

**TECHNICAL REPORT STANDARD PAGE**

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| 1. Report No.<br><b>FHWA/LA.08/439</b>  |  | 2. Government Accession No.   | 3. Recipient's Catalog No.                         |
| 4. Title and Subtitle<br><b>Update of Correlations between Cone Penetration and Boring Log Data</b>   |  | 5. Report Date<br><b>March 2008</b>   |  |
|   |  | 6. Performing Organization Code   |  |
| 7. Author(s)<br><b>Khalid Alshibli, Ph.D., P.E.<br/>Ayman M. Okeil, Ph.D., P.E.<br/>Bashar Alramahi, Ph.D.</b>  |  | 8. Performing Organization Report No.   |  |
| 9. Performing Organization Name and Address<br><b>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering<br/>Louisiana State University<br/>Baton Rouge, LA 70803</b>  |  | 10. Work Unit No.   |  |
|   |  | 11. Contract or Grant No.<br><b>LTRC Project Number: 06-6GT<br/>State Project Number: 736-99-1406</b> |  |
| 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address<br><b>Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development<br/>P.O. Box 94245<br/>Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9245</b>   |  | 13. Type of Report and Period Covered<br><b>Final Report<br/>February 2007 – March 2008</b>           |  |
|   |  | 14. Sponsoring Agency Code  |  |
| 15. Supplementary Notes<br><b>Conducted in Cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration</b>   |  |   |  |
| 16. Abstract<br><p>The cone penetration test (CPT) has been widely used in Louisiana in the last two decades as an in situ tool to characterize engineering properties of soils. In addition, conventional drilling and sample retrieval using Shelby tube followed by laboratory testing is still the acceptable practice in identifying soils engineering properties. The main objective of this project is to update the correlations that are currently used by Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD) to interpret CPT data for engineering design purposes and to assess the reliability of using CPT data to predict soil shear strength in both the magnitude and spatial variations in the field with respect to the Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) methodology. The results of laboratory soil testing were retrieved from borehole logs and were used as reference measurements in this study.</p> <p>The research team collected project data files in paper printout format from LADOTD and soil testing engineers. Most project files did not have spatial coordinates; therefore, aerial images were used to identify latitude and longitude coordinates of CPT and borehole locations. The borehole data was not available for all the located CPT soundings. Efforts were made to obtain any available data from LADOTD electronic archive as well as paper project documents. A total of 752 CPT tests were documented in which 503 were matched with adjacent boreholes and 249 did not have adjacent borehole data available. The CPT data was used to predict soil undrained shear strength, bulk density and classification according to Robertson and Zhang and Tumay methods [1], [2].</p> <p>The CPT data was then used to develop a database of undrained shear strength estimates with corresponding results from boreholes. The results in the database were preprocessed to apply some constraints on data points included in the calibration study, such as setting a maximum threshold on the distance between CPT and borehole locations; a minimum and maximum threshold on undrained shear strength values were used to represent realistic soil properties. The resulting database included results from 251 CPT soundings with borehole results in their vicinity that meet the aforementioned constraints. From these CPT soundings, 862 unique undrained shear strength data points were obtained at various depths. The dataset was analyzed for general as well as specific trends in order to identify appropriate parameters to be included in the study. Soil classification was clearly the most plausible parameter based on which the CPT undrained shear strength estimates should be calibrated.</p> <p>The calibration of the CPT expression for undrained shear strength was conducted using two approaches. The first approach is a direct correlation based of the transformation model currently used by LADOTD for estimating the shear strength. The First Order Reliability Method (FORM) forms the basis for the second approach, which is more detailed and accounts for all sources of uncertainty. Optimum CPT coefficient values were computed for various target reliability values. The results were summarized and implementation procedures were recommended for future research.</p> |  |   |  |
| 17. Key Words<br><b>cone penetrometer; soil testing; reliability; geographical information system</b>   |  |   | 18. Distribution Statement<br><b>Unrestricted.</b> |
| 19. Security Classification (of this report)<br><b>N/A</b>  | 20. Security Classification (of this page)<br><b>N/A</b> | 21. No. of Pages<br><b>172</b>  | 22. Price<br><b>N/A</b>                            |



## **Project Review Committee**

Each research project will have an advisory committee appointed by the LTRC Director. The Project Review Committee is responsible for assisting the LTRC Administrator or Manager in the development of acceptable research problem statements, requests for proposals, review of research proposals, oversight of approved research projects, and implementation of findings.

LTRC appreciates the dedication of the following Project Review Committee Members in guiding this research study to fruition.

### ***LTRC Administrator/ Manager***

Zhongjie “Doc” Zhang, Ph.D., P.E.  
Pavement Geotechnical Research Administrator

### ***Members***

Dr. Ching Tsai, Geotechnical Section  
Ben Fernandez, Geotechnical Section  
Dr. Murad Abufarsakh, LTRC  
Dr. Recep Yilmaz, Fugro Geosciences  
Bert Wintz, Materials Laboratory  
Kim Carlington, Geotechnical Section  
Philip Arena, FHWA  
Gavin Gautreau, LTRC

### ***Directorate Implementation Sponsor***

William B. Temple  
DOTD Chief Engineer



# **Update of Correlations between Cone Penetration and Boring Log Data**

by

Khalid Alshibli, Ph.D., P.E.  
Associate Professor

Ayman Okeil, Ph.D., P.E.  
Assistant Professor

Bashar Alramahi, Ph.D.  
Research Associate

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering  
3505 Patrick F. Taylor Hall  
Louisiana State University  
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

LTRC Project No. 06-6GT  
State Project No. 736-99-1406

conducted for

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development  
Louisiana Transportation Research Center

The contents of this report reflect the views of the author/principal investigator who is responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents of do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development or the Louisiana Transportation Research Center. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

March 2008



## ABSTRACT

The cone penetration test (CPT) has been widely used in Louisiana in the last two decades as an in situ tool to characterize engineering properties of soils. In addition, conventional drilling and sample retrieval using Shelby tube followed by laboratory testing is still the acceptable practice in identifying soils engineering properties. The main objective of this project is to update the correlations that are currently used by Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD) to interpret CPT data for engineering design purposes and to assess the reliability of using CPT data to predict soil shear strength in both the magnitude and spatial variations in the field with respect to the Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) methodology. The results of laboratory soil testing were retrieved from borehole logs and were used as reference measurements in this study.

The research team collected project data files in paper printout format from LADOTD and soil testing engineers. Most project files did not have spatial coordinates; therefore, aerial images were used to identify latitude and longitude coordinates of CPT and borehole locations. The borehole data was not available for all the located CPT soundings. Efforts were made to obtain any available data from LADOTD electronic archive as well as paper project documents. A total of 752 CPT soundings were documented in which 503 were matched with adjacent boreholes and 249 did not have adjacent borehole data available. The CPT data was used to predict soil undrained shear strength, bulk density and classification according to Robertson and Zhang and Tumay methods [1], [2].

The CPT measurements were then used to develop a database of undrained shear strength estimates with corresponding results from boreholes. The results in the database were preprocessed to apply some constraints on data points included in the calibration study, such as setting a maximum threshold on the distance between CPT and borehole locations; a minimum and maximum threshold on undrained shear strength values were used to represent realistic soil properties. The resulting database included results from 251 CPT soundings with borehole results in their vicinity that meet the aforementioned constraints. From these CPT soundings, 862 unique undrained shear strength data points were obtained at various depths. The dataset was analyzed for general as well as specific trends in order to identify appropriate parameters to be included in the study. Soil classification was clearly the most plausible parameter based on which the CPT undrained shear strength estimates should be calibrated.

The calibration of the CPT expression for undrained shear strength was conducted using two approaches. The first approach is a direct correlation based of the transformation model currently used by LADOTD for estimating the shear strength. The First Order Reliability Method (FORM) forms the basis for the second approach, which is more detailed and accounts for all sources of uncertainty. Optimum CPT coefficient values were computed for various target reliability values. The results were summarized and implementation procedures were recommended for future research.



## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The authors gratefully acknowledged the financial support provided by the Louisiana Transportation Research Center (LTRC) and Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD).

The authors also acknowledge the assistance of the graduate students Chaytanya Mamidala and Ashwin Bommathanahalli who helped in data archiving and analysis. The authors would also like to thank Benjamin Fernandez from LADOTD geotechnical section and Jesse Rauser from Ardaman & Associates, Inc. for providing the CPT and borehole data.

The constructive criticism and suggestions of Dr. Zhongjie “Doc” Zhang, pavement geotechnical research administrator, and Mark Morvant, associate director of research at LTRC, are highly valued and appreciated.



## IMPLEMENTATION STATEMENT

The results of this study demonstrated the benefit of performing in depth statistical analyses of soil property estimation methods. The cone penetration test has been in service for years, and it is prudent to update its coefficients and identify limits on its application so safe design can be achieved. In this study, a database of CPT soundings has been compiled with corresponding borehole results where available. The developed database should be updated as more borehole and CPT data become available for future projects. The database is useful and has been integrated into a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) system so LADOTD engineers may have easy access to its components. Comparison of the undrained shear strengths obtained from the CPT soundings and unconfined compression test on borehole samples revealed that it is possible to identify unique trends. These trends were used in updating the correlation of the CPT coefficient,  $N_{kt}$ . As a side product of this study, a procedure for identifying site variability is proposed that does not involve any subjective interpretation of the results. The procedure may be used when implementing new Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) design codes where some design coefficients are varied based on the site variability.

Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that the findings of this research be implemented for a pilot testing period where LADOTD engineers gradually start using the newly correlated CPT coefficient,  $N_{kt}$ , for estimating the undrained shear strength in conjunction with the traditional borehole assessments. During this period, it is important to assess the validity of the proposed changes from this study and document its outcome for future reference. As the findings get updated, it is anticipated that LADOTD engineers can gradually move toward replacing the conventional reliance on boreholes for undrained shear estimates with CPT soundings. This will translate, in the long run, as a cost benefit to LADOTD.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| ABSTRACT .....  | III  |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....   | V    |
| IMPLEMENTATION STATEMENT .....  | VII  |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS .....   | IX   |
| LIST OF TABLES .....  | XIII |
| LIST OF FIGURES .....   | XV   |
| Part I: Cone Penetration Test (CPT) .....   | 1    |
| Historic Background .....   | 1    |
| Apparatus Description and Correction Factors .....  | 3    |
| Soil Classification using CPT .....   | 6    |
| Strength Characteristics .....  | 10   |
| Effective Stress Strength Parameters .....  | 14   |
| Stress History .....  | 16   |
| Relative Density from CPT Data .....  | 18   |
| Correlations with Standard Penetration Test (SPT) .....   | 21   |
| Part II: Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) .....   | 23   |
| LRFD in Geotechnical Applications .....   | 24   |
| OBJECTIVE .....   | 27   |
| SCOPE .....   | 29   |
| METHODOLOGY .....   | 31   |
| CPT Database .....  | 31   |
| Locating CPT Sites using GIS .....  | 31   |
| Borehole Data .....   | 33   |
| CPT and Borehole Data Analysis and Archiving .....  | 35   |
| Reliability Analysis of CPT .....   | 42   |
| Direct Correlation of CPT and Boring Results–1 <sup>st</sup> Approach .....                               | 42   |
| Detailed Reliability Analysis for Correlation of CPT and Boring Results–2 <sup>nd</sup><br>Approach ..... | 43   |
| Preprocessing CPT Data .....  | 45   |
| Matching CPT and Borehole Data .....  | 45   |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Averaging CPT Readings .....   | 47  |
| Filtering Data Results .....   | 49  |
| Calibration of CPT Coefficient.....  | 51  |
| Limit State Function .....   | 51  |
| Chi-Square Statistical Test “Goodness of Fit” .....                          | 55  |
| Reliability-based Calibration .....  | 56  |
| DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....   | 57  |
| Repeatability Tests.....   | 57  |
| Statistical Characteristics of Repeatability Data.....                       | 59  |
| Utilizing CPT for Assessment of Site Variability.....                        | 67  |
| Initial Data Analysis .....  | 69  |
| General Trends.....  | 69  |
| Specific Parameter Trends .....  | 73  |
| CPT Reading Values ( $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$ ).....                              | 77  |
| Chi-Square Results.....  | 89  |
| Calibration of CPT Coefficient for Undrained Shear Strength.....             | 95  |
| Calibration–1 <sup>st</sup> Approach .....                                   | 95  |
| Calibration–2 <sup>nd</sup> Approach .....                                   | 99  |
| Correlation Between Unit Weight, $\gamma_T$ , from CPT and Boring Data ..... | 109 |
| SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....  | 111 |
| Summary .....  | 111 |
| Conclusions.....   | 111 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS .....  | 115 |
| ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMBOLS .....                                   | 117 |
| REFERENCES .....   | 121 |
| APPENDIX A.....  | 133 |
| List of Projects Included in Database .....                                  | 133 |
| APPENDIX B .....   | 139 |
| First Order Reliability Method (FORM).....                                   | 139 |
| APPENDIX C .....   | 143 |
| Chi-Square Statistical Test: Goodness-of-fit Test .....                      | 143 |
| APPENDIX D.....  | 145 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Normal and Lognormal Distribution Types.....                              | 145 |
| Normal or Gaussian Distribution .....                                     | 145 |
| Lognormal Distribution The random variable $X$ is a lognormal random..... | 146 |
| APPENDIX E .....  | 149 |
| Example Excel Template to Analyze CPT Data.....                           | 149 |





## LIST OF TABLES

|          |   |     |
|----------|---|-----|
| Table 1  | Nc values theoretically derived by different researchers (11)   | 12  |
| Table 2  | Constants for determination of $D_r$ [65]   | 19  |
| Table 3  | Suggested $Q_c$ values [67]   | 20  |
| Table 4  | Typical $I_c$ ranges for different soil types [73]  | 22  |
| Table 5  | Random variables used in reliability calibration  | 54  |
| Table 6  | Statistical characteristics of transformation model (Robertson classification)                        | 54  |
| Table 7  | Statistical characteristics of transformation model (Zhang and Tumay classification)                  | 55  |
| Table 8  | Range of parameters covered in reliability study  | 56  |
| Table 9  | Discrete tip resistance, $q_c$ , readings at 5 ft. intervals.   | 60  |
| Table 10 | Discrete unit weight, $\gamma_T$ , results at 5 ft. intervals.  | 60  |
| Table 11 | Discrete overburden pressure readings at 5 ft. intervals.   | 61  |
| Table 12 | Effect of soil depth on uncertainty of CPT results  | 75  |
| Table 13 | Effect of net difference between CPT readings, $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$ , on uncertainty of CPT results    | 78  |
| Table 14 | Effect of soil classification on uncertainty of CPT results   | 81  |
| Table 15 | Effect of soil classification on uncertainty of CPT results   | 83  |
| Table 16 | Effect of soil classification on uncertainty of CPT results (Robertson)                               | 85  |
| Table 17 | Effect of Plasticity Index on uncertainty of CPT results  | 87  |
| Table 18 | Summary of chi-square test results for transformation model   | 89  |
| Table 19 | Calibrated $N_{kt}$ values for different probability of exceedance, $P_e$ , values                    | 96  |
| Table 20 | Reliability results ( $\beta_T = 0.0$ , $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$ , Robertson classification)          | 100 |
| Table 21 | Reliability results ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ , $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$ , Robertson classification)       | 101 |
| Table 22 | Reliability results ( $\beta_T = 0.4308$ , $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$ , Robertson classification)       | 102 |
| Table 23 | Optimum $N_{kt}$ values ( $\beta_T = 0.0$ , Robertson classification)                                 | 104 |
| Table 24 | Optimum $N_{kt}$ values ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ , Robertson classification)                              | 104 |
| Table 25 | Optimum $N_{kt}$ values ( $\beta_T = 0.4308$ , Robertson classification)                              | 105 |
| Table 26 | Reliability results ( $\beta_T = 0.0$ , $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$ , Zhang and Tumay classification)    | 106 |
| Table 27 | Reliability results ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ , $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$ , Zhang and Tumay classification) | 107 |
| Table 28 | Reliability results ( $\beta_T = 0.4308$ , $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$ , Zhang and Tumay classification) | 108 |
| Table 29 | Optimum $N_{kt}$ values ( $\beta_T = 0.0$ , Zhang and Tumay classification)                           | 108 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table 30 Optimum $N_{kt}$ values ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ , Zhang and Tumay classification).....         | 109 |
| Table 31 Optimum $N_{kt}$ values ( $\beta_T = 0.4308$ , Zhang and Tumay classification).....         | 109 |
| Table 32 Recommended $N_{kt}$ values using 2 <sup>nd</sup> approach (Robertson classification).....  | 113 |
| Table 33 Recommended $N_{kt}$ values using 2 <sup>nd</sup> approach (Zhang and Tumay classification) | 113 |
| Table 34 Projects with CPT and borehole data.....  | 133 |
| Table 35 Projects with CPT data without borehole data.....   | 136 |
| Table 36 CDF of the chi-square distribution (Nowak and Collins 2000).....                            | 144 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|           |  |    |
|-----------|--|----|
| Figure 1  | Early cone penetrometers (a) Dutch cone with conical mantle, (b) Begemann cone with friction sleeve [11] ..... | 2  |
| Figure 2  | Typical Schematic of Piezocone [12].....   | 4  |
| Figure 3  | Typical results of CPT.....  | 5  |
| Figure 4  | Douglas and Olsen classification chart [18].....   | 8  |
| Figure 5  | Classification charts presented by Robertson et al. [19] .....   | 9  |
| Figure 6  | Eslami and Fellenius classification chart [26].....  | 9  |
| Figure 7  | Charts to obtain $S_u$ from excess pore water pressure measurements [51] .....                                 | 14 |
| Figure 8  | Interpretation diagrams for $\beta = 0$ and $\beta = -15^\circ$ [57] .....                                     | 15 |
| Figure 9  | Empirical correlations of OCR vs. normalized PCPT parameters [58].....   | 16 |
| Figure 10 | Comparison between the measured and predicted $\sigma'_p$ values [62].....                                     | 17 |
| Figure 11 | Variation of $q_c/N$ with $d_{50}$ [19].....   | 22 |
| Figure 12 | Uncertainty in soil property estimates [93] .....  | 25 |
| Figure 13 | CPT data points from LADOTD and STE .....  | 33 |
| Figure 14 | CPT data points with and without borehole data from LADOTD and STE .....                                       | 34 |
| Figure 15 | Example CPT point information displayed by selecting a CPT location.....                                       | 37 |
| Figure 16 | Example CPT classification file displayed by selecting the PDF link .....                                      | 38 |
| Figure 17 | Zoomed view of the northern part of Louisiana where a higher number of CPT points were available .....         | 39 |
| Figure 18 | Zoomed view of the southwestern part of Louisiana where a smaller number of CPT points were available.....     | 40 |
| Figure 19 | Histogram of depths for CPT points included in database .....  | 41 |
| Figure 20 | Depth histograms for different soil classifications [4], [5], [19].....  | 41 |
| Figure 21 | Array of CPT repeatability tests.....  | 44 |
| Figure 22 | Distance threshold between CPT and borehole locations showing number of data points included in analyses.....  | 46 |
| Figure 23 | Averaging raw CPT readings .....   | 48 |
| Figure 24 | Histogram of $S_u$ frequency in compiled database .....  | 49 |
| Figure 25 | Effect of $S_u$ thresholds on uncertainty of transformation model.....   | 50 |
| Figure 26 | Illustration of the limit state function (LSF) used in this study (general case) .....                         | 52 |
| Figure 27 | Illustration of the limit state function (LSF) used in this study (special case).....                          | 52 |
| Figure 28 | Cone data from all repeatability tests .....   | 58 |
| Figure 29 | Analysis of repeatability data for cone tip resistance.....  | 62 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Figure 30 Study of unit weight data scatter from repeatability tests .....   | 63  |
| Figure 31 Study of overburden pressure data scatter from repeatability tests .....   | 64  |
| Figure 32 Tip resistance, $q_c$ , readings from all CPT repeatability tests.....   | 65  |
| Figure 33 Study of tip resistance data scatter, $COV(q_c)$ , vs. soil classification. ....   | 66  |
| Figure 34 Study of unit weight data scatter, $COV(\gamma_T)$ , vs. soil classification .....   | 66  |
| Figure 35 Study of overburden pressure data scatter, $COV(\sigma_{vo})$ , vs. soil classification.....   | 67  |
| Figure 36 Comparison of undrained shear strength, $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests.....   | 70  |
| Figure 37 Analyzing data trends of different CPT readings versus $S_u^{UC}$ .....  | 72  |
| Figure 38 Comparison of undrained shear strength, $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests.....   | 76  |
| Figure 39 Comparison of undrained shear strength, $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests at different<br>CPT readings net difference, $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$ , values..... | 79  |
| Figure 40 Comparison of undrained shear strength, $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests for different<br>soil classifications (Zhang and Tumay – clay only).....       | 82  |
| Figure 41 Comparison of undrained shear strength, $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests for different<br>soil classifications (Zhang and Tumay – clay and silt) .....  | 84  |
| Figure 42 Comparison of undrained shear strength, $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests for different<br>soil classifications (Robertson) .....                        | 86  |
| Figure 43 Comparison of undrained shear strength, $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests for different<br>Plasticity Index values .....                                 | 88  |
| Figure 44 Chi square test results for transformation model (all data points).....  | 90  |
| Figure 45 Chi square test results for transformation model (Soil Classification 2).....  | 91  |
| Figure 46 Chi square test results for transformation model (Soil Classification 3).....  | 92  |
| Figure 47 Chi square test results for transformation model (Soil Classification 4).....  | 93  |
| Figure 48 Chi square test results for device uncertainty .....   | 94  |
| Figure 49 Histogram of $N_{kt}$ –values obtained from equation (42) –all data points .....   | 95  |
| Figure 50 Cumulative distribution function (CDF) for $N_{kt}$ –values [all data points] .....  | 96  |
| Figure 51 Histogram of $N_{kt}$ –values obtained from equation (42) (by Robertson soil<br>classification).....   | 97  |
| Figure 52 Histogram of $N_{kt}$ –values obtained from equation (42) (by Zhang and Tumay’s soil<br>classification).....   | 98  |
| Figure 53 Determining optimum $N_{kt}$ values ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ , $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.05$ ) .....  | 103 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Figure 54 Unit weight correlation $\gamma_T$ (CPT vs. boring results) .....           | 110 |
| Figure 55 Histogram of unit weight ratio $\gamma_{T,CPT} / \gamma_{T,BoreHole}$ ..... | 110 |
| Figure 56 Reliability index evaluated at design point (Nowak and Collins 2000).....   | 139 |
| Figure 57 Graphical representation of normal distribution.....                        | 146 |
| Figure 58 Graphical representation of lognormal distribution .....                    | 147 |



# INTRODUCTION

## Part I: Cone Penetration Test (CPT)

In recent years, the Cone Penetration Test (CPT) has gained popularity as a fast, inexpensive, and fairly accurate method for in-situ characterization of sub-surface soil layers. This is attributed to its ability to obtain nearly continuous measurements providing a much higher data resolution than standard soil sampling procedures. The data obtained from a CPT sounding can be used to determine the soil shear strength (e.g., [3], [4], and [5]), soil classification, in-situ stresses, compressibility, permeability, and other soil properties. The CPT is a simple, quick, and economical test that provides reliable and continuous in-situ soundings of subsurface soil.

In a CPT, a series of metal rods with a cone-shaped tip are pushed into the ground at a constant penetration rate. During this process, load sensors measure the amount of force required to penetrate different soil layers. Mainly, two force components are measured during a CPT: the force acting on the cone ( $Q_c$ ) and the total combined force acting on the cone and cylindrical friction sleeve located behind the tip ( $Q_t$ ). The cone resistance ( $q_c$ ) is calculated as the force ( $Q_c$ ) divided by the projected area of the cone ( $A_c$ ), while the sleeve friction ( $f_s$ ) is calculated as the net force acting on the friction sleeve ( $Q_t - Q_c$ ) divided by the surface of the sleeve ( $A_s$ ).

To further improve the interpretation ability of the CPT, pore water pressure transducers were added to the cone; it is referred to as Piezo-Cone Penetration Test (PCPT). Pressure measurements are usually obtained at three locations: the tip of the cone ( $u_1$ ), behind the cone ( $u_2$ ), and behind the friction sleeve ( $u_3$ ). The following sections present a historic background, a detailed description of the CPT/PCPT, and a brief overview of the measured and calculated parameters used to interpret CPT/PCPT data.


### Historic Background

The cone penetration test, in its current form, was invented in the Netherlands in 1932 by P. Barentsen. It was referred to as the Dutch cone penetrometer. It consisted of a steel rod with a cone tip sliding inside a metal gas pipe. While the rod was manually pushed in the ground, load measurements were performed at different depths. The apparatus was mainly used by Dutch engineers to determine the ultimate capacity of driven piles in sand [6].

The Dutch cone was later improved by Vermeiden and Plantema by adding a conical mantle just above the cone to prevent soil from entering the gap between the rod and the pipe

(Figure 1a) [7], [8]. A major improvement was introduced by Begemann by adding a friction sleeve behind the cone which enabled the measurement of friction as well as the cone resistance (Figure 1b) [9].

Several methods were used over time to advance the cone into the ground. The development of a cone penetrometer that consisted of a conical point connected to the piston of a small hydraulic jack at the base of the rod was reported by Sanglerat [10]. He also reported the development of a hydraulic penetrometer by the Centre Expérimental du Bâtiment et des Travaux Publics (CEBTP) in France in 1966. These types of mechanical cones are still in use because of their low cost and simplicity of use [11].



**Figure 1**

**Early cone penetrometers (a) Dutch cone with conical mantle, (b) Begemann cone with friction sleeve [11]**



## Apparatus Description and Correction Factors

A typical CPT apparatus consists of a 60° conical tip with a 10 or 15 cm<sup>2</sup> base and a 150 cm<sup>2</sup> friction sleeve located behind it. Figure 2 illustrates a typical PCPT apparatus showing the geometry of the cone and the friction sleeve in addition to the pore water pressure transducers.

As mentioned earlier, the main parameters measured during a PCPT are the cone resistance ( $q_c$ ) and the sleeve friction ( $f_s$ ) in addition to three pore water pressure measurements performed at different locations:  $u_1$  measured on the cone tip,  $u_2$  measured behind the cone, and  $u_3$  measured behind the sleeve. Many methods are employed to obtain the cone resistance and sleeve friction. Most popularly, two load cells are used: one is located behind the cone while the other is located behind the sleeve. The cone resistance is directly obtained from the reading of the first load cell while the sleeve friction is calculated from the difference between the first and second load cell readings. This type is called a “subtraction cone” and is preferred due to the overall robustness of the penetrometer [13].

Depending on the cone geometry, sensors’ locations, and temperature effects among other factors, several correction factors are suggested in order to ensure the quality of the obtained CPT data and to account for the different types of penetrometers that might be used.

Due to the “unequal area effect,” where the pore water pressure acts on the shoulders behind the cone and the sleeve, a cone area ratio ( $a$ ) is used to correct the obtained cone resistance. It is approximately equal to the ratio of the area of the load cell or shaft to the projected area of the cone. The corrected cone resistance is defined as:

$$q_t = q_c + u_2(1 - a) \quad (1)$$

The sleeve friction is also influenced by the unequal area effect; therefore, it is also corrected to account for the difference in the pore water pressure between the front ( $u_2$ ) and the shoulder ( $u_3$ ) of the sleeve. The corrected sleeve friction is calculated as:

$$f_t = f_s - \frac{(u_2 \cdot A_{sb} - u_3 \cdot A_{st})}{A_s} \quad (2)$$


where,  $A_{sb}$  is the cross sectional area at the bottom of the friction sleeve,  $A_{st}$  is the cross sectional area at the top of the friction sleeve, and  $A_s$  is friction sleeve surface area. Lunne et al. noted that this correction is rarely carried out because  $u_3$  is seldom measured [11]. On the other hand, the pore water pressure at the front of the cone can be estimated from pore water pressure readings at the tip of the cone using the following equation (14):

$$u_2 = u_o + k(u_1 - u_o) \quad (3)$$


where,

$u_o$  = hydrostatic or initial in-situ pore pressure, and

$k$  = adjustment factor (function of soil type and properties)



**Figure 2**  
**Typical Schematic of Piezocone [12]**



**Figure 3**  
**Typical results of CPT**

Another parameter commonly calculated from CPT data is the ratio of the sleeve friction to the tip resistance, known as the friction ratio illustrated in equation (4). This parameter is particularly useful in soil classification because different soil types exhibit different relative amounts of tip resistance and sleeve friction. Therefore, this ratio provides a useful tool to determine different soil types. This parameter is usually plotted alongside the tip resistance and sleeve friction when reporting CPT results. An example presentation of CPT data is illustrated in Figure 3.

$$R_f = \frac{f_t}{q_t} \tag{4}$$

### Soil Classification using CPT

Data obtained from a CPT can be used to classify the different types of soils along the path of the cone. It was observed that different types of soils exhibit distinctive responses during cone penetration making it possible to classify the soils based on their response. For example, while sandy soils are characterized by high cone resistance and low friction ratio, soft clays produce low cone resistance and high friction ratio [11]. Begemann noted that soil type is not a strict function of the tip resistance or sleeve friction but rather a combination of these values [15].

Several efforts were made to present a dependable classification chart using cone penetrometer data [16], [17]. Using an extensive database of CPT results in different soil types, Douglas and Olsen presented a chart that can be used to classify different types of soils using the cone resistance and the friction ratio (Figure 4) [18]. They noted that this classification provides a guide to the soil types based on their behavior and cannot be expected to provide accurate prediction about the soils grain size distribution.

In the following years, different classification charts were suggested using broader soil database; most of them still used the cone resistance and the friction ratio as a basis for classification [19], [20]. However, it was noticed that even with careful procedures and corrections for pore pressure effects, sleeve friction measurements are often less accurate and less reliable than the cone resistance [21], [22]. Therefore, classification charts have been proposed based on the tip resistance and pore water pressure [23], [24], [25]. A pore water pressure index  $B_q$  was used in the classification; it is defined as [11]:

$$B_q = \frac{u_2 - u_0}{q_t - \sigma_{vo}} \quad (5)$$

where,

$u_2$  = Pore pressure measured between the cone and the friction sleeve,

$u_0$  = equilibrium pore pressure,

$\sigma_{vo}$  = total overburden stress, and


$q_t$  = cone resistance corrected for unequal end area effects.

In order to perform a more accurate classification scheme, Robertson et al. as suggested classification charts based on all three pieces of data ( $q_t$ ,  $f_s$ , and  $B_q$ ), shown in Figure 5 [19]. These charts classify the soils based on their response to 12 distinct soil types and provide information about the relative density and over-consolidation ratio (OCR) of the soils.


Eslami and Fellenius presented a classification chart based on data obtained from 20 sites in 5 countries [26]. They used an “effective” tip resistance parameter ( $q_E = q_t - u_2$ ) to provide a more consistent delineation of envelopes than a plot of only the cone resistance. This parameter along with the sleeve friction were used to classify soils into five main categories as shown in Figure 6.

After comparing several soil classification methods using CPT data, Fellenius and Eslami concluded that the classification methods that do not correct for the pore pressure on the cone shoulder may not be relevant outside the areas where they were developed, and the error due to omitting the pore water pressure is highest in fine grained soils [27].


Since soil classification based on CPT data depends on the mechanical properties of the soils, such as strength and compressibility; Zhang and Tumay argued that due to complicated environmental conditions, the correlation between soil and mechanical properties will never be a simple one-to-one correspondence [2]. They also indicated that the CPT classification charts do not present an accurate prediction of soil types based on compositional properties but rather a guide to soil behavior type. They suggested an alternative classification method using statistical and fuzzy subset approaches to calculate a soil classification index (U) from CPT data that is used to determine probable Unified Soil Classification System (USCS) (compositional) soil types.



**Figure 4**  
**Douglas and Olsen classification chart [18]**



**Figure 5**  
**Classification charts presented by Robertson et al. [19]**



**Figure 6**  
**Eslami and Fellenius classification chart [26]**

This alternative classification method utilizes the fuzzy subset approach which aims to release the constraint of soil composition and put emphasis on the soil behavior instead [28], [29]. Three empirically defined density functions that correspond to three soil groups are presented: highly probable clay (HPC), highly probable mixed (HPM), and highly probable sand (HPS). The three functions as a whole will reflect the overall perspective of soil properties. This results in a classification that does not yield sharp boundaries between layers but rather a smooth transition from one soil type to another. This statistical approach has been adopted by LADOTD as a standard procedure for the interpretation on CPT data.

### Strength Characteristics

**Undrained Shear Strength.** Many researchers attempted to develop a dependable correlation between the parameters obtained from cone penetration tests and the undrained shear strength of cohesive soils. Some of the presented correlations were based on theoretical solutions like the bearing capacity theory, cavity expansion method strain path method and numerical methods using linear and non-linear soil models [30], [31], [32], [33], [34]. Other correlations, however, were empirically developed by comparing CPT results with laboratory shear strength experiments.

In theoretical solutions, the undrained shear strength is expressed as a function of the cone tip resistance using the following equation:

$$S_u = \frac{q_c - \sigma}{N_c} \quad (6)$$

where,  $N_c$  is a theoretical cone factor, and  $\sigma$  is the in-situ total pressure. Depending on the theory used to calculate  $N_c$ ,  $\sigma$  can be the total vertical ( $\sigma_{vo}$ ), horizontal ( $\sigma_{ho}$ ), or mean ( $\sigma_{mean}$ ) stress. Table 1 presents a summary of  $N_c$  values theoretically derived by different researchers.

Since cone penetration is a complex phenomenon, all theoretical solutions make several simplifying assumptions regarding soil behavior, failure mechanism, and boundary conditions. The theoretical solutions need to be verified from actual field and/or laboratory test data. Theoretical solutions have limitations in modeling the real soil behavior under conditions of varying stress history, anisotropy, sensitivity, aging and micro fabric. Hence,



empirical correlations are generally preferred although the theoretical solutions have provided a useful framework of understanding. Lunne and Kleven presented an equation to predict the undrained shear strength using the total cone resistance [44]:

$$S_u = \frac{q_c - \sigma_{vo}}{N_k} \quad (7)$$

where,  $q_c$  is the measured cone resistance,  $\sigma_{vo}$  is the in situ vertical stress, and  $N_k$  denotes the cone factor that includes the influence of the cone shape and depth factor; its value typically ranges from 11 to 19 for normally consolidated clays [11]. Kjekstad et al. reported a  $N_k$  value of 17 for over-consolidated clays [45]. Equation (7) was later modified where the corrected cone resistance ( $q_t$ ) was used:

$$S_u = \frac{q_t - \sigma_{vo}}{N_{kt}} \quad (8)$$

Many experiments were performed to estimate the value (or range of values) for  $N_{kt}$  [46], [47], [48]. A wide range of values were reported depending on the type of cone, field conditions, penetration rate and laboratory testing method. However, most of the reported values of  $N_{kt}$  ranged between 10 and 30.

**Table 1**  
**Nc values theoretically derived by different researchers [11]**

| $N_c(\phi = 0)$   | $\sigma_i$      | Remarks   | Reference |
|---|-----------------|---|-----------|
| 7.41  | $\sigma_{vo}$   |   | [35]      |
| 7.0   | $\sigma_{vo}$   |   | [36]      |
| 9.34  | $\sigma_{vo}$   | Smooth Base   | [37]      |
| 9.74  | $\sigma_{vo}$   | Rough Base  |           |
| 9.94  | $\sigma_{vo}$   |   | [38]      |
| $\frac{4}{3} \left[ 1 + \ln \frac{E_t}{3s_u} \right] + 1$   | $\sigma_{vo}$   | Spherical cavity expansion, $E_t$ : initial tangent modulus       | [37]      |
| $\frac{4}{3} \left[ 1 + \ln \frac{E_s}{s_u} \right] + 1$  | $\sigma_{vo}$   | Spherical cavity expansion, $E_s$ : secant modulus at 50% failure | [39]      |
| $\frac{4}{3} \left[ 1 + \ln \frac{E_s}{3s_u} \right] + \cot \theta$   | $\sigma_{vo}$   | Spherical cavity expansion  | [40]      |
| $\frac{4}{3} \left[ 1 + \ln \frac{E_s}{s_u} \right] + \cot \theta$  | $\sigma_{vo}$   | Spherical cavity expansion, finite strain theory                  | [40]      |
| $\frac{4}{3} [1 + \ln I_R]$   | $\sigma_{vo}$   | Spherical cavity expansion  | [31]      |
| $\frac{4}{3} [1 + \ln I_R] + 2.57$  | $\sigma_{mean}$ | Spherical cavity expansion  | [31]      |
| $[1 + \ln I_R] + 11$  | $\sigma_{ho}$   | Cylindrical cavity expansion                                      | [41]      |
| $\frac{s_a}{s_u} + \frac{4}{3} \frac{s_r}{s_u} \left[ 1 + \ln \frac{E_r}{3s_{ur}} \right] + \frac{4}{3}$  | $\sigma_{vo}$   | Trilinear stress-strain relationship                              | [42]      |
| $\left[ \frac{E_u/s_u - E_r/s_{ur} \cdot s_{ur}/s_u}{E_u/S_u - E_r/s_{ur}} \right] \ln \frac{E_u}{s_u} \frac{s_{ur}}{E_r}$<br>$+ 0.19 + 2.64 \ln(I_r) - \frac{\sigma'_{vo}}{s_u} (1 - K_o) + 2\alpha$ | $\sigma_{vo}$   | Elastic perfectly plastic- strain path approach                   | [43]      |

$\theta$ : semi apex angle; IR: rigidity index.

Another equation was suggested by Senneset et al. using the effective in lieu of the total cone resistance [49]:

$$S_u = \frac{q_E}{N_c} = \frac{q_t - u_2}{N_c} \quad (9)$$


They reported an average value of 15 for  $N_c$  with a likely variation of  $\pm 3$ . They also noted that  $S_u$  values are particularly questionable for small excess pore pressures corresponding to  $B_q < 0.4$  that is for materials coarser than clayey silt. Using the same equation, Lunne et al. reported  $N_c$  values of 1 to 13 [50]. Campanella and Robertson noted that although this method might work well for some deposits, it is not recommended to use the effective cone resistance to estimate  $S_u$  [51]. They explained that in soft normally consolidated clays, the total pore pressure behind the cone is approximately 90 percent or more of the measured cone resistance. This results in a very small value of  $q_c$  that is very sensitive to small errors in  $q_u$  or  $u_2$  measurement.

Several other researchers attempted to use the excess pore water pressure ( $\Delta u = u_2 - u_0$ ) to estimate the undrained shear strength [31], [52], [53], [54], [55]. They used:

$$S_u = \frac{\Delta u}{N_{\Delta u}} \quad (10)$$

The obtained values of  $N_{\Delta u}$  were between 2 and 20. One advantage of these methods over the effective cone resistance method is that  $\Delta u$  can be very large, especially in soft clays, making the effect of measurement errors less significant and resulting in a better accuracy for this method.

Based on cavity expansion theory, Massarch and Broms presented a semi-empirical solution that included the effects of overconsolidation and sensitivity of soils by using Skempton's pore pressure parameter at failure ( $A_f$ ) [55]. They presented a set of charts to obtain  $S_u$  based on excess pore pressure measurements (Figure 7).



**Figure 7**  
**Charts to obtain  $S_u$  from excess pore water pressure measurements [51]**

### Effective Stress Strength Parameters

Many correlations were suggested to calculate the effective stress parameters: friction angle  $\phi'$  and attraction  $a$  ( $= \frac{c}{\tan \phi'}$ ) from CPT data. Using the bearing capacity approach based on

the theory of plasticity, Senneset et al. presented a theoretical approach for using PCPT data to determine the effective stress parameters [49]. However, Campanella and Robertson argued that since this method is based on the bearing capacity theory and as with any method for determining drained parameters from undrained cone penetration, it can be subject to serious problems [51]. One of which is the location of the porous element, where different locations give different measures of the total pore pressures.

Keaveny and Mitchell suggested another method that uses empirical correlations to estimate the overconsolidation ratio (OCR), Skempton's pore pressure parameter ( $A_f$ ), lateral earth pressure parameter ( $K_0$ ), and Vesic's cavity expansion method to estimate the undrained shear strength ( $S_u$ ) [56]. These parameters are used to estimate the effective stress at failure, which combined with  $S_u$  to provide an estimate of the effective stress strength parameters. They reported good results for silts and overconsolidated clays; however, results for normally consolidated clays were poor. Although this method accounts for different pore pressure


measurement locations, it relies on simplified empirical correlations to estimate OCR,  $A_f$ , and  $K_o$ , which could cause poor interpretations [51].

Senneset et al. presented another solution based on the bearing capacity theory [57]. They suggested two parameters that can be calculated from measured PCPT data:

The cone resistance number: 
$$N_m = \frac{q_t - \sigma_{vo}}{\sigma'_{vo} + a} \quad (11)$$

The pore pressure ratio: 
$$B_q = \frac{u_1 - u_o}{\sigma'_{vo} + a} \quad (12)$$


where,  $\sigma'_{vo}$  is the effective overburden pressure. The friction angle is then found from an interpretation chart based of the two parameters in addition to the angle of plastification ( $\beta$ ) which expresses an idealized geometry of the generalized failure zones around the advancing cone. Figure 8 presents example interpretation charts.



**Figure 8**  
**Interpretation diagrams for  $\beta = 0$  and  $\beta = -15^\circ$  [57]**

### Stress History

Stress history can be expressed by either defining the maximum past effective stress  $\sigma'_p$  or the over-consolidation ratio OCR ( $= \sigma'_p / \sigma'_v$ ). Many approaches were suggested to correlate CPT data to stress history parameters. Based on data collected from high quality undisturbed specimens; Lunne et al. presented a set of charts to predict OCR from CPT measurements (Figure 9) [58]. They noted that these figures are based on local correlations and should be updated as local experience is obtained.



**Figure 9**  
**Empirical correlations of OCR vs. normalized PCPT parameters [58]**

On the other hand, Sully et al. presented an expression for OCR based solely on pore pressure measurements, which is shown in equation (13) [59]. This correlation, however, cannot be extended to clays with very high OCR values.


$$OCR = 0.66 + 1.43 \left( \frac{u_1 - u_2}{u_o} \right) \quad (13)$$

After reviewing the methods used to obtain OCR from CPT measurements, Mayne suggested an expression based on critical state soil mechanics and cavity expansion theory [60]:

$$OCR = 2 \left[ \frac{1}{1.95M + 1} \left( \frac{q_t - u_2}{\sigma'_{vo}} \right) \right]^{1.33} \quad (14)$$

As a first order estimate, Mayne suggested an expression to predict  $\sigma'_p$  using the corrected tip resistance  $q_t$ , i.e., equation (15) [61]. While this expression yielded good estimates of  $\sigma'_p$  for a wide variety of clays, it underestimated the values for fissured clays. Figure 10 presents a comparison between the values of  $\sigma'_p$  obtained from one-dimensional oedometer test and the values predicted by equation (15).

$$\sigma'_p = 0.33(q_t - \sigma'_{vo}) \quad (15)$$



**Figure 10**  
Comparison between the measured and predicted  $\sigma'_p$  values [62]

Chen and Mayne presented a set of expressions to estimate  $\sigma'_p$  incorporating pore water pressure measurements, i.e., equations (16) through (19) [63]. They argued that the redundancy of expressions give an opportunity to confirm the value of the calculated parameter in case they agree and gives a reason to further investigate the results if a discrepancy exists [62].

$$\sigma'_p = 0.41(u_1 - u_o) \quad (16)$$

$$\sigma'_p = 0.53(u_2 - u_o) \quad (17)$$

$$\sigma'_p = 0.75(q_t - u_2) \quad (18)$$

$$\sigma'_p = 0.60(q_t - u_2) \quad (19)$$

Not as many correlations were presented for determining OCR for sandy soils. This is because it is more challenging to determine the stress history for sandy soils. Mayne noted that this challenge is caused by two main reasons: (1) one dimensional oedometric experiments for sandy soils yield a fairly flat  $e$ - $\log(\sigma')$  curve making it difficult to detect the pre-consolidation pressure, and (2) it is difficult to obtain undisturbed specimens of sandy soil deposits [62]. Therefore, a relationship to obtain OCR for clean sands was empirically derived based on data from 24 calibration chamber experiments [11], [64]:

$$OCR = \left[ \frac{0.192 \cdot (q_t / p_a)^{0.22}}{(1 - \sin \phi') \cdot (\sigma'_{vo} / p_a)^{0.31}} \right]^{\left( \frac{1}{\sin \phi' - 0.27} \right)} \quad (20)$$

### Relative Density from CPT Data

The relative density ( $D_r$ ) of sands is an important engineering index property that gives an indication about the level of compaction (or density) that can be used to estimate other properties like the angle of internal friction. It is traditionally calculated as:

$$D_r = \frac{e_{\max} - e}{e_{\max} - e_{\min}} \quad (21)$$

where,  $e$  is the void ratio, and  $e_{\max}$  and  $e_{\min}$  are the maximum and minimum void ratios. It is well known that it is difficult to obtain reliable values for  $e_{\max}$  and  $e_{\min}$  because of variations



in sample preparation procedures (e.g., compaction effort) and their dependency on the operator. Therefore, CPT can provide a useful alternative for determining the in-situ relative density of sands.

$D_r$  is commonly related to the cone tip resistance ( $q_c$ ) with consideration to the overburden pressure ( $\sigma'_v$ ) and soil compressibility [65]. Baldi et al. performed calibration testing on clean Ticino silica sand that has a moderate compressibility and proposed the following equation [66]:

$$D_r = c_1 \cdot \ln\left(\frac{q_c}{c_2 \cdot \sigma_v^{c_3}}\right) \quad (22)$$

where,  $c_1$ ,  $c_2$ , and  $c_3$  are constants dependent on the compressibility; their values for high, moderate, and low compressibility sands are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2**  
**Constants for determination of  $D_r$  [65]**

| Compressibility | $c_1$ | $c_2$ | $c_3$ |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|
| High            | 0.35  | 68.1  | 0.35  |
| Moderate        | 0.41  | 157   | 0.55  |
| Low             | 0.42  | 53.6  | 0.81  |

Based on experiments performed on clean fine to medium silica sands, Kulhawy and Mayne suggested the following formula [67]:

$$D_r^2 = \frac{1}{305 \cdot Q_c \cdot OCR^{0.15} \cdot Q_A} \cdot \frac{q_c}{p_a} \cdot \left(\frac{p_a}{\sigma'_v}\right)^{0.5} \quad (23)$$

where,

$p_a$  = atmospheric pressure;

OCR= over-consolidation ratio;

$Q_c$ = compressibility factor, suggested values for this factor are summarized in Table 3; and

$Q_A$ = Aging factor, defined as:

$$Q_A = 1.2 + 0.05 \log\left(\frac{t}{100}\right) \quad (24)$$

where,  $t$  is time. The previous correlations used calibration chamber testing without considering the boundary effects. Jamiolkowski et al. re-examined a large set of calibration chamber tests and presented another expression for  $D_r$  that incorporates the boundary effects, [68].

**Table 3**  
**Suggested  $Q_c$  values [67]**

| Compressibility | Description  | $Q_c$ |
|-----------------|--|-------|
| Low             | Predominantly quartz sands, rounded grains with little or no fines | 0.91  |
| Medium          | Quartz sands with some feldspar and/or several percent fines       | 1.00  |
| High            | High fines content, mica or other compressible materials           | 1.09  |

$$D_R = 100 \cdot \left[ 0.262 \cdot \ln\left(\frac{q_t/p_a}{\sqrt{\sigma'_v/p_a}}\right) - 0.675 \right] \quad (25)$$

Kulhawy and Mayne used a database of 24 sands to establish a simpler correlation that uses an empirical constant of the least-square regression  $Q_F$ , [67].

$$D_r^2 = \frac{1}{Q_F} \cdot \left( \frac{q_c/p_a}{(\sigma'_v/p_a)^{0.5}} \right) \quad (26)$$

Juang et al. argued that although the previous methods are based on the compressibility of soils, compressibility itself is not well defined [69]. It is influenced by mineral type, particle angularity, particle gradation, particle size, particle surface roughness, and stress history. They also noted that sands with the same mineral type could be under different categories of compressibility (low, medium, or high) depending on  $D_r$  and stress history.

Based on these observations, they presented an approach using fuzzy sets to determine  $D_r$  from CPT data. In this method, the friction ratio  $R_f$  is used to calculate three weight factors ( $W_L$ ,  $W_M$ , and  $W_H$ ) that correspond to the three compressibility categories (low, medium, and high, respectively). These factors reflect how close the actual compressibility is to each of the three predefined categories. They also calculated three values of  $D_r$  corresponding to each of the three categories ( $Dr_L$ ,  $Dr_M$ , and  $Dr_H$ ) using the Kulhawi and Mayne model, i.e., equation (26). A weighted  $D_r$  value is then calculated as:

$$D_r = Dr_L \cdot W_L + Dr_M \cdot W_M + Dr_H \cdot W_H \quad (27)$$

### Correlations with Standard Penetration Test (SPT)


The standard penetration test is the most widely used method for in-situ characterization of subsurface soils. While CPT is gaining popularity as a simple, fast and reliable in-situ testing tool, many researchers attempted to develop correlations between CPT measurements and SPT  $N$  value [70], [71], [17], [72]. The relation between CPT and SPT is usually expressed as the ratio of the tip resistance to the  $N$  value ( $q_c/N$ ). Robertson et al. compiled the results for a number of studies correlating  $q_c/N$  to the mean grain size and soil type (Figure 11) and demonstrated that  $q_c/N_{60}$  ratio increases with increasing grain size [19]. They also noted that the scatter in results also increases with increasing grain size. Equations (28) and (29) show that  $q_c$  and  $N$  were also correlated with the mean particle size ( $d_{50}$ ) and the fines content (FC – passing sieve #200). Lunne et al. noted that if no grain size distribution is available for the in-situ soils, classification charts can be used to estimate  $d_{50}$  or FC [11].

$$\left( \frac{q_c}{p_a} \right) \cdot N = 5.44 \cdot D_{50} \quad (28)$$

$$\frac{(q_c/p_a)}{N} = 4.25 - \frac{FC}{41.3} \quad (29)$$

Jefferies and Davies developed an algorithm for estimating SPT  $N_{60}$  value from PCPT data without soil sampling [73]. They presented an equation that uses a soil classification index  $I_c$  to calculate  $q_c/N_{60}$  ratio, i.e., equation (30). Typical  $I_c$  ranges for different soil types are presented in Table 4.

$$\frac{q_c (MPa)}{N_{60} (Blows / 300mm)} = 0.85(1 - I_c/4.75) \quad (30)$$



**Figure 11**  
**Variation of  $q_c/N$  with  $d_{50}$  [19]**

**Table 4**  
**Typical  $I_c$  ranges for different soil types [73]**

| $I_c$               | Soil Classification                       |
|---------------------|---|
| $I_c < 1.25$        | Gravelly sand                             |
| $1.25 < I_c < 1.90$ | Sands – clean sand to silty sand          |
| $1.90 < I_c < 2.54$ | Sand mixtures – silty sand to sandy silt  |
| $2.54 < I_c < 2.82$ | Silt mixtures – clayey silt to silty sand |
| $2.82 < I_c < 3.22$ | Clays                                     |

## Part II: Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD)

Most civil engineering design codes have been adopting the Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) philosophy and moving away from the Allowable (Working) Stress Design (ASD) approach. This shift may be attributed to the many shortcomings associated with ASD such as:

- the inability to address the different levels of uncertainty associated with calculations/estimations of both loads and resistances;
- the inability of addressing stress concentrations, stress interactions, and residual stresses;
- the assumption that materials are elastic and are not representative of the condition at failure;
- the treatment of different kinds of load (e.g., dead and live) as if they share the same variability; and
- the designed members lack a uniform probability of failure.

In the U.S., the American Concrete Institute (ACI) was the first to adopt LRFD in its 1963 Building Code Requirements for Concrete Structures (ACI 318). Today, design codes for concrete (ACI 318-05), steel (AISC 2001), and highway bridges [74] are all based on the LRFD design philosophy. LRFD design codes appear to be deterministic to their user; while in fact they are probabilistically calibrated to ensure that a target risk level is not exceeded. This is achieved using a number of design coefficients that help account for excessive overloading conditions (load factors) and unforeseen strength deficiencies (resistance factors). In general, the main design equation is usually given as:

$$\phi R_n \geq \sum_i \gamma_i Q_i \quad (31)$$

where,  $R_n$  is the nominal capacity of the designed member,  $\phi$  is a resistance factor,  $Q_i$  is the demand due to applied loads (dead, live, etc.), and  $\gamma_i$  is the load factor. The development of LRFD codes was initially started for structural applications. The resistance of structural components has variabilities associated with it; however, more uncertainty is inherent in loads than in resistance. Geotechnical applications are unique in the sense that uncertainties

are high on the resistance side as well. Nevertheless, LRFD research ensued in the geotechnical engineering community early on to develop a rational design methodology based on available statistical information of geotechnical applications.


### **LRFD in Geotechnical Applications**

Hansen investigated the use of independent load and resistance factors for geotechnical applications within a Limit State Design (LSD) framework [75]. This work was later formulated into code where the resistance factors were applied to the soil properties rather than the nominal resistance [76]. Over the last decade, several researchers investigated the application of LRFD in geotechnical applications. The efforts covered a wide range of applications such as offshore structures general foundation design and deep foundations [77], [78], [79], [80], [81]. The findings of NCHRP Project 24-04 established load and resistance factors for transportation foundations that were incorporated in the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications [80], [82]. NCHRP Project 20-07 (Task 88) dealt with LRFD design of retaining walls which was further investigated in NCHRP Project 12-55 for earth pressure in general terms [83], [84]. In another effort through NCHRP Project 24-17, Paikowsky et al. conducted a study to develop resistance factors that focused on driven piles and drilled shaft foundations, which are recommended for inclusion in Chapter 10 of the latest version of AASHTO-LRFD [74], [85].

Despite the extensive efforts in this field, the geotechnical profession has not fully accepted the new load and resistance factors developed for AASHTO-LRFD. This is one of the most difficult hindrances of LRFD to implement in geotechnical applications. As a result, more research studies have been conducted to alleviate doubts and overcome the reluctance in the geotechnical community. For example, Allen developed geotechnical resistance factors and downdrag load factors for LRFD foundation strength limit state design based on the information used in NCHRP Projects 12-04 and 12-17 [86]. These efforts cover a wide range of geotechnical applications including shallow foundations, deep foundations, and retaining structures [86], [87], [88], [89], [90], [91], [92].

There are two main approaches for addressing uncertainties in geotechnical applications. In the first approach, uncertainties are dissected to their main sources and each source is investigated methodically in a rational way. The main sources of uncertainty for geotechnical applications include inherent soil variability, measurement errors, and expression

(transformation model) uncertainty. Figure 12 shows a schematic of these sources [93]. Several researchers used this approach to study geotechnical design within a reliability based framework [94], [95].



**Figure 12**  
**Uncertainty in soil property estimates [93]**

Conversely, reliability studies for geotechnical applications are often conducted at the foundation capacity level rather than the soil property level. In this second approach, the resistance of the component is investigated by comparing analytical estimates with experimental results for which a database of available results is assembled. This approach helps in overcoming the complexity and lack of information that may exist at the soil property level. Several researchers followed this approach. Investigations of reliability methods as related to Cone Penetration Test (CPT) are relatively limited. Babu et al. studied cone tip resistance ( $q_c$ ) data obtained from a static cone penetration test on a stiff clay deposit [98]. The data from these tests were analyzed by using random field theory, which estimated statistical parameters such as the mean, variance, and autocorrelation function. These parameters were then used in evaluating the reliability of the allowable bearing capacity of a strip footing founded on the above deposit. Abu-Farsakh and Nazzal investigated the reliability of seven interpretation methods for the piezocone penetration test (PCPT) in estimating the vertical coefficient of consolidation,  $c_v$ , of cohesive soils [99]. Six Louisiana sites were included in the study where piezocone penetrations were conducted and high-quality Shelby tube samples were collected to serve as reference. Estimates of  $c_v$  were

obtained using six different methods and compared to the oedometer laboratory. The authors concluded that the scatter was generally high. However, two of the six methods appeared to better predict  $c_v$  than the other methods. Roy et al. compared the reliability of the Self-boring Pressuremeter Test (SBPMT), which is often regarded to be less reliable, with the Cone Penetration Test (CPT) for seven sand silt sites in western Canada [100]. They concluded that observations do not support the notion of a general lack of reliability of the self-boring pressuremeter at sand-silt sites.

Several researchers studied the reliability of CPT as a feasible tool for identifying the probability of soil liquefaction for a given factor of safety. For example, Liu and Chen used data from 49 sites (71 cone penetrations) to develop statistical parameters for cone tip resistance,  $q_c$ , sleeve friction,  $f_s$ , groundwater Table, GWT, and soil unit weight,  $\gamma$  [101]. This information was then used to treat each parameter as a random variable in analyzing both demand (cyclic resistance ratio – CRR) and resistance (cyclic stress ratio – CSR). Based on this information, Monte Carlo simulations were conducted to determine soil properties in unsampled sites, which were then used to map the liquefaction potential.

Juang et al. also studied the liquefaction potential using CPT results after accounting for parameter and/or model uncertainties [69]. The First-order Reliability Method (FORM) was used to estimate the reliability index,  $\beta$ , based on a limit state function involving CRR, CSR, and the model uncertainty,  $c_1$ . Each of the six input parameters ( $q_c$ ,  $f_s$ ,  $\sigma_v$ ,  $\sigma_v'$ ,  $a_{\max}$ , and  $M_w$ ) was considered to be a random variable and correlation between these parameters was accounted for. The study used a database of 96 liquefaction case histories to determine these parameters, where they considered spatial variations using Bayesian mapping functions. The authors concluded that traditional liquefaction boundaries are often biased on the conservative side, which may lead to erroneous post-earthquake investigations.



## **OBJECTIVE**

The main objective of this research is to update the correlations that are currently used to interpret CPT and PCPT data for engineering design purposes and to assess the reliability of using CPT and PCPT data to predict soil shear strength in both the magnitude and spatial variations in the field with respect to the LRFD methodology. Specifically the following objectives will be fulfilled by this research:

1. Collect the available CPT and PCPT soundings with the corresponding boring log data from the LADOTD and other possible sources. Process/analyze the data and update the correlations of the shear strength and soil classification, which are currently used by the design section of LADOTD.
2. Evaluate the spatial variations of soil engineering properties in the field. Develop the Louisiana CPT database for corresponding engineering properties as a general guideline for design purposes with reliability consideration in preparation for use in the LRFD method.



## SCOPE

This study focuses on the utilization of the CPT to estimate undrained shear strengths,  $S_u$ , which is an important soil property for structural projects in Louisiana. While methodologies used in this study are applicable to any location where CPT's can be used, the study was limited to data obtained from Louisiana projects; hence, it is a direct representation of soil conditions in the state. Initially, the objective was to perform a complete study on the effects of spatial variations on the reliability of CPT results. However, because of the limited amount of data that the research team was able to collect, it was only possible to study the soil depth,  $h$ , parameter on the results. A complete investigation of this parameter should also cover the geographic location, which was not possible as can be seen from the sparsely covered maps showing CPT locations included in the database. The research team compensated for this hurdle by studying other factors that are somewhat related to spatial variations albeit indirectly (e.g., soil classification).

As more CPT data is included in the database, it will be possible to extend this study and cover such parameters that were not covered in the current study.



## METHODOLOGY

### CPT Database

Three databases were created for this study:

- The first database is GIS-based where all information pertinent to CPT and borehole data was merged such that they could be easily retrieved by engineers via a GIS-based user interface.
- The second database is Excel-based and is a compilation of analyses conducted for each CPT sounding identified for this study. The analyses in this database are mainly based on LTRC CPT computer program and a special excel template.
- The third and final database is an extraction of data points from the second database. This database was used for the reliability-based calibration of the CPT coefficient,  $N_{kt}$ .

The following sections describe the details about these databases.

#### Locating CPT Sites using GIS


CPT projects data were received from LADOTD in the form of paper documents containing CPT logs, borehole logs, and project maps. The data also included electronic raw (voltage) CPT data. The first task was to create an electronic archive of all the CPT sites using the geographic information system ArcView. However, most of the projects did not include the spatial coordinates of the CPT soundings. Therefore, in order to find the CPT coordinates, a procedure was implemented utilizing readily available high resolution satellite imagery along with digital orthophoto quarter quad (DOQQ) images.

In some recent projects, aerial images and/or high resolution maps of the project location were included in the project documents making it fairly easy to identify the location of the CPT soundings; however, in most projects such maps were missing. The documents only contained a map of the project location with the CPT soundings marked on it. Therefore, to find the accurate coordinates of every CPT point, some specific (stationary) features in the paper project map were located in the GIS satellite imagery using Google Earth. Such features included street intersections, buildings, bridges, and rivers. By determining the

locations of the CPT tests relative to these features in the paper project document, the points were marked on the electronic maps and the Latitude and Longitude data for each CPT sounding were determined and recoded. Moreover, station numbers of the CPT soundings were used to confirm the recorded coordinates where the distance between the points were compared to the distance calculated from the station numbers.

In many cases, the satellite imagery provided by Google Earth did not have sufficient resolution for the features to be accurately located. This issue was encountered when the projects were in remote locations away from inhabited areas. Therefore, an alternative method was implemented to locate the CPT soundings in such location. High resolution DOQQ images were acquired from the LSU ATLAS website for these locations. These images have much higher resolution; however, they had very large sizes and small land coverage area per images. Downloading and displaying these images was time-consuming and required much more computer storage space. Therefore, this procedure was used only when locating the CPT coordinates was not possible using Google Earth. These procedures were used to attempt to locate the CPT soundings in all the projects from LADOTD as well as LA1 project data received from Soil Testing Engineers (STE) Company.

Although the mentioned procedures were successful in determining the accurate locations of many CPT soundings, it was not possible to apply this procedure on all the CPT data received from LADOTD for different reasons. For example, some paper project documents could not be located for the files received in electronic format (raw CPT data), while in other instances, the project documents were located; however, they did not include the project maps, so it was not possible to pinpoint the location of the CPT project. After locating all the CPT soundings and recording their coordinates, ArcMap was used to plot all the CPT locations on a map of Louisiana. Figure 13 displays the CPT projects located using the mentioned procedures.




**Figure 13**  
**CPT data points from LADOTD and STE**

**Borehole Data**

The next step was to match the CPT data with adjacent borehole data. Therefore, for every CPT sounding, one or more boreholes were identified based on the distance from the CPT to allow for the comparison of parameters obtained from boreholes and CPT. The borehole data were included in the paper project documents; therefore, all the data had to be input into the excel spreadsheet to allow for the comparison. For every borehole, the density, water content, Atterberg limits, and undrained shear strength were recorded at different depths (when available as a measurement in the borehole log) to be later used in the correlation with the CPT data. Moreover, Atterberg limits were used to obtain the USCS classification based on the plasticity chart if the soil is fine-grained.

The borehole data was not available for all the located CPT soundings. Efforts were made to obtain any available data from LADOTD electronic archives as well as paper project documents. Figure 14 illustrates the projects where the borehole data was located along with the projects where the data could not be located. In summary, a total of 752 CPT soundings were documented, of which 503 were matched with adjacent boreholes, and 249 did not have adjacent borehole data available. Appendix A lists a summary of all projects included in this study. Table 34 and Table 35 list projects where CPT soundings were paired with boreholes and projects where borehole information could not be located, respectively.



**Figure 14**  
**CPT soundings with and without borehole data from LADOTD and STE**



## CPT and Borehole Data Analysis and Archiving

In order to be analyzed and compared to the borehole data, every CPT raw data file was input into an Excel data template to perform various calculations and produce different plots of the CPT data. The spreadsheet starts by converting the input voltage values from the load cells located at the tip and the sleeve of the cone apparatus to tip resistance and sleeve friction (pressure) along the depth of the CPT soundings and used these values to calculate different parameters. The following paragraph presents a detailed description of the spreadsheet along with the equations used to calculate each parameter. An electronic version of all the Excel spreadsheets used in this study, plus others that did not have a matching borehole, are provided to LTRC. Appendix E shows an example excel template.

The CPT raw data are imported from the text file that contains raw data and pasted in the “Raw data” sheet of the template. The following are processed data in the analysis sheet of the template. Columns A and B include the depth values in meters and feet, respectively, while the tip resistance and sleeve friction in MPa are displayed in columns C and D. These values are converted to tons per square foot (tsf) and displayed in columns E and G. In order to reduce the random noise (spikes) in  $q_c$  and  $f_s$ , a smoothing function was used where every value was calculated by averaging five points above and below the point. The smoothed values are listed in columns F and H; these values make it easier to select a representative data values and discreet depths to be used later in the analysis. The friction ratio (FR) was calculated in column I. The estimated shear wave velocity ( $V_s$ ) is calculated in column L using the correlation presented by Hegazy and Mayne [102]:

$$V_s \text{ (m/s)} = [10.1 \cdot \log(q_c) - 11.4]^{1.67} \left[ \frac{f_s * 100}{q_t} \right]^{0.3} \quad (32)$$

The calculated shear wave velocity was then used to calculate the soil unit weight ( $\gamma_T$ ) using the equation proposed by Mayne, i.e., equation (33). The calculated unit weight values are listed in column M. These values are converted to pounds per cubic foot and displayed in column N. The calculated unit weight along with the depth ( $z$ ) were then used to calculate the total overburden pressure ( $\sigma_{vo}$ ). Columns O and P contain the calculated  $\sigma_{vo}$  values in kPa and tsf, respectively. The depth of the ground water table is then used to calculate the pore water pressure (column Q), which is then used with the overburden pressure to calculate the

effective pressure (columns R and S). Then the net tip resistance  $q_{t-net}$  was calculated in column T as shown in equation (34).

$$\gamma_T (\text{kN/m}^3) = 8.32 \log(V_s) - 1.61 \log(z) \quad (33)$$

$$q_{net} = q_t - \sigma_{vo} \quad (34)$$

Columns V, W, and X are the normalized parameters  $Q$ ,  $F$ , and  $B_q$ , respectively, used to determine the behavioral soil type; they are calculated using equations (35) through (37). Next, the soil behavioral type index presented by Robertson et al., in equation (38), is calculated in column Y. The index is then used to determine the soil “Zone Number” in column Z. Similarly, the soil behavioral type index and zone numbers are determined using the equations presented by Jefferies and Davies, i.e., equation (39), in columns AA and AB. Finally, The undrained shear strength ( $S_u$ ) is calculated using equation (40) assuming a value of  $N_{kt} = 15$  in column AC.

$$Q = \frac{q_t - \sigma_{vo}}{\sigma_{vo}} \quad (35)$$

$$F = \frac{f_s}{q_t - \sigma_{vo}} \quad (36)$$

$$B_q = \frac{u_2 - u_o}{q_t - \sigma_{vo}} \quad (37)$$


$$I_c = \sqrt{[3.47 - \log(Q)]^2 + [\log(F) + 1.22]^2} \quad (38)$$

$$I_c^{**} = \sqrt{[3 - \log(Q \cdot (1 - B_q))]^2 + [1.3 \cdot \log(F) + 1.5]^2} \quad (39)$$


$$S_u = \frac{q_c - \sigma_{vo}}{N_{kt}} \quad (40)$$

Moreover, the LTRC CPT plotting and classification software were used to classify the soils using Zhang and Tumay statistical approach method [2]. Probability Density Functions (PDF) files were generated for each CPT sounding. The excel sheets and the PDF

classification files were used to generate an electronic archive of the CPT locations using ArcMap software. The GIS database included all the CPT soundings that were located throughout the state. Each point on the map contained the information about the CPT soundings including the job number, job location, parish, district, date, and station number. Clicking on any point on the map will display all the information of that test. Figure 15 depicts an example record where the information is displayed in a popup window when the location is selected. Such a database allows for the selection of a point or a group of points based on any of the mentioned attributes (e.g., district, job number, etc.). Moreover, when selecting a CPT sounding on the CPT map, two links are provided, one for the CPT classification PDF file generated from the LTRC CPT software and the other for the Excel data sheet where the CPT and borehole information are documented. Clicking on any of the links opens the PDF or Excel data sheet for the location selected. Figure 16 illustrates an example archive where the PDF classification file is displayed by selected the link for that file from the popup window.




**Figure 15**  
**Example CPT data information displayed by selecting a CPT location**



**Figure 16**


**Example CPT classification file displayed by selecting the PDF link**

It can be seen from Figure 14 that some regions of Louisiana have a large number of CPTs with boreholes while other regions contained a very small number of data. The northern and southeastern parts of the state have higher numbers of CPT soundings while the southwestern part of the state have very few CPT soundings. Figure 17 and Figure 18 depict zoomed views of northern and southwestern parts of the state where the difference in the number of CPT and borehole data points can be clearly noticed.



**Figure 17**


**Zoomed view of the northern part of Louisiana where a higher number of CPT soundings were available**




**Figure 18**

**Zoomed view of the southwestern part of Louisiana where a smaller number of CPT soundings were available**


To further illustrate the spatial variations in the assembled database of CPT results, a histogram of CPT depths of extracted soil engineering data is provided in Figure 19. It can be seen that a wide range of depths of extracted properties from CPT soundings is included in the database ranging from 2 ft. to 100 ft. However, the depths are not distributed uniformly. This means that the database is biased toward lower depths (< 25 ft.) than higher depths. It will be seen later in this report that for the database used in this study, depth variations do not significantly affect the correlation of the CPT coefficient. Hence, the results in the database are still viable for the purpose of this study. Similar depth histograms for each soil classification are also plotted in Figure 20.




**Figure 19**  
**Histogram of depths for CPT measurements included in database**




**Classification 2**



**Classification 3**



**Classification 4**



**Classification 5**

**Figure 20**  
**Depth histograms for different soil classifications [4], [5], [19]**

## Reliability Analysis of CPT

Two approaches were followed to correlate the undrained shear strength results obtained from CPTs and adjacent borings. Both approaches relied on the formula (transformation model) currently used by LADOTD for estimating the undrained shear strength from CPT readings,  $S_u^{CPT}$ , which is given as:

$$S_u^{CPT} = \frac{q_c - \sigma_{vo}}{N_{kt}} \quad (41)$$

The first approach was a direct correlation based on the formula in equation (41). In the second approach, a more detailed investigation in which all sources of uncertainty were accounted for utilizing the First Order Reliability Method (FORM). Both approaches are described in detail in the following sections.

### Direct Correlation of CPT and Boring Results–1<sup>st</sup> Approach

In this approach, the currently used expression, transformation model given in equation (41), will be correlated by equating the undrained shear strength values from both tests ( $S_u^{CPT}$  from CPT and  $S_u^{UC}$  unconfined compression test) to achieve the goal of this study. By rearranging the expression, one can obtain  $N_{kt}$  values for each CPT result in the database as follows:

$$N_{kt} = \frac{q_c - \sigma_{vo}}{S_u^{UC}} \quad (42)$$

Due to the uncertainties detailed earlier (inherent soil variability, device measurement, and used expression – transformation model), a constant  $N_{kt}$  is not to be expected, but rather a scatter of results. The resulting  $N_{kt}$  values can be studied statistically to establish appropriate probability density functions (PDF) and cumulative distribution functions (CDF) for  $N_{kt}$  that describe the scatter of  $N_{kt}$  values. Once these relations (PDF and CDF) are established, they can be used to determine acceptable  $N_{kt}$  for various probability of exceedance levels. Here, the probability of exceedance ( $P_e$ ) is defined as the probability of the borehole result



(benchmark) exceeding the CPT estimate for undrained shear strength. A higher probability of exceedance indicates a more conservative estimate of the undrained shear strength from CPT readings.

### **Detailed Reliability Analysis for Correlation of CPT and Boring Results–2<sup>nd</sup> Approach**

The second approach that was adopted in this study for calibrating the CPT coefficient  $N_{kt}$  is more involved and accounts for all uncertainties associated with CPT testing. In addition to the uncertainty caused by the used formula or transformation model, equation (41) that was covered in the first approach, uncertainties inherent in soil properties and device measurement are also accounted for. Before this approach could be carried out, the statistical characteristics of each of these sources of uncertainty will first need to be determined. In the next few sections, the methodology adopted for quantifying these uncertainties is explained.


### **Statistical Analysis of CPT Repeatability**

One of the identified sources of uncertainty is the inherent variations in the device and measurement equipment (see Figure 12). This uncertainty needs to be accounted for in the reliability analysis forming the basis for the correlation of the CPT coefficient. Lacking readily available repeatability test results, a test program was conducted to assess the variability inherent in CPT measurements. In planning the repeatability test program, the following factors were kept in mind:

- The CPT tests had to be closely spaced since the purpose of these tests was to identify the variations in the recorded readings under “almost identical” soil conditions.
- The CPT penetration should extend to a depth of 80 ft., which covers most of the LADOTD applications.
- A single boring is also requested to provide reference soil information with which the CPT readings can be related. The boring should be taken after the conclusion of the CPT tests to avoid disturbing the soil.

Sixteen CPT penetrations were conducted in dual polar array as shown in Figure 21. This layout was chosen because it allows a central zone where a soil boring can be taken for further analysis and comparison with CPT results. The minimum distance between adjacent CPT penetrations did not fall below 3 ft., and the farthest distance between penetrations did not exceed 12 ft. Thus, it can be said that the CPT readings are representative of “identical”

soil conditions. Figure 21b shows a photograph of the actual site where the 16 repeatability penetrations took place at LTRC's Accelerated Testing Facility (ALF) site. LTRC and LADOTD staff conducted the tests.



(a)



(b)

**Figure 21**  
**Array of CPT repeatability tests**

### **Preprocessing CPT Data**

The compiled database of CPT results was used to study the calibration of undrained shear strength,  $S_u$ , transformation model for Louisiana soils. The database comprised of results from over 700 CPTs. This database was obtained from projects all over Louisiana. The goal of the project is to calibrate the transformation models utilized by geotechnical engineers by comparing CPT results to corresponding results from borehole tests, specifically the more acceptable unconfined compression (UC) undrained shear strength,  $S_u^{UC}$ . It was possible to identify boreholes in the vicinity of 334 CPT soundings out of all those included in the database. The distance between the boreholes and the CPT soundings varied from site to site and limits on distance between both locations were set as is described next. Each CPT test provided several data points to the database. The soil properties were computed at the depth intervals that match the reported borehole results. In all, 2,630 data points for undrained shear strength results from boreholes were compiled. It was only possible to compute the undrained shear strength from CPT readings in 1,886 locations and depths. However, the number of data points where undrained shear strength results were available from matching CPT and borehole data was 1,814.

The following section describes the methodology by which the results were preprocessed, analyzed and presented in this study.


### **Matching CPT and Borehole Data**

As expected, the CPT and borehole locations were not exact matches. This was due to many site factors and is now considered historic data that are not changeable at the time of conducting this research. Thus, it was imperative that acceptable criteria be set to justify the hypothesis of *equal* soil properties at both CPT and borehole locations. These criteria address the fact that the distance between the CPTs and boreholes ranged from 1 ft. to 1,844 ft. Furthermore, it was not possible to exactly identify the coordinates of some locations, which had to be excluded from the database. At the same time, more than one borehole existed in the vicinity of some CPTs in the database, and a weighing function was needed for these locations. Criteria were set in this project to address these issues:

- A maximum distance between the CPT and borehole location was set to be 150 ft.

Figure 22 shows a plot showing the number of matches between CPTs and boreholes

at different distance intervals. Accordingly, the number of data points included in subsequent analyses is 1,263 from 251 CPT soundings.



**Figure 22**

**Distance threshold between CPT and borehole locations showing number of data points included in analyses**

- In the case of having more than one borehole in the vicinity of a CPT sounding, a  $1/D$  weight function was used to account for the proximity of borehole locations to CPT sounding. The weighted average function for any quantity,  $q$ , based on the results from  $n$  boreholes at distances  $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_i, \dots, D_n$  can be written as:

$$q = \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \left[ \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n D_j - D_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n D_j} \right] \quad (43)$$

This function yields the following weighted averages for the cases of two and three boreholes consecutively:

$$q = \left[ q_1 \left( \frac{\{D_1 + D_2\} - D_1}{\{D_1 + D_2\}} \right) \right] + \left[ q_2 \left( \frac{\{D_1 + D_2\} - D_2}{\{D_1 + D_2\}} \right) \right] = q_1 \left( \frac{D_2}{D_1 + D_2} \right) + q_2 \left( \frac{D_1}{D_1 + D_2} \right) \quad (44)$$



$$\begin{aligned}
q &= \left[ q_1 \left( \frac{\{D_1 + D_2 + D_3\} - D_1}{\{D_1 + D_2 + D_3\}} \right) \right] + \left[ q_2 \left( \frac{\{D_1 + D_2 + D_3\} - D_2}{\{D_1 + D_2 + D_3\}} \right) \right] + \left[ q_3 \left( \frac{\{D_1 + D_2 + D_3\} - D_3}{\{D_1 + D_2 + D_3\}} \right) \right] \\
&= q_1 \left( \frac{D_2 + D_3}{D_1 + D_2 + D_3} \right) + q_2 \left( \frac{D_1 + D_3}{D_1 + D_2 + D_3} \right) + q_3 \left( \frac{D_1 + D_2}{D_1 + D_2 + D_3} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

For illustration purposes, a scenario of two boreholes at distances  $D_1=35$  ft. and  $D_2=110$  ft. would yield the following weighted average :

$$q = 0.7586q_1 + 0.2414q_2 \tag{46}$$

### **Averaging CPT Readings**

CPT readings are known to have spikes due to many factors. One of these factors is the fact that continuous readings are recorded at very small intervals which is in many cases smaller than 1.0 in. of depth. Relying on pinpoint data readings would result in unnecessary scatter, especially that soil properties obtained from borehole tests are usually based on specimens of tangible dimensions (8 in. in the case of Shelby Tube sample). As a result, it was deemed necessary to average CPT data readings over a depth similar to what is used in borehole soil property testing. In this study, 11 consecutive CPT data readings were averaged around every desired depth where borehole data was available. These readings correspond to a depth of about 7.8 in. Figure 23 illustrates the averaging of device readings for the cone tip resistance,  $q_c$ . Figure 23a is a plot of the raw data obtained from the CPT device, while Figure 23b shows the same results after averaging them over a depth of about 7.8 in. It can be seen that localized spikes are almost eliminated without losing the general trend of the readings. This is the purpose of the averaging and is done for all CPT readings in the assembled database.




(a) raw tip resistance readings,  $q_c$       (b) averaged tip resistance readings,  $q_c$

**Figure 23**  
**Averaging raw CPT readings**

### Filtering Data Results


As is the case with any natural and hence uncontrollable material, a wide range of readings is always expected. Soils fall under this category of materials. Nevertheless, soil properties are known to fall within a confined physical range albeit it may be a wide range. Values outside this range represent soil properties that represent soil conditions that may lead to outcast data points. For example, extremely low undrained shear strength results indicate very soft soils that are difficult to test under normal laboratory conditions, thus results within this low range are in many cases unrepresentative of actual soil conditions. At the other extreme, high undrained shear strength values are usually attributed to stiff clays, which fluctuations in the cone readings may be excessive leading to unreliable CPT estimates of the undrained shear strength. It was therefore deemed necessary to set limits on the range of undrained shear strength,  $S_u$ , collected in the database. Values that exceed a maximum threshold or fall below a minimum threshold were excluded from the database.

Figure 24 shows a histogram of the undrained shear strength compiled in the database. The plot shows that the database includes points of extremely low and extremely high  $S_u$  values. Based on the literature,  $S_u$  values falling below 150 psf and above 2,500 psf were excluded from the database in subsequent analyses.




**Figure 24**  
**Histogram of  $S_u$  frequency in compiled database**

Figure 25 shows the impact the chosen threshold has on the scatter of the transformation model used in this study. The scatter is measured by the coefficient of variation, COV, of the ratio  $S_u^{CPT} / S_u^{UC}$ . It can be seen that as more data points with high or low undrained shear strength values are excluded, the smaller the COV of the transformation model becomes. Filtering the data using these two threshold results in a reduction in the number of data points used in the subsequent analyses. The database included 862 data points after applying the aforementioned thresholds.



(a) minimum  $S_u$  threshold



(b) maximum  $S_u$  threshold

Figure 25

Effect of  $S_u$  thresholds on uncertainty of transformation model




### Calibration of CPT Coefficient

The calibration of the CPT coefficient,  $N_{kt}$ , to achieve acceptable reliability in undrained shear strength,  $S_u$ , estimates will be conducted using the methodology described next. An acceptable reliability can be defined in terms of a probability of exceedance,  $P_e$ , which is described in detail in the next section. The statistical characteristics of the data in the compiled database of CPT results are first analyzed. These characteristics are essential for the reliability-based calibration. Statistical characteristics of random variables not analyzed in this study are obtained from the literature. A limit state function is first established, which is then used to calibrate  $N_{kt}$ . The calibration is performed for different soil classifications, different target reliability levels, and  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$  ratio.

### Limit State Function


The limit state function is simply the boundary between acceptable and unacceptable performance. In this study, the undrained shear strength estimates from borehole data,  $S_u^{UC}$ , and CPT data,  $S_u^{CPT}$ , should be identical in ideal circumstances. In real life, the difference between both is inevitable. An acceptable performance is achieved if CPT estimates for the undrained shear strength,  $S_u^{CPT}$ , is less than the borehole result,  $S_u^{UC}$ , and an unacceptable performance is to be expected if the opposite is true. Since both terms have inherent randomness in their values, they can be illustrated graphically as can be seen in Figure 26a. If the formula used in the determining  $S_u^{CPT}$ , transformation model in equation (41) is conservative, then the mean value of CPT estimates,  $\mu_{S_u^{CPT}}$ , would be less than the mean value of borehole results,  $\mu_{S_u^{UC}}$ . Alternatively, this can be described using a limit state function (LSF) that represents the difference between both estimates ( $Z = S_u^{UC} - S_u^{CPT}$ ), which will also be a random variable that can be plotted as can be seen in Figure 26b. The probability of estimating the undrained shear strength from borehole unconfined compression tests that will be higher than those obtain from the CPT readings is graphically represented by the shaded area. It can be seen that the larger this area, the safer the CPT estimates. An indirect measure of the area is the distance from the mean,  $\mu_Z$ , to the origin, which can be represented in multiples of the standard deviation,  $\sigma_Z$ . This multiple is defined as the reliability index,  $\beta$ . The higher the reliability index, the higher the probability of

exceedance,  $P_e$ . In the special case of calibrating a formula (transformation model) that results in equal mean values, i.e.,  $\mu_{S_u^{CPT}} = \mu_{S_u^{UC}}$  as illustrated in Figure 27a (the probability of exceedance,  $P_e$ ) would be equal to 50 percent as can be seen in Figure 27b. Hence, the corresponding reliability index would be equal to zero, which will be one of the target reliability levels in this study.



**Figure 26**

**Illustration of the limit state function (LSF) used in this study (general case)**



**Figure 27**

**Illustration of the limit state function (LSF) used in this study (special case)**

The reliability calibration conducted in this study is based on the limit state function (LSF) described above. However, the CPT estimate,  $S_u^{CPT}$ , will be replaced by the transformation model used to obtain its values, equation (41). This allows for including the uncertainties inherent in the original CPT readings, namely  $q_c$  and  $\sigma_{v_0}$ . Equation (47) shows the details

the LSF starting with the random variables  $S_u^{UC}$  and  $S_u^{CPT}$ . The expanded version is shown in equation (47-b), where  $S_u^{UC}$  is replaced by  $\gamma S_u^{UC}$  in which  $\gamma$  is random variable that accounts for uncertainty inherent in the soil property,  $S_u^{UC}$ , which is taken as a deterministic value representing soils in location under investigation. The other two newly introduced random variables,  $\xi$  and  $\eta$ , represent the uncertainties in the transformation model and tip resistance readings, respectively.

$$Z = S_u^{UC} - S_u^{CPT} \quad (47-a)$$

$$Z = \gamma S_u^{UC} - \xi \left[ \frac{\eta q_c - \sigma_{vo}}{N_{kt}} \right] \quad (47-b)$$

Table 5 lists the statistical characteristics of the random variables used in this study. The characteristics of the random variable  $\xi$  are given in Table 6 and Table 7 for both classification techniques used in this study, namely Robertson and Zhang and Tumay. The bias and standard deviation values were computed by determining the statistical descriptors (mean and standard deviation) for the ratio between the CPT estimates and borehole results,  $S_u^{CPT} / S_u^{UC}$ , in the database.

$$\text{bias, } \lambda_\xi = \text{mean} \left( \frac{S_u^{CPT}}{S_u^{UC}} \right) \quad (48)$$

$$\text{coefficient of variation, } \text{COV}(\xi) = \frac{\text{standard deviation} \left( \frac{S_u^{CPT}}{S_u^{UC}} \right)}{\text{mean} \left( \frac{S_u^{CPT}}{S_u^{UC}} \right)} = \frac{\sigma_\xi}{\lambda_\xi} \quad (49)$$

Several CPT coefficient values were considered in determining these statistical descriptors. For each value, the CPT undrained shear estimates,  $S_u^{CPT}$ , would change and cause the bias and coefficient of variation given above. The various values are needed for the optimization step that follows for determining an appropriate CPT coefficient,  $N_{kt}$ . Finally, the tip resistance uncertainty was obtained from the repeatability study presented earlier (see page 42) while the overburden pressure was taken as a deterministic quantity due to its low COV as will be seen later.

**Table 5**  
**Random variables used in reliability calibration**

| Variable                    | Mean          | COV (%) | Distribution | Source                   |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Soil Uncertainty, $\gamma$  | 1.0           | 33      | Lognormal    | Phoon and Kulhawy (1999) |
| Transformation Model, $\xi$ | varies        |         | Lognormal    | Current Study            |
| Tip Resistance, $\eta$      | varies        |         | Normal       | Current Study            |
| Overburden Pressure         | deterministic |         |              | Current Study            |

**Table 6**  
**Statistical characteristics of transformation model (Robertson classification)**

| $N_{kt}$ | ALL Cases |       | 2     |       | 3     |       | 4     |       |
|----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|          | Bias      | STDEV | Bias  | STDEV | Bias  | STDEV | Bias  | STDEV |
| 12       | 2.401     | 1.693 | 1.541 | 1.196 | 2.284 | 1.366 | 2.484 | 1.652 |
| 15       | 2.009     | 1.427 | 1.358 | 0.962 | 1.899 | 1.268 | 2.067 | 1.299 |
| 18       | 1.793     | 1.418 | 1.178 | 0.806 | 1.604 | 1.048 | 1.881 | 1.252 |
| 21       | 1.562     | 1.218 | 1.041 | 0.680 | 1.390 | 0.898 | 1.612 | 1.055 |
| 24       | 1.414     | 1.154 | 0.964 | 0.580 | 1.229 | 0.792 | 1.482 | 1.108 |
| 27       | 1.285     | 1.126 | 0.879 | 0.512 | 1.093 | 0.705 | 1.329 | 0.982 |
| 30       | 1.201     | 1.125 | 0.791 | 0.461 | 0.991 | 0.633 | 1.220 | 0.916 |
| 33       | 1.100     | 1.026 | 0.719 | 0.419 | 0.904 | 0.576 | 1.115 | 0.829 |
| 36       | 1.023     | 0.971 | 0.700 | 0.368 | 0.835 | 0.536 | 1.027 | 0.759 |
| 39       | 0.961     | 0.924 | 0.678 | 0.350 | 0.772 | 0.496 | 0.971 | 0.748 |
| 42       | 0.906     | 0.914 | 0.630 | 0.325 | 0.717 | 0.461 | 0.941 | 0.874 |
| 45       | 0.860     | 0.873 | 0.609 | 0.294 | 0.673 | 0.431 | 0.900 | 0.866 |
| 48       | 0.817     | 0.825 | 0.571 | 0.275 | 0.635 | 0.405 | 0.854 | 0.816 |
| 51       | 0.773     | 0.777 | 0.554 | 0.254 | 0.600 | 0.381 | 0.806 | 0.767 |

**Table 7**

**Statistical characteristics of transformation model (Zhang and Tumay classification)**

| N <sub>kt</sub> | ALL Cases |       | Clay > 75% |       | Clay = 50-75% |       | Clay = 25-50% |       |
|-----------------|-----------|-------|------------|-------|---------------|-------|---------------|-------|
|                 | Bias      | STDEV | Bias       | STDEV | Bias          | STDEV | Bias          | STDEV |
| 12              | 2.401     | 1.693 | 2.172      | 1.387 | 2.426         | 1.981 | 2.662         | 1.906 |
| 15              | 2.009     | 1.427 | 1.822      | 1.124 | 1.954         | 1.476 | 2.273         | 1.774 |
| 18              | 1.793     | 1.418 | 1.614      | 1.038 | 1.776         | 1.732 | 1.946         | 1.521 |
| 21              | 1.562     | 1.218 | 1.414      | 0.891 | 1.521         | 1.441 | 1.675         | 1.297 |
| 24              | 1.414     | 1.154 | 1.258      | 0.825 | 1.357         | 1.255 | 1.542         | 1.251 |
| 27              | 1.285     | 1.126 | 1.129      | 0.737 | 1.216         | 1.120 | 1.426         | 1.419 |
| 30              | 1.201     | 1.125 | 1.053      | 0.728 | 1.130         | 1.017 | 1.368         | 1.545 |
| 33              | 1.100     | 1.026 | 0.958      | 0.662 | 1.045         | 0.926 | 1.244         | 1.402 |
| 36              | 1.023     | 0.971 | 0.892      | 0.614 | 0.959         | 0.851 | 1.143         | 1.281 |
| 39              | 0.961     | 0.924 | 0.828      | 0.569 | 0.886         | 0.788 | 1.075         | 1.210 |
| 42              | 0.906     | 0.914 | 0.769      | 0.529 | 0.823         | 0.732 | 0.998         | 1.124 |
| 45              | 0.860     | 0.873 | 0.744      | 0.581 | 0.771         | 0.684 | 0.937         | 1.049 |
| 48              | 0.817     | 0.825 | 0.701      | 0.545 | 0.726         | 0.643 | 0.892         | 0.990 |
| 51              | 0.773     | 0.777 | 0.660      | 0.513 | 0.694         | 0.609 | 0.842         | 0.933 |

**Chi-Square Statistical Test “Goodness of Fit”**

In addition to the statistical descriptors that were determined in the previous section (bias,  $\lambda$ , and coefficient of variation, COV), a distribution type will be needed for the reliability study that follows. Statistical distributions are mathematical expressions that represent the frequency within a dataset continuously over the possible range for the entire population.

Any random variables can be described using different distribution types. The choice of one distribution over another is based on how well the chosen mathematical distribution *fits* the collected data (observations). Many statistical tests can be used to evaluate how well a certain distribution fits the collected data. In this study, the *Chi-Square Test* will be used. The details of how the test is conducted are given in Appendix C. The random variables in this study were tested for two possible distribution types, namely Normal and Lognormal. Details of both distributions can be found in the literature and are summarized in the Appendix for convenience. The results from conducting these tests are presented next for the two random variables that were determined in this study.

### Reliability-based Calibration

Calibration of the CPT coefficient,  $N_{kt}$ , will be conducted using the LSF described earlier. The goal is to identify  $N_{kt}$  values that result in desired reliability levels, which will be measured in terms of a reliability index,  $\beta$ , defined as the ratio between the mean value of the LSF and its standard deviation, which was previously illustrated in Figure 26b:

$$\beta = \frac{\mu_Z}{\sigma_Z} \quad (50)$$

The reliability index,  $\beta$ , is related to the probability of exceedance,  $P_e$ , using the following expression:

$$P_e = \Phi(\beta) \quad (51)$$

where,  $\Phi(\beta)$  is a cumulative distribution function (CDF) for a limit state function,  $Z$ . The reliability index was evaluated for each considered case. In all, a total of 672 cases were considered (14  $N_{kt}$  values  $\times$  4 Soil Classifications  $\times$  6  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$  ratios  $\times$  2 Classification Methods). The ratio of overburden pressure to the tip resistance,  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$ , in the reliability analyses was considered in the reliability study since the results should cover a wide range of possibilities (design space). The First Order Reliability Method (FORM) was used to compute  $\beta$  for all cases. FORM is based on a first order Taylor series expansion of the limit state function, which approximates the failure surface by a tangent plane at the point of interest. More details about FORM and the procedure used in this study are given in A B.

**Table 8**  
**Range of parameters covered in reliability study**

| Parameter                 |                 | Range                                |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| CPT Coefficient, $N_{kt}$ |                 | 12, 15, 18, 21, ... , 39, 42, 45, 48 |
| Ratio, $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$  |                 | 0.05, 0.10, 0.20, 0.50, 0.80, 0.90   |
| Soil Classification       | Robertson       | 2, 3, 4, 5                           |
|                           | Zhang and Tumay | > 75%, 50-75%, 25-50%, < 25%         |

## DISCUSSION OF RESULTS


### Repeatability Tests

The data files obtained from the CPT tests were analyzed by running the LTRC software for analysis of CPT readings. The main parameters of interest for this repeatability study are the variables included in the limit state function to be used in the reliability calibration. These parameters are:


- tip resistance,  $q_c$
- overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$

It should be noted that the overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$ , is computed using the estimated unit weight of the soil,  $\gamma_T$ . Hence, the data for the unit weight of the soil,  $\gamma_T$ , was also analyzed in addition to the two aforementioned variables. Each of the three parameters was first plotted from all 16 CPT tests. Figure 28a through Figure 28c show the plots for  $q_c$ ,  $\gamma_T$ , and  $\sigma_{vo}$ , respectively. The values of each parameter are plotted versus depth. As expected, it is obvious from Figure 28 that the tip resistance,  $q_c$ , shows more scatter than the other two variables. The variability in the unit weight of the soil,  $\gamma_T$ , is far less than it is for the tip resistance. Consequently, the variability of the overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$ , is also relatively less than that of the tip resistance. By comparing the plots for the  $\gamma_T$  and  $\sigma_{vo}$ , it is clear that the variability in the overburden pressure is almost negligible. This is due to the fact that the depth,  $h$ , is included in estimating the overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$ . Depth estimates are pretty accurate in CPT tests since they are based on pipe lengths. As the depth increases, so does the overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$ , and local variations in the soil unit weight,  $\gamma_T$ , become small compared to the total overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$ .


Another observation from the plots is that a major change in soil characteristics takes place somewhere in between the 40-ft. and 50-ft. depths. This is especially obvious from Figure 28 where the tip resistance suddenly shifts from values below 40 tsf to values easily exceeding 100 tsf. This observation will help explain one of the trends of uncertainty that are computed and presented in the next section.



(a) Tip resistance,  $q_c$



(b) Unit weight,  $\gamma_T$



(c) Overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$

**Figure 28**  
Cone data from all repeatability tests



### Statistical Characteristics of Repeatability Data

The data obtained from the analysis of all 16 CPT soundings were further analyzed to assess the statistical characteristics of the parameters of interest for the reliability calibration study, namely  $q_c$ ,  $\gamma_T$ , and  $\sigma_{vo}$ . Two spatial variation parameters were studied to investigate whether the variability inherent in the device could be related to either of them. The two parameters are the soil depth and the soil classification.

**Soil Depth.** The statistical analysis focused on discrete locations along the depth of the penetration with a resolution of 5 ft. intervals. As with the other analyses, the readings were averaged for a depth equal to 10 in. (5 in. above and 5 in. below) around each of the chosen depths. Table 9 through Table 11 show the data for all three parameters. The maximum and minimum reading for each variable at each depth are identified (highlighted) in the tables. The coefficient of variation, COV, was computed for each variable at each discrete depth, which is defined as:

$$COV(X_i) = \frac{\sigma_{X_i}}{\mu_{X_i}} \quad (52)$$

where,  $\sigma_{X_i}$  and  $\mu_{X_i}$  are the standard deviations and the mean value for the random variable,  $X_i$ , respectively. The COV is a direct measure of the scatter resulting from the CPT readings under *identical* soil conditions. A large COV indicates a wide scatter of the results and vice versa.

Table 9 through Table 11 also list the COV for all three parameters for each depth. The computed COV results also plotted in Figure 29 through Figure 31 versus depth. The average value for each of the parameters is plotted next to each of the COV plots as an indicator of the parameter's trend. Based on these plots, it can be said that there is no clear relationship between the variability inherent in the measuring device and the soil depth for the first two parameters  $q_c$  and  $\gamma_T$ . A trend is observed for the overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$ , which decreases steadily from the surface (depth = 0.0 ft.) to a depth of about 40 ft., after which the  $COV(\sigma_{vo})$  is almost a constant. In both regions, it should be noted that the variability is extremely low (< 1 percent). The  $COV(q_c)$ , on the other hand, is higher with values close to 40 percent in some cases. On average, the COVs for three studied parameters are 19.7 percent, 1.50 percent, and 0.51 percent, respectively. These COV values will be incorporated in the limit state function for the reliability calibration to account for uncertainties inherent in the measuring device, the cone for this study.

**Table 9**  
**Discrete tip resistance,  $q_c$ , readings at 5 ft. intervals**

| Job #               | Depth (ft) | Soil Classification | $q_c$ |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | COV( $q_c$ ) |
|---------------------|------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
|                     |            |                     | CPT   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |              |
|                     |            |                     | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12    | 13    | 14    | 15    | 16    |              |
| Repeatability (ALF) | 5          | 4                   | 5.4   | 5.6   | 5.8   | 5.8   | 4.9   | 6.1   | 4.8   | 6.4   | 5.2   | 4.6   | 7.1   | 5.8   | 6.0   | 6.3   | 6.9   | 6.4   | 12.3%        |
|                     | 10         | 3                   | 7.9   | 5.9   | 9.4   | 8.8   | 7.8   | 8.5   | 8.7   | 6.3   | 8.5   | 7.0   | 9.0   | 9.3   | 8.4   | 7.9   | 9.5   | 11.1  | 15.2%        |
|                     | 15         | 3                   | 8.6   | 9.6   | 9.1   | 8.3   | 7.9   | 10.8  | 10.3  | 10.6  | 9.3   | 9.8   | 10.5  | 8.5   | 9.9   | 9.4   | 10.6  | 10.1  | 9.4%         |
|                     | 20         | 3                   | 10.7  | 10.6  | 13.0  | 12.7  | 13.0  | 10.1  | 11.9  | 12.2  | 10.5  | 12.7  | 12.8  | 13.0  | 10.6  | 11.2  | 12.2  | 13.9  | 9.7%         |
|                     | 25         | 5                   | 34.6  | 27.5  | 23.8  | 23.5  | 29.3  | 31.8  | 38.5  | 34.8  | 35.4  | 32.6  | 19.8  | 26.9  | 23.5  | 21.3  | 32.5  | 31.8  | 19.3%        |
|                     | 30         | 5                   | 16.9  | 23.1  | 22.1  | 24.2  | 24.8  | 17.8  | 15.9  | 16.1  | 16.7  | 21.3  | 21.4  | 24.6  | 23.7  | 25.3  | 17.0  | 16.5  | 17.7%        |
|                     | 35         | 4                   | 20.7  | 10.6  | 20.3  | 25.1  | 17.6  | 13.4  | 27.5  | 29.4  | 32.0  | 15.3  | 11.5  | 18.1  | 15.6  | 13.2  | 14.8  | 22.7  | 34.0%        |
|                     | 40         | 5                   | 55.5  | 50.7  | 25.0  | 20.4  | 32.3  | 48.8  | 53.0  | 63.4  | 68.5  | 49.4  | 44.7  | 24.5  | 29.7  | 19.3  | 49.5  | 56.8  | 36.5%        |
|                     | 45         | 5                   | 83.8  | 80.5  | 75.9  | 76.9  | 75.7  | 79.0  | 78.5  | 77.2  | 79.2  | 74.9  | 71.4  | 67.6  | 69.8  | 69.5  | 73.6  | 63.2  | 7.2%         |
|                     | 50         | 5                   | 75.3  | 79.0  | 135.3 | 135.1 | 124.9 | 89.6  | 64.4  | 62.9  | 69.1  | 72.9  | 74.8  | 100.5 | 110.6 | 98.8  | 74.7  | 49.5  | 29.8%        |
|                     | 55         | 5                   | 99.8  | 95.0  | 115.4 | 110.0 | 108.8 | 121.8 | 118.8 | 104.3 | 111.0 | 102.9 | 93.5  | 98.0  | 106.0 | 99.2  | 101.6 | 61.9  | 13.3%        |
|                     | 60         | 5                   | 114.9 | 113.4 | 80.7  | 94.0  | 98.9  | 104.0 | 90.3  | 100.3 | 127.6 | 104.2 | 99.5  | 97.4  | 110.6 | 103.8 | 87.0  | 66.1  | 14.6%        |
|                     | 65         | 5                   | 99.2  | 126.8 | 112.2 | 115.1 | 118.7 | 69.9  | 21.8  | 48.3  | 78.3  | 81.4  | 79.6  | 125.6 | 115.0 | 94.3  | 63.2  | 57.1  | 34.9%        |
|                     | 70         | 5                   | 170.8 | 180.1 | 140.3 | 120.0 | 131.2 | 147.8 | 131.2 | 121.7 | 145.8 | 148.1 | 120.2 | 151.0 | 169.1 | 139.5 | 91.5  | 121.2 | 16.2%        |
|                     | 75         | 5                   | 85.6  | 52.7  | 77.3  | 61.5  | 68.0  | 95.0  | 126.8 | 150.2 | 123.4 | 116.9 | 81.3  | 95.8  | 105.9 | 89.6  | 91.7  | 109.2 | 26.9%        |
|                     | 80         | 5                   | 144.5 | 163.7 | 121.9 | 142.8 | 102.5 | 137.6 | 136.9 | 130.0 | 183.6 | 183.5 | 159.3 | 188.8 | 184.4 | 150.2 | 199.0 | 139.3 | 17.8%        |

Minimum= 7.2%

Average= 19.7%

Maximum= 36.5%

**Table 10**  
**Discrete unit weight,  $\gamma_T$ , results at 5 ft. intervals**

| Job #               | Depth (ft) | Soil Classification | $\gamma_T$ |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | COV( $\gamma_T$ ) |
|---------------------|------------|---------------------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------|
|                     |            |                     | CPT        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |                   |
|                     |            |                     | 1          | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12    | 13    | 14    | 15    | 16    |                   |
| Repeatability (ALF) | 5          | 4                   | 113.2      | 113.6 | 112.6 | 110.1 | 106.6 | 111.7 | 110.0 | 114.6 | 111.0 | 111.5 | 112.3 | 112.4 | 110.9 | 114.5 | 111.0 | 113.5 | 1.80%             |
|                     | 10         | 3                   | 114.1      | 108.0 | 114.4 | 112.7 | 112.9 | 114.3 | 113.2 | 110.6 | 113.3 | 111.4 | 111.7 | 114.6 | 110.9 | 113.5 | 113.0 | 112.9 | 1.53%             |
|                     | 15         | 3                   | 111.8      | 111.8 | 112.3 | 110.0 | 111.7 | 112.7 | 112.8 | 113.0 | 111.9 | 111.9 | 112.2 | 110.7 | 111.8 | 113.3 | 111.1 | 113.0 | 0.79%             |
|                     | 20         | 3                   | 113.3      | 114.0 | 115.7 | 112.7 | 115.9 | 113.4 | 114.2 | 115.0 | 113.4 | 114.8 | 114.4 | 116.2 | 109.3 | 115.0 | 114.3 | 115.0 | 1.43%             |
|                     | 25         | 5                   | 110.6      | 107.6 | 108.2 | 104.4 | 109.6 | 108.2 | 112.0 | 110.6 | 110.4 | 109.4 | 105.4 | 107.8 | 106.9 | 106.3 | 107.9 | 110.6 | 1.94%             |
|                     | 30         | 5                   | 107.7      | 108.6 | 105.4 | 107.0 | 108.4 | 109.5 | 108.1 | 107.5 | 107.2 | 107.8 | 107.3 | 106.9 | 108.0 | 107.5 | 107.9 | 109.3 | 0.91%             |
|                     | 35         | 4                   | 107.3      | 105.2 | 107.7 | 107.3 | 109.4 | 107.3 | 106.1 | 107.8 | 108.3 | 106.6 | 106.5 | 108.5 | 107.4 | 107.2 | 105.5 | 107.3 | 1.00%             |
|                     | 40         | 5                   | 109.3      | 109.0 | 111.9 | 110.6 | 108.4 | 108.2 | 112.8 | 111.5 | 115.0 | 109.2 | 107.3 | 109.3 | 108.0 | 106.4 | 107.3 | 111.7 | 2.12%             |
|                     | 45         | 5                   | 115.8      | 114.7 | 115.2 | 114.9 | 115.5 | 115.0 | 115.8 | 115.8 | 115.7 | 115.0 | 114.4 | 114.4 | 114.6 | 113.4 | 113.0 | 114.0 | 0.73%             |
|                     | 50         | 5                   | 116.2      | 118.4 | 120.8 | 120.9 | 120.6 | 120.0 | 113.5 | 112.3 | 113.9 | 117.5 | 117.8 | 119.3 | 120.2 | 118.9 | 117.1 | 112.7 | 2.53%             |
|                     | 55         | 5                   | 117.0      | 117.8 | 120.1 | 119.9 | 119.2 | 117.6 | 115.8 | 115.7 | 116.4 | 117.0 | 116.8 | 117.9 | 118.3 | 117.9 | 116.4 | 112.8 | 1.52%             |
|                     | 60         | 5                   | 115.1      | 114.8 | 115.3 | 115.9 | 116.4 | 117.7 | 116.0 | 116.1 | 117.2 | 116.3 | 116.1 | 117.1 | 117.6 | 117.2 | 115.3 | 111.7 | 1.25%             |
|                     | 65         | 5                   | 117.5      | 119.5 | 117.1 | 116.7 | 117.6 | 115.6 | 108.9 | 111.0 | 113.7 | 115.9 | 115.7 | 118.0 | 118.6 | 115.2 | 112.6 | 111.3 | 2.62%             |
|                     | 70         | 5                   | 118.1      | 117.7 | 116.9 | 116.4 | 115.2 | 118.9 | 116.6 | 117.1 | 118.5 | 117.9 | 117.0 | 117.5 | 119.4 | 117.4 | 112.1 | 114.6 | 1.53%             |
|                     | 75         | 5                   | 114.5      | 113.1 | 115.7 | 112.8 | 114.1 | 114.7 | 115.6 | 115.7 | 117.4 | 115.9 | 113.6 | 115.1 | 115.7 | 114.5 | 111.4 | 116.3 | 1.32%             |
|                     | 80         | 5                   | 118.1      | 117.1 | 116.3 | 115.1 | 116.3 | 116.7 | 115.9 | 116.1 | 118.6 | 118.5 | 116.7 | 117.1 | 118.3 | 115.9 | 117.9 | 118.2 | 0.94%             |

Minimum= 0.73%

Average= 1.50%

Maximum= 2.62%


**Table 11**  
**Discrete overburden pressure readings at 5 ft. intervals**

| Job #               | Depth (ft) | Soil Classification | $\sigma_{vo}$ |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | COV( $\sigma_{vo}$ ) |
|---------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----------------------|
|                     |            |                     | CPT           |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                      |
|                     |            |                     | 1             | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   |                      |
| Repeatability (ALF) | 5          | 4                   | 0.30          | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.87%                |
|                     | 10         | 3                   | 0.58          | 0.57 | 0.58 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.79%                |
|                     | 15         | 3                   | 0.87          | 0.86 | 0.87 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.87 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.65%                |
|                     | 20         | 3                   | 1.17          | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.17 | 1.17 | 1.16 | 1.15 | 1.17 | 1.14 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 1.17 | 0.61%                |
|                     | 25         | 5                   | 1.44          | 1.42 | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.42 | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.44 | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.42 | 1.44 | 1.41 | 1.43 | 1.43 | 1.44 | 0.58%                |
|                     | 30         | 5                   | 1.71          | 1.69 | 1.70 | 1.70 | 1.70 | 1.71 | 1.70 | 1.71 | 1.71 | 1.70 | 1.69 | 1.71 | 1.68 | 1.70 | 1.70 | 1.71 | 0.52%                |
|                     | 35         | 4                   | 1.98          | 1.97 | 1.97 | 1.97 | 1.97 | 1.98 | 1.97 | 1.98 | 1.98 | 1.97 | 1.96 | 1.98 | 1.95 | 1.97 | 1.97 | 1.99 | 0.47%                |
|                     | 40         | 5                   | 2.26          | 2.24 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2.26 | 2.25 | 2.26 | 2.26 | 2.25 | 2.23 | 2.26 | 2.23 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2.27 | 0.44%                |
|                     | 45         | 5                   | 2.55          | 2.54 | 2.54 | 2.53 | 2.54 | 2.55 | 2.54 | 2.55 | 2.55 | 2.54 | 2.52 | 2.54 | 2.51 | 2.54 | 2.53 | 2.56 | 0.45%                |
|                     | 50         | 5                   | 2.85          | 2.84 | 2.84 | 2.83 | 2.84 | 2.85 | 2.84 | 2.85 | 2.85 | 2.84 | 2.82 | 2.84 | 2.81 | 2.83 | 2.83 | 2.85 | 0.41%                |
|                     | 55         | 5                   | 3.15          | 3.14 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 3.13 | 3.15 | 3.14 | 3.15 | 3.15 | 3.13 | 3.12 | 3.14 | 3.11 | 3.13 | 3.12 | 3.14 | 0.37%                |
|                     | 60         | 5                   | 3.44          | 3.43 | 3.44 | 3.43 | 3.43 | 3.45 | 3.44 | 3.44 | 3.44 | 3.43 | 3.41 | 3.43 | 3.41 | 3.42 | 3.41 | 3.43 | 0.37%                |
|                     | 65         | 5                   | 3.74          | 3.73 | 3.73 | 3.73 | 3.72 | 3.74 | 3.72 | 3.73 | 3.74 | 3.73 | 3.70 | 3.73 | 3.70 | 3.72 | 3.70 | 3.71 | 0.36%                |
|                     | 70         | 5                   | 4.04          | 4.03 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 4.04 | 4.01 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 4.02 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 4.01 | 3.99 | 4.00 | 0.39%                |
|                     | 75         | 5                   | 4.34          | 4.33 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.34 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.30 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.28 | 4.30 | 0.42%                |
|                     | 80         | 5                   | 4.62          | 4.60 | 4.60 | 4.59 | 4.59 | 4.62 | 4.59 | 4.61 | 4.62 | 4.60 | 4.57 | 4.60 | 4.59 | 4.55 | 4.58 | 4.58 | 0.42%                |


Minimum= **0.36%**

Average= **0.51%**

Maximum= **0.87%**




(a) Average  $q_c$  readings




(b) COV ( $q_c$ ) vs. depth

Figure 29

Analysis of repeatability data for cone tip resistance




(a) Average  $\gamma_T$  readings



(b) COV( $\gamma_T$ ) vs. depth

Figure 30

Study of unit weight data scatter from repeatability tests



**Figure 31**


**Study of overburden pressure data scatter from repeatability tests**

**Soil Classification.** The same statistical results were studied by focusing on the soil classification obtained using Robertson’s method [1]. Classifications were obtained along the soil depth for all 16 CPT repeatability tests. These results are plotted in Figure 32 which shows that the first 40 ft. of the soil are classified as to be mixtures of silt and clay. The range is from clay (Classification 3) to clayey silt or silty clay (Classification 4). Some readings show silt/sand mixtures (Classification 5). Beyond the first 40 ft., an obvious change can be seen. The soil classification is mainly between Classification 5 and Classification 6 which corresponds to silt/sand mixture to clean sand, except for a thin layer around a depth of 50 ft., where it appears that more clay and silt are present. These classifications may be the


explanation why the trend for  $COV(\sigma_{vo})$  changed at this juncture ( $h=40$  ft.). It also raises interest in studying the variability of the measurements as a function of the soil classification.

Plots of the coefficient of variation, COV, for the same previous parameters are shown in Figure 33 through Figure 35 to study such an effect. By analyzing these plots, one can conclude that clays/silty clays (Classification 3) have a narrower range of COV, of the tip resistance,  $q_c$ , as compared to the same range for silt/sand mixtures (Classification 5).

Similar observations may be made for the unit weight,  $\gamma_T$ ; however, the difference is smaller. No clear trend is observed for the overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$ . Again, it should be noted that the COV of the unit weight,  $\gamma_T$ , and the overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$  are extremely small and that the COV of the tip resistance,  $q_c$ , will be the main source of device/procedural uncertainty in this study.




**Figure 32**  
**Tip resistance,  $q_c$ , readings from all CPT repeatability tests**



**Figure 33**


Study of tip resistance data scatter,  $COV(q_c)$ , vs. soil classification



**Figure 34**

Study of unit weight data scatter,  $COV(\gamma_T)$ , vs. soil classification





**Figure 35**

**Study of overburden pressure data scatter,  $COV(\sigma_{vo})$ , vs. soil classification**

### Utilizing CPT for Assessment of Site Variability

Recent LRFD design codes adopt an approach where design factors are dependent on site variability. The assessment of the site variability is an important step in the overall design process as it greatly influences the outcomes. In this section, a methodology is proposed to assist geotechnical engineers in determining the site variability from CPT readings. Although the goals of this study did not include developing methods for classification of sites based on their variability, the results presented in this report may assist in achieving this goal. It is believed that based on the repeatability study, a procedure can be established for the purpose of classifying sites without the need for any subjective interference by the designer.

The underlying principal in the proposed approach is that multiple CPT soundings in a certain site can reveal the uncertainties inherent in the site. These uncertainties include those related to the device itself as well as soil variability. If we assume that the overall scatter is presented as the  $COV(S_u^{CPT})$  from multiple CPT soundings from a specific layer at the investigated site, it can be said that this scatter is caused by:

- the device uncertainty, which is mostly caused by the uncertainty in cone tip resistance and measured by  $COV(\eta)$  since the variability in the overburden pressure is negligible and can be ignored, and
- the inherent variability in soil properties, which can be obtained from the literature as the coefficient of variation of the undrained shear strength for fine soils  $COV(\gamma)$ .

This assumption leads to the fact that the expected coefficient of variation of the undrained shear strength can be obtained as a function of the coefficient of variation for the two random variables,  $\eta$  and  $\gamma$ . Based on the coefficient of variation of the cone tip resistance that was established earlier (19.7 percent), it is possible to determine the expected coefficient of variation for the undrained shear strength for different assumed soil variabilities corresponding to low, medium, and high variability. Comparing the expected coefficient of variation,  $COV(S_u^{CPT})$ , to what is actually computed from multiple CPT soundings for the soil layer of interest can be used to classify the site variability.

The proposed procedure that lays out the framework that can be refined and tested in a future research project is outlined next. For illustration purposes, the coefficient of variation,  $COV(\gamma)$ , is taken as 6 percent, 25 percent, and 33 percent corresponding to low, medium, and high, respectively.

1. The CPT readings for the site in question are collected and soil layers (classifications) are identified.
2. For each layer of interest (e.g., foundation level), the estimate for the design property such as undrained shear strength,  $S_u^{CPT}$ , is obtained from all CPT soundings.
3. Statistical analysis of the soil property (e.g.,  $S_u^{CPT}$ ) will yield a mean and standard deviation. The coefficient of variation from these results,  $COV(S_u^{CPT})$ , is then computed to be used for site variability assessment.
4. By comparing  $COV(S_u^{CPT})$  to the coefficient of variation that is expected from the measuring device and the inherent soil variability, one can assess the site variability. This can be done in three groupings:
  - a. measured coefficient of variation values equal to or smaller than what is

- expected for the low end of inherent soil variability ( $COV(\gamma) = 6$  percent); i.e., expected  $COV(S_u^{CPT}) = 21$  percent, indicate that the site variability is *low*,
- b. measured  $COV(S_u^{CPT})$  values corresponding to what is expected for an average inherent soil variability ( $COV(\gamma) = 20$  percent); i.e., expected  $COV(S_u^{CPT}) = 28$  percent, indicate that the site variability is *medium*, and
  - c. Higher  $COV(S_u^{CPT})$  values indicate that the site variability is *high*.

It should be noted that this approach is only valid for fine soils if consistent soil layers could be identified. In the case where soil layers cannot be identified, the site variability assessment should be automatically set to *high*.

### Initial Data Analysis

#### General Trends

Before calibrating the CPT method for undrained shear strength results, data trends are examined to identify any possible relations. The current expression (transformation model) used for estimating the undrained shear strength is given as

$$S_u^{CPT} = \frac{q_c - \sigma_{vo}}{N_{kt}} \quad (41)$$


Figure 36 shows a preliminary comparison of the undrained shear strength as obtained from CPTs and boreholes (UC). The plot shows all 862 data points in the database. Two general conclusions may be made at this stage and these are:

The data scatter is considerably high (COV=71 percent)

CPT results are on average higher than the corresponding borehole results; i.e.,  $S_u^{CPT}$  is an overestimate of  $S_u^{UC}$ .

It should be noted that these results were obtained using equation (41) assuming a  $N_{kt}$  value of 15. As will be seen later, a single  $N_{kt}$  value that is valid for all soil types is not the right approach, which has therefore contributed to the wide scatter.

An attempt was then made to assess the relationship between the undrained shear strength and each of the variables involved,  $q_c$  and  $\sigma_{vo}$ .




**Figure 36**  
**Comparison of undrained shear strength,  $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests**

While studying the trends in collected data, it was deemed worthy to also study the trends of the borehole undrained shear strength values,  $S_u^{UC}$ , versus various CPT readings used in this study. The purpose of this analysis is to shed some light on the performance of equation (41) in predicting the undrained shear strength and whether a different expression is needed.


In Figure 37, three plots for the relation between the undrained shear strength,  $S_u^{UC}$ , and the tip resistance,  $q_c$ , as well as the overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$ , and the net difference,  $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$ , are shown. The plots reveal that there is a rising trend in the tip resistance versus undrained shear strength values. This confirms the inclusion of the first term in equation (41) as a first order with a positive sign. Figure 37b shows that the undrained shear strength drops as the overburden pressure increases. However, this trend is not as pronounced as it is for the tip resistance, which may suggest that including both parameters,  $q_c$  and  $\sigma_{vo}$ , with equal slopes in equation (41) may need to be revisited. Finally, Figure 37c confirms the rising trend of undrained shear strength,  $S_u^{UC}$ , as a function of the net difference,  $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$ , which is a basic

variable in equation (41). The figure also shows five ideal trends obtained using equation (41) for different  $N_{kt}$  values ranging from 12 to 30. The purpose of these trends is to provide the reader with a visual representation of which  $N_{kt}$  results in a better match to the borehole results in the database. It can be seen from these trend lines in Figure 37c that a  $N_{kt}$  value of 12 is biased on one side of the dataset and that a  $N_{kt}$  value between 25 and 30 better represents the results in the database. It should be noted that these remarks are based on the entire dataset compiled in the database.


Development of a more refined expression would need to include various factors that may affect the observed trends (e.g., soil classification, depth, etc.) Several attempts were made to come up with other expressions that would better match the available data. These expressions included higher order polynomials; elimination of the overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$ , from the expression; and a constant to address the non-zero intersect that can be seen in the Figure 37. The conclusion from these attempts is that a better bias can be achieved (results can be better matched on average); however, the scatter is not much different, which affects the uncertainty of the transformation model. Therefore, it was decided to keep the currently used transformation model, equation (41), because of its simplicity.



(a) cone tip resistance,  $q_c$



(b) overburden pressure,  $\sigma_{vo}$



(c) net difference,  $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$

Figure 37

Analyzing data trends of different CPT readings versus  $S_u^{UC}$

### Specific Parameter Trends

Following the initial review of the collected data, the next phase in the study was to study the results in light of specific relevant parameters that may affect the reliability of CPT readings. This section presents the results of these analyses which include studying the following parameters:

- Soil Depth,  $h$
- CPT Reading Values,  $(q_c - \sigma_{vo})$
- Soil Classification:
  - Zhang and Tumay Method (1999)
  - Robertson's Method (1990)
  - Plasticity Index

The range of each of the studied parameters was dissected into small intervals. The CPT results in the database within each of the intervals was statistically analyzed to obtain the bias,  $\lambda$ , and coefficient of variation, COV, of the ratio  $S_u^{CPT} / S_u^{UC}$  as described earlier. Both quantities represent how accurate the CPT results are when compared to the borehole results. Bias values close to unity (1.0) indicate an accurate method on average, whereas values below or above 1.0 mean that the CPT results are underestimating or overestimating the undrained shear strength, respectively. The scatter of the results is reflected in the COV values. The higher the COV, the more scatter in  $S_u^{CPT}$  is indicated. These results are presented next in tabular form for each of the listed parameters. They will form the basis for the reliability-based calibration study that follows this section. Also presented in the tables are the average and standard deviation for  $N_{kt}$  within each subcategory. These  $N_{kt}$  characteristics are provided for easier interpretation of the statistical parameters discussed earlier. In addition to the tabulated results, graphical plots (Figure 38 through Figure 43) of undrained shear strength estimates from CPT and boreholes are presented within each range of the chosen parameters. The purpose of these plots is to provide the reader with a sense of the extent of the scatter and the bias graphically, which may be needed for readers with little exposure to scientific literature in that area.

It should be noted that the purpose of investigating these trends is to identify any parameters that would improve CPT estimates of the undrained shear strength if included in the analysis.

The trends are determined based on the currently used value of 15. Despite the fact that this  $N_{kt}$  value is commonly used, it was picked for this part of the study as an arbitrary value. Other  $N_{kt}$  values could have been chosen without altering the observations made about the trends;  $N_{kt}$  is only a constant in any case. As will be seen later, other  $N_{kt}$  values will be determined during the calibration study.

**Depth,  $h$ .** Studying the effect of soil depth on the uncertainties inherent in CPT predicted undrained shear strength values can be viewed as part of studying the effect of spatial variations. The goal of this study is to determine whether different soil depths result in different overestimation or underestimation of the undrained shear strength. Several arbitrary depth intervals were chosen for this purpose. They represent a top layer with a 5 ft. depth followed by layers ending at 20 ft. depth intervals, i.e.,  $h = 5-20$ ,  $h = 20-40$ ,  $h = 40-60$ , and  $h$  greater than 60 feet. It should be noted that each depth range included an acceptable number of data points that can be analyzed statistically. A higher resolution of depth ranges might be possible in the future as more CPT results are included in the database. The  $S_u^{CPT} / S_u^{UC}$  ratio within each depth interval was analyzed and the bias and COV were calculated.


Table 12 summarizes the bias and COV results for the chosen depth ranges. The results do not indicate a clear trend for any of the computed statistical descriptors. For example, the bias increases from a value of 1.473 (overestimate) at depths < 5 ft. to 2.203 for depths between 5 ft. and 20 ft. However, this trend does not continue beyond this depth range. Actually, it fluctuates around an almost constant value. Similarly, the coefficient of variation, COV, also does not seem to follow a clear trend. After dropping from 85 percent to 58 percent at depth range 40-60 ft., it increases again for higher depths.

Based on these observations, it was concluded that no clear trends can be extracted from the available dataset. As a result, the reliability-based calibration would not result in a  $N_{kt}$  factor that depends on, or is a function of,  $h$ .




**Table 12**  
**Effect of soil depth on uncertainty of CPT results**


| <b>Depth range, <math>h_1 : h_2</math> (feet)</b>       | <b>&lt; 5</b> | <b>5-20</b> | <b>20-40</b> | <b>40-60</b> | <b>&gt; 60</b> |
|---|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| <b>Bias, <math>\lambda</math></b>                       | 1.473 ↗       | 2.203 ↘     | 2.191 ↘      | 1.826 ↗      | 1.940          |
| <b>Standard Deviation, <math>\sigma_\lambda</math></b>  | 1.248 ↗       | 1.600 ↘     | 1.347 ↘      | 1.057 ↗      | 1.410          |
| <b>Coefficient of Variation, COV</b>                    | 85% ↘         | 73% ↘       | 61% ↘        | 58% ↗        | 73%            |
| <b>Number of Points, <math>N</math></b>                 | 123           | 317         | 189          | 122          | 111            |
| <b>Average CPT Coefficient, <math>N_{kt}</math></b>     | 22.1          | 33.0        | 32.9         | 27.4         | 29.1           |
| <b>Standard Deviation, <math>\sigma_{N_{kt}}</math></b> | 18.7          | 24.0        | 20.2         | 15.9         | 21.2           |




$h < 5 \text{ ft.}$



$5 \text{ ft.} < h < 20 \text{ ft.}$



$20 \text{ ft.} < h < 40 \text{ ft.}$



$40 \text{ ft.} < h < 60 \text{ ft.}$

**Figure 38**  
**Comparison of undrained shear strength,  $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests**  
**at different depths**

### **CPT Reading Values ( $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$ )**


The second influence study conducted is related to the net difference between CPT readings,  $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$ . This difference is in the core of the CPT expression for undrained shear strength, equation (6). Studying whether the uncertainties in the CPT results are influenced by  $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$  is done for the purpose of incorporating such influence in the calibration study to follow. The hypothesis is that if such a trend exists, the user can easily compute the net difference and use an appropriate  $N_{kt}$  value for undrained shear strength calculations. As with the previous parameter (soil depth), the range of  $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$  was divided into several ranges. They are: less than 4 tsf, between 4 and 8 tsf, between 8 and 12 tsf, between 12 and 16 tsf, and greater than 16 tsf. The data points that fell within these ranges were statistically analyzed as before. Table 13 summarizes the results of this statistical analysis for each of the  $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$  ranges.

The results show that there is a clear trend in the bias for the ratio  $S_u^{CPT} / S_u^{UC}$ . The CPT estimates are conservative on average for the  $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$  below 4 tsf. However, unconservative estimates of the undrained shear strength are indicated for the higher  $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$  values. This COV varies slightly about an average value of 68 percent. It appears that the net difference between the CPT readings,  $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$  present the clearest parameter that influence the CPT coefficient  $N_{kt}$ . As more data become available, it may be possible to calibrate  $N_{kt}$  as a function of two parameters, one being the net difference between the CPT readings,  $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$ . Therefore, this information should be considered in any future research efforts that build on the findings of this study.


**Table 13**

**Effect of net difference between CPT readings,  $q_c - \sigma_{v0}$ , on uncertainty of CPT results**


| <b>Net Difference, <math>q_c - \sigma_{v0}</math> (tsf)</b> | <b>&lt; 4</b> | <b>4-8</b> | <b>8-12</b> | <b>12-16</b> | <b>&gt; 16</b> |
|---|---------------|------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|
| <b>Bias, <math>\lambda</math></b>                           | 0.849 ↗       | 1.751 ↗    | 2.215 ↗     | 2.339 ↗      | 2.491          |
| <b>Standard Deviation, <math>\sigma_\lambda</math></b>      | 0.610 ↗       | 1.082 ↗    | 1.474 ↗     | 1.636 ↗      | 1.724          |
| <b>Coefficient of Variation, COV</b>                        | 72% ↘         | 62% ↗      | 67% ↗       | 70% ↘        | 69%            |
| <b>Number of Points, <math>N</math></b>                     | 57            | 315        | 226         | 173          | 91             |
| <b>Average CPT Coefficient, <math>N_{kt}</math></b>         | 12.7          | 26.3       | 33.2        | 35.1         | 37.4           |
| <b>Standard Deviation, <math>\sigma_{N_{kt}}</math></b>     | 9.2           | 16.2       | 22.1        | 24.5         | 25.9           |




$$q_c - \sigma_{vo} < 4 \text{ tsf}$$



$$4 < q_c - \sigma_{vo} < 8 \text{ tsf}$$



$$8 < q_c - \sigma_{vo} < 12 \text{ tsf}$$



$$12 < q_c - \sigma_{vo} < 16 \text{ tsf}$$

**Figure 39**  
**Comparison of undrained shear strength,  $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests at different CPT readings net difference,  $q_c - \sigma_{vo}$ , values**

**Soil Classification.** Three soil classification methods were investigated to study the uncertainty in CPT undrained shear strength estimates:

- Zhang and Tumay Method (1999)
- Robertson's Method (1990)
- Plasticity Index (PI)

The first method is implemented in the LADOTD's software for CPT data analysis. It provides the probability of existence of three soil types, namely, clay, silt, and sand. The focus of this project is on the undrained shear strength that is related to clayey soils. Therefore, the predicted probability of clay percentage is chosen as the classification parameter. The second method by Robertson (1990) provides soil classifications as one of six possible types: two for organic soils and peats, three for clays (silty clay to clays), four for silt mixtures (clayey silt to silty clay), five for sand mixtures (silty sand to sandy silt), six for sands (clean sand to silty sand), and seven for gravelly sand to dense sand. The classifications of interest to this study are two through four where the undrained shear strength is relevant. Finally, the plasticity index, which is equal to Liquid Limit (LL) minus the plastic Limit (PL) is also investigated as a possible soil classification method by studying its correlation to CPT undrained shear strength estimates. The results from studying these three parameters are described next.

**Zhang and Tumay Method.** This classification approach provides the user with the probability of existence of clay, silt, and sand from CPT readings. Its major advantage in the context of this study is that no borehole results will be needed to assist in estimating the undrained shear strength, unlike the Plasticity Index for example where such information will be necessary. The data points were grouped twice based on: (1) the probability of existence of clay and (2) the probability of existence of clay plus silt combined. The probability of existence of sand was not considered since it is not related to the undrained shear strength. The results from the two groupings are presented next.


Table 14 lists the results for the first grouping of probability of existence of clay in the tested soil. Both silt and sand are excluded in this grouping. Four ranges of probability of clay existence were chosen for this study. They are less than 25 percent, between 25 and 50 percent, between 50 and 75 percent and greater than 75 percent. Data points falling

within each range were analyzed statistically as before. The bias, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation are given in Table 14. It can be seen that after an initial increase in the bias and coefficient of variation for the first two ranges (< 25 percent and 25-50 percent), a clear declining trend is noticed. This implies that as the probability of clay existence increases, the CPT becomes a more reliable tool for estimating the undrained shear strength. This is expected because the undrained shear strength is a quantity that describes soils with high clay contents and the existence of coarser materials in the soil adversely affects the CPT readings for undrained shear strength calculations.


Table 15 lists the results from the same classification method; however, the probabilities of existence of clay and silt are combined. Four ranges were chosen for the investigation. They are less than 80 percent, between 80 and 90 percent, between 90 and 97.5 percent and greater than 97.5 percent. The statistical results for the data points within each range showed trend similar to when only clay was considered. An initial rise for the bias between the first and second range was noticed followed by a consistent drop from one range to the other for subsequent ranges. The coefficient of variation's trend was not as clear. The first two ranges (< 80 percent and 80 – 90 percent) had a similar coefficient of variation (68 percent), followed with a rise in the third range to 83 percent and then a drop to 65 percent in the fourth range. This indicates that relying on the existence of clay might be a better solution in future calibration efforts due to the clearer trends it offers.

**Table 14**  
**Effect of soil classification on uncertainty of CPT results**  
**(Zhang and Tumay – clay only)**


| Clay Percentage (%)                                     | < 25    | 25-50   | 50-75   | > 75  |
|---|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| <b>Bias, <math>\lambda</math></b>                       | 2.112 ↗ | 2.273 ↘ | 1.954 ↘ | 1.822 |
| <b>Standard Deviation, <math>\sigma_\lambda</math></b>  | 1.422 ↗ | 1.774 ↘ | 1.476 ↘ | 1.124 |
| <b>Coefficient of Variation, COV</b>                    | 67% ↗   | 78% ↘   | 76% ↘   | 62%   |
| <b>Number of Points, <math>N</math></b>                 | 171     | 210     | 128     | 353   |
| <b>Average CPT Coefficient, <math>N_{kt}</math></b>     | 31.7    | 34.1    | 29.3    | 27.3  |
| <b>Standard Deviation, <math>\sigma_{N_{kt}}</math></b> | 21.3    | 26.6    | 22.1    | 16.9  |




**Clay < 25%**



**25 % < Clay < 50%**



**50 % < Clay < 75%**



**Clay > 75%**


**Figure 40**

**Comparison of undrained shear strength,  $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests for different soil classifications (Zhang and Tumay – clay only)**




**Table 15**  
**Effect of soil classification on uncertainty of CPT results**  
**(Zhang and Tumay – clay and silt)**


| <b>Clay and Silt Percentage (%)</b>                     | <b>&lt; 80</b> | <b>80-90</b> | <b>90-97.5</b> | <b>&gt; 97.5</b> |
|---|----------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| <b>Bias, <math>\lambda</math></b>                       | 2.168 ↗        | 2.207 ↘      | 2.203 ↘        | 1.853            |
| <b>Standard Deviation, <math>\sigma_\lambda</math></b>  | 1.478 ↗        | 1.505 ↗      | 1.825 ↘        | 1.212            |
| <b>Coefficient of Variation, COV</b>                    | 68% ≥          | 68% ↗        | 83% ↘          | 65%              |
| <b>Number of Points, <math>N</math></b>                 | 105            | 132          | 156            | 469              |
| <b>Average CPT Coefficient, <math>N_{kt}</math></b>     | 32.5           | 33.1         | 33.0           | 22.8             |
| <b>Standard Deviation, <math>\sigma_{N_{kt}}</math></b> | 22.2           | 22.6         | 27.4           | 18.2             |




**Clay and Silt < 80%**



**80 % < Clay and Silt < 90%**



**90% < Clay and Silt < 97.5%**



**Clay and Silt > 97.5%**


**Figure 41**

**Comparison of undrained shear strength,  $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests for different soil classifications (Zhang and Tumay – clay and silt)**


**Robertson’s Method.** The first four soil types [two for organic soils and peats, three for clays (silty clay to clays), four for silt mixtures (clayey silt to silty clay), and five for sand mixtures (silty sand to sandy silt)] are analyzed in this study. The remaining two classifications [six for sands (clean sand to silty sand) and seven for gravelly sand to dense sand)] were not included in this analysis because of the irrelevance of undrained shear strength to these soil types. The same can be said about Soil Type 5. It is, however, included in the analysis. Table 16 lists the summary of the results that show a consistent trend of a rising bias and a dropping coefficient of variation for the most relevant soil types (2, 3, and 4). This indicates that the CPT overestimates the undrained shear strength at a lower rate for Soil Type 2 than Type 3, which is also lower than Type 4. This method shows a good potential for inclusion in future CPT calibration efforts because it only relies on CPT data (no boreholes are needed) similar to the previous classification technique (Zhang and Tumay).

**Table 16**  
**Effect of soil classification on uncertainty of CPT results (Robertson)**


| Soil classification                                     | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5     |
|---|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| <b>Bias, <math>\lambda</math></b>                       | 1.358 ↗ | 1.899 ↗ | 2.067 ↗ | 2.643 |
| <b>Standard Deviation, <math>\sigma_\lambda</math></b>  | 0.962 ↗ | 1.268 ↗ | 1.299 ↗ | 2.292 |
| <b>Coefficient of Variation, COV</b>                    | 71% ↘   | 67% ↘   | 63% ↗   | 87%   |
| <b>Number of Points, <math>N</math></b>                 | 33      | 478     | 258     | 87    |
| <b>Average CPT Coefficient, <math>N_{kt}</math></b>     | 20.4    | 28.5    | 31.0    | 39.6  |
| <b>Standard Deviation, <math>\sigma_{N_{kt}}</math></b> | 14.4    | 19.0    | 19.5    | 34.4  |




**Classification 2**



**Classification 3**



**Classification 4**




**Classification 5**

**Figure 42**  
**Comparison of undrained shear strength,  $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests for different soil classifications (Robertson)**


**Plasticity Index.** The Plasticity Index (PI) was also analyzed as a classification technique in an attempt to relate the accuracy of CPT undrained shear strength estimates to this quantity. Unlike the previous classification techniques, the PI would require results from boreholes if it were to be used in interpreting CPT test readings. This approach eliminates the possibility of using the CPT as an independent testing tool. Five ranges of PI were chosen for the study, namely, less than 20, between 20 and 30, between 30 and 40, between 40 and 50, and greater than 50. The results of the statistical analysis for the accuracy of CPT undrained shear estimates with respect to borehole results are summarized in Table 17 for each of the studied ranges. There is no clear trend for the bias or the coefficient of variation. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no justification for including the plasticity index in subsequent calibration studies.

**Table 17**  
**Effect of Plasticity Index on uncertainty of CPT results**


| <b>PI range</b>   | <b>&lt; 20</b> | <b>20-30</b> | <b>30-40</b> | <b>40-50</b> | <b>&gt; 50</b> |
|---|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| <b>Bias, <math>\lambda</math></b>                       | 2.195 ↘        | 1.912 ↘      | 1.871 ↗      | 2.010 ↘      | 1.726          |
| <b>Standard Deviation, <math>\sigma_\lambda</math></b>  | 1.585 ↘        | 1.580 ↘      | 1.041 ↘      | 0.968 ↘      | 0.941          |
| <b>Coefficient of Variation, COV</b>                    | 72% ↗          | 83% ↘        | 56% ↘        | 48% ↗        | 55%            |
| <b>Number of Points, <math>N</math></b>                 | 214            | 148          | 137          | 69           | 132            |
| <b>Average CPT Coefficient, <math>N_{kt}</math></b>     | 32.9           | 28.7         | 28.1         | 30.2         | 25.9           |
| <b>Standard Deviation, <math>\sigma_{N_{kt}}</math></b> | 23.8           | 23.7         | 15.6         | 14.5         | 14.1           |




**PI < 20**



**20 < PI < 30**



**30 < PI < 40**



**40 < PI < 50**

**Figure 43**

**Comparison of undrained shear strength,  $S_u$ , from CPT and UC tests for different Plasticity Index values**


## Chi-Square Results

**Transformation Model,  $S_u^{CPT} / S_u^{UC}$ .** A Chi-Square test was conducted on the transformation model results, i.e., the ratio  $S_u^{CPT} / S_u^{UC}$ , following the procedure described in Appendix C. Figure 44 shows a plot of the observed data (862 points) and theoretical lognormal and normal values. It can be seen that the lognormal distribution fits the observed data better. The Chi Square test revealed that the summation  $\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{(n_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$  is equal to 9.115 for the lognormal distribution and 268.190 for the normal distribution. According to Table 36, the lognormal distribution passes the test, which requires the summation to be less than 10.64 for 6 degrees of freedom ( $f = m - 1 - k = 9 - 1 - 2 = 6$ ) with a significance level of  $\alpha = 10$  percent ( $1 - \alpha = 0.900$ ). The normal distribution fails this test.


Similar tests were conducted for the data subsets according to Robertson classification of soils. The conclusions were identical to those obtained from the whole dataset, except for Soil Classification 2 where both normal and lognormal distribution passed the test, however, at a lower significance level (5 percent).

**Table 18**  
**Summary of chi-square test results for transformation model**

| Dataset               | Count | $\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{(n_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$ |         |
|-----------------------|-------|--|---------|
|                       |       | Lognormal                                | Normal  |
| All data points       | 862   | 9.115                                    | 268.190 |
| Soil Classification 2 | 33    | 11.730                                   | 11.074  |
| Soil Classification 3 | 478   | 8.487                                    | 142.681 |
| Soil Classification 4 | 258   | 6.057                                    | 66.195  |




(a) Lognormal




(b) Normal

**Figure 44**  
**Chi square test results for transformation model (all data points)**






(a) Lognormal




(b) Normal

**Figure 45**  
**Chi square test results for transformation model (Soil Classification 2)**




(a) Lognormal




(b) Normal

**Figure 46**  
**Chi square test results for transformation model (Soil Classification 3)**



(a) Lognormal




(b) Normal


**Figure 47**  
**Chi square test results for transformation model (Soil Classification 4)**

**Repeatability of Tip Resistance,  $q_c$ .** The other random variable that is determined from this study is that related to the inherent uncertainty in the device measurements. The repeatability results (see on Page 59) were used to choose an appropriate distribution for this random variable. The results are plotted in Figure 48 for both distribution types. The

summation  $\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{(n_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$  was equal to 56.879 for the lognormal distribution and 11.814 for the normal distribution. This means that a normal distribution fits this random variable better as it passes the Chi-Square test at a significance level,  $\alpha$ , equal to 5percent ( $1 - \alpha = 0.950$ ).



**(a) Lognormal**



**(b) Normal**

**Figure 48**  
**Chi square test results for device uncertainty**

## Calibration of CPT Coefficient for Undrained Shear Strength

### $N_{kt}$ Calibration–1<sup>st</sup> Approach

As described earlier, the 1<sup>st</sup> approach adopted in this study for calibrating the CPT coefficient,  $N_{kt}$ , is straightforward and relies on direct correlation between undrained shear strength obtained from CPT and boring results. For the 862 points available in the database,  $N_{kt}$  values were computed. Figure 49 shows a histogram of the  $N_{kt}$  values computed using equation (42). It can be seen that a wide range of  $N_{kt}$  resulted from the data. To illustrate how this plot can be used, a  $N_{kt}$  value of 15 is chosen. For this value, it can be seen that the shear strength for 80.7 percent of the points in the database will be overestimated.





Figure 49

### Histogram of $N_{kt}$ –values obtained from equation (42) –all data points

To simplify this plot in such a way that can be used to determine  $N_{kt}$  values for target probabilities of exceedance, the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the data is constructed and plotted in Figure 50. This plot can be used to determine the probability of exceedance for any  $N_{kt}$  value. For example, the figure shows that if  $N_{kt}$  is set to 15, the probability of exceedance is equal to 19 percent ( $1.00 - 81$ ). Alternatively,  $N_{kt}$  can be determined for a given target probability of exceedance. In the same figure, a  $N_{kt}$  value can be determined for a desired target probability of exceedance (40 percent in this illustration)

can be easily determined to be 21. Similar plots can be generated for different soil classifications. Table 19 lists  $N_{kt}$  value obtained for probability of exceedance,  $P_e$ , equal to 50 percent, 55 percent, and 66.7 percent, which will be the target values throughout this study.




**Figure 50**  
**Cumulative distribution function (CDF) for  $N_{kt}$ -values [all data points]**


**Table 19**  
**Calibrated  $N_{kt}$  values for different probability of exceedance,  $P_e$ , values**

| Probability of Exceedance, $P_e$ | CPT Coefficient, $N_{kt}$ |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 50.0%                            | 24.879                    |
| 55.0%                            | 26.914                    |
| 66.7%                            | 32.285                    |

Plots similar to the histogram seen in Figure 49 can be generated for any subgroup of data points. For example, Figure 51 and Figure 52 show the histograms for each soil classification using both methods investigated in this study, namely Robertson (1990) and Zhang and Tumay (1999). It can be seen from the plots that the decrease in clay content (lower classification number in Robertson’s method and higher percentage in Zhang and Tumay method) is translated into an increase in  $N_{kt}$  value. This is illustrated with the shift in the histogram to higher  $N_{kt}$  values. Plots similar to the CDF shown in Figure 50 can also be generated for each soil classification. However, due to the limited number of data points, a smooth S-curve such as the one seen in Figure 50 is not achievable. As more data points become available, the development of these charts will be trivial.



**Figure 51**  
**Histogram of  $N_{kt}$  –values obtained from equation (42) (by Robertson soil classification)**



**Figure 52**  
**Histogram of  $N_{kt}$ -values obtained from equation (42)**  
**(by Zhang and Tumay's soil classification)**

It should be emphasized that this approach does not account for the variability inherent in soil properties or measuring device. In other words, each of the  $N_{kt}$  values is obtained using one CPT sounding and one unconfined compression test. In real life, different CPT soundings will result in different readings as was demonstrated by the repeatability study. Also, variations in soil properties are the norm and should be accounted for. If these sources of uncertainty are not accounted for at this level (soil property), proper care should be taken when using these properties in the next level of engineering computations (foundation design).



### $N_{kt}$ Calibration–2<sup>nd</sup> Approach

The 2<sup>nd</sup> approach for calibration of the CPT coefficient,  $N_{kt}$ , accounts for all uncertainties identified in this study using the limit state function equation (47-b), and applying the First Order Reliability Method (FORM) described in Appendix B. The results from this study are presented next.

Table 20 through Table 22 show the results for a series of computations considering  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$  and relying on Robertson's classification. The choice to present the results for a  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$  ratio equal to 0.10 was based on the average  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$  ratio of data points included in the database, which is 0.14. Furthermore, a sensitivity study was conducted, and it was determined that the  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$  ratio does not impact the reliability results except for high end values, e.g.,  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.80$ . The tables also show the term  $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ , which will be used in the optimization of  $N_{kt}$ . The three tables correspond to the three chosen target probability of exceedance levels, namely 50 percent ( $\beta_T = 0.0$ ), 55 percent ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ ), and 66.7 percent ( $\beta_T = 0.4308$ ). As can be seen, targeting higher  $\beta$  values requires higher  $N_{kt}$  values so the term  $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$  is equal to zero. An exact zero value cannot always be achieved due to the discrete  $N_{kt}$  values chosen in this study. Therefore, finding an optimum  $N_{kt}$  is achieved as can be seen in Figure 53 where the minimum value of the plot of  $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$  versus  $N_{kt}$  corresponds to the desired value.

**Table 20**  
**Reliability results ( $\beta_T = 0.0$ ,  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$ , Robertson classification)**


| $N_{kt}$ | ALL Cases |                       | 2       |                       | 3       |                       | 4       |                       |
|----------|-----------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|
|          | $\beta$   | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$ | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$ | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$ | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ |
| 12       | -0.971    | 0.944                 | -0.324  | 0.105                 | -1.116  | 1.245                 | -1.102  | 1.215                 |
| 15       | -0.727    | 0.529                 | -0.214  | 0.046                 | -0.731  | 0.534                 | -0.897  | 0.804                 |
| 18       | -0.491    | 0.241                 | -0.033  | 0.001                 | -0.505  | 0.255                 | -0.708  | 0.502                 |
| 21       | -0.329    | 0.108                 | 0.125   | 0.016                 | -0.303  | 0.092                 | -0.502  | 0.252                 |
| 24       | -0.176    | 0.031                 | 0.214   | 0.046                 | -0.124  | 0.015                 | -0.294  | 0.086                 |
| 27       | -0.021    | 0.000                 | 0.350   | 0.122                 | 0.049   | 0.002                 | -0.157  | 0.025                 |
| 30       | 0.091     | 0.008                 | 0.515   | 0.265                 | 0.190   | 0.036                 | -0.036  | 0.001                 |
| 33       | 0.188     | 0.035                 | 0.665   | 0.442                 | 0.325   | 0.106                 | 0.079   | 0.006                 |
| 36       | 0.277     | 0.077                 | 0.712   | 0.507                 | 0.444   | 0.197                 | 0.185   | 0.034                 |
| 39       | 0.352     | 0.124                 | 0.767   | 0.589                 | 0.559   | 0.313                 | 0.273   | 0.074                 |
| 42       | 0.431     | 0.186                 | 0.891   | 0.794                 | 0.668   | 0.446                 | 0.369   | 0.136                 |
| 45       | 0.489     | 0.239                 | 0.963   | 0.928                 | 0.762   | 0.580                 | 0.430   | 0.185                 |
| 48       | 0.544     | 0.295                 | 1.077   | 1.159                 | 0.848   | 0.719                 | 0.488   | 0.238                 |
| 51       | 0.603     | 0.363                 | 1.146   | 1.314                 | 0.933   | 0.870                 | 0.552   | 0.305                 |

**Table 21**  
**Reliability results ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ ,  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$ , Robertson classification)**


| $N_{kt}$  | ALL Cases |                       | 2       |                       | 3       |                       | 4       |                       |
|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|
|           | $\beta$   | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$ | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$ | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$ | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ |
| <b>12</b> | -0.971    | 1.204                 | -0.324  | 0.202                 | -1.116  | 1.541                 | -1.102  | 1.508                 |
| <b>15</b> | -0.727    | 0.727                 | -0.214  | 0.115                 | -0.731  | 0.733                 | -0.897  | 1.045                 |
| <b>18</b> | -0.491    | 0.381                 | -0.033  | 0.025                 | -0.505  | 0.397                 | -0.708  | 0.695                 |
| <b>21</b> | -0.329    | 0.206                 | 0.125   | 0.000                 | -0.303  | 0.184                 | -0.502  | 0.394                 |
| <b>24</b> | -0.176    | 0.091                 | 0.214   | 0.008                 | -0.124  | 0.062                 | -0.294  | 0.176                 |
| <b>27</b> | -0.021    | 0.021                 | 0.350   | 0.050                 | 0.049   | 0.006                 | -0.157  | 0.080                 |
| <b>30</b> | 0.091     | 0.001                 | 0.515   | 0.152                 | 0.190   | 0.004                 | -0.036  | 0.026                 |
| <b>33</b> | 0.188     | 0.004                 | 0.665   | 0.290                 | 0.325   | 0.040                 | 0.079   | 0.002                 |
| <b>36</b> | 0.277     | 0.023                 | 0.712   | 0.344                 | 0.444   | 0.101                 | 0.185   | 0.004                 |
| <b>39</b> | 0.352     | 0.051                 | 0.767   | 0.412                 | 0.559   | 0.188                 | 0.273   | 0.022                 |
| <b>42</b> | 0.431     | 0.093                 | 0.891   | 0.586                 | 0.668   | 0.294                 | 0.369   | 0.059                 |
| <b>45</b> | 0.489     | 0.132                 | 0.963   | 0.701                 | 0.762   | 0.405                 | 0.430   | 0.093                 |
| <b>48</b> | 0.544     | 0.175                 | 1.077   | 0.905                 | 0.848   | 0.522                 | 0.488   | 0.131                 |
| <b>51</b> | 0.603     | 0.227                 | 1.146   | 1.042                 | 0.933   | 0.651                 | 0.552   | 0.182                 |

**Table 22**  
**Reliability results ( $\beta_T = 0.4308$ ,  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$ , Robertson classification)**

| $N_{kt}$ | ALL Cases |                       | 2       |                       | 3       |                       | 4       |                       |
|----------|-----------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|
|          | $\beta$   | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$ | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$ | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$ | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ |
| 12       | -0.971    | 1.966                 | -0.324  | 0.570                 | -1.116  | 2.392                 | -1.102  | 2.350                 |
| 15       | -0.727    | 1.341                 | -0.214  | 0.415                 | -0.731  | 1.349                 | -0.897  | 1.762                 |
| 18       | -0.491    | 0.850                 | -0.033  | 0.215                 | -0.505  | 0.875                 | -0.708  | 1.297                 |
| 21       | -0.329    | 0.577                 | 0.125   | 0.094                 | -0.303  | 0.539                 | -0.502  | 0.871                 |
| 24       | -0.176    | 0.368                 | 0.214   | 0.047                 | -0.124  | 0.308                 | -0.294  | 0.525                 |
| 27       | -0.021    | 0.204                 | 0.350   | 0.007                 | 0.049   | 0.146                 | -0.157  | 0.346                 |
| 30       | 0.091     | 0.116                 | 0.515   | 0.007                 | 0.190   | 0.058                 | -0.036  | 0.217                 |
| 33       | 0.188     | 0.059                 | 0.665   | 0.055                 | 0.325   | 0.011                 | 0.079   | 0.124                 |
| 36       | 0.277     | 0.024                 | 0.712   | 0.079                 | 0.444   | 0.000                 | 0.185   | 0.060                 |
| 39       | 0.352     | 0.006                 | 0.767   | 0.113                 | 0.559   | 0.017                 | 0.273   | 0.025                 |
| 42       | 0.431     | 0.000                 | 0.891   | 0.212                 | 0.668   | 0.056                 | 0.369   | 0.004                 |
| 45       | 0.489     | 0.003                 | 0.963   | 0.283                 | 0.762   | 0.109                 | 0.430   | 0.000                 |
| 48       | 0.544     | 0.013                 | 1.077   | 0.417                 | 0.848   | 0.174                 | 0.488   | 0.003                 |
| 51       | 0.603     | 0.030                 | 1.146   | 0.512                 | 0.933   | 0.252                 | 0.552   | 0.015                 |



(a) All data



(b) by Robertson's classification

Figure 53

Determining optimum  $N_{kt}$  values ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ ,  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.05$ )

This optimization procedure was repeated for all studied cases, and the results are summarized in Table 23 through Table 25.

**Table 23**  
**Optimum  $N_{kt}$  values ( $\beta_T = 0.0$ , Robertson classification)**

| $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$ | Classification |        |        |        |
|-------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                   | ALL            | 2      | 3      | 4      |
| <b>0.05</b>       | 27.559         | 18.630 | 26.150 | 30.933 |
| <b>0.1</b>        | 27.557         | 18.630 | 26.151 | 30.933 |
| <b>0.2</b>        | 27.557         | 18.630 | 26.149 | 30.933 |
| <b>0.5</b>        | 27.555         | 18.632 | 26.150 | 30.932 |
| <b>0.8</b>        | 27.542         | 18.631 | 26.145 | 30.927 |
| <b>0.9</b>        | 27.528         | 18.628 | 26.132 | 30.918 |

**Table 24**  
**Optimum  $N_{kt}$  values ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ , Robertson classification)**

| $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$ | Classification |        |        |        |
|-------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                   | ALL            | 2      | 3      | 4      |
| <b>0.05</b>       | 31.064         | 21.016 | 28.630 | 34.311 |
| <b>0.1</b>        | 31.075         | 21.022 | 28.633 | 34.320 |
| <b>0.2</b>        | 31.107         | 21.036 | 28.642 | 34.343 |
| <b>0.5</b>        | 31.326         | 21.145 | 28.713 | 34.505 |
| <b>0.8</b>        | 32.783         | 21.986 | 29.231 | 35.631 |
| <b>0.9</b>        | 36.084         | 24.167 | 30.574 | 38.475 |

**Table 25**  
**Optimum  $N_{kt}$  values ( $\beta_T = 0.4308$ , Robertson classification)**

| $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$ | Classification |        |        |        |
|-------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                   | ALL            | 2      | 3      | 4      |
| <b>0.05</b>       | 41.941         | 28.458 | 35.657 | 44.992 |
| <b>0.1</b>        | 41.982         | 28.470 | 35.672 | 45.033 |
| <b>0.2</b>        | 42.137         | 28.500 | 35.709 | 45.133 |
| <b>0.5</b>        | 43.228         | 28.721 | 35.985 | 45.862 |
| <b>0.8</b>        | 49.973         | 30.297 | 37.970 | 50.411 |
| <b>0.9</b>        | N/A            | 38.159 | 42.805 | N/A    |

Table 26 through Table 31 list the reliability calibration results for Zhang and Tumay soil classification method that were obtained by repeating the procedure described above. It can be seen that the optimum  $N_{kt}$  values are also affected by the type of soil (clay content). Nevertheless, the differences between  $N_{kt}$  values for difference soil types are smaller than those obtained using the Robertson soil classification.

**Table 26**  
**Reliability results ( $\beta_T = 0.0$ ,  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$ , Zhang and Tumay classification)**

| $N_{kt}$ | ALL Cases |                       | > 75%   |                       | 50% - 75% |                       | 25% - 50% |                       |
|----------|-----------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
|          | $\beta$   | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$ | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$   | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$   | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ |
| 12       | -0.971    | 0.944                 | -0.931  | 0.867                 | -0.837    | 0.701                 | -1.092    | 1.193                 |
| 15       | -0.727    | 0.528                 | -0.710  | 0.505                 | -0.638    | 0.407                 | -0.800    | 0.640                 |
| 18       | -0.491    | 0.241                 | -0.506  | 0.256                 | -0.322    | 0.104                 | -0.604    | 0.364                 |
| 21       | -0.328    | 0.108                 | -0.331  | 0.110                 | -0.169    | 0.029                 | -0.422    | 0.178                 |
| 24       | -0.176    | 0.031                 | -0.143  | 0.021                 | -0.055    | 0.003                 | -0.286    | 0.082                 |
| 27       | -0.021    | 0.000                 | 0.006   | 0.000                 | 0.068     | 0.005                 | -0.068    | 0.005                 |
| 30       | 0.091     | 0.008                 | 0.125   | 0.016                 | 0.142     | 0.020                 | 0.047     | 0.002                 |
| 33       | 0.188     | 0.035                 | 0.253   | 0.064                 | 0.227     | 0.052                 | 0.142     | 0.020                 |
| 36       | 0.277     | 0.077                 | 0.350   | 0.122                 | 0.328     | 0.108                 | 0.226     | 0.051                 |
| 39       | 0.352     | 0.124                 | 0.451   | 0.203                 | 0.421     | 0.178                 | 0.290     | 0.084                 |
| 42       | 0.431     | 0.186                 | 0.552   | 0.305                 | 0.508     | 0.258                 | 0.365     | 0.134                 |
| 45       | 0.489     | 0.239                 | 0.609   | 0.371                 | 0.584     | 0.340                 | 0.428     | 0.183                 |
| 48       | 0.543     | 0.295                 | 0.685   | 0.469                 | 0.654     | 0.427                 | 0.475     | 0.226                 |
| 51       | 0.603     | 0.363                 | 0.761   | 0.579                 | 0.706     | 0.498                 | 0.534     | 0.285                 |



**Table 27****Reliability results ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ ,  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$ , Zhang and Tumay classification)**

| $N_{kt}$ | ALL Cases |                       | > 75%   |                       | 50% - 75% |                       | 25% - 50% |                       |
|----------|-----------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
|          | $\beta$   | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$ | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$   | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$   | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ |
| 12       | -0.971    | 1.204                 | -0.931  | 1.117                 | -0.837    | 0.927                 | -1.092    | 1.483                 |
| 15       | -0.727    | 0.727                 | -0.710  | 0.699                 | -0.638    | 0.583                 | -0.800    | 0.857                 |
| 18       | -0.491    | 0.381                 | -0.506  | 0.399                 | -0.322    | 0.201                 | -0.604    | 0.532                 |
| 21       | -0.328    | 0.206                 | -0.331  | 0.209                 | -0.169    | 0.087                 | -0.422    | 0.300                 |
| 24       | -0.176    | 0.091                 | -0.143  | 0.072                 | -0.055    | 0.033                 | -0.286    | 0.169                 |
| 27       | -0.021    | 0.021                 | 0.006   | 0.014                 | 0.068     | 0.003                 | -0.068    | 0.038                 |
| 30       | 0.091     | 0.001                 | 0.125   | 0.000                 | 0.142     | 0.000                 | 0.047     | 0.006                 |
| 33       | 0.188     | 0.004                 | 0.253   | 0.016                 | 0.227     | 0.010                 | 0.142     | 0.000                 |
| 36       | 0.277     | 0.023                 | 0.350   | 0.050                 | 0.328     | 0.041                 | 0.226     | 0.010                 |
| 39       | 0.352     | 0.051                 | 0.451   | 0.106                 | 0.421     | 0.087                 | 0.290     | 0.027                 |
| 42       | 0.431     | 0.093                 | 0.552   | 0.182                 | 0.508     | 0.146                 | 0.365     | 0.058                 |
| 45       | 0.489     | 0.132                 | 0.609   | 0.234                 | 0.584     | 0.210                 | 0.428     | 0.091                 |
| 48       | 0.543     | 0.175                 | 0.685   | 0.312                 | 0.654     | 0.279                 | 0.475     | 0.122                 |
| 51       | 0.603     | 0.227                 | 0.761   | 0.404                 | 0.706     | 0.337                 | 0.534     | 0.167                 |

**Table 28****Reliability results ( $\beta_T = 0.4308$ ,  $\sigma_{vo}/q_c = 0.10$ , Zhang and Tumay classification)**

| $N_{kt}$ | ALL Cases |                       | > 75%   |                       | 50% - 75% |                       | 25% - 50% |                       |
|----------|-----------|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
|          | $\beta$   | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$ | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$   | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ | $\beta$   | $(\beta - \beta_T)^2$ |
| 12       | -0.971    | 1.966                 | -0.931  | 1.855                 | -0.837    | 1.607                 | -1.092    | 2.319                 |
| 15       | -0.727    | 1.340                 | -0.710  | 1.302                 | -0.638    | 1.141                 | -0.800    | 1.515                 |
| 18       | -0.491    | 0.850                 | -0.506  | 0.877                 | -0.322    | 0.567                 | -0.604    | 1.070                 |
| 21       | -0.328    | 0.576                 | -0.331  | 0.580                 | -0.169    | 0.360                 | -0.422    | 0.727                 |
| 24       | -0.176    | 0.368                 | -0.143  | 0.330                 | -0.055    | 0.236                 | -0.286    | 0.514                 |
| 27       | -0.021    | 0.204                 | 0.006   | 0.180                 | 0.068     | 0.131                 | -0.068    | 0.249                 |
| 30       | 0.091     | 0.116                 | 0.125   | 0.093                 | 0.142     | 0.083                 | 0.047     | 0.147                 |
| 33       | 0.188     | 0.059                 | 0.253   | 0.031                 | 0.227     | 0.041                 | 0.142     | 0.083                 |
| 36       | 0.277     | 0.024                 | 0.350   | 0.007                 | 0.328     | 0.011                 | 0.226     | 0.042                 |
| 39       | 0.352     | 0.006                 | 0.451   | 0.000                 | 0.421     | 0.000                 | 0.290     | 0.020                 |
| 42       | 0.431     | 0.000                 | 0.552   | 0.015                 | 0.508     | 0.006                 | 0.365     | 0.004                 |
| 45       | 0.489     | 0.003                 | 0.609   | 0.032                 | 0.584     | 0.023                 | 0.428     | 0.000                 |
| 48       | 0.543     | 0.013                 | 0.685   | 0.064                 | 0.654     | 0.050                 | 0.475     | 0.002                 |
| 51       | 0.603     | 0.030                 | 0.761   | 0.109                 | 0.706     | 0.076                 | 0.534     | 0.011                 |

**Table 29****Optimum  $N_{kt}$  values ( $\beta_T = 0.0$ , Zhang and Tumay classification)**

| $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$ | Classification (clay probability) |        |           |           |        |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------|-----------|--------|
|                   | ALL                               | > 75%  | 50% - 75% | 25% - 50% | < 25%  |
| 0.05              | 27.557                            | 26.874 | 25.332    | 28.780    | 31.536 |
| 0.1               | 27.557                            | 26.874 | 25.332    | 28.780    | 31.536 |
| 0.2               | 27.557                            | 26.874 | 25.332    | 28.779    | 31.536 |
| 0.5               | 27.554                            | 26.874 | 25.331    | 28.774    | 31.535 |
| 0.8               | 27.540                            | 26.871 | 25.320    | 28.742    | 31.526 |
| 0.9               | 27.527                            | 26.869 | 25.305    | 28.710    | 31.515 |

**Table 30****Optimum  $N_{kt}$  values ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ , Zhang and Tumay classification)**

| $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$ | Classification (clay probability) |        |           |           |        |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------|-----------|--------|
|                   | ALL                               | > 75%  | 50% - 75% | 25% - 50% | < 25%  |
| <b>0.05</b>       | 31.063                            | 30.002 | 29.307    | 32.476    | 35.291 |
| <b>0.1</b>        | 31.075                            | 30.015 | 29.324    | 32.486    | 35.302 |
| <b>0.2</b>        | 31.106                            | 30.049 | 29.367    | 32.511    | 35.331 |
| <b>0.5</b>        | 31.326                            | 30.284 | 29.670    | 32.694    | 35.534 |
| <b>0.8</b>        | 32.784                            | 31.749 | 31.465    | 34.072    | 37.613 |
| <b>0.9</b>        | 36.081                            | 35.268 | 34.799    | 37.543    | 41.498 |


**Table 31****Optimum  $N_{kt}$  values ( $\beta_T = 0.4308$ , Zhang and Tumay classification)**

| $\sigma_{vo}/q_c$ | Classification (clay probability) |        |           |           |        |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------|-----------|--------|
|                   | ALL                               | > 75%  | 50% - 75% | 25% - 50% | < 25%  |
| <b>0.05</b>       | 41.939                            | 38.343 | 39.278    | 45.127    | 50.877 |
| <b>0.1</b>        | 41.984                            | 38.398 | 39.326    | 45.194    | 50.936 |
| <b>0.2</b>        | 42.136                            | 38.540 | 39.449    | 45.365    | N/A    |
| <b>0.5</b>        | 43.228                            | 39.505 | 40.298    | 46.563    | N/A    |
| <b>0.8</b>        | 49.976                            | 45.618 | 45.800    | N/A       | N/A    |
| <b>0.9</b>        | N/A                               | N/A    | N/A       | N/A       | N/A    |

**Correlation Between Unit Weight,  $\gamma_T$ , from CPT and Boring Data**


As a byproduct of this study, the correlation between unit weight estimates obtained from CPT and boring data was also investigated. Equation (33) was used to compute the unit weight from CPT readings, while direct unit weight values were available from boring data. A plot of this correlation can be seen in Figure 54. Unlike the undrained shear strength plots

presented earlier, this plot shows better correlation between unit weight estimates from CPT and boring data. As before, the bias ( $\lambda$ ) and COV of the ratio,  $\gamma_T^{CPT} / \gamma_T^{UC}$ , were computed to assess the accuracy of the CPT unit estimates. The results showed that the bias is equal to 0.98, which indicates that the CPT slightly underestimated the unit weight on average. The COV of the same ratio is computed to be 12.4 percent indicating a scatter in the results, which can be seen in Figure 55. However, it should be noted that these results are substantially better than those presented earlier for the undrained shear strength estimates ( $\lambda = 2.01$  and COV = 71 percent for  $N_{kt} = 15$ ). In summary, it can be said that the CPT is a valid testing tool for estimating the unit weight of Louisiana soils.



**Figure 54**

**Unit weight correlation  $\gamma_T$  (CPT vs. boring results)**



**Figure 55**

**Histogram of unit weight ratio  $\gamma_{T,CPT} / \gamma_{T,BoreHole}$**

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

### Summary

The purpose of this study is to update the correlations between cone penetration and boring log data. A thorough literature review was first conducted. An extensive database of CPT results from projects in Louisiana was collected and processed. This database was merged into a GIS software package to facilitate future retrieval of information generated from this study. A total of 752 CPT points were documented of which 503 were matched with adjacent boreholes and 249 did not have adjacent borehole data available. The CPT data was used to predict soil undrained shear strength, bulk density, and classification according to the Robertson (Robertson 1990) and Zhang and Tumay (1999) methods. A reliability based calibration of the CPT results with respect to borehole data as benchmarks was then conducted. The calibration considered the uncertainties known to be associated with soil properties, namely, inherent soil variability, device measurement, and analytical expression (transformation model). Finally, recommendations for future research and an implementation statement were suggested based on the findings of this research.

### Conclusions

The conclusions from this study can be summarized in the following:

1. A single  $N_{kt}$  value that is valid for all soil types is unwarranted as it will lead to acceptable results for some soil conditions and unacceptable results for others, which can be unconservative.
2. Two approaches for the calibration of the CPT coefficient,  $N_{kt}$ , were presented in this study. The first approach is a direct correlation between undrained shear strength results in the assembled database from CPT and boring data. The second approach utilizes the First Order Reliability Method (FORM) and accounts for all sources of uncertainty (soil properties, device measurement, and transformation model) as compared to the first approach, which only accounts for uncertainties in the transformation model, equation (41).
3. Based on the first approach, a value of 25 should be used for the CPT coefficient,  $N_{kt}$ , to achieve a 50 percent probability of exceedance, i.e.,  $\beta_T = 0.0$ . Safer designs will

- need higher probability of exceedance values (higher  $\beta_T$ ), which results in  $N_{kt}$  equal to 27 and 32 for target  $\beta_T$  values equal to 0.1257 (55 percent) and 0.4308 (66.7 percent), respectively.
4. The second approach yielded  $N_{kt}$  values equal to 27.5, 31.0, and 42.0 for target  $\beta_T$  values equal to 0, (0 percent), 0.1257 (55 percent) and 0.4308 (66.7 percent), respectively. The difference in  $N_{kt}$  values obtained from both methods is attributed to the fact that the first approach does not account for the uncertainties inherent in soil properties and the measuring device. Both uncertainties add to the overall confidence in the soil property, which was captured by the FORM analysis (2<sup>nd</sup> approach) but cannot be captured using the first approach.
  5. The  $N_{kt}$  results presented above are based on the entire dataset compiled for this study. The dataset was further analyzed by grouping data points in subgroups based on different parameters associated with each point. The parameters considered in this study for grouping the data are: (1) depth, (2) soil classification (three different methods), and (3) CPT readings. It was determined that the soil classification is the only parameter showing clear trends that affect CPT estimates of the undrained shear strength. Therefore, further calibrations were warranted taking into account the soil type. Values of  $N_{kt}$  for each soil type based on the Robertson (1990) classification and the Zhang and Tumay (1999) classification were obtained. The following tables summarize the recommended  $N_{kt}$  values obtained from the FORM analysis for both soil classification techniques. It is obvious that the  $N_{kt}$  coefficient for soils with higher clay content is lower than those with less clay content.
  6. Results obtained from this study also showed that the unit weight estimates from CPT readings using equation (33) are in good agreement with borehole results. The expression in equation (33) slightly underestimates the unit weight on average by 2 percent. The scatter of the results is also limited (COV = 12.4 percent) compared to the undrained shear strength discussed earlier.

**Table 32**  
**Recommended  $N_{kt}$  values using 2<sup>nd</sup> approach (Robertson classification)**

| Probability of Exceedance    | $N_{kt}$ values for different soil Classifications |      |      |      |
|------------------------------|--|------|------|------|
|                              | ALL  | 2    | 3    | 4    |
| 50% ( $\beta_T = 0.0$ )      | 27.5   | 18.6 | 26.2 | 30.9 |
| 55% ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ )   | 31.1   | 21.0 | 28.6 | 34.3 |
| 66.7% ( $\beta_T = 0.4308$ ) | 42.0   | 28.5 | 35.7 | 45.0 |

**Table 33**  
**Recommended  $N_{kt}$  values using 2<sup>nd</sup> approach (Zhang and Tumay classification)**

| Probability of Exceedance    | $N_{kt}$ values for different soil classifications (clay probability) |       |           |           |       |
|------------------------------|---|-------|-----------|-----------|-------|
|                              | ALL   | > 75% | 50% - 75% | 25% – 50% | < 25% |
| 50% ( $\beta_T = 0.0$ )      | 27.5  | 26.9  | 25.3      | 28.8      | 31.5  |
| 55% ( $\beta_T = 0.1257$ )   | 31.1  | 30.0  | 29.3      | 32.5      | 35.3  |
| 66.7% ( $\beta_T = 0.4308$ ) | 42.0  | 38.4  | 39.3      | 45.2      | 50.1  |

7. A procedure for classifying projects based on the site variability was proposed. The procedure builds on the results from the repeatability study conducted in this project. It can be used to obtain a non-subjective classification for site variability of a certain project (e.g., low, medium, or high) by studying the coefficient of variation of the CPT undrained shear strength estimates from multiple sounding at the project site. This classification can then be used in conjunction with AASHTO-LRFD design code to use appropriate design coefficients.





## RECOMMENDATIONS

The research team recommends promoting the developed database to LADOTD staff to use it before sending the drilling crew to the field. In some regions, there are a large number of borehole and CPT data files which can prove useful for future projects.

The research team also recommends expanding the GIS database when future measurements become available. The following procedure describes the steps to add more data, i.e., preparing a table of the new data points where each row of the table represents one CPT sounding. The column headers should be similar to the ones in the original database, i.e., Job Number, Location, Station, Date, latitude, longitude, etc.; the table should also include the location of the PDF and Excel files of the CPT soundings. This table can then be imported into ArcMap by using the “Add Data” function. Once the table is added to ArcMap, the new data can be displayed on the map by selecting the “Add X, Y data” option. This will prompt the user to select the columns where the latitude and longitude are located in the table. After selecting the column where the coordinates are located, the points will appear on the map. At this point, the data can be converted into a shape file to be saved and used in ArcMap. Finally, the “join” function can be used to add the new points to the original database.

Based on the statistical studies performed in this research effort, it is recommended that the LADOTD starts adopting the updated CPT coefficient in conjunction with borehole results for a transition period until the proposed values are validated. Updates of the CPT coefficient are also prudent as more CPT data becomes available, which mentioned earlier, should be added to the developed database.



## ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMBOLS

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| $\alpha$                     | Significance level   |
| $a$                          | Cone area ratio  |
| AASHTO                       | The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials |
| $A_c$                        | The projected area of the cone   |
| ACI                          | American Concrete Institute  |
| $A_f$                        | Skempton's pore pressure parameter at failure                          |
| ALF                          | LTRC's Accelerated Loading Facility                                    |
| $A_s$                        | The surface area of the sleeve   |
| $A_s$                        | Friction sleeve surface area   |
| $A_{sb}$                     | Cross sectional area at the bottom of the friction sleeve              |
| ASD                          | Allowable Stress Design  |
| $A_{st}$                     | Cross sectional area at the top of the friction sleeve                 |
| $B_q$                        | The pore pressure ratio  |
| $B$                          | Angle of plastification  |
| $\beta$                      | Reliability Index  |
| $B_q$                        | Pore water pressure index  |
| $c_v$                        | Coefficient of consolidation   |
| $cI$                         | Model uncertainty  |
| $c_1, c_2, \text{ and } c_3$ | Constants dependent on the compressibility                             |
| COV                          | The coefficient of variation   |
| CPT                          | Cone Penetration Test  |
| CRR                          | Cyclic resistance ratio  |
| CSR                          | Cyclic stress ratio  |
| $D_{50}$                     | Mean particle size   |
| $D_i$                        | Distance between CPT and borehole                                      |

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| DOQQ                     | Digital orthophoto quarter quad images   |
| $D_r$                    | Relative density   |
| $D_{rL}, D_{rM}, D_{rH}$ | Relative densities corresponding to low, medium, and high compressibility conditions |
| $\Delta u$               | Excess pore water pressure   |
| $e$                      | Void ratio   |
| $E_t$                    | Initial tangent modulus  |
| $E_s$                    | Secant modulus at 50 percent failure   |
| $e_{max}, e_{min}$       | The maximum and minimum void ratios  |
| $\phi$                   | Resistance factor  |
| $f_t$                    | The corrected sleeve friction  |
| FC                       | Fines content  |
| FORM                     | The First Order Reliability Method   |
| $F_s$                    | The force acting on the friction sleeve  |
| $f_s$                    | The sleeve friction  |
| $\phi'$                  | Friction angle   |
| ft.                      | Feet   |
| $\gamma_i$               | The load factor  |
| $\gamma_T$               | Soil unit weight   |
| GIS                      | Geographic information system  |
| $h$                      | Depth in feet  |
| HPC                      | highly probable clay   |
| HPM                      | highly probable mixed  |
| HPS                      | highly probable sand   |
| $I_c$                    | Soil classification index  |
| In.                      | Inch   |
| IR                       | Rigidity index   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| $k$                                    | Adjustment factor (function of soil type and properties) |
| $K_o$                                  | Earth pressure coefficient at rest                       |
| kPa                                    | Kilo Pascal  |
| $\lambda$                              | The bias   |
| LADOTD                                 | Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development   |
| LRFD                                   | Load and Resistance Factor Design                        |
| LSD                                    | Limit State Design                                       |
| LTRC                                   | Louisiana Transportation Research Center                 |
| $\mu_{X_i}$                            | The mean   |
| MPa                                    | Mega Pascal  |
| $N_c, N_k, N_{kb}, N_c', N_{\Delta u}$ | Theoretical cone factor                                  |
| NCHRP                                  | The National Cooperative Highway Research Program        |
| OCR                                    | over-consolidation ratio                                 |
| $p_a$                                  | Atmospheric pressure                                     |
| PCPT                                   | Piezo-Cone Penetration Test                              |
| PDF                                    | Portable document format                                 |
| PI                                     | Plasticity index   |
| psf                                    | Pounds per square foot                                   |
| $q$                                    | Weighted average   |
| $q_E$                                  | Effective tip resistance parameter                       |
| $Q_i$                                  | The demand due to applied loads (dead, live, etc.)       |
| $Q_A$                                  | Aging factor   |
| $Q_c$                                  | The total force acting on the cone                       |
| $q_c$                                  | The cone resistance                                      |
| $Q_F$                                  | Empirical constant of the least-square regression        |
| $q_t$                                  | Cone resistance corrected for unequal end area effects   |
| $q_{t-net}$                            | Net tip resistance                                       |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| $R_n$                        | The nominal capacity of the designed member       |
| $R_f$                        | Friction ratio                                    |
| $\sigma_{ho}$                | Horizontal pressure                               |
| $\sigma_{mean}$              | Mean stress                                       |
| $\sigma_{vo}$                | total overburden stress                           |
| $\sigma'_p$                  | Pre-consolidation pressure                        |
| $\sigma_{X_i}$               | Standard deviation                                |
| $S_u^{UC}$                   | Unconfined compression undrained shear strength   |
| $S_u^{CPT}$                  | Undrained shear strength calculated from CPT data |
| SBPMT                        | Self-boring Pressuremeter Test                    |
| SPT                          | Standard penetration test                         |
| SPT-N                        | Number of blows in SPT for 300 mm penetration     |
| STE                          | Soil Testing Engineers, Inc.                      |
| $S_u$                        | Undrained shear strength                          |
| $\theta$                     | Semi-apex angle                                   |
| tsf                          | Tons per square foot                              |
| $U$                          | soil classification index                         |
| $u_1$                        | Pore water pressure at the tip of the cone        |
| $u_2$                        | Pore water pressure behind the cone               |
| $u_3$                        | Pore water pressure behind the friction sleeve    |
| $u_o$                        | Hydrostatic or initial in-situ pore pressure      |
| USCS                         | Unified Soil Classification System                |
| $V_s$                        | Shear wave velocity                               |
| $W_L, W_M, \text{ and } W_H$ | Weight factors                                    |
| $X_i$                        | Random variable                                   |

## REFERENCES

1. Robertson, P.K. (1990), "Soil Classification Using the Cone Penetration Test." Canadian Geotechnical Journal, Vol. 27, No. 1. pp. 151-158.
2. Zhang, Z. and Tumay, M.T. (1999), "Statistical to Fuzzy Approach Toward CPT Soil Classification." Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, Vol. 125 (3), pp. 179-186.
3. Villet, W.C.B and Mitchell, J.K. (1981), "Cone Resistance, Relative Density and Friction Angle." Cone Penetration Testing and Experience; Session at the ASCE National Convention, St. Louis, 178-207, American Society of Engineers (ASCE).
4. Robertson, P.K. and Campanella, R.G. (1983a), "Interpretation of Cone Penetrometer Test: Part I: Sand." Canadian Geotechnical Journal, 20(4), pp.718-33.
5. Robertson, P.K. and Campanella, R.G. (1983b), "Interpretation of Cone Penetrometer Test: Part II: Clay." Canadian Geotechnical Journal, 20(4), pp. 734-45.
6. Meigh, A. C. (1987), "Cone penetration testing." CIRIA Rep., Butterworth's, London, U.K.
7. Vermeiden, J. (1948), "Improved Sounding Apparatus as Developed in Holland since 1936." Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Rotterdam, 1, pp. 280-7.
8. Plantema, G. (1948), "Construction and Method of Operating a New Deep Sounding Apparatus." Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Rotterdam, 1, pp. 277-9.
9. Begemann, H.K.S. Ph. (1953), "Improved Method for Determining Resistance to Adhesion by Sounding Through a Loose Sleeve Placed Behind the Cone." Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Zurich, 1, pp. 213-17.

10. Sanglerat, G. (1972), "The Penetrometer and Soil Exploration." Elsevier, Amsterdam, 464 pp.
11. Lunne, T.; Robertson, P.K.; and Powell J.J.M. (1997), "Cone Penetration Testing in Geotechnical Practice." Blackie Academic, EF Spon/Routledge Publishers, New York, 312 pp.
12. Kurup, P. U.; Voyiadjis, G. Z.; and Tumay, M. T. (1994), "Calibration Chamber Studies of Piezocone Test in Cohesive Soils." J. Geotechnical Engineering, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), 120(1), pp. 81-107.
13. Schaap, L.H.J. and Zuidberg, H.M. (1982), "Mechanical and Electrical Aspects of the Electric Cone Penetrometer Tip." Proceedings of the 2nd European Symposium on Penetration Testing, ESOPT-II, Amsterdam, 2, 841-51 Balkema Pub. Rotterdam.
14. Sandven, R.; Senneset, K.; and Janbu, N. (1988), "Interpretation of Piezocone Tests in Cohesive Soils." Proceedings of the International Symposium on Penetration Testing, ISOPT-1, Orlando, 2, 939-53, Balkema Pub., Rotterdam.
15. Begemann, H.K.S. Ph. (1965), "The Friction Jacket Cone an Aid in Determining the Soil Profile." Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Montréal, 1, 17-20.
16. Sanglerat, G.; Nhim, T. V.; Sejourne, M.; and Andina, R. (1974), "Direct Soil Classification by Static Penetrometer with Special Friction Sleeve." Proceedings of the First European Symposium on Penetration Testing, ESOPT-1, June 5-7, Stockholm, Vol. 2.2, pp. 337-344.
17. Schmertmann, J.H. (1970), "Static Cone to Compute Static Settlement Over Sand." Journal of the Soil Mechanics and Foundations Division, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), 96(SM3), pp. 1011-43.
18. Douglas, B.J. and Olsen, R.S. (1981), "Soil Classification Using Electric Cone Penetrometer. Cone Penetration Testing and Experience." Proceedings of the ASCE National Convention, St. Louis, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), pp. 209-27.



19. Robertson, P.K.; Campanella, R.G.; Gillespie, D.; and Greig, J. (1986), "Use of Piezometer Cone Data." Proceedings of the ASCE Specialty Conference In Situ '86: Use of In Situ Tests in Geotechnical Engineering, Blacksburg, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), pp. 1263-80.
20. Olsen, R.S. and Farr, J.V. (1986), "Site Characterization Using the Cone Penetration Test." Proceedings of the ASCE Specialty Conference In Situ '86: Use of In Situ Tests in Geotechnical Engineering, Blacksburg, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), pp. 854-68.
21. Lunne, T.; Eidsmoen, T.; Gillespie, D.; and Howland, J.D. (1986), "Laboratory and Field Evaluation of Cone Penetrometers." Proceedings of the ASCE Specialty Conference In Situ '86: Use of In Situ Tests in Geotechnical Engineering, Blacksburg, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), pp. 714-29.
22. Gillespie, D.G. (1990), "Evaluating Velocity and Pore Pressure Data from the Cone Penetration Test." Ph.D. thesis, Department of Civil Engineering, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.
23. Jones G.A. and Rust, E. (1982), "Piezometer Penetration Testing, CUPT." Proceedings of the Second European Symposium on Penetration Testing, ESOPT-2, Amsterdam, May 24-27, Vol. 2, pp. 607-614.
24. Baligh, M.M.; Vivatrat, V.; and Ladd, C.C. (1980), "Cone Penetration in Soil Profiling." Journal of the Geotechnical Engineering Division, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), 106(GT4), pp. 447-61.
25. Senneset K. and Janbu, N. (1985), "Shear Strength Parameters Obtained from Static Cone Penetration Tests In Situ Measurements." Symposium, San Diego, 1984, American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) special technical publication, STP 883, pp. 41-54.
26. Eslami, A. and Fellenius, B.H. (1997), "Pile Capacity by Direct CPT and CPTu methods applied to 102 Case Histories." Canadian Geotechnical Journal, Vol. 34, No. 6, pp. 880-898.

27. Fellenius, B.H. and Eslami, A. (2000), "Soil Profile Interpreted from CPTu data." Year 2000 Geotechnics, Geotechnical Engineering Conference, Asian Institute of Technology, Bangkok, Thailand, November 27-30, 2000, 18 pp.
28. Kaufmann, A. (1975), "Introduction to the Theory of Fuzzy Subsets, I: Fundamental Theoretical Elements." Academic Press, New York.
29. Brown, C.B.; Chameau, J.L.; Palmer, R.; and Yao, J.T.P. (1985). Proceedings, NSF Workshop on Civil Engineering Applications of Fuzzy Sets, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
30. Hill, R. (1950), "The Mathematical Theory of Plasticity." Oxford University Press, Oxford, England.
31. Vesic, A.S., (1972), "Expansion of Cavities on the Infinite Soil Masses." Journal of the Soil Mechanics and Foundation Division, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Vol. 98, SM3, pp. 265-290.
32. Baligh, M.M. (1985), "Strain path method." Journal of the Geotechnical Engineering Division, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), 111(GT9), pp. 1108-36.
33. Teh, C.I. and Houlsby, G.T. (1991), "An Analytical Study of the Cone Penetration Test in Clay." Geotechnique, 41(1), pp. 17-34.
34. Abu-Farsakh, M.Y.; Voyiadjis, G.Z; and Tumay, M.T. (1998), "Numerical Analysis of the Miniature Piezocone Penetration Tests (PCPT) in Cohesive Soils." International Journal for Numerical and Analytical Methods in Geomechanics. Vol. 22 (10), pp. 791-818.
35. Terzaghi, K. (1943), "Theoretical soil mechanics." John Wiley and Sons, New York, 510 pp.
36. Caquot, A. and Kerisel, J. (1956), "Traité de Mécanique des Sols." Gauthier-Villars, Paris.
37. Meyerhof, G.G. (1951), "The Ultimate Bearing Capacity of Foundations. Géotechnique." 2(4), pp. 301-2.

38. De Beer, E.E. (1977), "Static Cone Penetration Testing in Clay and Loam." Sondeer Symposium, Utrecht.
39. Skempton, A.W. (1951), "The Bearing Capacity of Clays." Proceedings of the Building Research Congress, London, Division I, 180-9.
40. Gibson, R.E. (1950), Discussion: G. Wilson. "The bearing capacity of screw piles and concrete cylinders." Journal of the Institution of Civil Engineers, 34, 382.
41. Baligh, M.M. (1975), "Theory of Deep Site Static Cone Penetration Resistance." Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Civil Engineering, Cambridge, Mass., Publication No. R75-56.
42. Ladanyi, B. (1967), "Deep Punching of Sensitive Clays." Proceedings of the Third Oan American Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Caracas, 1, pp. 533-46.
43. Teh, C.I. (1987), "An Analytical Study of the Cone Penetration Test". D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University.
44. Lunne, T. and Kleven, A. (1981), "Role of CPT in North Sea Foundation Engineering." Session at the ASCE National Convention: Cone Penetration Testing and Materials, St. Louis, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), pp. 76-107.
45. Kjekstad, O.; Lunne, T.; and Clausen, C.J.F. (1978), "Comparison Between In Situ Cone Resistance and Laboratory Strength for Overconsolidated North Sea Clays." Marine Geotechnology, 3(1), pp. 23-36.
46. Aas, G.; Lacasse, S.; Lunne, T.; and Hoeg, K. (1986), "Use of In Situ Tests for Foundation Design on Clay." Proceedings of the ASCE Specialty conference In Situ '86: Use of In Situ Tests in Geotechnical Engineering, Blacksburg, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), pp. 1-30.
47. La Rouchelle, P.; Zebdi, P.M.; Leroueil, S.; Tavenas, F.; and Virely, D. (1988), "Piezocone Tests in Sensitive Clays of Eastern Canada." Proceedings of the International Symposium on Penetration Testing, ISOPT-1, Orlando, 2 pp. 831-41, Balkema Pub., Rotterdam.

48. Rad, N.S. and Lunne, T. (1988), "Direct Correlations Between Piezocone Test Results and Undrained Shear Strength of Clay." Proceedings of The International Symposium on Penetration Testing ISOPT-1, Orlando, 2, 911-17, Balkema Pub., Rotterdam.
49. Senneset, K.; Janbu, N.; and Svanó, G. (1982), "Strength and Deformation Parameters from Cone Penetration Tests." Proceedings of the 2nd European Symposium on Penetration Testing, ESOPT-II, Amsterdam, 2, 863-70, Balkema Pub., Rotterdam.
50. Lunne, T.; Christopherson, H.P.; and Tjelta, T.I. (1985), "Engineering Use of Piezocone Data in North Sea Clays." Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, San Francisco, 2, 907-12, Balkema Pub., Rotterdam.
51. Campanella, R.G. and Robertson, P.K. (1988), "Current Status of the Piezocone Test." Proceedings of the International Symposium on Penetration Testing, ISOPT-1, Orlando, 1, 93-116, Balkema Pub., Rotterdam.
52. Battaglio, M.; Jamiolkowski, M.; Lancellotta, R.; and Maniscalco, R. (1981), "Piezometer Probe Test in Cohesive Deposits. Cone Penetration Testing and Experience." Proceedings of the Session ASCE National Convention, St. Louis, pp. 264-302.
53. Randolph, M.F. and Wroth, C.P. (1979), "An Analytical Solution for the Consolidation Around a Driven Pile." Proceedings of the International Journal for Numerical and Analytical Methods in Geomechanics, 3(3), 217-29.
54. Henkel, D.J. and Wade, N.H. (1966), "Plane Strain on a Saturated Remolded Clay." ASCE-J, Vol. 92, No. 6.
55. Massarsch, K.R. and Broms, B.B. (1981), "Pile Driving in Clay Slopes." Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Stockholm, 3, 469-74, Balkema Pub., Rotterdam.
56. Keaveny, J.M. and Mitchell, J.K. (1986), "Strength of Fine-Rained Soils Using the Piezocone." Proceedings of the ASCE Specialty Conference in Situ '86: Use of In Situ Tests in Geotechnical Engineering, Blacksburg, 668-85, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE).

57. Lunne, T., Lacasse, S. and Rad, N.S. (1989), "SPT, CPT, Pressuremeter Testing and Recent Developments on In Situ Testing of Soils." General report from the 12th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Roi de Janeiro, 4, 2339-403, Balkema Pub., Rotterdam.
58. Senneset, K.; Sandven, R.; and Janbu, N. (1989), "The Evaluation of Soil Parameters from Piezocone Tests." Transportation Research Record, No. 1235, pp. 24-37.
59. Sully, J.P.; Campanella, R.G.; and Robertson, P.K. (1988), "Overconsolidation Ratio of Clays From Penetration Pore Water Pressures." Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, ASCE, 114(2), pp. 209-15.
60. Mayne, P.W. (1991), "Determination of OCR in Clays by Piezocone Tests using Cavity Expansion and Critical State Concepts." Soils and Foundations, 31(2), pp. 65-76.
61. Mayne, P.W., "CPT-Based Prediction of Footing Response. Measured & Predicted Behavior of Five Spread Footings on Sand (GSP 41)." ASCE, Reston, Virginia, 1994, pp. 214-218.
62. Mayne, P.W. (2006), "The 2nd James K. Mitchell Lecture: Undisturbed Sand Strength from Seismic Cone Tests." Geomechanics & Geoengineering, Taylor & Francis Group, London, Vol. 1, No. 4, 2006.
63. Chen, B.S-Y. and Mayne, P.W. (1996), "Statistical Relationships between Piezocone Measurements and Stress History of Clays." Canadian Geotechnical Journal, Vol. 33, pp. 488-498.
64. Mayne, P.W. (2001), "Stress-Strain-Strength-Flow Parameters from Enhanced In-Situ Tests." Proceedings, International Conference on In-Situ Measurement of Soil Properties and Case Histories, Bali, Indonesia, pp. 27-48.
65. Juang, C.H.; Huang, X.H.; Holtz, R.D.; and Chen, J.W. (1996), "Determination of Relative Density from CPT Using Fuzzy Sets." J. Geotechnical Engineering, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), 122(1).

66. Baldi, G.; Bellotti, R.; Ghionna, V.; Jamiolkowski, M.; and Pasqualini, E. (1986), "Interpretation of CPTs and CPTUs; 2nd part: Drained Penetration of Sands." Proceedings of the Fourth International Geotechnical Seminar, Singapore, pp. 143-56.
67. Kulhawy, F.H. and Mayne, P.H. (1990), "Manual on Estimating Soil Properties for Foundation Design." Electric Power Research Institute, EPRI, August, 1990.
68. Jamiolkowski, M.; Swets, Zeitlinger and Lisse. (2001), "Where Are We Going." Pre-Failure Deformation Characteristics of Geomaterials, Vol. 2 (Proc. Torino '99), pp. 1251-1262.
69. Juang, C. H.; Fang, S. Y.; and Khor, E. H. (2006). "First-Order Reliability Method for Probabilistic Liquefaction Triggering Analysis Using CPT," Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, Vol. 132, No. 3, pp. 337-350.
70. Meigh, A.C. and Nixon, I.K. (1961), "Comparison of In-Situ Tests for Granular Soils." Proc. 5th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Paris, 1961, Vol. 1, pp. 499-507.
71. Thornburn, S. (1970), "Proc. Conference on Behavior of Piles." Institution Civil Engineers, London, pp. 53-54.
72. Burland, J.B. and Burbridge, M.C. (1985), "Settlement of Foundations on Sand and Gravel." Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers. December 1985 78 (Part 1), pp. 1325-1381.
73. Jefferies, M.G. and Davies, M.P. (1993), "Use of CPTu to estimate equivalent SPT N60." Geotechnical Testing Journal, GTJODJ, Vol. 15, No. 4, December 1993, pp. 458-468.
74. AASHTO (2004). LRFD Bridge Design Specifications. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C.
75. Hansen, B. (1956). "Limit Design and Safety Factors in Soil Mechanics." Bulletin No. 1, Danish Geotechnical Institute, Copenhagen, Denmark.
76. Hansen, B. (1966). "Code of Practice for Foundation Engineering." Bulletin No. 22, Danish Geotechnical Institute, Copenhagen, Denmark.

77. Tang, W. (1993). "Recent Developments in Geotechnical Reliability." Proceedings, Conference on Probabilistic Methods in Geotechnical Engineering, Balkema, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, Canberra, Australia, pp. 3-28.
78. Hamilton, J. and Murff, J. (1992). "Selection of LRFD Resistance Factors for Pile Foundation Design." Proceedings, Structures Congress, American Society of Civil Engineers, San Antonio, TX.
79. Kulhawy, F. and Phoon, K. (1996). "Engineering Judgment in the evolution from Deterministic to Reliability-Based Foundation Design." Proceedings, 1996 Conference on Uncertainty in the Geologic Environment, UNCERTAINTY '96, American Society of Civil Engineers, NY, Madison, WI, pp. 29-48.
80. Barker, R. M.; Duncan, J. M.; Rojiani, K. B.; Ooi, P. S. K.; Tan, C. K.; and Kim, S. G. (1991). "Manuals for the Design of Bridge Foundations: Shallow Foundations, Driven Piles, Retaining Walls and Abutments, Drilled Shafts, Estimating Tolerable Movements, and Load Factor Design Specifications and Commentary." NCHRP Report No. 343, TRB, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.
81. O'Neill, M. (1995). "LRFD Factors for Deep Foundations through Direct Experimentation." Proceedings, US/Taiwan Geotechnical Engineering Collaboration Workshop, Taipei, Taiwan, pp. 100-114.
82. AASHTO (1994). LRFD Bridge Design Specifications. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), Washington, D.C.
83. D'Appolonia (1998). "LRFD Specifications for Retaining Walls." NCHRP Project 20-07 (Task 88), TRB, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.
84. Withiam, J. L. (2004). "Load and Resistance Factors for Earth Pressures on Bridge Substructures and Retaining Walls." NCHRP Project 12-55, TRB, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.
85. Paikowsky, S. G.; Birgisson, B.; McVay, M.; Nguyen, T.; Kuo, C.; Baecher, G.; Ayyub, B.; Stenersen, K.; O'Malley, K.; Chernauskas, L.; and O'Neill, M. (2004). "Load and

Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) for Deep Foundations.” NCHRP Report No. 507, TRB, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.

86. Allen, T. M. (2005). “Development of Geotechnical Resistance Factors and Downdrag Load Factors for LRFD Foundation Strength Limit State Design.” FHWA-NHI-05-052, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C.
87. Phoon, K. K.; Kulhawy, F. H.; and Grigoriu, M. D. (2003). “Multiple Resistance Factor Design for Shallow Transmission Line Structure Foundations,” *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, Vol. 129, No. 9, 807-+ pp.
88. Phoon, K. K.; and Kulhawy, F. H. (2005). “Characterisation of Model Uncertainties for Laterally Loaded Rigid Drilled Shafts,” *Geotechnique*, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 45-54.
89. Abd Alghaffar, M. A. and Dymiotis-Wellington, C. (2005). “Reliability Analysis of Retaining Walls Designed to British and European Standards,” *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering*, TAYLOR & FRANCIS LTD, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 271-284.
90. Low, B. K. (2005). “Reliability-Based Design Applied to Retaining Walls,” *Geotechnique*, Vol. 55, No. 4, pp. 343.
91. Goh, A. T. C. and Kulhawy, F. H. (2005). “Reliability Assessment of Serviceability Performance of Braced Retaining Walls Using a Neural Network Approach,” *International Journal for Numerical and Analytical Methods in Geomechanics*, Vol. 29, No. 6, pp. 627-642.
92. Fenton, G. A.; Griffiths, D. V.; and Williams, M. B. (2005). “Reliability of Traditional Retaining Wall Design,” *Geotechnique*, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 55-62.
93. Kulhawy, F. H. and Phoon, K. K. (2002). “Observations on Geotechnical Reliability-Based Design Development in North America.” *Proceedings, Foundation Design Codes and Soil Investigation in View of International Harmonization and Performance Based Design*, Balkema, Lisse, Netherlands, pp. 31-48.
94. Phoon, K. K. and Kulhawy, F. H. (1999a). “Characterization of Geotechnical Variability,” *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 612-624.



95. Phoon, K. K. and Kulhawy, F. H. (1999b). "Evaluation of Geotechnical Property Variability," Canadian Geotechnical Journal, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 625-639.
96. McVay, M. C.; Birgisson, B.; Zhang, L.; Perez, A.; and Putcha, S. (2000). "Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) for Driven Piles Using Dynamic Methods-A Florida Perspective," Geotechnical Testing Journal, American Society for Testing and Materials, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 55-66.
97. Titi, H. H.; Mahamid, M.; Abu-Farsakh, M. Y.; and Elias, M. (2004). "Evaluation of CPT Methods for Load and Resistance Factor Design of Driven Piles." Geotechnical Engineering for Transportation Projects: Proceedings of Geo-Trans 2004, American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA 20191-4400, United States, Los Angeles, CA, United States, pp. 687-696.
98. Babu, G. L. S.; Srivastava, A.; and Murthy, D. S. N. (2006). "Reliability Analysis of the Bearing Capacity of a Shallow Foundation Resting on Cohesive Soil," Canadian Geotechnical Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 217-223.
99. Abu-Farsakh, M. Y. and Nazzal, M. D. (2005). "Reliability of Piezocone Penetration Test Methods for Estimating the Coefficient of Consolidation of Cohesive Soils," Geology and Properties of Earth Materials 2005, No. 1913, pp. 62-76.
100. Roy, D.; Hughes, J. M. O.; and Campanella, R. G. (1999). "Reliability of Self-Boring Pressuremeter in Sand," Canadian Geotechnical Journal, Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 102-110.
101. Liu, C. N. and Chen, C. H. (2006). "Mapping Liquefaction Potential Considering Spatial Correlations of CPT Measurements," Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, Vol. 132, No. 9, pp. 1178-1187.
102. Hegazy, Y.A and Mayne, P.W. (1995). "Statistical Correlations Between Vs and CPT Data for Different Soil Types." Proceedings, Cone Penetration Testing (CPT '95), Linkoping, Swedish Geotechnical Society, pp. 173-178.



## APPENDIX A

### List of Projects Included in Database

**Table 34**  
**Projects with CPT and borehole data**

| <b>Job Number</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>Parish Name</b> | <b>Date</b> | <b>Job Location</b>               |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| 700-44-0005       | Dist 02         | St. Bernard        | 10/1/2006   | LA 46 St Bernard                  |
| 006-05-0076       | Dist 02         | Orleans            | 2/1/2005    | Rigolets Pass Bridge & approaches |
| 845-09-0008       | Dist 02         | St. Charles        | 12/23/2004  | LA 632 Main Canal Bridge          |
| 005-07-0057       | Dist 02         | Lafourche          | 12/22/2004  | Drain Canal Bridge on LA 182      |
| 700-26-0229       | Dist 02         | Jefferson          | 11/19/2003  | Causeway Boulevard                |
| 700-18-0014       | Dist 02         | Jefferson          | 11/13/2003  | Huey P. Long Bridge               |
| 700-30-0068       | Dist 02         | Lafourche          | 8/20/2002   | T-Bois Bridge                     |
| 700-36-0146       | Dist 02         | Orleans            | 1/9/2002    | US 90 @ Rigolets @ Pass           |
| 424-04-0034       | Dist 03         | Iberia             | 5/18/2005   | US 90 Interchange @ LA 675        |
| 857-02-0006       | Dist 03         | Vermilion          | 8/17/2004   | LA 332 Maree Michel Canal Bridge  |
| 700-23-0208       | Dist 03         | Iberia             | 5/28/2003   | US 90 Iberia Parish               |
| 700-23-0205       | Dist 03         | Iberia             | 8/28/2002   | US 90 @ LA 83                     |
| 424-05-78         | Dist 03         | St marys           | 9/29/1992   | Mac drv over mopac rr             |
| 380-02-0007       | Dist 03         | St. Landry         | 1/26/2005   | LA 363 Drainage Canal             |
| 427-01-0029       | Dist 04         | Caddo              | 9/8/2005    | LA 3132 @ LA 526                  |
| 700-08-0110       | Dist 04         | Bossier            | 1/28/2004   | LA 154                            |
| 700-09-0125       | Dist 04         | Caddo              | 12/17/2003  | LA 523 @ Bayou Pierre             |
| 700-09-0123       | Dist 04         | Caddo              | 3/26/2003   | US 80                             |
| 700-08-0001       | Dist 04         | Bossier            | 3/25/2003   | Benoit Bridge                     |
| 700-09-0134       | Dist 04         | Caddo              | 10/1/2002   | LA 511                            |

|             |         |              |            |                             |
|-------------|---------|--------------|------------|-----------------------------|
| 001-04-0029 | Dist 04 | Webster      | 8/7/2002   | US 80 @ Dixie Inn           |
| 010-05-0027 | Dist 04 | Bossier      | 12/8/1999  | US 71 @ KCS RR              |
| 742-37-0010 | Dist 05 | Ouachita     | 5/2/2000   | N. 18 St. Ext Seg 2         |
| 069-03-0018 | Dist 05 | Union        | 12/25/2004 | LA 33 Creek Bridge          |
| 700-37-0115 | Dist 05 | Ouachita     | 1/27/2004  | Route US 80                 |
| 700-33-0101 | Dist 05 | Madison      | 1/30/2002  | Madison Parish              |
| 043-01-0017 | Dist 05 | Jackson      | 7/10/2001  | LA 147                      |
| 700-25-0024 | Dist 05 | Jackson      | 10/25/2000 | Chaptham-Eros               |
| 713-58-94   | Dist 05 | La Salle     | 6/28/1995  | Lat. 314724 Long.920509     |
| 126-01-0017 | Dist 05 | Jackson      | 6/27/1995  | JCT la 34 Jackson ph-line   |
| 700-17-61   | Dist 05 | Ouachita     | 10/26/1994 | Forsythe Ave                |
| 700-29-0069 | Dist 08 | Sabine       | 4/17/2001  | Zwolle-noble                |
| 700-30-0035 | Dist 08 | Rapides      | 8/5/2002   | Susek Dr. Pineville         |
| 362-01-0009 | Dist 08 | Natchitoches | 8/10/2004  | LA 491 str # 08353620105301 |
| 700-35-0121 | Dist 08 | Natchitoches | 4/8/2003   | str #08350420510011         |
| 700-58-0115 | Dist 08 | Vernon       | 3/19/2003  | Bayou Zourie                |
| 700-35-0108 | Dist 08 | Natchitoches | 3/29/2000  | Black Lake LA 9             |
| 700-30-0281 | Dist 08 | Rapides      | 8/19/1998  | LA 488 Bayou Boeuf          |
| 022-03-34   | Dist 08 | Winn         | 10/4/1995  | Dugdemonia Relief           |
| 713-58-63   | Dist 08 | Grant        | 4/12/1994  | Flag on Bayou Grant ph      |
| 126-02-12   | Dist 08 | Winn         | 3/31/1993  | LA 499                      |
| 023-01-41   | Dist 08 | Rapides      | 12/15/1992 | Red River Bridge Appro      |
| 022-03-34   | Dist 08 | Rapides      | 12/14/1992 | Red River Bridge Appro      |
| 023-01-41   | Dist 08 | Rapides      | 12/14/1992 | Red River Bridge Appro      |
| 700-30-0311 | Dist 58 | La Salle     | 4/2/2003   | Hemps Creek West Bridge     |
| 344-02-07   | Dist 58 | Franklin     | 12/13/1994 | Bayou Macon                 |

|             |         |                |            |                          |
|-------------|---------|----------------|------------|--------------------------|
| 700-17-0159 | Dist 61 | E. Baton Rouge | 5/10/2004  | Perkins Rd. \ LA 427     |
| 424-06-06   | Dist 61 | Assumption     | 6/12/1996  | Bayou Boeuf              |
| 454-04-0038 | Dist 62 | St. Tammany    | 6/7/2005   | LA1088 at I-12           |
| 454-02-0035 | Dist 62 | Livingston     | 4/21/2005  | I-12 @ Juban Road        |
| 262-31-0016 | Dist 62 | Livingston     | 12/28/2004 | LA 64 Amite River Bridge |
| 452-90-17   | Dist 62 | Tangipahoa     | 11/9/1994  | Ward Line Road           |

**Table 35**  
**Projects with CPT data without borehole data**

| <b>Job Number</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>Parish Name</b> | <b>Date</b> | <b>Job Location</b>               |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| 450-15-0100       | Dist 02         | Jefferson          | 3/3/2003    | US 190 St. Landry                 |
| 283-08-0143       | Dist 02         | Orleans            | 2/12/2003   | LA 158 Bayou Grappe               |
| 700-26-0252       | Dist 02         | Jefferson          | 3/22/2000   | Bayou Teche                       |
| 283-08-0146       | Dist 02         | Orleans            | 10/31/2000  | US 71/1 6 7                       |
| 700-55-0100       | Dist 02         | Terrebonne         | 6/13/2006   | LA 2 @ Sterlington                |
| 700-36-0129       | Dist 02         | Orleans            | 8/4/2004    | Causeway Interchange Phase 1      |
| 424-07-21         | Dist 02         | Terrebonne         | 11/22/2005  | Bayou Liberty                     |
| 700-30-0254       | Dist 03         | St. Landry         | 10/29/2005  | Russell Cemetery Road             |
| 700-49-0106       | Dist 03         | St. Landry         | 10/29/2005  | Philadelphia Road                 |
| 713-28-0104       | Dist 03         | Lafayette          | 10/28/2005  | Red Cut Loop Road                 |
| 380-03-0013       | Dist 03         | St. Landry         | 10/28/2005  | Bayou Oaks Drive                  |
| 700-01-0101       | Dist 03         | Acadia             | 10/26/2005  | Emmanuel road @ mill bayou        |
| 700-23-0200       | Dist 03         | Iberia             | 10/25/2005  | Mosswood Drive                    |
| 427-01-0035       | Dist 04         | Caddo              | 10/24/2005  | Hapsburg lane of US 167 Lafayette |
| 700-09-0152       | Dist 04         | Caddo              | 4/20/2005   | Creek Bridge of US 80             |
| 085-01-0017       | Dist 04         | Caddo              | 1/26/2005   | LA 103 Bayou Courtableau          |
| 427-01-17         | Dist 04         | Caddo              | 1/25/2005   | US 165 Oakdale to Glenmora        |
| 427-01-16         | Dist 04         | Caddo              | 12/26/2004  | LA 4 Biles Branch Bridge          |
| 070-06-0022       | Dist 05         | Ouachita           | 12/25/2004  | LA 577 Creek Bridge               |
| 713-37-0134       | Dist 05         | Ouachita           | 12/19/2004  | Camp Street                       |
| 713-37-0135       | Dist 05         | Ouachita           | 12/14/2004  | Inner Loop Extension              |
| 001-09-0068       | Dist 05         | Ouachita           | 3/26/2004   | Inner Loop Extension              |
| 068-03-0017       | Dist 05         | Jackson            | 11/4/2004   | Fremaux Interchange- US190b       |

|                     |         |                  |            |                                    |
|---------------------|---------|------------------|------------|------------------------------------|
| 185-03-0025         | Dist 05 | W. Carroll       | 8/11/2004  | la 1220 little river bridge        |
| 700-56-0104         | Dist 05 | Union            | 6/16/2004  | Drain Canal Bridge on LA 45        |
| 700-56-0102         | Dist 05 | Union            | 6/15/2004  | Tchoupitoulas to South Peters      |
| 713-31-0100         | Dist 05 | Lincoln          | 4/15/2004  | US190 @ LA 415                     |
| 700-56-0101         | Dist 05 | Union            | 3/23/2004  | Oakland Rd @ Bayou D'Loutre Bridge |
| 332-04-0005         | Dist 05 | W. Carroll       | 2/4/2004   | LA 98                              |
| 700-27-10           | Dist 05 | Richland         | 7/1/2003   | LA 182                             |
| 713-10-0106         | Dist 07 | Calcasieu        | 4/1/2003   | Bridge over Bayou D'Arbonne        |
| 0014-04-0032        | Dist 07 | Allen            | 3/18/2003  | LA 468                             |
| 700-02-0101         | Dist 07 | Allen            | 3/5/2003   | dollar road                        |
| LA 158 bayou grappe | Dist 08 | Grant            | 2/11/2003  | LA 127 drain bridge                |
| us 71/1 6 7         | Dist 08 | Rapides          | 1/29/2002  | Cypress Creek                      |
| 713-35-0123         | Dist 08 | Natchitoches     | 1/29/2002  | Lion Creek Bridge                  |
| 713-40-0128         | Dist 08 | Rapides          | 10/2/2001  | LA 530                             |
| 713-35-0122         | Dist 08 | Natchitoches     | 3/13/2001  | Loreauville Canal                  |
| 361-01-0008         | Dist 08 | Natchitoches     | 1/4/2001   | LA 1153 Allen Ph                   |
| 700-58-0102         | Dist 08 | Vernon           | 12/18/2000 | LA 572 @ Bayou Macon               |
| 700-01-0018         | Dist 08 | Vernon           | 5/8/2000   | Bayou Macon LA 585                 |
| 014-06-25           | Dist 08 | Rapides          | 11/18/1998 | Black Jack Branch                  |
| 455-05-62           | Dist 08 | Rapides          | 11/2/1998  | I-10 Lake Pont                     |
| 455-05-45           | Dist 08 | Rapides          | 8/26/1998  | I-10 relief canal                  |
| 700-30-0310         | Dist 58 | La Salle         | 11/8/1995  | Bayou L'ourse                      |
| 700-21-0102         | Dist 58 | Franklin         | 2/9/1994   | Brookwood Drive                    |
| 008-01-0044         | Dist 61 | West Baton Rouge | 2/7/1994   | Richland Parish Road #12           |
| 852-21-0024         | Dist 62 | St. Tammany      | 5/4/1993   | Inner Loop over W70 ST             |

|             |         |                      |            |                        |
|-------------|---------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|
| 700-18-0053 | Dist 62 | St. Tammany          | 4/29/1993  | Inner Loop over Ellerb |
| 713-59-0220 | Dist 62 | Washington           | 11/18/1992 | Red River bridge app   |
| 700-26-0058 | Dist 62 | St. John the Baptist | 11/17/1992 | Alex Urban sec 149     |




## APPENDIX B

### First Order Reliability Method (FORM)

FORM is based on a first order Taylor Series expansion of the limit state function that approximates the failure surface by a tangent plane at the point of interest. It is not always possible to find a closed form solution for a non-linear limit state function or a function including more than two random variables. Hence, to convert a non-linear limit state function into simple polynomials, Taylor series, equation (53) is used. The expansion of a function,  $f(X)$ , at a certain point “a” is given by:

$$f(X) = f(a) + (X - a)f'(a) + \frac{(X - a)^2}{2} f''(a) + \dots + \frac{(X - a)^n}{n!} f^n(a) \quad (53)$$

FORM uses this expansion to simplify the limit state function,  $g(Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n)$  by considering the expansion of the Taylor series after truncating terms higher than the first order. The expansion is done at the actual design point  $X^*$ . The design point is a point on the failure surface  $g(Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n)$  as shown in Figure 56 for the case of two variables in a non-linear limit state function.



**Figure 56**  
Reliability index evaluated at design point (Nowak and Collins 2000)

To locate this point on the design space of  $g(Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n) = 0$ , an iterative process is needed (Nowak and Collins 2000). For the convergence of a design point through iterative procedure requires solving of a set of  $(2n + 1)$  simultaneous equation with  $(2n + 1)$  unknowns  $\beta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n, Z_1^*, Z_2^*, \dots, Z_n^*$ :

$$\alpha_i = \frac{-\left. \frac{\partial g}{\partial Z_i} \right|_{\text{evaluated at design point}}}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n \left( \left. \frac{\partial g}{\partial Z_k} \right|_{\text{evaluated at design point}} \right)^2}} \quad (54)$$

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial Z_i} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial X_i} \frac{\partial X_i}{\partial Z_i} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial X_i} \sigma_{X_i} \quad (55)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha_i)^2 = 1 \quad (56)$$

$$Z_i^* = \beta \alpha_i \quad (57)$$

$$g(Z_1^*, Z_2^*, \dots, Z_n^*) = 0 \quad (58)$$

where,  $\alpha_i$  is a unit vector in the direction of a design point from the origin, and  $Z_i^*$  is the design point in transformed space. Equation (58) is a mathematical statement of the requirement that the design point must be on the failure boundary.

This procedure was derived with the assumption that the involved random variables are normally distributed. When the probability distributions for the variables involved in the limit state function are not normally distributed, it is required to calculate the “equivalent normal” values of the mean and standard deviation for each non-normal random variable. To obtain the equivalent normal mean,  $\mu_X^e$ , and standard deviation,  $\sigma_X^e$ , the CDF and PDF of the actual function should be equal to normal CDF and normal PDF at the value of the variable  $X^*$  on the failure boundary described by  $g = 0$ . Mathematically it can be expressed as

$$F_X(X^*) = \Phi\left(\frac{X^* - \mu_X^e}{\sigma_X^e}\right) \quad (59)$$

$$f_X(X^*) = \frac{1}{\sigma_X^e} \phi\left(\frac{X^* - \mu_X^e}{\sigma_X^e}\right) \quad (60)$$

where,  $X$  is a random variable with mean  $\mu_X$  and standard deviation  $\sigma_X$  and is described by a CDF  $F_X(X)$  and a PDF  $f_X(X)$ . Where,  $\Phi(\cdot)$  is the CDF for the standard normal distribution and  $\phi(\cdot)$  is the PDF for the standard normal distribution. Expressions for  $\mu_X^e$  and  $\sigma_X^e$  can be obtained as follows:

$$\mu_X^e = X^* - \sigma_X^e [\Phi^{-1}(F_X(X^*))] \quad (61)$$

$$\sigma_X^e = \frac{1}{f_X(X^*)} \phi[\Phi^{-1}(F_X(X^*))] \quad (62)$$

The basic steps in the iteration procedure (Nowak and Collins 2000) to obtain  $\beta$  are as follows:

1. Formulate the limit state function. Determine the probability distributions and appropriate parameters for all random variables,  $X_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, n)$  involved.
2. Obtain an initial design point,  $\{X_i^*\}$ , by assuming values for  $n-1$  of the random variables. (Mean values are a reasonable choice.) Solve the limit state equation  $g = 0$  for the remaining random variable which ensures that the design point is on the failure boundary.

3. Equivalent normal mean,  $\mu_X^e$  and standard deviation,  $\sigma_X^e$  is determined using equations (61) and (62) for design values corresponding to a non-normal distribution.

Determine the reduced variables  $\{Z_i^*\}$  corresponding to the design point  $\{X_i^*\}$  using

$$Z_i^* = \frac{X_i^* - \mu_{X_i}^e}{\sigma_{X_i}^e} \quad (63)$$

4. Determine the partial derivatives of the limit state function with respect to the reduced variables;  $\{G\}$  is a column vector whose elements are the partial derivatives equation (55), multiplied by -1.

$$\{G\} = \begin{Bmatrix} G_1 \\ G_2 \\ \vdots \\ G_n \end{Bmatrix} \quad \text{where, } G_i = - \left. \frac{\partial g}{\partial Z_i} \right|_{\text{evaluated at design point}} \quad (64)$$

5. Estimate of  $\beta$  is then calculated using

$$\beta = \frac{\{G\}^T \{Z^*\}}{\sqrt{\{G\}^T \{G\}}} \quad \text{where, } \{Z^*\} = \begin{Bmatrix} Z_1^* \\ Z_2^* \\ \vdots \\ Z_n^* \end{Bmatrix} \quad (65)$$

6. The direction cosines for the design point to be used in the subsequent iteration are then calculated using

$$\{\alpha\} = \frac{\{G\}}{\sqrt{\{G\}^T \{G\}}} \quad (66)$$

7. Determine a new design point for  $n-1$  of the variables using

$$Z_i^* = \alpha_i \beta \quad (67)$$

8. Determine the corresponding design point values in original coordinates for the  $n-1$  values in Step 7 by

$$X_i^* = \mu_{X_i}^e + Z_i^* \sigma_{X_i}^e \quad (68)$$

9. Determine the value of the remaining random variable by solving the limit state function  $g = 0$ .

10. Repeat Steps 3 to 10 until  $\beta$  and  $\{X_i^*\}$  converge.

## APPENDIX C

### Chi-Square Statistical Test: Goodness-of-fit Test

The Chi-Square test is often used to assess the goodness-of-fit between an obtained set of frequencies in a random sample and what is expected under a given statistical hypothesis. To be able to decide which distribution is better for a particular random variable, the difference between actual observation values (observed frequencies) and theoretical distribution values (theoretical frequencies) is quantified. The steps to determine the probability distribution of a random variable are given below.

1. Divide the observed data range into equal intervals.
2. Find the number of observations (Observed Frequency,  $n_i$ ) within each interval which do not depend on the distribution type.
3. Assume different distribution types that will represent the random variable and find the theoretical distribution values (Theoretical Frequency,  $e_i$ ) within each interval for the respective distributions. If a random variable,  $X$ , lies in an interval  $a$  to  $b$  such that  $a < X \leq b$ , then the Theoretical Frequency,  $e_i$ , for a certain distribution type is given by

$$e_i = P(a < X \leq b) * N \quad (69)$$

where,  $N$  is the total number of observation (data points), and

$$P(a < X \leq b) = P(X \leq b) - P(X < a) \quad (70)$$

The probability of  $X$  less than  $a$  or  $b$ ,  $P(X < a)$ , and  $P(X \leq b)$  is found using the CDF for the respective distribution. The CDF for different distribution types can be obtained from the literature.

4. For each interval, compute the difference between  $n_i$  and  $e_i$ , (squared) as a ratio of  $e_i$ .
5. Compute the summation of differences (squared) as a ratio of  $e_i$  which is given as

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{(n_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} \quad (71)$$

where,  $m$  is the total number of intervals.

6. Calculate the degree of freedom,  $f$ , for the Chi-Square test, which is given by  

$$f = m - 1 - k$$

where,  $k$  is the number of parameters required to describe a particular distribution. In this study, Normal and Lognormal distribution types are used for these types,  $k = 2$ .

7. The summation evaluated in Step 5 is compared to the Chi-Square distribution for a certain significance level,  $\alpha$ , which is always taken between 1 and 10 percent.

8. If  $\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{(n_i - e_i)^2}{e_i} < C_{\alpha, f}$ , then the assumed distribution is fitting statistical data well enough.  $C_{\alpha, f}$  values are given in Table 36.

**Table 36**  
**CDF of the chi-square distribution (Nowak and Collins 2000)**

## Table of the CDF of the Chi-Square Distribution with $f$ Degrees of Freedom

$$P(C \leq c_{\alpha, f}) = \int_0^{c_{\alpha, f}} \frac{1}{2^{f/2} \Gamma(f/2)} s^{(f/2)-1} e^{-s/2} ds$$

| $f \backslash \alpha$ | 0.001    | 0.005    | 0.010    | 0.025    | 0.050    | 0.100    | 0.900 | 0.950 | 0.975 | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.999 |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1                     | 1.57e-06 | 3.93e-05 | 1.57e-04 | 9.82e-04 | 3.93e-03 | 1.58e-02 | 2.706 | 3.841 | 5.024 | 6.635 | 7.879 | 10.83 |
| 2                     | 2.00e-03 | 1.00e-02 | 0.0201   | 0.0506   | 0.1026   | 0.2107   | 4.605 | 5.991 | 7.378 | 9.210 | 10.60 | 13.82 |
| 3                     | 2.43e-02 | 7.17e-02 | 0.1148   | 0.2158   | 0.3518   | 0.5844   | 6.251 | 7.815 | 9.348 | 11.34 | 12.84 | 16.27 |
| 4                     | 9.08e-02 | 0.2070   | 0.2971   | 0.4844   | 0.7107   | 1.064    | 7.779 | 9.488 | 11.14 | 13.28 | 14.86 | 18.47 |
| 5                     | 0.2102   | 0.4118   | 0.5543   | 0.8312   | 1.145    | 1.610    | 9.236 | 11.07 | 12.83 | 15.09 | 16.75 | 20.51 |
| 6                     | 0.3810   | 0.6757   | 0.8721   | 1.237    | 1.635    | 2.204    | 10.64 | 12.59 | 14.45 | 16.81 | 18.55 | 22.46 |
| 7                     | 0.5985   | 0.9893   | 1.239    | 1.690    | 2.167    | 2.833    | 12.02 | 14.07 | 16.01 | 18.48 | 20.28 | 24.32 |
| 8                     | 0.8571   | 1.344    | 1.647    | 2.180    | 2.733    | 3.490    | 13.36 | 15.51 | 17.53 | 20.09 | 21.95 | 26.12 |
| 9                     | 1.152    | 1.735    | 2.088    | 2.700    | 3.325    | 4.168    | 14.68 | 16.92 | 19.02 | 21.67 | 23.59 | 27.88 |
| 10                    | 1.479    | 2.156    | 2.558    | 3.247    | 3.940    | 4.865    | 15.99 | 18.31 | 20.48 | 23.21 | 25.19 | 29.59 |
| 11                    | 1.834    | 2.603    | 3.053    | 3.816    | 4.575    | 5.578    | 17.28 | 19.68 | 21.92 | 24.73 | 26.76 | 31.26 |
| 12                    | 2.214    | 3.074    | 3.571    | 4.404    | 5.226    | 6.304    | 18.55 | 21.03 | 23.34 | 26.22 | 28.30 | 32.91 |
| 13                    | 2.617    | 3.565    | 4.107    | 5.009    | 5.892    | 7.041    | 19.81 | 22.36 | 24.74 | 27.69 | 29.82 | 34.53 |
| 14                    | 3.041    | 4.075    | 4.660    | 5.629    | 6.571    | 7.790    | 21.06 | 23.68 | 26.12 | 29.14 | 31.32 | 36.12 |
| 15                    | 3.483    | 4.601    | 5.229    | 6.262    | 7.261    | 8.547    | 22.31 | 25.00 | 27.49 | 30.58 | 32.80 | 37.70 |
| 16                    | 3.942    | 5.142    | 5.812    | 6.908    | 7.962    | 9.312    | 23.54 | 26.30 | 28.85 | 32.00 | 34.27 | 39.25 |
| 17                    | 4.416    | 5.697    | 6.408    | 7.564    | 8.672    | 10.09    | 24.77 | 27.59 | 30.19 | 33.41 | 35.72 | 40.79 |
| 18                    | 4.905    | 6.265    | 7.015    | 8.231    | 9.390    | 10.86    | 25.99 | 28.87 | 31.53 | 34.81 | 37.16 | 42.31 |
| 19                    | 5.407    | 6.844    | 7.633    | 8.907    | 10.12    | 11.65    | 27.20 | 30.14 | 32.85 | 36.19 | 38.58 | 43.82 |
| 20                    | 5.921    | 7.434    | 8.260    | 9.591    | 10.85    | 12.44    | 28.41 | 31.41 | 34.17 | 37.57 | 40.00 | 45.31 |

## APPENDIX D


### Normal and Lognormal Distribution Types

#### Normal or Gaussian Distribution

If a variable is normally distributed then two quantities have to be specified: the mean,  $\mu_X$ , which coincides with the peak of the PDF curve and the standard distribution,  $\sigma_X$ , which indicates the spread of the bell curve. The PDF for a normal random variable  $X$  is given by equation (72).

$$f_X(X) = \frac{1}{\sigma_X \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{X - \mu_X}{\sigma_X}\right)^2\right] \quad (72)$$

There is no closed-form solution for the CDF of a normal random variable but tables have been developed to provide values of the CDF for the special case in which  $\mu_X = 0$  and  $\sigma_X = 1$  (Nowak and Collins 2000). These tables can be used to obtain values for any general normal distribution.



**Figure 57**  
**Graphical representation of normal distribution**

**Lognormal Distribution**


The random variable  $X$  is a lognormal random variable, Figure 58, if  $Y = \ln(X)$  is normally distributed,  $F_X(x) = F_Y(y)$ .

The mean and standard deviation for  $Y$  are given by equations (73) and (74).

$$\sigma_Y = \sigma_{\ln(X)} = \sqrt{\ln\left[\left(\frac{\sigma_X}{\mu_X}\right)^2 + 1\right]} \tag{73}$$

$$\mu_Y = \mu_{\ln(X)} = \ln(\mu_X) - \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{\ln(X)}^2 \tag{74}$$





**Figure 58**  
**Graphical representation of lognormal distribution**



# APPENDIX E

## Example Excel Template to Analyze CPT Data

|    | A                | B          | C              | D              | E              | F              | G              | H              | I   | J              | K              | L       | M       | N       |
|----|------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|----------------|----------------|---------|---------|---------|
| 1  |                  |            |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |                |                |         |         |         |
| 2  | Date:            |            | 10/25/05       |                | Sta:           | 0              |                |                |     |                |                |         |         |         |
| 3  | Sounding:        | CPT1       |                |                | Location:      |                |                |                |     |                |                |         |         |         |
| 4  | Latitude:        | 30 12 13.4 |                |                | Folder         | Dist 07        |                |                |     |                |                |         |         |         |
| 5  | Longitude:       | 93 21 2.6  |                |                | JN             | 713-10-0106    |                |                |     |                |                |         |         |         |
| 6  | Parish:          | Calcasieu  |                |                | File name:     | CPT1           |                |                |     |                |                |         |         |         |
| 7  |                  |            |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |                |                |         |         |         |
| 8  |                  |            |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |                |                |         |         |         |
| 9  |                  |            |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |                |                |         |         |         |
| 10 | Depth Sounding = |            | 0              | m              |                |                |                |                |     |                |                |         |         |         |
| 11 |                  |            |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |                |                |         |         |         |
| 12 | Depth            | Depth      | q <sub>c</sub> | f <sub>s</sub> | q <sub>c</sub> | q <sub>c</sub> | f <sub>s</sub> | f <sub>s</sub> | FR  | u <sub>0</sub> | u <sub>0</sub> | H&M95   | M2001   | Est. Yr |
| 13 | (m)              | (ft)       | (MPa)          | (kPa)          | (tsf)          | smoothed       | (tsf)          | smoothed       | (%) | (kPa)          | (tsf)          | Est. Yr | Est. Yr | pcf     |
| 14 | 0.02             | 0.07       | 10.560         | 8.0            | 110.28         |                | 0.08           |                | 0.1 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 18.00   | 13.18   | 82.28   |
| 15 | 0.04             | 0.13       | 11.66          | 8.0            | 121.76         |                | 0.08           |                | 0.1 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 18.00   | 12.69   | 79.25   |
| 16 | 0.06             | 0.20       | 10.62          | 32.4           | 110.90         |                | 0.34           |                | 0.3 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 196.74  | 21.05   | 131.43  |
| 17 | 0.08             | 0.26       | 7.33           | 23.2           | 76.49          |                | 0.24           |                | 0.3 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 180.90  | 20.55   | 128.28  |
| 18 | 0.10             | 0.33       | 5.68           | 42.7           | 59.26          | 66.67          | 0.45           | 0.61           | 0.8 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 218.86  | 21.08   | 131.60  |
| 19 | 0.12             | 0.39       | 5.31           | 50.7           | 55.45          | 58.25          | 0.53           | 0.76           | 1.0 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 230.71  | 21.14   | 131.99  |
| 20 | 0.14             | 0.46       | 4.27           | 57.4           | 44.59          | 48.56          | 0.60           | 0.92           | 1.3 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 240.27  | 21.18   | 132.24  |
| 21 | 0.16             | 0.52       | 3.05           | 99.5           | 31.85          | 39.89          | 1.04           | 1.05           | 3.3 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 283.58  | 21.69   | 135.39  |
| 22 | 0.18             | 0.59       | 2.75           | 128.2          | 28.67          | 34.53          | 1.34           | 1.20           | 4.7 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 305.60  | 21.88   | 136.56  |
| 23 | 0.20             | 0.66       | 2.63           | 138.0          | 27.41          | 30.77          | 1.44           | 1.32           | 5.3 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 312.21  | 21.88   | 136.59  |
| 24 | 0.22             | 0.72       | 2.50           | 151.4          | 26.11          | 27.14          | 1.58           | 1.39           | 6.1 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 320.73  | 21.91   | 136.78  |
| 25 | 0.24             | 0.79       | 2.38           | 155.1          | 24.85          | 24.47          | 1.62           | 1.45           | 6.5 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 322.73  | 21.87   | 136.54  |
| 26 | 0.26             | 0.85       | 2.32           | 161.2          | 24.23          | 22.87          | 1.68           | 1.47           | 6.9 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 326.29  | 21.86   | 136.44  |
| 27 | 0.28             | 0.92       | 2.20           | 167.9          | 22.92          | 21.54          | 1.75           | 1.45           | 7.6 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 329.83  | 21.84   | 136.36  |
| 28 | 0.30             | 0.98       | 2.08           | 153.2          | 21.67          | 20.33          | 1.41           | 1.41           | 7.4 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 320.38  | 21.69   | 135.40  |
| 29 | 0.32             | 1.05       | 1.83           | 120.9          | 19.11          | 19.25          | 1.26           | 1.35           | 6.6 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 297.04  | 21.37   | 133.41  |
| 30 | 0.34             | 1.12       | 1.71           | 117.2          | 17.86          | 18.23          | 1.22           | 1.26           | 6.9 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 293.48  | 21.28   | 132.88  |
| 31 | 0.36             | 1.18       | 1.53           | 114.8          | 15.93          | 17.27          | 1.20           | 1.17           | 7.5 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 290.00  | 21.20   | 132.36  |
| 32 | 0.38             | 1.25       | 1.47           | 109.9          | 15.30          | 16.51          | 1.15           | 1.05           | 7.5 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 285.60  | 21.11   | 131.78  |
| 33 | 0.40             | 1.31       | 1.47           | 100.7          | 15.30          | 15.81          | 1.05           | 0.95           | 6.9 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 278.25  | 20.98   | 130.96  |
| 34 | 0.42             | 1.38       | 1.47           | 88.5           | 15.30          | 15.37          | 0.92           | 0.87           | 6.0 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 267.68  | 20.80   | 129.88  |
| 35 | 0.44             | 1.44       | 1.41           | 76.9           | 14.67          | 14.99          | 0.80           | 0.79           | 5.5 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 256.01  | 20.61   | 128.67  |
| 36 | 0.46             | 1.51       | 1.41           | 68.4           | 14.67          | 14.80          | 0.71           | 0.71           | 4.9 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 247.12  | 20.45   | 127.68  |
| 37 | 0.48             | 1.57       | 1.47           | 57.4           | 15.30          | 14.67          | 0.60           | 0.63           | 3.9 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 235.01  | 20.24   | 126.36  |
| 38 | 0.50             | 1.64       | 1.41           | 51.3           | 14.67          | 14.61          | 0.54           | 0.57           | 3.6 | 0.00           | 0.00           | 226.67  | 20.08   | 125.36  |

|                                    | O                       | P                       | Q              | R                       | S                       | T                   | U                   | V        | W    | X     | Y                             | Z    | AA  | AB   |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------|------|-------|-------------------------------|------|---|------|
| 1                                  |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 2                                  |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 3                                  |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 4                                  |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 5                                  |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 6                                  |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 7                                  |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 8                                  |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 9                                  |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 10                                 |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| <b>Groundwater Information</b>     |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| Head = 0.00                        |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| <b>GW1 (m)</b>                     |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 1.00                               |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| <b>Normalized Parameters (kPa)</b> |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
|                                    | $\sigma'_{vo}$<br>(kPa) | $\sigma'_{vo}$<br>(tsf) | $u_o$<br>(kPa) | $\sigma'_{v'}$<br>(kPa) | $\sigma'_{v'}$<br>(tsf) | $q_{uncl}$<br>(kPa) | $\Delta u$<br>(kPa) | $Q$      | $F$  | $B_g$ | Robertson (1990)<br>SBT<br>Ic |      | Jefferies & Davies 93<br>SBT<br>Ic**<br>Soil Type |      |
| 11                                 |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 12                                 |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 13                                 | 0.26                    | 0.00                    | 0.00           | 0.26                    | 0.00                    | 10559.74            | 0.00                | 22531.48 | 0.07 | 0.00  | 0.88                          | 7.00 | 1.35  | 6.00 |
| 14                                 | 0.52                    | 0.01                    | 0.00           | 0.52                    | 0.01                    | 11659.48            | 0.00                | 11314.65 | 0.30 | 0.00  | 0.91                          | 7.00 | 1.34  | 6.00 |
| 15                                 | 0.94                    | 0.01                    | 0.00           | 0.94                    | 0.01                    | 10619.06            | 0.00                | 5427.02  | 0.32 | 0.00  | 0.77                          | 7.00 | 1.12  | 7.00 |
| 16                                 | 1.35                    | 0.01                    | 0.00           | 1.35                    | 0.01                    | 7323.65             | 0.00                | 3203.25  | 0.75 | 0.00  | 1.10                          | 7.00 | 1.43  | 6.00 |
| 17                                 | 1.77                    | 0.02                    | 0.00           | 1.77                    | 0.02                    | 5673.23             | 0.00                | 2419.29  | 0.95 | 0.00  | 1.20                          | 7.00 | 1.52  | 6.00 |
| 18                                 | 2.19                    | 0.02                    | 0.00           | 2.19                    | 0.02                    | 4267.38             | 0.00                | 1630.27  | 1.34 | 0.00  | 1.37                          | 6.00 | 1.68  | 6.00 |
| 19                                 | 2.62                    | 0.03                    | 0.00           | 2.62                    | 0.03                    | 3046.95             | 0.00                | 998.56   | 3.27 | 0.00  | 1.80                          | 6.00 | 2.17  | 5.00 |
| 20                                 | 3.05                    | 0.03                    | 0.00           | 3.05                    | 0.03                    | 2741.51             | 0.00                | 785.79   | 4.67 | 0.00  | 1.98                          | 6.00 | 2.37  | 5.00 |
| 21                                 | 3.49                    | 0.04                    | 0.00           | 3.49                    | 0.04                    | 2621.07             | 0.00                | 667.54   | 5.26 | 0.00  | 2.05                          | 6.00 | 2.44  | 5.00 |
| 22                                 | 3.93                    | 0.04                    | 0.00           | 3.93                    | 0.04                    | 2495.64             | 0.00                | 571.79   | 6.06 | 0.00  | 2.13                          | 5.00 | 2.53  | 5.00 |
| 23                                 | 4.36                    | 0.05                    | 0.00           | 4.36                    | 0.05                    | 2375.20             | 0.00                | 494.62   | 6.53 | 0.00  | 2.18                          | 5.00 | 2.58  | 4.00 |
| 24                                 | 4.80                    | 0.05                    | 0.00           | 4.80                    | 0.05                    | 2314.76             | 0.00                | 441.82   | 6.96 | 0.00  | 2.22                          | 5.00 | 2.62  | 4.00 |
| 25                                 | 5.24                    | 0.05                    | 0.00           | 5.24                    | 0.05                    | 2189.32             | 0.00                | 385.72   | 7.67 | 0.00  | 2.28                          | 5.00 | 2.68  | 4.00 |
| 26                                 | 5.68                    | 0.06                    | 0.00           | 5.68                    | 0.06                    | 2068.89             | 0.00                | 338.62   | 7.40 | 0.00  | 2.29                          | 5.00 | 2.67  | 4.00 |
| 27                                 | 6.11                    | 0.06                    | 0.00           | 6.11                    | 0.06                    | 1823.46             | 0.00                | 278.94   | 6.63 | 0.00  | 2.28                          | 5.00 | 2.63  | 4.00 |
| 28                                 | 6.54                    | 0.07                    | 0.00           | 6.54                    | 0.07                    | 1703.04             | 0.00                | 244.59   | 6.88 | 0.00  | 2.32                          | 5.00 | 2.66  | 4.00 |
| 29                                 | 6.96                    | 0.07                    | 0.00           | 6.96                    | 0.07                    | 1517.61             | 0.00                | 205.45   | 7.56 | 0.00  | 2.40                          | 5.00 | 2.73  | 4.00 |
| 30                                 | 7.39                    | 0.08                    | 0.00           | 7.39                    | 0.08                    | 1456.77             | 0.00                | 186.60   | 7.54 | 0.00  | 2.42                          | 5.00 | 2.74  | 4.00 |
| 31                                 | 7.81                    | 0.08                    | 0.00           | 7.81                    | 0.08                    | 1456.36             | 0.00                | 168.47   | 6.08 | 0.00  | 2.36                          | 5.00 | 2.63  | 4.00 |
| 32                                 | 8.23                    | 0.09                    | 0.00           | 8.23                    | 0.09                    | 1395.94             | 0.00                | 154.13   | 5.51 | 0.00  | 2.34                          | 5.00 | 2.59  | 4.00 |
| 33                                 | 8.64                    | 0.09                    | 0.00           | 8.64                    | 0.09                    | 1395.53             | 0.00                | 147.42   | 4.90 | 0.00  | 2.31                          | 5.00 | 2.54  | 5.00 |
| 34                                 | 9.06                    | 0.10                    | 0.00           | 9.06                    | 0.10                    | 1455.13             | 0.00                | 147.42   | 3.94 | 0.00  | 2.23                          | 5.00 | 2.42  | 5.00 |
| 35                                 | 9.47                    | 0.10                    | 0.00           | 9.47                    | 0.10                    | 1394.73             | 0.00                | 135.77   | 3.67 | 0.00  | 2.23                          | 5.00 | 2.40  | 5.00 |
| 36                                 | 9.87                    | 0.10                    | 0.00           | 9.87                    | 0.10                    |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 37                                 | 10.27                   | 0.11                    | 0.00           | 10.27                   | 0.11                    |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |
| 38                                 |                         |                         |                |                         |                         |                     |                     |          |      |       |                               |      |   |      |