the predictions are similar for all settlements, their variability is significantly higher.

As shown in Table 3, the condition for rigidity for 54 of the 68 load tests was satisfied thereby justifying the use of the simpler solutions developed with the CK method. Another 14 tests, however, returned rigidity results below the limit of unity. Figs 8 to 11 identify these latter tests with the value of the rigidity criterion presented adjacent to the individual points representing these tests. Apart from 2 to 3 points on the figures representing some of the larger total loads where the measured load is significantly underpredicted, the remaining points seem to be in a similar range to the test piles which could be considered as rigid.

Assessing ultimate side stress

The ultimate side stress (f_{su}) for the WJD method is determined by eq. (3) (with α given in Fig. 3). The ultimate side stress for the CK method is determined by eq. (7) with $C=1$.

As was discussed by Johnston (2020), there have been many studies involving the prediction of f_{su} , in reasonably intact rock and it has been shown that it can be influenced by many factors. Some factors such as q_a , E_m , E_c , L and D , can be evaluated relatively easily but other factors and especially the roughness of the interface between the side of the pile and its socket are not so easy to assess. Even if the roughness could be described, its influence on f_{su} is far from well understood (Rezazadeh and Eslami 2017; Haberfield and Lochaden 2019; Asem and Gardoni 2019; Xu et al. 2020; Gutierrez-Ch et al. 2020). It follows that when considering the complex factors influencing the development of side resistance, it is perhaps not surprising that f_{su} is difficult to accurately assess and the scatter of test data is significant.

While it is always possible that a practical relationship involving these many factors may be developed to more accurately and consistently predict f_{su} , as discussed by Johnston (2020), it seems reasonable to suggest that the

simple relationship proposed by Kulhawy et al. (2005) for the assessment of f_{su} and given as eq. (7) with $C=1$, provides an indication of what might be an acceptable practical “average”. This is the relationship used in the CK method. Figure 12 compares the WJD and CK methods for assessing f_{su} against q_a . This figure shows that the CK method (with $C=1$) produces f_{su} values which are less than the WJD method for q_a less than about 6 MPa with the WJD method producing lower values for q_a more than about 6 MPa. Figure 12 also presents the pairs of f_{su} and q_a extracted from each of the tests listed in Table 3 which clearly defined an ultimate load.

Figure 12 about here

As the CK method with $C=1$ is the Kulhawy et al. (2005) assessment of f_{su} and was developed many years later than the WJD assessment with more data sets than was possible with the original WJD assessment in 1980, it was thought that if the WJD predictions were repeated but with f_{su} determined by the Kulhawy et al. (2005) relationship with $C=1$, the WJD prediction might improve. The outcome of this investigation was that there were only small variations in the load-settlement predictions of the 68 pile tests considered with only minor movements of the data points shown in Figs 8 to 11. A re-examination of the data presented in Table 5 indicated a small increase in all the statistical parameters for the range of settlements considered suggesting that the original WJD method for assessing f_{su} leads to slightly better correlations with the measured loads.

Where design is controlled by load criteria rather than settlement criteria, the choice of f_{su} can have a relatively large impact on side resistance only rock socketed piles. The method by which f_{su} is assessed comes down to a design choice which could be further influenced by the results of representative pile load tests or of representative constant normal stiffness (CNS) direct shear tests (Johnston et al. 1987) conducted on rock samples from the design site.

Whichever approach is adopted for the assessment of f_{su} , it is unlikely that a justifiably better or more representative practical method will be found to include the influence of roughness (beyond being very smooth or very rough) simply because of the difficulty in establishing the roughness in a pile socket as drilled, how this can be quantified and what effect this has on the side shear behaviour. Practical methods to assess the strength parameter f_{su} will probably continue to be dominated by the convenient and conventional rock strength parameter q_a , even though q_a itself can be very much harder to establish than might appear (Johnston, 1985).

As about 47 of the 68 tests results reported in Table. 3 displayed clearly defined ultimate loads. It was possible to develop a data set relating the measured f_{su} with the site specific q_a . This data set is also shown in Fig. 12 and a best fit curve has been developed for this data. This curve demonstrates that different data sets will inevitably produce different general relationships between f_{su} and q_a .

Conclusions

In an earlier paper (Johnston, 2020), the load-settlement predictions of three design methods, originally proposed in the 1980s for rock socketed piles, were compared with the measured load-settlement response of full-scale load tests. The piles concerned were complete piles for which both the side and the base resistance contribute to the total load. For complete piles in reasonably competent rock, because base resistance develops at a much slower rate than the side resistance, it is settlement which usually controls design.

For situations where base resistance cannot be relied on, piles can be designed as side resistance only sockets. This topic is examined in this paper by considering the methods proposed by Williams et al. (1980), and Carter and Kulhawy (1988). The method proposed by Rowe and Armitage (1987a) could not decouple the base resistance from the side resistance, and therefore could not be considered.

Because base resistance is not included, the controlling factor in design can be either load or settlement. It follows that either of these criteria can be the starting point for design with the other checked subsequently.

As would be expected, and as was observed with complete piles, neither of the methods produces perfect predictions of load-settlement behaviour for the many test pile results examined. Analysis of the WJD predictions indicated that this method generally provided slightly conservative but reasonable predictions for load-settlement response with a moderate variability in terms of underprediction and overprediction. It appears that the WJD predictions for the load required to develop settlements in the range of 5 to 20 mm was consistent for the tests investigated.

Although as demonstrated by Johnston (2020), the CK method makes reasonable predictions of the performance of complete piles, it appears to generally underpredict the performance of side only socketed piles. It follows that the CK method could be considered to give generally conservative predictions of performance.

A key decision in the design process is the method used to assess the ultimate side stress, f_{su} , particularly for piles where design is controlled by load criteria rather than settlement criteria. This decision has a direct effect on the required socket length. There are several relationships available including the two used earlier with the two design methods. This comes down to a design choice which may be assisted by conducting representative pile tests and/or CNS tests in the laboratory. It is argued that while socket roughness must have a major influence on f_{su} , because of the difficulty in defining and measuring roughness and its variability in a drilled socket, how it can be quantified and how roughness affects performance, suggests that a more accurate but practical method is unlikely to be developed.

As with the earlier paper on complete piles (Johnston, 2020), there are several factors not considered in the above discussions. These include the influence of overburden on shaft resistance, the compression of the shaft above the socket, any variability of the materials forming the socket, there being other than clean contact between the concrete of the pile shaft and the surrounding rock, softening of the exposed rock in the socket after drilling has been completed, and inadequate roughness of the socket walls.

References

- AASHTO (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials). 2020. AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 9th Edition. Washington DC: AASHTO.
- Abu-Hejleh, N., O'Neill, M. W., Hanneman, D. and Atwooll, W.J. 2003. Improvement of the geotechnical axial design methodology for Colorado's drilled shafts socketed in weak rocks. Report No. CDOT-DTD-R-2003-6, Research Branch, Colorado Department of Transportation.
- Asem, P., and Gardoni, P. 2019. Evaluation of peak side resistance for rock socketed shafts in weak sedimentary rock from an extensive database of published field load tests: a limit state approach. *Can. Geotech. J.* **56**: 1816-1831. <https://doi-org/10.1139/cgj-2018-0590>.
- Boyd, P., and Ozsoy, B. 2013. High capacity rock socketed piles in Scotland, UK. *Int. Conf. on Case Histories in Geotechnical Engineering*. Paper No 2.08. <https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/icchge/7icchge/session02/19>
- Carter, J. P., and Kulhawy, F. H. 1988. Analysis and design of drilled shaft foundations socketed into rock. Report EL-5918, Research Project 1493-4. Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto.

- 331 Chang, C. Y., Legaspi, D. E., Ma, Y., Chin, C. C., and Orsolini, G. I. 2004. Design, testing and construction of
 332 rock socket for tower foundations of the New Carquinez Bridge. *Geotechnical Engineering for Transportation*
 333 *Projects*: 1229-1238. ASCE.
- 334 Charif, K. H., Najjar, S. S., and Sadek, S. 2010. Side friction along drilled shafts in weak carbonate rocks. *The*
 335 *Art of Foundation Engineering Practice Congress*: 190-205. ASCE.
- 336 Coyle, H. M., and Reece, L. C. 1966. Load transfer for axially loaded piles in clay. *J. Soil Mech. And Found.*
 337 *Eng.*, **92** (SM2): 1-26.
- 338 CSA. 2019. CSA S6, Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code. CSA Group
- 339 Donald, I. B., Chiu, H. K., and Sloan, S. W. 1980. Theoretical analyses of rock socketed piles. In *Proc. Int.*
 340 *Conf. on Structural Foundations on Rock*, edited by P.J.N. Pells: 303-316. Rotterdam, Netherlands: A. A.
 341 Balkema.
- 342 Gutierrez-Ch, J. G., Melentijevic, S., Senent, S., and Jiminez, R. 2020. Distinct-element method simulations of
 343 rock-socketed Piles: Estimation of side shear resistance considering socket roughness. *J Geotech. Geoenviron.*
 344 *Eng.*, **146** (12):04020133 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)GT.1943-5606.0002394](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)GT.1943-5606.0002394)
- 345 Haberfield, C. M., and Lochaden, A. L. E. 2019. Analysis and design of axially loaded piles in rock. *J. Rock*
 346 *Mech. Geotech. Eng.*, **11** (3): 535-548. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrmge.2018.10.001>.
- 347 Hassan, K. M., O'Neill, M. W., Sheikh, S. A., and Ealy, C.D. 1997. Design method for drilled shafts in soft
 348 argillaceous rock. *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, **123** (3): 272-280. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)1090-](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1090-0241(1997)123:3(272))
 349 [0241\(1997\)123:3\(272\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1090-0241(1997)123:3(272))
- 350 Horvath, R. G. 1980. Research project report on load transfer for rock-socketed drilled pier foundations.
 351 National Research Council of Canada, DSS file no 10x5.31155-9-4420, contract serial no 1SX79.00053.
- 352 Horvath, R.G. (1982). Drilled piers socketed into weak shale – methods of improving performance. Doctoral
 353 dissertation, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- 354 Horvath, R. G., and Kenney, T. C. 1979. Shaft resistance of rock-socketed drilled piers. In *Proc. Symp. on Deep*
 355 *Foundations*, 182-214. Reston VA: ASCE.

- Horvath, R. G., Kenney, T. C., and Trow, W. A. 1980. Results of tests to determine shaft resistance of rock-socketed piers. In Proc. Int. Conf. on Structural Foundations on Rock, edited by P.J.N. Pells, 349-361. Rotterdam, Netherlands: A. A. Balkema.
- Horvath, R. G., Kenney, T. C., and Kozicki, P. 1983. Methods of improving the performance of drilled piers in weak rock. *Can. Geotech. J.*, **20** (4): 758-772. <https://doi.org/10.1139/t83-081>.
- Johnston, I. W. 1985 Strength of intact geomechanical materials. *J. Geotech Eng.*, **111** (6): 730-749.
- Johnston, I. W. 2020. Revisiting methods for the design of rock socketed piles. *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, **146** (12). [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)GT.1943-5606.0002414](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)GT.1943-5606.0002414).
- Johnston, I. W., Donald, I. B., Bennet, A. G., and Edwards, J. W. 1980. The testing of large diameter pile rock sockets with a retrievable test rig. In Proc. 3rd ANZ Conf on Geomechanics, **1**: 105-108.
- Johnston, I.W., Lam, T. S. K., and Williams, A. F. 1987. Constant normal stiffness direct shear testing for socketed pile design in weak rock. *Geotechnique*, **37** (1): 83-89. <https://doi.org/10.1680/geot.1987.37.1.83>.
- Kulhawy, F. H., and Carter, J. P. 1992. Socketed foundations in rock masses. In *Engineering in Rock Masses*, edited by F.G. Bell, Chapter 25, 509-529. Oxford, UK: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Kulhawy, F. H., Prakoso, W. A., and Akbas, S. O. 2005. Evaluation of capacity of rock foundation sockets. In Proc. 40th US Symp. on Rock Mech. Anchorage, Alaska: American Rock Mechanics Association.
- Lam, T.S.K., and Johnston, I. W. 1982. A constant normal stiffness direct shear machine. In Proc. 7th Southeast Asian Geotech. Conf., 805- 820. Hong Kong: Southeast Asian Geotechnical Society, Hong Kong Institution of Engineers.
- Lewis, T.G. 1993. Load testing of permanently cased drilled shafts founded in Hartford shale. Design and Performance of Deep Foundations: Piles and Piers in Soil and Soft Rock. Geotech. Spec. Pub. No. 38, 218-228. ASCE.
- Matich, M. A. J., and Kozicki, P. 1967. Some load tests on drilled cast-on-place concrete caissons. *Can. Geotech. J.*, **4** (4):367-375. <https://doi.org/10.1139/t67-065>

- 380 Millar, A. D. 2003. Prediction of ultimate side shear for drilled shafts in Missouri shales. Masters dissertation,
381 University of Missouri-Columbia, MO.
- 382 Nam, M., and Vipulanandan, C. 2008. Roughness and unit side resistances of drilled shafts socketed in clay
383 shale and limestone. *J Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, **134** (9):1272-1279. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)1090-](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1090-0241(2008)134:9(1272))
384 [0241\(2008\)134:9\(1272\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1090-0241(2008)134:9(1272))
- 385 Ng, C. W. W., Yau, T. L. Y., Li, J. H. M., and Tang, W. H. 2001. Side resistance of large diameter bored piles
386 socketed into decomposed rocks. *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, **127** (8):642-657.
387 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)1090-0241\(2001\)127:8\(642\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1090-0241(2001)127:8(642))
- 388 O'Neill, M. W., Townsend, F. C., Hassan, K. M., Buller, A., and Chan, P. S. 1996. Load transfer for drilled
389 shafts in intermediate geomaterials. Publication No. FHWA-RD-95-172, US Dept of Transportation.
- 390 Osterberg, J. O. 1998. The Osterberg load test method for drilled shafts and driven piles the first ten years. In
391 *Proc. 7th Int. Conf. on Piling and Deep Foundations*, 1.28.1 – 1.28.11. Hawthorne, NJ: Deep Foundations
392 Institute.
- 393 Rezazadeh, S., and Eslami, A. 2017. Empirical methods for determining shaft bearing capacity of semi-deep
394 foundations socketed in rocks. *J. Rock Mech. And Geotech. Eng.*, **9**:1140-1151.
395 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrmge.2017.06.003>
- 396 Roberts, L. A., Fink, D., and Misra, A. 2011. Performance-based design of drilled shaft bridge foundations. *J.*
397 *Bridge Eng.*, **16** (6):749-758. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)BE.1943-5592.0000222](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)BE.1943-5592.0000222)
- 398 Rosenberg, P., and Journeaux, N. L. 1976. Friction and end bearing tests on bedrock for high capacity socket
399 design. *Can. Geotech. J.*, **13**: 324-333. <https://doi.org/10.1139/t76-033>
- 400 Rowe, R. K., and Armitage, H. H. 1987a. A design method for drilled piers in soft rock. *Can. Geotech. J.*, **24**
401 (1): 126-142. <https://doi.org/10.1139/t87-011>.
- 402 Rowe, R. K., and Armitage, H. H. 1987b. Theoretical solutions for axial deformation of drilled shafts in rock.
403 *Can. Geotech. J.*, **24** (1): 114-125. <https://doi.org/10.1139/t87-010>.

- 404 Seidel, J. P. 1993. The analysis and design of pile shafts in weak rock. Doctoral dissertation, Monash
405 University, Melbourne, Australia.
- 406 Seidel, J. P., and Collingwood, B. 2001. A new socket roughness factor for prediction of rock socket shaft
407 resistance. *Can. Geotech. J.*, **38** (1): 138-153. <https://doi.org/10.1139/t00-083>.
- 408 Seol, H., Jeong, S., Cho, C., and You, K. 2007. Shear load transfer for rock-socketed drilled shafts based on
409 borehole roughness and geological strength index (GSI). *Int. J. Rock Mech. & Min. Sci.*, **45**: 848-861.
410 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrmms.2007.09.008>
- 411 Shoib, R. S. N. S. R., Rashid, A. S. A., and Armaghani, D. J. 2017. Shaft resistance of bored piles socketed in
412 Malaysian granite. *Geotechnical Engineering*, **170** (GE4):335-352. <https://doi.org/10.1680/jgeen.15.00186>
- 413 Spanovich, M., and Garvin, R. G. 1979. Field evaluation of caisson-shale interaction. *ASTM STP 670*: 537-
414 557.
- 415 Standards Australia. 2009. AS 2159 – 2009 Piling, Design and Installation. Sydney, Australia: Standards
416 Australia.
- 417 Thorne, C. P. 1980. The capacity of piers drilled into rock. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Structural Foundations on*
418 *Rock*, edited by P.J.N. Pells, 223-233. Rotterdam, Netherlands: A. A. Balkema.
- 419 Turner, J. P., Sandberg, E., and Chou, N. N. S. 1993. Side resistance of drilled shafts in the Denver and Pierre
420 Formations. *Design and Performance of Deep Foundations: Piles and Piers in Soil and Soft Rock*. *Geotech.*
421 *Spec. Pub. No. 38*, 245-259. ASCE.
- 422 Walter, D. J., Burwash, W. J., and Montgomery, R. A. 1997. Design of large diameter drilled shafts for the
423 Northumberland Strait bridge project. *Can. Geotech. J.*, **34**: 580-587. <https://doi.org/10.1139/t72-008>.
- 424 Webb, D. L., and Davies, P. 1980. Ultimate tensile loads of bored piles socketed into sandstone rock. In *Proc.*
425 *Int. Conf. on Structural Foundations on Rock*, edited by P.J.N. Pells, 265-270. Rotterdam, Netherlands: A. A.
426 Balkema.
- 427 Williams, A.F. 1980. The design and performance of piles socketed into weak rock. Doctoral dissertation,
428 Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

- 429 Williams, A. F., and Ervin, M. C. 1980. The design and performance of cast in situ piles in extensively jointed
430 Silurian mudstone. In Proc. 3rd ANZ Conf on Geomechanics, **1**: 115-121.
- 431 Williams, A. F., Johnston, I. W., and Donald, I. B. 1980. The design of socketed piles in weak rock. In Proc.
432 Int. Conf. on Structural Foundations on Rock, edited by P.J.N. Pells, 327-347. Rotterdam, Netherlands: A. A.
433 Balkema.
- 434 Williams, A. F., and Pells, P. J. N. 1981. Side resistance rock sockets in sandstone, mudstone and shale. Can.
435 Geotech. J. **18** (4): 502-513. <https://doi.org/10.1139/t81-061>.
- 436 Wong, P. K., and Oliveira, D. 2012. Class A prediction versus performance of O-Cell pile load tests in Sydney
437 Sandstone. Australian Geomechanics, **47** (3): 87-94.
- 438 Xu, J., Dai, G., Gong, W., Zhang, Q., Haque, A., and Gamage R.P. 2020. A review of research on the shaft
439 resistance of rock-socketed piles. Acta Geotechnica. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11440-020-01051-2>

440

441 **Figure captions**

442 **Fig. 1.** Principles for normalising side resistance. (Copyright 1980, “The design of socketed piles in weak
443 rock,” A. F. Williams, I. W. Johnston, and I. B. Donald, reprinted with permission from Taylor and Francis.)

444 **Fig. 2.** Normalised design curve for side resistance. (Copyright 1980, “The design of socketed piles in weak
445 rock,” A. F. Williams, I. W. Johnston, and I. B. Donald, reprinted with permission from Taylor and Francis.)

446 **Fig. 3.** Side stress reduction factor. (Copyright 1980, “The design of socketed piles in weak rock,” A. F.
447 Williams, I. W. Johnston, and I. B. Donald, reprinted with permission from Taylor and Francis.)

448 **Fig. 4.** Elastic settlement influence factor. (Copyright 1980, “Theoretical analyses of rock socketed piles,” I. B.
449 Donald, H. K. Chiu, and S.W. Sloan, reprinted with permission from Taylor and Francis.)

450 **Fig. 5.** Definition of primary variables for CK method for a side only pile.

451 **Fig. 6.** Load-settlement patterns most frequently observed with predicted and measured responses.

452 **Fig. 7.** Load-settlement patterns infrequently observed with predicted and measured responses.

453 **Fig. 8.** Comparison of measured loads with predicted loads for settlements of 5 mm: (a) for the full load range
454 of data; and (b) for the low load range.

455 **Fig. 9.** Comparison of measured loads with predicted loads for settlements of 10 mm: (a) for the full load range
456 of data; and (b) for the low load range.

457 **Fig. 10.** Comparison of measured loads with predicted loads for settlements of 15 mm: (a) for the full load
458 range of data; and (b) for the low load range.

459 **Fig. 11.** Comparison of measured loads with predicted loads for settlements of 20 mm: (a) for the full load
460 range of data; and (b) for the low load range.

461 **Fig. 12.** Variation of f_{su} with q_a according to the WJD and CK methods along with data from the tests listed in
462 Table 3.

463 **Fig. A1.** Load–settlement curves for side resistance only socketed pile design examples.

Fig. 1. Principles for normalising side resistance. (Copyright 1980, "The design of socketed piles in weak rock," A. F. Williams, I. W. Johnston, and I. B. Donald, reprinted with permission from Taylor and Francis.)

Fig. 2. Normalised design curve for side resistance. (Copyright 1980, "The design of socketed piles in weak rock," A. F. Williams, I. W. Johnston, and I. B. Donald, reprinted with permission from Taylor and Francis.)

Fig. 3. Side stress reduction factor. (Copyright 1980, "The design of socketed piles in weak rock," A. F. Williams, I. W. Johnston, and I. B. Donald, reprinted with permission from Taylor and Francis.)

Fig. 4. Elastic settlement influence factor. (Copyright 1980, “Theoretical analyses of rock socketed piles,” I. B. Donald, H. K. Chiu, and S.W. Sloan, reprinted with permission from Taylor and Francis.)

Fig. 5. Definition of primary variables for CK method for a side only pile.

Fig. 6. Load-settlement patterns most frequently observed with predicted and measured responses.

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

Fig. 7. Load-settlement patterns infrequently observed with predicted and measured responses.

(a)

(b)

Fig. 8. Comparison of measured loads with predicted loads for settlements of 5 mm: (a) for the full load range of data; and (b) for the low load range.

Fig. 9. Comparison of measured loads with predicted loads for settlements of 10 mm: (a) for the full load range of data; and (b) for the low load range.

Fig. 10. Comparison of measured loads with predicted loads for settlements of 15 mm: (a) for the full load range of data; and (b) for the low load range.

Fig. 11. Comparison of measured loads with predicted loads for settlements of 20 mm: (a) for the full load range of data; and (b) for the low load range.

Fig. 12. Variation of f_{su} with q_a according to the WJD and CK methods along with data from the tests listed in Table 3.

Table 1. Variables used to predict load-settlement response of rigid side resistance only socketed piles by CK method

Slope of elastic behaviour	$S_{1s} = \frac{\pi E_m L}{(1 + \nu)\zeta}$
Slope of slip behaviour	$S_{2s} = \frac{\pi E_m L}{R_1}$
Intercept of slope of slip behaviour with load axis	$I_s = \frac{\pi E_m L D}{2R_1} R_2$
Ultimate side resistance	$Q_u = f_{su} \pi D L$

Draft

Table 2. Factors for use with the variables in Table 1

Factors	Evaluation of factors
R ₁ and R ₂	$R_1 = (1 + \nu) \left(\zeta + \frac{1}{2 \tan \varphi \tan \psi} \right)$ $R_2 = \frac{1 + \nu}{\tan \varphi \tan \psi} \frac{c}{E_m}$
Other	$\tan \varphi \tan \psi = 0.001 \left(\frac{q_a}{p_a} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}$ $c = 0.1 p_a \left(\frac{q_a}{p_a} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}$ $\zeta = \ln \left(5 (1 - \nu) \frac{L}{D} \right)$

Table 3. Details of side resistance only pile tests used in comparisons of performance

Reference	Pile ID	Socket dimensions		Elastic moduli		Rock unconfined compressive strength, UCS (MPa) (q _a)	Rock type	Ultimate side stress, f _{su} (MPa)		Rigidity criterion ^a eq. (8)
		(m)		(GPa)	(MPa)			WJD method eq. (3)	CK method eq. (7)	
		Diameter (D)	Length (L)	Pile (E _c)	Rock mass (E _m)					
Abu-Hejleh et al. (2003)	Broadway, lower sect.	1.37	2.74	28	1020	9.6	siltstone	0.9	0.99	1.72
Abu-Hejleh et al. (2003)	Broadway, mid. sect.	1.37	3.05	28	1020	4.64	sandstone	0.71	0.69	1.38
Boyd & Ozsoy (2013)	TP1	0.75	3	35	962 ^b	20	limestone	1.14	1.42	0.57
Chang et al. (2004)	St 1 Sth Tower ^c	1.675	20.7	35	247	1.32	claystone	0.47	0.37	0.23
Chang et al. (2004)	St 2 Sth Tower ^c	1.675	12	35	247	1.32	claystone	0.47	0.37	0.69
Charif et al. (2010)	Pile A3 Layer 1	1	6	38	345	4.5	carbonate	0.7	0.68	0.76
Charif et al. (2010)	Pile G Layer1	0.6	3.5	30	160	3.5	carbonate	0.75	0.75	1.38
Charif et al. (2010)	Pile G Layer 2	0.6	4.5	30	230	5.2	carbonate	0.74	0.73	0.58
Hassan et al. (1997)	Honolulu ^c	1.53	3.35	31	408 ^b	3.6	basalt	0.65	0.6	3.96
Horvath (1982)	5D	0.71	1.37	35	390	10.4	shale	0.92	1.03	6.03
Horvath et al. (1980)	Airport Rd No 3	0.635	1.015	35	1000	15.2	shale	1.04	1.24	3.42
Horvath et al. (1980)	Bay St	0.838	0.69	35	1370 ^b	40.6	shale	1.44	2.03	9.53
Horvath et al. (1980)	Whitby	0.76	1.00	35	1130 ^b	27.6	shale	1.27	1.67	4.47
Horvath et al. (1983)	P1	0.71	1.37	35	405	5.4	shale	0.74	0.74	5.80
Horvath et al. (1983)	P2	0.71	1.37	35	419	11.1	shale	0.94	1.06	5.61
Johnston et al. (1980)	Test 1 ^d	1.212	1	35	600	3.06	mudstone	0.62	0.56	21.42
Johnston et al. (1980)	Test 2 ^d	1.212	1	35	600	1.95	mudstone	0.53	0.44	21.42
Lewis (1993)	Centre shaft	0.76	1.2	35	1773 ^b	68	shale	1.7	2.62	1.98
Matich & Kozicki (1967)	Caisson No 4	0.61	4.11	35	204 ^b	0.9	shale	0.41	0.3	0.94

Miller (2003)	TS-2, stage 2 ^c	1.17	4	35	372 ^b	3	shale	0.61	0.55	2.01
Miller (2003)	TS-2, stage 2/3 ^c	1.17	4.23	35	420 ^b	3.8	shale	0.66	0.62	1.59
Nam & Vipulanandan (2008)	DT site ^c	0.76	2.1	35	212	3.1	shale	0.62	0.56	5.41
Nam & Vipulanandan (2008)	RC site ^c	0.76	2.6	35	5500	10.2	limestone	0.91	1.02	0.14
Ng et al. (2001)	Pile 3	1.02	2	35	1360 ^b	40	tuff	1.43	2.01	1.67
Ng et al. (2001)	Pile 5	1.32	2.1	35	527 ^b	6	granitic	0.77	0.78	6.56
Ng et al. (2001)	Pile 7	1.2	3.6	35	680 ^b	10	granite	0.91	1.01	1.43
Ng et al. (2001)	Pile 9	1	2.5	35	1154 ^b	28.8	granite	1.29	1.71	1.21
O'Neill et al. (1996)	Dallas test	0.61	6.09	46	232	0.71	shale	0.38	0.27	0.50
O'Neill et al. (1996)	TAMU test	0.61	6.76	31	154	0.8	hard clay	0.4	0.29	0.41
O'Neill et al. (1996)	Owensboro 9-42	1.78	5.16	34.7	2019	8.78	shale/sst	0.87	0.94	0.51
O'Neill et al. (1996)	Tampa test	0.76	2.44	15	264	2.3	limestone	0.56	0.48	1.38
Roberts et al. (2011)	^c	1.07	4.2	35	277 ^b	1.7	shale	0.51	0.41	2.05
Rosenberg & Journeaux (1976)	Load test	0.45	0.56	35	691	10.34	andesite	0.92	1.02	8.18
Seol et al. (2008)	Nam pile R ^c	0.76	2.9	35	900	10	limestone	0.91	1.01	0.67
Shoib et al. (2017)	V1-PTP2, F-G	1.2	1.5	35	1360 ^b	40	granite	1.43	2.01	4.12
Shoib et al. (2017)	V3-PTP2, F-H	1.35	1.8	35	1117	27	granite	1.26	1.65	4.41
Spanovich & Garvin (1979)	Caisson 2	0.76	1.5	35	259 ^b	1.45	shale	0.48	0.38	8.67
Spanovich & Garvin (1979)	Caisson 3	0.76	0.9	35	259 ^b	1.45	shale	0.48	0.38	24.09
Spanovich & Garvin (1979)	Caisson 4	0.46	0.9	35	259 ^b	1.45	shale	0.48	0.38	8.83
Spanovich & Garvin (1979)	Caisson 7	0.61	1.5	35	259 ^b	1.45	shale	0.48	0.38	5.59
Spanovich & Garvin (1979)	Caisson 9	0.61	0.9	35	259 ^b	1.45	shale	0.48	0.38	15.52

Thorne (1980)	P3	0.45	0.7	40	625	34	shale	1.36	1.86	6.61
Turner et al. (1993)	Denver V1 ^c	0.79	3.05	35	197 ^b	0.84	claystone	0.4	0.29	2.98
Walter et al. (1997)	UTS ^c	0.91	4	35	538 ^b	6.3	siltstone	0.78	0.8	0.84
Webb & Davies (1980)	1A	0.47	1.08	35	100	2.5	sandstone	0.58	0.5	16.57
Webb & Davies (1980)	1B	0.45	1.75	35	100	2.5	sandstone	0.58	0.5	5.79
Webb & Davies (1980)	1C	0.45	2.77	35	100	2.5	sandstone	0.58	0.5	2.31
Webb & Davies (1980)	2B	0.45	0.9	35	100	2.5	sandstone	0.58	0.5	21.88
Webb & Davies (1980)	2C	0.536	1.3	35	100	2.5	sandstone	0.58	0.5	14.87
Webb & Davies (1980)	2D	0.45	0.5	35	100	2.5	sandstone	0.58	0.5	70.88
Webb & Davies (1980)	2F	0.463	1.67	35	100	2.5	sandstone	0.58	0.5	6.73
Webb & Davies (1980)	3A	0.45	0.6	35	800	18	sandstone	1.1	1.35	6.15
Webb & Davies (1980)	3B	0.45	0.8	35	800	18	sandstone	1.1	1.35	3.46
Webb & Davies (1980)	3C	0.45	1.6	35	800	18	sandstone	1.1	1.35	0.87
Williams (1980)	M1 ^d	1.22	2	35	500	2.5	mudstone	0.58	0.5	6.51
Williams (1980)	M2 ^d	1.3	2	35	445	2.3	mudstone	0.56	0.48	8.31
Williams (1980)	M3 ^d	1.23	2	35	445	2.3	mudstone	0.56	0.48	7.44
Williams (1980)	M4 ^d	1.35	2	35	460	2.34	mudstone	0.57	0.49	8.67
Williams (1980)	ES	1.09	1.52	35	60	7.2	mudstone	0.82	0.85	74.99
Williams (1980)	S1	0.66	1.52	35	200	0.83	mudstone	0.4	0.29	8.25
Williams (1980)	S3	1.17	2.59	35	200	0.57	mudstone	0.36	0.24	8.93
Williams (1980)	S5	1.17	2.51	35	200	0.59	mudstone	0.36	0.24	9.51
Williams (1980)	S12	0.335	0.9	35	200	0.58	mudstone	0.36	0.24	6.06
Williams (1980)	S14	0.395	0.87	35	200	0.58	mudstone	0.36	0.24	9.02
Williams (1980)	S15	0.395	0.87	35	200	0.58	mudstone	0.36	0.24	9.02

Williams (1980)	WG303/2 ^d	1.58	2	35	1000	3.49	mudstone	0.64	0.6	5.46
Williams & Ervin (1980)	Side test	1.092	1.52	35	70	7.25	mudstone	0.82	0.86	64.52
Wong & Oliveira (2012)	SC-02 ^c	0.75	5.6	43	2000	30	sandstone	1.3	1.74	0.10

^aAccording to Carter & Kulhawy (1988), sockets with this criterion >1 can be considered rigid.

^b Estimated from $E_m = 215\sqrt{q_a}$

^c O-Cell test

^d An early version of the bi-directional O-Cell test (Johnston et al, 1980)

Draft

Table 4. Summary of qualitative observations of patterns describing the relationship of the predicted responses to the measured responses and to each other

Pattern observed	Example References	Fig. No.	Comment
Where WJD and CK predictions reasonably agree with measured load-settlement curves	Boyd & Ozsoy 2003, TP1	7a	Relatively uncommon
Where WJD and CK methods underpredict measured load-settlement curves.	Matich & Kozicki 1967, Caisson No 4	6a	Most common situation with CK predictions below that of WJD.
Where both WJD and CK methods overpredict measured load-settlement curves.	Webb & Davies 1980, 3A	7b	Relatively uncommon
Where CK predictions reasonably agree with measured load-settlement curves but WJD method underpredicts measured load-settlement curves.	Wong & Oliveira 2012, SC-02	7c	Relatively uncommon.
Where CK predictions reasonably agree with measured load-settlement curves but WJD method overpredicts measured load-settlement curves.	Ng et al. 2001, Pile 7	7d	Relatively uncommon
Where WJD predictions reasonably agree with measured load-settlement curves but CK underpredicts measured load-settlement curves.	Williams 1980, M1	6b	This is commonly observed.
Where WJD predictions reasonably agree with measured load-settlement curves but CK overpredicts.	-		No examples.
Where WJD method overpredicts and CK method underpredicts measured load-settlement curves.	O'Neill et al. 1996, TAMU test	6c	This is commonly observed.
Where CK overpredicts and WJD underpredicts measured load-settlement curves.	-		No examples.

Table 5. Statistical parameters developed from Figs. 8 to 11

Statistical parameter	For loads at 5 mm		For loads at 10 mm		For loads at 15 mm		For loads at 20 mm	
	settlement		settlement		settlement		settlement	
	WJD	CK	WJD	CK	WJD	CK	WJD	CK
Mean bias ^a	1.18	3.70	1.14	3.78	1.11	3.43	1.15	3.26
Standard deviation of bias (SDB) ^b	0.45	2.49	0.41	2.65	0.41	2.50	0.43	2.29
Coefficient of variation of bias (CVB) ^c	0.38	0.67	0.36	0.70	0.37	0.73	0.37	0.70
Root mean squared error (RMSE) ^d (MN)	1.89	3.83	1.67	4.22	1.85	4.71	2.09	5.12
Mean absolute error (MAE) ^e (MN)	1.26	2.44	1.23	2.67	1.24	2.78	1.28	2.84

^a Mean of individual measured to predicted loads, <1 is overpredicted, >1 is underpredicted.

^b Indicating the standard deviation about the mean bias or trend line of Figs. 8 to 11.

^c Indicating the variability relative to the mean bias or trend line in Figs. 8 to 11.

^d Indicating the variability relative to the line of equality in Figs. 8 to 11, units in MN

^e An alternative to RMSE, units also in MN

1 Appendix: Examples of design methods

2 Three examples of the design methods for side resistance only rock socketed piles are presented. Two of the
 3 examples use the WJD method and one the CK method. The input data for the first two examples is provided in
 4 Table A1 and Table A2 shows the parameters derived for a maximum allowable design settlement of 5mm.
 5 Both examples use a load factor $\gamma_i = 1.3$ and a resistance factor $\phi_i = 0.5$, indicating a factor of safety of 2.6. For
 6 Example 1, using a rock mass modulus of 400 MPa, the relaxed load for a socket of length of 4.3 m as
 7 determined by the WJD method, is 5.83 MN. As this is greater than the design load of 4 MN, the design is
 8 controlled by the load criterion and the length of 4.3 m is satisfactory. The resulting load-settlement curve,
 9 shown in Fig. A1, indicates that the settlement of this socket under design load is 2.4 mm. For Example 2, using
 10 a rock mass modulus is 150 MPa, the relaxed load for a socket of length of 4.3 m as determined by the WJD
 11 method, is 3.39 MN which is less than the design load. Further, for this pile, as shown in Fig. A1, the design
 12 load of 4 MN would produce about 6mm settlement. This indicates that the design is controlled by settlement
 13 and the length of the socket must be increased until the settlement under design load decreases to 5 mm. The
 14 design spreadsheet suggests that the socket length needs to be increased to about 6.1m.

15 *Tables A1 and A2 about here*

16 *Figure A1 about here*

17 The same input data as used Example 1 has been applied to the CK method. The resultant load-settlement curve
 18 is shown in Fig. A1 along with the two WJD based curves. It will be observed that, as defined by eq. (3) and eq.
 19 (7), the respective values of f_{su} for both the WJD and CK methods are effectively the same for $q_a = 6$ MPa. The
 20 load-settlement curve for the CK method indicates that for a 4.3 m long socket, the settlement corresponding to
 21 a design load of 4 MN is about 17.2 mm. This means that settlement controls design and the length of the
 22 socket must be increased until the settlement under design load decreases to 5 mm. The design spreadsheet
 23 suggests that according to the CK method, the socket length needs to be increased to about 7.0 m.

24 **Table A1.** Input data for examples of the WJD method

Example No	Qd (MN)	ρ_{dmax} (mm)	q_a (MPa)	E_m (MPa)	E_c (GPa)	D (m)	Load factor γ_i	Resistance factor ϕ_i
1	4	5	6	400	35	1	1.3	0.5
2	4	5	6	150	35	1	1.3	0.5

25 **Table A2.** Derived parameters for side resistance only socket design
26 using WJD method for maximum allowable design settlement of 5mm

Parameter	Source	Example 1 $E_m = 400 \text{ MPa}$	Example 2 $E_m = 150 \text{ MPa}$
Q_{su} (MN)	Eq. (4)	10.40	10.40
α	Fig. 3	0.128	0.128
f_{su} (MPa)	Eq. (3)	0.77	0.77
L (m)	Eq. (5)	4.3	4.3
L/D	-	4.3	4.3
E_c/E_m	-	88	233
I_p	Fig. 4	0.236	0.221
Q_{se} (MN)	Eq. (6)	8.47	3.39
f_{se} (MPa)	$= \frac{Q_{se}}{\pi \cdot D \cdot L}$	0.63	0.25
f_{se}/f_{su}	-	0.82	0.33
f_{sp}/f_{su}	Fig.2	0.26	0
f_s/f_{su}	-	0.56	0.33
f_s (MPa)	$= \frac{f_s}{f_{su}} \cdot f_{su}$	0.43	0.25
Q_s (MN)	$= f_s \cdot \pi \cdot D \cdot L$	5.83	3.39
Settlement at Q_d (mm)	Load-settlement curve	2.4	6.0
Controlling criterion	-	Load	Settlement
Design length (m)	-	4.3	6.1

Fig. A1.pdf

Fig. A1. Load-settlement curves for side resistance only socketed pile design examples.