REPORT

MV2 Wind Farm Soft Sea Barrier

Concept Design - Monopile Foundation

Client: Eneco Wind B.V.

Reference:BG8375-RHD-ZZ-XX-RP-S-0001Status:S4/P02Date:06 June 2020









HASKONINGDHV NEDERLAND B.V.

George Hintzenweg 85 3068 AX ROTTERDAM Maritime & Aviation Trade register number: 56515154

- +31 88 348 90 00 **T**
- +31 10 209 44 26 F
- info@rhdhv.com E
- royalhaskoningdhv.com W

Document title:	MV2 Wind Farm Soft Sea Barrier
Document short title: Reference: Status: Date: Project name: Project number: Author(s):	MV2 Eneco Wind Farm SSB - Monopile Concept Design BG8375-RHD-ZZ-XX-RP-S-0001 P02/S4 06 June 2020 MV2 Eneco Wind Farm BG8375
Drafted by:	
Checked by:	
Date / initials:	
Approved by:	
Date / initials:	
assification oject related	ISO 9001 - ISO 14001 ISO 45001

Disclaimer

P

No part of these specifications/printed matter may be reproduced and/or published by print, photocopy, microfilm or by any other means, without the prior written permission of HaskoningDHV Nederland B.V.; nor may they be used, without such permission, for any purposes other than that for which they were produced. HaskoningDHV Nederland B.V. accepts no responsibility or liability for these specifications/printed matter to any party other than the persons by whom it was commissioned and as concluded under that Appointment. The integrated QHSE management system of HaskoningDHV Nederland B.V. has been certified in accordance with ISO 9001:2015, ISO 14001:2015 and ISO 45001:2018.

i





Table of Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Project background	4
1.2	Scope of the report	4
1.3	Concept design loop	4
2	Starting points concept design loop	6
2.1	Design concept	8
2.2	Choice of design concept	8
2.3	Geotechnical starting points	9
2.3.1	Soil parameters Erro	r! Bookmark not defined.
2.3.2	Static and dynamic behaviour	12
2.3.3	Geotechnical design approach	12
2.4	Erosion and scour scenarios	13
2.5	Turbine interface loads and foundation target rotational stillness	15
2.6	Wave loads	16
2.7	Verification criteria	19
3	Model setup	20
3.1	Model overview	20
3.2	Model input	21
3.2.1	Soil profiles and properties	21
3.2.2	Pile geometry	22
3.2.3	Pile loads	23
3.2.3.1		23
3.2.3.2	Geotechnical stability (push-over) vehications	23
4	Verification results	25
4.1	Deformation behaviour	25
4.2	ULS structural capacity	26
4.3	ULS geotechnical stability (push-over and minimum pile toe leve	el) 28
4.4	Conceptual verification of the bolted connection	32
5	Transport, installation and grid connection	36
5.1	Transport and installation	36
5.2	Pile driving	37
5.3	Grid connection	38
5.3.1	General concept sketch	38
5.3.2	Construction sequencing	39





6	Conclusions and recommendations	43
6.1	Summary of verification results	43
6.2	Recommendations for preliminary design phase	44
7	References	45





Table of Tables

Table 2-1: Risk mitigation measures prescribing the monopile foundation concept	8
Table 2-2: Preliminary soil parameters for monopile foundation concept design: north profile (left) and south profile (right)	11
Table 2-3: Erosion scenarios considered for monopile concept design	14
Table 2-4: Turbine interface loads considered for monopile concept design, from [1]	16
Table 2-5: Verification criteria for monopile concept design	19
Table 4-1: ULS structural capacity verifications according to Eurocode 3 for D5000/90 monopile in South profile	27
Table 6-1: Summary of monopile concept design verification results	43

Table of Figures

Figure 1-1: Project area overview	4
Figure 1-2: Concept design loop in relation to monopile foundation design	5
Figure 2-1: Wind turbine with monopile foundation concept in MV2 Soft Sea Barrier	8
Figure 2-2: Location of North soil profile (left) and South soil profile (right) along the SSB	10
Figure 2-3: Measured coastal erosion at two cross-sections along the MV2 SSB	15
Figure 3-1: L-pile model overview for monopile concept design	20
Figure 3-2: Soil profile North (no erosion / scour) input in L-pile	21
Figure 3-3: Soil profile South (no erosion / scour) input in L-pile	21
Figure 3-4: Resulting soil property input for South profile in L-pile	22
Figure 3-5: Monopile geometry input in L-pile	23
Figure 3-6: Interface load input in L-pile for deformation and structural capacity verifications	23
Figure 3-7: Interface load input in L-pile for push-over analysis	24
Figure 4-1: Static rotational stiffness verifications for D5000/90 monopile in South profile	25
Figure 4-2: ULS internal forces for D5000/90 monopile in South profile for no-erosion scenario without cyclic degradation	26
Figure 4-3: ULS internal forces for D5000/90 monopile in South profile for full erosion scenario (NAP -7m) with cyc degradation	clic 27
Figure 4-4: Push-over curves at interface level for D5000/90 monopile in South profile	28
Figure 4-5: Push-over curves at mudline level for D5000/90 monopile in South profile	29
Figure 4-6: Minimum pile toe level assessment for D5000/90 monopile in South profile	30
Figure 5-1:Access platform – interface height	36
Figure 5-2: Grid connection provisions; DNVGL-RP-0360 fig 4-15 reference	39
Figure 5-3: Step I cable installation	39
Figure 5-4: Step 2 Cable installation – local excavation	40

Appendices

A1 Appendix 1 – EC3 structural capacity verifications





1 Introduction

1.1 **Project background**

Eneco will develop the new Wind Farm at Maasvlakte (MV2) in Rotterdam. The wind turbines will be positioned along the outer perimeter of the MV2 reclamation, i.e. along the sea defence. The northern stretch of the sea defence is referred to as the Hard Sea Barrier (HSB) and consists of a revetment structure. The western and south-western stretches of the MV2 outer perimeter accommodate the Soft Sea Barrier (SSB) which consists of a beach-dune system. An overview of the project site is presented in Figure 1-1. The SSB perimeter is indicated in orange, with the anticipated turbine locations within the SSB indicated by blue dots. A total amount of 12 turbines on the SSB will be installed. The intermediate distance is 454 m. Only for ZZ1 and ZZ2 the intermediate distance is 427 m.



Figure 1-1: Project area overview

1.2 Scope of the report

The scope of this report is the description and verification of a conceptual design of the foundation of the wind turbines positioned along the SSB. It is anticipated that the turbines along the SSB will be founded on large diameter monopiles. Chapters 2, 3, 4 will present the design approach for the concept evaluation and the obtained results, as part of the structural integrity assessment. In chapter 5 the conceptual aspect of the monopile transportation, installation, and grid connection will be presented to the reader.

1.3 Concept design loop

The monopile foundation design will be developed in three steps: concept design, preliminary design and final design, visualised in Figure 1-2. This report documents the concept design of the monopile foundation.





The aim of the concept design report is to prove the technical feasibility of the monopile foundation type for the new wind farm development along the MV2 SSB.

An envelope of sizes and dimensions will be given. Principles of techniques are presented and used as verification of the technical feasibility.



Figure 1-2: Concept design loop in relation to monopile foundation design

The preliminary design step will be based on data that will be generated in the concept design phase as a parallel activity. A wave study will be carried out. Also, a geotechnical survey will be undertaken to investigate the properties of the subsoil.

The concept design step is based on data available from previous studies and investigations, which are sufficient for a conceptual design verification. This concept design report together with the new investigations and studies will define the input and starting points of the next the preliminary design step. Along with the existing environmental conditions, basic input from four turbine suppliers is used for the concept design assessment. Care is taken in the analysis as the available turbine data is not suited for construction and is only meant as input for the concept design of the fixed concrete turbine foundations of the HSB. Further details on the starting points for detailed design are explained in Chapter 2.

Later, the design of the individual monopiles will be customised and optimised for their own location, their specific wave load and subsoil condition. At this stage no clustering of turbines is considered. In the concept design typical soil profiles were selected to envelope the conditions for all piles. Based on the outcomes of the erosion study, new geotechnical investigations and soil interpretations as well as wave studies, clustering and/or customization will be considered for the next phase.

A most probable optimistic and pessimistic scenario are considered now in terms of general erosion as well the most unfavourable soil conditions from available data. These items are further detailed and explained in upcoming sections of this report.





2 Starting points concept design loop

2.1 General – Design Codes and Standards

DNV-GL:

- DNVGL-SE-0190: Project certification of wind power plants
- DNVGL-SE-0074: Type and component certification of wind turbines according to IEC 61400-2
- DNVGL-ST-0126: Support structures for wind turbines
- DNVGL-ST-0437: Loads and site conditions for wind turbines
- DNVGL-ST-0054: Transport and installation
- DNVGL-ST-0359: Subsea power cables

Eurocodes, European Norms and their respective Dutch National Annexes:

- EN 1990 Eurocode Basis of structural design
- EN 1991-1-4: Actions on structures wind actions
- EN 1993-1-1 Eurocode 3: Design of steel structures Part 1-1: General rules and rules for buildings
- EN 1993-1-5 Eurocode 3: Design of steel structures Part 1-5: Plated structural elements
- EN 1993-1-6 Eurocode 3: Design of Steel Structures, Part 1-6: Strength and Stability of Shell Structures
- EN 1993-1-7 Eurocode 3: Design of steel structures Part 1-7: Plated structures subject to out of plane loading
- EN 1993-5 Eurocode 3: Design of steel structures Part 5: Piling
- EN 1997-1 Eurocode 7: Geotechnical design Part 1: General Rules
- EN 1997-2 Eurocode 7: Geotechnical design Part 2: Ground investigation and testing
- EN 10088-1 Stainless steels Part 1: List of stainless steels
- EN 10225 Weldable structural steels for fixed offshore structures technical delivery conditions
- EN 10228-3 Non-destructive testing of steel forgings Part 3: Ultrasonic testing of ferritic and martensitic steel forgings
- EN 12495 Corrosion Protection of Fixed Offshore Structure
- EN 14399 (All parts) High-strength structural bolting assemblies for preloading

Publications, design manuals, recommended practices

- DNV-RP-C201: Buckling Strength of Plated Structures
- DNVGL-RP-C202: Buckling strength of shell
- DNVGL-RP-C203: Fatigue design of offshore steel structures
- DNVGL-RP-C204: Design against accidental loads
- DNVGL-RP-C205: Environmental conditions and environmental loads
- DNVGL-RP-C207: Statistical representation of soil data
- DNVGL-RP-C208: Determination of structural capacity by non-linear finite element analysis methods
- DNVGL-RP-C210: Probabilistic methods for planning of inspection for fatigue cracks in offshore structures
- DNVGL-RP-0360 Subsea power cables in shallow water

Publications, articles, manuals, journals

• Fatigue estimation methods comparison for wind turbine control, J.J. Barradas, Berglind and Rafael Wisniewski, 2014





Dynamics of offshore wind turbines supported on two foundations, Subhamoy, Bhattacharya, James A. Cox, Domenico Lombardi, David Muir Wood, Institute of Civil Engineers - Geotechnical Engineering vol 166 Issue GE2

2.2 **Design Criteria**

2.2.1 Design reliability and design lifetime

The reliability of the foundation of the wind turbines is that it can be equal to what is normally required for onshore foundations: CC2. The failure probability associated with this category is 1.4 x 10⁻⁶ per year.

This chance is also sufficiently small to meet the simple test of 1% chance of failure in a storm condition with a return period of 10⁻⁴ per year. The foundation is hence a stable element in the vicinity of the flood defence. Consequential failure mechanisms associated with turbine foundation failure could be (a) a large break out of a soil cone: a slip circle failure in case of a too short pile, or (b) a local buckling or bending capacity failure of the pile, resulting in a turbine tower falling on the beach and/or the dune. The conditional failure probability associated with those mechanisms to happen simultaneous to a 10⁻⁴ storm condition is very low (< 1%) and will hence not reduce the safety level of the flood defence system.

The design service life of the wind turbine assembly is 25 years. The support structure is as a minimum designed for 25 year service life. The selected turbine supplier is to confirm this value for the other components, including the tower.

Based on the outcomes of the erosion and wave studies, zones of severity of corrosion can be distinguished and it will be decided what type of corrosion protection will be adopted.

Material factors 2.2.2

Soil:

In the following sections and detailed in paragraph 2.5.5, it is explained how the safety factors and load combinations have been used in estimating the monopile structural and geotechnical capacity.

Steel

For the Concept Design Phase, the standard EN1993-1-1 + Dutch Annex have been used as indicated in Table 2-1, with a high level of underutilization of the cross-section.

Cross-section class	умо	γ Μ1
13	1.0	1.0
4	1.0	1.1

Table 2-1: Steel material partial safety factors

In accordance with DNV-ST-0126, buckling factors do not distinguish between Cross section Classes. In the next project phase these will be considered, once the preliminary Fatigue analyses can be performed and the Cross-section further optimized.

Bolts: $\gamma_{M2} = 1.25$





2.3 Design concept

The design concept of the wind turbines along the Soft Sea Barrier (SSB) with monopile foundation is sketched in Figure 2-1.

The monopile foundation consists of an open-ended steel tubular pile. The turbine tower (provided by the turbine supplier) is connected to the monopile foundation at interface level. The interface level is initially defined at NAP +7.75m on basis of extreme water levels, wave action and a minimum airgap of 1 meter.

The mudline level is dependent on the extent of beach and dune erosion and development of local scour around the monopile. The native mudline level is initially assumed at average low water elevation, i.e. at NAP -0.6m. The embedment of the monopile foundation into the soil must be sufficiently deep to provide the required lateral and axial bearing capacity under the prescribed maximum load demands and the considered erosion and scour scenarios.



Figure 2-1: Wind turbine with monopile foundation concept in MV2 Soft Sea Barrier

2.4 Choice of design concept

The choice for the monopile foundation concept is directly related to the specific mitigation measures following from the risk management plan [1] and corresponding verification matrix [2]. The relevant mitigation measures prescribing the monopile foundation concept, including their specific ID, are listed in Table 2-2.

Risk 2.2-M10 [1] Risk 2.4-M1 [1] Measure M2.4.1.1 [2]	Hard elements in the SSB negatively influence the	Application of monopile foundation with maximum diameter of 5.5m at non-eroded mudline level. Scour	Minimised number of hard elements in SSB compared to traditional wind turbine foundation so that	We apply a scour protection locally around the monopiles, but below the minimum long-term bed level. This allows us to

Table 2-2: Risk mitigation measures prescribing the monopile foundation concept





	morphology of the SSB	protection is not applied. Daily inspection of scour holes and regular maintenance will be executed by local asset manager.	disturbance of sand transport / morphology is prevented.	enable cable entry into the monopile whilst still minimizing hard elements at the SSB surface. This is further explained in section 5.
Risk 2.3-M11 [1] Risk 2.4-M7 [1] Measure M2.3.11.1 [2]	Recreationists can showcase unpredictable and unsafe behaviour	Due to application of monopiles with a high interface level the turbines will be hard to climb	Additional safety on top of minimum legal requirements to prevent unsafe situations	The monopiles are designed with a smooth surface at human reach, no external cable ladders starting at current seabed level. and the wind turbine entry is several meters above the ground. See drawing BG8375-RHD-ZZ-XX-DR-S- 0004-20f1

2.5 Geotechnical starting points

2.5.1 General aspects – geotechnical interpretation

The existing soil data comprise results of a site investigation carried out before the Maasvlakte 2 was created and a site investigation after completion of the Maasvlakte 2 area. Site investigations consisted of CPT's and a few boreholes including laboratory testing. Relevant data used for the current phase are included in sections below. Locations of existing CPT's and boreholes on plot below, along with tentative locations of ZZ wind turbines.







Figure 2-2 Locations of available CPT's from previous soil investigations





Figure 2-3 Available CPT results from previous soil investigations (left to right: north to south)

Available data show:

- Variable degree of compactness of fill, also locally silty layers
- Large variation in thickness, nature and properties of the compressible layers on the original seabed
- Medium to extremely dense sand at greater depth

2.5.3 Soil parameters

Based on the available CPT data two preliminary soil profiles are defined for concept design: a North profile (based on MOS CPT2) and a South profile (based on PUMA CPT SL70). The PUMA CPT was carried out from original seabed but is governing with respect to the presence of clayey deposits. The upper sand soils are reclaimed soils. Given the relatively large distance of the CPT data points to the monopile locations and the variation shown it was considered prudent for the concept design phase to use one governing sand profile for the upper sands. In the next design phase, with the CPT data close to the monopile locations, representative clusters will be defined accounting for the variations and thereby reducing uncertainties for the design.



The locations of these profiles are presented in Figure 2-4.

Figure 2-4: Location of North soil profile (left) and South soil profile (right) along the SSB

06 June 2020

MV2 ENECO WIND FARM SSB - MONOPILE CONCEPT DESIGN





The preliminary soil profile parameters are summarised in Table 2-3. The presented soil parameters are for modelling the interaction between soil and monopile structure in the form of lateral soil springs (p-y curves). The preliminary p-y curves will be defined according to API standard [3]. The presented parameter values are interpreted as representative values.

The symbols in Table 2-3 represent the following soil properties:

- q_c = CPT cone resistance [MPa]
- γ' = effective volume weight [kN/m³]
- φ = angle of internal friction [°]
- S_u = undrained shear strength [kPa]
- kh = initial modulus of horizontal subgrade reaction [kN/m³]
- ε₅₀ = strain at 50% of the maximum deviator stress in laboratory undrained compression tests of undisturbed soil samples

Depth z	Soil Type	qc	۷	٠	Su	kb	s 50	Depth z	Soil Type	qc	Y	٠	Su.	kb	s 50
[m NAP]		[MPa]	[kNKm ³]	[°]	[kPa]	[kN/m ³]	[-]	[m NAP]		[MPa]	[kWm ³]	[°]	[kPa]	[k\V/m ³]	[-]
4.50	sand	30.0	21	37.5	0	31100	0	4.50	sand	30.0	21	37.5	0	31100	0
0.00	sand	30.0	11	37.5	0	31100	0	0.00	sand	30.0	11	37.5	0	31100	0
0.00	sand	23.0	11	37.5	0	31100	0	0.00	sand	23.0	11	37.5	0	31100	0
-2.00	sand	23.0	11	37.5	0	31100	0	-2.00	sand	23.0	11	37.5	0	31100	0
-2.00	sand	12.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0	-2.00	sand	12.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0
-3.50	sand	12.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0	-3.50	sand	12.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0
-3.50	sand	20.0	10	32.5	0	15400	0	-3.50	sand	20.0	10	32.5	0	15400	0
-7.00	sand	20.0	10	32.5	0	15400	0	-7.00	sand	20.0	10	32.5	0	15400	0
-7.00	sand	9.5	9	30.0	0	7400	0	-7.00	sand	9.5	9	30.0	0	7400	0
-8.00	sand	9.5	9	30.0	0	7400	0	-8.00	sand	9.5	9	30.0	0	7400	0
-8.00	sand	18.0	10	32.5	0	15400	0	-8.00	sand	18.0	10	32.5	0	15400	0
-12.50	sand	18.0	10	32.5	0	15400	0	-12.00	sand	18.0	10	32.5	0	15400	0
-12.50	sand	12.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0	-12.00	clay	1.0	8	0.0	50	1200	0.007
-15.00	sand	12.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0	-13.00	clay	1.0	8	0.0	50	1200	0.007
-15.00	sand	17.0	10	32.5	0	15400	0	-13.00	sand	17.0	10	32.0	0	10400	0
-16.50	sand	17.0	10	32.5	0	15400	0	-14.50	sand	17.0	10	32.0	-0 -50	10400	0 007
-16.50	silt	1.2	10	27.5	0	1300	0	-14.00	ciay	1.0	0	0.0	50	1200	0.007
-18.00	silt	1.2	10	27.5	0	1300	0	-15.00	cond	13.0	0	30.0	0	7400	0.007
-18.00	sand	18.0	10	32.5	0	15400	0	-16.50	sand	13.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0
-20.00	sand	18.0	10	32.5	0	15400	0	-16.50	clay	1.5	8	0.0	75	2000	0.005
-20.00	silt	4.0	11	30.0	0	7400	0	-26.50	clay	1.5	8	0.0	75	2000	0.005
-24.00	silt	4.0	11	30.0	0	7400	0	-26.50	sand	4.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0
-24.00	clay	1.2	8	0.0	60	1500	0.006	-28.75	sand	4.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0
-26.00	clay	1.2	8	0.0	60	1500	0.006	-28.75	sand	6.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0
-26.00	sand	30.0	11	37.5	0	31100	0	-32.75	sand	6.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0
-27.00	sand	30.0	11	37.5	0	31100	0	-32.75	sand	7.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0
-27.00	sand	30.0	11	37.5	0	31100	0	-34.00	sand	7.0	9	30.0	0	7400	0
-45.00	sand	30.0	11	37.5	0	31100	0	-34.00	sand	30.	11	37.5	0	31100	0

Table 2-3: Preliminary soil parameters for monopile foundation concept design: north profile (left) and south profile (right)





2.5.4 Static and dynamic behaviour

In the concept design loop of the monopile foundation the turbine design loads are introduced as static loads on top of the monopile (at interface level). The soil-structure behaviour that is computed with static p-y curves can be interpreted as pseudo-static behaviour. For the preliminary assessment of dynamic effects, the same calculation is also performed with cyclically degraded soil springs, compliant with API methodology described in [3]. In the calculation the maximum amount of load cycles is assumed for determining the degraded p-y curves. Through this approach the ultimate envelope condition for the foundation system is assessed.

2.5.5 Geotechnical design approach

In accordance with the applicable DNV-GL standards the geotechnical foundation design of wind turbine foundations is essentially based on a load and resistance factor design approach (LRFD). This is in conformity with Design Approach 3 (DA3) of Eurocode EN 1997 which prescribes the use of partial load factors and material factors to derive the design values for the loads and the various soil parameters from their respective characteristic (loads) and low representative (soil parameters) values. DA3 is commonly applied in the Netherlands for various geotechnical structures and foundation types. For the purpose of the wind turbine foundation, the partial material factors prescribed in Annex A of the Eurocode 7 apply [4]. More specifically the following applies for DA3:

It shall be verified that a limit state of rupture or excessive deformation will not occur with the following combination of sets of partial factors:

Combination: (A1* or A2+) "+" M2 "+" R3

Where:

- A represents the partial factors for actions
 - * on structural actions (i.e. turbine loads at the interface level)
 - + on geotechnical actions
- M represents the partial factors for materials (i.e. the soil parameters)
- R represents the partial factor for resistance
- "+" implies: "to be combined with".

Note 1: In this approach, partial factors are applied to actions or to the effects of actions from the Structure (i.e. turbine loads at the interface level) and to ground strength parameters (i.e. the soil parameters).

Note 2: For slope and overall stability analyses, actions on the soil (e.g. structural actions, traffic load) are treated as geotechnical actions by using the set of load factors A2.

Note 3: For the concept design stage it is assumed that Consequence Class 2 (CC2) / Reliability Class 2 (RC2) as specified in Eurocode 0 applies for the required safety level of the monopile foundation. Partial factors reported in Annex A of the Eurocode 7, which apply to CC2/RC2, are in this stage temporarily multiplied by a factor 1.1 to implement additional margin for uncertainty in the soil.

In the concept design step, the available geotechnical data is limited. An appropriate and accurate parameter determination for DA3 is not sensible, and therefore the concept design step Design Approach 2 (DA2) is adopted for the monopile foundation assessment. In DA2 equivalent to DA3 partial load factors (A1) are applied on the turbine loads (refer to Section 2.7) but the partial material factors (M2) on the specific soil parameter values are replaced by an equivalent soil resistance factor (" $R_{M2,eq}$ ") on the overall lateral soil-pile behaviour. This simplified approach is possible in this concept design stage because the overall





lateral behaviour appears to be dominated by the upper sand soils for which the resistance is determined by the single strength parameter ϕ , i.e. the angle of internal friction.

The value of the equivalent soil resistance factor $R_{M2,eq}$ will as such be based on the maximum of:

- Partial material factor on tangent of φ according to Eurocode 7 DA3 [4]
- Partial material factor on tangent of ϕ according to DNV-GL-ST-0126 [5]
- Soil resistance factor according to Eurocode 7 DA2 [4]

The partial material factor on the tangent φ according to EC7-DA3 equals 1.1 x 1.25 = 1.4. The partial material factor on the tangent φ according to DNV-GL-ST-0126 equals 1.15. The resistance on soil bearing capacity and earth resistance according to EC7-DA2 equals 1.1 x 1.4 = 1.5.

For the concept design phase the soil resistance factor $R_{M2,eq}$ is set to 1.5. Considering that the DNV-GL-ST-0126 standard is specifically developed for wind turbine support structures and mentions a considerably lower value for the partial material factor, it is concluded that adequate conservatism is implemented in the concept design phase with $R_{M2,eq} = 1.5$.

As a final remark, it is noted that lateral bearing capacity of the soil-pile system is governing over axial bearing capacity. As such the focus of the geotechnical foundation design during concept design loop is focused on the verification of lateral bearing resistance. Axial bearing capacity will be verified in the preliminary design stage when the final soil investigation is available.

2.5.6 Geotechnical ground investigations – surveys

The available soil data show significant spatial variation in ground conditions including the presence of old gullies. For this reason, a site investigation is scheduled to comprise one seismic CPTU in the centre of each wind turbine location to a depth of approx. NAP-45 m or deeper if encountered ground conditions are poor.

A total of 6 boreholes will be executed in the near vicinity of selected CPT locations to a depth of approx. NAP -35 m. These boreholes are in particular for calibration purposes but also to obtain undisturbed samples for more advanced laboratory tests.

2.6 Erosion and scour scenarios

Beach erosion and local scour are subject to separate specialist studies. These studies are aimed at gaining insight and as a mean of risk assessment of the effect of the wind turbines on the flood defence system. Outcomes of these studies not necessarily are one-to-one design scenarios for the turbine foundations themselves.

The beach erosion and natural accretion follow a maintenance plan with guaranteed quantities of sand in vertical zones, i.e. between -8 and -4, between -4 and +3 and above +3 m NAP.

Individual storms may cause erosion and temporary relocation of sand volumes to a lower zone. An associated lower beach level will be used as a design scenario for the piles.

Local scour is understood to be caused a wave-driven long-shore currents of typically maximum 1.5 m/s, associated with the 1:100 yr storm conditions. Scour holes that might occur under these conditions will be estimated base on the applicable standards and specialist studies, if needed.





Prior to final results, to obtain insight in the sensitivity of the monopile foundation to the beach/dune erosion and local scour development, a set of erosion scenarios is considered in the concept design step. The scenarios are summarised in Table 2-4.

Table 2-4: Erosion scenarios considered for monopile concept design

Erosion scenario	Mudline level	Remarks
No erosion / scour	NAP -0.6m	In this scenario the target static foundation stiffness defined by the turbine suppliers is assessed with SLS loads (see section 2.7)
General erosion -4m	NAP -4.0m	For the push-over analysis both static capacity of the soil and cyclic degradation is considered. For the moment this is only done for this mudline level to verify the sensitivity of the pile response to cyclic degradation. Recommended pile toe levels for other scour scenarios will include the outcome of this verification.
General erosion -7m	NAP -7.0m	For push-over analysis the static capacity of the soil is considered. For the structural capacity check the effect of cyclic degradation is considered for a mudline level at NAP -7.0m as a most likely worst-case scenario.
General erosion -7m + additional local scour	NAP -10.3m with reduced spring capacity to a level of NAP -13.5m	In this scenario the redundancy of the foundation system is assessed in case of lacking maintenance after considerable beach / dune erosion Cyclic degradation is for this scenario specifically not taken into account as it is considered to be an unlikely scenario.

Measured coastal erosion profiles at cross-sections along the MV2 SSB (Figure 2-5) support the assumption that the present mudline level at the monopile locations is situated around NAP -0.6m (i.e. average low water level). Considering the historic development of coastal erosion and potential dune erosion during a storm the two scenarios of general erosion to NAP -4m and NAP -7m were selected. General erosion is defined as an overall lowering of the beach level resulting in a sloping bed level with an e.g. 1:30 slope. In the geotechnical calculations this is modelled as a horizontal level. The scenario with general erosion to NAP -7m plus an additional scour hole around the piles is to assess the redundancy of the foundation system in case of lacking maintenance after considerable beach and dune erosion.



Figure 2-5: Measured coastal erosion at two cross-sections along the MV2 SSB

It is noted that along part of the MV2 SSB perimeter coastal accretion has been observed while at other locations coastal erosion has been measured (as shown in Figure 2-5). The locations of the soil profiles selected for design and the locations of coastal accretion / erosion zones are for concept foundation design not yet linked. In concept design phase the various erosion scenarios are assessed with the governing soil profile to secure that the design is also feasible in case conservative erosion scenario's would apply.

2.7 Turbine interface loads and foundation target rotational stiffness

The turbine interface loads for the monopile foundation concept design are selected the available non contractual data as shown in Annex A2. Turbine loads are provided by four suppliers: Enercom, GE, Vestas and Siemens. Their data are based on turbines of approximately the same category and size. The terminology of the load combinations differs per supplier and in this early phase of the project the level of detail is insufficient to clearly distinguish which turbine load cases are specifically included in the load combinations. Therefore, the approach for turbine interface load definition during concept design phase is as follows:

- The selection of interface loads is predominantly based on the turbine loads provided by Enercom and GE as these are most comprehensive. The turbine loads provided by GE are considered representative for the Vestas and Siemens turbine loads.
- For the ULS condition an envelope set of loads is selected per supplier. It is observed from the information provided by Enercom and GE that ULS 'normal' and 'abnormal' design load conditions fall within the same envelope.
- For the SLS condition the SLS (unfactored) 'normal' design load conditions are selected. For Enercom the overall factor between ULS and SLS 'normal' bending moment is approximately 1.35. For GE the overall factor between ULS and SLS 'normal' bending moment is approximately 1.5.

In summary the implemented turbine loads for concept design are presented in Table 2-5. The loads are introduced at interface level (i.e. NAP +7.75m). For the preliminary design phase further definition of the load combinations is required.





		1 0 7		
Supplier	Axial force [kN]	Shear force ¹ [kN]	Bending moment ¹ [kNm]	Torsion [kNm]
		ULS envelope ²		
Enercom	-12848	1878	228911	19428
GE / Vestas / Siemens	-8695	1717	158776	13534
		SLS 'normal'		
Enercom	-8727	1391	166806	14391
GE / Vestas / Siemens	-5885	1240	106532	10025

Table 2-5: Turbine interface loads considered for monopile concept design, from **Error! Reference source not found.**

¹ The presented shear forces and bending moments are the quadratically combined components in main horizontal directions

² Assumed to be factored in accordance with DA3

As presented inA2, Enercom and GE provide static target rotational stiffnesses of the foundation system:

- $k_{\varphi, Enercom} > 26.666 \text{ GNm/rad}$
- $k_{\phi,GE} > 30.000 \text{ GNm/rad}$

2.8 Wave loads

For the preliminary design a separate, site specific wave load study will be performed. This study includes the transformation of offshore wave and wind and water level data into near-shore data. This conditions are further analysed to calculate static and dynamic wave loads in the piles, for all sea states and load scenario's to be considered, whether or not corelated with wind.

The methodology of determination of wave loads in this concept design step is as follows. A beach profile is chosen as a starting point. Initially the beach is around -0.6 m NAP, having a 1:30 slope toward the sea. Over the years the beach might erode, leading to a typical bed level of - 2 m NAP at the position of the monopile.

In case of a design storm a surge level of +3 m NAP can occur. This leads to a water depth of 5 m.

In storm conditions large waves can be generated. The wave conditions used for the design of the sea defences can be used as a reference. For the SSD, the underwater geometry of the foreshore and the beach will cause shoaling and depth-induced breaking, which processes transform the waves, leading to a reduced wave height.

	H _{m0}	T _{m-10}
1:100 yr condition, point MZ4	6.8 m	11.3 s
1:100 yr, depth-limited 5 m	3.5	11.3

The depth-limited wave parameters are given as spectral values. In order to determine extreme values of cyclic loads typical combinations of individual waves and periods can be given.





	Hi	Ti
Combinations for 'normal' Rayleigh distributed wave heights	1.8	0.9
	1.0	1.3
	0.55	1.5
Combinations for depth-limited wave heights	1.4	0.9
	1.0	1.3
	0.55	1.5

Using dispersion relations, based on the combination of depth-limited wave height and period, the wave orbital velocities and acceleration can be computed as a vertical profile at the location of the pile.



The ration between wave period and pile diameter (5 m) permits the use of Morison equations for calculation of drag and inertia forces. Conservatively they are summed, and the result of these calculations is shown below. The adopted Morison coefficients are 1.2 for drag and 2.0 for inertia. The coefficient of 1.2 is conservative and is based on a rough surface, cause by marine growth. Based on

06 June 2020





these results a maximum wave load value of 2000kN is estimated. This wave load value is conservatively introduced at the interface level (i.e. NAP +7.75m).

intermediate water waves				1 2	3
spectral wave parameters					
Wave height	H _{m0}	3.5			
Wave period	T-10	11.3			
Water level (relative to Ref)		3.0			
Bottom level (relative to Ref)		-2.0			
Combinations of H and T	H _i	1.0	1.4	4 1.0	0.55
	Ti	1.0	0.	9 1.3	1.5
Total Marison farcas [kN]			177	7 1250	615
z coordinate of the force (rel to bo	ttom level)		4.	2 4.3	4.4
Impact force Wifi JIP I		388			





2.9 Verification criteria

The performance of the monopile foundation is verified on three main items, as summarized in Table 2-6.

Behaviour	Verification
SLS deformations ¹	 Rotational stiffness in SLS: k_{φ,Enercom} > 26.666 GNm/rad k_{φ,GE} > 30.000 GNm/rad Normal operational load conditions in SLS: Lateral deflection at mudline: 3% of pile diameter Maximum inclination: 1mm/m Extreme operational ("abnormal") load conditions in SLS: Lateral deflection at mudline: 6% of pile diameter Maximum inclination: 3mm/m
ULS structural capacity	Unity check in the final design step to be based on CC2 / RC2 Eurocode safety level ² . Working stress < 40% of yield stress to create sufficient margin for fatigue (which is not assessed in concept design yet) and to accommodate the equivalent soil resistance factor of 1.5.
ULS geotechnical stability (push-over)	Margin assessment: load demand and erosion scenarios in relation to push-over curves and minimum pile toe level

Table 2-6: Verification criteria for monopile concept design

¹ A separate check is the effect of the initial rotation of the unloaded as-installed wind turbine immediately after construction (installation tolerance). This check will be performed during preliminary design phase when more details are available.

² For CC2 / RC2 the probability of exceedance is 10^{-4} ($\beta = 3.8$) for a design life of 50 years. This is considered conservative as the design lifetime of the wind turbines is only 25 years.

For structures in offshore wind farms, in the DNV-GL codes two safety classes are considered.

- Low safety class is used for structures, whose failures imply low risk for personal injuries and pollution, low risk for economic consequences and negligible risk to human life. This level complies to CC1 in the Eurocode system.
- Normal safety class is used for structures, whose failures imply some risk for personal injuries, fatalities and pollution and significant economic consequences. This level complies to CC2 in the Eurocode system.

DNV-GL guidance note: Support structures and foundations for wind turbines are usually to be designed to the lower end of the normal safety class. Given their location on a beach accessible by the general public a level of CC2 is recommended. Although in the circumstances where the design conditions occur the beach will be flooded and strong winds will blow, which will in practice mean that there will be no risk of injuries and casualties as a consequence of structural or geotechnical failure of the structure.

The overall safety implemented in the lateral geo-structural assessment in the monopile foundation concept design step is 1.35 (Enercom factor between envelope ULS and 'normal' SLS) x 1.5 (equivalent soil resistance) = 2.0.





3 Model setup

3.1 Model overview

L-pile software (developed by Ensoft Inc.) is applied for the monopile concept design. The L-pile program provides the capability to analyse individual piles for a variety of applications in which lateral loading is applied. The L-pile program is a commonly applied and proven tool in the offshore industry.

The L-pile analysis is based on a solution of a differential equation describing the behaviour of a beamcolumn supported by non-linear springs (i.e. the soil p-y curves defined from the parameters in Table 2-3). An overview of the monopile concept design model is presented in Figure 3-1.



Figure 3-1: L-pile model overview for monopile concept design

It is noted that the use of the p-y curve methodology for single piles larger than 1.0m diameter should be validated with other models. This will be done during preliminary design phase.





3.2 Model input

3.2.1 Soil profiles and properties

The soil profiles introduced in the calculation model are presented in Figure 3-2 (North profile) and Figure 3-3 (South profile). The figures show the examples for the soil profiles without erosion and scour. In the erosion scenarios the top layers are accordingly removed from the calculation model. The soil properties (γ' , ϕ , k_h for sand and γ' , S_u , ϵ_{50} for clay) are introduced as stated in Table 2-3, resulting in the input presented in Figure 3-4.

	Select p-y Curve Type	Vertical Depth Below Pile Head	Vertical Depth Below Pile Head	Press Button to Enter
	from Drop-down List	of Top of Soil Layer (m)	of Bottom of Soil Layer (m)	Soil Properties
1	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	8.35	8.35	1: API Sand
2	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	8.35	9.75	2: API Sand
3	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	9.75	11.25	3: API Sand
4	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	11.25	14.75	4: API Sand
5	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	14.75	15.75	5: API Sand
6	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	15.75	20.25	6: API Sand
7	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	20.25	22.75	7: API Sand
8	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	22.75	24.25	8: API Sand
9	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	24.25	25.75	9: API Sand
10	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	25.75	27.75	10: API Sand
11	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	27.75	31.75	11: API Sand
12	Stiff Clay w/o Free Water (Reese) $\qquad \lor$	31.75	33.75	12: Stiff Clay without Free Water
13	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	33.75	34.75	13: API Sand
14	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	34.75	52.75	14: API Sand

Figure 3-2: Soil profile North (no erosion / scour) input in L-pile

	Select p-y Curve Type	Vertical Depth Below Pile Head	Vertical Depth Below Pile Head	Press Button to Enter
	from Drop-down List	of Top of Soil Layer (m)	of Bottom of Soil Layer (m)	Soil Properties
1	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	8.35	8.35	1: API Sand
2	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	8.35	9.75	2: API Sand
3	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	9.75	11.25	3: API Sand
4	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸 🗸	11.25	14.75	4: API Sand
5	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	14.75	15.75	5: API Sand
6	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	15.75	19.75	6: API Sand
7	Soft Clay (Matlock) 🗸 🗸	19.75	20.75	7: Soft Clay
8	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸 🗸	20.75	22.25	8: API Sand
9	Soft Clay (Matlock) 🗸 🗸	22.25	22.75	9: Soft Clay
10	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	22.75	24.25	10: API Sand
11	Stiff Clay w/o Free Water (Reese) $\qquad \lor$	24.25	34.25	11: Stiff Clay without Free Water
12	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸 🗸	34.25	36.5	12: API Sand
13	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	36.5	40.5	13: API Sand
14	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸 🗸	40.5	41.75	14: API Sand
15	API Sand (O'Neill) 🗸 🗸	41.75	52.75	15: API Sand

Figure 3-3: Soil profile South (no erosion / scour) input in L-pile







Figure 3-4: Resulting soil property input for South profile in L-pile

During the concept design phase, it was found that the overall lateral behaviour is dominated by the upper sand soils. As such the calculation results are rather similar for the North and South profile, as the top layers in both soil profiles consist of reclaimed MV2 sand. The South profile is somewhat more governing though due to thicker clay deposits (including soft clay) in the native soil stratigraphy underneath the reclamation. As such the final concept design is only assessed with the governing South profile.

3.2.2 Pile geometry

The monopile geometry properties introduced in the calculation model are presented in Figure 3-5. The monopile is an open-ended steel tubular pile with the following properties:

- Diameter = 5000 mm
- D/t ratio = 55 → Wall thickness = 90 mm → Class 3 cross-section
- Top level = NAP +7.75m
- Toe level = +7.75m 47.75m = NAP -40m
- Steel quality = S355
- Young's modulus = 2.1.10⁸ kN/m²

Corrosion allowance of the monopiles is at this stage not yet specifically considered.

Project related





Section 1, Top	~	[0.00 - 47.75] m	Number of De	fined Sections	= 1 Total Len	gth = 47.75 m
Section Type Pipe Pile	Dimensions	Steel Properties			01	
Elevation Dimensio	ns		Steel Pipe Pile		SnowSection	○ Profile
Length of Section (m)	47.75		Pine Outside Diameter (mm)	5000		\frown
Elastic Section Prope	rties:		Dies Well Thiskness (mm)	3000		
Structural Shares	Select Shape	• ~	Pipe vvail Thickness (mm)	90		\
Structural Shape			Section Width (mm)	0		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	At Top	At Bottom	Section Depth (mm)	0		
Elastic Sect. Width (mm)	0	0	Correct Chamfer (mm)			
No data required (mm)	0	0	Corner Chamler (mm)	U	1	
A == = (== == ??)	0		Core Void Diameter (mm)	0		/
Area (mm·2)	U	U	Core Wall Thickness (mm)	0		
Mom. of Inertia (mm^4)	0	0	Elando Thickness (mm)	0		
Plas Mom Can (m-kN)	0	0	Flange mickness (mm)	0		
i las. Mont. Cap. (II-Kiv)	0	0	Web Thickness (mm)	0		
Shear Capacity (kN)	0	0	Elastic Mod. (kN/m^2)	0		
Compute Mom. of Iner	tia and Areas	and Draw Section	Copy Top Properties t	to Bottom		

Figure 3-5: Monopile geometry input in L-pile

3.2.3 Pile loads

3.2.3.1 Deformation and structural capacity verifications

For the deformation and structural capacity verifications the concept design loads specified in Section 2.7 and 2.8 are introduced at interface level in the calculation model. The load input is presented in Figure 3-6. Load cases 1 and 3 refer to Enercom ULS and SLS loads (Table 2-5). Load cases 2 and 4 refer to GE ULS and SLS loads (Table 2-5). The ULS shear force values in load cases 1 and 2 consist of the turbine shear forces added with the 2000kN wave load.

Load Case	Pile-Head Loading Condition	Condition (1) for Loading Type	Condition (2) for Loading Type	Axial Load (p-delta) (kN)	Compute Top y vs. L?
1	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	3878	228911	12848	Yes 🗸 🗸
2	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	3717	158776	8695	Yes 🗸 🗸
3	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	1391	166806	8727	Yes 🗸 🗸
4	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	1240	106532	5885	Yes ~

Figure 3-6: Interface load input in L-pile for deformation and structural capacity verifications

3.2.3.2 Geotechnical stability (push-over) verifications

For the push-over analysis the lateral interface loads are stepwise increased until the software reaches nonconvergence indicating instability / failure of the soil-structure system. Both the shear and bending interface loads are increased with a constant amount. Based on the available turbine load data in **Error! Reference source not found.**, an average ratio of 100:1 is assumed between shear and bending. The axial compression load is kept at a constant value. This approach is visualised in Figure 3-7.

Project related





Shear - Factor 100 - Bending

Load Case	Pile-Head Loading Condition	Condition (1) for Loading Type	Condition (2) for Loading Type	Axial Load (p-delta) (kN)	Compute Top y vs. L?	
1	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	0	0	8000 Constant	Yes	~
2	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	500	50000	8000 value	Yes	~
3	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	1000	100000	8000	Yes	~
4	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	1500	150000	8000	Yes	~
5	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	2000	200000	8000	Yes	~
6	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	2500	250000	8000	Yes	~
7	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	3000	300000	8000	Yes	~
8	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	3250	325000	8000	Yes	~
9	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	3500	350000	8000	Yes	~
10	(1) Shear [lb or kN] and (2) Moment [in-lb or kN-m] $$\sim$$	3750	375000	8000	Yes	~

Figure 3-7: Interface load input in L-pile for push-over analysis





4 Verification results

4.1 Deformation behaviour

The static target rotational stiffness values provided by Enercom and GE are verified against the respective SLS load conditions listed in Table 2-5, assuming the scenario without erosion. It is not specifically stated by the suppliers at which level the target rotational stiffness values are defined. It is expected that the values are defined around mudline level for a regular shallow foundation system. Nonetheless the target stiffness verification is in this design phase performed for both interface level and NAP level, with the interface level verification being more conservative. For verifying the target rotational stiffness at NAP level the bending moment values at interface level are lowered as such that the SLS loads at NAP level match the SLS loads listed in Table 2-5. The verification result is presented in Figure 4-1.



Figure 4-1: Static rotational stiffness verifications for D5000/90 monopile in South profile

It is concluded from Figure 4-1 that the soil-pile system with the D5000/90 monopile reaches sufficient static rotational stiffness:

- Static rotational stiffness at interface level:
 - Enercom: $k_{\phi,calculated} = 32.7GNm/rad > k_{\phi,required} = 26.7GNm/rad → OK$
 - \circ GE: k_{φ,calculated} = 31.9GNm/rad > k_{φ,required} = 30.0GNm/rad → OK
- Static rotational stiffness at NAP level:
 - Enercom: $k_{\phi,calculated} = 44.9GNm/rad > k_{\phi,required} = 26.7GNm/rad \rightarrow OK$
 - \circ GE: k_{φ,calculated} = 43.2GNm/rad > k_{φ,required} = 30.0GNm/rad → OK

In addition it can directly be observed from the deformation graphs plotted in Figure 4-1 that the SLS lateral deflection around mudline level is sufficiently low: $u_{\text{ENERCOM}} = 3 \text{cm} < 15 \text{cm} (=3\% \text{ of } D_{\text{pile}}) \rightarrow \text{OK}$

The monopile overall inclination is estimated from the deformation plots in Figure 4-1 by calculating the inclination over the pile length between interface level and the first level of zero lateral deformation in the soil. As such an equivalent inclination of 2.5mm/m is estimated. This value is in between the normal operational and extreme operational SLS requirements (1mm/m and 3mm/m respectively, see Table 2-6).





As explained in Section 2.7 it is at this stage not yet sufficiently clear how the SLS 'normal design conditions' provided by the suppliers relate to the SLS normal operational and SLS extreme operational load conditions defined for the inclination requirement. The inclination requirement needs further assessment in the preliminary design phase.

4.2 ULS structural capacity

The ULS structural capacity of the monopile cross-section is verified against the maximum internal forces computed for the ULS load conditions listed in Table 2-5 for the following two outer ULS scenarios:

- No erosion and scour (mudline at NAP -0.6m) without cyclic degradation of soil springs
- Full erosion to NAP -7.0m with full cyclic degradation of soil springs

The internal force results for the two scenarios are plotted in Figure 4-2 and Figure 4-3 respectively.



Figure 4-2: ULS internal forces for D5000/90 monopile in South profile for no-erosion scenario without cyclic degradation







Figure 4-3: ULS internal forces for D5000/90 monopile in South profile for full erosion scenario (NAP -7m) with cyclic degradation

The internal force verifications according to Eurocode 3 ([6], [7]) are presented in Table 4-1. The structural capacity verification is elastic as the D5000/90 cross-section with S355 steel quality falls within Class 3. The yield stress is reduced from 355N/mm² to 315N/mm² because of the large wall thickness. The full calculation sheets are documented in Appendix 1.

Internal force results	No erosion / scour (NAP -0.6m) without cyclic degradation	General erosion to NAP -7.0m with cyclic degradation
Maximum bending moment [kNm]	275000	310000
Maximum shear force [kN]	15000	26000
Maximum axial force [kN]	13000	13000
Torsion load [kNm]	19500	19500
Unity Check on bending moment	0.52	0.59
Unity Check on shear force	0.09	0.16
Combined Unity check	0.55	0.59

Table 4-1: ULS structural capacity verifications according to Eurocode 3 for D5000/90 monopile in South profile

Although the presented unity checks are comfortably below 1.0, the target utilisation of 40% (to provide margin for fatigue and uncertainty in the soil) is not reached. If the wall thickness would be locally increased to 100mm the cross-section becomes a Class 2 profile. The locally thickened Class 2 cross-section has sufficient capacity to reach the 40% utilisation criterion.

06 June 2020





4.3 ULS geotechnical stability (push-over and minimum pile toe level)

The push-over curves for the various erosion scenarios are presented in Figure 4-4. In the top figure the interface shear force is plotted against the interface horizontal deformation. In the bottom figure the interface bending moment is plotted against the interface horizontal deformation. For every scenario the push-over curves excluding and including the equivalent soil resistance factor of 1.5 are shown (except for the abnormal scenario with full erosion to NAP -7m with lacking maintenance). For the scenario with full erosion to NAP -4m the push-over results with both static and cyclically degraded soil springs are shown. In both figures the turbine envelope ULS load demands are plotted as well.



Figure 4-4: Push-over curves at interface level for D5000/90 monopile in South profile





In Figure 4-5 the push-over curve computed at mudline level is presented as well. The figure plots the interface shear force against the mudline horizontal deformation



Figure 4-5: Push-over curves at mudline level for D5000/90 monopile in South profile

The following is concluded from the push-over curves presented in Figure 4-4 and Figure 4-5:

- The studied soil-pile system with the D5000/90 monopile is sufficiently stable under the ULS turbine load demands, even in the abnormal scenario with full erosion to NAP -7m and an additional scour hole around the pile due to lacking maintenance. The ULS load demands cross the push-over curves in the branch which is predominantly elastic due to limited plasticity in the soil.
- The abnormal scenario with full erosion to NAP -7m and successive lacking maintenance should be prevented. It can be derived from the top graph in Figure 4-4 that the system in that specific scenario would not have sufficient residual capacity to resist the additional incoming wave load of 2000kN.

The push-over curves have been calculated for a pile toe level at NAP -40m. In addition, a separate set of calculations is performed to assess the minimum required pile toe level for realising sufficient stability. For every scenario the ULS loads (including wave shear) as listed in Figure 3-6 are used. The result is presented in Figure 4-6 which plots horizontal deformation at interface level against pile toe level per erosion and load scenario. The pile is considered stable when the curve becomes a vertical line. The results do yet include partial safety on soil resistance.







Figure 4-6: Minimum pile toe level assessment for D5000/90 monopile in South profile

Based on the set of observations in Figure 4-4, Figure 4-5 and Figure 4-6 minimum pile toe levels are recommended which include sufficient margin for cyclic degradation, local scour and uncertainty in the soil resistance:

- Mudline at NAP -0.6m → minimum pile toe level at NAP -40m
- Mudline at NAP -4.0m → minimum pile toe level at NAP -45m
- Mudline at NAP -7.0m → minimum pile toe level at NAP -50m

These values are based on calculations for the South soil profile. It should be noted that the larger scour risk occurs at locations ZZ1 to ZZ7, for which the North coil profile applies.

These values are further clarified in Table 4-2.





Table 4-2: Clarification of recommended minimum pile toe levels

General Erosion scenario	Pile toe level from static calculation	Pile toe level with cyclic degradation	Margin for local scour, soil disturbance and uncertainty in the soil	Minimum pile toe level recommendation
NAP -0.6m	NAP -30m	NAP -35m (estimated)	5m (estimated)	NAP -40m
NAP -4.0m	NAP -35m	NAP -40m (calculated)	5m (estimated)	NAP -45m
NAP -7.0m	NAP -40m	NAP -45m (estimated)	5m (estimated)	NAP -50m

These values are based on calculations for the South soil profile. It should be noted that the larger general beach erosion and larger scour risk occurs at locations ZZ1 to ZZ7, for which the North soil profile applies.







4.4 Conceptual verification of the bolted connection

Mono-pile tower connections in onshore situation shall have bolted connections. The accessibility of the location, and also the possibilities to give the monopile an interface with a flange, accurately dimensioned and levelled respecting strict tolerances lead to this preference.

Specific for the MV2 location close to the seashore and in permanent salt spray, the connection is ideally design as an interior flange, as indicated in the figure below. The flange can be designed with one bolt rows, dependent on the pile diameter, the wall thickness and stress levels in the steel shell.

For our case it appears that a connection with one bolt row is feasible.



m

Clamping length St





The bending moments in the flange connection at the level of (approx. +7 m NAP) are:

	M _{Ed_0} [kNm]	V _{Ed} [kN]	M _{Ed_+7} [kNm]	Diameter [m]	Tension force = M _{Ed+7} / (π/4 x D²) [kN/m]
GE	158776	1717	146757	5.0	7474
Vestas	154600	1474	144282	5.0	7348
Enercom	228911	1878	215765	5.0	10989
Siemens	153017	1509	142454	5.0	7255

The difference between ULS load and SLS load is a factor 1.5. With the SLS load the elastic cyclic capacity is verified. For the concept design the maximum load will be check, which corresponds to the Enercon available load sets.

The calculation below shows that one row of bolts is feasible, in the preliminary design stage the design of the bolts and flange can be optimize.

Used bolts:

M72 10.9 (As = 3460mm²). The bolt force capacity is: $F_{t,Rd} = 0.9 f_{ub} A_s / \gamma_{M2}$

 $F_{t,Rd. M72} = 0.9 \cdot 1000 \cdot 3460 / 1.25 = 2491 \text{ kN}$

To tighten the bolt M72 the following equipment can be used: D-Flex 18, with a minimum head radius R = 78 mm. A tolerance of 10 mm will be added.

The minimum c.t.c. distance of the bolts is R + e/2 + tolerancee = outer bolt diameter ctc of an M72 = 78 + 125/2 +10 = 150.5 mm

The bolts will be placed as showed in picture below:







The green circle is the minimum required space to tighten the bolts. The thickness of the flange plate is 200 mm, with $f_{y,flange} = 285 \text{ N/mm}^2$ (S355 for thick plates)

The ULS verification of the connection is done with formula for the bolt force capacity and the plastic bending capacity of the flange. Refer to [9].



In the concept design step failure mode B is verified, since there is freedom to choose for a thick plate. The failure load is computed with:

The SLS verification is done for the diameter 5.0m and $F_{Ed} = 10989$ kN/m, for the case with bolts M72. For the SLS check a FEM model is used. The model consists of two beams, connect together with only non-tension springs. The bolts are modelled as tension-only members.

At the shell end there is a flexible rotation support, with the stiffness calculated with:



The bolt preload is modelled as a load. The maximum preload is: $F_{p; M56} = 0.7 \cdot 1000 \cdot 3460 = 2422 \text{ kN}$ To account for losses: $F_{p'} = 0.9 \cdot 2422 = 2280 \text{ kN}$

The loads in the flange is step by step increased from 0 to $F_{Ed} = 10989 \cdot 0.1584 = 1741 \text{ kN}$ 0.1584 = length of circle segment of one bolt.

The results are presented in two graphs, the left one sowing the bolt force and gap development, both as a function of the force in the shell. The right-hand figure resents the bending stress in the flange and the membrane and bending in the shell.






The ratio of increase in bolt force per tension force in the shell is a measure of efficiency and ultimately for fatigue resistance of the connection.

A critical element in this connection is the bending stress in the shell. When choosing this connection, the membrane stress in the shell is always supplemented with approximately 15-30% bending stress, which might require a zone with an increased wall thickness at the foot of the tower and at the top of the monopile. This should be taken in account in the preliminary design stage.

Alternatively, to reduce these bending stresses the flange thickness can increased, or the contact area can be reduced, as indicated in the sketch below.

Vertical stiffeners could be used, but this will reduce the available space and possible number of bolts and will hence reduce the capacity of the connection. This is not recommended.







5 Transport, installation and grid connection

5.1 Transport and installation

The monopiles will consist of hot rolled steel bend plates, jointed by full penetration welding. As the fabrication and welding will largely determine the cost of the monopile, the steel design will be optimized in the next design step. This will likely result in a pile design with segments of different wall thickness and steel grade over the height of the pile.

The monopiles are envisaged to be transported and delivered by onshore methods, in a horizontal position. Due to their large diameter and the circular cross-section is at risk of ovalization. In the preliminary design phase, we will separately analyse this situation and make the necessary recommendations for the suppliers in order to minimize the impact on the structural shape. Any deformations occurred during this stage can influence the drivability of the monopile, the connection to the tower and can introduce secondary effects in the structure.

The installation segments and connection welds will be carefully placed outside the high stress regions. If required, the regions of the on-site welds will be separately checked and evaluated for any fatigue assessment and to avoid weld failure.

Temporary installation platforms will be constructed to accommodate the installation machinery and to allow access for the monopile onsite delivery. The piles will be installed with cranes operating on a platform at +3.5 m NAP, presently foreseen to be constructed as a cofferdam of sheet pile walls with a sand fill.

The maintenance, operation and security considerations dictate the monopile to be equipped with a working platform at interface height, to avoid accessibility of the tower by the general public. The permanent access platform of the tower will be equipped with crane to lift the necessary goods/ machinery at this level. Turbine installation and maintenance personal can access the tower through high vehicles and secured access ladders starting at 4 m above beach level.



Figure 5-1: Access platform – interface height

After pile driving the monopile will be cut and levelled. A flange will be welded to the top edge of the steel wall of the circular pile, to allow a bolted connection of the first tower segment.





5.2 Pile driving

The estimated weight of the monopile is 300 to 350 ton. The pile will be installed in 45 m soil, partly consisting of dense sand layers. The steel tubular piles are typically open ended, which for large diameter pile will mean that that soil column inside the pile will more or less remain in position during installation.

For pile installation the following methods are considered:

- The common method used to drive monopiles into the seabed is hydraulic impact piling (hammering). The advantage is that it provides a verification of ground conditions related to bearing capacity and that it avoids adverse effects on the bearing capacity which are associated with other techniques as low frequency vibrating, water jetting etc. The hammering technique has two disadvantages: the noise levels during pile driving (which is on issue under-water, not so much in air), and the high stress peaks in the monopiles induced by the hammer. Pile hammering is normally not associated with high vibrations and with risks of damage to adjacent structures or of failure of unstable soil slopes.
- The second method is the use of vibratory hammers. This technique is based on local fluidizing and temporarily weakening of the soil. The feasibility and suitability of this method depends on a variety of parameters. Low frequency vibration for a pile of this size is considered a risk for the stability of adjacent structures, including the temporary work platform.
- The third method to consider is a novel technique, known as gentle pile driving. This technique is based on simultaneous application of low-frequency and high-frequency vibrators exciting two different modes of motion on the monopiles. This method is called "gentle" for its envisaged capability to reduce the driving loads and to reduce the noise levels. This method is being developed and aimed at finding a balance maintaining the penetration speed and the soil bearing capacity normally guaranteed when the classical pile hammering is applied. First field trials (on relatively small sized monopiles) were carried out at the Maasvlakte II in November 2019, and although the results were promising the technique must still prove itself for larger pile diameters in a variety of ground conditions including those at the ZZ-windturbine locations. The feasibility of this method is promising but uncertain at the moment. It is however very well possible that the technique is fully developed and timely available for use in this project.

The pile driving analysis in this concept design step is aimed to assess optimum installation options using vibratory hammers and/or impact hammers able to install the piles to their target depths with acceptable stress levels and with a minimum impact on the environment, the stability of the beach, the hard sea defence, the dunes and the temporary work platform of the project.

We aim to have at least two feasible and permitted methods available. Both methods shall not have a negative and unacceptable impact on the stability of the beach, the hard sea defence, the dunes and the temporary work platform of the project.

The present analysis results can be summarized as follows:

A Dieseko vibro hammer PVE 500M with clamps 350T can install the pile at 18 m penetration depth. CPT 11 was the CPT that is most limiting.

- Total hammer weight in air inclusive clamps, excluding hoses etc: approx. 41 ton
- Maximum width is approx. 5.1 m and max height is approx. 3.4 m

An IHC Hydrohammer S-1200 is considered able to install the pile at full depth

06 June 2020





- Total hammer weight in air including ram, excluding anvil and pile sleeve: approx. 140 t
- Length of hammer is approx. 14.3 m, excluding anvil and pile sleeve
- Extra weight for pile sleeve at least approx. 60 t
- Extra length approx. 4 m or more

The installation with the IHC hammer is considered as having the lowest risk profile with regard to disturbance of the soil conditions and adverse effects on the bearing capacity, and for the adjacent structures.

5.3 Grid connection

5.3.1 General concept sketch

The foundation of the turbines on the SSD are offshore type of foundations. The grid connection is in offshore projects normally done at seabed level using J-tubes, which is not an acceptable choice for on on-shore project. Hence, the grid connection will hence have to be done in a unique manner. The location on the beach, in a constant dynamic environment from a morphological point of view, impacts the traditional way in which wind turbines are connected to the grid.

Starting from the recommendations of DNVGL-RP-0360 and in the same time fulfilling the safety requirements on generally accessible areas, it has been decided to elevate the power cables form the grid through the inside of the monopile. Allowance for the cables to pass is made at -5.00m NAP (average insertion centred at that level). Two groups of holes have been envisioned to accommodate incoming and outgoing cable groups. On each side 3 x 250mm diameter for the electrical current cables and two smaller ones for internat. Further details are shown in Figure 5-2: Grid connection

In order to counteract the loss of strength in the cross-section local thickened plates are to be welded with a minimum width of 1m and a height of 3m. These areas will be carefully analysed in the next project phase as these regions become prone to stress concentrations and become thus subject to Fatigue Analysis.

The cable is to be buried in the sand at a safe distance, based on the final erosion and morphological studies. The cables are to be lifted through the inside of the pile by means of a hoisting system situated on the platform from the interface level. The hoisting system and the platform will be designed to support the self-weight of this equipment, cable and tension force in the cable.

The hole cuts in the monopile are considered to be one at 45 degrees inclination and pre-drilled. After cable installation the holes are required to be sealed by means of rubber materials or epoxy resins.

In section 5.3.2 are presented the main steps envisioned for the cable installation.







Figure 5-2: Grid connection provisions; DNVGL-RP-0360 fig 4-15 reference

5.3.2 Construction sequencing

For the installation of the electrical cables and connection to the grid several steps are necessary which are also not standard in the wind energy industry.

• Step I: After the monopile installation, temporary sheet piles and props will be installed around the pile to secure the area for excavation around the pile. A layer of underwater concrete will be installed at one side as indicated on drawing BG8375-RHD-ZZ-XX-DR-S-0004-2of2. The underwater concrete is designed a mass concrete, connected to the steel sheet piles. No tension piles and envisaged.



Figure 5-3: Step I Excavation and deep scour protection





• Step II: After the 1st layer of deep scour protection, the cables will be installed and pulled inside the monopile. The bundle will be sequentially split, so as just the cables without the protective tubes will be pulled inside the monopile. The aim is to minimize the section loss in the monopile shell.



Figure 5-4: Step II Cable installation

• Step III: filling of excavated ground to the general estimated morphologically dynamic zone. It aims to secure the monopile against deep local scour and protect the cable entry zone against the general erosion and scour. The cables at entry level will be buried and protected against general erosion and local scour. For this layer gravel and small rock material will be used. The upper and lower levels will vary in accordance to the cable entry zone.



Figure 5-5: Step III Cable installation – Scour protection





• Step IV: filling of excavated ground to the general initial beach level. The inside area of the pile will be equally filled to the initial level.



Figure 5-6: Step IV Filling

• Step V: Removal of temporary sheet piles. The final situation has a buried scour protection. The idea is that the beach will have a morphologic dynamic zone with a typical thickness the differs per pile. General erosion can occur in the sandy top layer. When deep local scour holes would form, the scour protection will be encountered, and the formation of a local scour hole will be stopped.



Figure 5-7: Step V – in place new situation

The procedure as described will result in a reduction of local scour but is associated with local disturbance of the original density and compaction of the soil above and including the scour protection layer.





Table 5-1: Electrical cables entry levels

Pile	morphologic dynamic zone <i>z</i> ı [m]	category [m]	additional margin [m]	scour layer thickness [m]	underside of scour layer [m NAP]	top of under water concrete [m NAP]	thickness of under water concrete [m]	bottom of under water concrete [m NAP]
ZZ-01	-2.4	-3.0	1.0	1.5	-5.5	-8.4	2.00	-10.4
ZZ-02	-1.1	-2.0	1.0	1.5	-4.5	-7.4	1.75	-9.1
ZZ-03	-0.9	-2.0	1.0	1.5	-4.5	-7.4	1.75	-9.1
ZZ-04	-1.3	-2.0	1.0	1.5	-4.5	-7.4	1.75	-9.1
ZZ-05	-2.0	-3.0	1.0	1.5	-5.5	-8.4	2.00	-10.4
ZZ-06	-2.8	-3.5	1.0	1.5	-6.0	-8.9	2.25	-11.1
ZZ-07	-2.0	-3.0	1.0	1.5	-5.5	-8.4	2.00	-10.4
ZZ-08	-1.7	-2.5	1.0	1.5	-5.0	-7.9	2.00	-9.9
ZZ-09	-1.3	-2.0	1.0	1.5	-4.5	-7.4	1.75	-9.1
ZZ-10	-2.1	-2.5	1.0	1.5	-5.0	-7.9	1.75	-9.6
ZZ-11	-1.6	-2.0	1.0	1.5	-4.5	-7.4	1.75	-9.1
ZZ-12	-1.5	-2.0	1.0	1.5	-4.5	-7.4	1.75	-9.1





6 Conclusions and recommendations

6.1 Summary of verification results

In line with the requirements following from the risk management plan ([1], [2]) a monopile foundation concept has been developed for the wind turbines that will be installed along the SSB of MV2. During the concept design loop the performance of the monopile foundation is assessed with a lateral beam-spring model (using p-y curves) and verified on three main items: deformation behaviour, structural capacity and geotechnical stability. The verification results of the concept design loop are summarised in Table 6-1.

Table 6-1: Summary of monopile concept design verification results

Behaviour	Observation	Verification
	Static rotational stiffness is sufficient with D5000/90 monopile foundation.	Rotational stiffness in SLS: • $k_{\varphi,Enercom} > 26.666$ GNm/rad • $k_{\varphi,GE} > 30.000$ GNm/rad
SLS deformations	The lateral deflection at mudline level is sufficiently low for the D5000/90 monopile	 Normal operational load conditions in SLS: Lateral deflection at mudline: 3% of pile diameter Maximum inclination: 1mm/m
	The inclination requirement needs further assessment in the preliminary design phase in relation to lacking load combination data.	 Extreme operational ("abnormal") load conditions in SLS: Lateral deflection at mudline: 6% of pile diameter Maximum inclination: 3mm/m
ULS structural capacity	Sufficient structural capacity against internal force demand is obtained by applying D5000/90 (S355) with a locally increased wall thickness of 100mm.	Unity check based on CC2 / RC2 Eurocode safety level. Working stress < 40% of yield stress to create sufficient margin for fatigue (which is not assessed in concept design yet) and to accommodate the equivalent soil resistance factor of 1.5.
ULS geotechnical stability (push-over)	 The studied soil-pile system with the D5000/90 monopile is sufficiently stable under the ULS turbine load demands. The abnormal scenario with full erosion to NAP -7m and successive lacking maintenance should be prevented. In that specific scenario residual capacity can be insufficient to resist an additional incoming wave load of 2000kN. Minimum pile toe levels are recommended in relation to erosion scenarios: Mudline at NAP -0.6m → minimum pile toe level at NAP -40m Mudline at NAP -4.0m → minimum pile toe level at NAP -4.5m Mudline at NAP -7.0m → minimum pile toe level at NAP -50m 	Margin assessment: load demand and erosion scenarios in relation to push-over curves and minimum pile toe level





6.2 Recommendations for preliminary design phase

During the concept design phase, several recommendations have been identified for the preliminary design phase in relation to further development and optimisation of the monopile foundation design:

- The applicability of the p-y curve methodology for the 5.0m diameter monopiles needs to be validated with other calculation models, including finite element models.
- For the preliminary design phase, a more detailed definition of the turbine load combinations is required for comprehensive foundation verifications and fatigue evaluation. In addition, the turbine load combinations need to be further developed for the exact location and supporting condition.
- Wave loads will be determined in detail in a separate specialist desk study. The loads on the monopiles will also consider the forming of marine growth. The wave study will define oscillating loads, and slamming loads caused by breaking of waves due to limited depth of high wave steepness.
- Once final soil investigation is available the preliminary soil interpretation needs to be updated and the geotechnical safety approach implemented in the design further developed according to Eurocode DA3, in accordance with the DNV-GL standards.
- The design soil profiles that will be selected from the updated soil interpretation can be aligned with the coastal accretion and erosion zones observed along the SSB.
- Realistic scour and erosion scenarios need to be selected for preliminary design phase.
- Although not governing over lateral bearing capacity, axial bearing capacity needs to be verified once final soil investigation is available.
- The SLS inclination requirement needs further assessment in the preliminary design phase in relation to lacking load combination data.
- The structural cross-section utilisation in relation to fatigue needs to be verified. Currently the structural unity check in ULS is reduced to allow for sufficient fatigue capacity.
- Constructability constraints in relation to the required monopile dimensions need to be studied, e.g. in relation to risk mitigation measures M2.1.8.1 and M2.2.6.2 listed in [2].

It is noted that during concept design phase a monopile diameter of 4.3m was also assessed. The results of this assessment are not reported in detail as the D4300/80 monopile capacity appeared insufficient to meet several verification requirements for some turbine types under the assumptions introduced in this concept design step. The 4.3m monopile might proof to be feasible though, once analysed with more detailed input data during the preliminary design phase.

Considering the required size of the monopiles and the MV2 soil conditions it needs to be taken in account that installation of the monopiles with a vibro-hammer might not be feasible. In further consideration of the risk mitigation measures M3 described in [1] and M2.3.3.1 / M2.4.3.1 described in [2], anticipated installation of the monopiles through impact driving and/or using the so-called GPD approach is feasible in terms of driving efficiency, achieved pile bearing capacity, noise levels and collateral damage risk.





7 References

- [1] Eneco, Risicobeheersplan Windpark Maasvlakte 2, 2019
- [2] Eneco, Verificatiematrix Windpark Maasvlakte 2, 2019
- [3] ANSI/API Recommended Practice 2GEO / ISO 19901-4 Geotechnical and Foundation Design Considerations, 2014
- [4] NEN, NEN9997-1+C2 / EN1997-1 Geotechnical design of structures Part 1: General rules, 2017
- [5] DNVGL-ST-0126 Support Structures for wind turbines, Edition April 2016
- [6] NEN, NEN-EN 1993-1-1+C2+A1 Design of steel structures Part 1-1: General rules and rules for buildings, 2016
- [7] NEN, NEN-EN 1993-5 Design of steel structures Part 5: Piling, 2008
- [8] Zur Bemessung geschraubter Ringflanschverbindung von Windenergieanlagen, Marc Seidel, Hannover, 2001
- [9] Roark's Formulas for Stress and Strain- Seventh Edition





A1 Appendix 1 – EC3 structural capacity verifications

PROJECT TITLE:	ENECO	MV2 WINDFA	RM - N	/ON(OPILE F	OUN	DATI	ON (CONC	EPT D	DESIG	N		_	5	5							
SUBJECT: SO	UTH PRO	FILE - NO ERC) SION /	/ SCO	UR - N	O CY	CLIC	DEG	RADA	TION				_	ļ	~	Ro	ya	al				
PROJECT NO:	BG8375		FILE	REF	:					RE\	V:						Ha Enh	anci	ng So	ociet	gDF y Toget	IV ther	
PREPARED BY:	CHA		DAT	ΓE:		1	1-5-2	020		RE\	V DA	TE:		_									
CHECKED BY:			DAT	ΓE:																			
(SEE CALC PAGE	E NO		FOF	R ALT	ERNAT	IVE C	ALCU	JLAT	IONS)													
REF.																				OU	TPUT.		
	Α	INPUT																					

		University of Pile Discussions				
	A.1	Uncorroded Pile Dimensions				
		Outer Diameter (d)	_	5000	mm	Class 2
		Wall Thickness (t)	_	00.0	mm	Class 5
			-	90.0		
	Δ2	Corroded Pile Dimensions				
	-					
		Total corrosion loss to outer surface in zone considered	=	0	mm	
		Total corrosion loss to interior surface	=	0	mm	
		Outer Diameter (d)	=	5000	mm	
		Wall Thickness (t)	=	90	mm	
		Inside Diameter (d _i)		4820	mm	
	A.3	Material Properties				
		Steel Grade	=		S355	
		Design Yield Stress (f _y)	=	315	N/mm ²	
		Young's Modulus	=	210000	N/mm ²	
		Cross Section Limits	=	Cold Form	led	
	A.4	Eurocode Partial Factors				
BS EN 1993-		Partial Factor for resistance of cross section $$\gamma_{M0}$$	=	1.0		
5: 2007		Partial Factor for resistance of members to				
CI 5.1.1(4)		instability assessed by member checks $$\gamma_{\rm M1}$$	=	1.0		
	A.5	Pile Length				
BS EN 1993-						
5: 2007	7	A				
Figure 5.8	- 7	THB TT A concrete or steel str	Inte	170 D		
		A - concrete of steel stru		ne R-	connection	
		C - water or soit soil		D -	In the solution	
	н					
			on E	B translation	n fixed and rotation free	
		with $k = 0.7$ connection	on F	B translation	n fixed and rotation fixed	d
		A Fixity Level	on F	B translation	n free and rotation fixed	
		Vertical Pile Raker Pile				
	L					
		Length of Pile From Soffit to Fixity Level (H)	=	15	m	
		Length Factor (k)	=	1		
		Buckling Length = I _{cr} = k x H				
		= 1 x 15				
		l _{cr} = 15.00 m				

SUBJECT: SO	UTH PROFILE - NO EROS	ION / SCOUR - NO (CYCLIC DEGRADAT	ION	Royal
PROJECT NO:	BG8375	FILE REF:		REV:	Enhancing
PREPARED BY:	CHA	DATE:	1-5-2020	REV DATE:	_
CHECKED BY:		DATE:		-	
(SEE CALC PAGE	E NO	FOR ALTERNATIVE	CALCULATIONS)		

REF.						0	OUTPUT.
A.	.6	Maximum Design Forces And Bending Moment					
A.	.6.1	Individual Maximum Forces and Bending Moments					
		Design Maximum Axial compressive Force (N)			10000	1.11	
				=	13000		
		Design Maximum Shear (V _{E +})		=	0	KN	
				-	10500	kin	
		Design Maximum rolation (T _{Ed})		-	19500	kNm	
		Design Max Bending Moment (M		-	075000		
		Design Resultant Bending moment (M _{z,Ed)}		-	275000	kinm	
				-	275000	KINITI	
	^ ^	On Eviation Avial Foress and Danding Managet					
A.	.6.2	CO-Existing Axial Forces and Bending Moment					
		Design Axial Force (N _{Ed})		=	13000	kN	
		Design Shear (V _{Ed})		=	0	kN	
		Design Torsion (T _{Ed})		=	19500	kNm	
		Design Bending Moment at top in y-y axis ($M_{y,Ed}$)		=	0	kNm	
		Design Bending Moment at top in z-z axis ($M_z E_d$)		=	275000	kNm	
Refer section		Design Resultant Bending Moment at top (M _{Ed})		=	275000	kNm	
B.11.3 and		Design Bending Moment at bottom in y-y axis ($M_{v,Ed}$)		=	0	kNm	
table B.3 of		Design Bending Moment at bottom in z-z axis ($M_{z,Ed}$)		=	0	kNm	
this Sheet		Design Resultant Bending Moment at bottom (M _{Ed)}		=	0	kNm	
Α.	.6.3	Second Order Moment					
		(Max p-delta moment that co-exists with forces/moments	en	tere	ed in A.6.1	or A.6.2 above)	
		p∆ moment co-existing with forces entered in A.6.1		=	0	kNm	
		p∆ moment co-existing with forces entered in A.6.2		=	0	kNm	
A.	.6.4	Co-Existing Maximum Shear and Torsion					
		Design Shear (V _{Ed})		=	15000	kN	
		Design Torsion (T _{Ed})		=	19500	kNm	
A.	.6.5	Local Bending Moment					
		If there is a local bending moment in the pile due to e.g. v	wav	/e lo	oad insert i	here	
		Design Local Bending Moment (M _s)		=	0	kNm	
		Type of loading creating local moment		=	Concentra	ted	
A.	.6.6	Equivalent Uniform Moment Factor					
		Equivalent uniform moment factor	C _m	=	1.00		

Royal HaskoningDHV Enhancing Society Together

PROJECT TITLE: E	ENECO MV2 WINDFARM	M - MONOPILE FOUI	NDATION CONCE	PT DESIGN	
SUBJECT: SOUT	TH PROFILE - NO EROSI	ON / SCOUR - NO C	CLIC DEGRADAT	ON	Royal
PROJECT NO:	3G8375	FILE REF:		REV:	HaskoningDHV Enhancing Society Together
PREPARED BY:	СНА	DATE:	1-5-2020	REV DATE:	
CHECKED BY:		DATE:			
(SEE CALC PAGE N	10	FOR ALTERNATIVE	CALCULATIONS)		

REF.				OUTPUT.							
	в	STRUCTURA	CALCULATIONS	+							
		The following	relevilations will be based on the pile in Corrected condition								
		The following									
	B.1	Parameters f	or Structural Calculations								
		Outer Diamete	r (d) = 5000 mm								
		Wall Thicknes	s (t) = 90 mm								
		Inner Diamete	(d _i) = 4820 mm								
		Diameter/wall	thickness (d/t) = 55.56								
		Pile Area	= 1388270 mm ²								
		Moment of Ine	rtia (I) = 4.18E+12 mm ⁴								
		Radius of Gyr	tion (i) = 1736 mm								
		Elastic Section	$modulus (W_{el}) = 1.6/E+09 mm$								
		Plastic Section	$= 2.1/E + 09 \text{ mm}^{\circ}$								
		Shear Area (A	() = 883800 (1111								
	B.2	Classification	of Cross Section								
		Table 5.2 (s	heet 3 of 3): Maximum width-to-thickness ratios for compression								
RS EN 1002			parts								
1 1: 2005			Angles h								
Table 5.2											
		Refer also to "O	tstand flanges" t b Does not apply to angles in continuous contact with other								
		(see shee	2 of 3) components								
		Class	155 Section in compression								
		distribution	is tionf								
		section									
		(compression positive)	U L								
		3	$h/t \le 15\varepsilon$: $b+h \le 11.5\varepsilon$								
			2t Tubular sections								
			t-((-)) d								
		Class	Section in bending and/or compression								
		1	$\frac{d}{t} \le 50\varepsilon^2$								
		3	$\frac{d}{t} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt}$								
		NO	⁵ NOTE For $d/t > 90\varepsilon^2$ see EN 1993-1-6.								
		$\epsilon = \sqrt{235 / f_y}$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$								
			ϵ^2 1,00 0,85 0,66 0,56 0,51								
		3	$= \sqrt{235/t_y} = 0.80$	+							
		50 c ²	- 27.20								
		50 ε ²	= 52.22								
			= 67.14								
		d/t = 55.56	$\leq 90 \epsilon^2$								
		u, c 00.00									
		Type of Class	= Class 3	Class 3							
		.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,									
	-										

PROJECT TITLE:	ENECO	MV2 WI	NDFARI	M - M	ONOPIL	le fou	NDAT	ΓΙΟΝ	CON	CEPT [DESIG	N	 	6	A	-				
SUBJECT: SOU	JTH PR	OFILE - NO) EROSI	ON/	SCOUR	- NO C	YCLIC	DEG	irad	ATION	I			1	5	Ro	ya	ι	- DUV	
PROJECT NO:	BG837	5		FILE	REF:					RE	V:					Ha	SK	on g So	ciety Together	
PREPARED BY:	CHA			DATI	E: .		1-5-	2020		RE	V DAT	ΓE:								
CHECKED BY:				DATE	E: .															
(SEE CALC PAGE	NO			FOR	ALTERN	IATIVE	CALC	CULA	FION:	5)										
REF.																			OUTPUT.	
	B.3	Maxim	um Ax	ial C	ompre	ssion														
			N _{Ed}	=	1300	0 kN	1													

			N_{Ed}	=	13000) kN	l													
BS EN 1993-		The de	esign Va	alue	of the co	ompre	ssio	n fo	rce I	N _{Ed} 8	at eac	h cro	oss sectio	on shall	satisfy	:				
1-1: 2005			Neu																	
CI 6.2.4(1) P			N _{c,Rd}	≤	1.0													-		
			N _{Ed}	=	Design	Norma	al Fo	orce										N	_{Rd} inc	. yield
			N _{c,Rd}	=	Design	Resist	anc	e of	the	cros	s sect	ion f	or uniforn	n comp	oressior	n l		st	ress	reduction
					٨f												N _{Rd} (kN)	du	ie to	shear effects
BS EN 1993-			$N_{c,Rd}$	=		= 4	373	805	kN		For cl	ass	1,2 and 3	cross	section	s	437305	R	efer 6	6.2.8
1-1: 2005			N– .		⁷ M0															
Eq 6.10				=	0.03	≤	•	1.0		ОК					N _E	d/N _{Rd}	0.03			ОК
			• •c,Ra																	
	B.4	Maxim	num Ax	ial 1	Fension															
		The de	N _{Ed} esign Va	= alue	0 of the te	kN nsion	l forc	e N	_{Ed} at	eac	h cros	s se	ction sha	ll satisf	ív:			_		
BS EN 1993-			Ū																	
1-1: 2005			N _{Ed}	≤	1.0															
CI 6.2.3(1) P			N _{t,Rd}																	
			N_{Ed}	=	Design	Norma	al Fo	orce										N	_{Rd} inc	. yield
			N _{t,Rd}	=	Design	Resist	anc	e of	the	cros	s sect	ion f	or tensior	n				st	ress	reduction
					Af												N _{Rd} (kN)	dı	ie to	shear effects
BS EN 1993-			N _{t,Rd}	=	<u>γ</u> γ _{M0}	= 4	373	805	kN		(For c	lass	1,2 or 3 (cross s	ections	.)	437305	R	efer 6	6.2.8
1-1:2005	_		NEd		· MU						01/						0.00	_		014
Eq 6.6	-		N _{t,Rd}	=	0.00	2		1.0			UK				N _E	g/IN _{Rd}	0.00			UK
	B.5	Maxim	num Be	ndi	na Mom	ent														
			M_{Ed}	=	27500	0 kN	lm													
BS EN 1993-		The de	esign va	lue	of bendiı	ng mo	mer	nt M	_{Ed} at	eac	h cros	s-se	ction sha	ll satist	fy:					
1-1: 2005			Mea																	
CI 6.2.5(1) P	_		M _{c,Rd}	≤	1.0													_		
			M _{c,Rd}	=	Design	resista	ance	e of t	the c	cross	s-secti	on fo	or bending	g						
BS EN 1993-	++		Mand	=	W _{pl} f _y	<u>/</u>	for	Cla	ss 1	or ?	Cross	sec	tions							
1-1.2005			····c,Rd	-	γ _{M0}	-	101	510	55 1	51 2	0.000	500								
Fa 6 13 &						_														
Eq 6.14			M _{c,Rd}	=	W _{el, mi}	n fy	for	cla	ss 3	cros	ss sec	tions								
					γ _{MC})														
		Section	n Modul	us t	o be con	sidere	ed:	Ela	astic	Sec	tion N	lodu	lus							
			M _{c,Rd}	=	52730	7 kN	lm													
			M _{Ed}	-	0.52	<		1.0		٥ĸ										OK
			M _{c,Rd}	-	0.52		⊢	1.0												

	BC007	5		EUT	DEL.						DE//-				-			Ha	ask	on	ing	DH	V
NOJECT NU.	0.14	5			- NLF.			4	000-		- INE V :				-			Enk	ancin	g Soo	tiety	logeti	her
REPARED BY:	CHA			DA	TE:			1-5-2	2020		REV I	DATE:			-								
HECKED BY:				DA	TE:						_												
SEE CALC PAGE	NO			FOF	R ALTE	RNAT	IVE C	CALC	ULAT	ions)													
REF.																					OUTF	UT.	
	B.6	Maxim	um Sh	ear																			
			V_{Ed}	=	15	000	kN																
S EN 1993-		The de	sign va	alue	of she	ar V _l	_{Ed} at	eac	h cro	oss-se	ection	shall s	atisfy	:									
-1: 2005			V _{Ed}																				
CI 6.2.6(1) P			V _{c,Rd}	≤	1	.0																	
		The de	sian pl	astic	shea	r res	istan	се о	ofas	ectior	n mav	be us	ed in	elasti	desic	n une	der E(C3					
			5 -								,							-					
S EN 1993-		Elastic	shear	verif	icatio	n is c	onse	ervat	ive a	and ex	clude	s parti	al pla	stic s	near di	stribu	ition v	vhic	h is				
		permitt	ed in e	lasti	c desi	gn. T	here	fore	elas	stic sh	ear ve	rificat	ion sl	nould	only be	e carr	ied ou	ut w	here	\square			
0.2.0(4) P			moatio				~' v c	,Rd a		any	.o oqui		5.17)	Jan	SUDE		meu.						
			V _{c,Rd}	=	V _{pl.F}	d =	<u>A</u> \	/(fy/. γ	√ 3)	(P	lastic	Shear	Resi	stanc	e)								
								4 M0															
lefer section			A _v	=	She	ar Ai	ea	=	2A/π	ι													
.1 of this			V . - .	=	883	800	mn kN	۱ ^۲															
illeet			♥ pl.Rd	-	100	755																	
				=	0.09) ≤	1	.0														OK	
			v _{c,Rd}																				
	B.7	Maxim	um To	rsio	n																		
3S EN 1993-		The de	sign va	alue	of the	torsi	on T	_{Ed} at	t eac	h cro	ss-sec	tion s	hall s	atisfy									
-1: 2005			Ŧ																				
(6.27(1))																							
			T _{Rd}	≤	1																		
			T _{Rd}	≤	1																		
			$\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$	≤ =	1 Desig	gn tor	sion	al re	sista	ance o	of the c	ross	sectio	n									
			T _{Rd} T _{Rd} T _{Ed}	≤ = =	1 Desig 19	gn tor 500	sion kNr	al re m	esista	ance d	of the c	ross	sectio	n									
		The res	T _{Rd} T _{Rd} T _{Ed}	≤ = =	1 Desig 19 ad of a	gn tor 500 circu	sion kNr	al re m	esista w se	ance o	of the c shall b	ross s e bas	sectic ed or	n the c	esign	shear	strer	ngth	-				
		The res Therefo	T _{Rd} T _{Rd} T _{Ed} sistanc	≤ = = e T _R eck s	1 Desig 19 ad of a	gn tor 500 circu	sion kNr Ilar h	al re m iollov	esista w se rsion	ance of ction	of the c shall b ss thar	ross s e bas shea	sectic ed or r stre	n the c ngth o	esign alcula	sheai ted ir	strer B.6 a	ngth	/e.				
		The res Therefo	T _{Rd} T _{Rd} T _{Ed} sistanc	≤ = = e T _R eck s	1 Desig 19 ad of a shear	gn tor 500 circu	sion kNr Ilar h ed b	al re m iollov iy tor	esista w se rsion	ction	of the o shall b is than	ross s e bas shea	sectioned or r stre	n the c ngth (esign alcula	sheai ted ir	strer B.6 a	ngth abov	/e.				
		The res	$\frac{I_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} sistance ore che $\tau_{t,Ed}$	≤ = e T _R eck s	1 Desi 19 ad of a shear	gn tor 500 circu nduc	sion kNr Ilar h ed b	al re m nollow by tor	esista w se rsion	ance of the state	of the o shall b s than to St.	ross s e bas shea Venar	sectic ed or r stre nt tors	n the c ngth o ion	esign alcula	sheai ted ir	strer B.6 a	ngth	/e.				
		The rea	$\frac{I_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} sistanc ore che $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$	 = = = = = 	1 Design and of a shear D	gn tor 500 circu induc	sion kNr llar h ed b	al re m oollov y tor ear s <u>te:</u>	sista w se rsion tress	ction is les due circula	of the c shall b s than to St.	ross s e bas shea venar effec	ed or r stre nt tors	n the c ngth o ion	esign alcula	sheai ted ir	strer B.6 a	ngth abov	/e. glecte	d			
		The res	$\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Ed} sistancore che	<pre> </pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <pre> <td>1 Desig 19 ad of a shear D</td><td>gn tor 500 nduc esigr</td><td>sion kNr Ilar h ed b</td><td>al re m ollow y tor ear s <u>te:</u></td><td>sista w se rsion tress For (T_w</td><td>ction is les s due circula</td><td>of the o shall b s thar to St. ar tube 0). Th</td><td>ross s e bas shea v/enar effec erefor</td><td>ed or r stre ht tors t of to e T_{Ed}</td><td>n the c ngth o ion orsion = $T_{t,E}$</td><td>esign alcula al warp</td><td>shear ted ir</td><td>strer B.6 a</td><td>ngth abov</td><td>/e. glecte</td><td>d</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre></pre>	1 Desig 19 ad of a shear D	gn tor 500 nduc esigr	sion kNr Ilar h ed b	al re m ollow y tor ear s <u>te:</u>	sista w se rsion tress For (T _w	ction is les s due circula	of the o shall b s thar to St. ar tube 0). Th	ross s e bas shea v/enar effec erefor	ed or r stre ht tors t of to e T _{Ed}	n the c ngth o ion orsion = $T_{t,E}$	esign alcula al warp	shear ted ir	strer B.6 a	ngth abov	/e. glecte	d			
		The res Therefore	$\frac{I_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} sistancore che $T_{t,Ed}$ $T_{t,Ed}$	<pre></pre>	1 Desig ad of a shear $T_{t,E}$ C	gn tor 500 circu nduc esigr id	sion kNr Ilar h ed b n she <u>Not</u>	al re m ollov y tor ear s <u>te:</u> ulus	w se rsion tress (T _w Con	ction is les circula v,Ed =	of the o shall b ss thar to St. ar tube 0). Th	ross s e bas shea v/enar effec erefor	ed or r stre nt tors t of to e T _{Ed}	the c ngth o ion $T_{t,E}$	esign alcula al warp	shear ted in	strer B.6 a	ngth abov	/ē. glecte	d			
		The res Therefore	$\frac{I_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} sistance ore che $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ C C	<pre> </pre>	1 Desig 19: R_d of a shear $T_{t,E}$ C Torsi 2 x	gn tor 500 circu induc esign id onal W _{el}	sion kNr Ilar h n she <u>Not</u>	al re m oollov y tor ear s <u>te:</u>	w se rsion tress For (T _w Con	ction is les s due circula v,Ed =	of the c shall b to St. ar tube 0). Th	ross s e bas shea v/enar effec erefor	ed or r stre nt tors t of to e T _{Ed}	n the c ngth o vision $T_{t,E}$	esign alcula al warp	shear ted ir	strer B.6 a	ngth abov	/e.	d			
		The res Therefore Where	$\frac{I_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} sistancore che $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ C C C C	 = =	1 Desig 19: t_{d} of a bhear $T_{t,E}$ C Torsi 2 x 2 x 3,35	gn tor 500 induce esign dd onal W _{el} 1. 5+09	sion kNr llar h ed b n she <u>Not</u> Mod	al re m ollov y tor ear s <u>te:</u> ulus	sista w se rsion tress (T _w Con	ance c ction i is les s due circula v,Ed = istant	of the c shall b to St. ar tube 0). Th	ross s e bas shea effec erefor	ed or r stre ht tors t of to e T _{Ed}	n ngth o iion = T _{t,E}	esign alcula al warp	shear ted ir	strer B.6 a	ngth abov	/e.	d			
		The res Therefore Where	$\frac{I_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} sistancore cheore che	<pre> </pre>	1 Designed and a constraint of a constraint	gn tor 500 circu esign dd 000 circu esign dd 1. 1. 1. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2.	sion kNr llar h ed b n she <u>Not</u> Mod	al re m nollov y tor ear s te: ulus	w se rsion tress For (T _w Con	ction is les s due circula v,Ed =	of the of shall b ss thar to St. ar tube 0). Th	ross s e bas shea v/enar effec erefor	ed or r stre ht tors t of to e T _{Ed}	n ngth (ion yrsion = T _{t,E}	esign alcula al warı	shear ted ir	strer B.6 a	ngth abov	/e.	d			
		The res Therefore Where	$\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T _{Rd} T _{Ed} sistanc ore che $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ C C C C C $\tau_{t,Ed}$	<pre></pre>	$\frac{1}{100}$ $\frac{1}$	gn tor 500 circu essign cid 000 circu essign cid 1.1 1.1 24	sion kNr llar h ed b n she <u>Not</u> 67E+	al re m oollow y tor ear s <u>te:</u> ulus +09	w se rsion tress For (T _w Con	ance c ction i is les s due circula v,Ed = istant	of the c shall b to St. ar tube 0). Th	ross s e bas shea effec erefor	sectic ed or r stre t of to e T_{Ed}	n the c ngth c ion $rsion = T_{t,E}$	esign alcula al warp	ted in	strer B.6 a	ngth abov	glecte	d			
		The rest Therefore Where	$\frac{I_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} sistancorre che $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ C C C C C $\tau_{t,Ed}$ dut	 = =	1 Desig 19: R_d of a shear $T_{t,E}$ C Torsi 2 x 3.35 58 torsio	gn tor 500 circu esign dd 0nal W _{el} 1.1 E+09 24 n =	sion kNr llar h ed b n she <u>Not</u> 67E-1 kN/ T _t	al re m nollov yy tor ear s te: +09	w se rsion tress For (T _w Con	ction is les circula v,Ed = istant	shall b ss thar to St. ar tube 0). Th	ross s e bas shea v/enar effec erefor	sectic ed or r stre t of to e T_{Ed}	n ngth (ion rrsion = T _{t,E}	esign alcula	sheal ted ir	strer B.6 a	ngth abov	glecte	d			
		The res Therefore Where	$\frac{I_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} sistancore che $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ C C C C $\tau_{t,Ed}$ due	<pre></pre>	1 Desig 19: d d of a shear C Torsi 2 x 3.35 58 torsio	gn tor 500 circu eesigr d d u u esigr 1.1 1.1 24 n =	sion kNr llar h ed b Nod Mod 67E-1 KN/ Tt	al re m ollow y tor ear s te: ulus +09 'm ² .Ed	w se rsion tress For (T _w Con	ance c ction i is less s due v,Ed = Shear x (of the of shall b as thar to St. ar tube 0). Th 0). Th Area 2.8838	ross s e bas shea effec erefor	ed or r stre ht tors t of to e T _{Ed}	n ngth o ion orsion = T _{t,E}	esign alcula al warp	ted in	strer B.6 a	ngth abov	ye.	d			
		The res Therefore Where	$\frac{I_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} sistancorre che $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ C C C C C $\tau_{t,Ed}$ due	<pre></pre>	$\frac{1}{100}$ $\frac{1}$	gn tor 500 circu esign dd 0nal W _{el} 1.1 E+09 24 n = = =	sion kNr llar h ed b n she <u>Not</u> 67E+	al re m oollov y tor ear s te: ulus +09 /m ² .Ed 5824 5148	w se rsion tress (T _w Con	ance c ction is les s due circula s due s due s due s due s due s due s due circula s due s due circula s due s d	shall b ss thar to St. ar tube 0). Th Area D.8838	e bas shea v/enar effec erefor	sectic ed or r stre t of to e T_{Ed}	n ngth (ion rrsion = T _{t,E}	esign alcula	sheal ted ir	an be	ngth abov	glecte	d			
		The res Therefore Where	$\frac{I_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} sistanc ore che $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ C C C C $\tau_{t,Ed}$ due V_{Ed}	<pre></pre>	1 Desig 19: d of a shear C $T_{t,E}$ C C Torsi 2 x 2 x 3.35 58 torsio	gn tor 500 circu eesigr d d 000al 1.1 1.1 24 1.2 24 n = 24 n = 24 .0	sion kNr llar h ed b Not Modu 67E-1 KN/ Tt ;	al re m ollow y tor ear s te: ulus +09 'm ² .Ed 5824	w se rsion tress For (T _w Con	ance c ction i is less s due circula v,Ed = stant Shear x (of the of sshall b as thar to St. ar tube 0). Th Area 2.8838	ross s e bas shea effec erefor	ed or r stre ht tors t of to e T _{Ed}	n ngth o ion orsion = T _{LE}	esign alcula al warp	bing c	strer B.6 a	ngth abov	ye.	d			
		The res Therefore Where	$\frac{I_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} sistance ore chean $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ C	≤ = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	1 Designed of a lease of a lea	gn tor 500 circu eesign d d unal W _{el} 1.1 E+09 224 n = = = 24	sion kNr llar h ed b n she <u>Not</u> 67E+ kN/ T _t	al re m ollow y tor ear s te: ulus +09 (m ² .Ed 5824	w se rsion tress For (T _w Con	ance c ction is les circula circula stant Shear x = 0	of the of shall b ss thar to St. ar tube 0). Th Area D.8838	ross s e bas shea effec erefor	section r stree t of to e T _{Ed}	n ngth (ion rrsion = T _{t,E}	esign alcula	shear ted ir	an be	ngth abov	glecte	d			

PROJECT TITLE: ENECO MV2 WI	NDFARM - MONOPILE FOUND	ATION CONCEPT DESIGN	
SUBJECT: SOUTH PROFILE - N	O EROSION / SCOUR - NO CYCL	IC DEGRADATION	Royal
PROJECT NO: BG8375	FILE REF:	REV:	HaskoningDHV Enhancing Society Together

CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____ (SEE CALC PAGE NO ______ FOR ALTERNATIVE CALCULATIONS)

 PREPARED BY:
 CHA
 DATE:
 1-5-2020
 REV DATE:

BS EN 1992- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.7(9) For combined shear force and torsional moment the plastic shear resistance accounting for torsional effects should be reduced from $V_{k,mb}$ to $V_{k,T,Re}$ and the design shear force should satisfy: SS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.7(9) SS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4) $V_{k1,Tkl} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{T_{kell}}{(T_k^{T})Y_{k1,Tkl}} \end{bmatrix}_{k,Re}$ $\frac{V_{k2}}{V_{k1,Tkl}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{T_{kell}}{(T_k^{T})Y_{k1,Tkl}} \end{bmatrix}_{k,Re}$ $\frac{V_{k1}}{V_{k1,Tkl}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{T_{kell}}{(T_k^{T})Y_{k1,Tkl}} \end{bmatrix}_{k,Re}$ $\frac{V_{k1}}{V_{k1,Tkl}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{T_{k2}}{(T_k^{T})Y_{k1,Tkl}} \end{bmatrix}_{k,Re}$ $\frac{V_{k1,Tkl}}{V_{k1,Tkl}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{T_{k1,Kl}}{T_{k1,Kl}} \end{bmatrix}_{k,Re}$ $\frac{V_{k1,Tkl}}{T_{k1,Tkl}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{T_{k1,Kl}}{T_{k1,Kl}} \end{bmatrix}_{k,Re}$ $\frac{V_{k1,Tkl}}{T_{k1,Tkl}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{T_{k1,Kl}}{T_{k1,Kl}} \end{bmatrix}_{k,Re}$ $\frac{V_{k1,Tkl}$	DEE																							IT	
Part in the probability of the	REF. BS EN 1993- B 8	2	Torsio	n and	Sho	ar																	OUTP	01.	
For combined shear force and torsional moment the plastic chear resistance accounting for torsional effects a hould be reduced from $V_{p,red}$ by $V_{p,1,Re}$ and the design shear force should satisfy: $V_{p,1,Re} = 1 0$ $V_{p,1,Re} = 0.10 \le 1.0$ $V_{p,1,Re} = 0.10 \le 1.0$ $V_{e,1} = 1000 \text{ k/m}$ $V_{e,1,Re} = 1000 \text{ k/m}$ $V_{e,1} = 10000 \text{ k/m}$ $V_{e,1} = 100000 \text{ k/m}$ $V_{e,1} = 10000000000000000000000000000000000$	1-1·2005	,	101310																						
$ \begin{array}{c} Cl = 2 + (y) \\ \hline \label{eq:constraint} \\ \hline eq:constrain$	C = 2.7(0)		For on	mhinad	loho	or foro	0.01	d tor	niona	d mo	mon	t tha	olocti	o obo	or roo	ioton			unting	, for	toroid	anal			
BS EN 1993- 11: 2005 or 6 25 & 6.29 $V_{\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}} \leq 1.0$ $T_{ee} = 19500 \text{ kMm}$ $T_{ted} = 5824 \text{ kMm}^{*}$ $T_{ted} = 5824 \text{ kMm}^{*}$ $V_{\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}} = 103500 \text{ kMm}$ $V_{\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}} = 103505 \text{ kMm}$ $V_{\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}} = 100733 \text{ kM}$ $V_{\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}} = 0.52 \text{ kM}$ $V_{\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}} = 0.52 \text{ s} 1.0 \text{ KM}$ $V_{\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}} = 0.52 \text{ s} 1.0 \text{ KM}$ $V_{\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}} = 0.52 \text{ s} 1.0 \text{ KM}$ V_{μ	CI 0.2.7(9)		effects	should	l srie I be	reduce	e ar d fro	n Ula m V.	t nou	a 1110 ∩ V_i	пеп	and t	he de	sian	shear	force	e shr	ould	satis	fv ·	เปราต	Jiai			
BS EN 1993- 14:2005 96.625.8.629 $V_{RT,Ret} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{r_{LER}}{(t_{1}, v_{1})_{Y_{1}}} \\ V_{RT,Ret} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{r_{LER}}{(t_{1}, v_{1})_{Y_{$			oncoto	onoure		ouuoo		μ, sin γ	n, r a •	e • pi	, I .Ra	ana e	ne de	Joigin	onour	1010		Julu	outio	· y .					
$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \in \mathbf{P} \ \mathbf{P} $				V _{Ed}																					
$\frac{1-1}{1000} \frac{1}{2005} \frac{1}{100} $	BS EN 1993-		V	pl,T,Rd	≤	1.0																			
$V_{0,1,T,Rd} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{(t_{j} + \sqrt{t_{0,1}} + \sqrt{t_{0,1}}$	1-1:2005					1	$ au_{\mathrm{t,E}}$	Ed																	
$\frac{1}{112005} = \frac{1}{1000} \text{ k/m} = \frac{1}{100} \text$	eq 0.20 & 0.20			V _{pl,T.R}	d =	$\int \frac{1}{(f_y)}$	/√3)/ ₇ M0	Vpl,F	٦d															
$T_{cd} = 19500 \text{ k/m}$ $T_{cd} = 19500 \text{ k/m}$ $T_{cd} = 5624 \text{ k/lm}$ $T_{cd} = 5624 \text{ k/lm}$ $T_{cd} = 19500 \text{ k/m}$ $V_{pl,rd} = 160733 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{pl,rd} = 10733 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{pl,rd} = 155555 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{cd} = 15000 \text{ k/m}$ $V_{pl,rd} = 155555 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{cd} = 15000 \text{ k/m}$ $V_{bd} = 19500 \text{ k/m}$ $V_{cd} = 19500 \text{ k/m}$ $V_{bd} = 275000 \text{ k/m}$ $V_{bd} = 275000 \text{ k/m}$ $V_{bd} = 160733 \text{ k/m}$ $V_{bd} = 165585 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{bd} = 165785 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{bd} = 16773 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{bd} = 165785 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{bd} = 16773 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{bd} = 165785 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{bd} = 160733 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{bd} = 165785 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{bd} = 160733 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{bd} = 16073 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{$								WIO																	
$T_{LEG} = T_{LEG} + T_{L$				T _{Ed}	=	195	00	kNm	۱																
$\frac{1}{112205} = \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{100} \frac{1}{100$				$\tau_{t,\text{Ed}}$	=	T _{t,Ed}																			
$T_{LEd} = 5624 \text{ k/lm}^{-1}$ $T_{LEd} = 19500 \text{ k/lm}^{-1}$ $Q_{R}Rd = 19500 \text{ k/lm}^{-1}$ $V_{R}Rd = 160733 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{R}Rd = 155585 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{R}Rd = 155585 \text{ k/l}$ $V_{R}Rd = 1000 \text{ k/l}$ $T_{L}Rd = 10000 \text{ k/l}$ $T_{L}Rd = 10$																									
$ \frac{1}{12205} = \frac{1}{12205} \frac$				$\tau_{t,\text{Ed}}$	=	582	24	kN/r	n-																
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				$T_{t,Ed}$	=	195	00	kNm	۱																
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				Av	=	8838	300	mmʻ	2																
$V_{kf} = 15585 \text{ kN} $ $V_{eff} = 15585 \text{ kN} $ $V_{eff} = 1500 \text{ kN} $ $V_{eff} = 0.10 \text{ s} 1.0$ $V_{eff} = 0 \text{ kN} $ $V_{eff} = 0 \text{ kN} $ $V_{eff} = 19500 \text{ kNm} $ $V_{eff} = 100733 \text{ kN} $ V_{eff}				V _{pl.Rd}	=	1607	733	kN																	
$\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 15000 \text{ kN}$ BS EN 1993 1-1: 2005 1 $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 0.10 \le 1.0$ BS EN 1993 1-1: 2005 1 $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 19500 \text{ kNm}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 19500 \text{ kNm}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,Rd}} = 19500 \text{ kNm}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,Rd}} = 19500 \text{ kNm}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,Rd}} = 10733 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Fd}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 15535 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 15535 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 15535 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 10733 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 10733 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 105733 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 10733 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 105733 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 105733 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 10733 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 105733 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 10733 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{Ed}}$				V _{pl,T.R}	= b	1555	585	kN																	
BS EN 1993 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8 B.9 Bonding and Shear 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8 Ved = 0 KN T _{LEd} = 0 KN T _{LEd} = 19500 KNm T _{LEd} = 5824 KNm ² M _{Ed} = 275000 KNm V _{pLTRd} = 160733 KN V _{pLTRd} = 160733 KN V _{pLTRd} = 15585 KN Assuming some torsion is present. V _{pLTRd} will be more onerous than V _{pLRd} . Hence check effect of V _{pLTRd} on moment resistance first: 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4) Reduced Yield Strength = (1-0) f _y 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4) Design Yield Strength for bending in shear Design Resistance remains the same. M _{ERd} = 0.52 ≤ 1.0 M _{ERd} = 527307 KNm M _{ERd} = 527307 KNm				V _{Ed}	=	150	00	kN																	
$\frac{V_{ed}}{V_{\mu,T,Rd}} = 0.10 \le 1.0$ BS EN 1993 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8 B.9 Bending and Shear 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8 Vest = 0 KN T _{1,Ed} = 19500 KNm T _{1,Ed} = 5824 KN/m ² M _{Ed} = 275000 KNm V _{µLT,Rd} = 160733 KN V _{µLT,Rd} = 160733 KN V _{µLT,Rd} = 155585 KN Assuming some torsion is present, V _{µLT,Rd} will be more onerous than V _{µ,Rd} . Hence check effect of V _{µLT,Rd} = 155585 KN Assuming some torsion is present, V _{µLT,Rd} will be more onerous than V _{µ,Rd} . Hence check effect of V _{µLT,Rd} = 155585 KN Assuming some torsion is present, V _{µLT,Rd} will be more onerous than V _{µ,Rd} . Hence check effect of V _{µLT,Rd} = 155585 KN Assuming some torsion is present, V _{µLT,Rd} will be more onerous than V _{µ,Rd} . Hence check effect of V _{µLT,Rd} No effect on the Moment Resistance needs to be considered. CI 6.2.8(2) CI 6.2.8(3)(4) Note: If there is no torsion present then V _{µ,Rd} = V _{µ,LRd} and the above conclusion regarding effect on moment resistance remains the same. Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear M _{E,Rd} = 0.52 ≤ 1.0 M _{E,Rd} = 527307 KNm																									
BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8 BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8 BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8 BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(2) BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(2) CI 6.2.8(2) CI 6.2.8(3)(4) BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4) BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4) CI 6: 2.8(3)(4) BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4) CI 6: 2.8(3)(4) CI			-	V _{Ed}	=	0 10	<	1 (n															OK	
BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8 V_{Ed} = 0 KN V_{Ed} = 0 KN $T_{1.Ed}$ = 19500 KNm $T_{1.Ed}$ = 275000 KNm V_{pLRd} = 160733 KN V_{pLRd} = 160743 KN V_{pLRd} = 160743 KN V_{pLRd} = 160753 KN V_{pLRd} = 160754 KN V_{pLRd} = 0.52 \leq 1.0			V	pl, T, Rd		0.110	-																		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	BS EN 1993- B		Bendi	na and	She	ar																			
$V_{Ed} = 0 kN$ $T_{LEd} = 19500 kNm$ $T_{LEd} = 5824 kN/m^2$ $M_{Ed} = 275000 kNm$ $V_{pkRd} = 160733 kN$ $V_{pkRd} = 165733 kN$ $V_{pkRd} = 155855 kN$ $Assuming some torsion is present, V_{pkTRd} will be more onerous than V_{pkRd}. Hence check effect$ $G = 28(2)$ $V_{Ed} \leq V_{pkTRd} = 165585 kN$ $Reduced Yield Strength = (1-p) f_y$ $Reduced Yield Strength = (1-p) f_y$ $Reduced Yield Strength = (1-p) f_y$ $C = 2V_{Ed} \leq V_{pkT,Rd} = 10580 kNm^2$ $V_{pkTRd} = 105800 kNm^2$ $V_{pkRd} = 105800 kNm^2$ $V_{pkRd} = 0.52 \leq 1.0$ OK	1-1· 2005		Denan	ing and																					
$\frac{1}{1 + 2} = \frac{1}{1 + 2} + $	CI 6.2.8			Ved	=	0		kN																	
$\frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{12} $	0.0.2.0				=	195	00	kNm	1																
				Tura	=	582	24	kN/r	n ²																
$\frac{W_{pl,Rd}}{V_{pl,Rd}} = 160733 \text{ kN}$ $V_{pl,Rd} = 160733 \text{ kN}$ $V_{pl,Rd} = 155855 \text{ kN}$ Assuming some torsion is present, $V_{pl,Rd}$ will be more onerous than $V_{pl,Rd}$. Hence check effect $\frac{W_{pl,Rd}}{V_{pl,Rd}} = 155855 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{W_{pl,Rd}}{V_{pl,Rd}} = 10573 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{W_{pl,Rd}}{V_{pl,Rd}} = 10572 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{W_{pl,Rd}}{W_{pl,Rd}} = 10572 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{W_{pl,Rd}}{W_{pl,Rd}} = 0.52 \text{ k} 1.0 $ $\frac{W_{pl,Rd}}{W_{pl,Rd}} = 10.52 \text{ k} 1.0 $ $\frac{W_{pl,Rd}}{W_{pl,Rd}} = 0.52 \text{ k} 1.0 $ $\frac{W_{pl,Rd}}{W_{pl,Rd}} = 0.52 \text{ k} 1.0 $				Vt,Ed	-	2750		kNm))																
$\frac{V_{p LRd} = 100733 \text{ kN}}{V_{p LRd} = 155585 \text{ kN}}$ Assuming some torsion is present, $V_{p LRd}$ will be more onerous than $V_{p Rd}$. Hence check effect $\frac{V_{p LRd}}{V_{p LRd}} = 155585 \text{ kN}$ Assuming some torsion is present, $V_{p LRd}$ will be more onerous than $V_{p Rd}$. Hence check effect $\frac{V_{p LRd}}{V_{p LRd}} = 100733 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{V_{p LRd}}{V_{$				WEd	-	1607	722		•																
$V_{pl,T,Rd} = 0.05265 \text{ KN}$ Assuming some torsion is present, $V_{pl,T,Rd}$ will be more onerous than $V_{pl,Rd}$. Hence check effect $S E N 1993-11.2005$ $C I 6.2.8(2)$ $2 V_{Ed} \leq V_{pl,T,Rd} \text{ No effect on the Moment resistance needs to be considered.}$ $S E N 1993-11.1 2005$ $C I 6.2.8(3)(4)$ $I = 0.52 + 0.$				V pl,Rd	-	1007	55																		
Assuming some torsion is present, $V_{pl,T,Rd}$ will be more onerous than $V_{pl,Rd}$. Hence check effect SS EN 1993- 1.1: 2005 (If V_{ed} is less than half $V_{pl,T,Rd}$ then no reduction in moment resistance needs to be considered. (I 6.2.8(2)) Reduced Yield Strength = (1- ρ) fy 1.1: 2005 (I 6.2.8(3)(4) Note: If there is no torsion present then $V_{pl,Rd} = V_{pl,T,Rd}$ and the above conclusion regarding effect on moment resistance of the cross section for bending in shear $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ KNm $M_{c,Rd} = 0.52 \le 1.0$ $M_{c,Rd} = 0.52$				Vpl,T.Ro	d —	1555	000	KIN																	
Assuming some torsion is present, $v_{p,IT,Rd}$ will be more onerous than $v_{p,Rd}$. Hence check effect BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 If V_{Ed} is less than half $V_{p,I,Rd}$ then no reduction in moment resistance needs to be considered. 2 $V_{Ed} \leq V_{p,I,Rd}$ No effect on the Moment Resistance. Ignore boxed section below No reduction in moment Reduced Yield Strength = (1-p) fy 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4) Reduced Yield Strength or bending in shear = 315 N/mm ² Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ kNm More down on the moment of the cross section for bending in shear $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ kNm			•																						
BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(2) BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(2) BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4) BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4) BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4) CI 6.2.8(3)(4) BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4) BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4)			Assum	ing sor	ne to	orsion i	is pr	esent	., V _{pl,}	T,Rd V	VIII De	e mor	e one	erous	than	V _{pl,Rd}	. Her	nce	cnec	кет	ect				
1.1: 2005 (I 6.2.8(2) $2 V_{Ed} \le V_{p T,Rd}$ then no reduction in moment resistance needs to be considered. $2 V_{Ed} \le V_{p T,Rd}$ No effect on the Moment Resistance. Ignore boxed section below No reduction in moment resistance req'd 1.1: 2005 (I 6.2.8(3)(4) $p = (\frac{2V_{Ed}}{V_{p T,Rd}} - 1)^2$ (Where torsion is present. See note below) Note: If there is no torsion present then $V_{p Rd} = V_{p T,Rd}$ and the above conclusion regarding effect on moment resistance remains the same. Design Yield Strength for bending in shear = 315 N/mm ² Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ kNm $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ kNm	BS EN 1993-		of V _{pl,T,}	_{,Rd} on n	nom	ent res	istai	nce fir	rst:																
$\frac{Cl 6.2.8(2)}{2 V_{Ed}} \leq V_{pl,T,Rd} \text{ No effect on the Moment Resistance. Ignore boxed section below} \text{ No reduction in moment resistance reg} Moment Resistance. Ignore boxed section below resistance reg} Moment Resistance Ignore boxed section below resistance reg} Moment Resistance reg Moment Resistance reg} Moment Resistance reg Moment Resistance remains the same. In the same resistance of the cross section for bending in shear in the same resistance of the cross section for bending in shear in the same resistance remains the same resistance of the cross section for bending in shear in the same resistance remains the same resistance of the cross section for bending in shear in the resistance remains the same resistance $	1-1: 2005		lf V _{Ed} is	s less t	han	half V _p	I,T,Rd	then	no r	educ	tion	in mo	ment	resis	tance	e nee	ds to	be	cons	idere	ed.				
$\frac{2 V_{Ed}}{2 V_{Ed}} \le V_{pl,T,Rd}$ No reflect on the Moment Resistance. Ignore boxed section below No reduction in moment resistance req'd Tesistance remains the same. Tesist	CI 6.2.8(2)																								
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			2 ۱	V _{Ed} ≤	V _{pl,}	T,Rd	No	o effec	ct on	the I	Mom	ent R	esista	ance.	Ignor	e bo	xed s	secti	on be	elow	,		No r	eductio	on in
BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005 CI 6.2.8(3)(4) Note: If there is no torsion present then $V_{pl,T,Rd} = V_{pl,T,Rd}$ and the above conclusion regarding effect on moment resistance remains the same. Design Yield Strength for bending in shear = 315 N/mm ² Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear = 315 N/mm ² Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear = 527307 kNm $M_{c,Rd} = 527307 kNm$		17							- + -	- + -													n	nomen	t
1-1: 2005 Cl 6.2.8(3)(4) $\rho = (\frac{2V_{Ed}}{V_{p,T,Rd}} - 1)^2$ (Where torsion is present. See note below) Note: If there is no torsion present then $V_{p,LRd} = V_{p,LT,Rd}$ and the above conclusion regarding effect on moment resistance remains the same. Design Yield Strength for bending in shear = 315 N/mm ² Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ kNm $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ kNm $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ kNm	BS EN 1993-	į.	Reduc	ed Yiel	d Str	ength	=	(1-	·ρ) f	/													resis	tance i	ed.q
CI 6.2.8(3)(4) $\rho = (\frac{2\sqrt{Ed}}{V_{p ,T,Rd}} - 1)^2$ (Where torsion is present. See note below) 1 Note: If there is no torsion present then $V_{p ,Rd} = V_{p ,T,Rd}$ and the above conclusion regarding effect 1 on moment resistance remains the same. 1 1 Design Yield Strength for bending in shear = 315 N/mm ² Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear = 527307 KNm $\frac{M_{Ed}}{M_{c,Rd}}$ = 0.52 ≤ 1.0 OK	1-1: 2005	i.						2\																	
Note: If there is no torsion present then $V_{pl,Rd} = V_{pl,T,Rd}$ and the above conclusion regarding effect on moment resistance remains the same. Design Yield Strength for bending in shear = 315 N/mm ² Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ kNm $M_{c,Rd} = 0.52 \le 1.0$	Cl 6.2.8(3)(4)	i.				ρ	=	$\left(\frac{2}{V}\right)$	Ed	-1)2		(Wh	ere to	orsion	is pre	esent	. See	e no	te be	low)					
Note: If there is no torsion present then $V_{pl,Rd} = V_{pl,T,Rd}$ and the above conclusion regarding effect on moment resistance remains the same. Design Yield Strength for bending in shear = 315 N/mm ² Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear = 527307 kNm $\frac{M_{Ed}}{M_{c,Rd}} = 0.52 \leq 1.0$		i			L			* pi,	1,Rd												11				
Note: If there is no torsion present then $V_{pl,Rd} = V_{pl,T,Rd}$ and the above conclusion regarding effect on moment resistance remains the same. Design Yield Strength for bending in shear = 315 N/mm ² Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ kNm $M_{c,Rd} = 0.52 \le 1.0$																									
Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the same. Image: Stance remains the sam			Note: I	f there	is no	o torsio	n pr	esent	ther	ו V _{pl,F}	_{عط} = ۱	V _{pl,T,R}	_d and	the a	bove	conc	lusio	n re	gardi	ing e	effect				
Design Yield Strength for bending in shear = 315 N/mm ² Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ kNm $\frac{M_{Ed}}{M_{c,Rd}} = 0.52 \le 1.0$			on mor	ment re	esista	ance re	emai	ins the	e sar	ne.															
Design Yield Strength for bending in shear = 315 N/mm ² Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ kNm $\frac{M_{Ed}}{M_{c,Rd}} = 0.52 \le 1.0$																									
Design Yield Strength for bending in shear = 315 N/mm ² Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear $M_{c,Rd}$ = 527307 kNm M_{Ed} = 0.52 \leq 1.0 OK																									
Design Resistance of the cross section for bending in shear $M_{c,Rd} = 527307$ kNm $\frac{M_{Ed}}{M_{c,Rd}} = 0.52 \le 1.0$			Desian	Yield :	Strer	ngth fo	r bei	ndina	in sł	near	=	3	15	N/m	m ²										
$\frac{M_{\text{Ed}}}{M_{c,\text{Rd}}} = 0.52 \le 1.0$ $M_{c,\text{Rd}} = 527307 \text{ kNm}$			Dociar	Desi-	tone	of #							Ì												
$\frac{M_{Ed}}{M_{c,Rd}} = 0.52 \le 1.0$			section	i rtesisi i for he	ndin	e oi the a in sh	= cro ear	155	N	1 _{c,Rd}	=	52	7307	kNr	n							\square			
$\frac{M_{Ed}}{M_{c,Rd}} = 0.52 \leq 1.0$						on				T															
			ME	d		0 52	<	1 (h															OK	
			M _{c,F}	Rd –				1.0	-																
																						\square			

PROJECT TITLE:	ENECO	MV2 W	VINDFARI	M - 1	MONOPIL	E FOL	INDAT	FION C	0	NCEPT	DESIGN			L	
SUBJECT: SO	UTH PRC	TH PROFILE - NO EROSION / SCOUR - NO CYCLIC DEGRADATION									🍹	Royal			
PROJECT NO:	BG8375	5		FILI	E REF:					RE	:V:			Hasko Enhancing	NINGDHV Society Together
PREPARED BY:	CHA			DA	TE:		1-5-	2020		RE	V DATE	:			
CHECKED BY:				DA	TE:										
(SEE CALC PAGE	NO			FO	R ALTERN	IATIVE	CALC	ULATI	ON	1S)					
REF.															OUTPUT.
BS EN 1993-	B.10	Bend	ing, She	ear a	and Axia	al Foi	ce								
CI 6.2.10	B.10.1	Effec	t of She	ar F	orce										
		Туре	of Class	=	Clas	ss 3	NI								
			v _{Ed} V _{pl,Rd}	=	16073	83 k	N								
			P.9												
		Wher	e the sh	ear	force is l	ess tł	nan h	alf the	e pl	lastic s	shear r	esistar	ice its effect on the	bending and	
		axial f	force res	sista	nce ma	y be r	egleo	cted.							
		2	V _{Ed} ≤	Vp	ol,Rd	Henc	e no	reduc	tio	n in yi	eld stre	ngth a	ue to shear only		
						but c	onsid	er fy r	red	luction	, if app	licable	, due to torsional sh	ear	
		Redu		a St	rengtn	-	(1-p)	т _у							
					ρ	= ($2V_{Ec}$	<u>-</u> – 1)	2						
							Vpl,R	d							
		Desig	n Yield S	Stre	ngth for I	bendi	ng in	shear	r	=	315	N/m	m²		
	B.10.2	Effec	t of Axia	al Fo	orce										
		0 ''			0 11	_									
		Section	on is C	lass	3 ther	refore	go to	secti	ion		3.10.2.2	of th	e following calculati	ons.	
BS EN 1993-	B.10.2	.1 CI	ass 1 ar	nd 2	Cross	Secti	ons								
1-1: 2005		Fo	or Class	1 ar	nd 2 cros	s sec	tions	follov	vin	g crite	rion sh	all be s	satisfied: M _E	d ≤ M _{N,Rd}	
CI 6.2.9.1(2)			Μ	_	Design	nlasti	c mo	ment	res	sistand	e redu	ced du	e to axial force N _E .		
			M _{Ed}	=	27500)0 k	Nm			Jotane	Je redu				
BS EN 1993-		I	M _{N,y,Rd}	=	M _{N,z,R}	Rd =	M _{pl}	_{,Rd} x ((1-	n ^{1.7})					
1-1: 2005			n	=	N _{Ed} /N _p	l,Rd									
Cl 6.2.9.1(6)			N _{Ed}	=	1300	0 k	N								
			Nal Pd	=	Afy	=	4373	05 k	'N				Overall interaction		
			· •µi,r<0		⁷ мо —				••				BS EN 1993-		
			n	=	0.030	D							1-1: 2005		
			M _{pl,Rd}	=	68354	11 k	١m						CI 6.2.1(7)		
			M _{N,Rd}	=	M _{N,Z,Rd}	= IV	N,y,Rd	і = Ж	68	31807	kNm		$N_{Ed} / N_{Rd} + M_{Ed} / M_{R}$	d = 0.43	N/A
			WEd	-	Ratio M	1 _{Ed} / N	N.Rd =	:	0.4	40					N/A
							.,								
		(T	he chec	k be	elow is st	tated	in the	code	, b	ut can	be cor	nsidere	ed secondary to that	done above)	
BS EN 1993-		Fc	or biaxial	l ber	nding in c	class	1 and	2 cro	oss	sectio	ons foll	owing	criterion shall be sa	tisfied:	
1-1:2005 CL6 2 9 1(6)		M _{y, E}	id	N	z,Ed	<	10								
0. 0.2.0. 1(0)		M _{N,y,I}	Rd	M	,z,Rd	-									
			M _{y,Ed}	=	0	k	١m								
			$M_{z,\text{Ed}}$	=	27500	00 k	١m								
			α	=	2										+ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$
			β	=	2 §										+
		M _{y, Ec}	d +	M	z,Ed	=	0.10	6 ≤	5	1.0		OK			N/A
		I VI N,y,F	sq] [IVIN	,z,Rd _										

SUBJECT: SOUTH PROFILE - NO EROSION / SCOUR - NO CYCLIC DEGRADATION



PREPARED BY: CHA DATE: 1-5-2020 REV DATE: CHECKED BY: _____ DATE:

REF.																OUT	PUT.	
BS EN 1993-	B.'	10.2.2	Class 3	3 Ci	ross Sectio	ons												
1-1: 2005			For cla	ss 3	3 cross sec	tions, in	the	e abs	sence o	of shea	r force	e , the m	aximu	m longitu	dinal stress			
CI 6.2.9.2(1)			shall sa	atisf	y the criteri	on:-												
					f													
			$\sigma_{\text{x,Ed}}$	≤														
					M0													
			$\sigma_{\text{x,Ed}}$	=	Design va	ue of th	ie lo	ocal l	ongitud	inal stre	ss du	e to mor	ment a	nd axial f	force			
			σ_{axial}	=	N _{Ed} /													
					/A													
			N_{Ed}	=	13000	kN												
			А	=	1388270	mm ²												
			σ_{axial}	=	9	N/mm'	-											
		σ	moment	=	MEd													
					/ vv _{el}													
			M _{Ed}	=	275000	kNm			M _{Rd} =	52730	6.7	kNm	l	M _{Ed} /M _{Rd}	0.52	M _{Rd} i	nc. yie	ld
			W _{el}	=	1.67E+09	mm										stres	s redu	ction
		σ	moment	=	164	N/mm'	-									due t	o shea	ar effects
			$\sigma_{\text{x,Ed}}$	=	9 +	164					0	verall i	nterac	tion		Refer	[.] 6.2.8	
				=	174	N/mm ²	2					BS EI	N 1993	3-				
	Yie	eld Strer	ngth, f _y	=	315	N/mm ²	2					1-1: 2	2005					
												CI 6.2	2.1(7)					
			<u> </u>	=	315	N/mm ²	2				N	_{Ed} / N _{Rd}	+ M _{Ed}	/ M _{Rd} =	0.55		Ok	
			γ _{M0}		4													
			$\sigma_{\text{x,Ed}}$	≤	<u> </u>	ОК		=	0.55	Stress	Ratio						OK	
					γ _{M0}													
	B.11	Buckli	ing Res	ista	ance of Me	mbers												
	B.11.1	Unifor	m Mem	ber	rs in Comp	ression	n											
BS EN 1993-		A com	pressior	n m	ember shou	uld be v	erifi	ed a	gainst b	uckling	as fol	lows:						
1-1: 2005			N															
CI 6.3.1.1(1)			NEd	≤	1.0													
			N _{b,Rd}															
			N_{Ed}	=	13000	kN												
			N _{b,Rd}	=	Design Bu	ckling F	Resi	stan	ce of th	e Comp	ressic	on Memb	ber					
BS EN 1993-				=	$\gamma \frac{Af_y}{\gamma}$	For Cla	ass	1, 2	and 3 S	ections	;							
1-1: 2005					^γ _{M1}													
CI 6.3.1.1(3)			χ	=	Reduction	Factor	for	the F	Relevan	t Buckli	ng Mo	de						
					1													
BS EN 1993-			χ	=		2	≤	1.	.0									
1-1: 2005					$\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2}$	- λ												
Eq 6.49					Г		2]											
			φ	=	$0.5 1 + \alpha(\lambda$	- 0.2) + 2	a											
						Í												
			λ	=	Non-dime	nsional	sler	ndern	ess rat	ю								
BS EN 1993-																\square		
1-1: 2005				=	$\frac{At_y}{N} = $	L _{cr} 1		For	Class	1, 2 and	3 cro	ss secti	ons					
Eq 6.50					N _{cr}	i λ_1										\square		
			L _{cr}	=	Buckling L	ength	=		15	m						\square		
			i	=	1736	mm	(R	adius	s of Gyr	ation)								

PROJECT TITLE:	ENECO MV2 WINDFA	RM - MONOPIL	E FOUNDATION CONC	CEPT DESIGN		5	
SUBJECT: SO	OUTH PROFILE - NO ERO	SION / SCOUR	- NO CYCLIC DEGRADA	TION	_	le Royal	
PROJECT NO:	BG8375	FILE REF:		REV:	_	Enhancing	Society Together
PREPARED BY:	CHA	DATE:	1-5-2020	REV DATE:	_		
CHECKED BY:		DATE:					
(SEE CALC PAGE	E NO	FOR ALTERN	IATIVE CALCULATIONS)			
REF.							OUTPUT.
		[E					
	λ	$1 = 11\sqrt{f_y}$	= 93.9 ε				
	λ	1 = 93.9	x 0.86 = 81	.10			
	1	= 0.11					
	λ.	0.11					
3S EN 1993- 5·2007	The Slender	ness criterion	for which overall bu	ckling may be assumed	to be satisf	fied is:	
CI 5.3.3(3)	N _{Ed}	≤ 0.1					
	If this criteria	a is not met co Af.	onsideration should b	be given to buckling			
	N _{cr}	$= \frac{1}{2}$					
	N	λ = 385397	785 kN				
	l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l	- 000001					
	NEd N	- = 0.00	o ≤ 0.1 C	ж			
							OK
	For $^\lambda$	= 0.11	χ can be estat	lished from table 6.1, 6.	.2 and figur	e 6.4	OIX
	Table 0.4. In		-tt				
	Buckling cur	ve	a ₀ a b	c d			
	Imperfection	Factor α	0.13 0.21 0.34	4 0.49 0.76			
	Cross	s section limite	s – Cold Form	ad			
	Choose a	= 0.49					
			2				
	<i>\$</i>	9 = 0.51-	$+ \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda$	= 0.483			
			1				
	;	κ =	$\frac{1}{2} = 1.05$	≥ 1.0			
		$\phi + \sqrt{\phi}$	$p^2 - \lambda$				
	Use ;	κ = 1					
28 EN 1002 1							
1:2005					Buckling	Buckling curve S 235	
Table 6.2		Cross section	1	Limits	about	S 275 S 355 S 460	
					unio	S 420	
	M SUC			hot finished	any	a a ₀	
	Hollo	\mathcal{I}					
				cold formed	any	c c	



SUBJECT: SOUTH PROFILE - NO EROSION / SCOUR - NO CYCLIC DEGRADATION

 PROJECT NO:
 BG8375
 FILE REF:
 REV:



PREPARED BY: CHA DATE: 1-5-2020 REV DATE:

CHECKED BY: _____DATE:

													001P01.
		1.1.	Tab	ole 6.7	7: Va	alue	s fo	or N	N _{Rk} = f.	Ai. Mi	Rk = fy W	and ∆Mi Ed	
S EN 1993-			Cl		1	1		1	-KK -y	[) [,	2	4. A	
-1:2005			Ch	455	+	A		+	2 A		3 A	A.g	
able 6.7			W	V _v		Wply		+	WpLy		Welv	Weff.v	
			W	V _z		Wplz			W _{pl,z}		Wel,z	Weff,z	
			ΔM	y,Ed		0			0		0	e _{N,y} N _{Ed}	
			ΔM	z,Ed		0			0		0	$e_{N,z} N_{Ed}$	
	NO	TE For	mer	nbers n	ot sus	ceptil	ole to	o to	rsional de	eformat	ion χ_{LT} wou	Id be $\chi_{LT} = 1,0.$	
		N _{Rk}	=	f _y A	=	31	5	х	138827	70 x 10)-~		
					=	4373	05	kN	1				
	Туре	of Class	=	Class	s 3								
	Use												
		Wy	=	Wz	=	W	=		Wel				
		M _{Rk}	=	f _y	х	Wel							
			=	315	x 1	.67E	+09						
			=	5.27E	+11 N	lmm							
			=	5273	07 k	Nm							
S EN 1993-	L	∆M _{y,z,Ed}	=	0	(For	class	5 1, 2	2 ar	nd 3 secti	ons)			
-1:2005		k	=	Interac	tion fa	actor							
able 6.7													
	Metho	od 2 shal	ll be	used to	o calcu	ulate	k far		- 1		with Stool	O	
							n iac	CLOI	s. In acco	ordance	with Steel	Construction Institute	
	advic	e, circula	ar ho	ollow se	ctions	can	be u	isec	s. In acco I in this a	pproact	h even thou	gh reference is only m	ade
	to I a	e, circula nd RHS ຄ	ar ho sect	ollow se ions.	ctions	can	be u	isec	s. In acco I in this a	pproact	h even thou	gh reference is only m	ade
	to I a	e, circula nd RHS s	ar hc sect	ollow se ions.	ctions	can	be u	ISEC	s. In acco	pproacl	h even thou	gh reference is only m	ade
	advic to I ai	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1 :	ar ho sect	ollow se ions. Iteract	ctions	can	be u	isec	s. In acco d in this a	pproach	ot suscer	gh reference is only m	ade
	advic to I ai Tal	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1 :	ar ho sect	ollow se ions. Iteract	ctions ion fa	can	be u rs k d	isec	s. In acco d in this a d in this d in the the this d in the	pproach bers n ns	ot suscer	gh reference is only m	ade
S EN 1993-	advic to I an Tal	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1 :	ar ho secti : In	ollow se ions. Iteract	octions	can	be u rs k d	isec	s. In acco d in this a pr memi prmation	pproach bers n ns	ot suscer	gh reference is only m	
S EN 1993- 1:2005	Tal	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1:	ar ho secti In	of of of	ion fa	can acto	rs k d	isec isec isec	or meml or meml or mation	pproach pproach bers n ns	ot susceptions	gh reference is only m otible to torsional	
S EN 1993- 1:2005 nnex B	Tal	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1:	ar ho secti : In	of ns	ion fa	actor	rs k d	sij fo lefo 3, c	br meml br meml br mation D Donal prope lass 4	pproach pproach bers n ns Design as erties	ot susceptions	construction institute gh reference is only m otible to torsional cross-sectional properties class 1, class 2	
S EN 1993- -1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Tal	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1:	ar ho secti : In	of of ns	etions ion fa elas	tic erector	rs k d oss-se lass 0,62	ection asec	or meml prmation Demal proper lass 4	bers n bers n besign as erties	ot susceptions plastic of C _m (1+	preference is only model of the second seco	
S EN 1993- -1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Tal	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1:	ar hc secti : In	of ons	elas C _m	tic erectory $\left(1+\frac{1}{2}\right)$	rs k d	ection isec	In this a bor memlormation $\frac{D}{M_{Ed}}$	bers n ns Design as erties	ot susceptions $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)$	philote to torsional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$	
S EN 1993- 1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors kyy	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1:	ar hc sections sections sections	of of strings	elas	tic erector	be u rs k d 0,67 + 0	isec is for ection $3, c$	d in this a bor memlormation Dormati	bers n ns Design as erties	the even thou ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my}(1 + C_{my}(1 + C_$	processing the properties of	s
S EN 1993- .1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors kyy	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1: s s s s s s s	ar hc sections sections sections sections	of of ons stions.	elas c m	tic cro $y \left(1 + C_{my} \left(1 +$	be u rs k d 0,67 + 0,	isec isec in formation in the second	a in this a br meml brmation $\frac{D}{D}$ $\frac{D}{$	bers n bers n ns Design as rrties	the even thou ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} C_{my} \right)$	prostruction institute gh reference is only model of tible to torsional prostruction institute prostruction institute class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}} + 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$	s
S EN 1993- -1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors kyy	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: on T s s L-s RHS	ectio	of of ons ctions	elas C _m ≤ C	tic erec $y \left(1 + C_{my} \left($	be u be u rs k d 0,67 + 0,	isection isection $\lambda_y = -\frac{1}{\chi}$ $\delta = -\frac{1}{\chi}$	In this a finite constraints of the second	bers n bers n besign as erties	the even thou ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my} \left(1 + \leq C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right)$	proference is only more than the statute of the st	
S EN 1993- -1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors k _{yy}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: on T s s I-s RHS L-s RHS	sections sec	of ons thins ons thins ons ons think on the set of the	elas C _m	tic erec y $\left(1+\frac{2}{my}\right)$	be u be u rs k d sss-se lass 0,67 + 0,	lisection isection $k_{y} - \frac{1}{\chi}$ k_{zz}	In this a finith the second s	bers n ns Design as erties	the even thou ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \right)$	prostruction institute gh reference is only m potible to torsional pross-sectional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda}_y - 0.2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}} + 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}} \int_{0.6 \text{ k}_{zz}}$	ade
S EN 1993- -1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors k _{yy} k _{yz}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1: tis s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s	sections sec	of of ons etions ons etions etions etions ons etions etion	ctions ion fa elass C _m ≤ C	tic cro $y = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{$	be u be u rs k d 0ss-se lass 0,67 + 0,	isection isection $\lambda_y = \frac{1}{\chi}$ $\delta = \frac{1}{\chi}$	In this a finite contract of the second sec	bers n ns Design as erties	the even thou ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)$	prostruction institute gh reference is only m potible to torsional pross-sectional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$	s
S EN 1993- 1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors k _{yy} k _{yz}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1: con T s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s	ar ho sections sectio	ons etions ons etions ons etions ons etions	ctions ion fa elasi ≤ (tic ero c	be u rs k d 0,67 + 0,	k_{zz}	In this a fin this a for meml prmation D D D D D D D D	bers n bers n ms metries	ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my}(1 + \le C_{my}(1 + \le C_$	protection institute gh reference is only m possible to torsional pross-sectional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$	ade 5
S EN 1993- -1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors kyy k _{yy}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1:	ar ho secti 'ype ectio sectio sectio sectio sectio sectio sectio	ons ttions ons ttions ons ttions	ctions ion fa elas: ≤ C	can actor $y \left(1 + \frac{2}{my} \right)$	be u rs k d 0,67 + 0,	k_{zz}	In this a finite the second s	bers n bers n Design as erties	the even thou ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my}(1+$ $\leq C_{my}(1+$	proference is only model of the solution institute gh reference is only model of the solution	
S EN 1993- 1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors k _{yy} k _{zy}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1:	ar ho sections sectio	ons ttions ons ttions ons ttions ons ttions	ctions ion fa elas ≤ (can actor $\frac{1}{y}\left(1+\frac{1}{y}\right)$	be u rs k d 0,67 + 0,	k_{zz}	In this a finite constraints of the second	bers n ns Design as erties	ot susceptions $C_{my}(1 + \leq C_{my}(1 + < $	prostruction institute gh reference is only m potible to torsional pross-sectional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda_y} - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda_z} - 0,6) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_z N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$	ade
S EN 1993- 1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors k _{yy} k _{zy}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1: T-s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS	ar ho sections sectio	ons etions ons etions ons etions ons etions ons ons ons ons	ctions ion fi elas C _m ≤ C	can actor y (1+ z my (1+	rs k d 0,67 + 0, 0	k_{zz}	$\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Ed}}$	bers n ns Design as erties	the even thou ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)$	prostruction institute gh reference is only m potible to torsional pross-sectional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda}_{y} - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{y} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{y} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $0.6 k_{zz}$ $0.6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_{z} - 0, 6) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 1.4 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{YMI}}$	ade
S EN 1993- 1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors k _{yy} k _{zy}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1: con T s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s	ar ho sections sectio	ons etions ons etions ons etions ons etions	C _m C _m	can actor	view (k)	$k_{zz} = \frac{1}{\chi}$	$\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Ed}}$	bers n ns Design as erties	the even thou ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \right)$	prostruction institute gh reference is only m potible to torsional pross-sectional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda}_{y} - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{y} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{y} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_{z} - 0,6) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 1,4 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$	ade
S EN 1993- 1:2005 nnex B able B.1	k _{zz}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1: on T s s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS	ar ho sections sectio	ons etions ons etions ons etions ons etions	ctions ion fa elasi ≤ (C _m ≤ (can actor y (1+ z (1+ cm (1)	rs k d pss-se lass 0,67 + 0, 0 0,67 + 0,	$k_{zz} = \frac{1}{\chi}$	s. In accc in this a prmation pr	bers n bers n bers n bers n n berties	or susceptions plastic of $C_{my}(1 + \le C_{my}(1 + \le C_$	prostruction institute gh reference is only m pross-sectional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_z - 0,6) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_z N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 1.4 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_z N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$	ade
S EN 1993- -1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors kyy k _{zy}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1: on T s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS	ar ho sections sectio	ons ttions ons ttions ons ttions	ctions ion fa elass C_m $\leq ($	can actor solutions tic cross solutions solutions tic cross solutions solutions tic cross solutions solutions tic cross solutions solutions tic cross solutions tic cross tic cross	be u be u sss-se lass 0,67 + 0, 0 0,67 + 0,	isection isection $k_{zz} = \frac{1}{\chi}$ $k_{zz} = \frac{1}{\chi}$	$\frac{N_{Ed}}{\sum_{x} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{M}}$	bers n bers n besign as erties 	the even thou ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my}(1+$ $\leq C_{my}(1+$ $\leq C_{mz}(1+$ $\leq C_{mz}(1+$	production institute gh reference is only m pross-sectional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda}_{y} - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{y} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{y} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_{z} - 0,6) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 1,4 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$	ade
S EN 1993- .1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors k _{yy} k _{zz}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: on T s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS	ar ho sections sectio	ons ttions ons ttions ons ttions ons ttions	Cm elass Cm ≤ C	can actor tic erec $y \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{mx} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Ed}} = \frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Ed}}$	bers n ns Design as erties	ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my}(1+$ $\leq C_{my}(1+$ $\leq C_{mz}(1+$ $\leq C_{mz}(1+$ $\leq C_{mz}(1+$	prostruction institute gh reference is only m pross-sectional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda_y} - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda_z} - 0,6) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_z N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 1,4 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_z N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $(\overline{\lambda_z} - 0,2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_z N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$	ade
S EN 1993- -1:2005 nnex B able B.1	k _{zz}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1: rHS I-s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS	ar ho secti S-sections section	ons terions ons trions ons trions ons trions ons trions	Cm clion fi elas Cm ≤ C	can actor tic erc $y \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} m_y \left(1 + $	rs k d rs k d $0,6\bar{2}$ +0, $0,6\bar{2}$ +0,	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$\frac{N_{Ed}}{\sum_{x} N_{Ek} / \gamma_M}$	bers n ns Design as erties m) n)	the even thou ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my}(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{my}(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{mz}(1 + \frac{1}{2} < C_{mz}$	prostruction institute gh reference is only m pross-sectional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda}_y - 0.2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_y N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $0.6 k_{zz}$ $0.6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_z - 0.6) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_z N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 1.4 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_z N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $(\overline{\lambda}_z - 0.2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_z N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$	ade
S EN 1993- -1:2005 nnex B able B.1	k _{zz}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1: T-s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS	ar ho sections sectio	of of ons etions e	ctions ion fa elass C_m $\leq ($ C_m $\leq ($	can actor y (1+ Cmy (1 cmy (1 cmy (1)	vise (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	is a constraint of the section of t	S. In accc a in this a por meml pormation $\frac{D}{D}$	bers n bers n n Design as erties m n m m m m m m m m m m m m m	the even thou ot susceptions plastic of $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{my} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{my}$	prostruction institute gh reference is only m potible to torsional pross-sectional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda}_{y} - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{y} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{y} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_{z} - 0,6) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 1.4 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $(\overline{\lambda}_{z} - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$	ade
S EN 1993- 1:2005 nnex B able B.1	Interacti factors k _{yy} k _{zz} k _{zz}	e, circula nd RHS s ble B.1: ble B.1: ble B.1: con T s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS d H-section icient k _{ay}	ar ho sections sectio	ons etions ons etions ons etions ons etions ons etions ons etions ons etions	ctions ion fa elass C_m $\leq C$ C_{π}	can actor y (1+ cmy (1 cmy (1 cmy (1 cmy (1)	view level be u be	$k_{zz} = \frac{1}{\chi}$	s. In accc d in this a por memlor portation $\frac{D}{D}$ $\frac{D}{$	bers n ns Design as erties m) n) m) m) axial con	ot susceptions plastic of susceptions $C_{my}(1+$ $\leq C_{my}(1+$ $\leq C_{mz}(1+$ $\leq C_{mz}(1+$ $\leq C_{mz}(1+$ $\leq C_{mz}(1+$	construction institute gh reference is only m potible to torsional pross-sectional properties class 1, class 2 $(\overline{\lambda}_{y} - 0, 2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{y} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{y} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_{z} - 0,6) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 1,4 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $(\overline{\lambda}_{z} - 0,2) \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $+ 0.8 \frac{N_{Ed}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk} / \gamma_{MI}}$	ade

SUBJECT: SOUTH PROFILE - NO EROSION / SCOUR - NO CYCLIC DEGRADATION

ADATION REV: Enhancing

Royal HaskoningDHV Enhancing Society Together

1 1990-1			. =9	urvuici	it uni	Ionn	mo	nen	t luc		miliii	ables	D.1 8	ind E	 2	_	
005	Mom	ent diagra	am		rai	ige		_	uni	form loa	C _{my} and	C _{mz} an	d C _{mLT}	ntrated	load	_	
x B 9 B.3	м]ψM	t.	-1≤	ψ ≤ 1					0,6 +	·0,4ψ≥	0,4				
				0 ≤ α	₅≤1	-1 ≤ v	$y \le 1$	+	0,2	+ 0,8α ₅ ≥	≥ 0,4		0,2+	0,8α _s	≥0,4	-	
	Mh	M _s	ψM _l	1		0 ≤ y	$s \le 1$	+	0,1	- 0,8α, ≥	≥ 0,4		-0,	8α <u>,</u> ≥ (0,4		
	α	$- M_s/M_l$	h	-1 ≤ o	ι _s < 0	-1 ≤ v	ψ < 0		0,1(1-	ψ) - 0,8c	$\alpha_{s} \ge 0,4$. (),2(- ψ)	- 0,80	s≥0,4	-	
		. †]ψM _t	₁ 0 ≤ α	h ≤ 1	-1 ≤ v	$\psi \le 1$		0,9	95 + 0,05	5α _h		0,90	+ 0,1	Dα _h	-	
	- Mh N	1s				0 ≤ y	$y \le 1$		0,9	95 + 0,05	5α _h		0,90	+ 0,1	Dα _h	-	
	$\alpha_{\rm h}$	= M _h ∕M	s	-1 ≤ o	t _h < 0	-1 ≤ v	ψ < 0		0,95 +	0,05α _h ((1+2 y)	(0,90 - 0	,10α _h (1+2ψ)		
	For member $C_{11} = 0.9$	ers with	sway	buckling	mode t	he equ	ivale	nt un	iform 1	noment	factors	should I	oe take	n C _{my} :	= 0,9 or		
	C _{Mz} = 0,9 C _{my} , C _{mz} a braced poi	and C_{mLT} ints as fo	shoul llows:	d be obta	ined ac	cordin	g to t	he be	ending	moment	diagra	m betw	een the	releva	ant		
	moment f	actor	bendir	ng axis	point	s brace	d in o	lirect	ion								
	C _{my} y-y C _{mz} z-z C _{mLT} y-y			-y -z		z y	-z -y										
	C _{mLT}		y.	-y		ÿ	-y									_	
		Mmay	_	275000	kNn	n											
N 1993-		M _{min}	-	0	kNn	n											
005		Ψ	=	0.00													
хВ		Ms	=	0.0	kNn	n	(loc	al m	omen	t)							
B.3																	
	Equiva	alent uni	iform	moment	factor	-											
		C _m	=	1.00													
	Tabla	P 1 aive	a the	following	n form			oulot	o Into	raction	factor	k for di	fforon	oroor		n	
	(Tub	D. I give	es ine	are not		ntible t	o tor	culat	e me al daf	action		K IOF GI	neren	cross	sectio	n.	
	For Cl	ass 1 ar	nd cla	are not a	ss ser	tion.	0 101	51011		Jinauoi	15)						
																_	
N 1993-		Г				1		Г		N	7						
005	k =	C _m 1	1+(λ·	- 0.2)	IN _{Ed}	≤	Cm	1+	0.8-	TNEd	+						
хB				'χΝ	Rk ^{/γ}	VI1		L	λ	$N_{\rm Rk}/\gamma_{\rm N}$	/1						
B.1								The	se eq	uations	have k	been si	mplifie	d as i	or tubu	lar	
								pile	only s	ingle a	kis nee	eds to t	be con	sidere	d		
	And																
	For Cl	ass 3 cr	oss s	ection:													
		Г		_		1		Г		м	٦						
	k =	C _m 1	+ 0.6	3λN	Ed	≤	C	n 1-	0.6-	NEd	-1						
				χN _{Rk}	/γ _{M1}			L		ζίN _{Rk} /γ	M1						
						-											

REPARED BY: HECKED BY: EE CALC PAGE EF. efer section	СНА																							COT	1000	Ther
HECKED BY: EE CALC PAGE EF.	ONA					F.			1_1	5_202	0		REV								Eni	nanci	ing so	Julety	loge	arer
EECKED BY: EE CALC PAGE EF.					DAI	L.			1.	5 202	.0		-	DAII												
EE CALC PAGE					DAT	E:	_						-													
efer section	NO				FOR	ALTE	ERN/	ATIV	e cai	_CUL/		NS)														
efer section																								OUT	PUT.	
40 4 541 -																										
10.1 of this																										
neet		lype	of cla	1	=	Cla	155 11	3																		
			N	λ Ed	=	13	.000)	N																	
			N	Rk	=	437	730	5 k	N																	
			χ	C	=		1																			
			χı	T	=	1	1.0 1	(Circi	ular I	nollo	w se	ectio	ns no	ot sus	cept	ible t	o late	eral to	orsioi	nal b	uckli	ng)			
			۲۸ Mr	M1 Ed	-	275	י 500	0 1	۲Nm																	
			ΔN	l _{Ed}	=		0	ŀ	Nm																	
			M	Rk	=	527	730	7 ⊧	Nm																	
				k	=	1.	002																			
			N _E	d	· + k	M _{Ed}	+ /	ΔM _E	d	_	0.5/	5	<	1 (0ĸ								0	ĸ
			$\left(\chi \frac{N_{i}}{2}\right)$	Rk)		χ_{L}	л т (Л _{Rk})		0.0		-	1.0												
			γı	M1			· •	M1																		
																								\vdash		
																								+		

PROJECT TITLE:	DJECT TITLE: ENECO MV2 WINDFARM - MONOPILE FOUNDATION CONCEPT DESIGN												-					
SUBJECT: SO	UTH PRO)FILE - FULL ER	ROSION (NAP -7	m) - CY	CLIC DE	GRADA	TION					h	R	oya	al		DU	
PROJECT NO: BG8375 FILE REF: REV:													En	asi	KOF ing Sc	Ding	JDH Toget	V
PREPARED BY:	CHA		DATE:		1-5-202	20	REV DA	TE:										
CHECKED BY:			DATE:															
(SEE CALC PAGE	NO		FOR ALTERN	ATIVE	CALCUL	ATIONS)											
REF.																OUTF	PUT.	
	Α	INPUT																

	A.1	Uncorroded Pile Dimensions								
		Outer Diameter (d)			=	5000	mm			Class 3
		Wall Thickness (t)			-	90.0	mm			
					-	90.0				
	A.2	Corroded Pile Dimensions								
		Total corrosion loss to outer surface	e in zone consider	red	=	0	mm			
		Total corrosion loss to interior surfa	ice		=	0	mm			
		Outer Diameter (d)			=	5000	mm			
		Wall Thickness (t)			=	90	mm			
		Inside Diameter (d _i)				4820	mm			
	A.3	Material Properties								
		Steel Grade			=		S355			
		Design Yield Stress (f _y)			=	315	N/mm ⁻			
		Young's Modulus			=	210000	N/mm²			
		Cross Section Limits			=	Cold Form	ed			
	A.4	Eurocode Partial Factors								
		Dertial Factor for registence of erec	a apation		_	1.0				
BS EN 1993-		Partial Factor for resistance of cros	ssection	Ύмо	=	1.0				
5: 2007		Partial Factor for resistance of men	hbers to		_	10				
CI 5. I. I(4)		Instability assessed by member che	ecks	ΎM1	-	1.0				
	A 5	Dile Length								
PS EN 1003	A.5									
5: 2007					-					
5. 2007 Figure 5.8		Α								
rigure 5.0	T	- HB HT	A - concrete or st	teel stru	ctu	re p	connectio			
			C - water or soft	soil	010	ю В- D-	firm soil	11		
			C - Water of Solt a	501		0-	1111 301			
		Ē	lor = k H							
	Н	/ / Н								
		D	1,0 co	onnectio	n B	translation	fixed an	d rotation fro	ee	
	•		with $k = -0.7$ co	onnectio	n B	translation	n fixed an	d rotation fib	ked	
			20 00	nnectio	n P	translation	free and	rotation five	be	
			2,0 00	ninectio	11 0	anslation	ince and		ACI	

with k = 10,7 connection B translation fixed and rotation fixed 2,0 connection B translation free and rotation fixed

=

=

15

15 m

1

Ler	ngth	of I	Pile	Fro	m S	offit	to I	=ixit	y Le	vel	(H)	
Ler	ngth	Fa	ctor	(k)								
Bu	cklir	ng L	eng	th	=	I,	cr	=	k	(x H	ł	
								=	-	1	х	
						I,	cr	=	1	5.0	0	m

Raker Pile

Vertical Pile

SUBJECT: SO	UTH PROFILE - FULL ER	OSION (NAP -7m) - C	YCLIC DEGRADAT	ION	Royal
PROJECT NO:	BG8375	FILE REF:		REV:	HaskoningDHV Enhancing Society Together
PREPARED BY:	CHA	DATE:	1-5-2020	REV DATE:	
CHECKED BY:		DATE:		-	
(SEE CALC PAGI	ENO	FOR ALTERNATIVE	CALCULATIONS)		

REF.									OUTPUT	г.
	A.6	Maximum Design Forces And Bending Moment								
	A.6.1	Individual Maximum Forces and Bending Moments								
		Design Maximum Axial compressive Force (N_{Ed})		=	13000	kN				
		Design Maximum Tension Force (N _{Ed})		=	19500	kN				
		Design Maximum Shear (V _{Ed})		=	26000	kN				
		Design Maximum Torsion (T _{Ed})		=	0	kNm				
		Design Max Bending Moment (M _{y,Ed)}		=	0	kNm				
		Design Max Bending Moment (M _{z,Ed)}		=	310000	kNm				
		Design Resultant Bending moment (M _{Ed)}		=	310000	kNm				
	A.6.2	Co-Existing Axial Forces and Bending Moment								
		Design Axial Force (N _{Ed})		=	13000	kN				
		Design Shear (V _{Ed})		=	0	kN				
		Design Torsion (T _{Ed})		=	19500	kNm				
		Design Bending Moment at top in y-y axis (M _{y,Ed})		=	0	kNm				
		Design Bending Moment at top in z-z axis (M _{z,Ed})		=	310000	kNm				
Refer section		Design Resultant Bending Moment at top (M_{Ed})		=	310000	kNm				
B.11.3 and		Design Bending Moment at bottom in y-y axis ($M_{y,Ed}$)		=	0	kNm				
table B.3 of		Design Bending Moment at bottom in z-z axis ($M_{z,Ed}$)		=	0	kNm				
this Sheet		Design Resultant Bending Moment at bottom (M_{Ed})		=	0	kNm				
	A.6.3	Second Order Moment								
		(Max p-delta moment that co-exists with forces/moment	s ent	tere	ed in A.6.1	or A.6.2	2 above	e)		
		p∆ moment co-existing with forces entered in A.6.1		=	0	kNm				
		p∆ moment co-existing with forces entered in A.6.2		=	0	kNm				
	A.6.4	Co-Existing Maximum Shear and Torsion								
		Design Shear (V _{Ed})		=	26000	kN				
		Design Torsion (T _{Ed})		=	19500	kNm				
	A.6.5	Local Bending Moment								
		If there is a local bending moment in the pile due to e.g.	wav	e k	oad insert i	t here				
		Design Local Bending Moment (M _s)		=	0	kNm				
		Type of loading creating local moment		=	Concentra	ated				
	A.6.6	Equivalent Uniform Moment Factor								
		Equivalent uniform moment factor	C _m	=	1.00					

PROJECT TITLE: ENECO MV2 WINDFAR	M - MONOPILE FOUNDATION CONCE	EPT DESIGN	
SUBJECT: SOUTH PROFILE - FULL ERC	SION (NAP -7m) - CYCLIC DEGRADAT		Royal
PROJECT NO: BG8375	FILE REF:	REV:	Enhancing Society Together
PREPARED BY: CHA	DATE: 1-5-2020	REV DATE:	
CHECKED BY:	DATE:	-	
(SEE CALC PAGE NO	_FOR ALTERNATIVE CALCULATIONS)		

REF.											
	в	STRUCTUR	AL CALCULAT	TIONS							
		The followin	g calculations w	ill be based on the pile	in Co	rroded	cond	ition.			
	B.1	Parameters	for Structural	Calculations							
		Outor Diam	otor (d)			5000					
		Wall Thickn				9000	mm				
		Inner Diame	ter (d _i)		=	4820	mm				
		Diameter/wa	Ill thickness (d/t)	=	55.56					
		Pile Area		,	=	1388270	mm ²				
		Moment of I	nertia (I)		=	4.18E+12	mm ⁴				
		Radius of G	vration (i)		=	1736	mm				
		Elastic Sect	on Modulus (W	/ _{el})	=	1.67E+09	mmĭ				
		Plastic Sect	on Modulus (W	/ _{pl})	=	2.17E+09	mmĭ				
		Shear Area	(A _v)		=	883800	mm				
	B.2	Classificati	on of Cross Se	ction							
		Table 5.2	(sheet 3 of 3)	: Maximum width-to parts	o-thickness	ratios fo	r compr	essio	n		
S EN 1993-				Angles							
C LIT 1000				h	1						
-1: 2005					1						
-1: 2005 able 5.2					1 1 1 .	Does no	t apply to a	ngles in	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to ' (see sl	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)		þ	Does no continuou	t apply to a is contact to component	ngles in vith oth	n ler		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to ' (see sh	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)		b	Does no continuou	t apply to a is contact v component	ngles in vith oth s	n ler		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to ' (see sl Class Stress	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	t Section in		Does no continuou	t apply to a is contact v component	ngles ir vith oth	n er		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to ' (see sh Class Stress distribution across	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)		$\frac{1}{b}$	Does no continuou	t apply to a is contact to component	ngles ir vith oth s	n ler		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to (see sl Class Stress distribution across section (compression	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)		$\frac{1}{b}$	Does no continuou	t apply to a is contact t component	ingles in vith oth s	n ler		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to (see sl Stress distribution across section (compression positive)	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)		$\frac{1}{b}$	Does no continuou	t apply to a is contact v component	ngles in vith oth s	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to (see sl Class Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	t^{\dagger} Section in $h/t \le 15\epsilon$	$\frac{1}{b}$ $\frac{f_{y}}{f_{y}}$ $\frac{f_{y}}{f_{y}}$	Does no continuo 55	t apply to a as contact v component	ngles ir vith oth s	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to (see sl Class Stress distribution aeross section (compression positive) 3	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	t^{\dagger} Section in $h/t \le 15\varepsilon$ Tubular sect	$\frac{f_{t}}{f_{t}}$ $\frac{f_{t}}{f_{t}}$ $\frac{f_{t}}{f_{t}} \leq 11.5$ $\frac{b+h}{2t} \leq 11.5$	Does no continuot	t apply to a is contact t component	ngles in vith oth s	n =		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to (see sl Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	$h/t \le 15\varepsilon$ Tubular sect	$\frac{1}{b}$	Does no continuo 55	t apply to a is contact v component	ngles in vith oth s	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to (see sl Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	$h/t \le 15\varepsilon$ Tubular sect $t \rightarrow 0$	$\frac{1}{b}$	Does no continuor	t apply to a is contact v component	ngles in vith oth s	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to (see sl Class Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	$h/t \le 15\varepsilon$ Tubular sect	$\frac{f_{t}}{f_{t}} = \frac{f_{t}}{f_{t}}$	Does no continuor	t apply to a is contact t component	ngles in vith oth s	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to (see sl Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3 Class	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	$h/t \le 15\varepsilon$ Tubular sect t. Section in bendir	$\frac{1}{b}$ $\frac{1}$	Does no continuor	t apply to a is contact v component	ngles in vith oth s	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to (see sl Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3 Class 1 2	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	$h/t \le 15\varepsilon$ Tubular sect $t = \frac{1}{100}$ Section in bendin $\frac{d}{d}$	$\frac{1}{b}$ $\frac{1}$	Does no continuo 55 55 55	t apply to a is contact v component	ngles in vith oth s	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to '(see sl Class Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3 Class 1 2 3	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	$h/t \le 15\varepsilon$ Tubular sect $t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{d}{d}}}$ Section in bendin $\frac{d}{d}$	$\frac{f_{y}}{f_{y}}$ $\frac{f_{y}}{f$	Does no continuor	t apply to a is contact to component	ngles in vith oth s	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to (see sl Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3 Class 1 2 3	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	$h/t \le 15\varepsilon$ Tubular sect $t + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\frac{1}{2}}}$ Section in bendir $d/$ $d/$ $d/$ $d/$ $d/$ $235 = 275$	$\frac{f}{f}$ \frac{f}	Does no continuor 5 5 5 5 6	t apply to a is contact y component	460	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to $\frac{c(see sl)}{c(see sl)}$ Stress distribution aeross section (compression positive) 3 Class 1 2 3 $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f}$	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	$h/t \le 15\epsilon$ Tubular sect $t + \frac{1}{100}$ Section in bendin $\frac{d}{100}$ Section in bendin $\frac{d}{100}$ $\frac{235}{100} = 2752$ 1,000 0,85	$\frac{1}{b}$ $\frac{1}$	Does no continuor 52 52	tapply to a scontact version of the scontact version o	460 0,71	n		
1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to '(see sl Class Stress distribution aeross section (compression positive) 3 Class 1 2 3 $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_y}$	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	$h/t \le 15\epsilon$ Tubular sect t. Section in bendir d/ d/ d/ 90\epsilon ² see EN 1993-1-6. 235 275 1,00 0,92 1,00 0,85	$\frac{f_{y}}{f_{y}} = \frac{f_{y}}{f_{y}}$	Does no continuor	tapply to a is contact visionponent	460 0,71	n		
1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to $\frac{c}{(\text{see sl})}$ Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3 Class 1 2 3 $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f}$,	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3)	$h/t \le 15\varepsilon$ Tubular sect t_{+} Section in bendir $d/$ $d/$ $g0\varepsilon^{2} see EN 1993-1-6.$ $235 275$ $1.00 0.92$ $1.00 0.85$ $= 0.86$	$\frac{f}{f}$ \frac{f}	Does no continuor 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52	tapply to a scontact vomponent	460 0,71 0,51	n		
1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to $\frac{c}{(\text{see sl})}$ Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3 Class 1 2 3 $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f}$,	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3) NOTE For $d/t > \frac{f_y}{\epsilon^2}$ $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_y}$	$h/t \le 15\epsilon$ Tubular sect $t + \frac{1}{1000}$ Section in bendin $\frac{d}{1000}$ Section in bendin $\frac{d}{1000}$ Section in bendin $\frac{d}{1000}$ $= 0.86$	$\frac{1}{b}$ $\frac{1}$	Does no continuor 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52	tapply to a scontact v component	460 0,71 0,51	n		
1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to '(see sl Class Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3 Class 1 2 3 $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_3}$	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3) NOTE For d/t > $\frac{f_v}{\varepsilon^2}$ $\varepsilon = \sqrt{235/f_y}$ 2 = 37.30	$h/t \le 15\epsilon$ Tubular sect $t + \frac{1}{100}$ Section in bendin $\frac{1}{100}$ Section in bendin $\frac{1}{100}$ $\frac{1}{100}$ $\frac{235}{100}$ $\frac{235}{100}$ $\frac{235}{100}$ $\frac{235}{100}$ $\frac{235}{100}$ $\frac{235}{100}$ $\frac{235}{100}$	$\frac{1}{b}$ $\frac{f_{y}}{f_{y}}$	Does no continuor	tapply to a is contact visionponent	460 0,71 0,51	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to $\frac{c}{(\text{see sl})}$ Class Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3 Class 1 2 3 $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_y}$ $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_y}$	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3) NOTE For d/t > $\frac{f_y}{\epsilon^2}$ $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_y}$ 2 = 37.30 2 = 52.22	$h/t \le 15\epsilon$ Tubular sect t. Control in bendir d/ d/ d/ e90\epsilon ² see EN 1993-1-6. 235 235 235 205 1,00 0,92 1,00 0,85 = 0.86	$\frac{1}{1}$	Does no continuor 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55	tapply to a scontact vomponent	460 0,71 0,51	n	Image: Section of the sectio	
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to $\frac{c(see sl)}{(see sl)}$ Stress distribution aeross section (compression positive) 3 Class 1 2 3 $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_s}$ $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_s}$ $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_s}$	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3) NOTE For $d/t > \frac{f_v}{\epsilon^2}$ $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_y}$ $\epsilon = 52.22$ $\epsilon = 52.22$ $\epsilon = 67.14$	$h/t \le 15\epsilon$ Tubular sect $t + \frac{1}{1000}$ Section in bendin $\frac{d}{1000}$ Section in bendin $\frac{d}{1000}$ $\frac{235}{1,000}$ $$	$\frac{1}{b}$ $\frac{1}{c}$ $\frac{1}$	Does no continuor 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52	tapply to a scontact vomponent	460 0,71 0,51	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to '(see sl Class Stress distribution across section (compression positive) 3 Class 1 2 3 $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f}$, $\epsilon = 235$	Contend flanges eet 2 of 3) NOTE For $d/t \ge \frac{f_y}{\varepsilon^2}$ $\varepsilon = \sqrt{235/f_y}$ $\varepsilon = 52.22$ z = 67.14 $\epsilon \le 90$ ε^2	$h/t \le 15\epsilon$ Tubular sect $t + \frac{1}{100}$ Section in bendin $\frac{d}{100}$ Section in bendin $\frac{d}{100}$ $\frac{d}{100}$ $\frac{235}{1,00}$ $0,92$ 0.86	$\frac{1}{b}$ $\frac{1}$	Does no continuor 58 58 58 58 58 58 58 58 58 58 58 58 58	tapply to a scontact vector of the scontact vector vect	460 0,71 0,51	n		
-1: 2005 able 5.2		Refer also to $\frac{(\text{see sl})}{(\text{see sl})}$ Stress distribution aeross section (compression positive) 3 Class 1 2 3 $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_3}$ $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_3}$ $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_3}$ $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_3}$ $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_3}$	Outstand flanges" eet 2 of 3) NOTE For $d/t > \frac{f_y}{\epsilon^2}$ $\epsilon = \sqrt{235/f_y}$ $\epsilon = 52.22$ $\epsilon = 52.22$ $\epsilon = 67.14$ $\epsilon \le 90 \epsilon^2$	$h/t \le 15\epsilon$ Tubular sect d/t Section in bendir d/t Section in bendir d/t 90 ϵ^2 see EN 1993-1-6. 235 275 1,00 0,92 1,00 0,85 = 0.86 = 0.86	$\frac{1}{1}$	Does no continuor 5c	tapply to a scontact voormonent	460 0,71 0,51	n	Image: Constraint of the sector of	

PROJECT TITLE:	ENECO	MV2 WI	NDFAR	M - M	ONOPI	le fou	INDA	TION	1001	NCEP	T DES	SIGN			1	-					
SUBJECT: SO	JTH PRO)FILE - FL	JLL ERO	SION	(NAP -7	7m) - C	YCLI	C DE(GRAD	ATIC	N		 		ŀ	R	oy	al		DU	
PROJECT NO:	BG8375	5		FILE	REF:					F	REV:					En	as	KO cing S	ning ociety i	DH Togeth	V
PREPARED BY:	CHA			DATI	Ξ:		1-5	-202	0		REV D	DATE:									
CHECKED BY:				DATE	Ξ:																
(SEE CALC PAGE	NO			FOR	ALTERN	NATIVE	CAL	.CULA		1S)											
REF.																			OUTP	UT.	
	B.3	Maxim	um Ax	ial C	ompre	ssion															
			N _{Ed}	=	1300	0 ki	N														

			Lu						<u> </u>							_	_								
BS EN 1993-		The desig	gn Va	alue	of the	COI	mpre	ssio	n fo	rce l	N _{Ed}	at ea	ich ci	ross	sectio	on sh	all sa	tisfy							
1-1: 2005		Ν																							
CI 6.2.4(1) P			Ed	≤	1.0																				
		IN _C	c,Rd																						
		1	N _{Ed}	=	Desig	gn N	lorma	al Fo	orce													N _{Rd} ii	nc.	yield	
		N		=	Desid	n F	Resist	anc	e of	the	cros	ss se	ction	for u	Inifor	m coi	mpre	ssior	ו			stres	s re	ductic	on
			0,i tu			, T											Ť			Np	. (kN)	due t	o sl	near e	effects
BS EN 1993-		N	o Pd	=	_Af _y	-	= 4	373	05	kN		For	class	1.2	and 3	3 cros	s se	ction	s	437	305	Refe	r 6.2	2.8	
1-1:2005			C,IXU		γ _{M0}									.,_											
Fa 6 10		N	Ed	=	0	03	<	1			OK							N _E	/Np.	0	03			אר	
Lq 0.10		N	c,Rd		•		-	-										. •E0	, · · Ru				_		
	D 4	Maximum		iel 7																					
	D.4	waximur	n Ax	a	rensic	n																			
			N	_	104	500	L'N	1																	
		The desig	NEd	-	19t	500	KIN	foro	0 NI			h ar		ootio	n aha	ul e et	iof "								
		i ne desiç	gn va	aiue	or the	ter	ision	TOPC	e N	_{Ed} at	eac	n cro	oss s	ectio	n sna	ill sat	isty:								
BS EN 1993-			Ned																						
1-1: 2005				≤	1.0																				
CI 6.2.3(1) P		· · · ·	∙t,Rd			<u> </u>																NI 5		بشماط	
		ſ	N _{Ed}	=	Desig	gn N	lorma	al Fo	orce													IN _{Rd} II	nc.	yield	
		N	t,Rd	=	Desig	gn F	Resist	anc	e of	the	cros	ss se	ction	for te	ensio	n						stres	s re	ductio	ึงท
					Af															N _R	ց (kN)	due t	o sł	near e	ffects
BS EN 1993-		N	t,Rd	=	γ	:	= 4	373	05	kN		(For	clas	s 1,2	or 3	cross	sec	tions)	437	305	Refe	r 6.2	2.8	
1-1: 2005			N= .		4 M0																				
Eq 6.6			*Ed	=	0.	04	≤	1	0.1			OK						N _E	J/N _{Rd}	0.	04		(ЭК	
		ľ	∙t,Rd																						
	B.5	Maximur	n Be	ndi	ng Mo	ome	ent																		
		N	M _{Ed}	=	310	000) kN	lm																	
BS EN 1993-		The desig	gn va	lue	of ber	ndin	g mo	mer	nt M	_{Ed} at	eac	ch cro	oss-s	ectio	n sha	all sat	isfy:								
1-1: 2005		Ν	1																						
CI 6.2.5(1) P			"Ed	≤	1.0																				
			'c,Rd																						
		N	1 _{c,Rd}	=	Desig	gn re	esista	ance	e of t	the c	cros	s-sec	tion	for be	endin	g									
					W	.f																			
BS EN 1993-		N	1 _{c,Rd}	=	F	огу	-	for	cla	ss 1	or 2	cros	ss se	ction	s										
1-1: 2005					Y N	V10																			
Eq 6.13 &					147		£																		
Eq 6.14		N	1 _{c,Rd}	=	vv _{el}	, min	ı'y	for	cla	ss 3	cro	ss se	ction	s											
					γ	MO																			
		Section M	/lodul	lus t	to be c	cons	sidere	ed:	Ela	astic	Sec	ction	Modi	ulus											
		N	1 _{c,Rd}	=	527	307	7 kN	lm																	
			Ì																						
		<u>_N</u>	И _{Ed}	=	0.	59	≤	1	1.0		ОК												(ЭК	
		N	l _{c,Rd}			Ť		t																	
																						++			

$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		BG827	5		FIIG	FREE						RE/				-			ŀ	ła	sk	or	nin	gD	HV
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		CUA	5		- · · · ·		·		1 5 1	2020									E	nh	ancin	ng So	ociety	Tog	ethei
HECKED BY:	KEPAKED BY:	СПА			DA	IE:			1-2-7	2020		KEV	DATE			_									
EFEC ALC PARCINO	HECKED BY:				DA	TE:																			
EF B.6 Maximum Shear CUTPUT. V _{E1} = 2000 kN V V S EN 1993- 1: 2005 The design value of shear V _{E1} at each cross-section shall satisfy: Image: Comparison of the sector of th	SEE CALC PAGE	NO			FOF	R ALT	ERNAT	IVE C	CALC	ULA	TIONS)													
6.6 Maximum Shear $V_{Eg} = 20000$ kN IS EN 1992 The design value of shear V_{Eg} at each cross-section shall satisfy: 1:2005 IS EN 1993 Eleastic shear verification is conservative and excludes partial plastic shear distribution which is permitted in elastic design. Therefore elastic shear verification should only be carried out where the verification on the basis of $V_{c,Rag}$ according to equation (6.17) can not be performed. $V_{c,Rag} = V_{g Rag} = \frac{A_{11}(t_{f_{12}}(t_{f_{12}}))}{T_{Rag}}$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) Lefer section 1. of this $V_{c,Rag} = 0$. If ≤ 1.0 8.7 Maximum Torsion IS EN 1993 The design value of the torsion T_{Eg} at each cross-section shall satisfy: 1.1 of this $V_{c,Rag} = 0$. If ≤ 1.0 8.7 Maximum Torsion IS EN 1993 The design value of the torsion T_{Eg} at each cross-section shall satisfy: 1.1 of this $V_{c,Rag} = 0$. If ≤ 1.0 8.7 Maximum Torsion IS EN 1993 The design value of the torsion T_{Eg} at each cross-section shall satisfy: 1.2 20(5) $T_{Eg} = 0$ kNm The resistance T_{Rag} of a circular hollow section shall satisfy: 1.2 20(5) $T_{Eg} = 0$ kNm The resistance T_{Rag} of a circular hollow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. $T_{LEG} = 0$ besign torsional resistance of the cross section $T_{LEG} = 0$ besign shear stress due to St. Venant torsion $T_{LEG} = 0$ is Num $T_{LEG} = 0$ is Num	REF.																						OUT	PUT	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c } \hline V_{GI} &= 26000 \text{ kN} \\ \hline \text{The design value of shear V_{GI} at each cross-section shall satisfy: :-::2005 \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		B.6	Maxim	num Sh	ear																		_		
SE N 1993- -1: 2005 The design value of shear V_{E0} at each cross-section shall satisfy: Image: constraint of the section may be used in elastic design under EC3 SE N 1993- -1: 2005 The design plastic shear resistance of a section may be used in elastic design under EC3 SE N 1993- -1: 2005 Elastic shear verification is conservative and excludes partial plastic shear distribution which is permitted in elastic design Therefore elastic shear rewritication should only be carried out where the verification on the basis of $V_{c,Rd}$ according to equation (6.17) can not be performed. Ve_{c,Rd} = $V_{p,Rd}$ = $\frac{\Lambda_c (t_p / \delta)}{r_{M0}}$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) Ve_{c,Rd} = $V_{p,Rd}$ = $\frac{\Lambda_c (t_p / \delta)}{r_{M0}}$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) Ve_{c,Rd} = $V_{p,Rd}$ = $\frac{\Lambda_c (t_p / \delta)}{r_{M0}}$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) Ve_{c,Rd} = $\frac{\Lambda_c (t_p / \delta)}{V_{c,Rd}}$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) OK SE N 1993- -1: 2005 The design value of the torsion $T_{c,d}$ at each cross-section shall satisfy: Image: Constraint $T_{c,d}$ at each cross-section shall satisfy: -1: 2005 $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ = 1 Image: Constraint $T_{c,d}$ Image: Constraint $T_{c,d}$ SE N 1993- -1: 2005 The design value of the torsion $T_{c,d}$ at each cross-section shall satisfy: Image: Constraint $T_{c,d}$ Image: Constraint $T_{c,d}$ Therefore check shear induced by torsion is leas than s				V _{Ed}	=	26	6000	kN																	
1: 205 1: 2.2.6(1) P $V_{c,Rd} \leq 1.0$ The design plastic shear resistance of a section may be used in elastic design under EC3 1: 2.05 1: 2.05 Elastic shear verification is conservative and excludes partial plastic shear distribution which is permitted in elastic design. Therefore elastic shear verification should only be carried out where the verification on the basis of V _{Le,R} according to equation (6.17) can not be performed. 1: 2.05 1: 2.05 1: 2.05 1: 2.05 1: 2.05 1: 2.05 1: 2.05 1: 2.07 1: 2.07	S EN 1993-		The de	esign va	alue	of sh	ear V	_{=d} at	eac	h cr	oss-s	ection	shall	satis	ÿ:										
$\frac{18226(1)P}{V_{C,Rd}} \leq 1.0$ The design plastic shear resistance of a section may be used in elastic design under EC3 IS EN 1993. Elastic shear verification is conservative and excludes partial plastic shear distribution which is permitted in elastic design. Therefore elastic shear verification should only be carried out where the verification on the basis of $V_{c,Rd}$ events of	-1: 2005			V _{Ed}																					
The design plastic shear resistance of a section may be used in elastic design under EC3 Elastic shear verification is conservative and excludes partial plastic shear distribution which is berefit and the verification on the basis of $V_{c,Ra}$ according to equation (6.17) can not be performed. $V_{c,Rd} = V_{pl,Rd} = \frac{A_{c}(l_{p}^{1}/\sqrt{3})}{V_{tot}}$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) $V_{c,Rd} = V_{pl,Rd} = \frac{A_{c}(l_{p}^{1}/\sqrt{3})}{V_{tot}}$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) $V_{c,Rd} = V_{pl,Rd} = \frac{A_{c}(l_{p}^{1}/\sqrt{3})}{V_{tot}}$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) $V_{c,Rd} = 160733$ kN $V_{c,Rd} = 160733$ kN $V_{c,Rd} = 100733$ kN $V_{c,Rd} = 100733$ kN $V_{c,Rd} = 0.16 \le 1.0$ $V_{c,Rd} = 0.16 \le 0.0$ $V_{c,Rd} = 0.0 \text{ k/M}$ $V_{c,Rd} = 0.0 \text{ k/M}$ $V_{c,Rd} = 0.0 \text{ k/M}$ $V_{c,R} = 0.0 \text{ k/M}$	3 6.2.6(1) P			V _{c,Rd}	≤		1.0																		
BS EN 1993- 1: 2005 2:6.2.6(4) P Elastic shear verification is conservative and excludes partial plastic shear distribution which is permitted in elastic design. Therefore elastic shear verification should only be carried out where the verification on the basis of $V_{c,Rd}$ according to equation (6.17) can not be performed. $V_{c,Rd} = V_{p Rd} = \frac{A_v(t_p/\sqrt{3})}{r_{Ad}}$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) Refer section $A_v = Shear Area = 2A/\pi$ $V_{p,Rd} = 160733$ kN $\frac{V_{ed}}{V_{e,Rd}} = 0.16 \le 1.0$ B.7 Maximum Torsion BS EN 1993- 1: 2005 2:62.7(1) The design value of the torsion T_{Ed} at each cross-section shall satisfy: 1: 2005 2:62.7(1) The design value of the torsion T_{Ed} at each cross-section shall satisfy: 1: 2005 2:62.7(1) The resistance T_{Rd} of a circular hollow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Thereresistance T_{Rd} of a circular hollow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore $T_{LEd} = \frac{T_{LEd}}{C}$ Note: For circular tube effect of torsional warping can be neglected $(T_{LEd} = 0 \ KNm^{-1}$ $C = 2 \times W_{eff}$ $C = 2 \times W_{eff}$ C = 3.35E+09 $T_{LEd} = 0 \ KNm^{-1}$ V_{Ed} due to torsion $= T_{LEd} \times Shear Area A_v$ $= 0 \ K 0.8383$ $= 0 \ K N$			The de	esign pla	astic	c she	ar res	istan	ce c	ofas	sectio	on may	be u	sed ir	elas	tic d	esign	under	EC	3					
Si EN 1993- Si EN 1993- Si EN 1993- Si EN 1993- Si En 1993- Te 2.6(4) P V _{0,Rd} = V _{pLRd} = $\frac{A_{v}(t_{v}\sqrt{3})}{r_{HO}}$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) V _{0,Rd} = V _{pLRd} = $\frac{A_{v}(t_{v}\sqrt{3})}{r_{HO}}$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) V _{0,Rd} = V _{pLRd} = $\frac{A_{v}(t_{v}\sqrt{3})}{r_{HO}}$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) V _{0,Rd} = 0.16 ≤ 1.0 OK B.7 Maximum Torsion Si EN 1993- The design value of the torsion T _{Ed} at each cross-section shall satisfy: 1: 2005 2: 2.0(1) $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}} \le 1$ The design value of the torsion lesistance of the cross section T _{Ed} = 0 KNm The resistance T _{Rd} of a circular holiow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength at a data of the cross section The resistance T _{Rd} of a circular holiow section shall be based on the design shear strength. The resistance T _{Rd} of a circular holiow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. $\frac{\tau_{LEd}}{\tau_{LEd}} = \frac{T_{Ed}}{C}$ Note: For circular tube effect of torsional wapping can be neglected (T _{w,Ed} = 0 KNm ⁻) (C = 2 × W _{eff} C = 0 KN ^m $\frac{\tau_{LEd}}{\tau_{LEd}} = 0$ KN ^m $\frac{\tau_{LEd}}{\tau_{LEd}} = $																									
$\begin{array}{c c} 1: 20.9 \\ 1: 62.6(4) P \\ \hline \\ 1: 62.6(4) P $	S EN 1993-		Elastic	shear	verif	ficatio	on is c	onse	ervat	tive a	and e	xclude	s par	tial pl	astic	shea	r distr	ibutic	n wh	nich	is				
Note: $V_{c,Rd}$ V_{pLRd} $A_v(ty/\sqrt{3})$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) Refer section A_v A_v $V_v(y/\sqrt{3})$ (Plastic Shear Resistance) 3.1 of this = 883800 mm ² V_{cRd} = $24/\pi$ Sheet $V_{g,Rd}$ = 0.16 1.0 OK B.7 Maximum Torsion V_{cRd} = $0.16 \le 1.0$ OK B.7 Maximum Torsion V_{cRd} = $0.16 \le 1.0$ OK B.7 Maximum Torsion V_{cRd} = $0.16 \le 1.0$ OK B.7 Maximum Torsion V_{cRd} 1.0 OK B.7 Maximum Torsion V_{cRd} 1.0 OK B.7 The design value of the torsion T_{Ed} at each cross-section shall satisfy: $1.202.7(1)$ T_{Ed} 1.0 V_{cRd} 1.0 V_{cRd} 1.0 The resistance T_{Rd} of a circular hollow section shall be based on the design shear strength. <td>-1: 2005 Cl 6.2.6(4) P</td> <td></td> <td>permit the ver</td> <td>ted in e rificatior</td> <td>ıasti n on</td> <td>c des the l</td> <td>sign. T basis (</td> <td>here of V_c</td> <td>tore</td> <td>e ela: acco</td> <td>stic s rding</td> <td>hear v to equ</td> <td>erifica iation</td> <td>ation s (6.17</td> <td>houl) car</td> <td>d onl</td> <td>y be c be pe</td> <td>arrieo form</td> <td>i out ed.</td> <td>wh</td> <td>ere</td> <td></td> <td>\vdash</td> <td></td> <td></td>	-1: 2005 Cl 6.2.6(4) P		permit the ver	ted in e rificatior	ıasti n on	c des the l	sign. T basis (here of V _c	tore	e ela: acco	stic s rding	hear v to equ	erifica iation	ation s (6.17	houl) car	d onl	y be c be pe	arrieo form	i out ed.	wh	ere		\vdash		
$V_{c,Rd} = V_{p,I,Rd} = \frac{-V_{V(y,Y)}}{\gamma_{mo}} (Plastic Shear Resistance)$ $A_v = Shear Area = 2\lambda\pi$ $Shear Area A_{x}$ She								Λ	, (f)	21				·			, T						\square		
Refer section A_v = Shear Area = 2Vir Short Mis = 883800 mm ²				$V_{c,Rd}$	=	V _{pl.}	Rd =	<u>-</u>	γ(1y) γ _{Μ0}	v 3)	(Plastic	Shea	r Res	istan	ce)									
$F_{V} = Streat Area = Exc.$ $F_{V} = Streat$) of or				_	0				20/-	π														
1. In this V _{plRd} = 160733 km V _{plRd} = 160733 km $\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{e,Rd}}$ = 0.16 ≤ 1.0 8.7 Maximum Torsion ISE IN 1993- -1: 2005 1.10 $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ ≤ 1 T_{Rd} = Design torsional resistance of the cross section shall satisfy: 1.1: 2005 $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ ≤ 1 T_{Rd} = Design torsional resistance of the cross section T_{Rd} = Design torsional resistance of the cross section T_{Rd} = Design torsional resistance of the cross section T_{Rd} = Design shear stress due to St. Venant torsion τ_{LEd} = $\frac{T_{LEd}}{C}$ Note: τ_{LEd} = $\frac{T_{LEd}}{C}$ Note: τ_{LEd} = 0 kNm ⁺ τ_{LEd} due to torsion = τ_{LEd} x Shear Area Av τ_{LEd} due to torsion = τ_{LEd} x Shear Area Av τ_{LEd} due to torsion = τ_{LEd} x Shear Area Av τ_{LEd} due to torsion = τ_{LEd} x Shear Area Av τ_{LEd} due to torsion = τ_{LEd} x 0.8838 τ_{LEd} = 0 kN <td>leter section</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>A_v</td> <td>=</td> <td>Sh</td> <td>ear A</td> <td>rea mm</td> <td>= 1²</td> <td>270</td> <td></td>	leter section			A _v	=	Sh	ear A	rea mm	= 1 ²	270															
$\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{cRd}} = 0.16 \le 1.0$ B.7 Maximum Torsion IS EN 1993- -1: 2005 $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}} \le 1$ The design value of the torsion T _{Ed} at each cross-section shall satisfy: -1: 2005 $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}} \le 1$ The design value of the torsion at resistance of the cross section $T_{Ed} = 0$ KNM The resistance T _{Rd} of a circular hollow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. $T_{LEd} = 0$ $T_{LEd} = 0$ Where C = Torsional Modulus Constant C = 2 × W _{eff} C = 335E+09 $T_{LEd} = 0$ KN/m^{*} V_{Ed} V_{Ed} due to torsion = T_{LEd} x Shear Area A _v = 0 x 0.8838 = 0 KN	Sheet			V _{pl.Rd}	=	16	0733	kN																	
$\frac{1}{V_{cRd}} = 0.16 \le 1.0$ B.7 Maximum Torsion B.7 Maximum Torsion The design value of the torsion T _{Ed} at each cross-section shall satisfy: 1: 2005 1:				V																					
B.7 Maximum Torsion SEEN 1993- 11: 2005 Cl.6.2.7(1) Ted design value of the torsion Ted at each cross-section shall satisfy: T_{Ed} = 1 T_{Ed} = 1 T_{Ed} = 0 kNm The resistance T_{Rd} of a circular holiow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. T_{Ed} = 0 kNm T_{LEd} = Design shear stress due to St. Venant torsion T_{LEd} = T_{LEd} Note: For circular tube effect of torsional warping can be neglected $(T_{w,Ed} = 0)$. Therefore $T_{Ed} = T_{LEd}$ Where C = Torsional Modulus Constant C = 2 x Wel C = 2 x Wel C = 2 x 1.67E+09 C = 3.35E+09 T_{LEd} = 0 kNm ⁻ T_{LEd} = 0 kN ⁻				V _{c,Rd}	=	0.1	6 ≤	1	.0															C	Ж
B.7 Maximum Torsion Image: Construct on the design value of the torsion Ted at each cross-section shall satisfy: Image: Construct on the design value of the torsion Ted at each cross-section shall satisfy: Image: Construct on the design value of the torsion Ted at each cross-section shall satisfy: Image: Construct on the design value of the torsion Ted at each cross-section shall satisfy: Image: Construct on the design value of the torsion Ted at each cross-section shall satisfy: Image: Construct on the design value of the torsion of the cross section C16.2.7(1) Image: Construct on the design shear strength on the design shear strength. Image: Construct on the design shear strength. Image: Construct on the design shear strength. C16.2.7(1) Image: Construct on the design shear strength. Image: Construct on the design shear strength. Image: Construct on the design shear strength. The resistance Trd of a circular hollow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Image: Construct on the design shear strength. Image: Construct on the design shear strength. Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C16.2.7(1) Image: C1																									
SE EN 1993- IS EN 1993- I-1: 2005 C16.2.7(1) The design value of the torsion T _{Ed} at each cross-section shall satisfy: T _{Ed} = Design torsional resistance of the cross section T _{Ed} = 0 KNm The resistance T _{Rd} of a circular hollow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. T _{LEd} = Design shear stress due to St. Venant torsion T _{LEd} = Design shear stress due to St. Venant torsion T _{LEd} = Design shear stress due to St. Venant torsion T _{LEd} = T <u>LEd</u> Note: T _{LEd} For circular tube effect of torsional warping can be neglected (T _{w,Ed} = 0, Therefore T _{Ed} = T _{LEd} Where C = Torsional Modulus Constant C = 2 x W _{el} C = 3.35E+09 T _{LEd} = 0 KN/m ⁴ V _{Ed} due to torsion = T _{LEd} X Shear Area A _v = 0 x 0.8838 = 0 KN V _{Ed} Stress Stress Stress Area A _v = 0 KN		B.7	Maxim	າum To	rsio	n																			
BS EN 1993- L-1: 2005 D16.2.7(1) The design value of the torsion T_{Ed} at each cross-section shall satisfy: $T_{Ed} = 0$ kNm The resistance T_{Rd} of a circular hollow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. $T_{LEd} = 0$ kNm Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. $T_{LEd} = 0$ kNm Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. $T_{LEd} = \frac{T_{LEd}}{C}$ Note: For circular tube effect of torsional warping can be neglected $(T_{w,Ed} = 0)$. Therefore $T_{Ed} = T_{LEd}$ Where C = Torsional Modulus Constant C = 2 x W_{el} C = 2 x W_{el} C = 3.35E+09 $T_{LEd} = 0$ kN/m ⁴ V_{Ed} due to torsion = T_{LEd} x Shear Area A _v = 0 x 0.8838 = 0 kN																									
$\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}} \leq 1$ $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Ed}} \leq 1$ $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Ed}} \leq 1$ $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Ed}} = 0 kNm$																									
$T_{Rd} = Design torsional resistance of the cross section T_{Ed} = 0 kNm The resistance T_{Rd} of a circular hollow section shall be based on the design shear strength.Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above.T_{t,Ed} = Design shear stress due to St. Venant torsion T_{t,Ed} = \frac{T_{t,Ed}}{C} Note: For circular tube effect of torsional warping can be neglected (T_{w,Ed} = 0). Therefore T_{Ed} = T_{t,Ed} Where C = Torsional Modulus Constant C = 2 \times W_{el} C = 2 \times W_{el} C = 3.35E+09 T_{t,Ed} = 0 kN/m^{\circ} V_{Ed} due to torsion = T_{t,Ed} \times Shear Area A_v = 0 x 0.8838 = 0 kN$	3S EN 1993-		The de	esign va	alue	of the	e torsi	on T	_{Ed} a	t ea	ch cr	oss-se	ction	shall	satisf	y:									
$T_{Rd} = Design torsional resistance of the cross section T_{Ed} = 0 kNm The resistance T_{Rd} of a circular hollow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in B.6 above. Therefore the check shear strength calculated in $	3S EN 1993- -1: 2005		The de	esign va	alue <	of the	e torsi	on T	_{Ed} a	t ea	ch cr	oss-se	ction	shall	satisf	y:									
$T_{Ed} = 0 \text{ kNm}$ The resistance T_{Rd} of a circular hollow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. $T_{t,Ed} = Design \text{ shear stress due to St. Venant torsion}$ $T_{t,Ed} = \frac{T_{t,Ed}}{C} \frac{\text{Note:}}{\text{Note:}} \text{ For circular tube effect of torsional warping can be neglected}$ $(T_{w,Ed} = 0). \text{ Therefore } T_{Ed} = T_{t,Ed}$ $C = Torsional Modulus Constant$ $C = 2 \times W_{el}$ $C = 2 \times W_{el}$ $C = 3.35E+09$ $T_{t,Ed} = 0 \text{ kN/m}^{+}$ $V_{Ed} \text{ due to torsion } = T_{t,Ed} \times \text{Shear Area } A_{v}$ $= 0 \text{ kN}$	3S EN 1993- -1: 2005 Cl 6.2.7(1)		The de	esign va <u>T_{Ed}</u> T _{Rd}	alue ≤	of the	e torsi	on T	_{Ed} a	t ea	ch cr	oss-se	ction	shall	satisf	y:									
The resistance T _{Rd} of a circular hollow section shall be based on the design shear strength. Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. $\tau_{t,Ed}$ Design shear stress due to St. Venant torsion $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\overline{\tau}_{t,Ed}$ Design shear stress due to St. Venant torsion $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\overline{\tau}_{t,Ed}$ Note: For circular tube effect of torsional warping can be neglected ($T_{w,Ed} = 0$). Therefore $T_{Ed} = T_{t,Ed}$ Where C = Torsional Modulus Constant C = 2 × W _{ell} - C = 2 × W _{ell} - C = 2 × M _{ell} - C = 2 × 1.67E+09 - C = 2 × 1.67E+09 - The due to torsion = 0 kN/m ⁴ V _{Ed} due to torsion = 0 x 0 V _{Ed} = 0 kN - 0 V _{Ed} = 0 kN - 0 K = 0 kN - - 0 K = 0 kN <td>S EN 1993- -1: 2005 Cl 6.2.7(1)</td> <td></td> <td>The de</td> <td>esign va <u>T_{Ed}</u> T_{Rd} T_{Rd}</td> <td>alue ≤</td> <td>of the 1 Des</td> <td>e torsi ign toi</td> <td>on T sion</td> <td>_{Ed} a</td> <td>t ea</td> <td>ch cr</td> <td>oss-se of the</td> <td>ction :</td> <td>shall : secti</td> <td>satisf on</td> <td>y:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	S EN 1993- -1: 2005 Cl 6.2.7(1)		The de	esign va <u>T_{Ed}</u> T _{Rd} T _{Rd}	alue ≤	of the 1 Des	e torsi ign toi	on T sion	_{Ed} a	t ea	ch cr	oss-se of the	ction :	shall : secti	satisf on	y:									
Therefore check shear induced by torsion is less than shear strength calculated in B.6 above. $T_{t,Ed} = Design shear stress due to St. Venant torsion$ $T_{t,Ed} = \frac{T_{t,Ed}}{C} Note: For circular tube effect of torsional warping can be neglected (T_{w,Ed} = 0). Therefore T_{Ed} = T_{t,Ed}$ Where C = Torsional Modulus Constant $C = 2 \times W_{el}$ $C = 2 \times 1.67E+09$ $C = 3.35E+09$ $T_{t,Ed} = 0 kN/m^{4}$ V_{Ed} due to torsion = $T_{t,Ed} \times Shear Area A_{v}$ $= 0 x 0.8838$ $= 0 kN$	3S EN 1993- -1: 2005 X 6.2.7(1)		The de	esign va T _{Ed} T _{Rd} T _{Rd} T _{Rd} T _{Ed}	alue ≤ =	of the 1 Des	e torsi ign tor 0	on T sion kNr	_{Ed} a al re	t ea	ch cr ance	oss-se	ction : cross	shall : secti	satisf	y:									
$\tau_{t,Ed} = Design shear stress due to St. Venant torsion$ $\tau_{t,Ed} = \frac{T_{t,Ed}}{C} \qquad Note: For circular tube effect of torsional warping can be neglected (T_{w,Ed} = 0). Therefore T_{Ed} = T_{t,Ed}$ $Where C = Torsional Modulus Constant$ $C = 2 \times W_{el}$ $C = 2 \times W_{el}$ $C = 2 \times 1.67E+09$ $C = 3.35E+09$ $\tau_{t,Ed} = 0 KN/m^{\circ}$ $V_{Ed} due to torsion = \tau_{t,Ed} \times Shear Area A_v$ $= 0 x 0.8838$ $= 0 KN$	3S EN 1993- -1: 2005 Cl 6.2.7(1)		The de	esign va T _{Ed} T _{Rd} T _{Rd} T _{Ed}	alue ≤ = =	of the 1 Des	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu	on T sion kNr	_{Ed} a al re m	t ead	ch cr ance	of the	ction : cross	shall secti	satisf on n the	y: desi	qn sh	ear st	renc	ıth.					
$T_{t,Ed} = Design shear stress due to St. Venant torsion$ $T_{t,Ed} = \frac{T_{t,Ed}}{C} \qquad Note: For circular tube effect of torsional warping can be neglected (T_{w,Ed} = 0). Therefore T_{Ed} = T_{t,Ed}$ $C = 2 \times W_{el}$ $C = 2 \times W_{el}$ $C = 2 \times W_{el}$ $C = 3.35E+09$ $T_{t,Ed} = 0 \qquad NNm^{\circ}$ $T_{t,Ed} = 0 \qquad NNm^{\circ}$ $T_{t,Ed} = 0 \qquad NNm^{\circ}$ $C = 0 \times 0.8838$ $T_{t,Ed} = 0 \times NN$	3S EN 1993- -1: 2005 Cl 6.2.7(1)		The de The re Theref	T _{Ed} T _{Rd} T _{Rd} T _{Rd} T _{Ed}	e T _R	of the 1 Des Rd of a	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu	on T sion kNr Ilar h	_{Ed} a al re m nollo	t ead	ch cr ance ectior	of the shall	cross cross be bas	shall sections sections sections are structured as the section of	satisf on n the ength	y: desi	gn she	ear st I in B	reng	jth.	θ.				
$T_{t,Ed} = \frac{T_{t,Ed}}{C}$ Note: For circular tube effect of torsional warping can be neglected $(T_{w,Ed} = 0)$. Therefore $T_{Ed} = T_{t,Ed}$ Where $C = Torsional Modulus Constant$ $C = 2 \times W_{el}$ $C = 2 \times W_{el}$ $C = 3.35E+09$ $T_{t,Ed} = 0$ KN/m^{2} V_{Ed} $V_$	3S EN 1993- -1: 2005 CI 6.2.7(1)		The de The re	esign va $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} esistance	er T _R	of the 1 Des Rd of a	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu	on T sion kNi ilar h ed b	_{Ed} a al re n oollo	t ead esist	ch cr ance ectior	of the shall	cross cross be bas	shall secti sed o ar str	satisf on n the ength	y: desi i calo	gn she	ear st I in B	reng 6 at	jth.	e.				
$C = 2 \times W_{el}$ $C = 2 \times 1.67E+09$ $C = 3.35E+09$ $C_{t,Ed} = 0 kN/m^{2}$ $V_{Ed} due \text{ to torsion} = \tau_{t,Ed} \times \text{Shear Area } A_{v}$ $C_{t,Ed} = 0 kN/m^{2}$	3S EN 1993- -1: 2005 Cl 6.2.7(1)		The de The re Theref	esign va $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} esistance fore che $\tau_{t,Ed}$	alue = = e T_{R}	of the 1 Des Rd of a	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu induc Design	on T sion kNr Ilar h ed b	_{Ed} a al re nollo y to ear s	t ead esist rsior	ance ectior n is le	of the shall ess that e to St	cross cross be bas n she Vena	shall sections sections ar structure and too	satisf on n the ength	y: desi	gn sh	ear st I in B	renç 6 at	jth.					
WhereC= Torsional Modulus ConstantC= $2 \times W_{el}$ C= $2 \times W_{el}$ C= $2 \times 1.67E+09$ C= $3.35E+09$ T _{t,Ed} = 0 KN/m ² KN/m ² V _{Ed} due to torsion= $T_{t,Ed} \times Shear Area A_v$ = 0×0.8838 V_{Ed} V _{Ed} <	3S EN 1993- -1: 2005 CI 6.2.7(1)		The de	esign va $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Ed} esistance fore che $T_{t,Ed}$ $T_{t,Ed}$	\leq = = e T _R =	of the 1 Des ad of a shear	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu Design	on T sion kNr Ilar h ed b	Ed a al re m oollo y to ear s te:	t ead esist w se rsior stres	ance ectior n is le s due	of the shall es to St	ction a cross pe baa n she Vena	shall sections section and too	on n the ength sion	y: des i calo	gn shi ulatec	ear st I in B	renç .6 ak	jth.	ecte	d			
$C = 2 \times W_{el}$ $C = 2 \times 1.67E+09$ $C = 3.35E+09$ $T_{t,Ed} = 0 kN/m^{2}$ $V_{Ed} \text{ due to torsion} = T_{t,Ed} \times \text{Shear Area } A_{v}$ $= 0 x 0.8838$ $= 0 kN$	3S EN 1993- -1: 2005 CI 6.2.7(1)		The de	esign va $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} esistance fore chea $T_{t,Ed}$ $T_{t,Ed}$	\leq = = e T _F eck s =	of the 1 Des ad of a shear $T_{t,t}$	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu induc Design	on T sion kNr Ilar h ed b	ear s	t ead essist: w se rsior stres For (T,	ance ectior n is le s due circu	of the shall ess tha e to St lar tub = 0). Th	cross cross n she Vena e effe	shall sections section	on n the ength corsic	y: desi i calo nal v	gn shi ulatec varpin	ear st I in B g can	reng .6 at	jth. Dov	e.	ď			
$C = 2 \times 1.67E+09$ $C = 3.35E+09$ $T_{t,Ed} = 0 KN/m^{2}$ $V_{Ed} \text{ due to torsion} = T_{t,Ed} \times \text{Shear Area } A_{v}$ $= 0 x 0.8838$ $= 0 KN$	S EN 1993- -1: 2005 D 6.2.7(1)		The de The re Theref	esign va $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Ed} esistance fore che $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{c,Ed}$	≤ = = = eck s = =	of the 1 Des Rd of a shear $T_{t,}$ (e torsi ign tor 0 a circu Design Ed C	on T sion kNr ilar h ed b n she <u>Not</u>	al re m nollo y to ear s te:	t ead essist: w se rsior stres For (T,	ance ectior n is le circu w,Ed ⁼	of the shall ess tha e to St lar tub = 0). Th t	ction a cross oe baa n she Vena e effe	shall : secti sed o ar str ant too ct of f	on ength corsice	y: desi i cald	gn shu ulatec varpin	ear st I in B g can	renç 6 ak	jth. pov	e.	ed.			
$\tau_{t,Ed} = 0 kN/m^{2}$ $V_{Ed} \text{ due to torsion} = \tau_{t,Ed} \times \text{Shear Area } A_{v}$ $= 0 x 0.8838$ $= 0 kN$	US EN 1993- -1: 2005 216.2.7(1)		The de The re Theref	esign va $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} sistance fore che $T_{t,Ed}$ $T_{t,Ed}$ $T_{t,Ed}$	halue \leq = = = = =	of the 1 Des Rd of a shear 1 $\frac{T_{t,}}{2}$	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu induc Design <u>Ed</u> C	on T sion kNr Ilar h ed b n she <u>Not</u>	ear s	t ead esist: w se rsior stres For (T,	ection n is le circu w,Ed ⁼	of the shall ess that a to St lar tub t	cross cross n she Vena e effe	secti sed o ar str ct of f	on n the ength corsico d = T	y: desi i cald	gn shi ulatec varpin	ear st I in B	reng 6 at	jth.	e.	ad			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	IS EN 1993- -1: 2005		The de The re Theref	esign va $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} esistance fore che $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$	alue \leq = = = = = = =	of the 1 Des ad of a shear 1 $T_{t, c}$ 2 2 2 2 2	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu Design Ed C sional k W _{el} k 1.	on T sion kNr llar h ed b n she <u>Not</u>	ear s te:	t ead esist rsior stres For (T,	ance ectior n is le s due circu w,Ed ⁼	of the shall ess tha e to St lar tub = 0). Th t	cross cross oe ba n she Vena e effe	secti sed o ar str ant to ct of f	on n the ength corsicn d = T	y: des i cald	gn shu ulatec	ear st I in B g can	reng .6 at	gth.	e.	ad			
$V_{Ed} \text{ due to torsion} = \tau_{t,Ed} \times \text{Shear Area } A_v$ $= 0 \times 0.8838$ $= 0 \times N$ $V_{Ed} \times V_{Ed} \times V_{Ed}$	IS EN 1993- -1: 2005 216.2.7(1)		The de The re Theref	esign va $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} esistance $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ τ_{c} C C C	alue \leq = = = = = = =	of the 1 Des R_d of a shear 1 $\frac{T_{t,i}}{2}$ 2 : 3.35	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu induc Design <u>Ed</u> C cional k W _{el} k 1. 5E+09	on T sion kNr lar h ed b n she <u>Not</u>	al rem m nollo y to ear s te: ulus	t ead esist rsior stres For (T,	ectior n is le circu w,Ed ⁼	of the shall ess that a to St lar tub t	cross cross n she Vena e effe nerefo	secti sed o ar str ct of f	satisf on n the ength sion corsic $d = T_1$	y: desi a cald	gn shi ulatec varpin	ear st l in B	renç .6 at	jth.	e.	d			
$= 0 \times 0.8838$ $= 0 \times 0.8838$ $= 0 \times N$	IS EN 1993- -1: 2005 D 6.2.7(1)		The de The re Theref	esign va $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} esistance fore che $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$	Alue \leq $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$	of the 1 Des ad of a shear $T_{t,}$ (Tors 2 x 2 x 3.33	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu Design Ed C Sional k U _{el} k 1. 5E+09 0	sion T kNr llar h ed b Not Mode	ear s ear s ear s ear s	t ead esist: w se rsior stres For (T,	ance ectior n is le s due circu w,Ed ⁼	of the shall ess tha e to St lar tub t	cross cross n she Vena e effe	secti sed o ar str ant to ct of f	on n the ength corsic $d = T_1$	y: desi i cald	gn shi ulatec	ear st I in B	reng 6 at	jth.	e.				
$\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{pl,Rd}} \le 1.0$	S EN 1993- -1: 2005		The re Theref	esign va T_{Ed} T_{Rd} T_{Rd} T_{Ed} sistance $T_{t,Ed}$ $T_{t,Ed}$ C C C C C C C C	alue = $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$	of the 1 Des ad of a shear 1 $\frac{T_{t,r}}{r}$	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu induc Design cional k W _{el} k 1. 5E+09 0 0 0	on T sion kNr lar h ed b n she <u>Not</u> 67E+	Ed a al re m oollo y to ear s te: ulus +09	t ead esist rsior for (T, Cor	ectior n is le circu circu s du circu s du Shea	of the shall ess that a to St lar tub c 0). The t	cross cross n she Vena e effe merefo	secti sed o ar str ct of f	satisf on n the ength sion $corsiccd = T_1$	y: desi nalv	gn shi ulatec varpin	ear si l in B	reng .6 at	gth.	e.	d			
$\frac{V_{Ed}}{V_{pl,Rd}} \leq 1.0$	IS EN 1993- -1: 2005 DI 6.2.7(1)		The de The re Theref	esign va $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} esistance fore che $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$ c c c c c c $\tau_{t,Ed}$ $\tau_{t,Ed}$	alue \leq $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$	of the 1 Des ad of t shear 1 $T_{t,}$ (Tors 2) 2) 3.35 torsid	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu induc Design Ed C sional $\langle W_{el}$ $\langle W_{el}$ $\langle W_{el}$ $\langle N_{el}$ $\langle 1.$ 5E+09 0 on =	sion T kNr llar h ed b Not 67E+	Ed a al re m oollo yy to ear s te: ulus +09	t ead esist: w se rsior stres For (T, o Cor	ance ectior n is le s due circu w,Ed ⁼ nstan	of the shall ess tha e to St lar tub c 0). Th t t ur Area 0.883	ction s cross De baa n she Vena e effe merefo A _v 8	secti sed o ar str ant to ct of f	on n the ength corsic d = T	y: desi i cald	gn shi ulatec	ear st l in B	reng 6 at	gth.	e.				
vpl,Rd	3S EN 1993- -1: 2005 DI 6.2.7(1)		The re Theref	esign va $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Ed} esistance $T_{t,Ed}$ $T_{t,Ed}$ $T_{t,Ed}$ C C C C C $T_{t,Ed}$ $T_{t,Ed}$	alue \leq $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$	of the 1 Des Rd of a shear 1 $\frac{T_{t,r}}{r_{t,r}}$	e torsi ign tor 0 a circu induc Design cional k W _{el} k 1. 5E+09 0 0 con = = =	on T sion kNr lar h ed b n she <u>Not</u> 67E+	Ed a al re m oollo y to ear s te: ulus +09 (m ² .Ed 0 0	t ead esist rsior stres For (T, Cor	ectior n is le s due circu stan	of the shall ess that to St lar tub c 0). The t t 0.883	cross cross n she Vena e effe herefo A _v 8	secti sed o ar str ct of f	satisf on n the ength sion $d = T_1$	y: desi i cald	gn shi ulatec varpin	ear sí	be i	neg	e.	d			
人名法格 法法律法律法律法律法律法律法律法律法律法律法律法律法律法律法律法律法律法律	IS EN 1993- -1: 2005 -1: 2005		The de The re Theref	esign va $\frac{T_{Ed}}{T_{Rd}}$ T_{Rd} T_{Rd} T_{cd} esistance $\tau_{t,Ed}$	alue \leq = = = = = = = =	of the 1 Des ad of t shear 1 Tors 2 y 3.38 torsid	e torsi ign tor 0 induc Design Ed C Sional k W _{el} k 1. 5E+09 0 0 0 cn = = =	sion T kNr llar h ed b n she <u>Not</u> 67E+	Ed a al re m oollo yy to ear s te: ulus +09	t ead esist: w se rsior stres For (T, Cor	ectior n is le s due circu w,Ed ⁼ nstan	of the shall ess tha e to St lar tub c 0). Th t t	ction s cross De bas n she Vena e effe herefo A _v 8	secti sect of ant to ct of f	on n the ength corsic d = T	y: desi i cald	gn shi ulatec	ear st l in B	be i	Jth.	e.				

PROJECT TITLE: SUBJECT: <u>SO</u>	ENECO MV2 WINDFAR	M - MONOPILE FOU DSION (NAP -7m) - C	JNDATION CONCE	ION	Royal
PROJECT NO:	BG8375	FILE REF:		REV:	HaskoningDHV Enhancing Society Together
PREPARED BY:	CHA	DATE:	1-5-2020	REV DATE:	
CHECKED BY:		DATE:		-	

REF.																							OUT	PUT.		
BS EN 1993-	В.8		Torsion and	Shea	ar																					
1-1: 2005																										
CI 6.2.7(9)			For combined	l she	ar forc	e ano	d tors	iona	mor	ment t	the	plastic	c she	ar re	sist	anc	e aco	cour	nting	for	torsio	nal				
			effects should	l be r	educe	d fro	m V _p	_{I,Rd} to	v V _{pl,}	_{T.Rd} a	nd t	he de	sign	shea	ar fo	rce	shou	ıld s	atisf	y:						
			Vel																							
BS EN 1993-				≤	1.0																					
1-1: 2005			p, , , , , , , ,		Γ	τ]																		
eq 6.25 & 6.28			V _{pl,T.R}	d =	$1 - \frac{1}{(f_v)}$	$\sqrt{3}$	1 'γ	V _{pl,R}	d																	
							́М0 .]																		
			T _{Ed}	=	1950	00	kNm																			
			$ au_{t,Ed}$	=	T _{t,Ed}																					
					/ (LALIA	- 6																		
			$ au_{t,Ed}$	=	582	4	KIN/N	1																		
			T _{t,Ed}	=	1950	00	kNm																			
			A _v	=	8838	00	mm																			
			V _{pl.Rd}	=	1607	33	kN																			
			V _{pl,T.R}	d =	1555	85	kN																			
			V _{Ed}	=	2600	00	kN																			
			V _{Ed}																							
			V _{pl,T,Rd}	=	0.17	≤	1.0)																0	K	
BS EN 1993-	В.9		Bending and	She	ar																					
1-1:2005			N N	_	0		LN																			
CI 0.2.8			V _{Ed}	-	1050	20	KIN																			
	_		¹ t,Ed	-	593	10	KINIII	2																		
	_		Vt,Ed	-	3100	4 00	kNm	1														_				
	_		V	-	1607	33	kN															_				
			Vurn	. =	1555	85	kN																			
			• pi, i .Ro	3	1000																					
			Assumina sor	ne to	orsion i	s pre	sent	V., .	D W	/ill be	mor	re one	rous	than	۱ V.,	D .4.	Hend	ce c	heck	effe	ect					
BS EN 1993-			of V _{NTR4} on n	nome	ent resi	istan	ce fir	st:	,Ru ··	T					pi	,Ru-										
1-1: 2005			If V _{Ed} is less t	han I	nalf V _n	TPd	then	no re	educ	tion in	mc	ment	resis	stanc	e n	eed	s to b	be c	onsi	dere	ed.					
CI = 628(2)			Lu		pi	, 1 ,1																				
010.2.0(2)			2 V _{Ed} ≤	V _{pl.}	T.Rd	No	effec	t on	the N	<i>Aome</i>	nt R	Resista	ance.	Igno	ore	boxe	ed se	ectio	n be	low			No	rodu	uctic	n in
								- + -	+ -								- + -	- +			,		NU	mor	nen	t
BS EN 1993-		i	Reduced Yiel	d Str	ength	=	(1-	ρ) f _v													, i		resi	stan	ce r	eq'd
1-1: 2005		÷																			Ì					
CI 6.2.8(3)(4)					ρ	=	$\left(\frac{2V}{V}\right)$	Ed	-1) ²	(Wh	ere to	rsior	ı is p	rese	ent.	See	note	e bel	ow)	İ					
		¦					v pl,⁼	F,Rd			_		L		_						<u>j</u>					
			Note: If there	is no	torsio	n pre	sent	then	$V_{pl,R}$	$R_d = V_p$	ol,T,R	_d and	the a	above	e co	nclu	ision	reg	ardi	ng e	ffect					
			on moment re	esista	ance re	mair	ns the	e san	ne.																	
			Design Yield	Strer	igth for	ben	ding	in sh	ear	=	3	815	N/n	nm²												
			Design Resis	tance	e of the	cros	ss																			
			section for be	nding	g in she	ear		М	c,Rd	=	52	7307	kNı	m												
			Med																							
			$\frac{L_{u}}{M_{c,Rd}} =$		0.59	≤	1.0)																0	K	

PROJECT TITLE:	ENECO	MV2 W	INDFAR	M - I	MONOPIL	E FOU	NDATI	ON CO	NCEPT	DESIGN		_		
SUBJECT: SOU	JTH PRO	FILE - F	ULL ERO	SIO	N (NAP -7	'm) - C'	CLIC D	EGRA	DATION	J		1	Royal	
PROJECT NO:	BG8375			FIL	E REF:				RI	EV:			Hasko	ningDHV
PREPARED BY:	CHA			DA	TE:		1-5-20	020	RI	EV DATE			2 manual g	ocicity rogetiner
CHECKED BY:				DA	TE:									
	NO			FO	RAITERN		CALCU							
(SEE CALCITAGE	NO			10	IN ALI LINI		CALCO	LATIO	(113)					
REF.	D 40	Danal	Chu											OUTPUT.
BS EN 1993- 1-1: 2005	В.10	Benai	ing, Sn	ear	and Axia	ai For	ce							
CI 6.2.10	B.10.1	Effect	t of She	ar F	orce									
		Turne	of Class		Clar									
		туре с	V _{Ed}	=	0	ss 3 kN	J							
			$V_{\text{pl,Rd}}$	=	16073	33 kN	I							
								C 11						
		Where axial f	e the sh orce res	ear sista	torce is l ince ma	ess th v be n	an hal ealecte	t the p ed.	plastic	shear re	sistanc	ce its effect on the	bending and	
						y 80 m	ogioot	Ju.						
		2	V _{Ed} ≤	Vŗ	ol,Rd	Hence	e no re	ductio	on in y	ield stre	ngth du	e to shear only		
		Reduc	ed Yiel	d St	renath	but co	nsider 1-0) f	r fy re	ductior	n, if appl	icable,	due to torsional sl	hear	
		literate			longui			y						
					ρ	= (-	2V _{Ed} Vn Rd	-1) ²						
				0 1			· pi,rtu			0.1.5	N/mm	2 ²		
		Desigi	n Yield S	Stre	ngth for	bendir	ig in sl	hear	=	315	IN/IIII			
	B.10.2	Effect	t of Axia	al Fo	orce									
		Sectio	onis C	Class	s 3 ther	refore	go to s	sectio	n /	3.10.2.2	of the	e following calculat	tions.	
BS EN 1993-	B.10.2.	.1 Cla	ass 1 ai	nd 2	2 Cross	Sectio	ons							
1-1: 2005		Fo	r Class	1 ar	nd 2 cros	s sect	ions fo	ollowii	ng crite	erion sha	all be sa	atisfied: M _E	$\leq M_{N,Rd}$	
CI 6.2.9.1(2)			Mura	-	Desian	plastic	c mom	ent re	esistan	ce redu	ed due	e to axial force N⊨	4	
			M _{N,Rd}	=	31000)0 kN	Im							
BS EN 1993-		Ν	M _{N,y,Rd}	=	M _{N,z,F}	Rd =	M _{pl,R}	_d x (1	-n ^{1.7})					
1-1:2005			n	=	N _{Ed} /N _p	ol,Rd								
CI 6.2.9.1(6)			N _{Ed}	=	1300		1							
			N _{pl,Rd}	=	$\frac{Af_y}{v}$	= 4	137305	5 kN	1		0	verall interaction	ו ו	
					7 M0							BS EN 1993-		
			n	=	0.030		Ima					1-1: 2005		
			M _{N.Rd}	=	M _{N.Z.Rd}	= M	N.V.Rd	= 6	81807	kNm	N	C16.2.1(7) _{Ed} / N _{Rd} + M _{Ed} / M _F	_{Rd} = 0.50	N/A
			M _{Ed}	≤	M _{N,Rd}		Ok	(
					Ratio N	1 _{Ed} / M	_{N,Rd} =	0	.45					N/A
		/_	ho at - 1	4 5		late d'	n tha	ode	but c -		oida	l accordant to the	t done obsist	++++
BS EN 1993-		(1) Fo	r biaxial	n De I ber	nding in o	class ²	l and 2	2 cros	sui car s secti	ons follo	sidered owing c	riterion shall be sa	atisfied:	
1-1: 2005	Г		γα		β	_								
CI 6.2.9.1(6)		M.	d +		z,Ed	≤	1.0							
		ı́N,y,F	Mura	L	v,z,Kd] N	kN	lm							
			M _{z.Ed}	=	31000	00 kN	lm							
			α	=	2									
			β	=	2									
	- F	M _{y, Ed}		М	β z,Ed	_	0.24	-	1.0		OK			N1/A

SUBJECT: SOUTH PROFILE - FULL EROSION (NAP -7m) - CYCLIC DEGRADATION



PREPARED BY: CHA DATE: 1-5-2020 REV DATE: CHECKED BY: _____ DATE:

REF. BS EN 1993-	B	1022	Class	3 ()	ross Sactiv	one										OU	TPUT.	
1_1· 2005		10.2.2	For cla	ss 3	B cross sec	tions in	the	ab	sence c	of shear	r forc	e the m	aximı	um lonait	udinal stres	ss		
C = 1.2000			chall er	otief	iv the criteri	on:-				, onea		, and m	axiirix	liniongit		,0		
010.2.3.2(1)			Shall Se	1131		011												
			σ _{v Ed}	≤														
			x,Lu		γ													
			Ov Ed	=	Design va	lue of th	e lo	cal l	onaitudi	nal stre	ss di	ie to mor	nent	and axial	force			
			- X, Lu		2 co.g.r ra				ongita a									
			Gautal	=	NL. /													
			axiai		A													
			NEd	=	13000	kN												
			Δ	_	1388270	mm ²												
			- Coviel	=	9	N/mm'	-											
			Taxial	=	Meu /													
		,	moment		W _{el} —													
			Meu	=	310000	kNm			M _{Rd} =	52730	67	kNm		Med/Med	0.59	MRd	inc. yi	eld
			Wal	=	1 67E+09	mmĭ				02.00	•				0.00	stre	ss redi	uction
			J	=	185	N/mm'	-									due	to she	ar effect
		,		=	9 +	185					c)verall i	ntera	ction		Ref	er 6 2 {	3
			- X, Lu	_	105	N/mm ²	2						1 100	2			51 0.2.0	
	Yie	eld Stre	nath f	-	315	N/mm ²	2					1_1· 2	005	55-				
			ngui, iy		010							016.2	000					
			fy	=	315	N/mm ²	2				N		(/) + M _E	. / Mo. =	0.63		0	(
			γ _{MO}		010							•Ed / ••Ra	- IIIE	a' in Ra	0.00			
			σ _{x Ed}	≤	fy	ОК		=	0.62	Stress	Ratio						Oł	<
			x,Eu		γ _{MO}	0.11			0.01									
					inic													
	B 11	Buck	ina Res	ista	ance of Me	mhers												
	5.11	Buok	ing ites															
	B 11 1	Unifo	rm Merr	hei	rs in Comr	ression	1											
							Ī											
BS EN 1993-		A com	pressio	n m	ember sho	ıld be v	erifi	ed a	gainst b	ucklina	as fo	llows.						
1-1. 2005									94	Gorang								
CI 6.3.1.1(1)			N _{Ed}	≤	1.0													
0.0.0(!)			N _{b,Rd}															
			N _{Ed}	=	13000	kN												
			N _{b.Rd}	=	Design Bu	ckling F	Resi	stan	ce of the	e Comp	ressi	on Memt	ber					
BS EN 1993-				=	Af _y	For Cla	ass	1, 2	and 3 S	ections								
1-1: 2005					$\chi \frac{\gamma}{\gamma_{M1}}$													
CI 6.3.1.1(3)			χ	=	Reduction	Factor	for t	he F	Relevan	t Bucklir	ng Mo	ode						
			~		1													
BS EN 1993-			χ	=		2	≤	1	.0									
1-1: 2005			~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		$\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2}$	_λ												
Eq 6.49					Γ		2]											
			φ	=	$0.5 1 + \alpha(\lambda)$	-0.2)+2	2											
						,,												
			2	=	Non-dime	nsional	slen	derr	ness rati	io								
BS EN 1993-	1		10															
1-1: 2005				=	$Af_y =$	L _{cr} 1		For	Class '	1, 2 and	3 cro	oss secti	ons					
Eq 6.50					۷N _{cr}	i λ ₁							T					
			L _{cr}	=	Buckling L	ength	=		15	m								
			i	=	1736	mm	(Ra	adius	s of Gyr	ation)								

UNDECT: SOUTH PROPILE - FULL ERGSION (NAP-7m) - CYCLIC DEGRADATION PROTECT NO: GR372
ROJECT NO. <u>B63275</u> FILE REF:REV ATTEX REPARED BY: <u>CHA</u> DATE:S2020REV DATE: PREVARED BY: <u>CHA</u> DATE: DATE: SEC CALC PAGE NOFOR ALTERNATIVE CALCULATIONS) REFRALTERNATIVE CALCULATIONS (CALCULATIONS) REFRALTERNATIVE CALCULATIONS (CALCULATIONS) REFR
REPARED EX: CHA DATE:
THE CRED BY: DATE: SEC CALC PAGE NO FOR ALTERNATIVE CALCULATIONS) REF OR A
SET CALC PAGE NO TABLE PARTICULATIONS) REF. A, = $\pi \sqrt{\frac{E}{L_y}} = 93.9 c$ A, = $93.9 $
REF. $\lambda_{1} = \pi \sqrt{\frac{E}{f_{y}}} = 93.9 \epsilon$ $\lambda_{1} = 93.9 \times 0.86 = 81.10$ $\lambda_{1} = 0.11$ The Siendemess criterion for which overall buckling may be assumed to be satisfied is: $\frac{1}{\lambda_{1}} = 0.11$ Si EN 1993. $\frac{N_{eff}}{N_{eff}} \leq 0.1$ If this criteria is not met consideration should be given to buckling If this criteria is not met consideration should be given to buckling $\frac{N_{eff}}{N_{eff}} = 0.00 \leq 0.1$ $\frac{N_{eff}}{N_{eff}} $
$\lambda_{1} = \pi \sqrt{\frac{E}{V_{p}}} = 93.9 \epsilon$ $\lambda_{1} = 93.9 \times 0.86 = 81.10$ $\overline{\lambda} = 0.11$ The Stendences criterion for which overall buckling may be assumed to be satisfied is: $\frac{N_{cd}}{\lambda_{c}} \leq 0.1$ If this criteria is not met consideration should be given to buckling $\frac{N_{cd}}{N_{cr}} \leq 0.1$ If this criteria is not met consideration should be given to buckling $\frac{N_{cd}}{N_{cr}} = 0.00 \leq 0.1 \text{OK}$ $\frac{N_{cr}}{N_{cr}} = 0.00 \leq 0.1 \text{OK}$ $N_{$
$\lambda_{1} = \prod_{v} \frac{1}{V_{v}} = 93.9 \text{ fm}$ $\lambda_{1} = 93.9 \text{ fm}$ $\lambda_{1} = 93.9 \text{ fm}$ $\lambda_{2} = 0.11$ $\lambda_{3} = 0.11$ $\lambda_{4} = 0.11$ $\lambda_{5} = 0.11$ The Slenderness criterion for which overall buckling may be assumed to be satisfied is: $\sum_{2007} \frac{1}{N_{c}} \leq 0.1$ If this criteria is not met consideration should be given to buckling $N_{cr} = \frac{A_{c}}{2}$ λ_{c} $N_{cr} = 38539785 \text{ kN}$ $N_{cr} = 10.00 \leq 0.1 \text{ OK}$ $N_{cr} = 0.00 \leq 0.1 \text{ OK}$ $N_{cr} $
$\frac{\lambda_{1}}{\lambda} = 93.9 \times 0.86 = 81.10$ $\frac{\lambda_{1}}{\lambda} = 0.11$ $38 EN 199-3207$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Cr}} \leq 0.1$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Cr}} \leq 0.1$ If this criteria is not met consideration should be given to buckling $\frac{N_{Cr}}{\lambda} = 0.00 \leq 0.1$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Cr}} = 0.00 \leq 0.1$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Cr}} = 0.00 \leq 0.1$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Cr}} = 0.11 \times can be established from table 6.1, 6.2 and figure 6.4$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Cr}} = 0.41 \times can be established from table 6.1, 6.2 and figure 6.4$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Cr}} = 0.49$ $\frac{N_{Cr}}{\lambda} = 0.49$ $\frac{N_{Cr}}{\lambda} = 0.483$ $\frac{N_{C}}{N_{Cr}} = 0.483$
$\frac{\lambda}{2} = 0.11$ The Stenderness criterion for which overall buckling may be assumed to be satisfied is: $\frac{N_{cd}}{N_{cr}} \leq 0.1$ If this criteria is not met consideration should be given to buckling If this criteria is not met consideration should be given to buckling $\frac{N_{cr}}{N_{cr}} = 0.1$ If this criteria is not met consideration should be given to buckling $\frac{N_{cr}}{\lambda} = 0.1$ Ner = 38539785 kN $\frac{N_{cr}}{N_{cr}} = 0.00 \leq 0.1 OK$ For $\frac{1}{\lambda} = 0.11$ χ can be established from table 6.1, 6.2 and figure 6.4 Table 6.1: Imperfection factors for buckling curves Buckling curve $\frac{1}{0.13} \frac{1}{0.21} \frac{1}{0.34} \frac{1}{0.49} \frac{1}{0.76}$ Cross section limits = Cold Formed Choose $\alpha = 0.49$ $\frac{1}{\psi} = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda \right] = 0.483$ $\frac{1}{\psi} = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda \right] = 0.483$ $\frac{1}{\psi} = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda \right] = 0.483$ $\frac{1}{\psi} = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda \right] = 0.483$ $\frac{1}{\psi} = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda \right] = 0.483$ $\frac{1}{\psi} = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda \right] = 0.483$ $\frac{1}{\psi} = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda \right] = 0.483$
The Slenderness criterion for which overall buckling may be assumed to be satisfied is: 32007 3215.3.3(3) Neg Nor S2007 Nor S15.3.3(3) Neg Nor S2007 Nor S2007 S15.3.3(3) Neg Nor S2007 Nor S207 Nor S207 Nor S207 Nor S207 Nor S207 Nor S207 Nor S207 Nor S207 Nor S207
By Even 1993- 11 the Silendemess criterion for which overall buckling may be assumed to be satisfied is: $\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{tr}} \leq 0.1$ If this criteria is not met consideration should be given to buckling $\frac{At_{j}}{2}$ $\frac{\lambda_{j}}{\lambda_{tr}} = \frac{At_{j}}{2}$ $\frac{\lambda_{j}}{\lambda_{tr}} = 0.00 \leq 0.1 \text{ OK}$ Ner = 38539785 kN $\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{er}} = 0.00 \leq 0.1 \text{ OK}$ For $\lambda = 0.11 \chi$ can be established from table 6.1, 6.2 and figure 6.4 Table 6.1: Imperfection factors for buckling curves Buckling curve a_{0} a b c d Imperfection Factor α 0.13 0.21 0.34 0.49 0.78 Cross section limits = Cold Formed Choose $\alpha = 0.49$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sqrt{2}-\lambda}} = 1.05 \geq 1.0$ $\chi = 1$ Buckling $\frac{Buckling curve}{S 235}$ $\frac{Buckling curve}{S $
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $
If this criteria is not met consideration should be given to buckling Image: the second
$N_{cr} = \frac{A_{b}^{r}}{2}$ $N_{cr} = 38539785 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{N_{cr}}{N_{cr}} = 0.00 \le 0.1 \text{ OK}$ $\frac{N_{cd}}{N_{cr}} = 0.00 \le 0.1 \text{ OK}$ $\frac{N_{cd}}{N_{cr}} = 0.11 \chi \text{ can be established from table 6.1, 6.2 and figure 6.4}$ $\frac{Buckling curve}{Buckling curve} = \frac{a_{0}}{a} = \frac{b}{c} = \frac{c}{d}$ $\frac{Buckling curve}{Buckling curve} = 0.49$ $\frac{a_{0}}{\phi} = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\overline{\lambda} - 0.2) + \lambda^{2}\right] = 0.483$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^{2} - \lambda^{2}}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ $\frac{Buckling curve}{Buckling curve} = 1$ $\frac{Buckling curve}{Buckling curve} = 1$
$N_{cr} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ λ $N_{cr} = 38539785 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{N_{cr}}{\sqrt{2}} = 0.00 \leq 0.1 \text{ OK}$ $\frac{N_{cr}}{\sqrt{r}} = 0.00 \leq 0.1 \text{ OK}$ $\frac{N_{cr}}{\sqrt{r}} = 0.11 \chi \text{ can be established from table 6.1, 6.2 and figure 6.4}$ $Table 6.1: Imperfection factors for buckling curves$ $\frac{Buckling curve}{1} = 0.49$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} = 0.49$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} = 0.483$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} = 0.483$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} = 1.05 \geq 1.0$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} = 1$
$N_{cr} = 38539785 \text{ kN}$ $\frac{N_{cr}}{N_{cr}} = 0.00 \leq 0.1 \text{ OK}$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{cr}} = 0.00 \leq 0.1 \text{ OK}$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{cr}} = 0.11 \chi \text{ can be established from table 6.1, 6.2 and figure 6.4}$ $\frac{N_{cr}}{Table 6.1: Imperfection factors for buckling curves}$ $\frac{Buckling curve}{Buckling curve} \frac{a_0}{0.13} \frac{a}{0.21} \frac{b}{0.34} \frac{c}{0.49} \frac{d}{0.76}$ $\frac{Cross section limits}{\phi} = 0.5 \left[1 + a(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda^2\right] = 0.483$ $\frac{\chi}{\chi} = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \geq 1.0$ $\frac{Buckling curve}{Buckling curve} \frac{Buckling curve}{S \times 255} \frac{Buckling curve}{S \times 400}$
$\frac{N_{cr}}{N_{cr}} = 0.00 \le 0.1 \text{ OK}$ For $\frac{1}{\lambda} = 0.11 \chi$ can be established from table 6.1, 6.2 and figure 6.4 Table 6.1: Imperfection factors for buckling curves Buckling curve <u>a_0 a b c d</u> Imperfection Factor a 0.13 0.21 0.34 0.49 0.76 Cross section limits = Cold Formed Choose $\alpha = 0.49$ $\psi = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda \right] = 0.483$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\psi + \sqrt{\psi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ Use $\chi = 1$ S EN 1993-1 1:2005 Table 6.2 Cross section Limits Buckling curve Limits Buckling curve Limits Buckling curve Limits S 235 S 460
$ \frac{1}{N_{cr}} = 0.00 \le 0.1 OK $ $ For \lambda = 0.11 \chi \text{ can be established from table 6.1, 6.2 and figure 6.4} $ $ For \lambda = 0.11 \chi \text{ can be established from table 6.1, 6.2 and figure 6.4} $ $ \frac{1}{Table 6.1: Imperfection factors for buckling curves} $ $ \frac{Buckling curve}{1} = 0.13 0.21 0.34 0.49 0.76 $ $ Cross section limits = Cold Formed $ $ Cross section limits = Cold Formed $ $ \frac{1}{\phi} = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda \right] = 0.483 $ $ \chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0 $ $ \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0 $ $ \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0 $ $ \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0 $ $ \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0 $ $ \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0 $ $ \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0 $ $ \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0 $ $ \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0 $ $ \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0 $ $ \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0 $ $ \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0 $ $ \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 = 1.0 $
OK For $\overline{\lambda}$ = 0.11 χ can be established from table 6.1, 6.2 and figure 6.4 Table 6.1: Imperfection factors for buckling curves Buckling curve a_0 a b c d Buckling curve a_0 a b c d a
For $\lambda = 0.11$ χ can be established from table 6.1, 6.2 and figure 6.4 Table 6.1: Imperfection factors for buckling curves Buckling curve a_0 a b c d Imperfection Factor α 0.13 0.21 0.34 0.49 0.76 Cross section limits = Cold Formed Choose $\alpha = 0.49$ $\phi = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda \right] = 0.483$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ Use $\chi = 1$ Use $\chi = 1$ Buckling curve Buckling curve Buckling curve Buckling curve S 235 S 460
Table 6.1: Imperfection factors for buckling curves Buckling curve <u>a_0 a b c d</u> Imperfection Factor α 0.13 0.21 0.34 0.49 0.76 Cross section limits = Cold Formed Choose α = 0.49 $\phi = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha (\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda \right] = 0.483$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ Use $\chi = 1$ Buckling <u>Buckling curve</u> Buckling <u>S 235</u> S 275 S 460
Buckling curve a_0 a b c d Imperfection Factor α 0.13 0.21 0.34 0.49 0.76 Cross section limits = Cold Formed Choose α = 0.49 $\phi = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda \right] = 0.483$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ Use $\chi = 1$ Buckling curve $\chi = 1$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ Buckling curve $\chi = 1$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Cross section limits = Cold Formed Choose $\alpha = 0.49$ $\phi = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda^2 \right] = 0.483$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ Use $\chi = 1$ Use $\chi = 1$ Buckling curve $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1$
$\phi = 0.5\left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda^{2}\right] = 0.483$ $\phi = 0.5\left[1 + \alpha(\lambda - 0.2) + \lambda^{2}\right] = 0.483$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^{2} - \lambda^{2}}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ Use $\chi = 1$ Use $\chi = 1$ $Use \chi = 1$ Us
$\phi = 0.5 \left[1 + \alpha(\overline{\lambda} - 0.2) + \overline{\lambda} \right] = 0.483$ $\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \overline{\lambda}^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ $Use \chi = 1$ $Use $
$\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ $Use \chi = 1$
$\chi = \frac{1}{\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda^2}} = 1.05 \ge 1.0$ Use $\chi = 1$ Use $\chi = 1$ Use Cross section Use Limits Use $\chi = 1$ Use χ
$\phi + \sqrt{\phi^2 - \lambda}$ Use $\chi = 1$ 3S EN 1993-1 1:2005 Table 6.2 Cross section Limits Buckling S 235 S 275 S 460 S 460
Use $\chi = 1$ 3S EN 1993-1 1:2005 Table 6.2 Cross section Limits Buckling curve S 235 S 275 S 460
3S EN 1993-1 1:2005 Table 6.2 Cross section Limits Buckling S 235 S 2460 S 260 S 275 S 460
Buckling curve Buckling curve 1:2005 Imits Buckling S 235 Fable 6.2 Cross section Limits
Fable 6.2 Cross section Limits about \$ 275 avia \$ 255 \$ 460
axis 5 333
S 420
hot finished any a a ₀
cold formed any c c



SUBJECT: SOUTH PROFILE - FULL EROSION (NAP -7m) - CYCLIC DEGRADATION

 PROJECT NO:
 BG8375
 FILE REF:
 REV:

 PREPARED BY:
 CHA
 DATE:
 1-5-2020
 REV DATE:

CHECKED BY: DATE:

			Tab	ole 6.7	7: \	/alues	s fo	or N	Pr = f. A	A., M		and ∆M	Ed		
EN 1993-		_	CI		1			1		-1,1,1			,Eu		
2005			Cla	ass	⊢	1		+-	2		3	4	-		
le 6 7			W	V.	⊢	Walu		+	Wala		Wala	W	f -		
			W	V _z	+	Wnlz		1	Wplz		Welz	Wef	fz –		
			ΔM	v,Ed		0			0		0	e _{N,y} N	V _{Ed}		
			ΔM	I _{z,Ed}		0			0		0	e _{N,z} N	V _{Ed}		
	NO	TE For	mer	mbers n	ot si	usceptib	le to	o tor	sional de	formatio	on χ _{LT} wo	uld be $\chi_{LT} =$	1,0.		
		N _{Rk}	=	f _y A	=	315	5	x	138827	ס x 10	5				
					=	4373	05	kN							
	Туре с	of Class	=	Class	s 3										
	Use														
		Wy	=	Wz	=	W	=		Wel						
		M _{Rk}	=	f _y	х	Wel									
			=	315	x	1.67E	+09								
			=	5.27E-	+11	Nmm									
			=	5273	07	kNm									
					<u> </u>										
EN 1993-	Δ	M _{y,z,Ed}	=	0	(F	or class	1, 2	2 an	d 3 sectio	ns)					
2005		k	=	Interac	tion	factor									
ole 6.7															
	Metho	d 2 shal	ll be	used to	o ca	lculate	< fac	ctors	. In acco	dance	with Steel	Constructio	n Institute		
	advice	circula	ar ho	ollow se	ctio	ns can l	oe u	sed	in this an	proach	even thou	Jah referenc	e is only i	nade	
	to Lan				00101	is ourri	JC U	JUU	in and up	producin			is only i	nuuc	
	10 1 411		COCI	ione								Ŭ			
		и кпо е	sect	ions.											
			sect	ions.											
	Tab	le B.1:	sect	ions. Iteract	ion	factor	sk d	ij fo	r memb	ers no	ot susce	ptible to te	orsional		
EN 1993-	Tab	le B.1:	sect	ions. Iteract	ion	factor	sk d	ij fo efo	r memb rmation	ers no	ot susce	ptible to te	orsional		
EN 1993- 2005	Tab	n T	sect In	of	ion eli	factor	s k d	ij fo efo	r memb rmation	ers no s sign ass	umptions	ptible to to	orsional		
EN 1993- :2005	Tab Interaction factors	n T	ype Sype	of of of of of ons	ion el:	factor	s k d ss-se lass	ij fo efo	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4	ers no s sign ass ties	umptions plastic	ptible to to cross-section class 1, cla	al propertie	25	
EN 1993- :2005 1ex B	Tab Interaction factors	ole B.1:	ype ype	of of	ion eli	factor	ss-se lass	ij fo efo ectio 3, cla	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{F4}	ers no s sign ass ties	umptions plastic	ptible to te	al propertie ss 2 N _{F4}	25	
EN 1993- :2005 nex B xle B.1	Tab Interaction factors		ype ype	of of ons	ion el:	factor astic cro c c my (1+	ss-se lass 0,67	ij fo efoi ectio: 3, cl:	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} v N _{Rk} / γ_{M}	ers no s sign ass ties	umptions plastic C _{my} (1+	ptible to to cross-section class 1, cla $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\gamma}$	al properties 2 N_{Ed} $\sqrt{N_{Rk}}/\gamma_M$	25	
EN 1993- :2005 nex B ble B.1	Tab Interaction factors k _{yy}	Ile B.1:	ype ectio	of ons ons otions	ion el:	factor	ss-se lass 0,67	iii fo eforection $3, classify = \frac{1}{\chi}$	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} yN _{Rk} / γ _M N _E .	ers no s sign ass ties	umptions plastic of C _{my} (1+	ptible to to cross-section class 1, cla $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$	al properties ss 2 N_{Ed} $\gamma N_{Rk} / \gamma_M$		
EN 1993- 2005 nex B nle B.1	Tab Interaction factors kyy	le B.1:	: In 'ype ectio	of ons ctions	el: C	factor astic cro c $C_{my} \left(1 + c \right)$	rs k d ss-se lass 0,67 + 0,-	iii fo effort a, cla $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\chi_{1}^{2}}}$	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed}	ers no s sign ass ties	t susce unptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, clar $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi} N - \frac{1}{\chi}$	orsional al properties $SS = \frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Rk} / \gamma_M}$	25	
EN 1993- 2005 lex B le B.1	Tab Interaction factors k _{yy}	Ile B.1:	ype sectio	of ons ons ons	el: C	factor astic cro c $C_{my}\left(1+$ $c C_{my}\left(1+\right)$	rs k d ss-se lass 0,6λ + 0,	iii fo ection 3, cli $-\frac{1}{\chi_y}$ $\frac{1}{\chi_y}$	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Rk} /γ _M	ers no s sign ass ties	t susceptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \leq C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right)$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, clast $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_F}$	al properties ss 2 N_{Ed} $\sqrt{N_{Rk}}/\gamma_{M}$	25 	
EN 1993- :2005 nex B ole B.1	Tab Interaction factors k _{yy}	Ile B.1:	sections sec	of of ons cons ctions ctions	eli C	factor astic cro $C_{my} \left(1 + C_{my} \left(1$	rs k d sss-se lass 0,67 + 0,	iii fo efforestion $3, cliconstants\frac{1}{\chi_y} - \frac{1}{\chi_y}6 - \frac{1}{\chi_y}k_{zz}$	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Rk} / γ _{M1}	ers no s sign ass ties	t susce umptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_F}$ 0,6 k _{zz}	Drsional al properties ss 2 N_{Ed} $_yN_{Rk}/\gamma_M$ $_{Ed}$ $_k/\gamma_{MI}$		
EN 1993- 2005 Nex B Ne B.1	Tab Interaction factors k _{yy} k _{yz}	Ile B.1:	sections sec	ons of ons ons ctions ons ctions	el: C	factor astic cro $C_{my}\left(1+\frac{1}{2}C_{m$	rs k d sss-se lass 0,6λ + 0,	iii fo ection 3, cla $-y - \frac{1}{\chi_y}$ k_{zz} 8 k-	r memb rmation Demail proper ass 4 N_{Ed} N_{Ed} N_{Rk} / γ_{MI}	ers no s sign ass ties	t susce umptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \right)$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_F}$ 0,6 k _{zz} 0.6 k	$\frac{\text{al properties}}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^$		
EN 1993- 2005 nex B ole B.1	Tab Interaction factors kyy kyy kyz kzy	Ile B.1: IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	section sectio	ons ons ttions ons ttions ons ttions	el:	factor astic cro $C_{my} \left(1 + C_{my} \left(1$	ss-se lass 0,6λ + 0,	$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Ed}	ers no s sign ass ties	t susce unptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \right)$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_F}$ $0.6 k_{zz}$ $0.6 k_{yy}$	al properties ss 2 $\frac{N_{Ed}}{\gamma N_{Rk} / \gamma_M}$ $\frac{F_{Ed}}{k} / \gamma_{M1}$		
EN 1993- :2005 nex B ble B.1	Tab Interactio factors k _{yy} k _{yz}	Ile B.1: IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	ype sectio sectio sectio sectio sectio sectio sectio	ons ons ttions ons ttions ons ttions ons ttions	eli C	factor	ss-se lass 0,67 + 0,	$\frac{1}{3}$	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Rk} / γ _{MI}	ers no s sign ass ties	t susceptions plastic of $C_{my}(1 + C_{my}(1 + C_{my$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, clast $(\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_F}$ $0.6 k_{zz}$ $0.6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_z - 0.6) - \frac{1}{\chi}$	orsional al properties N_{Ed} $N_{N_{Ed}}$		
EN 1993- :2005 nex B ole B.1	Tab Interaction factors k _{yy} k _{yz} k _{zy}	Ile B.1: Ile B.1: I-s RHS I-s RHS I-s RHS	sectio	ons ons ons ons ons ons ons ons ons ons	ela C	factor astic cro $C_{my} \left(1 + C_{my} \left(1$	rs k d sss-se lass 0,6λ + 0,0	ij fo ection 3, cla $\frac{1}{\chi_y}$ $\frac{1}{\chi_y}$ k_{zz} $8 k_y$	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Rk} / γ _{M1}	ers no s sign ass ties	t susce umptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_B}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_z - 0,6) - \frac{1}{\chi}$	$\frac{\text{al propertiess 2}}{N_{\text{Ed}}}$ $\frac{N_{\text{Ed}}}{\sqrt{\gamma_{\text{MI}}}}$ $\frac{N_{\text{Ed}}}{\sqrt{\gamma_{\text{MI}}}}$		
EN 1993- 2005 lex B le B.1	Tab Interaction factors k _{yy} k _{yz} k _{zy}	Ile B.1: IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	'ype ectio sectio sectio sectio sectio sectio sectio	ons ons ons etions ons etions ons etions ons etions	eli c	factor astic cro $C_{my}\left(1+\frac{1}{2}C_{m$	rs k d sss-see lass 0,67 + 0, 0,67	ection 3, cli $x_y - \chi$ χ k_{zz} $8 k_{yy}$	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Rk} / γ _{M1}	ers no s sign ass ties	t susce umptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)$ $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_F}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_z - 0,6) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $+ 1,4 - \frac{N_F}{\chi_y}$	$\frac{\text{al properties}}{N_{\text{Ed}}}$ $\frac{N_{\text{Ed}}}{N_{\text{Rk}}/\gamma_{\text{MI}}}$ $\frac{N_{\text{Ed}}}{N_{\text{Ed}}}$		
EN 1993- 2005 Nex B Ne B.1	Tab Interactio factors k _{yy} k _{yz} k _{zy}	Ile B.1: IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	sections sec	ons ons ons ons ons ons ons ons ons ons	ela c ≤	factor astic cro $C_{my}(1 + C_{my}(1 + C$	ss-se lass 0,67 + 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	r memb rmation De mal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Rk} / γ _{MI}	ers no s sign ass ties	t susce umptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_F}$ $0.6 k_{zz}$ $0.6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_z - 0, 6) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $+ 1,4 \frac{N_F}{\chi_z N_{Rk}}$	$\frac{ }{ } = \frac{ }{ } = \frac{ }{ } = \frac{ }{ } = \frac{ }{ } = \frac{ }{ } = \frac{ }{ $		
EN 1993- 2005 Nex B Ne B.1	Tab Interaction factors kyy kyy kyz kzy	Ile B.1: Ile B.1: II-s RHS II-s RHS II-s II-s	section sectio	ons ons ttions ons ttions ons ons ons ons ons ons ons	el; 	factor astic cro $C_{my}\left(1+\frac{1}{2}C_$	rs k d ss-se $lass$ $0, 6\overline{\lambda}$ + 0, 0 $0, 6\overline{\lambda}$	iii fo ection 3, cli $-\frac{1}{\chi_y}$ k_{zz} $8 k_y$	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Rk} / γ _{MI} y	ers no sign ass ties	t susce umptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)$ $C_{mz} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_F}$ $0.6 k_{zz}$ $0.6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_z - 0, 6) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $+ 1,4 \frac{N_F}{\chi_z N_{Rk}}$	$\frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Ed}}$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{\sqrt{2}N_{Rk}/\gamma_{M}}$		
EN 1993- 2005 nex B ble B.1	Tab Interactio factors kyy kyz kzy kzy	Ile B.1: Ile B.1: II-s RHS II-s RHS II-s RHS	sectio sectio sectio sectio sectio sectio	ons ons ttions ons ttions ons ttions ons ttions ons	ion el: ≤	factor astic cro $C_{my}\left(1+\frac{1}{2}C_$	rs k d ss-se lass $0, 6\overline{\lambda}$ + 0, - 0, - 0, - 0, - 0, - 0, -	iii fo ection 3, cli $-y - \frac{1}{\chi_{z}}$ $6 - \frac{1}{\chi_{z}}$ $8 k_{y}$	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} γ N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Ed}	ers no sign ass ties	t susceptions plastic of $C_{my}(1 + d \leq C_{my}(1 + d \leq C_{mz}(1 + d < C_{mz}(1$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $(\overline{\lambda}_{y} - 0, 2) - \overline{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_{y} N_{F}}$ $0.6 k_{zz}$ $0.6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_{z} - 0, 6) - \overline{\chi}$ $+ 1.4 \frac{N_{H}}{\chi_{z} N_{Fk}}$ $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_{z} - 0, 2) - \overline{\chi}$	$\frac{ }{ } = \frac{ }{ } = \frac{ }{ } = \frac{ }{ } = \frac{ }{ } = \frac{ }{ $		
EN 1993- :2005 nex B ole B.1	Tab Interactio factors kyy kyz k _{zy}	Ile B.1: Ile B.1: II-S RHS I-S RHS I-S RHS	section sectio	ons etions ons etions ons etions ons etions	ion el: ≤	factor astic cro $C_{my}\left(1+$ $C_{my}\left(1+$ $C_{my}\left(1+$ $C_{my}\left(1+$ $C_{my}\left(1+$	rs k d ss-se $lass$ $0,6\overline{\lambda}$ + 0, $0,6\overline{\lambda}$ + 0,	iii fo ection 3, cli $\frac{1}{2}$ 1	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Rk} / γ _M y N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Ed}	ers no s sign ass ties	t susce umptions plastic $C_{my}(1+$ $\leq C_{my}(1+$ $\leq C_{mz}(1+$ $\leq C_{mz}(1+$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_{y} - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_{y} N_{B}}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_{z} - 0,6) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $+ 1,4 \frac{N_{H}}{\chi_{z} N_{Rk}}$ $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_{z} - 0,2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$	$\frac{\text{orsional}}{\text{al propertiess 2}} \frac{N_{Ed}}{N_{Ed}}$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{\sqrt{\gamma}N_{Rk}/\gamma_{M}}$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{\sqrt{\gamma}N_{Rk}/\gamma_{M}}$ $\frac{N_{Ed}}{\sqrt{\gamma}N_{M}}$	$\frac{2s}{1}$	
EN 1993- :2005 Nex B Ne B.1	Tab Interactio factors k _{yy} k _{yz} k _{zy}	Ile B.1: Ile B.1: II-S RHS I-S RHS I-S RHS	section sectio	ons etions ons etions ons etions etions	el: 	factor astic cro $C_{my}(1+$ $C_{my}(1+$ $C_{my}(1+$ $C_{my}(1+$ $C_{my}(1+$	rs k d ss-se lass $0,6\overline{\lambda}$ + 0, $0,6\overline{\lambda}$ + 0,	iii fo ection 3, cli $z_{y} = \frac{1}{\chi_{y}}$ $k_{zz} = \frac{1}{\chi_{y}}$ $k_{zz} = \frac{1}{\chi_{z}}$	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Rk} / γ _M y N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Ed}	ers no s sign ass ties	t susce umptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{mz} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{mz} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_B}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_z - 0,6) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $+ 1,4 \frac{N_H}{\chi_z N_{Bk}}$ $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_z - 0,2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_B}$	$\frac{ \mathbf{x} ^{2}}{ \mathbf{x} ^{2}}$		
EN 1993- :2005 nex B ole B.1 	Tab Interactio factors k _{yy} k _{yz} k _{zy}	Ile B.1: Ile B.1: II-S RHS I-S RHS I-S RHS	sections sec	ons ons ons ons ons ons ons ons ons ons	eli c ≤	factor astic cro $C_{my}(1 + C_{my}(1 + C$	rs k d ss-sec lass $0,6\overline{\lambda}$ + 0, $0,6\overline{\lambda}$ + 0,	iii fo ection 3, cli $x_{y} = \frac{1}{\chi_{y}}$ k_{zz} x_{z} k_{zz} x_{z}	r memb rmation De nal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Rk} / γ _M v N _{Ed} N _{Rk} / γ _M	ers no s sign ass ties	ot susce umptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{my} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{mz} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{mz} \right) \right)$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_F}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_z - 0,6) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $+ 1,4 \frac{N_f}{\chi_z N_{Fk}}$ $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_z - 0,2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_z N_F}$	$\frac{ \mathbf{n} }{ \mathbf{n} }$		
EN 1993- 2005 Nex B Ne B.1	Tab	Ile B.1: Ile B.1: II-section RHS II-section RHS	sections and sections and sections and sections and sections and sections are sections and sections and sections are sections and sections are sections and sections are secti	ons ons terions ons trions ons trions ons trions ons trions ons trions	ion el: < <	factor astic cro $C_{my}\left(1+\frac{1}{2}C_$	rs k d ss-se lass $0,6\overline{\lambda}$ + 0, $0,6\overline{\lambda}$ + 0, $0,6\overline{\lambda}$ + 0, w se	iii fo ection 3, cli $\frac{1}{\chi_{y}}$ $\frac{1}{\chi_{z}}$ $\frac{1}{\chi_{z}}$ $\frac{1}{\chi_{z}}$ $\frac{1}{\chi_{z}}$ $\frac{1}{\chi_{z}}$	r memb rmation De mal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Rk} / γ _{MI} y N _{Rk} / γ _{MI} y	ers no s sign ass ties	ot susce umptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{my} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{mz} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{mz} \right) \right)$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $(\overline{\lambda}_y - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_F}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda}_z - 0,6) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $+ 1,4 \frac{N_F}{\chi_z N_{Rk}}$ $\cdot (\overline{\lambda}_z - 0,2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_z N_F}$ $n + 1,0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_z N_F}$ $n + 1,0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_z N_F}$ $n + 1,0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_z N_F}$	orsional al properties al properties N_{Ed} N_{Fd} N_{Ed} N_{N		
EN 1993- 2005 lex B le B.1	Tab Interaction factors kyy kyy kyz kzy kzz For I- and the coeffic	Ile B.1: IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	section sectio	ons ons terions ons trions ons trions ons trions ons trions ons trions ons trions	ion el: < < <	factor astic cro $C_{my}\left(1+\frac{1}{2}C_$	rs k d ss-se lass $0,6\bar{\lambda}$ + 0, $0,6\bar{\lambda}$ + 0, $0,6\bar{\lambda}$ + 0, $0,6\bar{\lambda}$	iii fo ection 3, cli $\frac{1}{\sqrt{y}}$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}$	r memb mation De mal proper ass 4 N _{Ed} N _{Ed} N _{Rk} / γ _{MI} y N _{Rk} / γ _{MI} y	ers no sign ass ties	ot susce umptions plastic $C_{my} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{my} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \leq C_{mz} \right)$	ptible to to cross-section class 1, class $(\overline{\lambda_y} - 0, 2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_y N_B}$ $0,6 k_{zz}$ $0,6 k_{yy}$ $(2\overline{\lambda_z} - 0,6) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $+ 1,4 \frac{N_B}{\chi_z N_{Rk}}$ $\cdot (\overline{\lambda_z} - 0,2) - \frac{1}{\chi}$ $1 + 0.8 \frac{N}{\chi_z N_B}$ nd uniaxial be	$\frac{\text{orsional}}{\text{ss 2}}$ $\frac{\text{N}_{Ed}}{\text{y} \text{N}_{Rk} / \gamma_{M}}$ $\frac{\text{Ed}}{\text{k} / \gamma_{MI}}$ $\frac{\text{N}_{Ed}}{(2 \text{N}_{Rk} / \gamma_{M})}$ $\frac{\text{N}_{Ed}}{\frac{1}{2} \text{N}_{Rk} / \gamma_{M}}$ $\frac{\text{N}_{Ed}}{\text{ending } M_{y,j}}$		


PROJECT TITLE: ENECO MV2 WINDFARM - MONOPILE FOUNDATION CONCEPT DESIGN

SUBJECT: SOUTH PROFILE - FULL EROSION (NAP -7m) - CYCLIC DEGRADATION

PROJECT NO: BG8375 FILE REF: REV:



 PREPARED BY:
 CHA
 DATE:
 1-5-2020
 REV DATE:
CHECKED BY: DATE:

(SEE CALC PAGE NO _____ FOR ALTERNATIVE CALCULATIONS)

REF.		OUTPUT.
	Table B.3: Equivalent uniform moment factors C _m in Tables B.1 and B.2	
BS EN 1993-	C _{my} and C _{mz} and C _{mLT}	
1-1:2005	uniform loading concentrated load	+++++
Annex B Table B 3	M $-1 \le \psi \le 1$ $0.6 + 0.4\psi \ge 0.4$	
	ΨΜ	
	$M_{\rm h} = M_{\rm h} = 4 {\rm m} M_{\rm h} = 0 \le \alpha_{\rm s} \le 1 -1 \le \psi \le 1 0, 2 + 0, 8\alpha_{\rm s} \ge 0, 4 \qquad 0, 2 + 0, 8\alpha_{\rm s} \ge 0, 4$	
	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	
	$\alpha_{\rm s} = M_{\rm s}/M_{\rm h} \qquad -1 \le \psi < 0 \qquad 0,1(1-\psi) - 0,8\alpha_{\rm s} \ge 0,4 \qquad 0,2(-\psi) - 0,8\alpha_{\rm s} \ge 0,4$	
	$M_{h} M_{s} \psi M_{h} 0 \le \alpha_{h} \le 1 -1 \le \psi \le 1 0,95 + 0,05\alpha_{h} 0,90 + 0,10\alpha_{h}$	
	$-1 \le \alpha_h < 0$ $0 \le \psi \le 1$ $0.95 + 0.05\alpha_h$ $0.90 + 0.10\alpha_h$	
	$\alpha_{h} = M_{h}/M_{s} \qquad -1 \le \psi < 0 \qquad 0.95 + 0.05\alpha_{h}(1+2\psi) \qquad 0.90 - 0.10\alpha_{h}(1+2\psi)$	
	For members with sway buckling mode the equivalent uniform moment factor should be taken $C_{my} = 0.9$ or $C_{My} = 0.9$ respectively.	
	C _{my} , C _{mz} and C _{mLT} should be obtained according to the bending moment diagram between the relevant braced points as follows:	
	moment factor bending axis points braced in direction	
	C _{my} y-y z-z	
	C _{mz} Z-Z Y-Y C _{mLT} Y-Y Y-Y	
	M _{max} = 310000 kNm	
BS EN 1993-	$M_{min} = 0$ kNm	
1-1:2005	$\Psi = 0.00$	
Annex B	M _s = 0.0 kNm (local moment)	
Table B.3		
	Equivalent uniform moment factor	
	$C_{\rm m} = 1.00$	
	Table B.1 gives the following formulas to calculate Interaction factor k for different cross section.	
	(Tubular members are not susceptible to torsional deformations)	
	For Class 1 and class 2 cross section:	
DO EN 1002		
BS EN 1993-	NET NET C 1.00 NET	+++++
1-1:2005	$K = C_m 1 + (\lambda - 0.2) - \frac{U_m}{N_{\rm Pk}/\gamma_{\rm Mid}} \le C_m 1 + 0.8 - \frac{U_m}{\chi N_{\rm Pk}/\gamma_{\rm Mid}}$	
		+++++
Table B.1	These equations have been simplified as for tubular	+++++
	pile only single axis needs to be considered	
		+++++
	For Class 3 cross section:	
	$\kappa = C_{\rm m} \left[1 + 0.0 \lambda \frac{-2}{2 N_{\rm Rk} / \gamma_{\rm M1}} \right] \leq C_{\rm m} \left[1 + 0.0 \frac{-2}{2 N_{\rm Rk} / \gamma_{\rm M1}} \right]$	+ $+$ $+$ $+$
		+ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$
		+ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$
	$ \begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	++++
		+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
	$\blacksquare + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +$	+ $+$ $+$ $+$

								,	5													H	asl	kol	nin	gD	HV
ROJECT NO:	BG8375				FILE	REF:	: -						RE	V:								Enh	anc	ing S	ociet	Tog	ether
REPARED BY:	CHA				DAT	E:	-		1	-5-2()20		RE	V DA	TE:												
HECKED BY:					DAT	E:	-																				
EE CALC PAGE	NO				FOR	ALTI	ERN	ATI	VE CA	ALCU	lati	ons)														
EF.																									OU.	TPUT.	
efer section																											
.10.1 of this																											
neet		Туре	of cla	iss	=	Cla		3																			
			N	λ Ed	=	13).11 300(0	kN																		
			N	Rk	=	43	730)5	kN																		
			2	ί	=		1																				
			χι	LT	=		1.0		(Circ	cular	hol	low	secti	ons	not s	usce	eptib	le to	later	al to	rsion	al b	uckli	ng)			
			γı	M1	=	04	1	0	LN-																		
				Ed 1r	=	31	000	U	kNm kNm	1																	
			M	-∈d Rk	=	52	730)7	kNm	1																	
				k	=	1.	.002	2																			
			N-	d		M-	4 +	۸М	드신																		
		ŀŀ	N N	u Rk v	- + k		<u> </u>	M _{Rk}	<u>a</u>	=	0.	62	≤	1	.0		C	Ж								0	K
			α_{γ}	—) M1		χĽ	<u>, т</u>	γ _{M1}	-)																		
	\vdash																										





Input turbine suppliers **A2**

Vestas V162 – preliminary extreme loads A2.1

Resulting bending moment. SQRT(Mxt1^2 + Myt1^2) (also M_{res}) Resulting shear force. SQRT(Fxt1^2 + Fyt1^2) (also F_{res}) Mbt1: FndFr:

Character	Characteristic Extreme								
Lead	LC/Family	PLF	Туре	Mbt1	Mzt1	FndFr	Fzt1		
Sensor	[-]	[-]	[-]	[kNm]	[kNm]	[kN]	[kN]		
Mbt1	23NTMVrm00(fam162)	1.49	Abs	153600	2513	1366	-7804		
Mzt1	23NTMHWO100(fam166)	1.49	Abs	51090	-17880	862.9	-7529		
FndFr	23NTMVrm00(fam162)	1.49	Abs	144000	3143	1474	-7796		
Fzt1	42NTMRPVo00(fam249)	1.49	Abs	32600	6132	209.9	-7891		
Table 2-1 Cha	aracteristic Extreme (excl. PLE). Load cases	sorted with PL	F						

me (excl. PLF). Load cases sorted with

Character	Characteristic Extreme									
Lead	LC/Family	PLF	Туре	Mbt1	Mzt1	FndFr	Fzt1			
Sensor	[-]	[-]	[-]	[kNm]	[kNm]	[kN]	[kN] 🖞			
Mbt1	14EcdVrma00(fam43)	1.35	Abs	154600	1726	1312	-7777 8			
Mzt1	23NTMHWO100(fam166)	1.49	Abs	51090	-17880	862.9	-7529			
FndFr	23NTMVrm00(fam162)	1.49	Abs	144000	3143	1474	-7796			
Fzt1	12IceUHWO200(fam27)	1.35	Abs	61780	2696	509.5	-7968			
Table 2-2 Cha	aracteristic Extreme (excl. PLF). Load cases	sorted without	PLF.							

Character	Characteristic Extreme									
Lead	LC/Family	PLF	Туре	Mbt1	Mzt1	FndFr	Fzt1			
Sensor	[-]	[-]	[-]	[kNm]	[kNm]	[kN]	[kN]			
Mbt1	62E50b06000(fam291)	1.10	Abs	141100	3004	1273	-7638			
Mzt1	22OSFHWO200(fam103)	1.10	Abs	27150	-14760	194.0	-7544			
FndFr	62E50b06000(fam291)	1.10	Abs	140100	2658	1287	-7629			
Fzt1	22VOGVo00(fam112)	1.10	Abs	53730	3775	432.7	-7889			
Table 2-3 Characteristic Extreme (excl. PLF). Only load cases with PLF = 1.10.										
Convicted	Visite Wild Curlens A/C Hadapare 44 DK 82	00 Aartur N. Da								

Copyright © - Vestas Wind Systems A/S, Hedeager 44, DK-8200 Aarhus N, Denmark, www.vestas.com

VESTAS PROPRIETARY NOTICE

Character	Characteristic Extreme									
Lead	LC/Family	PLF	Туре	Mbt1	Mzt1	FndFr	Fzt1			
Sensor	[-]	[-]	[-]	[kNm]	[kNm]	[kN]	[kN]			
Mbt1	14EcdVrma00(fam43)	1.35	Abs	154600	1726	1312	-7777			
Mzt1	98NTM2300(fam468)	1.35	Abs	39860	-15720	264.3	-7499			
FndFr	1310etm00(fam35)	1.35	Abs	129900	-2116	1377	-7776			
Fzt1	12IceUHWO200(fam27)	1.35	Abs	61780	2696	509.5	-7968			

Table 2-4 Characteristic Extreme (excl. PLF). Only load cases with PLF = 1.35.

5





J

The nominal spring stiffness used for the load calculations is 500 GNm/rad resulting in a nominal tower frequency of 0.189 Hz. The spring stiffness of the foundation must be at least $C_{\phi,dyn} \ge 64$ GNm/rad for the loads to be valid. Concurrent values for rotational- and lateral stiffness of the foundation are given in Table 5-1.

Rotational stiffness	[GNm/rad]	77	105	143	196	268	366	445	500
Lateral stiffness	[MN/m]	32.7	13.8	10.5	8.5	7.6	7.0	6.8	6.8
able 5-1 Minimum lateral stiffness.									







Enercom – E160 – preliminary extreme loads A2.2



Title	Foundation Desig	Foundation Design Loads - E-160 E2 EP5-MST-120-FB-C-01				
Document number	M00-C8-30-1086	M00-C8-30-10861-R0-1				
Date	24.03.2020, 16:39	24.03.2020, 16:39:58				
Author	Mun Jung					
Document revision	RO	NOT RELEASED				
REVISIONS						

REVISIONS

REVISIONS		FUR PRODUCTION
RO	Initial document	
R1		
R2		

Wind Zone

DIBt, October 2012	WZ2 GK II
IEC 61400-1 3rd Edition, 2005-08	WC IIIA (AW7.5 TI16.0)
Design Lifetime	20 years

Technical data

Dead Weight nacelle + rotor	Fz = -2945 kN
Dead Weight tower	Fz = -4288 kN
Total Weight	Fz = -7233 kN
Xcog nacelle + rotor w.r.t tower top axis	Sx,Tower = -4.556 m
Zcog nacelle + rotor w.r.t tower top axis	Sz,Tower = 2.195 m





Ground parameters (miminal value)

Flat Foundation

- Dynamic rotational spring constant	Kφ,dyn,flat ≥ 160000 MNm/rad			
- Static rotational spring constant	Kφ,stat,flat ≥ 26666 MNm/rad			
Pile Foundation				
- Dynamic rotational spring constant	Kφ,dyn,pile ≥ 160000 MNm/rad			
- Static rotational spring constant	Kφ,stat,pile ≥ 26666 MNm/rad			
- Dynamic translational spring constant	KF,dyn,pile ≥ 500 MN/m			

Coordinate System

The coordinate system has its origin at the intersection of the tower axis and the upper edge of the foundation, and does not rotate with the nacelle.

- X: horizontal

- Z: vertically upwards in direction of the tower axis

- Y: horizontally sideways, so that X, Y, Z rotate clockwise

Ultimate loads at top of foundation

- Dynamic properties of the wind turbine (e.g. gust reactions) as well as the effects of imperfections have been considered in the load cases.

- All loads refer to the top of foundation.

- Loss of pressure between soil and foundation, maximally as far as centre of gravity of foundation area for load case Group N/T/DLC8.2.

- No loss of pressure between soil and foundation and no tension in the piles for load case NTM DLC D.3

- Loads for all German earthquake areas are covered according to [1] with stated loads

- Additional saftey factor of 1.05 is applied on the listed load values.

Load case description	Partial safety factors	Fz,min* [kN]	Fz,max* [kN]	Fxy [kN]	Mxy [kNm]	Mz [kNm]
Group A	with	-9576	-6481	1856	229395	-18002
Group N/T	with	-12848	-7759	1878	228911	-19428
Group N/A/T	with	-12848	-6481	1878	229395	-19428
Group N/A/T	without	-8727	-5747	1688	207572	-16365
Group N/T/DLC8.2	without	-8727	-5747	1391	166806	-14391
Group DLC8.1/8.2	without	-8700	-5926	821	96915	-8858
NTM DLC D.3**	without	-8727	-5747	838	94051	4840

Table 1 Summary of extreme loads at the tower base including consideration of the additional moment

- *The value of Fz,min and Fz,max consider partial saftey factor of γ F = 1.1 and γ F = 0.9.

- ** |Mz| is taken in probability calculation.

- Due to dynamic action from the machine Fz is no longer constant as per calculated from dead weight but fluctuates between the given values of Fz,min and Fz,max.

Load Case Description and Partial Safety Factors acc. to [2] and [3]

Group N	Normal Design Load Case.
Group A	Abnormal Design Load Case.

Project related





Group T	Transport and Erection
NTM DLC 8.1 / EWM	Transport, assembly, maintenance and repair turbine states which may persist for
DLC8.2	longer than one week.
NTM DLC D.3	Operating loads, normal turbulence model with probability exceeding 10 ⁻² .
DLC D.5a / 6a	Earthquake wind loads (International) according to [1].

References

[1]	Auslegung von Bauwerken gegen Erdbeben – Teil 1: Grundlagen,
	Erdbebeneinwirkungen und Regeln für Hoch-bauten; Deutsche Fassung EN 1998-
	1:2004 + AC:2009 + DIN EN 1998-1/NA:2011-01
[2]	IEC 61400-1:2005-08, Wind Turbines – Part 1: Design requirements, Third Edition,
	2005-08
[3]	DIN EN 61400-1:2011-08 Windenergieanlagen – Teil 1: Auslegungsanforderungen
	(IEC 61400-1:2005 + A1:2010)





Load case	Fx [kN]	Fy [kN]	Fz [kN]	Mx [kNm]	My [kNm]	Mz [kNm]	Fr [kN]	Mr [kNm]	γ[-]
DLC 2.2	5950.8	-338.2	325.1	-9445.5	18136.8	27749.7	469.0	33150.2	1.00
DLC 6.2	5634.9	-958.4	-116.6	-2460.4	-20254.9	83768.5	965.5	86182.8	1.00
DLC 2.3	5776.0	-117.9	1161.5	-1609.5	115629.4	8409.4	1167.5	115934.8	1.00
DLC 2.2	5811.8	-22.9	247.5	-10990.8	24965.4	4746.6	248.5	25413.6	1.00
DLC 2.3	57 72.0	-118.7	1160.2	-1407.2	115794.9	8444.7	1166.2	116102.4	1.00
DLC 6.2	5604.7	-942.4	-300.0	-2564.3	-43038.3	86175.1	989.0	96325.6	1.00
DLC 2.3	5773.6	-160.9	1159.0	-1519.2	115516.5	9288.4	1170.1	115888.8	1.00
DLC 2.3	5772.0	-118.7	1160.2	-1407.2	115794.9	8444.7	1166.2	116102.4	1.00

A2.3 General Electric GE158 – extreme loads

Table 1: All IEC 61400 Design Situations and Load Cases; excluding partial safety factor

Load case	Fx [kN]	Fy [kN]	Fz [kN]	Mx [kNm]	My [kNm]	Mz [kNm]	Fr [kN]	Mr [kNm]	γ[-]
DLC 1.3	5885.4	52.0	568.3	836.5	40671.3	-2526.5	570.7	40749.3	1.00
DLC 1.5	5667.1	-728.6	125.8	2502.1	2237.1	27747.3	739.4	27837.5	1.00
DLC 1.3	5793.3	40.7	1003.6	-416.6	78285.3	4584.5	1004.4	78419.6	1.00
DLC 1.3	5609.5	-117.5	309.3	10025.1	25226.5	17795.0	330.9	30869.8	1.00
DLC 1.4	5778.5	12.4	911.9	-2446.3	91981.2	6173.6	912.0	92188.2	1.00
DLC 6.1	5586.8	-579.4	118.4	-3049.9	123.9	53745.6	591. 3	53746.1	1.00
DLC 1.3	5747.4	102.3	1003.0	-2599.1	82584.9	5595.7	1008.2	82774 .6	1.00
DLC 1.4	5778.5	12.4	911.9	-2446.3	91981.2	6173.6	912.0	92188.2	1.00

Table 1A: IEC 61400 Normal Design Situations and Load Cases Only; excluding partial safety factor

Load case	Fx [kN]	Fy [kN]	Fz [kN]	Mx [kNm]	My [kNm]	Mz [kNm]	Fr [kN]	Mr [kNm]	γ[-]
DLC 8.1	8694.6	-10.1	110.1	-1669.2	3565.5	4675.4	110.6	5879.8	1.50
DLC 6.2	6198.4	-1054.2	-128.2	-2706.5	-22280.4	92145.3	1062.0	94800.7	1.10
DLC 1.3	7821.0	55.0	1354.9	-562.4	105685.2	6189.1	1356.0	105866.2	1.35
DLC 1.3	7572.8	-158.6	417.6	13533.8	34055.8	24023.3	446.7	41676.3	1.35
DLC 2.3	6349.2	-130.5	1276.2	-1547.9	127374.4	92 89.1	1282.8	127712.6	1.10
DLC 6.2	6165.1	-1036.7	-329.9	-2820.8	-47342.1	94792.7	1087.9	105957.2	1.10
DLC 1.3	7758.9	138.2	1354.1	-3508.8	111489.6	7554.2	1361.1	111745.2	1.35
DLC 2.3	6349.2	-130.5	1276.2	-1547.9	127374.4	9289.1	1282.8	127712.6	1.10

Table 2: All IEC 61400 Design Situations and Load Cases; including partial safety factor

Load case	Fx [kN]	Fy [kN]	Fz [kN]	Mx [kNm]	My [kNm]	Mz [kNm]	Fr [kN]	Mr [kNm]	γ _F [-]
DLC 1.1	5784.7	43.5	732.7	2120.0	72243.5	11257.7	733.9	73115.4	1.00

Table 7: Load cases for check against pile tension loading

The minimum values for the dynamic foundation stiffness that have to be achieved are:

 $k_{p,min} = 1.5 \cdot 10^8 \text{ kNm/rad}; \quad k_{yz,min} = 1.0 \cdot 10^6 \text{ kN/m}$

The minimum value for the static foundation stiffness that has to be achieved is 1/5 of the dynamic stiffness:

k_{o,stat,min} = 3.0 · 10⁷ kNm/rad



Figure 3: Coordinate System







A2.4 Siemens Gamesa



Extreme load

The extreme loads for the design of the SG 6.0-155 T102.5-50A foundations are shown in Table 3.

Load case	Load facto r	F _× (kN)	F _y (kN)	F _z (kN)	F _{×y} (kN)	M _× (kNm)	M _y (kNm)	M _z (kNm)	M _{xy} (kNm)
dlc62_V42.5_ 030_s6	1,1	-28,18	-1509,07	-6261,58	1509,33	152409,4	-13619,72	1657,48	153016,71

Table 3 SG 6.0-155 T102.5-50A Factored/Unfactored Extreme loads at tower bottom

Characteristic load

Characteristics loads (maximum M_{xy} bending moment load combination of groups N, E and T according to GL2012 Sec. 5.4.3.1.3, or equivalent groups N-T according to IEC 61400-1 2006) have been estimated as shown in *Table 4*:

Load case	F _x (kN)	F _y (kN)	F _z (kN)	F _{×y} (kN)	M _× (kNm)	M _y (kNm)	M _z (kNm)	M _{xy} (kNm)
dlc62_V42.5_030_s6	-25,62	-1371,88	-5692,34	1372,12	138554	-12381,56	1506,8	139106,1
Table 4 SG 6.0-155 T102.5-50A Characteristics Loads at the base of the tower								

Quasi-permanent load

Loads according to GL2010, considering DLC 1.1 and 6.4 with a probability of exceedance of pf = 10^{-2} (equivalent to 1750 h in 20 years) with γ F = 1.0 have been estimated as shown in Table 5:

pf=0.01000		Tower loads at section							
Section Height from bottom (m)	Fx (KN)	Fy (KN)	Fxy (KN)	Fz (KN)	Mx (KNm)	My (KNm)	Mxy (KNm)	Mz (KNm)	
0	872,32	98,51	872,67	-5726,9	16276,45	91477	91849,96	3965,41	

WTG	SG 6.0-155 T102.5-50A
Minimum rotational stiffness of the foundation	1.5E+11 Nm/rad

Table 2 SG 6.0-155 T102.5-50A Minimum rotational stiffness