

Full Length Research Paper

A refined formula for the allowable soil pressure using shear wave velocities

Kubilay Kaptan

Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey. E-mail: tezokan@gmail.com. Tel: +90. 212. 352 65 59. Fax: +90. 212. 352 65 58.

Accepted 13 January, 2012

Based on a variety of case histories of site investigations, including extensive bore hole data, laboratory testing and geophysical prospecting at more than 550 construction sites, an empirical formulation is proposed for the rapid determination of allowable bearing pressure of shallow foundations in soils and rocks. The proposed expression corroborates consistently with the results of the classical theory and is proven to be rapid, and reliable. Plate load tests have been also carried out at three different sites, in order to further confirm the validity of the proposed method. It consists of only two soil parameters, namely, the *in situ* measured shear wave velocity and the unit weight. The unit weight may be also determined with sufficient accuracy, by means of other empirical expressions proposed, using P or S - wave velocities. It is indicated that once the shear and P-wave velocities are measured *in situ* by an appropriate geophysical survey, the allowable bearing pressure as well as the coefficient of subgrade reaction and many other elasticity parameters may be determined rapidly and reliably.

Key words: Shear wave velocity, shallow foundations, allowable bearing pressure, dynamic technique, soils and rocks.

INTRODUCTION

Schulze (1943), a prominent historical figure in soil mechanics and foundation engineering in Germany, stated in 1943 that "for the determination of allowable bearing pressure, the geophysical methods, utilizing seismic wave velocity measuring techniques with absolutely no disturbance of natural site conditions, may yield relatively more realistic results than those of the geotechnical methods, which are based primarily on bore hole data and laboratory testing of so-called undisturbed soil samples".

Since that time, various significant contributions have been made to solving geotechnical problems by means of geophysical prospecting. The P-wave velocities, for instance, have been used to determine the unconfined compressive strengths and modulus of elasticity of soil samples by Coates (1970). Hardin and Black (1968), Hardin and Drnevich (1972), based on extensive experimental data, established indispensable relations between the shear wave velocity, void ratio, and shear rigidity of soils. Similarly, Ohkubo and Terasaki (1976)

supplied various expressions relating the seismic wave velocities to weight density, permeability, water content, unconfined compressive strength and modulus of elasticity.

The use of geophysical methods in soil mechanics has been extensively studied for the purpose of determining the properties of soils and rocks by Imai and Yoshimura (1976), Tatham (1982), Willkens et al. (1984), Phillips et al. (1989), Keceli (1990, 2000), Jongmans (1992), Sully and Campanella (1995), and Pyrak-Nolte et al. (1996). Imai and Yoshimura (1976) proposed an empirical expression for the determination of bearing capacity q_f and / or q_a as:

$$nq_a = q_f = V_s^{2.4} / (1590) \text{ (kPa)} \quad (1)$$

This yields values unacceptably much higher than the classical theory as will be evident in next section. Campanella and Stewart (1992), determined various soil parameters by digital signal processing, while Butcher




Figure 1. Soil column and related parameters.

and Powell (1995), supplied practical geophysical techniques to assess various soil parameters related to ground stiffness. An empirical expression is also proposed by Abd El-Rahman et al. (1992), for the ultimate bearing capacity of soils, using the logarithm of shear wave velocity.

A series of guidelines have also been prepared in this respect by the Technical Committee TC 16 of IRTP, ISSMGE (1999), and also by Sieffert and Bay-Gress (2000). Keceli (2000), Turker (2004), based on extensive case studies, supplied explicit expressions for the allowable bearing pressure, using shear wave velocity. In this paper, the earlier formula presented by Tezcan et al. (2006), has been calibrated and improved with the soil data of 550 construction sites. Massarsch (2004) determined deformation properties of fine-grained soils from seismic tests. As to the in situ measurement of P and S – wave velocities, various alternate techniques are available as outlined in detail by Stokoe and Woods (1972), Tezcan et al. (1975), Butcher et al. (2006), Richart et al. (1970), Kramer (1996), Santamarina et al. (2001).

Theoretical basis for the empirical expression

In order to be able to arrive at a particular empirical expression for the allowable soil pressure q_a - underneath a shallow foundation, the systematic boundary value approach used earlier by Keceli (2000) will be followed. The state of stress and the related elastic parameters of a typical soil column are shown in Figure 1.

Considering a foundation depth of D_f with a unit cross-sectional area of $A = 1$, the typical form of the compressive ultimate bearing capacity at the base of the

foundation nothing but only as a format, may be written approximately as;

$$q_f = \gamma D_f \tag{2}$$

$$q_a = q_f / n = \gamma D_f / n \tag{3}$$

Where q_f = ultimate bearing capacity at failure, γ = unit weight of soil above the base of the foundation, q_a = allowable bearing pressure, and n = factor of safety. In order to be able to incorporate the shear wave velocity V_{s2} into the above expressions, the depth parameter D_f will be expressed as velocity multiplied by time as;

$$D_f = V_{s2} t \tag{4}$$

in which, the V_{s2} is purposely selected to be the shear wave velocity measured under the foundation, t = is an unknown time parameter. The time parameter t is introduced herein just as a dummy parameter in order to keep consistency in appropriate units. Substituting Equation (4) into Equation (3), yields

$$q_a = \gamma V_{s2} t / n \tag{5}$$

The unknown time parameter t , will be determined on the basis of a calibration process. For this purpose, a typical 'hard' rock formation will be assumed to exist under the foundation, with the following parameters, as suggested earlier by Keceli (2000);

$$q_a = 10\,000 \text{ kN/m}^2, \quad V_{s2} = 4\,000 \text{ m/s} \tag{6}$$

$$\gamma = 35 \text{ kN/m}^3, \quad n = 1.4$$

Table 1. Factors of safety, n , for soils and rocks⁽¹⁾.

Soil type	V_s – range (m/s)	n	q_a (kN/m ²)
'Hard' rocks	$V_s \geq 4\,000$	$n = 1.4$	$q_a = 0.071 \gamma V_s$
'Soft' rocks	$750 \leq V_s \leq 4\,000$	$n = 4.6 - 8.10^{-4} V_s$	$q_a = 0.1 \gamma V_s / n$
Soils	$750 \geq V_s$	$n = 4.0$	$q_a = 0.025 \gamma V_s \beta$

⁽¹⁾Linear interpolation is applied for $750 \leq V_s \leq 4\,000$ m/s; β , correction factor is used for sands only (Equation 10).

Substituting these numerical values into Equation (5), we obtain $t = 0.10$ sec, thus;

$$q_a = 0.1 \gamma V_{s2} / n \quad (7)$$

This is the desired empirical expression to determine the allowable bearing pressure q_a , in soils and rocks, once the average unit weight, γ , for the soil layer above the foundation and the in situ measured V_{s2} - wave velocity for the soil layer just below the foundation base are available. The unit of V_{s2} is in m/s, the unit of γ is in kN / m³, then the resulting q_a – value is in units of kPa. The unit weight values may be estimated using the empirical expressions;

$$\gamma_p = \gamma_0 + 0.002 V_{p1} \text{ and } \gamma_s = 4.3 V_{s1}^{0.25} \quad (8a) \text{ (8b)}$$

as proposed earlier by Tezcan et al. (2006), and by Keceli (2009), respectively. The second expression is especially recommended for granular soils, for which the measured V_{s1} values represent appropriately the degree of water content and / or porosity. The wave velocities must be in units of m/s. The only remaining unknown parameter is the factor of safety, n , which is assumed to be, after a series of calibration processes, as follows:

$$n = 1.4 \text{ (for } V_{s2} \geq 4\,000 \text{ m/s), } n = 4.0 \text{ (for } V_{s2} \leq 750 \text{ m/s)} \quad (9)$$

The calibration process is based primarily on the reference q_a – values determined by the conventional Terzaghi method, for all the data sets corresponding to the 550 – construction sites considered. For V_{s2} values greater than 750 m/s and smaller than 4, 000 m/s a linear interpolation is recommended. The engineering rock formations are assumed to start for $V_{s2} > 750$ m/s. The factors of safety, as well as the empirical allowable bearing pressure expressions, for various soil (rock) types, are given in Table 1. It is seen that three distinct ranges of values are assumed for n = factor of safety. For soil types with $V_{s2} \leq 750$ m/s the factor of safety is $n = 4$, for rocks with $V_{s2} \geq 4\,000$ m/s it is $n = 1.4$. For other intermediate values of shear wave velocity, linear interpolation is recommended. The validity of these

values has been extensively checked and calibrated by the soil data at 550 construction sites. The relatively higher value of factor of safety assumed for soils is deemed to be appropriate to compensate the inaccuracies and gaps existing in the measured values of shear wave velocity. In fact, Terzaghi and Peck (1976) states that “the factor of safety of the foundation with respect to breaking into the ground should not be less than about 3”.

It was determined by Terzaghi and Peck (1976) that the width of footing, B , has a reducing influence on the value of allowable bearing pressure for granular soils. Therefore, a correction factor β is introduced into the formula, for sandy soils only, as shown in the third line of Table 1.

The proposed values of this correction factor, for different foundation width B , are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= 1.00 && \text{for } (0 \leq B \leq 1.20 \text{ m}) \\ \beta &= 1.13 - 0.11 B && \text{for } (1.2 \leq B \leq 3.00 \text{ m}) \\ \beta &= 0.83 - 0.01 B && \text{for } (3.0 \leq B \leq 12.0 \text{ m}) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Coefficient of subgrade reaction

The shear wave velocity may be used successfully to determine k_s =coefficient of subgrade reaction of the soil layer just beneath the foundation base by making use of the expressions given in Figure 1. The coefficient of subgrade reaction k_s , is defined, similar to the definition of spring constant in engineering mechanics, to be the necessary vertical pressure to produce a unit vertical displacement and expressed as;

$$k_s = q_a / d \quad (11)$$

For shallow foundations, the total vertical displacement is restricted to 1 inch =0.025 m, as prescribed by Terzaghi and Peck (1976). When, $d=0.025$ m is substituted in equation (11), the coefficient of subgrade reaction becomes in units of kN/m³;

$$k_s = 40 q_a \text{ or, } k_s = 4\gamma V_{s2} / n \quad (12), (13)$$

Elasticity parameters

Once, V_{p2} and V_{s2} seismic wave velocities are measured, by geophysical means, for the soil layer No.2 just under the foundation, several parameters of elasticity, such as G = Shear modulus, E_c = Constraint modulus of elasticity, E = Modulus of elasticity (Young's modulus), E_k = Bulk modulus, and μ = Poisson's ratio may be obtained easily. The Shear modulus, G , and the Constraint modulus, E_c , are related to the shear and P- wave velocities by the following expressions, respectively;

$$G = \rho V_s^2 \quad \text{and} \quad E_c = \rho V_p^2 \quad (14), (15)$$

where, ρ = mass density given by $\rho = \gamma/g$. From the Theory of Elasticity, it is known that, E = the Young's modulus of elasticity is related to E_c = the Constraint modulus and also to G = the Shear modulus by the following expressions:

$$E = E_c (1 + \mu) (1 - 2\mu) / (1 - \mu) \quad (16)$$

$$E = 2 (1 + \mu) G \quad (17)$$

Utilising Equations (14) and (15) and also substituting α , as

$$\alpha = E_c / G = (V_p / V_s)^2 \quad (18)$$

into Equations (16) and (17), we obtain

$$\mu = (\alpha - 2) / 2 (\alpha - 1) \quad \text{or,} \quad \alpha = (2\mu - 2) / (2\mu - 1) \quad (19), (20)$$

The modulus of elasticity is directly obtained from Equation (17) as;

$$E = (3\alpha - 4) G / (\alpha - 1) \quad (21)$$

The Constraint modulus E_c , may be also obtained in terms of α as;

$$E_c = \alpha (\alpha - 1) E / (3\alpha - 4) \quad \text{or,} \quad E_c = \gamma V_p^2 / g \quad (22), (23)$$

The Bulk modulus E_k , of the soil layer, may be expressed, from the theory of elasticity, as

$$E_k = E / 3 (1 - 2\mu) \quad (24)$$

$$E_k = (\alpha - 1) E / 3 = \gamma (V_p^2 - 4 V_s^2 / 3) / g \quad (25)$$

Case studies

The allowable bearing pressures have been also

determined at more than 550 construction sites in and around the Kocaeli and Istanbul provinces in Turkey, between the years 2005-2010. At each construction site, by virtue of City by-law, seven bore holes were drilled, SPT counts conducted, undisturbed soil samples were taken for laboratory testing purposes, where cohesion of soil - c , the internal angle of friction - ϕ , unconfined compression strength - q_u and unit weight - γ were determined. Subsequently, following the classical procedure of Terzaghi and Peck (1976), the ultimate capacity and also the allowable bearing pressures were determined, by assuming the factor of safety as $n=3$. For granular soils, immediate settlement calculations were also conducted, in order to determine whether the shear failure mechanism or the maximum settlement criterion would control the design.

The numerical values of the allowable bearing pressures, q_a , determined in accordance with the conventional Terzaghi theory, are shown by a triangular (Δ) symbol, in Figure 2. Parallel to these classical soil investigations, the P- and S- wave velocities have been measured in situ, right at the foundation level for the purpose of determining the allowable bearing pressures, q_a , which are also plotted in Figure 2.

Two separate linear regression lines were also shown in Figure 2, for the purpose of indicating the average values of allowable bearing pressures determined by 'dynamic' and 'conventional' methods. In order to obtain an idea about the relative conservatism of the two methods, the ratios of allowable bearing pressures ($r = q_{ad} / q_{ac}$), as determined by the 'dynamic' and 'conventional' methods, have been plotted against the V_s - values in Figure 2.

It is seen that the linear regression line indicates for V_s - values smaller than 400 m/s a narrow band of $r = 1.03$ to $r = 1.12$, which should be regarded as quite acceptable. The 'dynamic' method proposed herein yields allowable bearing pressures slightly (on the order of 3 to 10%) greater than those of the 'conventional' method for V_s - values smaller than 400 m/s. In fact, the 'conventional' method fails to produce reliable and consistent results for relatively strong soils and soft rocks, because it is difficult to determine the appropriate soil parameters c , and ϕ for use in the 'conventional' method.

At construction sites where the soil conditions have been mostly weathered andesite, granodiorite arena, greywacke, limestone, etc did not allow for the measurement of c and ϕ - values. Therefore, the use of 'dynamic' method becomes inevitable for such strong soils with $V_{s2} > 400$ m/s.

The list of soil parameters determined by in situ and also by laboratory testing through geotechnical prospecting, as well as the in situ measured V_p and V_s - velocities at each of the 550 construction sites, are too voluminous to be included herein. Those researchers interested to have access to these particular data base, may inquire from internet (Tezcan, 2009).




Figure 2. Comparative results of 'conventional' and 'dynamic' methods.

Seismic wave velocities

The seismic wave velocities have been measured using P – and S – geophones by means of a 24 - Channel Geometrics Abem – Pasi seismic instrument, capable of noise filtering. The P – waves have been generated by hitting 6 – blows vertically, with a 0.15 kN hammer, onto a 250 x 250 x 16 mm size steel plate placed horizontally on ground. For the purpose of generating S – waves however, an open ditch of size 1.4 x 1.4 x 1.4 m was excavated and then two steel plates were placed on opposite vertical faces of this ditch parallel to the centerline of the geophones. Using the same 0.15 kN hammer, 6 heavy horizontal blows were applied onto each of these vertical steel plates. The necessary polarity of the S – waves was achieved by hitting these vertical steel plates horizontally in opposite directions, non-concurrently.

Plate load testing

For purposes of correlating the allowable bearing pressures determined by various methods, plate loading tests have been carried out at three particular construction Sites Nos: 335, 502 and 544 (Figure 4). The soil parameters c , q_u , and γ as determined by laboratory

testing, as well as the P and S – wave velocities measured at site by geophysical prospecting are all shown in Table 3. A thick steel bearing plate of 316.2 mm x 316.2 mm = 0.10 m² in size is used under the test platform of size 1.50 by 1.50 m. The tests are carried out right at the bottom elevations of foundations. One half of the bearing pressure σ_0 , which produced a settlement of $s = 12.7$ mm was selected as the allowable pressure q_a as shown in Figure 3. It is from Table 2 that the results of the proposed 'dynamic' method using P and S – wave velocities are in very close agreement with those of the plate load testing. The allowable bearing pressures q_a , in accordance with the conventional theory assuming $N_c = 5.14$ and $N_q = 1$, are also calculated using

$$q_a = (c N_c + \gamma D_f N_q) / 3.0 \tag{26}$$

Numerical example

For purposes of illustration, a soft clayey soil layer of $H = 15$ m beneath a shallow strip footing of depth $D_f = 2.90$ m, width $B = 1.30$ m, is considered.

The in situ measured seismic wave velocities are determined to be $V_{p2} = 700$ m/s and $V_{s2} = 200$ m/s, within the soil layer just below the foundation base. By coincidence, the P - wave velocity within the soil layer




Figure 3. Ratios of allowable bearing pressures ($q_{a,d} / q_{a,c}$) as determined by the 'dynamic' and the 'conventional' methods




Figure 4. Load test results at Sites No: 335, 502, and 544. σ = pressure under the test plate, kPa; ($\sigma_0 = 2 q_a =$ pressure, which produces $s = 12.7$ mm).

Table 2. Comparative evaluation of allowable pressures.

Site No Owner Lot Nos (Soil type)	Various soil parameters ($\phi = 0$)						$q_a =$ allowable pressure		
	$q_u^{(1)}$	D_f	c	γ_{lab}	V_{p2}	V_{s2}	Terzaghi ⁽²⁾ Equation 26	Tezcan et al. ⁽³⁾ Equation 7	Load test Figure 4
	kPa	m	kPa	kN/m ³	m/sec	m/sec	kPa	kPa	kPa
335 Suleyman Turan 8 Paft./A/930 Pars. (silty clay)	172	1.50	86	18.9 $\gamma_0 = 16$	896	390	157	173	180
544 Ayhan Dede G22B / 574 / 11 (weathered diorite)	190	1.50	95	18.0 $\gamma_0 = 16$	1 020	453	172	204	208
502 Ebru Çınar 30 L1C / 440 / 8 (clay stone)	147	1.00	140	22.7 $\gamma_0 = 20$	1 210	489	248	274	280

⁽¹⁾ q_u = unconfined compressive strength; ⁽³⁾ $q_a = 0.025 \gamma_p V_s$ (Equation 7), $n = 4$; ⁽²⁾ Terzaghi and Peck (1976).

above the foundation base is also measured to be $V_{p1} = 700$ m/s. A comprehensive set of classical soil investigations, including a number of bore hole data and laboratory testing exist for this particular site, together with the numerical values of various soil parameters ($c = 52$ kPa, and $\phi = 0$), including the bearing pressure capacity determined to be $q_f = 322$ kPa by the conventional method of Terzaghi and Peck (1976). Therefore, the validity and the reliability of the proposed empirical formulae have been rigorously verified. Calculation of some elasticity parameters, using the empirical expressions presented is summarized in Table 3.

Discussion on the degrees of accuracy

The degrees of accuracy of the proposed 'dynamic' method are quite satisfactory and consistent as verified rigorously at more than 550 construction sites. The conventional approach however, depends heavily on the degrees of accuracy of in situ and laboratory determined soil parameters. In fact, the allowable bearing pressure calculations are very sensitive to the values of c , and ϕ , determined in the laboratory using so-called 'undisturbed' soil samples, which may not necessarily represent the true *in situ* conditions. This may explain the reason why at a number of construction sites, some inconsistent and erratic results for q_a are obtained using the classical theory, as already depicted in Figure 2, because the laboratory measured c , and ϕ - values differed considerably from one soil sample into the other. The 'Point Load' tests^(†) of rock samples have been carried

out for V_{s2} - values greater than 400 m/s as recommended by Hunt (1984).

For 'hard soil' formations, corresponding to shear wave velocities, greater than $V_{s2} > 400$ m/s, the 'conventional' method is unable to yield any reliable q_a - allowable soil pressure, since neither c , nor ϕ - values may not be determined in the laboratory. Any approximate approach however, using either, q_u = unconfined compressive strength or, RQD ratios etc, will not be accurate enough. The 'dynamic' method in such cases produced consistently the same results as those obtained from the 'Point Load' tests (Figure 5). It is a fact that, the orientation of joints within a rock formation plays an important role in the in situ measured V_s - values. The average of V_s - values however, measured in various plan directions may help to improve the degree of accuracy, as recommended by Bieniawski (1979). It is true that the shear modulus, as well as the shear wave velocity of a soil layer is reduced with increasing levels of shear strain, as reported by Massarsch (2004). The ultimate failure pressure is certainly related to very large levels of shear strains.

However, the levels of shear strains associated with allowable bearing pressure are compatible with those generated during the in situ measurement of shear wave velocities. Nevertheless, the nature of the empirical expression proposed herein for the determination of the allowable bearing pressure, using shear wave velocities measured at low shear strains, is appropriate to produce reliable results for a wide range of soil conditions. The influence of high level shear strains is considered not to be relevant for our case. Further, when the soil is saturated, the reduction necessary to consider in

Table 3. Results of numerical example.

Formula	Equation	Numerical calculations	Result	Unit
$\gamma_p = \gamma_0 + 0.002 V_{p1}$	Equation (8a)	$\gamma_p = 16 + 0.002 (700)$	17.4 ⁽¹⁾	kN/m ³
Laboratory	-	-	17.2	kN/m ³
$n = 4$	Table 1	$V_{s2} \leq 750$ m/sec	4	-
$q_f = c N_c + \gamma D_f N_q$	Equation (26)	$q_f = 52 (5.14) + 17.2 (2.9) 1$	318	kN/m ²
$q_f = 0.1 \gamma V_{s2}$	Equation (7)	$q_f = 0.1 (17.4) 200$	348	kN/m ²
$q_a = q_f / n$	Equation (3)	$q_a = 348 / 4$	87	kN/m ²
$k_s = 40 q_a = 4\gamma V_{s2} / n$	Equation (12)	$k_s = 40 (87)$	3 480	kN/m ³
$G = \gamma V_s^2 / g$	Equation (14)	$G = 17.4 (200)^2 / 9.81$	70 948	kN/m ²
$\alpha = (V_{p2} / V_{s2})^2$	Equation (18)	$\alpha = (700 / 200)^2$	12.25	-
$\mu = (\alpha - 2) / 2(\alpha - 1)$	Equation (19)	$\mu = (12.25 - 2) / 2(11.25)$	0.456	-
$E = 2 (1+\mu) G$	Equation (17)	$E = 2 (1.456) 70 948$	206 537	kN/m ²
$E_c = \gamma V_{p2}^2 / g$	Equation (15)	$17.4 (700)^2 / 9.81$	870 000	kN/m ²
$E_k = E / 3 (1-2\mu)$	Equation (24)	$206 537 / 3 (1-2\mu)$	774 417	kN/m ²
$E_k = E (\alpha - 1) / 3$	Equation (25)	$206 537 (12.25-1) / 3$	774 514	kN/m ²
$d = \text{displacement}$	Equation (11)	$d = q_a / k_s = 87 / 3480$	0.025	m

⁽¹⁾ Result of Equation (8a), $\gamma = 17.4$ kN/m³ is used in all subsequent expressions. $H = 15$ m, $V_{p2} = 700$ m/s, $V_{s2} = 200$ m/s. ($c = 52$ kPa, $\phi = 0$), ($V_{p1} = 700$ m/s above the base).




Figure 5. Point load testing. q_a = Allowable bearing pressure, kN / m²; P_u = Crushing Point load acting laterally; D_e = Effective diameter of the soil 'rock' sample, $D_e = (4A / \pi)^{0.5}$; A = Cross – sectional area of the irregular soil sample; r = Quality parameter, $r = 2.4$ for weathered and jointed soft rocks, $r = 7.2$ for reliable hard rock. An appropriate value is selected by engineering judgment for other samples and $L \geq 1.5 D_e$, (L = Length of soil 'rock' sample).

allowable pressure is readily expected to be taken care of by a likewise and appropriate reduction in the values of in situ measured shear wave velocities.

Conclusions

1. The P and S - wave velocities are most powerful soil

properties representing a family of geotechnical soil parameters, ranging from compressive and shear strengths to void ratio, from subgrade coefficient to cohesion etc,

2. Once the shear and P – wave velocities are measured, the allowable bearing pressure, the coefficient of subgrade reaction, various other elasticity parameters, as well as the approximate values of the unit weight are

rapidly and economically determined, using relatively simple empirical expressions. Bore hole drilling and laboratory testing of soil samples including the 'point load' method of rock samples, may be beneficially utilised for correlation purposes.

3. Empirical expression proposed herein for the determination of the allowable bearing pressure, using shear wave velocities measured at low shear strains, is appropriate to produce reliable results for a wide range of soil conditions.

4. The proposed expression corroborates consistently with the results of the classical theory and is proven to be rapid, and reliable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writers gratefully acknowledge the supply of voluminous site data by Mr. Mustafa Cevher, Head, the Earthquake Research Department, Greater Municipality of Kocaeli Province, and also the scientific assistance by Dr. Osman Uyanik, Associate Professor of Geophysics at Suleyman Demirel University, Turkey.

REFERENCES

- Abd El-Rahman MM, Setto I, El-Werr A (1992). Inferring mechanical properties of the foundation material, from geophysical measurements. Egyptian Geophysical Society, Proceedings of the 9th Annual Meeting, pp. 206-228.
- Bieniawski ZT (1979). Engineering Rock Mass Classification, Wiley - Interscience Publication, New York, NY, John Wiley & Sons, USA.
- Butcher AP, Campanella RG, Kaynia AM, Massarsch KR (2006). Seismic cone downhole procedure to measure shear wave velocity" - A guideline prepared by ISSMGE TC10: Geophysical Testing in Geotechnical Engineering. Proc. of the XVIth International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering, Osaka, Japan, p. 5.
- Butcher AP, Powell JJ (1995). Practical considerations for field geophysical techniques to use assess ground Stiffness". Proc. Int. Conf. on Advances in Site Investigation Practice, ICE London, March 1995. Thomas Telford, pp. 701-714.
- Campanella RG, Stewart WP (1992). Seismic cone analysis using digital signal processing for dynamic site characterization, Can. Geotechnical J., 29(3): 477-486.
- Coates DF (1970). Rock Mechanics Principles, Mines Branch Monographs, No. 874.
- Hardin BO, Black WL (1968). Vibration modulus of normally consolidated clays, J. Soil Mech. Found. Div. ASCE, 94(SM2): 353-369.
- Hardin BO, Drnevich VP (1972). Shear modulus and damping in soils, J. Soil Mech. Found. Div. ASCE, 98(SM7): 667-692.
- Hunt RE (1984). Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Manual", Mc Graw Hill Book Co., New York, N.Y.
- Imai T, Yoshimura M (1976). The relation of mechanical properties of soils to P and S- Wave velocities for soil ground in Japan, Urana Research Institute, OYO Corporation.
- IRTP, ISSMGE Technical Committee TC16 (1999), Ground Property Characterization from In-situ Testing, International Reference Test Procedure (IRTP) for the Cone Penetration Test (CPT) and the Cone Penetration Test with pore pressure (CPTU). Proc. XIIth ECSMGE Amsterdam. Balkema. pp. 2195-2222.
- Jongmans D (1992). The application of seismic methods for dynamic characterization of soils. Bull. Int. Assoc. Eng. Geol., 46:63-69.
- Keceli AD (1990). Determination of bearing capacity of soils by means of seismic methods (in Turkish), Geophys. J., Ankara, Turkey, 4: 83-92.
- Keceli AD (2000). Bearing capacity determination by seismic methods, Geophysical Journal, Ankara, Turkey (in Turkish), 14: 1-2.
- Keceli AD (2009). Applied Geophysics, UCTEA Chamber of Geophysical Engineers, Ankara, Turkey, July 2009, <http://jeofizik.org.tr> (in Turkish).
- Kramer LK (1996). Geotechnical Earthquake Engineering", Prentice Hall international Series in Civil Engineering Mechanics, Upper Saddle River, N.J., USA.
- Massarsch KR (2004). Deformation properties of fine-grained soils from seismic tests". Keynote lecture, International Conference on Site Characterization, ISC'2, 19-22 Sept. Porto, pp. 133-146.
- Ohkubo T, Terasaki A (1976). Physical property and seismic wave velocity of Rocks, OYO Corporation, Japan.
- Phillips DE, Han DH, Zoback MD (1989). Empirical relationships among seismic velocity, effective pressure, porosity, and clay content in sandstone, Geophysics, 54(1):82-89.
- Pyrak-Nolte LJ, Roy S, Mullenbach BI (1996). Interface waves propagated along a fracture. J. Appl. Geophys., 35:79-87.
- Richard FE, Hall JR, Woofs RD (1970). Vibrations of Soils and Foundations, Prentice Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Santamarina JC, Klein AK, Fam MA (2001). Soils and Waves", John Wiley & Sons, New York, N.Y., USA.
- Schulze WE(1943). Grundbau, Deutsche Forschungsgesellschaft für Bodenmechanik, 7th ed., B.G. Taubner Publishers, Leipzig, Germany. Also available: Technical University of Istanbul, Issue 48, No DK624-15, Uçler Printing House, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Sieffert JG, Bay-Gress Ch (2000). Comparison of the European bearing capacity calculation methods for shallow foundations. Geotechnical Engineering, Institution of Civil Engineers, England, 143:65-74.
- Stokoe KH, Woods RD (1972). Insitu shear wave velocity by cross-hole method, J. Soil Mech. Found. Div., ASCE, 98(SM5):443-460.
- Sully JP, Campanella RG (1995). Evaluation of in situ anisotropy from crosshole and downhole shear wave velocities measurements. Geotechnique, 45(2):267-282.
- Tatham RH (1982). V_p / V_s and lithology, Geophysics, 47:336-344.
- Terzaghi K, Peck RB (1976). Soil Mechanics in Engineering Practice". 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons, London.
- Tezcan S (2009). Particular data base of case studies, Tezokan – 20 March 2009, <<http://www.tezokan.com>>
- Tezcan SS, Erden SM, Durgunoğlu HT (1975). Insitu measurement of shear wave velocity at Boğaziçi University Campus, Proc. Int. Conf. Soil Mech. Found. Eng., Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey, 2: 157-164.
- Tezcan SS, Ozdemir Z, Keceli AD(2006). Allowable bearing capacity of shallow foundations based on shear wave velocity, J. Geotechnical Geol. Eng., 24:203-218, DOI 10.1007/s.10706-004-1748-4, Netherlands, Springer, www.springerlink.com.
- Turker E (2004). Computation of ground bearing capacity from shear wave velocity, Continuum Models and Discrete Systems, Eds. D. Bergman et al., Netherlands, pp. 173-180.
- Willkens R, Simmons G, Caruso L (1984). The Ration V_p / V_s as a discriminant of composition for siliceous limestones, Geophysics, 49(11): 1850-1860.