

Geotechnique

Physical modelling to demonstrate the feasibility of screw piles for offshore jacket supported wind energy structures

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	18-P-311R3
Full Title:	Physical modelling to demonstrate the feasibility of screw piles for offshore jacket supported wind energy structures
Article Type:	General Paper
Corresponding Author:	Craig Davidson University of Dundee Dundee, UNITED KINGDOM
Corresponding Author's Institution:	University of Dundee
Order of Authors:	Craig Davidson Michael John Brown, BEng PhD Benjamin Cerfontaine, BSc, MSc, PhD Jonathan Adam Knappett, MEng (Hons), PhD Andrew J Brennan, MEng PhD Therar Al-Baghdadi, BSc, MSc, PhD Charles Augarde, BSc MSc DPhil Will Coombs, MEng PhD Lei Wang, PhD Anthony Blake, BEng, PhD David Richards, BEng MSc PhD Jonathan David Ball, BSc
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Manuscript Region of Origin:	UNITED KINGDOM
Abstract:	<p>Screw piles potentially offer quieter installation and enhanced axial tensile capacity over straight-shafted driven piles. As such, they have been suggested as a possible foundation solution for offshore jacket supported wind turbines in deeper water. To investigate the feasibility of their use in this setting, centrifuge testing of six model screw piles of different designs was conducted to measure the installation requirements and ultimate axial capacity of the piles in very-dense and medium-dense sand. The screw piles were designed to sustain loads generated by an extreme design scenario using published axial capacity and torque prediction formulae. Single and double-helix designs, including an optimised design, intended to minimise installation requirements, with reduced geometry were installed and tested in-flight. Piles in the medium-dense sand for example had significant installation requirements of up to 18.4MNm (torque) and 28.8MN (vertical force) which were accurately predicted using correlations with cone resistance data (CPT). Existing axial capacity design methods did not perform well for these large-scale screw piles, overestimating compressive and tensile capacities. Revised analytical methods for installation and axial capacity estimates are proposed here based on the centrifuge test results.</p>
Suggested Reviewers:	
Opposed Reviewers:	
Additional Information:	

1
2
3
4
5 **Date of Submission**
6

7 Original submission date: 16/11/18
8

9
10 2nd submission date: 25/10/19
11

12 3rd submission date: 05/05/20
13

14 4th submission date: 13/07/20
15

16
17 Géotechnique paper reference number: 18-P-311
18

19 **Title**
20

21 Physical modelling to demonstrate the feasibility of screw piles for offshore jacket supported wind energy
22 structures
23
24

25 **Author list**
26

27 Craig Davidson*, Michael John Brown, Benjamin Cerfontaine, Therar Al-Baghdadi, Jonathan Knappett,
28 Andrew Brennan, Charles Augarde, William Coombs, Lei Wang, Anthony Blake, David Richards and
29 Jonathan David Ball
30
31

32 **Corresponding author*
33
34

35 **Author details**
36

37 Craig Davidson, BSc MSc

38 Research Associate, School of Science and Engineering, University of Dundee, Fulton Building,
39 Dundee, DD1 4HN, UK

40 ORCID: 0000-0002-4843-5498

41 Email: c.s.davidson@dundee.ac.uk
42

43 Michael John Brown, BEng PhD GMICE

44 Reader, School of Science and Engineering, University of Dundee, Fulton Building, Dundee, DD1
45 4HN, UK

46 ORCID: 0000-0001-6770-4836

47 Email: m.j.z.brown@dundee.ac.uk
48

49 Benjamin Cerfontaine, BSc, MSc, PhD

50 MSCA Research Fellow, School of Science and Engineering, University of Dundee, Fulton Building,
51 Dundee, DD1 4HN, UK

52 ORCID: 0000-0002-4833-9412

53 Email: b.cerfontaine@dundee.ac.uk
54

55 Jonathan Adam Knappett, MEng (Hons), PhD

56 Reader, School of Science and Engineering, University of Dundee, Fulton Building, Dundee, DD1
57 4HN, UK

58 ORCID: 0000-0003-1936-881X

59 Email: j.a.knappett@dundee.ac.uk
60
61

1
2
3
4 Andrew Brennan, MEng PhD GMICE
5 Senior Lecturer, School of Science and Engineering, University of Dundee, Fulton Building,
6 Dundee, DD1 4HN, UK
7 ORCID: 0000-0002-8322-0126
8 Email: a.j.brennan@dundee.ac.uk
9
10 Therar Al-Baghdadi, BSc, MSc, PhD
11 Geotechnical Engineer, Municipality of Karbala, Karbala, Iraq
12 ORCID: 0000-0002-7368-4285
13 Email: therarb@yahoo.co.uk
14
15 Charles Augarde, BSc MSc DPhil CEng FICE
16 Professor, Department of Engineering, Durham University, Durham, DH1 3LE, UK
17 ORCID: 0000-0002-5576-7853
18 Email: charles.augarde@durham.ac.uk
19
20 Will Coombs, MEng PhD
21 Associate Professor, Department of Engineering, Durham University, Durham, DH1 3LE, UK
22 ORCID: 0000-0003-2099-1676
23 Email: w.m.coombs@durham.ac.uk
24
25 Lei Wang, PhD
26 Research Assistant, Department of Engineering, Durham University, Durham, DH1 3LE, UK
27 Email: lei.wang@durham.ac.uk
28
29 Anthony Blake, BEng, PhD
30 Research Fellow, Faculty of Engineering and the Environment, University of Southampton, SO17
31 1BJ, UK
32 ORCID: 0000-0001-5718-7900
33 Email: a.p.blake@soton.ac.uk
34
35 David Richards, BEng MSc PhD CEng MICE
36 Professor, Faculty of Engineering and the Environment, University of Southampton, UK
37 ORCID: 0000-0002-3819-7297
38 Email: djr@soton.ac.uk
39
40 Jonathan David Ball, BSc, CGeol, FGS
41 Chief Geotechnical Engineer, Roger Bullivant Ltd, Burton Upon Trent, UK

42 **Main text word count:** 9041

43
44 **Number of tables:** 8

45
46 **Number of Figures:** 16
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Physical modelling to demonstrate the feasibility of screw piles for offshore jacket supported wind**
2 **energy structures**

3 Craig Davidson*, Michael John Brown, Benjamin Cerfontaine, Jonathan Adam Knappett, Andrew
4 Brennan, Therar Al-Baghdadi, Charles Augarde, William Coombs, Lei Wang, Anthony Blake, David
5 Richards and Jonathan David Ball
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Abstract**

12
13
14
15 Screw piles potentially offer quieter installation and enhanced axial tensile capacity over straight-
16 shafted driven piles. As such, they have been suggested as a possible foundation solution for offshore
17 jacket supported wind turbines in deeper water. To investigate the feasibility of their use in this
18 setting, centrifuge testing of six model screw piles of different designs was conducted to measure the
19 installation requirements and ultimate axial capacity of the piles in very-dense and medium-dense
20 sand. The screw piles were designed to sustain loads generated by an extreme design scenario using
21 published axial capacity and torque prediction formulae. Single and double-helix designs, including an
22 optimised design, intended to minimise installation requirements, with reduced geometry were
23 installed and tested in-flight. Piles in the medium-dense sand for example had significant installation
24 requirements of up to 18.4MNm (torque) and 28.8MN (vertical force) which were accurately predicted
25 using correlations with cone resistance data (CPT). Existing axial capacity design methods did not
26 perform well for these large-scale screw piles, overestimating compressive and tensile capacities.
27 Revised analytical methods for installation and axial capacity estimates are proposed here based on
28 the centrifuge test results.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Keywords**

50
51
52
53 Offshore engineering, Piles & piling, Torsion
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Introduction

2
3 Currently, 81% of existing offshore turbines in Europe are supported by monopile foundations, with
4
5 gravity base structures and jackets making up the remainder (Windeurope Business Intelligence,
6
7 2017). Monopile foundation diameters have increased from typically 4m (LeBlanc et al., 2010), suited
8
9 to water depths up to 25m (DNV, 2010), to 7.8m diameter in 41m water depth at the Veja Mate wind
10
11 farm (EEZ2 German North Sea). Monopiles with diameters of 10m or more are expected in
12
13 forthcoming developments (Byrne et al., 2017) and although these can be manufactured, their
14
15 installation may prove challenging. Others argue that monopiles have already reached their practical
16
17 maximum or economically viable size (Golightly, 2014) at 10m in diameter in 45m water depths and
18
19 that investment should be placed in developing more cost effective alternatives.
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 11 As wind energy moves into deeper water (>45m), piled steel jackets may become the preferred
27
28 solution. For example, the Beatrice Wind Farm (Moray Firth, UK) uses jackets situated in up to 55m
29
30 water depth with single tubular piles (2.2m diameter and 35 – 60m long) driven at each corner
31
32 (Beatrice Offshore Windfarm Ltd, 2017). With increasing water depth, it may be necessary to increase
33
34 the numbers of piles per jacket. Consequentially, for a wind farm with maybe hundreds of turbines, at
35
36 least 3 to 4 times as many (and possibly many more) piles would need to be deployed for jacket
37
38 structures. This would result in long duration pile driving operations raising concerns over the effects
39
40 of noise and vibration on marine inhabitants (JNCC, 2010). Such concerns have led to tight controls on
41
42 offshore pile driving (Huisman, 2019) such as maximum times to drive piles and limits on underwater
43
44 noise during driving and/or the need to implement expensive noise mitigation measures (Bruns et al.,
45
46 2014).
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 22 With these challenges facing jacket deployment, alternative foundation types are being explored. One
54
55 onshore technique with potential is screw piles. Currently this type of steel pile has a low diameter
56
57 tubular core (typically 64 – 200mm) with one or more (average of 2 (Perko, 2009)) larger diameter
58
59 (typically 150 – 400mm) helical plates (helices) welded to the central core (Perko, 2009, Sakr, 2015),
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

as shown in Figure 1. They are commonly installed onshore by a 360° excavator using a hydraulic torque head that rotates the pile, while vertical or “crowd” force is applied by the boom/arm of the excavator (Perko, 2009) as required. This type of pile, known for their high tensile capacity and quick installation with low noise and vibration, is attractive for potential use with jackets for offshore wind, but also as a potential anchor for future floating wind or wave energy converters (Byrne and Houlsby, 2015).

The combined axial and lateral loads in the offshore environment present a particular difficulty in developing screw piles for the offshore wind sector. Most onshore screw pile applications are subject to relatively low lateral loads resulting in the pile geometry in Figure 1, with typical helix diameter (D_h) to core diameter (D_c) ratios (D_h/D_c) of 1.5 to 8 (average 3.3) (Perko, 2009, Sakr, 2015). Therefore, for offshore deployment it is envisaged that the pile geometry will need to change significantly (Al-Baghdadi et al., 2017a) with a particular need to increase the structural bending moment capacity (Al-Baghdadi et al., 2015) through an increased core diameter or upper section.

Previous screw pile studies in sand (Knappett et al., 2014, Al-Baghdadi, 2018) indicate that greater efficiencies can be achieved under vertical compressive loading by varying the helix to core diameter ratio (D_h/D_c) and in the case of multi-helix designs, changing the vertical spacing of the helices (S/D_h). Such variations in geometry and diameters are well outside the current experience of onshore screw pile design (Perko, 2009, Das and Shukla, 2013, BS 8004:2015) and deployment. This is of particular concern when adopting screw piles for offshore wind applications where it is likely that new plant will be needed to accommodate the large installation loads and torque. In turn, this means that the geometries required offshore may not be controlled only by in-service or extreme loading but may need to be optimised to reduce installation requirements (Morais and Tsuha, 2014). Current prediction of installation torque is based upon: correlation of field measured torque with anticipated or measured pile capacity (Hoyt and Clemence, 1989, Perko, 2009); modification of empirical pile capacity design methods (Ghaly and Hanna, 1991, Tsuha and Aoki, 2010, Sakr, 2015); or is related to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 in situ testing such as Cone Penetration Testing (CPT) (Gavin et al., 2013, Spagnoli, 2016, Al-Baghdadi
52 et al., 2017b, Davidson et al., 2018a) for much smaller piles. These methods show wide scatter in
53 predicted torque values and/or may have seen limited validation for a limited range of pile sizes and
54 configurations.

55 The design case considered in this paper, consists of an 8MW turbine on a four-legged steel jacket in
56 80m water depth, founded on a single screw pile at each corner, in either medium-dense or very-
57 dense sand. This scenario allows quantification of upper-bound installation and in-service loads that
58 may be placed upon an appropriately modified pile geometry. Six screw pile designs, theoretically
59 capable of sustaining loads from this design scenario were fabricated at model scale and tested to
60 determine their installation requirements and axial capacities. Of the six piles, four were designed for
61 the very-dense sand condition based on existing methods (e.g. Mitsch and Clemence (1985) and Perko
62 (2009)), while the design of a further two piles for the medium-dense sand state were based upon
63 modifications to the existing design methods, which are discussed in this paper, following the test
64 results of the first four screw piles. An analysis of these design methods is performed and
65 recommendations given to new design approaches based on centrifuge modelling, as well as to the
66 feasibility of using large screw piles as offshore wind turbine jacket structure foundations

67 **Methodology**

68 *Assessment of Loads: Design scenarios*

69 Jackets to support offshore wind turbines are likely to be deployed in water depths of 45 to 80m,
70 between the proven capability of monopiles and potential future floating structures. Therefore, the
71 worst-case design scenario was to select the deepest water conditions coupled with a suitably large
72 wind turbine of 8MW size. A homogenous sand profile consisting of either medium-dense ($D_r = 57\%$)
73 or very-dense ($D_r = 84\%$) sand was considered to investigate the relationships between pile geometry,
74 installation requirements and axial capacities generated from the differing soil properties.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

75 The jacket and turbine used in the scenarios are shown in Figure 2. The vertical force transmitted from
76 the jacket to the foundation comprises the self-weight of the steel (density of 7800kg/m³), ancillary
77 equipment weighing 2MN and heavy marine growth as per DNV (2007). The dead load of the wind
78 turbine was derived from the Leanwind (2013) 8MW turbine. Parameters representing environmental
79 conditions with a 1% exceedance level in the North Sea (Table 1) were used to determine the wind
80 and wave loads using DNV (2007). The wind speed adopted was above the operational limit of the
81 turbine and therefore the blades were assumed to be statically positioned as in Figure 2, at an angle
82 of attack to present the largest surface area possible to the wind.

83 All loads were assumed to act in unison, diagonally across the jacket to calculate the upwind tensile
84 and downwind compressive loads. A pinned jacket-foundation pile connection was assumed, and
85 calculations were undertaken using a factor of 1.35 on the final loads for each pile (a value provided
86 confidentially by an offshore consultant undertaking this type of design on a commercial basis). This
87 resulted in each pile requiring capacities of 3.08MN laterally, 32.31MN in compression and 24.23MN
88 in tension.

89 *Screw pile design process*

90 Initially, it was envisaged that multi-helix screw piles with helix spacing (S) equal to $2 - 3D_h$ would be
91 the most appropriate design solution over a single-helix approach, due to the expected enhanced
92 compressive axial capacity, as suggested by Knappett et al. (2014) and Al-Baghdadi (2018). Therefore,
93 multi-helix piles were designed, with single-helix designs considered for comparison. Initially, only the
94 very-dense sand scenario was investigated in the physical model testing to prevent unnecessary
95 remanufacturing of model screw piles for subsequent tests if the results were unfavourable. The
96 process for the multi-helix screw piles in the very-dense sand followed the steps outlined below to
97 calculate the various components contributing to the relevant capacity.

1 98 Following analysis of the tests results from the very-dense sand scenario, with respect to the measured
2 99 versus predicted values for installation and axial loads, the medium-dense sand scenario piles were
3
4 100 designed. This process used a modified procedure from that used in the very-dense sand scenario and
5
6
7 101 is described in the Results section of the paper (Methods 1c and 3t).
8
9

10
11 102 *Step 1: Lateral capacity and initial assumptions*
12

13
14 103 The shaft or core diameter, wall thickness (t_s) and material properties of the core were established
15
16 104 through analytical lateral and moment capacity methods, outlined in Randolph and Gourvenec (2011),
17
18
19 105 to determine the lateral load capacity of the screw pile (acting as a conventional pile). The axial
20
21 106 capacity of a screw pile with multiple helices spaced at $2D_h$ apart act in a cylindrical-shear
22
23 107 arrangement. The adopted design approaches varied with tensile or compressive conditions as
24
25
26 108 described below.
27
28

29
30 109 *Step 2: Tensile Axial Capacity (Method 1t)*
31

32
33 110 The tensile capacity calculation followed the method developed by Mitsch and Clemence (1985) and
34
35 111 prescribed by Das and Shukla (2013) and is equal to the sum of Equations (1) and (4). The tensile
36
37
38 112 cylindrical shear resistance (Q_{st}) generated along the soil-soil shear interface between the helices at
39
40 113 their perimeter is determined by Equation (1), where the peak friction angle (ϕ'_{pk}) is used and K_u is the
41
42
43 114 earth pressure coefficient of a screw pile in uplift as determined by Mitsch and Clemence (1985). K_u is
44
45 115 calculated in Equation (2), where m defines the gradient of the linear relationship between K_u and the
46
47
48 116 ratio of the depth (H) to diameter (D_h) of the helix of interest (H/D_h) as a function of the peak soil
49
50 117 friction angle. The values of m , presented in Table 2, were derived by Mitsch and Clemence (1985)
51
52 118 from their uplift capacity tests of helical anchors in sand. The length of the cylinder is determined by
53
54
55 119 the depth of deepest helix (H_1) minus the depth of the shallowest helix (H_n). The diameter of the
56
57 120 shallowest helix is denoted as D_{hn} and when helices of different diameter are specified the average
58
59 121 diameter (D_{ha}) is used.
60
61

$$Q_{st} = \sigma'_v K_u \tan \phi'_{pk} \pi D_{ha} (H_1 - H_n) \quad (1)$$

$$K_u = 0.6 + m \frac{H_n}{D_{ha}} \quad (2)$$

122 The helix tensile capacity (Q_{ht}) generated by the uppermost helix can have either a shallow or deep
123 failure mechanism depending on the embedment depth of the helix. A shallow failure mechanism
124 results in a conical failure surface, emanating from the shallowest helix, reaching the soil surface
125 (Figure 1) (Cerfontaine et al., 2019a), whereas a flow-around mechanism occurs for deeply embedded
126 helices and the failure plane terminates below the surface instead. The initial approach adopted was
127 to design the screw piles to operate with a shallow failure mechanism in uplift. The formation of the
128 soil wedge from the uppermost helix to the soil surface obscures the limited contribution from shear-
129 resistance along the soil-steel interface of the shaft and thus the shaft resistance is not included in the
130 tensile capacity, in line with Ghaly et al., (1991) and also as demonstrated by Cerfontaine et al., (2019a)
131 from finite element modelling. In the case of a shallow failure mechanism, the non-dimensional
132 breakout factor (F_q), which is dependent on the soil friction angle can be calculated from Equation (3)
133 as shown in Figure 3, with the ultimate uplift capacity (Q_{ht}) of the helical plate calculated by Equation
134 (4). The earth pressure coefficient and thus the breakout factor reach a maximum value when the
135 failure mode transitions to a deep mechanism, at an embedment ratio which is dependent on the soil
136 friction angle, as defined by Mitsch and Clemence (1985). Horizontal lines in Figure 3 show the
137 ultimate values of the breakout factor for deep failure conditions.

$$F_q = \left(\frac{H_n}{D_{hn}}\right)^2 K_u \tan \phi'_{pk} \cos^2 \frac{\phi'_{pk}}{2} \left(0.5 \frac{H_n}{D_{hn}} + \frac{1}{3} \tan \frac{\phi'_{pk}}{2}\right) + 1 + \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{H}{D_{hn}}\right)^2 \tan^2 \frac{\phi'_{pk}}{2} + 2 \left(\frac{H}{D_{hn}}\right)^2 \tan \frac{\phi'_{pk}}{2} \quad (3)$$

$$Q_{nt} = F_q \sigma'_v A_h \quad (4)$$

139 *Step 3: Compressive Axial Capacity (Method 1c)*

140 The compressive capacity predictions of the proposed screw piles were calculated from the sum of
 141 the shaft and cylindrical-shear resistances (cylindrical-shear mechanism) (Figure 1) and the bearing
 142 resistance of the bottom helix and pile tip using Equations (6) to (8). Values of the lateral earth
 143 pressure coefficient (K_{uc}) were determined from the values recommended by Mitsch and Clemence
 144 (1985) and represented as an equation by Perko (2009) as shown in Equation (5). The compressive
 145 cylindrical shear capacity was then calculated using Equation (6).

$$K_{uc} = 0.09e^{0.08\phi'_{pk}} \quad (5)$$

$$Q_{sc} = \sigma'_v K_{uc} \tan \phi' \pi D_h (H_1 - H_n) \quad (6)$$

146 The shaft resistance contribution to the compressive capacity was calculated with Equation (7) and as
 147 suggested by Zhang (1999), Tappenden and Segio (2007), Elsherbiny and El Naggar (2013), Mohajerani
 148 et al. (2016), a portion of the shaft, equal to one helix diameter, above the upper helix does not
 149 contribute to the shaft capacity. This is at odds with Perko (2009) who recommends that the soil-steel
 150 component of the shaft capacity of small diameter piles is conservatively neglected due to installation
 151 disturbance but he does suggest that larger diameter shafts may derive some of their capacity from
 152 shaft resistance.

$$Q_s = \sigma'_v K_{uc} \tan \delta'_{crit} \pi D_c (H_n - D_{hn}) \quad (7)$$

153 Following standard foundation capacity calculations, a bearing capacity factor (N_q) was used to
 154 determine the compressive capacity (Equation (8)) of the lowermost helix (Q_{hc}). In this calculation, the
 155 full area of the helix was used, based on the assumption that the open-ended pile shaft would either
 156 plug during installation or behave in a plugged manner under compressive loading (Randolph and
 157 Gourvenec, 2011). Meyerhof (1951) bearing capacity factors (Equation (9)) were used in an
 158 unrestricted manner, i.e. the values were not limited with depth as is proposed in some approaches.

$$Q_{Hc} = N_q A_h \sigma'_v \quad (8)$$

$$N_q = e^{\pi \tan \phi'_{pk}} \tan^2 \left(45 + \frac{\phi'_{pk}}{2} \right) \quad (9)$$

159 *Step 4: Installation Torque*

160 The helix pitch and plate thickness were selected with values chosen to be consistent with those used
 161 by Al-Baghdadi (2018) in previous centrifuge modelling of screw piles in sand and with those reported
 162 in Spagnoli and Gavin (2015).

163 To determine a suitable installation torque prediction method, existing analytical (Ghaly and Hanna,
 164 1991, Sakr, 2015) and CPT methods (Gavin et al., 2013, Spagnoli, 2016, Al-Baghdadi et al., 2017b) were
 165 compared for the single-helix pile reported in Al-Baghdadi et al. (2017b). As a full suite of CPT cone
 166 resistance data (q_c) data was unavailable for the CPT torque correlations, synthetic q_c data was
 167 calculated based on relative densities of 31, 55 and 73% using the method of Baldi et al. (1986). The
 168 resulting torque predictions are shown in Figure 4, showing significant differences between the
 169 methods. As a result, the analytical methods were discounted in the design process and the Al-
 170 Baghdadi et al. (2017b) method (Appendix A) was selected, as analysis by Al-Baghdadi (2018)

171 suggested a good correlation for multi-helix screw piles, while both Gavin et al. (2013) and Spagnoli
172 (2016) present verification of their methods on single-helix screw piles only.

173 The predicted installation torque was checked against the torsional capacity (T_{max}) (Equation (10)) of
174 the screw pile shaft to ensure that structural failure would not occur during installation.

$$T_{max} = \frac{\pi}{16} \tau_{steel} \frac{(D_c^4 - (D_c - 2t_s)^4)}{D_c} \quad (10)$$

175 where τ_{steel} is the shear strength of the steel in the pile shaft.

176 *Screw pile designs*

177 The naming system for the screw pile designs tested in this paper has an initial letter which denotes
178 the use of optimisation in the design (U = uniform; O = optimised i.e. a stepped diameter to provide
179 greater lateral resistance through a large diameter near-surface whilst reducing installation torque
180 through smaller diameter at depth (Davidson et al., 2018b)). The following number denotes the
181 number of helices while the next two letters describe the soil density (VD = very dense, MD = medium
182 dense). The final letter denotes differences between similar designs for the same scenario. Model and
183 prototype dimensions of the screw piles in Figure 5 are presented in Table 3.

184 The first screw pile design (U2VD) for the very-dense sand scenario is presented in Figure 5a. During
185 the design process, the tensile capacity was found to be the most critical design step, with relatively
186 deep embedment of the uppermost helix required to meet the design loads. Placing the upper helix
187 at a greater depth while maintaining $S/D_h = 2$ resulted in the compressive capacity being significantly
188 over-rated with respect to the design load as N_q increased with depth.

189 The requirement to place the upper helix at a relatively deep embedment necessarily required
190 significant shaft length. Al-Baghdadi (2018) demonstrated that the shaft contributed the greatest

191 amount to the total installation torque. Therefore, an investigation was conducted to optimise the
192 screw pile geometry where possible to reduce the torque. From the calculations of the lateral capacity,
193 it was found that the screw pile shaft would be expected to fail in a 'long-pile' failure mode where a
194 plastic hinge is assumed to form in the pile at some depth (Randolph and Gourvenec, 2011). Therefore,
195 $1.24D_c$ below the depth of the predicted plastic hinge point, the shaft diameter was reduced.
196 Furthermore, as the compressive capacity was greater than required, the lower helix diameter was
197 also reduced to a diameter which gave a predicted capacity closer to the design load. Torsional
198 capacity checks were again performed and the design iteratively refined until all capacities were
199 satisfied, resulting in the design (O2VD) shown in Figure 5b which had a 67% reduction in predicted
200 torque (using the method in Al-Baghdadi et al. (2017b)) over the non-optimised design in Figure 5a.

201 To provide a benchmark against which the double-helix designs could be compared, the single-helix
202 design (U1VD-A) in Figure 5c was also created by following the steps previously outlined. Although the
203 predicted capacities of this design satisfied the design requirements, a further single-helix screw pile
204 (U1VD-B) was created based upon the non-optimised (U2VD) design, by removing the upper helix, to
205 investigate the effectiveness of the cylindrical shear component of the U2VD design and of increasing
206 H/D_h in the U1VD-A single helix design. The embedment ratios (Table 3) for the shallowest helix of
207 these screw piles are less than the values presented by Mitsch and Clemence (1985) for the transition
208 from shallow to deep failure mechanisms and therefore a shallow failure mechanism should be
209 expected for all designs presented.

210 *Centrifuge Testing*

211 To replicate prototype stress conditions, geotechnical centrifuge testing of scaled model piles was
212 conducted. The model piles had solid cores to avoid structural failure and scaling issues with testing
213 open-ended piles where plugging may occur prematurely due to grain size effects. Thus, the fully
214 plugged pile behaviour resulted in upper bound measurements of installation loads.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

215 Pile testing was undertaken on the University of Dundee 3m radius geotechnical centrifuge at 48g in
216 a box with internal dimensions of 500 x 800 x 550mm using a dedicated screw pile actuator developed
217 to allow installation and testing of a single pile in one operation (inflight) (Al-Baghdadi et al., 2016).
218 Two tests were undertaken in each box with manual repositioning of the actuator between flights and
219 considering the box as effectively split into two halves to maximise results. Axial loads and torque
220 were measured during installation and subsequent load testing using a combined torque-load cell
221 (Novatech Measurements Ltd F310-Z, 20kN/30Nm capacity), while displacement was measured with
222 a draw-wire sensor (Davidson et al., 2018b). Tests in dry sand at 48g result in in situ effective stresses
223 equivalent to saturated sand at 80g due to the increased dry unit weight (Li et al., 2010). On this basis,
224 the tests and piles were actually scaled at 1:80 from the prototype case.

225 Sand beds, pluviated to a depth of 430mm at average relative densities of $D_r = 84\%$ and $D_r = 57\%$ for
226 the very-dense and medium-dense scenarios respectively, used HST95 sand which is a fine-grained
227 quartz sand (Table 4). For the $D_r = 84\%$ sand tests, the shortest distance to the container boundaries
228 from the test locations was greater than $7D_h$ (Phillips and Valsangkar, 1987, Bolton et al., 1999).
229 However, actual radial interference for a screw pile during installation is likely to be associated with
230 volume change from the pile core rather than the helix, resulting in $14D_c$ minimum separation from
231 the side boundaries. The minimum spacing to the side wall was greater than $3D_h$ or $10D_c$ in the $D_r =$
232 57% sand. The smallest pile shaft diameter gave a minimum value of $53D_{50}$ satisfying the
233 recommendations by Garnier et al. (2007) regarding the ratio of pile to average grain size diameters.
234 Similarly, the ratio of the smallest helix diameter to average grain size is equal to 120, which is greater
235 than the minimum of 58 proposed by Schiavon et al. (2016).

236 The piles were installed using displacement control to advance vertically by an amount equal to the
237 helix pitch per revolution (Perko, 2009) (i.e. at 7mm per revolution at 3RPM) sometimes referred to
238 as “pitch matched” or “perfect” installation (Lutenegger, 2019). Pitch matched installation is generally
239 recommended to minimise soil disturbance and improve in-service pile performance (Perko, (2009)

240 and BS 8004:2015, (2015)). Tensile and compression load tests were undertaken at 1mm/min up to a
241 typical displacement of 10mm ($0.4 - 0.6D_r$) at model scale. Torque and vertical force values for the
242 full centrifuge test duration, from spinning up the centrifuge to the operating g-level (stage 1), through
243 installation (stage 2) to the end of the axial capacity test (stage 3) are shown in prototype scale units
244 for pile U1VD-B in Figure 6, for both compression and tensile tests. Intervals between the described
245 stages represent monitoring periods. All data are offset by the respective values recorded immediately
246 before the installation phase of the test. This results in a non-zero value at the start of the test
247 sequence in Figure 6. The testing programme is summarised in Table 5 for the 12 tests conducted.

248 *Cone Penetration Tests (CPT)*

249 Cone penetration tests (CPT) were conducted in sand of $D_r = 52$ and 82% at 20mm/min rate of
250 penetration using an Actidyn In-Flight Loading System (P67-2L) and Actidyn CPT probe of 12mm
251 diameter, giving a $B/D_{50} = 86$ which exceeds the limiting B/D_{50} ratio of 20 suggested by Bolton et al.
252 (1999). The resulting q_c data from the tests are shown at prototype scale in Figure 7.

253 **Results and discussion**

254 *Installation Torque*

255 Measured torque from all tests with “perfect” installation are shown at prototype scale in Figure 8.
256 The 5.97 to 7.49MNm required to install the optimised and uniform screw piles respectively in very-
257 dense sand is substantial, although equipment such as casing rotators can provide up to 7.4MNm of
258 torque and may be suitable in terms of the installation torque required for very-dense sand
259 (particularly for the optimised designs).

260 Comparing the performance of the optimised and non-optimised piles (U2VD and O2VD respectively)
261 in Figure 8 shows there is potential to reduce the torque requirements through geometry
262 optimisation. The 11% reduction in the screw pile surface area of the optimised design produced a
263 17% reduction in torque; comparable to the 33% drop found by Morais and Tsuha (2014) for a 28%

264 reduction in screw pile surface area of field tested smaller onshore piles. Any further reduction in pile
265 geometry was not possible in this study without compromising the structural integrity of the screw
266 pile.

267 The decreased soil strength associated with the reduction in relative density from $D_r = 84$ to 57% is
268 not sufficient to offset the greater torque generated by the larger screw pile geometry required to
269 provide sufficient axial capacity in the medium-dense sand. Thus, the 10.18MNm (U1MD) to
270 18.37MNm (U2MD) (Figure 8) measured in the medium-dense screw pile tests would appear to be
271 beyond the capacity of any existing equipment and would require the development of new equipment
272 for installation.

273 Both of the single helix piles (U1VD-A and U1VD-B) in the very dense sand tended to the same final
274 torque as the optimised double helix pile (O2VD) with the effect of optimised shaft diameter from pile
275 O2VD only being apparent up to a depth of 9.8m in Figure 8. The effect of the second helix on the
276 torque became apparent at approximately 6m depth, where the torque values of the single-helix
277 (U1VD) and double-helix (U2VD) diverged as the second helix began to engage with the sand. The
278 single and double-helix very-dense sand designs differed by 1.39MNm at 12.9m, indicating the
279 additional torque required to install the second helix.

280 The torque measured during installation of all screw piles was higher than the anticipated values from
281 the Al-Baghdadi et al. (2017b) prediction method (e.g. Figure 9 for piles U2VD, U1VD-B, O2VD and
282 U1MD), which was developed alongside an installation force prediction method in Appendix C (Al-
283 Baghdadi et al., 2018) from centrifuge tests of screw piles with various geometries in dense and
284 medium-dense sand. Figure 9 also shows an updated version of the Al-Baghdadi et al. (2017b) method
285 proposed by Davidson et al. (2018a) and summarized in Appendix B. The Davidson et al. (2018a)
286 equations modified the previous Al-Baghdadi et al. (2017b) correlations in several ways: by omitting
287 the rotation force reduction factors proposed for the shaft and base components as they are larger

288 than that suggested by Deeks (2008) and their use is not clearly defined; the full cone resistance (q_c)
289 value is employed instead of $0.6q_c$; a missing $\tan(\delta_{crit})$ term was added to base component; and the
290 stress drop index (a) is related to the CPT friction ratio and interface friction angle instead of $a = 0.03$.
291 In addition to these methods, predictions are also shown using Ghaly and Hanna (1991), Gavin et al.
292 (2013), Sakr (2015), and Spagnoli (2016) methods. The analytical methods of Ghaly and Hanna (1991),
293 and Sakr (2015) both over-predict the required installation torque (by up to 53% and 84% respectively
294 in the tensile test of pile U2VD). Sakr (2015) reported an increased accuracy over Ghaly and Hanna
295 (1991) as effective stress was incorporated instead of total stress. For double-helix designs, the
296 effective stress on the lower helix calculated in the Sakr (2015) formulae is based on the package of
297 soil between the helices and is thus limited in magnitude. Unlike Ghaly and Hanna (1991) who
298 proposed a 70% reduction of the lateral earth pressure (K_p) for the torque acting on the shaft, Sakr
299 (2015) employs the full value of K_p .

300 The Gavin et al. (2013) and Spagnoli (2016) CPT-torque prediction methods were conceived for single
301 helix screw pile designs, but the addition of further helices is considered possible by repeating the
302 helix torque calculations for the additional helices (at their respective depths) using the appropriate
303 formulae from each method. These additional calculations were performed for the double-helix
304 designs (U2VD, O2VD and U2MD) to investigate the effectiveness of the Gavin et al. (2013) and
305 Spagnoli (2016) CPT-torque correlations on multi-helix screw pile designs. Analysis of the CPT-torque
306 prediction methods by Gavin et al. (2013) and Spagnoli (2016) in Figure 9 indicates generally good
307 predictions for the non-optimised (U1VD-B) single helix pile for which these methods were derived in
308 dense sand. Unfortunately, though when the methods are applied for a single helix pile in medium
309 dense sand both methods significantly overpredict torque (166% and 164% for Gavin et al. (2013) and
310 Spagnoli (2016) respectively) and appear sensitive to changes in the data that are not apparent in the
311 other prediction techniques. It is interesting to note though that in the case of U2VD that the Spagnoli
312 (2016) method again appears to work well for additional helices as does the Gavin et al. (2013) method

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

313 up to a depth of approximately 6.2m. Below 6.2m the Gavin et al. (2013) method begins to overpredict
314 the installation torque. This depth coincides with an increase in the CPT cone resistance, relating to a
315 minor change of 2-3% relative density, (Figure 7) and highlights the sensitivity of the predicted torque
316 values to the raw q_c values used in the Gavin et al. (2013) method compared to the methods which
317 use averaged q_c data (Spagnoli (2016), Al-Baghdadi et al (2017b) and Davidson et al (2018)).

318 *Installation Force*

319 To date, concern over offshore deployment of screw piles has centred around predicting torque (Byrne
320 and Houlsby, 2015). However, the prototype vertical forces measured during the installation of the
321 pitch matched (or “perfect” installation) screw piles herein have considerable magnitudes which
322 would pose significant challenges to the use of screw piles offshore. The final installation compressive
323 forces of the designs tested range from 13.3 to 28.8MN (Figure 10). The self-weight of the casing-
324 rotators previously discussed are less than 1MN and would thus require significant reaction to enable
325 their use. In onshore screw pile installation, vertical or “crowd” forces are rarely measured, although
326 for quality control and torque prediction this along with rates of installation should become routine.
327 This lack of consideration of installation force is reflected in the literature with only two prediction
328 methods currently available. Ghaly and Hanna (1991) analytically consider the vertical forces acting
329 on the shaft and the upper and lower surfaces of the helices under total stress conditions while Al-
330 Baghdadi (2018) correlates installation force with q_c via Equations C1 – C7 in Appendix C.

331 Predictions of the installation force for pitch matched installation using both methods for all piles are
332 given in Figure 11a – d. In all tests, the prediction using Equations C1 – C7 in Appendix C provide a
333 close match with the measured force, whereas the Ghaly and Hanna (1991) equations only appear to
334 work for the final value in the $D_r = 84\%$ tests of piles U1VD and U2VD. In the $D_r = 57\%$ tests, the Ghaly
335 and Hanna (1991) method over-predicts below a depth of approximately 7.5m, indicating that the
336 second helix does not affect the outcome of the prediction method and that the formulae are not
337 applicable to medium-dense sand. Al-Baghdadi (2018) proposed that the rotation reduction factor, f ,

338 in Equation C2 and C3 are related to the relative density, but a constant value of $f = 0.6$ was more
339 appropriate for the tests herein and is similar to that found by Deeks (2008), Garcia-Galindo (2017)
340 and Garcia-Galindo et al. (2018).

341 Comparing the results in Figure 11b and c shows that optimizing the screw pile geometry can reduce
342 the installation force, where a reduction of the volume of steel in the shaft of 18% resulted in a 34%
343 reduction in force. Linking this drop in force to the reduced core volume as per Al-Baghdadi (2018), is
344 further verified by the similarity in force between the non-optimised single (U1VD-B) and double-helix
345 (U2VD) piles where the addition of another helix has a relatively limited effect on the installation force.

346 *Compressive Capacity Tests*

347 The centrifuge installation rig used separate motors to control the rotary and vertical motion (Al-
348 Baghdadi et al., 2016). These motors were synchronised to operate together which leaves a residual
349 force on the pile at the end of the installation, which is clearly visible at the end of stage 2 in Figure 6a
350 and b. This residual force is evident at zero displacement in the results of compression testing in Figure
351 12a, where the data starts from a non-zero value on the y-axis of the measured compressive capacity
352 (Q_{cm}). However, this is not considered to affect the ultimate capacity, which is taken as the measured
353 force (Q_{cm}) at a displacement (z) of $0.1D_{ha}$ (Al-Baghdadi, 2018) (Table 6).

354 Considering the measured capacity of each pile in relation to the required compressive capacity of
355 32.31MN from the design scenario; designs U2VD, U1MD and U2MD exceed the requirements, while
356 the remaining piles (U1VD-A, U1VD-B and O2VD) do not, as shown in Table 6. The results for the
357 optimised pile (O2VD) are somewhat disappointing in that this pile was designed to reduce installation
358 requirements whilst maintaining sufficient compressive capacity. However, although the compressive
359 capacity is 39.5% lower than the non-optimised (U2VD) pile, it is also 34.5% below the required
360 compressive capacity from the prescribed design scenario.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

361 The empirical relationship proposed by Hoyt and Clemence (1989) and widely adopted by the screw
362 pile industry, provides a parameter, K_t , which relates the axial capacity to the final installation torque
363 value (Equation (11)). This correlation suggests that the capacity of a given shaft diameter should be
364 unique at a specific installation torque and therefore, the capacity of the optimised pile (O2VD) should
365 be lower than the non-optimised version (U2VD) since they have different shaft diameters. However,
366 this relationship is not considered an appropriate way to calculate the capacity of a screw pile. From
367 the results of numerous field tests presented in Perko (2009), significant scatter is apparent in the
368 data, which draws into question the supposed uniqueness of this relationship, although this may also
369 reflect the of the potential for a lack of installation control in the field. From this data, Perko (2009)
370 suggests a method to calculate K_t for a given shaft diameter in Equation (12).

$$Q = TK_t \quad (11)$$

$$K_t = \frac{1433}{D_c^{0.92}} \quad (12)$$

371 Using Equation (12), values of K_t were calculated using the minimum shaft diameter for the reported
372 screw pile designs and compared to the K_t values calculated from Equation (11) using the measured
373 capacity and installation torque (Table 7). Differences of up to 283% between the theoretical and back-
374 calculated values of K_t were observed. Using the theoretical K_t values for these designs would lead to
375 significant over-estimations of the tensile capacity. Furthermore, Perko (2009) states that it is
376 permissible to use the same value of K_t for both compression and tension. Table 7 highlights that this
377 would also be inappropriate for the large screw piles presented, with significant differences observed
378 between the back-calculated values of K_t for tensile and compressive conditions. This suggests that
379 for the piles investigated here that capacity determination based upon torque measured during
380 installation is inappropriate as would be inferring torque requirements from capacity calculations.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

381 Lutenegger (2019) highlights that correlations of torque to capacity are often assumed to be the same
382 whether one or two helices are included (i.e. the inclusion of additional helix plates is ignored) and
383 goes onto show that the torque encountered during installation is also affected by the pitch of a helix
384 plate, while the capacity is unaffected. Thus, non-unique values of K_t can be observed for screw piles
385 with the same shaft diameter. The values of K_t in Table 7 from the centrifuge tests confirm that non-
386 unique values of K_t are observed between piles with the same shaft diameter, but different numbers
387 of helices in the same relative density. The observed K_t values also appear to decrease with shaft
388 diameter, in line with previous observations on smaller diameter piles (e.g. Perko, (2009)).

389 It is noted that both of the single-helix very-dense piles (U1VD-A and U1VD-B) have a slightly greater
390 compressive capacity than the optimised double-helix pile and therefore the only slight advantage of
391 the optimised double-helix design over the single-helix piles is a reduced installation force and slightly
392 less energy required to overcome the torque resistance in the upper stages of installation. The
393 compression tests of the two medium-dense screw pile designs (U1MD and U2MD) resulted in
394 structural failure (Figure 12a) of the lower helix of each pile through the upwards bending of the helix,
395 highlighting the difficulty in designing the helices with a large D_h/D_c ratio of 3. The compression tests
396 of both the single (U1MD) and double-helix (U2MD) medium-dense screw pile designs achieved a
397 displacement of 10% of the helix diameter or greater in both cases before failure of the helix was
398 observed. It is at this level of displacement where the capacity is conventionally calculated, so
399 although the U2MD design did not reach the maximum resistance before the failure occurred, the
400 required data to calculate the in-service capacity was obtained. No helix bending was observed with
401 the other piles during testing or on inspection after testing.

402 None of the test results from the six screw piles tested compared well with the predicted values (Q_{cp})
403 from the initial method adopted (Method 1c) to design the model screw piles, with the best prediction
404 achieving just 74% of the observed value for pile U2VDA as shown in Figure 12b which presents the
405 measured compressive capacity (Q_{cm}) normalised by the predicted values from Method 1c (Q_{cm}/Q_{cp}).

1
2 406 This suggests that Method 1c is non-conservative for these modified pile geometries and that the N_q
3 407 and/or K_{uc} values require further investigation.
4

5
6 408 *Alternative compressive capacity prediction (Method 2c)*
7

8
9 409 As the measured compressive capacity results from the centrifuge tests did not match the compressive
10 410 capacity predictions from the initial design method (Method 1c), an alternative approach was
11 411 considered in the analysis of the results to investigate the performance and suitability of the
12 412 alternative method.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19
20 413 The compressive capacity design method suggested by Perko (2009) and supported by (BS 8004:2015,
21 414 2015) differs from Method 1c by imposing a limit on the bearing capacity factor (N_q) used in calculating
22 415 the resistance from the pile tip and helices, similar to the idea of ‘critical-depth’ in straight-shafted
23 416 pile design (Tavenas, 1971, Meyerhof, 1976), which is no longer supported (Fleming et al., 2009) as
24 417 this is related to dilation suppression which would not be appropriate for shallow screw piles. Perko
25 418 (2009) calculates bearing capacity factor using Meyerhof (1951) equations, corrected for shape and
26 419 depth by formulae proposed by Hansen (1970) and Vesic (1973). Based on experience, Perko (2009)
27 420 limits the corrected N_q values to a maximum value as determined at a depth of $2D_{ha}$. In Method 1c,
28 421 the N_q values were not limited with depth, but in Method 2c which follows Perko (2009), N_q was limited
29 422 as prescribed to test this affect. Compressive shaft resistance and cylindrical-shear resistance values
30 423 were calculated as directed by Perko (2009) and as in Method 1c. Predictions made for all pile designs
31 424 using the Perko (2009) method (Method 2c) are compared against the measured values in Figure 13,
32 425 where it is evident that the approach provides a good match with the measured compressive capacity
33 426 values in the very-dense designs (U2VD, O2VD, U1VD-A, U1VD-B). However, this is not the case in the
34 427 two medium-dense tests where the measured capacities are equal to 56% and 75% of the predicted
35 428 loads.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 429 *Proposed compressive capacity prediction (Method 3c)*
60
61
62
63
64
65

430 Based upon the poor performance of the compressive capacity predictions from Methods 1c and 2c,
431 further analyses were conducted using previous research on continuous helical displacement (CHD)
432 piles (Jeffrey, 2016) to improve the predictions (resulting in Method 3c). Jeffrey et al. (2016) obtained
433 bearing capacity factor values, from deconvolution of instrumented CHD piles (cast-insitu type screw
434 piles), which differed from those proposed by Berezantzev (1961). The overprediction of the
435 compressive capacity of the screw piles from both Method 1c and 2c was suspected to be related to
436 the bearing capacity factors used in the calculation of the compressive resistances generated by the
437 pile tip and lowermost helix. To investigate this, firstly the soil-soil and soil-steel shaft resistances,
438 calculated from Equations (6) and (7) with the same soil properties and lateral earth pressure used in
439 Method 1c, were subtracted from the total measured capacity to give the contribution from the
440 bearing areas of the pile tip and lowermost helix. The calculated contribution of the steel-soil shaft
441 resistance to the total compressive capacity was found to be low for each pile design. For example,
442 the shaft of pile U1VD-B ($H/D_h = 7.33$) contributed 10.5% to the total capacity, as calculated with
443 Equation (7) or 0.09MPa in terms of shaft resistance. This value is in line with centrifuge tests by Urabe
444 et al. (2015) of a compressively loaded 480mm core diameter, wing-tip pile installed into very-dense
445 sand to an H/D_h of 7.14. From their instrumented piles, Urabe et al. (2015) reported a shaft
446 contribution ranging from 5.9 to 10.8% (up to 0.05MPa shaft resistance) of the total capacity for their
447 1W2.1 pile. Field data from Gavin et al. (2014) of a single-helix screw pile ($D_c = 110\text{mm}$, $D_h = 400\text{mm}$,
448 $H/D_h = 6$) showed 0.06MPa of shaft resistance during compressive loading. Discrete Element Modelling
449 (DEM) of the O2VD pile by Sharif et al. (2019) and the other pile designs in this paper also
450 demonstrates that the total shaft contribution to the compressive capacity is approximately 8%.

451 The bearing capacity factor, N_q , was then back-calculated for each of the pile designs using the
452 relationship in Equation (8). These calculated N_q values agree well with those determined by Jeffrey
453 et al. (2016) in a study of continuous helical displacement (CHD) piles, as shown in Figure 14. Jeffrey
454 et al. (2016) investigated a type of cast-insitu pile where the split between shaft and base capacity and

1 455 the applicability of the approach was verified by strain gauge instrumentation placed within the model
2 456 pile. This study was used as the reference for the analysis adopted here as the CHD process involves
3
4 457 the full displacement penetration of a relatively large flighted bullet device into the soil in a perfect
5
6
7 458 pitch matched manner. The bullet device is then reversed in a similar perfect manner with concrete
8
9 459 injection to form the final pile and maintain the stress and strain regime in the ground associated with
10
11 460 the bullet penetration. The approach was adopted as a basis for analysis due to its general similarities
12
13
14 461 with the screw pile process and was previously used to determine screw pile performance by Al-
15
16 462 Baghdadi (2018). Jeffrey et al. (2016) showed that enhanced shaft capacity is obtained in these
17
18
19 463 rotationally installed full displacement techniques resulting in a greater share of resistance being
20
21 464 associated with the shaft than the tip and the need to use reduced values with respect to the approach
22
23 465 proposed by Berezantsev et al. (1961). Using the empirical relationship (Equation (13)) proposed by
24
25
26 466 Jeffrey et al. (2016) between N_q and peak friction angle (Table 4), with Equation (5) for the lateral earth
27
28 467 pressure coefficient used in the calculation of the shaft resistance (also used by Perko (2009) and
29
30
31 468 Jeffrey et al. (2016)), a third method (Method 3c) is proposed to calculate the compressive capacity of
32
33 469 the screw piles. The results of Method 3c, included in Figure 13, provide a much closer match to the
34
35 470 measured values with an average measured to predicted capacity ratio (Q_{cm}/Q_{cp}) of 0.98. The
36
37
38 471 advantage of the proposed method (Method 3c) over the previously discussed methods (1c and 2c) is
39
40 472 most apparent in the medium-dense designs where the measured to predicted capacity ratios
41
42 473 (Q_{cm}/Q_{cp}) are equal to 0.79 and 0.83 for piles U1MD and U2MD respectively.

44
45
46 474 The area of cylindrical shear between the helices of the optimised O2VD pile is 10.4 % less than the
47
48 475 non-optimised U2VD design. Whereas, the area of the lower helix (including the pile tip) of O2VD is
49
50
51 476 37.9 % less than U2VD. Thus, since the combined surface area of the lower helix and assumed plugged
52
53 477 pile tip generate the majority of the compressive resistance of a screw pile, the reliable calculation of
54
55
56 478 the bearing capacity factor is critically important. The proposed Method 3c, using the revised N_q

479 calculation from Equation 13 gave a measured to predicted compressive capacity ratio of 1.07 which
480 is a significant improvement over the initial Method 1c ratio of 0.68.

$$N_q = 1.33e^{0.11\phi'_{pk}} \quad (13)$$

481 *Tensile Capacity Tests*

482 The results of tensile loading on the piles are shown in Figure 15a, with the ultimate tensile capacity
483 defined as the value at a displacement of $0.1D_{ha}$. Predictions of the tensile capacity (Q_{tp}) from the Das
484 and Shukla (2013) based Method 1t used in the initial design process are 34 to 77% lower than the
485 measured loads (Q_{tm}) (Table 8 and Figure 15b) in the very-dense sand (U2VD, U1VD-A, U1VD-B, and
486 O2VD). Evaluation of piles U2VD and U1VD-B (Figure 15a) shows that they have very similar uplift
487 capacity, suggesting a relatively deep single helix ($H_n/D_{hn} = 7.35$) in a non-optimised form is more
488 efficient in terms of tensile loading and installation requirements and the inclusion of the second helix
489 ($H_n/D_{hn} = 5.35$) is not justified.

490 The optimised pile (O2VD) again under performs with the changes in cross section and helix diameter
491 having a negative effect on tensile capacity (24.4% less than non-optimised U2VD). A similar
492 conclusion can be drawn from the results of the two tensile tests in the medium-dense sand, in that
493 there is little benefit in the addition of a second helix in terms of either tensile capacity, which is not
494 significantly improved, or installation requirements (Figure 9), which increase with the presence of
495 the second helix. The results in Figure 15 highlight that although the ultimate capacity of pile U2MD
496 appears to be in line with the other pile tests, the stiffness is greatly reduced in comparison to the
497 other piles, indicating that this test may have been compromised through elastic deformation of the
498 helical plates from the vertical force experienced during installation. No visible damage to the pile was
499 apparent after the test, but the large helices may have experienced elastic deformation during

1
2 500 installation, creating a pre-strained system that was more pliable on initial loading in the upwards
3 direction.
4

5
6 502 *Alternative tensile capacity prediction (Method 2t)*
7

8
9 503 Since the predicted tensile capacity from Method 1t did not match the measured tensile capacity, an
10 alternative method was again investigated. Figure 16 presents measured versus predicted tensile
11 capacities using the method prescribed by Perko (2009), termed Method 2t. Perko (2009) calculates
12 the tensile capacity as per the compressive capacity, but applies a global factor of 0.87 to the
13 calculated capacity on account of disturbance caused during installation. The Perko (2009) approach
14 differs from Method 1t in the way in which the shallow failure wedge contributes to the capacity.
15 Instead of varying the wedge with the soil friction angle, the wedge defined by Perko (2009) has a
16 fixed angle of 45° from vertical, only includes the weight of soil and neglects friction on the failure
17 surface (i.e. between the uplifting wedge and the undisturbed soil). As evident in Figure 16 and Table
18 8, the predictions from this method were also significantly greater than the measured values with
19 over-predictions of 36 to 63%.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 514 *Alternative tensile capacity prediction (Method 3t)*
38

39
40 515 As the previous methods (1t and 2t) did not provide satisfactory estimates of tensile capacity in the
41 very-dense designs, an alternative approach was used for the tensile design of the medium-dense
42 piles (U1MD and U2MD). The results from the very-dense tests were compared with a large number
43 of plate and screw anchor uplift simulations using FEA by Cerfontaine et al. (2018), from which the
44 relationship in Equation (14) was derived as a best-fit line through tests in medium-dense sand with
45 friction angles of 38 – 41° ($\phi = 40.4^\circ$ for HST95 at $D_r = 57\%$ (Table 4)). This uplift capacity was calculated
46 as part of the design process previously outlined to create the medium-dense screw pile designs
47 shown in Figure 5.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

$$N_y = 0.5226 \left(\frac{H}{D_h} \right)^2 + 1.6675 \frac{H}{D_h} \quad (14)$$

523 The uplift factors for the chosen designs were equal to 19.24 and 11.06 for the single (U1MD) and
524 double-helix (U2MD) designs respectively. Although these are significantly lower than previously
525 employed uplift factors, Q_{tm}/Q_{tp} was still much less than unity at 0.55 and 0.56 for the single and
526 double-helix designs respectively (Figure 15b) and suggests that the plate anchor uplift factors only
527 perform marginally better than Das and Shukla (2013). This over-prediction by a factor of two is also
528 in line with findings reported in Schiavon et al. (2016), who attribute the over prediction to disturbance
529 caused by installation and by Giampa et al. (2017) with their proposal that the failure wedge angle
530 should be defined by the peak dilatancy angle of the soil which is more in line with the behaviour
531 observed by Cheuk et al (2008) for pipeline uplift and Zhang et al. (2018) for the uplift of plates in
532 sand. Although it should be noted that the inclination of this failure envelope may be influenced by
533 control of the installation process where Kulhawy (1985) adopted a vertical failure plane to allow for
534 significant disturbance above the top helix.

535 *Proposed tensile capacity prediction (Method 4t)*

536 An improved procedure for tensile design can be obtained by defining the uplift wedge angle as equal
537 to the soil dilation angle, a change further supported by the Finite Element Analysis (FEA) in
538 Cerfontaine et al. (2019a) as well as by Cheuk et al (2008), Zhang et al. (2018) and Giampa et al. (2017).
539 Cerfontaine et al. (2019a) investigated the failure mechanism generated by the model screw piles
540 reported herein. The results which showed an angle of the failure plane of 17° and 10.25° to the
541 vertical for the very-dense and medium-dense conditions respectively (Cerfontaine et al., 2019a).
542 These values are approximately equal to the dilatancy values for HST95 sand at the respective relative
543 densities (Lauder et al., 2013).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

544 Furthermore, based upon the FEA by Cerfontaine et al. (2019b), which incorporates installation effects
545 on the soil properties through step-wise loading at discrete depth intervals, it is suggested that the
546 lower portion of the inclined failure surface above the uppermost helix (a distance $1.5D_h$ and $2.5D_h$ in
547 very-dense and medium-dense sand, respectively) reflects a mobilised shear strength associated with
548 post-peak behaviour and tending towards critical state, whilst further up the failure surface the
549 shearing is initially in a pre-peak situation. Therefore, in calculating the shear resistance along the
550 failure plane (at an angle from vertical equal to the dilation angle of the soil), in the lower section of
551 the failure surface, the lateral earth pressure is assumed to equal K_{uc} (Equation (5)) and the friction
552 angle on the failure plane equal to that at critical state (32°). For the remainder of the failure surface
553 the at-rest lateral earth pressure coefficient and peak friction angles are used (see Cerfontaine et al.
554 (2019b) for more detail). The shear resistance on the wedge failure surface plus the weight of the soil
555 cone and the cylindrical shear resistance (in the case of the double-helix designs) were combined to
556 give the total pull-out capacity for each pile. The cylindrical shear resistance was calculated with
557 Equation (1) as per Perko (2009) for multi helix piles. The ratio of measured to predicted capacities
558 from this process (Method 4t) (Figure 16) suggest an improved approach to design with Q_{tm}/Q_{tp}
559 averaging 0.91 (0.99 with pile U2MD excluded). This method performs very well for all piles except
560 U2MD, for which the capacity is over-predicted by 41% which is similar to that of the other calculation
561 methods discussed. It is suggested that this poor prediction is due to the deformation of the pile during
562 installation and testing.

563 From the FEA (Cerfontaine et al. (2019a and b) and centrifuge modelling herein it is suggested that
564 inclusion of the second helical plate, for the geometry and helix plate depths adopted here, limits the
565 size of the wedge uplift mechanism and the additional contribution from the cylindrical-shear
566 mechanism is not as great as can be achieved from a deeper wedge mechanism as found for the single
567 helix pile. Therefore, based upon the investigation of tensile capacity and mechanisms (for the H/D_h
568 range of 2.83 to 7.35 investigated and reported herein), using more than one helix is not justified in

1 569 terms of tensile uplift capacity (Figure 15) or the additional installation effort for the pile geometries
2 570 investigated in this study. Lutenegeger (2011) suggests that in tension two widely spaced helix plates
3
4 571 may give better individual performance. This though suggests that there is greater scope for
5
6 572 optimisation of screw piles for offshore applications and a particular pile design may have to be
7
8
9 573 developed for each application depending on the relative magnitude of the tension and compression
10
11 574 load requirements.

15 575 Conclusions

18 576 Six single and double helix screw piles designed for a single offshore loading case in very-dense and
19
20 577 medium-dense sand have been installed using pitch matched parameters and tested in a geotechnical
21
22
23 578 centrifuge for installation torque and load, compressive capacity and tensile capacity.

26 579 Very high installation torques and corresponding vertical forces were measured, with the medium-
27
28
29 580 dense sand designs proving worse due to the larger core diameter required. An “optimized” design in
30
31 581 which the core diameter was reduced near the pile tip was able to reduce installation loads
32
33
34 582 significantly in very-dense sand, but was not able to provide the required axial capacity. Existing
35
36 583 analytical and CPT-based torque prediction methods were found to perform poorly with respect to
37
38 584 measured values while the CPT-torque correlation proposed by Davidson et al. (2018a) provided a
39
40
41 585 close match for both torque and vertical force for all screw pile designs.

44 586 In all cases, the axial capacity in both tension and compression did not meet the predicted loads using
45
46 587 published existing design methods. Alternative bearing capacity factors derived from CHD pile tests
47
48
49 588 were found to perform better than factors derived in the screw pile literature for compressive
50
51
52 589 capacity. Numerical analysis by Cerfontaine et al. (2019a and b) provided insight into the failure
53
54 590 mechanisms of the screw pile designs under tensile loading. This information was used to modify
55
56 591 previous design methods to provide a more accurate prediction of the tensile capacity.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

592 The results also reveal that the inclusion of a second helix does not provide a significant advantage in
593 terms of the compressive and tensile axial performance compared to an appropriately-designed single
594 helix pile for the depth of installation adopted here. Furthermore, the double-helix designs generate
595 more installation force and torque and therefore it is recommended that single-helix designs are
596 utilised. It is likely that further reductions in installation forces will be necessary and thus groups of
597 smaller screw piles at each corner of a jacket structure may be a more feasible option for employing
598 screw piles in the offshore wind energy sector where pitch matched installation is used. Large single
599 screw piles may however be suitable for shallower water depths where the induced in-service axial
600 forces are smaller.

601 Analysis of the measured installation torque and axial capacity data reveals that non-unique values of
602 the empirical torque-capacity correlation factor (K_t), proposed by Hoyt and Clemence (1989), are
603 possible for the same shaft diameter. Lutenegger (2019) also highlights that K_t values are often
604 assumed to be unique regardless of the number of helices. A non-unique K_t value (for both tension
605 and compression) contradicts both the K_t relationship proposed by Hoyt and Clemence (1989), who
606 suggested a unique value of K_t in tension, and the K_t to shaft diameter correlation proposed by Perko
607 (2009). However, the value of K_t does appear to decrease with increasing shaft diameter, in line with
608 previous research (e.g. Perko (2009)). The K_t correlation is widely used in industry to predict and verify
609 the axial capacity of screw piles from the final installation torque values. Applying this relationship,
610 which does not depend on critical screw pile design factors such as, the number of helices, to the large
611 diameter screw piles presented in this paper would lead to a significant over-estimation of the tensile
612 capacity and under-estimation of the compressive capacity.

613 Acknowledgements

614 The authors would like to acknowledge the support of EPSRC (Grant no. EP/N006054/1: Supergen
615 Wind Hub Grand Challenges Project: Screw piles for wind energy foundations). This project has also
616 received support from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

617 the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 753156. The fourth author would like to
618 acknowledge the financial support of the Iraqi Ministry of higher Education of Scientific Research
619 (MOHESR). Elements of this work were undertaken using facilities developed as part of the ERDF-
620 funded Scottish Marine & Renewables Test Centre (SMART) at the University of Dundee.

621 References

- 622 Al-Baghdadi TA (2018). *Screw piles as offshore foundations: Numerical & physical modelling*. PhD
623 thesis, University of Dundee, Dundee, UK.
- 624 Al-Baghdadi TA, Brown MJ & Knappett JA (2016). Development of an inflight centrifuge screw pile
625 installation and loading system. In *3rd European Conference on Physical Modelling in Geotechnics*
626 (*Eurofuge 2016*) (L Thorel, A Bretschneider, M Blanc and S Escofier (eds)). IFSTTAR, France, pp. 239–
627 244.
- 628 Al-Baghdadi TA, Brown MJ, Knappett JA & Al-Defae AH (2017a). Effects of vertical loading on lateral
629 screw pile performance. In *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Geotechnical Engineering*
630 **170 (3)**, 259–272, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1680/jgeen>.
- 631 Al-Baghdadi TA, Brown MJ, Knappett JA & Ishikura R (2015). Modelling of laterally loaded screw piles
632 with large helical plates in sand. In *3rd International Symposium on Frontiers in Offshore Geotechnics*
633 (V Meyer (ed.)). Taylor & Francis Group, London, pp. 503–508.
- 634 Al-Baghdadi TA, Brown MJ, Davidson C, Knappett JA, Brennan AJ, Wang L, Coombs WM, Augarde, CE,
635 Richards D & Blake A (2017b). CPT based design procedure for installation torque prediction for screw
636 piles installed in sand. In *8th International Conference on Offshore Site Investigation & Geotechnics*
637 (*SUT OSIG*). London, UK, vol. 1, pp. 346–353.
- 638 Al-Defae AH, Caucis K & Knappett JA (2013). Aftershocks and the whole-life seismic performance of
639 granular slopes. *Géotechnique* **63 (14)**, 1230–1244.
- 640 Baldi G, Bellotti R, Ghionna V, Jamiolkowski M & Pasqualini E (1986). Interpretation of CPTs and CPTUs;
641 2nd part: drained penetration of sands. In *Fourth International Geotechnical Seminar*. Nanyang
642 Technological Institute, Singapore, pp. 143–156.
- 643 Beatrice Offshore Windfarm Ltd (2017). *Beatrice Offshore Wind Farm Piling Strategy*. Beatrice
644 Offshore Windfarm Ltd, UK. See [https://www2.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Licensing/marine/
645 scoping/Beatrice/piling](https://www2.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Licensing/marine/scoping/Beatrice/piling) (accessed 07/03/2018).
- 646 Berezantsev VC, Khristoforov V & Golubkov V (1961). Load bearing capacity and deformation of piled
647 foundations In *Proceedings of 5th International Conferences on Soil Mechanics and Foundation*
648 *Engineering*. Paris, France, vol. 2, pp. 11–12.
- 649 Bolton MD, Gui MW, Garnier J, Corte JF, Bagge G, Laue J & Renzi R (1999). Centrifuge cone penetration
650 tests in sand. *Géotechnique* **49 (4)**: 543–552, <https://doi.org/10.1680/geot.1999.49.4.543>.
- 651 Bruns B, Stein P, Kuhn C, Sychla H & Gattermann J (2014). Hydro sound measurements during the
652 installation of large diameter offshore piles using combinations of independent noise mitigation
653 systems. In *INTER-NOISE and NOISE-CON Congress and Conference Proceedings*. Institute of Noise
654 Control Engineering, Melbourne, Australia, vol, 249, pp. 5629-5638.
- 655 BSI (2015) BS 8004:2015. Code of practice for foundations. BSI, London, UK.
- 656 Byrne B, Mcadam R, Burd H, Houlsby G, Martin C, Beuckelaers W, Zdravkovic L, Taborda D, Potts D,
657 Jardine R, Ushev E, Liu T, Abadias D, Gavin K, Igoe D, Doherty P, Gretlund JS, Andrade MP, Wood AM,
658 Schroeder F, Turner S & Plummer M (2017). *PISA: New Design Methods for Offshore Wind Turbine*

- 659 Monopiles. In *8th International Conference on Offshore Site Investigation & Geotechnics (SUT OSIG)*.
1 660 London, UK, vol. 1, pp. 142–156.
2
- 3 661 Byrne BW & Houlsby GT (2015) Helical piles: an innovative foundation design option for offshore wind
4 662 turbines. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* **373** (2035),
5 663 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2014.0081>.
6
- 7
8 664 Cerfontaine B, Knappett JA, Brown MJ & Bradshaw AS (2018) Effect of soil deformability on the failure
9 665 mechanism of shallow plate or screw anchors in sand. *Computers and Geotechnics* **109**: 34–45,
10 666 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compgeo.2019.01.007>.
11
- 12 667 Cerfontaine B, Knappett JA, Brown MJ & Bradshaw AS (2019a). Design of plate and screw anchors in
13 668 dense sand: failure mechanism, capacity and deformation. In *7th International Symposium on*
14 669 *Deformation Characteristics of Geomaterials (IS-Glasgow 2019)* (A Tarantino & E Ibraim (eds)). E3S
15 670 Web of Conferences, EDP Sciences, pp. 1–6, <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/20199216010>.
16 670
17
- 18 671 Cerfontaine B, Brown MJ, Knappett JA and Davidson C, (2019b). Finite element modelling of the uplift
19 672 behaviour of screw piles in sand. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Symposium on Screw Piles for*
20 673 *Energy Applications (ISSPEA 2019)* (C Davidson, MJ Brown, JA Knappett, AJ Brennan, CE Augarde, L
21 674 Wang, WM Coombs, D Richards, D White, & A Blake (eds)). University of Dundee, Dundee, UK, pp.69–
22 675 75. <https://doi.org/10.20933/100001123>.
23 675
24
- 25 676 Cheuk CY, White DJ and Bolton MD (2008). Uplift mechanisms of pipes buried in sand. *Journal of*
26 677 *Geotechnical Geoenvironmental Engineering* **134** (2): 154–163.
27
28
- 29 678 Das BM & Shukla SK (2013) *Earth anchors*. J Ross Publishing, USA.
30
- 31 679 Davidson C, Al-Baghdadi TA, Brown MJ, Knappett JA, Brennan AJ, Augarde CE, Coombs WM, Wang L,
32 680 Richards D, Blake A & Ball J (2018a) A modified CPT based installation torque prediction for large screw
33 681 piles in sand. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium CPT'18 - Cone Penetration Testing*
34 682 (MA Hicks, F Pisanò, J Peuchen (eds)). CRC Press, Leiden, The Netherlands, pp. 255–261,
35 683 <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429505980>.
36 683
37
- 38 684 Davidson C, Al-Baghdadi TA, Brown MJ, Knappett JA, Brennan AJ, Augarde CE, Coombs WM, Wang L,
39 685 Richards D, Blake A & Ball J (2018b) Centrifuge modelling of optimised screw piles for offshore wind
40 686 energy foundations. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Physical Modelling in*
41 687 *Geotechnics (ICPMG 2018)* (A McNamara, S Divall, R Goodey, N Taylor, S Stallebrass, J Panchal (eds)).
42 688 Taylor and Francis, pp. 695–700, <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429438646>.
43 688
44
- 45 689 Deeks AD (2008) *An investigation into the strength and stiffness of jacked piles in sand*. PhD thesis.
46 690 University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.
47
- 48 691 Deeks AD and White D (2008) Centrifuge modelling of rotary-jacked tubular piles: gyropiling. In
49 692 *Proceedings of the 2nd BGA International Conference on Foundations (ICOF 2008)* (MJ Brown, MF
50 693 Bransby, AJ Brennan, and JA Knappett (eds)). IHS BRE Press, vol. 2, pp. 532–544.
51 693
52
- 53 694 DNV (2007) Recommended Practice DNV-RP-C205: Environmental Conditions and Environmental
54 695 Loads. Høvik, Norway, DNV.
55
- 56 696 DNV (2010) DNV-OS-J101: Design of Offshore Wind Turbine Structures. Høvik, Norway, DNV.
57
58
- 59 697 Elsherbiny, ZH & MH El Nagggar (2013). "Axial compressive capacity of helical piles from field tests and
60 698 numerical study." *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* **50** (12): 1191-1203.
61
62
63
64
65

- 699 Fleming K, Weltman A, Randolph M & Elson K (2009) Piling engineering. Abingdon, UK, Taylor and
1 700 Francis.
- 2
3 701 Garcia-Galindo P (2017) *Installation behaviour of open and close ended piles in sand while applying*
4 702 *torque*. MSc thesis. University of Dundee, Dundee, UK.
- 5
6
7 703 Garcia-Galindo P, Davidson C & Brown MJ (2018) Installation behavior of open ended and closed
8 704 ended piles with torque application. *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Press-in*
9 705 *Engineering 2018*. International Press in Association, Japan. pp. 379–386.
- 10
11 706 Garnier J, Gaudin C, Springman S, Culligan P, Goodings D, Konig D, Kutter B, Phillips R, Randolph M &
12 707 Thorel L (2007) Catalogue of scaling laws and similitude questions in geotechnical centrifuge
13 708 modelling. *International Journal of Physical Modelling in Geotechnics* **7 (3)**: 01–23.
- 14
15
16 709 Gavin K, Doherty P, & Spagnoli G (2013) Prediction of the installation torque resistance of large
17 710 diameter helical piles in dense sand. In *Proceedings of 1st International Geotechnical Symposium of*
18 711 *Helical Foundations*. International Society for Helical Foundations, University of Massachusetts,
19 712 Amherst, USA, pp. 578 – 585.
- 20
21
22 713 Gavin K, Doherty P, & Tolooitan A (2014) Field investigation of the axial resistance of helical piles in
23 714 dense sand. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* **51 (11)**: 1343–1354.
- 24
25 715 Ghaly A & Hanna A (1991) Experimental and theoretical studies on installation torque of screw
26 716 anchors. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* **28 (3)**: 353–364.
- 27
28 717 Ghaly A, Hanna A & Hanna M (1991) Uplift behavior of screw anchors in sand I: dry sand. *Journal of*
29 718 *Geotechnical Engineering* **117**: 773–793.
- 30
31
32 719 Giampa JR, Bradshaw AS & Schneider JA (2017) Influence of Dilation Angle on Drained Shallow Circular
33 720 Anchor Uplift Capacity. *International Journal of Geomechanics* **17 (2)**: 04016056-1–04016056-11.
- 34
35 721 Golightly C (2014) Technical Paper: Tilting of monopiles Long, heavy and stiff; pushed beyond their
36 722 limits. *Ground Engineering* January 2014: 20–23.
- 37
38
39 723 Hansen JB (1970) *A revised and extended formula for bearing capacity*. Copenhagen, Denmark, Danish
40 724 Geotechnical Institute.
- 41
42 725 Huismann M (2019) Silent foundation concept: helical piles for skirt and pre-piled jacket foundations.
43 726 In *Proceedings of the 1st International Symposium on Screw Piles for Energy Applications (ISSPEA 2019)*
44 727 (C Davidson, MJ Brown, JA Knappett, AJ Brennan, CE Augarde, L Wang, WM Coombs, D Richards, D
45 728 White, & A Blake (eds)). University of Dundee, Dundee, UK, pp.117–118.
46 729 <https://doi.org/10.20933/100001123>.
- 47
48
49 730 Hoyt RM & Clemence SP (1989) Uplift capacity of helical anchors in soil. In *Proceedings of the 12th*
50 731 *International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering*. Taylor & Francis, Rio de
51 732 Janeiro, Brazil, vol. 2, pp. 1019–1022.
- 52
53
54 733 Jeffrey JR, Brown MJ, Knappett JA, Ball JD & Caucis K (2016) CHD pile performance: part I – physical
55 734 modelling. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Geotechnical Engineering* **169 (5)**: 421–
56 735 435. <https://doi.org/10.1680/jgeen.15.00131>.
- 57
58
59 736 Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) (2010) Statutory nature conservation agency protocol
60 737 for minimising the risk of injury to marine mammals from piling noise. JNCC, Aberdeen, UK. See

738 http://archive.jncc.gov.uk/pdf/jncc_guidelines_piling%20protocol_august%202010.pdf (Accessed
1 739 30/09/19).

2

3 740 Knappett JA, Brown MJ, Brennan AJ & Hamilton L (2014) Optimising the compressive behaviour of
4 741 screw piles in sand for marine renewable energy applications. In *DFI/EFFC 11th International*
5 742 *Conference on Piling and Deep Foundations*. Deep Foundations Institute, Stockholm, Sweden, Vol. IC-
6 743 2014, 1904.

7

8

9 744 Kulhawy FH (1985) Uplift Behavior of Shallow Soil Anchors—An Overview In Proceedings of Uplift
10 745 Behavior of Anchor Foundations in Soil (Clemence SP (ed)). American Society of Civil Engineers, New
11 746 York, NY, pp. 1-25.

12

13

14 747 Lauder KD, Brown MJ, Bransby MF & Boyes S (2013) The influence of incorporating a forecutter on the
15 748 performance of offshore pipeline ploughs. *Applied Ocean Research* **39**: 121–130.
16 749 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apor.2012.11.001>.

17

18 750 Leanwind (2013) *Summary description of LEANWIND 8 MW reference turbine*. See
19 751 <http://www.leanwind.eu/>.

20

21

22 752 Leblanc C, Houlsby GT & Byrne BW (2010) Response of stiff piles in sand to long-term cyclic lateral
23 753 loading. *Géotechnique* **60 (2)**: 79–90.

24

25 754 Lehane BM, Schneider JA & Xu X (2005) The UWA-05 method for prediction of axial capacity of driven
26 755 piles in sand. In *Frontiers in Offshore Geotechnics: Proceedings of the International Symposium on*
27 756 *Frontiers in Offshore Geotechnics (IS-FOG 2005)*. (S Gourvenec, and M Cassidy (eds)) CRC Press, Perth,
28 757 Australia, pp. 683–689.

29

30

31 758 Li Z, Haigh SK & Bolton MD (2010) Centrifuge modelling of mono-pile under cyclic lateral loads. In
32 759 *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Physical Modelling in Geotechnics*. (S Springman, J
33 760 Laue and L Seward (eds)) CRC Press, Zurich, Switzerland, vol. 2, pp. 965–970.

34

35

36 761 Lutenecker AJ (2011) Behavior of Multi-Helix Screw Anchors in Sand. In *14th Pan-American Conference*
37 762 *on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering 64th Canadian Geotechnical Conference*. ISSMGE.

38

39 763 Lutenecker AJ (2019) Screw Piles And Helical Anchors – What We Know And What We Don’t Know: An
40 764 Academic Perspective – 2019. In Proceedings of the 1st International Symposium on Screw Piles for
41 765 Energy Applications (ISSPEA 2019) (C Davidson, MJ Brown, JA Knappett, AJ Brennan, CE Augarde, L
42 766 Wang, WM Coombs, D Richards, D White, & A Blake (eds)). University of Dundee, Dundee, UK, pp.15–
43 767 28. <https://doi.org/10.20933/100001123>.

44

45

46 768 Meyerhof GG (1951) The ultimate bearing capacity of foundations. *Géotechnique* **2 (4)**: 301–332.

47

48 769 Meyerhof GG (1976) Bearing Capacity and Settlement of Pile Foundations. *Journal of the Geotechnical*
49 770 *Engineering Division, ASCE* **102 (3)**: 197–228.

50

51

52 771 Mitsch MP & Clemence SP (1985) The uplift capacity of helix anchors in sand. In *Uplift Behavior of*
53 772 *Anchor Foundations in Soil*. (SP Clemence (ed)) American Society of Civil Engineers, New York, USA,
54 773 pp. 26–47.

55

56 774 Mohajerani A, Bosnjak D & Bromwich D (2016) Analysis and design methods of screw piles: A review.
57 775 *Soils and Foundations* **56 (1)**: 115–128.

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

- 776 Morais TDSO & Tsuha CDHC (2014) A new experimental procedure to investigate the torque
 1 777 correlation factor of helical anchors. *Electronic Journal of Geotechnical Engineering* **19 (Bund. P)**:
 2 778 3851–3864.
 3
- 4 779 Perko HA (2009) *Helical piles: a practical guide to design and installation*. Hoboken, USA, John Wiley
 5 780 & Sons.
 6
- 7
 8 781 Phillips R & Valsangkar A (1987) *An experimental investigation of factors affecting penetration*
 9 782 *resistance in granular soils in centrifuge modelling*. Cambridge, UK, Technical Report No. CUED/D -
 10 783 Soils TR 210.
 11
- 12 784 Randolph M & Gourvenec S (2011) *Offshore Geotechnical Engineering*. Spon Press, Abingdon, Oxon,
 13 785 UK.
 14
- 15
 16 786 Sakr M (2015) Relationship between installation torque and axial capacities of helical piles in
 17 787 cohesionless soils. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* **52 (6)**: 747–759.
 18
- 19 788 Schiavon JA, Tsuha CDHC & Thorel L (2016) Scale effect in centrifuge tests of helical anchors in sand.
 20 789 *International Journal of Physical Modelling in Geotechnics* **16 (4)**: 185–196.
 21
- 22
 23 790 Sharif Y, Brown MJ, Ciantia M, Knappett JA, Davidson C, Cerfontaine B, Robinson S & Ball J (2019)
 24 791 Numerically modelling the installation and loading of screw piles using DEM. In *Proceedings of the 1st*
 25 792 *International Symposium on Screw Piles for Energy Applications (ISSPEA 2019)* (C Davidson, MJ Brown,
 26 793 JA Knappett, AJ Brennan, CE Augarde, L Wang, WM Coombs, D Richards, D White, & A Blake (eds)).
 27 794 University of Dundee, Dundee, UK, pp.101–108. <https://doi.org/10.20933/100001123>.
 28
- 29
 30 795 Spagnoli G (2016) A CPT-based model to predict the installation torque of helical piles in sand. *Marine*
 31 796 *Georesources & Geotechnology* **35 (4)**: 578–575.
 32
- 33 797 Spagnoli G & Gavin K (2015) Helical piles as a novel foundation system for offshore piled facilities. In
 34 798 *Proceedings of the Abu Dhabi International Petroleum Exhibition and Conference*. Society of Petroleum
 35 799 Engineers, Abu Dhabi, UAE.
 36
- 37
 38 800 Tappenden KM & Segoo DC (2007) Predicting the axial capacity of screw piles installed in Canadian soils.
 39 801 In *Proceedings of OttawaGeo2007*. Canadian Geotechnical Society, Ottawa, Canada, pp.1608–1615.
 40
- 41 802 Tavenas FA (1971) Load tests results on friction piles in sand. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* **8 (1)**: 7–
 42 803 22.
 43
- 44 804 Tsuha CDHC & Aoki N (2010) Relationship between installation torque and uplift capacity of deep
 45 805 helical piles in sand. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* **47 (6)**: 635–647.
 46
 47
- 48 806 Urabe K, Tokimatsu K, Suzuki H, & Asaka Y (2015) Bearing Capacity and Pull-Out Resistance of Wing
 49 807 Piles During Cyclic Vertical Loading. In *6ICEGE – Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on*
 50 808 *Earthquake Geotechnical Engineering*, Christchurch, New Zealand, pp.358-3675.
 51
- 52
 53 809 Vesic AS (1973) Analysis of ultimate loads of shallow foundations. *Journal of Soil Mechanics and*
 54 810 *Foundation Design* **99 (No. SM 1)**: 45–73.
 55
- 56 811 Windeurope Business Intelligence (2017) *The European offshore wind industry: Key trends and*
 57 812 *statistics 2016*. See <https://windeurope.org/>.
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

813 Zhang D (1999). Predicting capacity of helical screw piles in Alberta soils. MSc thesis, University of
1 814 Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
2
3 815 Zhang X, Liu J & Liu M (2018) Experimental Study on Uplift Behavior of Group Anchors in Sand.
4 816 Geotechnical Testing Journal **42 (no.3)**: 687-702.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

817 Figure Caption list

818 Figure 1. Schematic of a screw pile and the typical terminology used with addition of potential failure
819 mechanisms during loading in tension and compression (Mitsch & Clemence, 1985).

820 Figure 2. Schematic of an 8MW offshore wind turbine and four-legged steel jacket (dimensions in
821 metres unless otherwise stated).

822 Figure 3. Uplift breakout factors for various peak friction angles, based upon Das & Shukla (2013), with
823 maximum values given as horizontal lines for deep failure mechanism cases.

824 Figure 4. Comparison of installation torque predictions from published methods.

825 Figure 5. Screw piles tested in centrifuge. See Table 3 for dimensions.

826 Figure 6. Centrifuge test data showing torque and force data for the duration of the installation and
827 load test of screw pile U1VD-B in a) compression and b) tension. 1 = centrifuge spin up; 2 = installation;
828 3 = load test.

829 Figure 7. Cone penetration test data for medium-dense ($D_r = 52\%$) and very-dense ($D_r = 82\%$) dry
830 HST95 sand at prototype scale.

831 Figure 8. Measured installation torque at prototype scale for all model screw piles.

832 Figure 9. Measured vs predicted installation torque for piles: a) U2VD, b) U1VD-B, c) O2VD and d)
833 U1MD.

834 Figure 10. Measured installation force at prototype scale for all model screw piles.

835 Figure 11. Measured vs predicted installation force for piles: a) U2VD, b) U1VD-B, c) O2VD and d)
836 U1MD.

1 837 Figure 12. a) Measured prototype compressive capacity test results, b) measured/predicted
2 838 compressive capacity using Method 1c predictions. The asterix indicates the point of structural failure
3
4 839 of the helix in piles U1MD and U2MD.
5
6
7
8 840 Figure 13. Measured vs predicted compressive capacity.
9
10
11 841 Figure 14. Back calculated bearing capacity factors (N_q) from single helix piles in this study and
12
13 842 continuous helical displacement piles in Jeffrey et al. (2016).
14
15
16
17
18 843 Figure 15. a) Measured tension capacity test results, b) measured/predicted tensile capacity.
19
20
21 844 Figure 16. Measured vs predicted tensile capacity.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

845 Table caption list

846 Table 1. Aerodynamic and hydrodynamic properties for loading calculations.

847 Table 2. Values of m for various soil friction angles, as derived by Mitsch and Clemence (1985).

848 Table 3. Prototype model screw pile dimensions (m) with 1:80th scale model dimensions in brackets
849 (mm). See Figure 5 for locations of dimensions.

850 Table 4. HST95 sand material properties (Lauder, 2010, Al-Defae, 2013).

851 Table 5. Screw pile centrifuge testing programme. Peak friction angles calculated from relative density
852 using relationship proposed by Al-Defae, (2013) for HST95 sand).

853 Table 6. Compression test results for comparison with the 32.31MN compressive design load. Note:
854 measured compressive capacity is defined at a displacement of $0.1D_{ha}$.

855 Table 7. Theoretical (Perko, 2009) and back-calculated torque-capacity correlation factors (K_t).

856 Table 8. Predicted and measured tensile capacities of all screw pile designs. Note: measured tensile
857 capacity is defined at a displacement of $0.1D_{ha}$.

858 Appendix A

859 Al-Baghdadi et al. (2017b) equations for installation torque prediction from CPT cone resistance data.

$$T = T_s + T_b + T_h \quad A1.$$

$$T_s = aq_{ca} \tan \delta \pi L \frac{D_c^2}{2} f_1 \quad A2.$$

$$T_b = \frac{q_b \pi D_c^3}{12} \tan \delta f_2 \quad A3.$$

$$T_h = T_{h1} + T_{h2} + T_{h3} \quad A4.$$

$$T_{h1} = aq_{ca} \tan \delta \frac{\pi (D_h^3 - D_c^3)}{12k_0} \quad A5.$$

$$T_{h2} = aq_{ca} t \tan \delta \frac{\pi D_h^2}{2} \quad A6.$$

$$T_{h3} = q_{ca} t \frac{D_h^2 - D_c^2}{8} \quad A7.$$

$$k_0 = 1 - \sin \phi_{crit} \quad A8.$$

860 where T is the total torque which includes contributions from the shaft area (T_s), base of the pile core

861 (T_b) and the helix (T_h), which has three components - T_{h1} from the underside of the helix, T_{h2}

862 associated with the circumferential edge and T_{h3} from the leading or cutting edge of the helix. The

863 earth pressure at rest term (K_0) uses the critical state friction angle and q_{ca} is the average q_c over a
 1
 2 864 distance of $\pm 1.5 D_h$ from the depth of the helix in question. The pile end bearing resistance q_b was
 3
 4 865 taken as $0.6 q_{ca}$ and the stress drop index (a) assumed to be 0.03 after Lehane et al. (2005). Al-
 5
 6
 7 866 Baghdadi et al. (2017b) also proposed that a rotation reduction factor was required for the shaft and
 8
 9 867 base components ($f_1 = 0.75$ and $f_2 = 0.7$, respectively) for torque prediction after work by Deeks and
 10
 11
 12 868 White (2008). Al-Baghdadi (2018) also suggested that the stress drop index and rotation reduction
 13
 14 869 factors were related to relative density.

870 Appendix B

871 Davidson et al. (2018a) equations for installation torque prediction from CPT cone resistance data.

$$T = T_s + T_b + \sum_1^n T_{h(n)} \quad \text{B1.}$$

$$T_h = T_{h1} + T_{h2} + T_{h3} \quad \text{B2.}$$

$$T_s = \sum_{\Delta x=1}^{\Delta x=L} a q_{ca} \tan \delta_{crit} \pi \Delta x \frac{D_c^2}{2} \quad \text{B3.}$$

$$T_b = q_{ca} \tan \delta_{crit} \pi \frac{D_c^3}{12} \quad \text{B4.}$$

$$T_{h1} = a q_{ca} \tan(\delta_{crit} + \theta) \frac{D_h^3 - D_c^3}{12k_0} \quad \text{B5.}$$

$$T_{h2} = a q_{ca} \tan \delta_{crit} \pi t \frac{D_h^2}{2} \quad \text{B6.}$$

$$T_{h3} = a q_{ca} t \frac{D_h^2 - D_c^2}{4} \quad \text{B7.}$$

$$a = \frac{F_r}{\tan \delta_{crit}} \quad \text{B8.}$$

$$k_0 = 1 - \sin \phi_{crit} \quad \text{B9.}$$

$$\theta = \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{p}{\pi(D_h - D_c)} \right) \quad \text{B10.}$$

872

873 Appendix C

874 Equations for installation force prediction from CPT cone resistance data from Al-Baghdadi (2018).

$$F_v = F_s + F_b + \sum_1^n F_{h(n)} \quad \text{C1.}$$

$$F_s = \sum_{\Delta x=1}^{\Delta x=L} a q_{ca} \tan \delta_{crit} \pi D_c L f \quad \text{C2.}$$

$$F_b = q_{ca} \pi \frac{D_c^2}{4} f \quad \text{C3.}$$

$$F_h = F_{h1} + F_{h2} + F_{h3} \quad \text{C4.}$$

$$F_{h1} = a q_{ca} \pi \frac{D_h^2 - D_c^2}{4 k_0} \quad \text{C5.}$$

$$F_{h2} = a q_{ca} t \pi \frac{D_h}{k_0} \quad \text{C6.}$$

$$F_{h3} = q_{ca} t \frac{D_h - D_c}{2} \quad \text{C7.}$$

875

Notation

a	Stress drop coefficient
A_h	Area of helical plate
B	Cone penetrometer shaft diameter
D_{10}	Effective soil particle diameter
D_{50}	Average soil particle diameter
D_c	Pile core diameter
D_h	Helix diameter
D_{ha}	Average helix diameter
D_{hn}	Uppermost helix diameter
D_{hl}	Lowermost helix diameter
D_r	Relative density
f	Rotation reduction factor
f_1	Rotation reduction factor for pile shaft
f_2	Rotation reduction factor for pile tip
F_b	Installation force from pile tip
F_h	Installation force from helix
F_q	Bearing capacity factor in uplift from Das & Shukla (2013)
F_s	Installation force from pile shaft
F_v	Vertical installation force of screw pile
g	Acceleration due to Earth's gravity
H	Helix depth
H_l	Depth of lowermost helix
H_n	Depth of uppermost helix
k_0	At-rest earth pressure coefficient
K_p	Passive earth pressure coefficient
K_u	Post screw pile installation earth pressure coefficient for uplift
K_{uc}	Post screw pile installation earth pressure coefficient for compression
L	Length of screw pile shaft
m	Shape coefficient in relationship between ϕ and K_u
N_q	Bearing capacity factor
N_y	Uplift factor for screw anchors and plates
p	Helix pitch
q_b	Pile tip bearing capacity
q_c	CPT cone resistance
q_{ca}	Average CPT cone resistance over a distance of $\pm 1.5D_h$
Q_{cm}	Measured compressive capacity
Q_{cp}	Predicted compressive capacity
$Q_{c,helix}$	Helix bearing capacity

$Q_{c,tip}$	Pile tip bearing capacity
Q_s	Shaft resistance
Q_{sc}	Cylindrical-shear resistance in compression
Q_{st}	Cylindrical-shear resistance in tension
Q_{tm}	Measured uplift capacity
Q_{tp}	Predicted uplift capacity
Q_u	Ultimate screw pile uplift capacity
S	Helix spacing
t	Helix plate thickness
T	Total torque
T_b	Torque from pile tip
T_h	Torque from helix
T_{h1}	Torque from lower surface of helix
T_{h2}	Torque from outer perimeter of helix
T_{h3}	Torque from leading edge of helix
T_s	Torque from pile shaft
z	Depth below surface
ψ	Dilation angle
ϕ'_{pk}	Peak internal friction angle
ϕ'_{crit}	Critical state friction angle
δ'_{crit}	Critical state interface friction angle
δ	Interface friction angle
γ'	Effective unit weight of soil
ρ_{max}	Maximum density of soil
ρ_{min}	Minimum density of soil




Figure 2. Schematic of an 8MW offshore wind turbine and four-legged steel jacket (dimensions in metres unless otherwise

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 2. Schematic of an 8MW offshore wind turbine and fou.tiff](#)





Figure 3. Uplift breakout factors for various peak friction angles, based upon Das & Shukla (2013), with maximum values given as

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 3. Uplift breakout factors for various peak friction.tif](#)






Figure 5. Screw piles tested in centrifuge. See Table 3 for dimensions.

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 5. Screw piles tested in centrifuge. See Table 3.tif](#)




Figure 6a Centrifuge test data showing torque and force data

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 6a Centrifuge test data showing torque and force data.tif](#)





Figure 6b Centrifuge test data showing torque and force data

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 6b Centrifuge test data showing torque and force data.tif](#)








Figure 8. Measured installation torque at prototype scale for all model screw piles.

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 8. Measured installation torque at prototype scale fo.tif](#)












Figure 10. Measured installation force at prototype scale for all model screw piles.

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 10. Measured installation force at prototype scale fo.tif](#)














Figure 12. a) Measured prototype compressive capacity test results, b) measured/predicted compressive capacity using

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 12a. Measured prototype compressive capacity test.tif](#)











Figure 14. Back calculated bearing capacity factors (NRqR) from single helix piles in this study and continuous helical displacement bearing capacity factors (N_q) from Jeffrey et al (2016) and Berezantzev (1961)










Table 1. Aerodynamic and hydrodynamic properties for loading calculations.

Parameter	Value
Reference wind speed (m/s)	32
Reference wind speed elevation (mASL)	10
Air temperature [°C]	5
Kinematic viscosity of air at 5° (m ² /s)	13.60x10 ⁶
Density of air at 5°C (kg/m ³)	1.226
Significant wave height (m)	11.5
Wave period (s)	15
Storm Duration (hours)	3
Water temperature (°C)	5
Kinematic viscosity of water at 5°C (m ² /s)	1.56x10 ⁶
Density of sea water at 5°C (kg/m ³)	1027.6
Current speed (m/s)	0.5

Table 2. Values of m for various soil friction angles, as derived by Mitsch and Clemence (1985).

Soil friction angle, ϕ (°)	m
25	0.033
30	0.075
35	0.18
40	0.25
45	0.289

Table 3. Prototype model screw pile dimensions (m) with 1:80th scale model dimensions in brackets (mm).

See Figure 5 for locations of dimensions.

Dimension	Screw Pile Model					
	U2VD	O2VD	U1VD-A	U1VD-B	U2MD	U1MD
Total length, L	13.00 (162.50)	13.00 (162.50)	10.24 (128.00)	13.00 (162.50)	18.00 (225.00)	16.00 (200.00)
Upper helix mid-depth, H_n	12.66 (158.30)	12.66 (158.30)	9.90 (123.80)	12.66 (158.30)	10.94 (136.80)	15.66 (195.80)
Helix spacing, S	3.40 (42.50)	3.40 (42.50)			6.72 (84.00)	
Helix pitch, p	0.56 (7.00)	0.56 (7.00)	0.56 (7.00)	0.56 (7.00)	0.56 (7.00)	0.56 (7.00)
Helix plate thickness, t	0.11 (1.40)	0.11 (1.40)	0.11 (1.40)	0.11 (1.40)	0.11 (1.40)	0.11 (1.40)
Upper helix diameter, D_{hn}	1.70 (21.25)	1.70 (21.25)	1.70 (21.25)	1.70 (21.25)	3.36 (42.00)	3.36 (42.00)
Lower helix diameter, D_{h1}	1.70 (21.25)	1.34 (16.75)			3.36 (42.00)	
Upper core diameter, D_c	0.88 (11.00)	0.88 (11.00)	0.88 (11.00)	0.88 (11.00)	1.12 (14.00)	1.12 (14.00)
Lower core diameter, D_{cl}		0.60 (7.50)				
Upper core length, L_u		8.22 (102.75)				
Upper helix depth/diameter, H_n/D_{hn}	5.35	5.35	5.82	7.35	2.83	4.17
Lower helix depth/diameter H_1/D_{h1}	7.35	9.33			4.85	

Table 4. HST95 sand material properties (Lauder, 2010, Al-Defae, 2013).

Property	Value
Effective particle size, D_{10} (mm)	0.09
Average particle size, D_{50} (mm)	0.14
Peak friction angle, ϕ'_{pk} ($^{\circ}$) at 57% relative density	40.40
Peak friction angle, ϕ'_{pk} ($^{\circ}$) at 84% relative density	45.80
Critical state friction angle, ϕ'_{crit} ($^{\circ}$)	32
Sand-steel interface friction angle, δ'_{crit} ($^{\circ}$)	24
Angle of dilation*, ψ ($^{\circ}$)	16
Maximum dry density, ρ_{max} (kN/m ³)	17.58
Minimum dry density, ρ_{min} (kN/m ³)	14.59

* Inferred from best-fit peak strength relationship from direct shear tests for data at effective stresses between 50-200kPa and critical state friction angle, at 80% relative density (Al-Defae, 2013).

Table 5. Screw pile centrifuge testing programme. Peak friction angles calculated from relative density using relationship proposed by Al-Defae, (2013) for HST95 sand).

Test	Screw Pile	Test Type	Relative Density, D_r (%)	Peak Friction Angle, ϕ_{pk}
01-U2TVD	U2VD	Tension	83.4	45.7
02-O2TVD	O2VD	Tension	82.2	45.4
03-U2CVD	U2VD	Compression	84.6	45.9
04-O2CVD	O2VD	Compression	84.6	45.9
05-U1TVD-A	U1VD-A	Tension	84.7	45.9
06-U1CVD-A	U1VD-A	Compression	84.7	45.9
07-U1TVD-B	U1VD-B	Tension	82.7	45.5
08-U1CVD-B	U1VD-B	Compression	84.8	45.9
09-U1TMD	U1MD	Tension	56.0	40.2
10-U1CMD	U1MD	Compression	56.0	40.2
11-U2TMD	U2MD	Tension	58.5	40.7
12-U2CMD	U2MD	Compression	58.5	40.7

Table 6. Compression test results for comparison with the 32.31MN compressive design load. Note: measured compressive capacity is defined at a displacement of $0.1D_{hg}$.

Pile	Test	Measured (MN)	Measured/Predicted – Method 1c	Measured/Predicted – Method 2c	Measured/Predicted – Method 3c
U2VD	03-U2CVD	34.99	0.75	1.00	1.25
O2VD	04-O2CVD	20.96	0.68	0.94	1.07
U1VD-A	06-U1CVD-A	23.62	0.73	0.86	1.20
U1VD-B	08-U1CVD-B	23.63	0.57	0.83	0.92
U1MD	10-U1CMD	41.57	0.47	0.56	0.79
U2MD	12-U2CMD	67.26	0.57	0.69	0.88
		Average	0.63	0.81	1.02

Table 7. Theoretical (Perko, 2009) and back-calculated torque-capacity correlation factors (K_t).

Screw Pile	Back-calculated Torque-Capacity values (Kt)		Theoretical Torque-Capacity values (Kt) $K_t = \frac{1433}{D_c^{0.92}}$ from Perko (2009)
	Tension	Compression	
U2VD	1.58	4.67	2.80
O2VD	1.44	3.19	3.98
U1VDA	1.88	5.44	2.80
U1VDB	1.89	5.05	2.80
U1MD	1.45	3.16	2.24
U2MD	0.79	2.73	2.24

Table 8. Predicted and measured tensile capacities of all screw pile designs. Note: measured tensile capacity is defined at a displacement of $0.1D_{ha}$.

Pile	Test	Measured (MN)	Measured/ Predicted Tensile Capacity			
			Method 1t	Method 2t	Method 3t	Method 4t
U2VD	02U2TVDB	11.76	0.66	0.64		1.00
O2VD	03O2TVD	8.89	0.52	0.52		1.07
U1VD-A	06U1TVDA	6.96	0.30	0.51		1.00
U1VD-B	18U1TVDB	11.31	0.23	0.52		0.93
U1MD	21U1TMD	14.69	0.32	0.37	0.53	0.95
U2MD	23U2TMD	14.47	0.60	0.43	0.55	0.59
		Average	0.44	0.50		0.91



[Click here to access/download](#)

Supplementary material

[MainText_Post3rdReview-v02-WithTrackChanges.docx](#)

