

Displacement-Based Seismic Design of a Large Naval Pier

Louis Klusmeyer, PE, SE, MASCE* and Robert E. Harn, PE, SE, MASCE**

*Project Engineer, BERGER/ABAM Engineers Inc.; 720 Olive Way, Suite 1100, Seattle, WA 98101; PH 206-357-5619; klusmeyer@abam.com

**Project Manager, BERGER/ABAM Engineers Inc.; 33301 Ninth Avenue South, Suite 300, Federal Way, WA 98003-2600; PH 206-431-2325; harn@abam.com

Abstract

This paper discusses the displacement-based seismic design of the newest naval pier at Naval Station Bremerton in Bremerton, Washington. It is 45.72 meters wide by 399.3 meters long and is capable of simultaneously berthing two aircraft carriers. Displacement-based design is the state-of-the-art in seismic design and its basic premise is to determine what displacement will occur during the design earthquake and detail the structure to accommodate its displacement. This is a significant change from most current codes, which are force based. The project enjoyed a 50 percent reduction in piling by using the displacement-based when compared to the force-based method.

Soil-structure interaction, push-over analysis, material overstrengths, and site-specific response spectra are used to determine the displacement response of the pier under Levels 1 and 2 earthquakes, the “displacement demand.” A push-over analysis is then performed to the displacement demand and the expected capacity of individual members and connections are evaluated and compared to the displacement demand on each member and connection.

Introduction

Pier Delta was designed and built using the design/build method of procurement. A photo of the completed pier is shown in Figure 1.

The new Pier Delta replaced the existing pier, which was 30.5 meters wide and 365.8 meters long. The new pier consists of a 32.9-meter-wide center section constructed with a reinforced concrete topping slab (used to embed conduit), supported on precast-prestressed concrete haunched deck panels spanning 9.14 meters to cast-in-place concrete pile caps supported on (467) 610-millimeter (mm) solid prestressed concrete piles and (164) 914-mm steel pipe piles (631 total piles). Utilities are routed in 7.5-meter-wide by 8.2-meter-long precast concrete utility tunnels on both sides of the pier, each weighing approximately 935 kilonewtons (kN). The precast elements also contained an integral trench drain



Figure 1: Completed Pier Delta

that provided drainage and stormwater retention, completely eliminating the need for storm drain piping on the pier.

In addition to the pier, the project included a fleet recreation facility, substantial upland utility improvements, and (2) 15-kilovolt (kV) substations on the pier. The pier is of heavy-duty construction, capable of supporting a uniform live load of 3.56 kN per square meter (kN/m²) and 127-metric-ton mobile cranes with 1,039 kN outrigger loads operating anywhere on the pier. Mooring hardware consists of 890- and 1,780-kN bollards at 18 meters on center with cleats between. The total lateral mooring load was 22,600 kN. A pier cross section is shown in Figure 2. Photos showing the typical elements described above are shown in Figures 3 and 4.

Introduction to Displacement Design

Most current seismic codes use a force-based design method as follows. A base shear (force) is determined and applied to the structure in accordance with the code. That force (static and/or dynamic) is reduced from the actual earthquake force by a ductility factor “R”, for that type of structure. The “R” factor is a measure of how well a structural system is expected to perform in an earthquake. The higher the “R” value the greater the assumed ductility and consequently the better the performance in an earthquake. Typically the various codes have applied “R” factors to various structural types based on testing and actual performance in earthquakes. However, piers do not fit in neatly with the structural systems used in building codes and so criteria specific to piers has been developed, such as the U.S. Navy Technical Report TR-2069, J.M. Ferrito, 1997.

One of the drawbacks to force-based design is that the engineer only analyzes the undamaged, elastic structure and consequently does not have a complete understanding of the inelastic behavior that occurs in an earthquake. Although this

approach has proved to be effective in preventing collapse, it has not prevented significant damage and the resulting economic loss to the owner from occurring.

Displacement-based design involves determining the expected displacement of the structure during the design earthquake and then designing the structural elements for that displacement. The main benefit of the displacement-based design method is the ability to better predict and control where inelastic behavior will occur in a structure, resulting in less uncertainty about how a structure will behave in an earthquake. In most cases, the method will result in a more economical structure.

Design Code

The design of Pier Delta was performed in accordance with “Seismic Criteria for California Marine Oil Terminals, Technical Report TR-2103-SHR,” John Ferrito, et al, 1999 (TR-2103). This technical report represents the state-of-the-art in seismic design in waterfront construction. It expands on Technical Report TR-2069 developed by the U.S. Navy to provide design criteria for waterfront construction. The California State Lands Commission, Marine Facilities Division, has now codified this technical report into “Marine Oil Terminal Engineering and Maintenance Standards,” California State Lands Commission, 2002.




Figure 2: Cross Section of Pier Delta



Figure 3: View of Deck Panels, Pile Caps, and Piles under Construction



Figure 4: View of Precast Concrete Utility Tunnel Being Erected

TR-2103 requires designing for Levels 1 and 2 earthquakes. The Level 1 earthquake has a 50 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years (72-year return period) and is considered a serviceability event. The structure should resist the Level 1 earthquake without sustaining damage. The Level 2 earthquake has a 10 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years (475-year return period) and is considered a damage-control event. The structure should resist the Level 2 earthquake without collapse but with repairable damage.


Design Criteria

Pier Delta was designed to criteria established by the U.S. Navy in the request for proposal (RFP). Included in the RFP was geotechnical data, such as soil parameters, minimum pile capacities, and Levels 1 and 2 site-specific seismic response spectra. The Level 2 spectrum is shown in tripartite format in Figure 5 with a damping of 5 percent. The tripartite logarithmic plot uses one curve to plot the displacement, velocity, and acceleration relative to the period. The plot is a simplified representation intended to envelope the actual motion indicated by the jagged lines. For short periods, the spectral acceleration is equal to the peak ground acceleration (pga) or 0.31g. The acceleration is amplified as the period increases, reaching a peak of 1.0g between a period of 0.3 and 0.6 second. The spectral velocity remains constant and acceleration decreases between periods of 0.6 and 2 seconds. The spectral displacement is taken as constant at 30 centimeters for periods beyond 2 seconds for this response spectra. This is commonly referred to as a displacement cap; and beyond this point, the structure is soft enough that it is effectively base isolated. In other words the structure essentially remains still while the ground moves beneath it, and the displacement between the structure and the ground is equal to the maximum ground motion.

Because Pier D has a period of 4 seconds, it is effectively base isolated. Recognition of the displacement cap in the design criteria was key to the success of the Pier D project. The cap helped produce a simple, yet elegant plumb pile system that used no additional piles to resist seismic loads beyond what was required for gravity (dead plus live) loads. This resulted in a savings of approximately 690 piles when compared to a batter pile system studied during preliminary design.

Design Approach

In concept, displacement-based design is relatively simple. Determine what displacement will occur during the design earthquake and design and detail the structure to accommodate that displacement. The difficulty comes in determining the expected displacement and detailing the structure for that displacement. The displacement cap in the site-specific response spectrum for Pier D made the design simpler because the global response of the structure was obvious when examining the spectrum.



Other lateral loads included in the design were very substantial mooring loads (22,600 kN) distributed approximately uniformly along the pier length from the two carriers. The seismic and mooring load cases required designing a structure with the ductility desired for seismic loads and the stiffness and strength desired for mooring loads. The final solution used 610-mm concrete piles for Bents 1 through 5, 914-mm steel pipe piles for Bents 6 through 12, 610-mm concrete piles for Bents 13 through 35, and 914-mm pipe piles for Bents 36 through 46. This pile layout provided a structure that was flexible enough for seismic design and with plenty of stiffness and strength to resist the mooring loads.

Displacement Demand

Although determining the overall displacement demand was simplified by the displacement cap, a detailed analysis was required to accurately determine the displacements at the landside interface and along the pier to design the seismic joints for the utilities and the deck elements. This analysis included the effects of soil/structure interaction that was complicated by the range in mudline elevation and geotechnical properties throughout the length of the pier.

The project site was dredged prior to construction of the previous Pier Delta in 1946. A mound of granular material was placed under the pier after dredging and prior to driving the piles to consolidate and densify the remaining native material. This 1946 mound remains under the replacement Pier Delta as shown in Figure 2.

The geotechnical report divided the pier into 11 different segments to account for the variation in soil parameters along the pier. The software “L-Pile” was used to accurately model the soil structure interaction. Variables included the range of mudline elevations, the different geotechnical properties for each segment, and the moment capacity of the pile-to-cap connection. A force-displacement or push-over curve was developed for each bent combining the soil-structure interaction results with the moment curvature characteristics of the pile-to-cap connection resulting in a stiffness for each bent. The bent stiffness ranged from 30 to 66 kN/cm.

A multimodal spectral analysis was run with a two-dimensional spine model to determine the seismic displacement of the pier. In the model, seismic masses were lumped at nodes along the pier centerline at each bent location. The stiffness matrix developed from the push-over analysis was used for the support condition at each node. The spine section properties consisted of the deck section and utility tunnels on each side of the pier. The initial modal analysis indicated a significant difference between the displacements at each end of the pier due to the variation in bent stiffness inshore to offshore. This created an eccentricity between the center of mass and center of stiffness that created significant torsion for pier motions transverse to the long axis of the pier; in turn, causing displacements at the ends of the pier during seismic events that were up to 50 percent larger than the global seismic displacement of 300 mm that was expected due to the displacement cap.

The calculated displacement at the inshore end exceeded the capacity of the seismic joints in the pipes and would have caused the pipes to hit the side walls of the utility tunnel. In addition, the displacement would have caused the short concrete piles at the inshore end to fail in shear. The solution was to pin the tops of the concrete piles in Bents 1 through 3 to reduce the stiffness and the associated moments and shears in the piles by approximately a factor of 4. The resulting loss of stiffness from pinning the landside concrete piles was offset by the addition of 914-mm steel pipe piles in Bents 6 through 12. The net effect was to produce a pier with a relatively uniform distribution of mass, strength, and stiffness resulting in calculated displacements that ranged from 297 mm at the landside end to 338 mm at the outer end.

Displacement Capacity

After determining the displacement demand on the structure, all the elements and connections in the structure must be designed for that displacement. TR-2103 provides for dependable inelastic action by specifying that the inelastic behavior occurs in carefully detailed plastic hinges located in the piles. This means that the piles are detailed to undergo that inelastic behavior without losing their load-carrying capacity to prevent collapse of the structure. Shear failures of piles and inelastic actions of deck members are prevented by ensuring that the dependable

strength of these members exceeds the maximum feasible input corresponding to the plastic hinging in the piles.

A moment curvature analysis was used to determine the strains in the pile plastic hinges. A plot for a typical concrete pile below mudline is shown in Figure 6. The analysis takes into account the strength of the concrete, the amount and location of the reinforcing, and is performed using the probable lower bound estimates of the constituent material strengths. These strengths are higher than the minimum specified material strengths to reflect the reality that actual strengths of the materials are higher than the minimum specified strengths. The lower bound estimates are used because strength is less important to seismic resistance than is displacement capacity. Material strengths used for the lower bound analysis are $f'_{ce}=(1.3)(f'_c)$ for concrete, $f_{ye}=(1.1)(f_y)$ for mild reinforcement, and $f_{pe}=(1.0)(f_{pu})$ for prestress strands. The concrete extreme fiber compression and prestressing strand strains in the concrete piles and the structural steel strains in the steel pipe piles were checked for the Levels 1 and 2 earthquakes using the moment curvature analysis. The strains in the plastic hinges located below mudline were very low because of the flexibility of the piles.

The initial analysis indicated strains were very high at the pile-to-cap connection. As a result, two innovative connections were developed to reduce them. As previously mentioned, Bents 1, 2, and 3 were pinned to prevent shear failure as shown in Figure 7. Although this type of connection is often used in bridge and building construction, the strains in the reinforcement exceeded the criteria, so the bar was taped to increase the yield length and reduce the strains. Foam was provided to isolate the outer portion of the pile.




Figure 6: Typical Moment Curvature Plot




Figure 7: Typical Pinned Connection Bents 1 to 3

The typical connection used for the remainder of the concrete piles is shown in Figure 8. A similar connection was used for the pipe piles. To keep strains below the limit set in TR-2103, a 305-mm length of the dowels was debonded by taping as indicated.

The connection to the pile cap always has less strength than the pile below. Consequently, the rotation is concentrated at the joint that will cause a gap to open on the order of 6 to 10 mm during the Level 2 earthquake. This creates a condition where commercially-available moment curvature software is not valid because it typically assumes that there are many small cracks distributed over the length of the plastic hinge zone rather than being concentrated in one location. In recognition of this, a length of the bar was taped to debond it, and a special analysis was done to determine the strains associated with this connection. The strains were checked against the specified maximum strain.

Capacity Protection

Shear failures of piles and inelastic actions of deck members are prevented by ensuring that the dependable strength of these members exceeds the maximum feasible input corresponding to the plastic hinging in the piles. They are designed using the moments and shears associated with upper-bound estimates of material strengths. These upper-bound material strengths are $f'_{cm}=(1.7)(f'_c)$ for concrete, $f_{ym}=(1.3)(f_y)$ for mild reinforcement, and $f_{pum}=(1.1)(f_{pu})$ for prestress strands. Alternatively, the forces resulting from the initial moment curvature analysis can be increased by a factor of 1.4 and used for this portion of the design. Phi factors are used in computing the moment and shear strength to ensure that the dependable strength exceeds the maximum feasible demand.




Figure 8: Typical Pile Connection with Debonded Dowels

Summary of Design Innovations

In addition to the innovative use of long-span precast deck panels and precast concrete utilidors, three innovations in particular helped make the seismic design of Pier Delta a success. First and most important was the recognition of the significance of the displacement cap in the site-specific spectrum that made the plumb pile concept feasible and resulting in a savings of 690 piles. The second innovation was the use of the 914-mm steel pipe piles in Bents 6 through 12 in conjunction with the effective pinned connection in Bents 1 through 3 to tune the strength and stiffness of the bents, thereby reducing the torsion and differential motions between the ends of the piers. Third was debonding the dowels in the pile-to-cap connection. This maintained the stiffness and strength of the pile-to-cap connection, resulting in lower service load deflections while at the same time reducing the strains to allowable limits in the Level 2 earthquake.

References

Marine Oil Terminal Engineering and Maintenance Standards, MOTEMS, (2002), by California State Lands Commission, Marine Facilities Division

Technical Report, TR-2069-SHR (1997), Design Criteria for Earthquake Hazard Mitigation of Navy Piers and Wharves, J.M. Ferritto, Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center, Port Hueneme, CA 93043

Technical Report, TR-2103-SHR (1999), Seismic Criteria for California Marine Oil Terminals, John Ferritto, Stephen Dickenson, Nigel Priestley, Stuart Werner, and Craig Taylor, Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center, Shore Facilities Department, Structures Division, Port Hueneme, CA 93043