STA PILE3 COMPARISONS

Technical Note

Revision 0

Produced by: STEWART TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATES LIMITED (STA)



728 Bering Drive, Unit M Houston, TX 77057-2175 And Park View, Romney Park West End, Tortola, BVI VG1130 Tel: +1-713-789-8341 Fax: +1-713-583-2058 Email: public@stewart-usa.com Web: www.stewart-usa.com Alternative Telephone Numbers: Mobile: 832-472-2811 UK: +44-(0)207-193-5134 BVI: +284-495-4925

STA PROJECT No. 999-04

Last Revision to this document: March 10th, 2011.

No part of this document should be read in isolation or quoted in part in a manner inconsistent with the intent of the complete document. This document must be read in whole.

STEWART TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATES	
+1-832-472-2811 - public@stewart-usa.com	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Descr	ription	Page Number
1.0	INTRODUCTION	
2.0	CASE 1 – Submarine Pipeline Start-Up Suction Anchor	
3.0	RESULTS COMPARISON	11
No	tes on Pile Vertical Capacity in STA PILE3	
No	tes on Suction Embedment	

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1 - AGSPANC Input Page for Base Case	3
Figure 2 - Design Shear Strength Profile and su Data	4
Figure 3 - Pile and Soil as Modeled in STA PILE3	5
Figure 4 - Help for cu reduction factor	7
Figure 5 - Help for closed end or open	8
Figure 6 - Help for psi method	8
Figure 7 - Help for under and normally consolidated	9
Figure 8 - STA PILE3 Summary Results	9
Figure 9 - STA PILE3 Unity Stress Check	10
Figure 10 - STA PILE3 Detailed Results	10
Figure 11 - Bending Moment, Shear Force and Horizontal Soil Reaction Graphs from STA PILE3	11
Figure 12 - STA PILE3 End Bearing Calculations	11
Figure 13 - STA PILE3 External Friction (API psi method)	12
Figure 14 - STA PILE3 Base Shear Calculations.	12
Figure 15 - Help for multiplier on base shear	13
Figure 16 - STA PILE3 Summary Results for Suction Embedment	13
Figure 17 - Single Page of Input and Results.	14

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Technical Note compares STA PILE3 solutions with solutions from other analysis methods

2.0 CASE 1 – Submarine Pipeline Start-Up Suction Anchor

Saipem UK supplied STA with an AGSPANC start-up suction anchor design report in March, 2011. The AGSPANC input page for the base case is shown in Figure 1, below.



Figure 1 - AGSPANC Input Page for Base Case

Figure 2, below, shows the design soil shear strength profile from the AGSPANC report.



Figure 2 - Design Shear Strength Profile and su Data



Figure 3 - Pile and Soil as Modeled in STA PILE3

The Imperial (US) dimensions are shown together with the metric dimensions in Figure 3. The AGSPANC pile length is 5.0 meters, or 16.40 feet. The load is applied 0.70 meters above the pile "top", which is at the mudline.

The first 0.40 meters of soil is considered to have zero strength. The next three layers are clay with an undrained shear strength as reported in Figure 2. This reported shear strength profile is shown by the blue line in the graph in Figure 3 in US units. The profile used in STA PILE3 is shown by the brown line in Figure 3. The slight simplification is conservative for the horizontal pile capacity calculation.

The pile model in STA PILE3 is 5.00 meters (196.8 inches) in diameter and 5.70 meters (18.7 feet) in length, with the pile top 3.61 feet above the sea bed. This results in the pile bottom being penetrated the correct depth into the soil and the top 1.31 feet of soil not being modeled (as it has no strength).

Table 1 shows the soil strength table from the AGSPANC analysis in metric and US units.

Table 1 - Soil Strengths from AGSPANC

Depth	s _u (avg)	Depth	s _u (avg)
m	kPa	ft	psf
0	0	0.00	0
0.4	0	1.31	0
0.4	21.73913	1.31	454.0
2	21.73913	6.56	454.0
4	72.82609	13.12	1521.0
4.4	43.47826	14.44	908.1
10	76.08696	32.81	1589.1

The soil property input for the STA PILE3 analysis is shown in Table 2.

Table 2 -STA PILE3 Soil Data

SOIL PROPERTIES (up to three layers)		
5.25	Z1, thickness of upper soil layer (ft)	soil-pile
7.22	Z2, thickness of middle soil layer (ft)	friction
19.03	Z3, thickness of lowest soil layer (ft)	angles
0.00	Phi1, 1st layer friction angle (deg.)	0
0.00	Phi2, 2nd layer friction angle (deg.)	0
0.00	0.00 Phi3, 3rd lay er friction angle (deg.) 0	
454.03 cu1, undrained sh. strength top 1st layer (psf)		
454.03 cu2, undrained sh. strength bottom 1st layer (psf))
454.03 cu3, undrained sh. strength top 2nd layer (psf)		
1521.05 cu4, undrained sh. strength bottom 2nd layer (psf)		;f)
908.06 cu5, undrained sh. strength top 3rd layer (psf)		
1589.11 cu6, undrained sh. strength bottom 3rd lay er (psf)		f)
57.30 Gamma1, 1st layer buoyant weight (pcf)		
57.30	57.30 Gamma2, 2nd lay er buoy ant w eight (pcf)	
57.30	Gamma3, 3rd layer buoyant weight (pcf)	open

Table 3 - Pile Properties and Analysis Options for STA PILE3

PILE PROPERTIES and ANALYSIS OPTIONS				
36.00	Fy, Yield stress for pile steel (ksi)	490	pile mass density (lb/cuft)	
18.70	Lp, length (ft)	0	no. radial bulkheads	
3.61	ztop, top to seabed (-ve if buried) (ft)	1	1 radial bulhead thickness (in)	
0.00	zc, dist.pile head to pad eye (ft)	1	1 pile top thickness (in)	
196.85	pile OD (in)	1	1 cu reduction factor	
1.00	t, pile wall thickness (inches)	2	2 Installed capacity analysis	
2900000	E, Young's Modulus pile (psi)	2	1=closed end, 2=open	
414	Hmax, applied lateral load (kip)	1	1 cu_switch; 1=psi, 2=old API method	
1	Vmax, applied vert.load (+ve up) (kip)	2	1=underconsol., 2=normal	

The pile is modeled in steel with a 1" wall and a 1" pile top thickness. An applied horizontal load of 414 kips (1840 kN from the AGSPANC input, Figure 1) is specified together with a small uplift of 1.0 kips, to cause a solution for vertical pull out resistance.

The cu reduction factor is set to 1.0 for determining ultimate horizontal capacity.

The pile is specified with an open end and the "psi" method for axial loading is used. The clay is specified as being normally consolidated.

The STA PILE3 "Explain" button gives help for these analysis options:



Figure 4 - Help for cu reduction factor

STEWART TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATES	
www.stewart-usa.com - USA and Caribbean	

STA Help	X
OK D	
This is a selection switch which determines if the pile is to be analyzed with open or closed bottom end. If it is a suction embedded pile, it MUST have an open bottom end. Additionally the user should specify a thickness for the top plate on a suction pile.	
If an open pile is analyzed for penetration resistance, the program will check to see if plugging	
can occur. If plugging is predicted, (based upon internal friction exceeding end-bearing resistance	
inside the pile) the coefficient of lateral earth pressure, K, will be increased from 0.8 to 1.0.	
This term is used only in cohesionless soils, where shaft friction is found from:	
friction = $f = K \times p0 \times tan(delta)$	
delta = friction angle between the soil and the pile wall	
delta is taken as 10 degrees less than the user-input friction angle for the soil, Phi.	
p0 = effective overburden pressure at point in question	

Figure 5 - Help for closed end or open

	STA Help	S X
	OK	
	This term is a selection switch which determines if the skin f (nineteenth edition) psi method, or if the old API method (de	riction is to be calculated by the API RP 2A escribed in the commentary) should be used.
	In the psi method:	In the old API method:
	friction = f = alpha x Cu	f = Cu (for Cu =< 0.25 ton/sqft)
	alpha = 0.5 x psi^5 (for psi =< 1.0)	$f = 0.5 \times Cu$ (for Cu > 0.75 ton/sqft)
	alpha = 0.5 x psi ^25 (for psi > 1.0)	A linear variation of f with Cu is used between
	psi = Cu/p0	the above values of Cu.
	p0 = effective overburden pressure at point in question	
	It is simple to investigate the difference between results ob this particular term.	tained by either method, simply by changing
I		

Figure 6 - Help for psi method

STA Help	8 ×
OK	
This term is a selection switch which sets $alpha = 1.0$ in the cal API RP2A (19th edition) psi method. This sets $f = Cu$, which is clays (clays with excess pore pressures, undergoing active con	culation of pile skin friction using the s appropriate for underconsolidated nsolidation).
Note that the psi method must be selected if this switch is to h	ave effect (see psi switch above)
In the psi method:	In the old API method:
friction = f = alpha x Cu	f = Cu (for Cu = < 0.25 ton/sqft)
alpha = 0.5 x psi^5 (for psi =< 1.0)	f = 0.5 x Cu (for Cu > 0.75 ton/sqft)
alpha = 0.5 x psi ^25 (for psi > 1.0)	A linear variation of f with Cu is used between
psi = Cu/p0	the above values of Cu.
p0 = effective overburden pressure at point in question	

Figure 7 - Help for under and normally consolidated

	SUMMARY RESULTS		
0.92	Horizontal load safety factor	Explain value	
> 100	Vertical load safety factor		
0.02 Unity stress check (app.loads)			
1.76	Ult. capacity unity check (Meyerhof)		
	Short pile criteria probably OK		

Figure 8 - STA PILE3 Summary Results

The horizontal load safety factor is 0.92, meaning that the ultimate horizontal capacity of this pile as modeled by STA PILE3 is 92% of the input load, 414 kips, corresponding to that obtained in the AGSPANC analysis (if we have interpreted the AGSPANC data correctly). This is in part due to the conservative interpretation and input of the soil shear strength profile. If the depth of the second soil layer in STA PILE3 was 6.56 feet (as in AGSPANC) and had the same peak value, the result would be 94% of that found in AGSPANC.

The vertical load safety factor is not meaningful as only a horizontal load is being applied.

The steel unity stress check is not appropriate for this pile geometry as it is based on engineers beam bending theory. The "Explain" button gives the user the information shown in Figure 9.

STA Help
ОК
The reported unity stress check accounts for axial and bending stresses in the pile material.
The axial stress, fa, is equal to the vertical load, V, divided by the pile cross section area, A.
The bending stress, fb, is shown below:
$fb = M/I \times D/2$
Where:
M = calculated bending moment
I = second moment of area of pile cross section
D = pile outer diameter.
Allowable axial stress, Fa, is set to 0.6 x fy, where fy is the pile material yield stress.
Allowable bending stress, Fb, is set to 0.66 x fy.
The unity stress check, USC, is computed from:
USC = fa/Fa + fb/Fb - NOTE! this stress check does not account for local stresses
the padeye and is not appropriate for large diameter/length piles.

Figure 9 - STA PILE3 Unity Stress Check

STA PILE3 contains this simple material stress check for preliminary evaluation of pile anchors used for mooring systems. These anchor piles generally have larger L/D ratios than this start-up anchor (where L/D =1.0) and with a more optimally located padeye to maximize the pile capacity (maybe at a depth of 0.75 x D). In these circumstances, the STA PILE3 stress check has merit for preliminary pile design.

It should be noted that STA CHAIN may be used to compute mooring line loads at buried padeyes, with an inverse catenary type of solution.

DETAILED	RESULTS		Meyerhof unity check based	d on a safety factor of 1.5
382	Hult, ult.horiz. capacity in kips	n/a	n/a	Rotation center shown as blue dot
483	Vult, ult.vert. capacity in kips	n/a	n/a	Pile Elevation
177	f, dist.top to rotation center (in)	n/a	plug resistance (kips)	
-0.51	fb, max bend.str.from Hmax (ksi)	0.00	weight radial bulkheads (kips)	¹⁰ T
0.00	fa, max.ax.str.from Vmax (ksi)	8.63	weight of pile top (kips)	5 toad
0.51	fmax, comb.str.applied loads (ksi)	41.54	pile weight in water (kip)	0
47.78	pile weight in air (kips)	64.00	(editable) density of sea water (lb/cuft)	-5 -5 layer 1
8.56E+13	El, for pile (lbf-in^2)	1.00	multiplier on base shear: 1=full, 0=none	-10 +
56.21	T, rel.stiffness (avg. value)	2.95E+06	I, for pile in in^4	-15 -15
0.27	L/T, embed.length/stiff.factor, T	502	average skin friction (psf)	-20 +
0.92	L/B, embedment length/pile OD	-0.47	fb, max bending stress in pile in ksi from Hult	-25 +
39	max +ve BM from Hult (ft-kip)	0.79	fa, max. axial stress in pile in ksi from Vult	-30 •
-1182	max -ve BM from Hult (ft-kip)	1.26	max. combined stress in pile in ksi from ult. loads	-35 badeve shown, and depth in feet
Explain value	Select Analy	vsis Type	and/or Change Applied Loads	

Figure 10 - STA PILE3 Detailed Results

3.0 RESULTS COMPARISON

The Ultimate pile horizontal capacity (Figure 10) is calculated to be 382 kips. The vertical capacity when all soil strength has been regained, sometime after installation, is calculated to be 483 kips. These numbers compare to AGSPANC horizontal of 1840 kN, or 414 kips and AGSPANC vertical of 1779 kN, or 400 kips.

It should be noted that the STA PILE3 weight comes from the user-input material density and pile dimensions, resulting in this case, of a weight in water of 41.54 kips, or 185 kN. It should be noted that the AGSPANC pile weight (assumed to be the weight in water) is specified as 210 kN, or 47.2 kips. If this was reduced to 41.5 kips, the AGSPANC vertical capacity (if it is for uplift) would be reduced to 393.9 kips.

It is not clear that the AGSPANC "Total Vert. Cap." is for uplift or downwards load.



Figure 11 - Bending Moment, Shear Force and Horizontal Soil Reaction Graphs from STA PILE3

Calculate end bearing force for downwards load					
15.09	9 depth of pile toe (ft) 15.00667 length of radial bulkheads in soil (
1002.00	undrained shear strength of soil at pile toe (psf)	d shear strength of soil at pile toe (psf) 0 area/unit length of radial bulkheads (sqft)			t)
0	phi for cohesionless soil at pile toe (degrees)	615.28	A, pile wall cross section area (sqin)		
864.657	overburden pressure at pile toe (psf)				
262.78	external skin friction (kips)				
260.11	internal skin friction if not plugged (kips)			260	
1905.95	end bearing if in cohesive soil and if plugged or clos	sed (kips)		1906	
0	limiting unit end bearing value in cohesionless soil (kip/sqft)				
0	Nq, from table 6.4.3-1 API RP 2A				< 1 if plugged in cohesive soil
0	po, end bearing value to use at pile toe in cohesionless soil (ksf)				< 1 if plugged in cohesionless soil
0.00	end bearing if in cohesionless soil and if plugged or closed (kips)				
4.27	end area in square feet if not plugged or closed, including radial bulkheads				
1905.95	maximum end bearing for this analysis if plugged or closed (kips)				
260.11	minimum of either internal friction or end bearing if plugged or closed (kips)				
38.53	end bearing on annulus in cohesive soil (kips)				
0.00	end bearing on annulus in cohesionless soil (kips)				
298.64	minimum of either end bearing on annulus plus internal skin friction, or end bearing if plugged or closed. (kips)				
298.64	I if pile is closed end (cell H12=1) then the plugged or closed value is used here, if open, the value in cell A70 is used.				
298.64 embedment resistance from internal skin friction and end bearing on annulus of suction embedment anchor					

Figure 12 - STA PILE3 End Bearing Calculations

STEWART TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATES	Z:\STA TECHNICAL PAPERS\Technical Note STA PILE3 Comparisons.docx
+1-832-472-2811 - public@stewart-usa.com	Page 11 of 14



Figure 13 - STA PILE3 External Friction (API psi method)

Look at Base Shear Force for Large Shallow Suction Anchors				
41.54	weight of pile in water (kips)			
179.05	weight of soil inside pile (kips)			
219.59	effective force over pile base (accounting for uplift, if applied) (kips)			
1002.004101	cu at bottom of pile (psf)			
0	phi at bottom of pile (degrees)			
211.3488868	pile cross sectional area (square ft)			
211.7724514	cohesive shear force needed to slide base in cohesive soil (inc. reduction factor =eff. force/soil wt.)			
0	frictional sliding resistance of base in cohesionless soil (kips)			
211.7724514	base sliding friction used in calculating Hult (kips)			

Figure 14 - STA PILE3 Base Shear Calculations.

Two items are also editable in the detailed results area. They are the mass density of water, which affects the pile weight in water and hence the pile vertical capacity, and the "multiplier on base shear". This term is described in Figure 15, which is obtained by clicking the "Explain" button.

STA Help
OK
The multiplier on base shear should normally be set to 1.
In cohesive soil, if vertical applied load is downwards, the base shear contribution is unchanged by this factor.
In cohesive soil, if vertical applied load is upwards, the base shear contribution is multiplied by this factor.
In cohesionless soil, in all cases, the base shear contribution is multiplied by this factor.
Note1: the effective force over the pile base is pile + plug weight (in water) plus (or minus) applied vertical force.
Note2: in cohesive soil, the base cu value is modified by the ratio (pile + plug weight - Fv)/(pile + plug weight),
where Fv is the vertical applied uplift. No modification is made for a downward applied load.

Figure 15 - Help for multiplier on base shear.

Notes on Pile Vertical Capacity in STA PILE3

The ultimate vertical pile uplift capability is reported by STA PILE3 as being 483 kips with the cu reduction factor set to 1.0. In the cohesive soil modeled in this analysis, the soil in contact with the pile inner and outer skin will be disturbed by the pipe embedment. Without more details of the soil engineering properties the time before full undisturbed undrained shear strength is recovered cannot be predicted. It would be prudent to use a cu reduction factor of 0.5 to estimate the pile's vertical capacity for design for the first few months after embedment. This reduces the vertical uplift capacity to 365 kips.

The ultimate pile downwards capacities are 520 kips with c_u reduction factor of 1.0 and 301 kips with a factor of 0.5.

Notes on Suction Embedment

Installation Probably OK					
10.11	max psi for embedment	Explain value			
301.42	plug uplift force (kips)				
340.07	plug resistance (kips)				
301.42 Force required for embedment (kips)					
Short pile criteria probably OK					

Figure 16 - STA PILE3 Summary Results for Suction Embedment

Figure 16 is the table of summary results from STA PILE3, using a c_u reduction factor of 0.5. The program warns that plug uplift is probable if the c_u reduction factor exceeds a value of 0.67.

STA PILE3 Comparisons – Technical Note Rev 0, March 10th, 2011

STA PILE3	Anch	or Pile Des	sign (usin	g API RP 2	2A) w/Suc	tion Embedment
v.1.8 Novembe	r 2009 Rur	n ref: Saipem	Compariso	on with AGS	PANC	03/09/11 22:10
Copyright Stewart Technology Associates 1992 and onwards. For support telephone: (713) 789-8341, or email info@stewart-usa.com						
Explain value Select Anal	ysis Type and Apply Load	s Assumpti	ons Fric	ction Print	t Input & Res	ults
	Navy soil design p	arameters		AP	l Cohesionles	s soil design parameters
INPUT DATA BELOW For pile top below sea bed make ztop negative.					make ztop negative.	
<u>SOIL PROPERT</u>	TIES (up to three layers)		<u> </u>	<u>PILE PROPER</u>	RTIES and A	NALYSIS OPTIONS
<mark>5.25</mark> Z1, th	nickness of upper soil layer (ft)	soil-pile	36.00 Fy,	, Yield stress for pi	ile steel (ksi)	490 pile mass density (lb/cuft)
7.22 Z2, th	nickness of middle soil layer (ft)	friction	18.70 Lp,	, length (ft)		0 no. radial bulkheads
19.03 Z3, th	nickness of low est soil lay er (ft)	angles	3.61 ztop	p, top to seabed (-	ve if buried) (ft)	1 radial bulhead thickness (in)
0.00 Phi1,	1st lay er friction angle (deg.)	0	0.00 zc,	dist.pile head to p	ad eye (ft)	1 pile top thickness (in)
0.00 Phi2,	2nd lay er friction angle (deg.)	0	196.85 pile	e OD (in)		1 cu reduction factor
0.00 Phi3,	3rd lay er friction angle (deg.)	0	1.00 t, pi	oile wall thickness ((inches)	2 Installed capacity analysis
<mark>454.03</mark> cu1, u	undrained sh. strength top 1st layer	(psf)	29000000 E, `	Young's Modulus p	pile (psi)	2 1=closed end, 2=open
454.03 cu2, u	undrained sh. strength bottom 1st la	yer (psf)	414 Hm	nax, applied lateral	load (kip)	1 cu_switch; 1=psi, 2=old API method
454.03 cu3, u	undrained sh. strength top 2nd layer	r (psf)	1 Vm	nax, applied vert.lo	bad (+ve up) (kip)	2 1=underconsol., 2=normal
1521.05 cu4, u	undrained sh. strength bottom 2nd la	ayer (psf)	, ,	SU	MMARYR	ESULTS
908.06 cu5, u	undrained sh. strength top 3rd layer	(psf)	0.92 Ho	orizontal loa	d safety fact	or Explain value
1589.11 cu6, u	undrained sh. strength bottom 3rd la	ayer (psf)	> 100 Ve	ertical load s	afety factor	
57.30 Gamr	ma1, 1st lay er buoy ant w eight (pcf)		0.02 Ur	nity stress ch	eck (app.loa	ads)
57.30 Gamr	ma2, 2nd layer buoyant weight (pcf	f)	1.76 UI	lt. capacity u	nity check (l	Meyerhof)
57.30 Gamr	ma3, 3rd lay er buoy ant w eight (pcf)	open		Short	pile criteria	probably OK
DETAILED RE	SULTS	Meyer	rhof unity	check bas	sed on a s	afety factor of 1.5
382 Hult, t	ult.horiz. capacity in kips	n/a n/a			Ro	tation center shown as blue dot
483 Vult, u	ult.vert. capacity in kips	n/a n/a				Pile Elevation
177 f, dist	t top to rotation center (in)	n/a plug resista	tance (kips)			
- 0.51 fb, ma	ax bend.str.from Hmax (ksi)	0.00 w eight radi	lial bulkheads (kips)			I
0.00 fa, ma	ax.ax.str.from Vmax (ksi)	8.63 weight of pi	ile top (kips)			load
0.51 IIIax,	, comp.str.applied loads (KSI)	64 00 (editable) d	in water (kip)	ater (lb/cuff)	-5	laver 1
8 56F+13 EL for	r pile (lbf-in^2)	1.00 multiplier or	n base shear: 1=	full 0=none	-10	
56.21 T, rel	.stiffness (avg. value) 2.9	5E+06 I, for pile in	in^4		-15	layer 2
0.27 L/T, e	embed.length/stiff.factor, T	502 av erage sk	skin friction (psf)			
0.92 L/B, e	0.92 L/B, embedment length/pile OD -0.47 fb, max bending stress in pile in ksi from Hult -25				4	
39 max -	+ve BM from Hult (ft-kip)	0.79 fa, max. ax	al stress in pile	in ksi from Vult	-30	laver 3
-1182 max	-ve BM from Hult (ft-kip)	1.26 max. comb	pined stress in pil	ile in ksi from ult. Io	oads -35	padeye shown, and depth in feet
Explain value	Select Analysis	Type and/or C	hange Appli	ied Loads		
Graphs below Bending M	<u>w are based upon Hult a</u> Ioments	Horiz	<u>e pile. (not i</u> ontal Shear	Hmax) r Force	Hori	zontal Soil Reactions
ki	p-feet		Kips			kip/ft
-1400 -1200 -1000 -800 -	-600 -400 -200 0 200	-200	0 2	200 400	- 150	-100 -50 0 50 100
					0	
40		40			40	
60		60			60	╌┼╍╍╍┝╍╍╍┝╍╸┥╴╽╴│
Ē 80	+	<u>(ب</u> 80			(i) 80	-+ \
표 ¹⁰⁰		두 ¹⁰⁰			두 100 오	
160		160			160	╶┟╧ ┓╞╼╍╞╼╸ ┥││
180	+} −- 	180			180	╶┼╴<mark>┖┼╼╶┤</mark>╶╌┤ ╴┤││
200		200			200	

Figure 17 - Single Page of Input and Results.