THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR PREDICTING THE RESPONSE OF TOLERABLY MOBILE SUBSEA INSTALLATIONS
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Abstract:

Tolerable mobility of subsea foundations and pipelines supporting offshore oil and gas developments has recently become an accepted design concept. It enables a smaller foundation footprint and so is a potential cost-saving alternative to conventionally engineered ‘fixed’ seabed foundations. Dominant sources of loading on subsea infrastructure arise from connection misalignment or thermal and pressure induced expansion and these are reduced if the structure is permitted to displace while ensuring that additional loading is not induced by excessive settlements. A sound prediction of the resulting sliding response will provide a robust design basis for mobile subsea infrastructure. This paper presents a theoretical model based on critical state soil mechanics to predict the performance of a subsea installation that is founded on soft normally consolidated or lightly overconsolidated soil, and subjected to intermittent horizontal sliding movements. The framework is validated against centrifuge test results and is shown to capture the essential elements of the soil-structure interaction, which include (i) the changing soil strength from cycles of sliding and pore pressure generation, (ii) the regain in strength due to dissipation of excess pore pressure (consolidation), and (iii) the soil contraction and consequent settlement of the foundation caused by the consolidation process.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Subsea facilities to support oil and gas developments include pipelines and associated structures that experience significant loads from thermal and pressure-induced expansions, as well as connector misalignment. These loads are relieved if the infrastructure can move, so the conventional design approach of aiming to eliminate plastic movements or to resist factored maximum loads can be inefficient. Instead, an emerging design philosophy is to allow foundations and pipelines to move back and forth in response to such loads, subject to other criteria such as ensuring that the associated settlements do not cause unacceptable secondary loads (Fisher & Cathie, 2003; Cocjin et al., 2014; Deeks et al., 2014).

For robust design of such tolerably mobile seabed infrastructure, it is necessary to predict the changing seabed resistance through cycles of infrastructure movement, and also the accumulating settlements. The framework presented in this paper provides these predictions by applying a methodology based on critical state soil mechanics that is appropriate for soft normally-consolidated or lightly-overconsolidated soil. The framework is validated against centrifuge test results of a tolerably mobile sliding subsea foundation but is equally applicable to other boundary value problems that involve horizontal shearing at the mudline, such as axial walking of seabed pipelines.

2. MOTIVATION

To predict the resistance and settlement of a seabed installation during episodes of horizontal movement and intervening periods of consolidation, three key elements are required: (i) the undrained strength associated with large strains that cause remoulding, and the associated pore pressure generation, (ii) the changes in strength due to dissipation of the excess pore pressure (consolidation), and (iii) the contraction and consequent settlement caused by the consolidation process.

Previous research on shallow foundations under cyclic loading has mainly focused on events that are fully undrained, such as for conditions beneath a typical gravity-based platform during a design storm event (e.g. Andersen, 1976; Andersen, 2009; Xiao et al. 2016). Some studies have investigated the subsequent change in soil strength due to reconsolidation (e.g. France & Sangrey, 1977), but the timescales are such that this has limited practical relevance for fixed surface-piercing offshore platforms founded on clay. Subsea infrastructure is supported on foundations of smaller dimension than for a gravity based or jacket platform and the governing
load cases are typically caused by thermal expansion or operating pressures in pipelines, which have a much longer cyclic period – typically days or weeks – so significant consolidation can occur between load cycles.

The combined effects on soil strength and infrastructure settlement of cycles of loading and consolidation can be captured via an effective stress framework based on critical state concepts. Such a framework has been proposed previously to analyse the cyclic remoulding and reconsolidation processes during penetration of a cylinder into the seabed, such as a T-bar penetrometer or a pipeline element (White and Hodder, 2010; Hodder et al., 2013). In this analysis, the degradation of soil strength comes from the gross remoulding of the soil around the pipe due to cyclic vertical movement.

In the case of an installation moving horizontally at the soil surface, the shearing process is concentrated close to the surface, as illustrated by analyses of a pipeline sliding over soft clay presented by Yan et al. (2014). In this case the associated generation of excess pore pressure varies with depth according to the distribution of mobilised shear stress. Through cycles of sliding and reconsolidation, the surrounding soil gains strength from episodes of undrained failure followed by pore pressure dissipation and contraction. In the present paper, this behaviour is idealised as one-dimensional – in an extension of the widely-used oedometer method for foundation settlement (Skempton & Bjerrum, 1957) – and both the settlement and the evolving sliding resistance are calculated on a cycle-by-cycle basis. This methodology provides a practical tool to support the design of tolerably mobile subsea installations.

3. OVERVIEW OF THE FRAMEWORK

The problem addressed in this study is illustrated in Fig. 1. An infinite half space is considered with a constant vertical stress applied at the mudline, $\sigma_{op}$, representing the submerged self-weight of the subsea facility. Cycles of horizontal shear stress, $\tau_{op}$, in alternating directions are applied at the mudline to represent the effect of the sliding movement, $\delta u$, of the infrastructure. Sliding is assumed to take place at a rate that causes an undrained soil response, with intervening periods of consolidation between each shear stress reversal. The half-space is idealised as a one-dimensional column of soil elements, each subject to a vertical total stress and cycles of horizontal shear stress, and responding according to a simple form of critical state model. The framework can be applied in a cycle-by-cycle manner, solving for the response at each soil element to determine the cumulative change in void ratio and the variation in shear stress and settlement at the soil surface. Key elements of the framework include:
(i) Profiles of vertical stress and horizontal shear stress with depth, proportional to $\sigma_{op}$ and $\tau_{op}$;

(ii) A critical state model for undrained shear strength, $s_u$, defined in the volumetric plane in terms of void ratio, $e$, and vertical effective stress, $\sigma'$, and in the stress plane in terms of $s_u$ and $\sigma'$, which defines the current undrained strength and the excess pore pressure generated during shearing to failure. A critical state line (CSL) is defined in the usual way and is reached when the soil is first sheared to failure. However, the CSL is not fixed in the volumetric plane but instead migrates towards a limiting lower void ratio as a result of on-going cycles of shearing.

(iii) Simple scaling rules for cycles of shear stress that do not cause failure of the soil element, to determine the generated excess pore pressure in pre-failure cycles and the equivalent fraction of a full cycle of shearing, to determine the CSL migration.

The imposed soil stresses during shearing cycles on a soil element located at a depth, $z$, below the surface, are the total vertical stress, $\sigma$, and shear stress, $\tau$. These are defined as proportions of the surface values by influence factors $I_{\sigma}$ and $I_{\tau}$ that scale the distribution of vertical and shear stresses with depth ($I_{\sigma} = I_{\tau} = 1$ at $z = 0$ and $I_{\sigma} = I_{\tau} \to 0$ for $z \to \infty$) (with the geostatic vertical stress superimposed). Solutions for stress profiles with depth are presented by Poulos & Davis (1974) for different surface loading configurations on an elastic half space.

The critical state framework is defined in terms of the vertical stress and horizontal shear stress acting in the ground (Fig. 1), since these are more convenient inputs than the mean principal effective stress, $p'$, and the deviatoric stress, $q$, for the boundary conditions being considered. This simplification is similar to the approach adopted by White & Hodder (2010) and Hodder et al. (2013) for cyclic penetrometer resistance.

**Figure 2** illustrates a critical state interpretation of the problem, in terms of the state and stress paths in (a) $\sigma' - e$, and (b) $\sigma' - \tau$ planes, respectively.

An initially normally consolidated, (point A in Fig. 2(a)) or lightly over consolidated soil (point B) is considered. During undrained shearing, for instance from sliding of a surface foundation or pipeline, positive excess pore pressure is generated, $\Delta u_{ex} > 0$, resulting in a decrease of the effective vertical stress, $\sigma'$. The stress state moves towards the CSL at constant void ratio, $e$. Unless the soil profile has a weaker layer at depth, the soil element at the mudline level will fail, so the stress state reaches the CSL (B to C in Fig. 2(a)). Elements
of soil at depth will move towards, but not reach the critical state line (B to C'), at least during the initial cycle. At the critical state, the current undrained shear strength is mobilised (C in Fig. 2(b)).

During the subsequent period of consolidation, the excess pore pressures dissipate ($\Delta u_{ue,dis}$ through C – D in Fig. 2, or with partial consolidation terminating at D') and the effective vertical stress returns towards the initial condition, i.e. $\sigma_v = \sigma'_v$. The increase in $\sigma'_v$ follows the unload-reload line (URL), defined by slope $\kappa$, causing a decrease in the void ratio ($\Delta e$), and an accumulation of settlement at the soil surface. The shear stress could be sustained during this period, or could decay (if the infrastructure is held at a fixed position, for example), but for simplicity the framework does not distinguish between these cases.

During subsequent shearing cycles the soil element will fail at a higher vertical effective stress, $\sigma'_v$ (D – E, Fig. 2(a)) and consequently mobilise a larger shear stress at failure (E in Fig. 2(b)).

4. COMPONENTS OF THE FRAMEWORK

Figure 3 presents the components of the framework in the order that they are required to perform a cycle-by-cycle calculation. The components are introduced in the same sequence below.

(a) **Vertical equilibrium conditions**

The framework first considers vertical equilibrium of the soil mass under the applied vertical stress at the surface and the soil self-weight stresses (Fig. 3(a)). The equilibrium vertical effective stress at depth $z$ is:

$$\sigma_{v,eqm} = \sigma'_v + \sigma_{op} \cdot I_{\sigma}$$

where $\sigma'_v$ is the in situ soil self-weight vertical effective stress, equivalent to $\gamma'_a \cdot z$ with $\gamma'_a$ being the average effective unit weight of the overlying soil, $\sigma_{op}$ is the applied vertical stress at the surface, due to the submerged self-weight of the infrastructure, and $I_{\sigma}$ is the influence factor defining the distribution of applied vertical stress with depth.

The void ratio at the state of equilibrium, $e_{eqm}$, is defined as:

$$e_{eqm} = N - \lambda \ln(OCR \cdot \sigma'_{v,eqm}) + \kappa \ln(OCR) + \Delta e \left( \frac{\sigma'_{v,eqm}}{OCR \cdot \sigma'_v} \right)^{b_{OCR}}$$
where $N$ and $\lambda$ are state parameters defining the void ratio at $\sigma'_v = 1$ kPa and the slope of the normal compression line (NCL) at high levels of $\sigma'_v$, respectively. The over-consolidation ratio, OCR is defined as the ratio of the maximum vertical effective stress experienced by the soil, $\sigma'_v,\text{max}$, over the equilibrium vertical effective stress, $\sigma'_v,\text{eqm}$ where $\sigma'_v,\text{max}$ is the sum of the in situ self-weight vertical effective stress and additional soil surcharge pressure ($\sigma'_v,\text{max} = \sigma'_v,0 + \sigma'_v,\text{sur}$).

A curved NCL is considered (Fig. 2(a)) which accounts for the additional void ratio at low levels of vertical stress. This feature is required to match the experimental data shown later, and follows the model defined by Liu & Carter (2003). The additional void ratio at low levels of $\sigma'_v$ is represented by the last term on the right-hand side of Equation 2, where $\Delta e_i$ is the additional void ratio at $\sigma'_v = \sigma'_v,i$ where virgin yielding begins at effective stress, $\sigma'_v,i$. Power $b_{\text{NCL}}$ quantifies the rate of increase of void ratio with decreasing $\sigma'_v$.

The initial CSL in $e - \ln(\sigma'_v)$ space (Fig. 2(a)) is a curved line parallel to the NCL, defined by the initial spacing ratio, $R_0$, given by the ratio of vertical stresses on the NCL and the initial CSL in $e - \ln(\sigma'_v)$ space:

$$R_0 = \exp \left( \frac{N - \Gamma_0}{\lambda - \kappa} \right)$$  

(3)

At any void ratio, $e$, the corresponding vertical effective stress on the CSL, $\sigma'_v,\text{CSL}$ can be calculated from Equation 4:

$$e = \Gamma - \lambda \ln(\sigma'_v,\text{CSL}) + \kappa \ln(\text{OCR}) + (1 - k_R) \Delta e_i \left( \frac{\sigma'_v,i}{R \sigma'_v,\text{CSL}} \right)^{b_{\text{NCL}}}$$  

(4)

The spacing ratio, $R$ and parameter $k_R$ in Equation 4 concurrently increase with cycles of shearing, which causes the CSL to migrate to a lower void ratio with increasing cycles to represent cyclic densification, as introduced later in sub-section (e).

(b) Undrained shear strength

The undrained shear strength, $s_u$, of a soil element is mobilised when the stress state reaches the CSL, and is calculated from the vertical effective stress at failure via a strength parameter, $M$ (Figs. 2(b), 3(b)):

$$s_u = 0.5M\sigma'_v$$  

(5)
The distribution of the current shear strength with depth can therefore be derived from the current void ratio through:

\[ s_u = 0.5M \exp \left( \frac{\Gamma - e}{\lambda} \right) \]  

\[ \text{(6)} \]

(c) *Mobilised shear stress*

Cycles of surface shearing mobilise a shear stress, \( \tau_{op} \) at the soil surface, with magnitude diminishing with depth (Fig. 3(c)). The mobilised shear stress will be controlled by the weakest ‘slice’ of soil in the one-dimensional column, with both \( s_u \) and \( \tau \) varying with depth. For most practical soil strength profiles which have \( s_u \) increasing with depth, failure will occur at the soil surface, but strictly \( \tau_{op} \) is controlled by:

\[ \tau_{op} = \min \left( \frac{s_u}{I_r} \right) \]  

\[ \text{(7)} \]

between \( z = 0 \) and \( \infty \).

The mobilised shear stress at depth \( z \) can then be determined as \( \tau = I_r \tau_{op} \) where \( I_r \) is the influence factor defining the distribution of shear stress with depth.

(d) *Equivalent cycle number*

For a soil element that fails during each cycle of shear stress, the cycle number is simply equal to the number of shear stress reversals. However, for soil elements that mobilise only a fraction of the undrained strength during a cycle, an equivalent number of cycles is defined, \( \Delta N_{eq} \), to allow these ‘partial’ cycles to be accumulated (Fig. 3(d)):

\[ \Delta N_{eq} = \left( \frac{\tau}{s_u} \right)^\chi \]  

\[ \text{(8)} \]

Since \( \Delta N_{eq} \) varies with depth, each soil layer possesses a different total of equivalent cycles, which reduces with increasing depth.

The power \( \chi \) controls the non-linearity of equivalent cycle number with the stress ratio, \( \tau/s_u \), and is expected to be greater than unity, implying an escalating rate of ‘damage’ the closer the shear stress is to the soil strength.
Selection of an appropriate value for $\chi$ is presented in the section on calibration and derivation of model parameters.

**CSL migration based on shearing cycles**

A limitation of the basic critical state models such as Original and Modified Cam Clay is that the progressive densification that results from multiple cycles of shearing to the critical state is not captured. In the present study, to overcome this limitation, the critical state line migrates to a lower void ratio as a function of the number of equivalent cycles experienced. This concept is achieved by defining a progressive increase in the spacing ratio, $R$, with cycles of shearing (Fig. 3(e)). The spacing ratio is assumed to increase from the initial value of $R_0$ towards a limiting value, $R_f$, according to:

$$R = R_0 + (R_f - R_0) \cdot k_R$$

where $R_0$ is calculated from the critical state parameters and the in situ stresses in the virgin soil (defined later in Eq. (27)) and $R_f$ is determined from the initial spacing ratio and soil sensitivity defined by a cyclic T-bar test (Eq. (28)). The parameter $k_R$ depends on the number of cycles (or equivalent cycles – Eq. (8)) of failure previously imposed on the soil element:

$$k_R = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{3}{N_{\text{eq}(95)}} \sum \Delta N_{\text{eq}}\right)$$

where $\sum \Delta N_{\text{eq}}$ provides the current equivalent cycle number and $N_{\text{eq}(95)}$ is a parameter controlling the rate of migration of the CSL, equal to the number of cycles required for 95% of the migration of the current CSL to the final location. The selection of a value of $N_{\text{eq}(95)}$ is presented later, with the case study for the sliding foundation.

**Generation of excess pore pressure**

The excess pore pressure mobilised when a soil element is sheared to failure (Fig. 3(f)) is given by:

$$\Delta u_{v,\text{max}} = \sigma'_v - \sigma'_{v,\text{CSL}}$$

where $\sigma'_v$ is the current (pre-shearing) vertical effective stress. During the first shearing cycle, $\sigma'_v = \sigma'_{v,\text{eqm}}$ (Eq. 1), while during subsequent shearing cycle, $\sigma'_v$ is calculated as:
\[ \sigma'_v = \sigma'_{v(N-1)} + \Delta u_{e,dis} - \Delta u_{e,gen} \]  

(12)

where \( \sigma'_{v(N-1)} \) is the (pre-shearing) vertical effective stress of the preceding cycle, and \( \Delta u_{e,dis} \) is the dissipated excess pore pressure during the current reconsolidation cycle (to be defined later).

The generated excess pore pressure, \( \Delta u_{e,gen} \) is given by:

\[ \Delta u_{e,gen} = \Delta u_{e,max} \left( \frac{T}{s_u} \right)^\beta \]  

(13)

The parameter \( \beta \) represents the curvature of the \( \sigma'_v - \tau \) effective stress path created by the generated excess pore pressure, \( \Delta u_{e,gen} \). For \( \beta = 1 \) the stress path is linear, but \( \beta > 1 \) is more typical, reflecting the shape of the stress path derived from Cam clay-type models, as shown schematically in Fig. 2(b).

**g) Dissipation of excess pore pressure**

The degree of consolidation, \( U \) (based on settlement, rather than pore pressure dissipation), after shearing during a reconsolidation period can be estimated through a normalised time-settlement response of the form:

\[ U = 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \left( \frac{T}{T_{50}} \right)^m} \]  

(14)

In the present analysis, \( U \) is inferred from a solution based on elasto-plastic finite element analysis of a boundary value problem (e.g. Gourvenec & Randolph (2010), Gourvenec et al. (2014), Feng & Gourvenec (2015) for shallow foundations, or Chatterjee et al. (2012) and Chatterjee et al. (2013) for pipelines). It is assumed that the global dissipation rates identified in these previous studies provide adequate approximations of the pore pressure dissipation at element level within the one-dimensional model used in the present study.

In Eq. 14, the parameter \( T_{50} \) refers to the dimensionless time factor for 50 % of the consolidation settlement, \( w \) to occur (i.e. \( U = \Delta e/\Delta e_{U=1} = 0.5 \) where \( \Delta e \) is the change in void ratio within a consolidation cycle, and \( \Delta e_{U=1} \) is the reduction in current void ratio when full consolidation takes place within a cycle such that when \( t \to \infty, U = 1 \) as defined below), and \( m \) is a constant. The dimensionless time, \( T \) is expressed as:

\[ T = \frac{c_{ref} t}{d^2} \]  

(15)
where $t$ is the reconsolidation period, and $d$ is drainage length (depending on the dimension of the infrastructure, typically taken as the foundation breadth, $B$ or pipe diameter, $D$). The current operative coefficient of consolidation, $c_{ref}$ can be obtained as:

$$c_{ref} = \alpha \left( k(1 + e) \frac{\sigma'_{v,CSL}}{\lambda'_{w}} \right)$$

(16)

where $\alpha$ is a factor to account for the anisotropic dissipation of pore water pressure during consolidation (Cocjin et al., 2014), and $k$ is the coefficient of soil permeability which can be expressed as a function of void ratio as:

$$k = a \left( \frac{e^b}{1 + e} \right)$$

(17)

with $a$ and $b$ being fitting parameters to estimate the permeability-void ratio relationship of the soil (Sahdi, 2013).

The reduction in the current void ratio during a reconsolidation cycle for an equivalent degree of consolidation, $U$ (Fig. 3(g)) is equivalent to $\Delta e = \Delta e_{U=1} \cdot U$, where $\Delta e_{U=1}$ can be obtained as:

$$\Delta e_{U=1} = \kappa' \ln \left( \frac{\sigma'_{v(N-1)}}{\sigma'_{v(N-1)} - \Delta u_{e,gen}} \right)$$

(18)

During reconsolidation, the vertical effective stress increases by an amount equivalent to the dissipated excess pore pressure, which is given by (Fig. 3(g)):

$$\Delta u_{e,dis} = \exp \left( \frac{\Delta e}{\kappa} \right) - 1 \left( \sigma'_{v(N-1)} - \Delta u_{e,gen} \right)$$

(19)

This completes the calculations for a given cycle of shearing and reconsolidation, and the current void ratio, $e$ is updated by $\Delta e$ through Eq. 18, leading to a revised undrained strength, $s_u$ (Eq. 6) to be used for the next cycle computation.

(h) Change in soil height and surface settlement

As the cycles progress, accumulating change in void ratio allows the change in height of each soil element with height, $dz$ (Fig. 3(h)) to be determined as:
\[ \delta h = \frac{\Delta e}{1 + e} \, dz \]  

Equation 20 is integrated over the whole depth of the soil column to obtain the incremental settlement of the soil surface within a cycle of reconsolidation,

\[ \delta w = \int_{z=0}^{\infty} \delta h \, dz \]

where the current settlement of the soil surface, \( w \), is obtained by summing \( \delta w \) for the current number of cycles \( N \),

\[ w = \sum_{1}^{N} \delta w \]  

5. COMPARISON OF THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND MODEL TEST DATA

The proposed framework has been applied to centrifuge test results reported by Cocjin et al. (2014). The sliding resistance and settlement of a rectangular mat foundation on normally-consolidated clay is analysed, as well as changes in the strength of the underlying soil. Pertinent details of the centrifuge model testing and calibration of the framework parameters are outlined below.

Foundation test

The centrifuge test was conducted in the University of Western Australia – Centre for Offshore Foundation Systems (UWA – COFS) fixed beam centrifuge at an acceleration level of 100g. The rectangular model foundation (Fig. 4) (with dimensions \( B = 5 \) m and \( L = 10 \) m at prototype scale) was set down on the surface of a bed of normally consolidated kaolin clay and subjected to cycles of undrained sliding with periods of intervening consolidation. An operative vertical stress \( \sigma_{op} = 1.85 \) kPa (equivalent to an operative vertical load, \( V_{op} = 92.7 \) kN) was imposed by the model foundation throughout the test. The soil was allowed to consolidate fully under this stress prior to the cycles of sliding and consolidation. The loading sequence prescribed in the centrifuge test is illustrated in Fig. 5. The foundation was translated horizontally a distance \( \delta u = 0.5B \) at a rate of 1 mm/s, which was sufficiently rapid to maintain undrained conditions during the slide. A single slide (which occurred only once at the start of the sliding cycles), or a double slide (reverse and forward
without intervening consolidation) is defined as a single cycle. The consolidation period after each movement lasted $t = 1.5$ years at prototype scale, during which the foundation was prevented from moving horizontally but was free to settle under the applied $\sigma_{op}$. The foundation sliding resistance and settlements were recorded over cycles of horizontal sliding and intervening periods of consolidation, totalling more than 60 years (prototype scale) of foundation response.

**Stress distribution**

The influence factors for the vertical stress, $I_\sigma$ and shear stress, $I_\tau$ distribution beneath the centreline of a rectangular, uniformly loaded area on the surface of a semi-infinite mass (Holl, 1940) were adopted, given by:

$$I_\sigma = \frac{2}{\pi} \left[ \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{lb}{zr_3} \right) + \frac{lbz}{r_5} \left( \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{1}{r_2} \right)^2 \right]$$

$$I_\tau = \frac{2}{\pi} \left[ \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{lb}{zr_3} \right) - \frac{lbz}{r_1^2 r_5} \right]$$

where $l = 0.5L$ and $b = 0.5B$ with $L > B$. The parameters $r_1$, $r_2$, and $r_3$ are given as follows:

$$r_1 = \left( l^2 + z^2 \right)^{0.5}$$
$$r_2 = \left( b^2 + z^2 \right)^{0.5}$$
$$r_3 = \left( l^2 + b^2 + z^2 \right)^{0.5}$$

**Calibration and derivation of model parameters**

Appropriate parameter values for the application of the theoretical framework were drawn from auxiliary tests carried out during the sliding foundation tests in the centrifuge as reported in Cocjin et al. (2014). Table 1 provides a list of these model parameters and corresponding calibrated values used in the application of the theoretical model.

**Critical state parameters**

The critical state parameters $\lambda$, $\kappa$, and $N$ were calibrated from the moisture content profile of the centrifuge model soil sample.
The moisture content, \( m_c \), at different depths was obtained from vertical core samples taken from undisturbed sites of the centrifuge soil sample. This was used to calculate the effective unit weight of the soil as \( \gamma' = \gamma_w (G_s - 1)/(1 - e_0) \) where \( e_0 = m_c G_s \) is the in situ void ratio, and \( \gamma_w \) is the unit weight of water. The specific particle density, \( G_s = 2.6 \) (Stewart, 1992) yielded an average effective unit of \( \gamma'_\text{av} = 6.0 \text{kN/m}^3 \) over the range \( 0.4 < z \text{ (m)} < 11.5 \).

The in situ void ratio, i.e. in the virgin soil prior to placement or loading of the foundation, \( e_0 \), and the natural logarithm of the vertical effective stress, \( \sigma'_v = \gamma'_\text{av} z \) representing undisturbed soil are presented in Fig. 6. The measured data show higher in situ void ratios at low stress levels (\( \sigma'_v < 10 \text{kPa} \)) than predicted by critical state parameters derived from one-dimensional compression tests at higher stresses (Stewart, 1992). This reflects the high compressibility of clays with high initial water contents (Boukpeti et al., 2012) and justifies our use of a modified shape of NCL and CSL, following Liu & Carter (2003).

By minimising the residuals between the measured and predicted void ratio from Eq. 2, best-fit values for the slopes, \( \lambda \) and \( \kappa \), and void ratio intercept at \( \sigma'_v = 1 \text{kPa} \), \( N \), and additional void ratio parameters \( \Delta e_v \), \( \sigma'_v, i \) and \( b_{NCL} \), were obtained (Table 1).

The value of the void ratio intercept at \( \sigma'_v = 1 \text{kPa} \) of the initial CSL in the \( \ln(\sigma'_v) - e \) plane, \( \Gamma_0 \), was obtained by equating the ratio of the in situ undrained shear strength (Eq. 6) and the effective vertical stress at the NCL (Eq. 2), with the normally consolidated strength ratio of the soil, \( (s_u/\sigma'_v)_{NC} \) such that

\[
\Gamma_0 = \lambda \ln \left[ \frac{2}{M} \left( \frac{s_u}{\sigma'_v} \right)_{NC} \right] + N \tag{26}
\]

Spacing ratio

The initial spacing ratio, \( R_0 \), is expressed as a function of the normally consolidated strength ratio by substituting Eq. 26 into Eq. 3:

\[
R_0 = \exp \left[ \frac{\lambda}{\kappa - \lambda} \ln \left( \frac{2}{M} \left( \frac{s_u}{\sigma'_v} \right)_{NC} \right) \right] \tag{27}
\]

wherein the obtained \( R_0 \) (Table 1) is derived from an \( (s_u/\sigma'_v)_{NC} \sim 0.15 \) reported in Cocjin et al. (2014) from T-bar penetrometer tests, assuming \( M = 0.92 \) following Stewart (1992).
The final spacing ratio, \( R_f \), which defines the limiting position of the CSL in the volumetric plane, was obtained from the measured soil sensitivity through cyclic T-bar penetrometer tests, \( S_t \sim 2.4 \) (Cocjin et al., 2014) as:

\[
R_f = R_0 S_t
\]  

(28)

Remoulding parameter

The variation of the change in equivalent cycle number \( \Delta N_{eq} \) caused by the mobilised stress ratio, \( \tau/s_u \) is illustrated in Fig. 7 for different values of \( \chi \). The parameter \( \chi \) controls the level of ‘damage’ for non-failing soil elements as quantified in Eq. 8. A choice of \( \chi > 1 \) reflects a realistic assumption regarding the level of ‘damage’ for non-failing soil elements as a function of the mobilised stress ratio, \( \tau/s_u \). A very large \( \chi \) would limit significant ‘damage’ only to a soil element that has reached the critical state failure, whereas a linear variation of the level of ‘damage’ with \( \tau/s_u \) is implied by \( \chi = 1 \). As \( \chi \) controls the fraction of the full pore pressure that is generated during shearing without failure, the \( \tau/s_u \) versus \( \Delta N_{eq} \) representation (as shown in Fig. 7) might be expected to resemble a mirror image of the effective stress path in \((\sigma', \tau)\) space. For soft clays this path bends to the left, and is approximately elliptical (e.g. as in Modified Cam Clay). The adopted value of \( \chi = 2.5 \) approximates this well, and might therefore be expected to apply more generally, as well as fitting the present experimental data.

Similarly, by using \( \beta = 2 \) in Eq. 13, a parabolic form is adopted for the curvature tracked by the generated excess pore pressure, \( \Delta u_{e,gen} \) in \((\sigma', \tau)\) space (Fig. 2(b)). A value of \( N_{eq(\beta)} = 40 \) provided a good match with the observed data.

Assessment of the theoretical model

This section compares the results from the framework with observations from the centrifuge model test reported in Cocjin et al. (2014).

Foundation sliding resistance

Figure 8 compares the horizontal sliding resistance calculated by the framework (via Eq. 7) and measured in the centrifuge test. The model captures well the general trend and magnitude of increasing sliding resistance due to increasing soil strength following cycles of shearing and reconsolidation. A residual coefficient of sliding friction, \( \mu = \tau_{op}/\sigma_{eq} \) is calculated at every sliding cycle where \( \tau_{op} \) obtained from the centrifuge test refers to the residual, steady state, shear stress mobilised at a horizontal foundation displacement of \( \delta u/B = 0.25 \). The test
results showed a declining sliding resistance during the later cycles \((N > 30)\) which was not included in Fig. 8. This occurred because contact between the edge of the mudmat and the seabed was not maintained as the mudmat moved in and out of the depression created by the consolidation process and onto the adjacent berm (see Cocjin et al., 2014). Further work would be required to introduce this three-dimensional behaviour into a theoretical model.

**Foundation settlement**

Figure 9(a) compares the calculated and measured accumulation of foundation consolidation settlement. The measured consolidation settlement in the early cycles is slightly greater than the calculations while the settlement in the later cycles and the final consolidation settlement are very well matched.

The final consolidation settlement was obtained from the measured initial and final void ratio profiles (Fig. 6) by summing the changes in soil height with depth. The settlement derived from the changes in void ratio is identical to the final cyclic consolidation settlement measured directly from the foundation test, providing confidence in the two independently calculated values (Fig. 9(a)).

The settlement of the foundation accumulates over a larger number of cycles than the rise in sliding resistance, which is virtually complete after 20 cycles (Fig. 8). This is due to continued pore pressure generation due to pre-failure shearing in the deeper soil, which leads to settlement but no change in the sliding resistance, which is controlled by the shallow soil. The framework correctly captures these different rates of resistance and settlement build-up with sliding cycles.

The sliding movement of the foundation also contributes plastic vertical displacement to the overall settlement, as evidenced from the centrifuge data in Fig. 9(b), which shows the overall cumulative foundation settlement against the horizontal sliding displacement, \(\delta u\). The undrained shearing settlement, \(w_p\) is deducted from the overall cumulative foundation settlement in Fig. 9(b) and plotted against cycle number in Fig. 9(a). This settlement is due to the ploughing of the sheared soil during sliding (Cocjin et al., 2015), and is presented in Fig. 10 as a plastic strain ratio, \(\delta w_p/\delta u\) plotted against the normalised vertical load \(v = V_{op}/V_{u,cons}\) where \(V_{u,cons}\) is the consolidated, undrained vertical load capacity calculated from the updated soil strength following Gourvenec et al. (2014).

An associated flow rule was considered for prediction of the plastic settlement, but the actual response is non-associated, with higher settlement observed than predicted using normality combined with the failure envelopes.
for rectangular surface foundations by Feng et al. (2014) and the classical solution for a strip foundation by Green (1954). This is consistent with previous model test observations reported by Martin & Houlsby (2001), who applied an ad hoc scaling to the flow rule to capture non-associativity in their model tests of foundations on clay. In the present case, a simple relationship between the plastic strain direction and the normalised vertical load derived from the centrifuge data in Fig. 10 is given as:

\[
\frac{\delta v_p}{\delta u} = \Lambda (v - v_0)^\xi \quad \text{for } v > v_0, \tag{29a}
\]

and

\[
\frac{\delta v_p}{\delta u} = 0 \quad \text{for } v \leq v_0 \tag{29b}
\]

where \(\Lambda\) and \(\xi\) are fitting parameters (see Table 2), and \(v_0\) is the lowest vertical load ratio with non-zero plastic strain. The cut-off of \(v_0 = 0.27\) is lower than the theoretical value derived from failure envelopes (0.4 and 0.5 in Feng et al. (2014) and Green (1954), respectively).

**Undrained shear strength profiles**

Figure 11 shows a good correlation between the in situ undrained shear strength in the virgin soil, \(s_{u,0}\) profile measured in the centrifuge sample with a miniature T-bar test (Stewart & Randolph, 1991) and calculated by the framework through Eq. 6.

A T-bar test was also carried out in the foundation footprint, after removal of the foundation at the end of the test, to assess the final undrained shear strength, \(s_{u,f}\) of the sheared and consolidated soil. The profile of \(s_{u,f}\), measured from the surface of the foundation footprint is compared with the calculations from the theoretical framework in Fig. 11 and also shows good agreement (noting that the T-bar diameter corresponds to 0.5 m at prototype scale, so detection of the hardened zone is challenging).

**Moisture content profiles**

Figure 12 compares the in situ and final moisture content profiles with depth from the framework and measured in the centrifuge test sample. The framework result was derived from the cycle-by-cycle void ratio profile, where moisture content was obtained as \(m_c = e/G_s\) for the first and last cycle. The framework provides a good estimate of the in situ moisture content profile of the centrifuge test sample, and a reasonable estimate of the lower post-test moisture content at shallow depth.
6. INSIGHTS INTO SOIL RESPONSE

The analysis framework has been shown to provide good predictions of the foundation resistance to sliding and settlement with cycles of shearing and consolidation, as well as capturing the changing undrained shear strength and moisture content of the underlying soil. The framework can also provide insights into the cycle-by-cycle elemental soil response as described below.

**Void ratio**

Figure 13 shows the cycle-by-cycle evolution of the profile of void ratio, \( e \) as a function of depth for 40 loading cycles. The general behaviour shows that during the early cycles, the greatest contraction is at the soil surface. However, as this zone hardens, the shear stress and pore pressure generation in the deeper soil increase, leading to a greater change in void ratio. This effect propagates deeper but diminishes as the mobilised shear stress becomes a smaller proportion of the in situ shear strength.

**Undrained shear strength**

Figure 11 is replotted in Fig. 14 to show the cycle-by-cycle evolution of undrained shear strength, \( s_u \) (Eq. 6) as a function of depth showing the general increase in soil strength, over the depth of influence of pore pressure generation, with increasing cycles of surface shearing and reconsolidation. The undrained shear strength close to the surface reaches a limiting value after some cycles, while the zone of strength gain propagates deeper. This stabilisation of the strength reflects the final critical state being reached and the end of the CSL migration, leading to no further excess pore pressure.

**Stress and state path**

State paths during cycles of surface shearing and reconsolidation for a soil element at the shearing interface, i.e. at \( z = 0 \) is presented in \( e - \ln(\sigma'_v) \) space for 40 loading cycles in Fig. 15. This figure shows the progressive reduction of vertical effective stress at constant void ratio within a surface shearing cycle, and the recovery of effective stress and associated reduction in void ratio during each reconsolidation period. The decay and migration of the CSL in \( e - \ln(\sigma'_v) \) space becomes less pronounced with increasing cycles of shearing and reconsolidation. The effect of partial consolidation is also seen by the decreasing value of \( \sigma'_v \) from \( \sigma'_{v,eqm} \) with increasing loading cycle.
7. CLOSING REMARKS

The analytical framework set out in this paper is an extension of the widely-used oedometer method for estimating foundation settlement. It provides a basis to predict the changing seabed resistance and accumulating settlements of surface installations that experience cycles of horizontal sliding movements.

The framework considers a one-dimensional column of soil elements beneath a foundation, with each element subject to a vertical total stress and cycles of horizontal shear stress, and responding via a simple form of critical state model. The framework is presented in a cycle-by-cycle manner, solving for the response at each soil element to determine the cumulative change in void ratio, defining changes in soil shear strength and surface settlement.

The change in undrained shear strength is quantified in terms of the generation and dissipation of excess pore water pressure. The model incorporates the effects of partial dissipation of excess pore water pressure during cycles of reconsolidation. Soil contraction due to void ratio reduction during cycles of reconsolidation allows for the estimation of soil surface settlement.

The framework was shown to simulate well the behaviour of a tolerably mobile subsea foundation tested at prototype stress levels in the centrifuge. The model captures the increasing foundation sliding resistance due to increasing soil strength, the overall settlement of the foundation following cycles of shearing and reconsolidation, as well as the different build-up rates of resistance and settlement. The theoretical model also provided an accurate estimate of the spatial variation with depth of the undrained shear strength and the moisture content of the soil within the foundation footprint.

This framework provides a simple yet effective means to analyse a soil-structure interaction process that involves episodes of horizontal surface shearing and reconsolidation. It is a simple tool that is convenient for foundation design purposes – validated for specific conditions, if necessary, via more complex model tests or numerical analysis. It also provides a simple method to integrate the foundation behaviour into a structural model that includes the connected equipment such as pipelines, without requiring the full soil domain to be modelled explicitly. It offers a useful addition to the toolbox of methods that can be used to design and optimise subsea installations.
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Figure 1. Idealisation of the boundary value problem showing distributed loads on the surface of a semi-infinite mass.
Figure 2. A critical state interpretation of a soil element submitted to cyclic surface shearing and reconsolidation, presented in the (a) volumetric (inset: migration and decay of critical state line), and (b) stress planes.
Figure 3. Schematic of model framework.

(a) Current effective vertical stress
(b) Current undrained shear strength
(c) Mobilised shear stress in a cycle
(d) Cycle number
(e) Current critical state line
(f) Maximum potential excess pore pressure in a cycle
(g) Pore pressure dissipation and void ratio reduction in a cycle
(h) Change in soil layer height and surface settlement in a cycle
Figure 4. Experimental set-up of the sliding foundation test in the centrifuge.
Figure 5. Loading sequence for a sliding foundation test in the centrifuge
Figure 6. Vertical effective stress, $\sigma'_v$ (in natural logarithm scale) plotted against void ratio, $e$ showing measured data on in situ and sheared/consolidated soil (final), with linear models of the normal compression line (NCL) based on curve fits using state parameters obtained from the centrifuge, and one-dimensional compression tests.
Figure 7. Variation of the change in cycle number $\Delta N_{eq}$ with mobilised stress ratio, $\tau/s_u$ for different values of $\chi$. 
Figure 8. Residual coefficient of sliding friction, $\mu = \tau_{op}/\sigma_{op}$ mobilised at every loading cycle, measured from sliding foundation test in the centrifuge, and the prediction by the theoretical model.
Figure 9. (a) accumulation of foundation settlement with increasing loading cycles, measured from sliding foundation test in the centrifuge, and the prediction by the theoretical model; and (b) overall foundation settlements measured in the centrifuge test.
Figure 10. Incremental plastic undrained settlements.
Figure 11. In situ and sheared/consolidated soil (final) undrained shear strength profiles with depth measured from the centrifuge test soil sample, and the prediction by the theoretical model.
Figure 12. Moisture content, $m_c$, profile with depth measured from the centrifuge test soil sample, and the prediction by the theoretical model.
Figure 13. Cycle-by-cycle evolution of the current void ratio, $e$ as a function of depth reflecting the degradation of the mudline level
Figure 14. Cycle-by-cycle evolution of the current undrained shear strength, $s_u$ as a function of depth reflecting the degradation of the mudline level.
Figure 15. Vertical effective stress - void ratio space, showing state paths of a soil element at shearing interface, i.e. at $z = 0$. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework components</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Notes on calibration or source of selected value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundary conditions</strong></td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Foundation breadth</td>
<td>5 m</td>
<td>Test parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L )</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Foundation length</td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td>Test parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \sigma_{op} )</td>
<td>m/LT^2</td>
<td>Operative vertical bearing pressure</td>
<td>1.85 kPa</td>
<td>Test parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil sample characteristics</strong></td>
<td>( \gamma_{av} )</td>
<td>m/T^2</td>
<td>Unit weight of the soil (average)</td>
<td>5.9 kN/m^3</td>
<td>Obtained from moisture content data of soil core samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( [\sigma'<em>{v}/\sigma'</em>{v0}]_{NCL} )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Normally consolidated strength ratio</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Obtained from moisture content data of soil core samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_t )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Soil sensitivity</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Ratio of intact to fully remoulded shear strength obtained from cyclic T-bar penetrometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Void ratio - vertical effective stress relationship</strong></td>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Void ratio intercept at ( \sigma'_v = 1 \text{ kPa} ) of the Normal Compression Line (NCL) in the ( e - \ln \sigma'_v ) plane</td>
<td>2.447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \Delta e_i )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Additional void ratio at ( \sigma'<em>v = \sigma'</em>{v0} ), where virgin yielding begins</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \sigma'_{v,i} )</td>
<td>m/LT^2</td>
<td>Initial vertical yield stress</td>
<td>1.5 kPa</td>
<td>Calibrated from moisture content data of soil core samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b_{NCL} )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Compression destructuring index, where ( 0 &lt; b_{NCL} &lt; \infty )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Slope of swelling line</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \Gamma_0 )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Void ratio intercept at ( \sigma'_v = 1 \text{ kPa} ) of the initial Critical State Line (CSL) in the void ratio -natural logarithm of vertical effective stress ( (e - \ln \sigma'_v) ) plane</td>
<td>2.163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \lambda )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Slope of NCL in the ( e - \ln \sigma'_v ) plane</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shear stress - vertical effective stress relationship</strong></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Slope of CSL in vertical effective stress - shear stress ( (\sigma'_v - \tau) ) plane</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>Critical state parameter from Stewart (1992), Cocjin et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSL migration/decay</strong></td>
<td>( R_0 )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Initial spacing ratio</td>
<td>7.978</td>
<td>Calibrated from moisture content data of soil core samples and in situ undrained shear strength of the soil sample as assessed from a T-bar penetrometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N_{eq(95)} )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>CSL migration parameter</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Cycle number required for the current spacing ratio, ( R_0 ), to be equivalent to 95% of the value of the final spacing ratio, ( R_f ). Fitted based on model test observations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( R_f )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Final spacing ratio</td>
<td>19.148</td>
<td>Equivalent to the product of the initial spacing ratio and soil sensitivity, i.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remoulding</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Excess pore pressure parameter, represents the curvature of the effective stress path created by the generated excess pore pressure, Remoulding parameter, controls the fraction of the full pore pressure that is generated during shearing without failure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A parabolic curvature of the effective stress path in the stress plane was selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \chi )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Selected to mimic a parabolic curvature of the effective stress path in the stress plane, and consistent with experimental observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation parameters</td>
<td>( \tau_{50} )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Dimensionless time factor for 50% of the consolidation settlement to occur</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>Obtained from a finite-element analysis of a rectangular sliding mudmat (see Feng &amp; Gourvenec (2015))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( a )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Void ratio - permeability relationship parameter</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Obtained from Rowe cell tests on kaolin clay (see Sahdi 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Ratio of vertical to operative coefficient coefficient</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Obtained from the dissipation response of a 'piezofoundation' reported in Cocjin et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Void ratio - permeability relationship parameter</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Obtained from Rowe cell tests on kaolin clay (see Sahdi 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( m )</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Numerical solution for rectangular foundation taken from Feng &amp; Gourvenec (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>( \gamma_w )</td>
<td>m/FL^2</td>
<td>Unit weight of water</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>Universal constant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Curve-fitting parameters for plastic strain ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda$</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_0$</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\xi$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>