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ABSTRACT: A mechanical model is suggested here to explore the interaction between a boulder and a pile being driven, taking into account the properties of the rock forming the boulder and the embedding geological formation. A one-dimensional model is considered as a first attempt, with a view to integrate it into a classical one-dimensional wave-equation representation of the pile being driven. A typical case of a tubular pile driven into stiff glacial till by a hydraulic hammer is investigated. The proposed model is shown to highlight the influence of pile dimensions, boulder size, and hammer energy on the potential damage to the pile toe. Conclusions can be drawn in terms of an optimal range of hammer operational setting, depending on expected boulder size.

1 INTRODUCTION

Damage to the pile tip may be encountered during the different pile driving installation stages. Pile tip buckling, ovality, deformation or denting could result from lifting and handling operations and driving into the subsoil. Whilst there are standard protocols to mitigate and check occurrence of damage to the pile during fabrication and handling, investigation of pile tip damage during driving and incremental penetration into the soil is not typically performed.

However, damage to the pile is a real risk that can occur when the pile hits a hard stratum or encounters objects such as boulders in the subsoil as it is being driven. Once an initial imperfection to the pile tip has been initiated, progressive pile failure may develop. Full pile failure with “severely crushed” tips and the resulting consequences have been reported for the Valhall Water Injection Platform jacket in the North Sea, Norwegian Sector (Alm et al. 2004) and for the Goodwyn A platform on the North West Shelf of Australia (Barbour & Erbrich 1995, Erbrich et al. 2010). This type of failure or pile damage propagation is likely to occur for thin-walled piles and very stiff subsoil conditions such as very dense sand, stiff boulder-clay formations, and stiff chalk strata (Barbour & Erbrich 1994, Aldridge et al. 2005). Hence, the potential for pile damage may be especially critical for very large diameter tubular piles such as monopiles with increasingly higher $D/t$ or diameter to wall thickness ratios, which are used to support offshore wind turbines and driven into boulder prone formations such as stiff glacial till.

This paper focuses on a model based on the 1D wave theory to predict the likely initiation of pile tip damage as it encounters a boulder during pile driving in stiff boulder clay formations (till) and the ensuing risk of pile damage propagation. Several limit states are considered in the following sections focusing on the pile, the medium surrounding the boulder, and finally the boulder itself. The case for a large-diameter pile with $D = 6$ m is investigated.

2 PILE LIMIT STATES

2.1 Modes of pile failure

The term “damage” is normally associated with failure, yielding or buckling, but may generally encompass any pile imperfections such as denting or ovalisation, etc. The following seeks to clarify the pile failure modes and the more general pile imperfections.

Axial pile buckling implies yielding of the pile material due to an axial stress while ring or shell buckling is yielding due to radial pressures. If the pile fails or yields at the tip due to an axial force encountered, e.g. when it hits a hard stratum or object, this is known as pile tip local buckling. Pile imperfections include ovality (initial out-of-circularity) or dents. While imperfections of the pile do not necessarily imply material failure or buckling, these may lead to axial and shell buckling of the pile.

Another pile failure phenomenon is known as damage propagation or propagation buckling. Damage propagation is the progressive yielding of the pile during driving, stemming from an initial imperfection at the pile tip and developing into full pile failure. Full pile failure may be a combination of axial and shell buckling and is typically evident by crushed
pile ends with axial crimping and/or closed pile ends due to fully-formed shell buckling failure resulting in a peanut form cross-section, hence the synonymous term “peanut buckling”.

2.2 Existing assessment methods

Limiting stresses from solutions of classical elastic equations for tubular systems may be used to assess pure axial or shell buckling of the pile. However, damage to the pile due to driving and penetration into the subsoil is a more complex failure mechanism that must account for the soil response.

An HSE (2001) study on pile tip integrity provides solutions based on classical mechanics for pure axial and shell buckling and the maximum pile tip force $F_{\text{tip}}$ to cause a local dent:

$$F_{\text{tip}} = 1.2 \sigma_y t^2$$  

with $\sigma_y$ = pile yield stress and $t$ = pile wall thickness.

Aldridge et al. (2005) investigated the lateral and near axial forces, $F_{\text{lateral}}$ and $F_{\text{axial}}$, at the pile tip to initiate a local dent by applying upper bound theory for an assumed plastic hinge mechanism and proposed similar expressions:

$$F_{\text{lateral}} = 1.4 \sigma_y t^2$$  

$$F_{\text{axial}} = 2.8 \sigma_y t^2$$

Based on solutions for inward deflection of a ring, similar to ovalisation, the above authors also proposed expressions to compare the pile diameter to thickness ratio $D/t$ with the pile and soil stiffness, $E_p$ and $E_s$, and yield strengths $\sigma_y$ and $\sigma_{\text{soil}}$, respectively, that would likely lead to pile damage propagation.

The pile and soil conditions that would lead to progressive pile damage were investigated in more detail by Barbour and Erbrich (1995) and Erbrich et al. (2010), who developed a numerical model BASIL with a user implemented soil “extrusion” algorithm to more accurately predict progressive damage. The numerical analysis tracks the growth of an initial imperfection of a pile and establishes whether this will lead to a structural collapse.

2.3 Proposed 1-D wave equation model of pile-boulder interaction

This study deals with the premise that encountering a boulder during driving as the pile penetrates into the subsoil will cause a contact force at the pile tip that may be large enough to initiate a local imperfection or even local pile tip buckling. The magnitude of the contact force depends on the hammer settings, properties of the pile, boulder, and embedding soil.

The boulder-pile interaction is a dynamic problem and is proposed to be modeled based on the 1D wave theory. Figure 1 illustrates the considered situation and the assumed mechanical model representation in 1D, where $f_p$ is the pile impedance, $F_d \downarrow$ is the hammer generated incoming wave force, $k_c$ and $k_s$ are respectively the pile contact stiffness and boulder contact stiffness, $M_B$ is the boulder mass, $C_B$ and $K_B$ are the impedance terms of the boulder within the embedding soil, and $R_B$ is the boulder ultimate resistance to displacement within the embedding soil.

The mechanical model is developed within the lumped parameter software GRLWEAP (2010) through user-defined elements representing the interacting boulder. It is emphasized that the model within GRLWEAP rests on two major assumptions: (1) material behaviour and interaction laws are linear and (2) only axial behaviour is modelled. The numerical analysis can output the load exerted by the obstructing boulder as a result of the hammer generated incoming wave force $F_d \downarrow$. The peak contact force can be compared to the minimum axial force required to initiate local pile tip buckling, i.e. Equation 1 and Equation 3.

3 SOIL LIMIT STATES

3.1 Boulder-soil model

The mechanical impedance terms $C_B$ and $K_B$ of the boulder within the embedding soil medium can be evaluated using shape and geometrical factors depending on the boulder size and using the mass and deformation properties of the matrix soil.

Although a boulder may take various shapes, it can be assumed for the sake of simplicity to have an axisymmetric ellipsoidal shape, characterised by a diameter in the horizontal plane and by a given height. In the present analysis, the boulder diameter and height were defined by a 1.5:1 (H:V) ratio. It is assumed to be impacted at its very top with a view to remain under a 1D axial framework.
It is further assumed that the boulder possesses a much higher modulus than that of the embedding medium thus allowing us to consider, for service limit state assessments, the boulder as a rigid body embedded in an elastic medium.

As a result, the low-strain stiffness and damping coefficients of the solid boulder in the vertical direction about its initial position ($K_B$ against vertical displacement and $C_B$ against vertical velocity, respectively) will depend on the boulder geometry and on the density $\rho$ and shear modulus $G$ of the embedding medium as follows:

$$K_B = a G \alpha$$

$$C_B = B G \alpha a^3$$

where $a$ is the radius of the boulder in the horizontal while $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are shape factors that can be assessed based on Selvadurai (1980) for a disk and on Chadwick & Trowbridge (1967) for a sphere, following an equivalency principle developed by Lysmer (1966). Values of 15 and 7 have been adopted here for $\alpha$ and $\beta$, respectively. It should be noted that a Poisson’s ratio of 0.5 can be adopted to reflect the undrained behavior of the embedding medium under transient loading conditions.

Following Equations 4 and 5, the impedance of e.g. a 1 m wide and 0.67 m high axisymmetric boulder with a volume of 0.35 m$^3$ and a weight of approximately 0.94 t, assuming a density $\rho_{\text{rock}}$ of 2.7 t/m$^3$, and embedded within a stiff till (boulder clay) matrix with $G = 60$ MN/m$^2$, may be characterized by an embedding stiffness $K_B$ of 450 MN/m and a geometrical damping $C_B$ of 0.62 MN/ms$^{-1}$.

3.2 Vertical penetration and deviation

At large vertical displacements, elasticity can no longer be assumed to evaluate the behavior of the boulder. Several soil failure mechanisms within the embedding medium can be speculated to address ultimate limit state conditions, some of which are illustrated on Figure 2. We have assumed the simple case shown in Figure 2a (or Figure 1) to remain within a 1D framework. This can be considered as a drastic assumption since most of the times, it can be expected that the pile will not hit the boulder at the vertex of its resistance center, as shown e.g. in Figure 2b.

The ultimate resistance of the boulder $R_B$ to a vertical displacement can be assessed based on the undrained shear strength $S_u$ of the embedding medium, using a classical formula of the following type:

$$R_B = N_c S_u \pi a^2$$

where $N_c$ is a shape factor that can be assessed based on sphere penetration research; e.g. Randolph et al. (2000). A value $N_c$ of 15 has been adopted here.

Thus, once embedded within a soil medium with $S_u = 300$ kN/m$^2$, as is typical for stiff glacial till, a 1 m wide boulder can be expected to have an ultimate vertical resistance to penetration of approximately $R_B = 3.5$ MN.

4 BOULDER LIMIT STATES

4.1 Pile-boulder contact

The boulder-pile contacting stiffness can be assessed at low strain using elastic solutions pertaining to both bodies: $k_s$ represents the stiffness of the pile contact, evaluated based on the tube wall thickness $t$ and Young modulus of the steel $E_{\text{steel}}$, while $k_c$ represents the stiffness of the boulder contact, evaluated based on the rock wall thickness $t$, the radius of curvature of the boulder at the contacting point, and the rock deformation modulus. Several approximations of the geometry of the tube toe and boulder in the vicinity of their contact can be made to assess a global contact stiffness based on original developments by Hertz (1882). It should be noted that the load-interpenetration relationships evidenced by Hertz using elasticity theory are not linear, reflecting the progressive growth of the contacting area between the two elastic bodies as the load increases.

4.2 Modes of boulder failure

Because of the limited intrinsic strength of the rock forming the boulder, other ultimate limit states have to be considered, involving failure of the boulder itself. Two possible mechanisms are for example illustrated in Figure 3. Figure 3a shows a local failure of the boulder due to the pile wall penetration into it, while Figure 3b illustrates boulder splitting or shearing.

These failure modes require that the strength of the rock be characterised under triaxial loading. To that end, the Hoek-Brown (1997) criterion can be adopted. This criterion calls upon several parameters, including rock mass GSI (Geological Strength Index) describing rock weathering and fissuring, on top of a reference “intact” rock strength.

For our sample problem, we have adopted a rock Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) $\sigma_{\text{uc}}$ of 40 MN/m$^2$ and a shear strength $\tau_{\text{rock}}$ of 6 MN/m$^2$.
Table 1. Summary of applied parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile diameter, $D$</td>
<td>6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile wall thickness, $t$</td>
<td>80 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile/Steel Young’s modulus, $E_{\text{p/steel}}$</td>
<td>210,000 MN/m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer type Menck MHU</td>
<td>1500S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer operational energy setting</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder geometry (width)</td>
<td>1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder geometry (height)</td>
<td>0.67 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder density, $\rho_{\text{rock}}$</td>
<td>2.7 t/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder/rock Young’s modulus, $E_{\text{rock}}$</td>
<td>26,700 MN/m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder/rock UCS, $\sigma_{\text{c,rock}}$</td>
<td>40 MN/m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder/rock shear strength, $\tau_{\text{rock}}$</td>
<td>6 MN/m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil matrix (stiff till) shear strength, $S_u$</td>
<td>300 kN/m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil matrix (stiff till) shear modulus, $G$</td>
<td>60 MN/m$^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These values lead to an estimate of the limit penetration pressure of the steel wall into the boulder that exceeds the yield strength of the steel.

5 SAMPLE ANALYSES

5.1 Case considered

The methodology presented in Section 4 has been applied considering the elements listed in Table 1.

The pile mechanical impedance can be ascertained as $I_p = 60.4 \text{ MN/m}^2$. Application of Equation 3 leads to a pile axial yield force $F_{\text{yield}}$ of 5.8 MN to initiate a local dent. The mechanical parameters listed above lead to a pile-boulder tangent contacting stiffness (compliance $= 1/k_s + 1/k_c$) of the order of 1900 MN/m, under that reference load.

A very long pile has been modelled to isolate the pile-boulder interaction from the effects of a 25 MN assumed skin friction. GRLWEAP models the pile itself by a succession of masses and springs and the boulder itself has been modelled by an equivalent pile.

A splice element has been introduced between the pile toe and the boulder to emulate the contact law and disallow tension forces. The tangent stiffness increases with the load until the load reaches the pile reference yield load $F_{\text{yield}}$ of 5.8 MN. It then remains constant beyond that threshold, which is found compatible with the onset of yielding of the steel within the contact zone.

5.2 Results

Figure 4a presents the evaluated force as a function of time at a point remote from the pile tip (solid line for a point located approximately 90 m above the pile toe) and in the vicinity of the pile tip (dotted line) along with the incoming (downward) force $F_{\text{d, \downarrow}}$ generated by the hammer for a free-ended pile.

That reference case confirms an amplitude of the incoming compressive force $F_{\text{d, \downarrow}}$ in the order of 120 MN. At one meter above the pile tip, it can be noted that the force is not negligible ($\approx 20$ MN), as a result of GRLWEAP modeling wave reflections using a lumped parameter approach.

Figure 4b presents the same diagram when the 1 m boulder is added to the pile tip. The force diagram in the vicinity of the pile tip is much higher than that calculated in the first case, but contains interference with clean end modelling conditions. The local load generated by the boulder can be better ascertained by comparing two GRLWEAP analyses at several points.

The difference between pairs of corresponding force signals such as those shown on Figures 4a and 4b can be used with a view to mitigate such artefacts. This approach allowed the authors to estimate that the
peak dynamic force $F_{\text{contact}}$ endured by the pile tip at its contact with the boulder is, for the parameters listed above, approximately $11.6 \text{ MN}$. Since this peak contact load is clearly in excess of the pile local yield load $F_{\text{yield}}$ ($5.8 \text{ MN}$), one must check whether the soil or boulder would not fail before the steel tube would locally yield.

5.3 Soil and boulder failure

The peak axial contact load $F_{\text{contact}}$ of $11.6 \text{ MN}$ obtained by the contact model in the wave equation analysis is actually larger than the boulder ultimate resistance to penetration within the soil matrix ($R_B = 3.5 \text{ MN}$, see Section 3.2). This indicates that the driving force acting on the boulder is able to plastically displace the boulder within its soil matrix.

If the boulder is centered right beneath the pile wall and the soil reactions are symmetrical, its shear force can be approximated as half the peak contact load. The resulting $5.8 \text{ MN}$ shear force ($1/2 F_{\text{contact}}$) can be compared to the shear resistance offered by the area defined by a vertical cross-section of the boulder. For the selected rock properties, it is found that that the shear or splitting resistance of the boulder $T_{b,\text{split}}$ is at most $3.2 \text{ MN}$, which means that the boulder would be split before it would get vertically displaced.

5.4 Influence of boulder size

A parametric analysis of the boulder size can be conducted to explore its influence on the various limit loads considered above. Figure 5 shows the results of such an analysis keeping constant the aspect ratio of the boulder. It should be noted that the boulder shear strength has been estimated based on a scaling law inspired by Heuze (1980) to reflect the higher probability to encounter weaknesses within a larger boulder. While a detailed discussion of scaling laws is beyond the scope of this paper, the experimental data compiled by Heuze suggest a non-linear decrease in rock strength with respect to its intact rock strength as a function of specimen size.

Figure 5 plots the likely increase in boulder penetration resistance $R_b$ (solid line) and boulder splitting resistance $T_{b,\text{split}}$ (dotted line) with increasing boulder width and compares these with the pile axial yield limit $F_{\text{yield}}$ (dashed line) and calculated peak dynamic contact force $F_{\text{contact}}$ for a 1 m and 2.5 m wide boulder, assuming a 70% hammer operational energy setting.

It can be observed from Figure 5 that, for the case considered and within the represented range of boulder size:

- The peak driving force potentially transmitted to the boulder exceeds the pile yield load $F_{\text{yield}}$, the boulder splitting resistance $T_{b,\text{split}}$, and to some extent the soil limit load (boulder penetration resistance $R_b$);
- The mode of failure depends on boulder size.

6 CONCLUSIONS

A novel approach has been suggested to assess the pile-boulder encounter within an axial framework. The approach rests on the modelling of (1) the pile, using its 1-D longitudinal wave equation, (2) the boulder, based on its shape, mass, and mechanical impedance properties of its embedding medium, and (3) their contact law; based on elastic theory up to the pile yield load. The application of the proposed methodology to a 1 m wide boulder embedded in stiff glacial till indicates that the local contacting force under a typical hammer blow would clearly exceed the quasi axial yield load of an 80 mm thick walled 6 m diameter pile.

The need to define boulder size and fully characterize boulder strength with respect to breaking/splitting modes is highlighted.

In practice, such analysis may prove useful in estimating the risk of local pile tip yielding or initial dent formation during driving in boulder prone formations, whether the obstructing boulder can be displaced within the soil matrix, and the ensuing risk of pile damage propagation should local pile tip yielding occur. Depending on the risk assessment, counter-measures such as increased pile tip wall thickness combined with lower hammer operational energy settings may be employed to mitigate the risk of pile damage.
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