# A STUDY ON NATURAL FREQUENCY OF OFFSHORE WIND TURBINE IN A LAYERED SOIL

Prof. Neenu Maria Jose<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Alice Mathai<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Dept. of Civil Engineering, Mar Athanasius College of Engineering, Kothamangalam, Kerala, India

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Dept.of Civil Engineering, Mar Athanasius College of Engineering, Kothamangalam, Kerala, India\_\_\_\_\_\_\*\*\*\_\_\_\_\_\_\*\*\*

Abstract - A Modal Analysis using Finite Element Method is<br/>performed to evaluate natural frequency of monopile and<br/>tower of Offshore Wind Turbine (OWT) in medium dense sand.<br/>In this study monopile, tower and soil modeled as 3 Dimension<br/>solid model in ANSYS workbench. Soil modeled as layers with<br/>different depth and material properties in each layer. An<br/>explicit dynamic analysis is conducted, considering soil as an<br/>explicit material with environmental loads like wind and wave<br/>hee<br/>loads on turbine as static loads. From the analysis it is<br/>concluded that the natural frequency of the offshore wind<br/>[2]2.

*Key Words*: Monopile, turbine tower, soil pile interaction, explicit dynamic analysis, natural frequency, Modal analysis

# **1. INTRODUCTION**

Wind energy are more abundant and of better quality at offshore as compared to onshore. Wind conditions at offshore sites are stronger and more stable and soil condition is sandy and silty in nature. Design and construction of foundations for offshore turbines are very challenging because of the harsh environmental conditions [1]. Most of the Offshore Wind Turbine (OWT) founded on monopile due to their simplicity in installation and construction. This type of foundation is opted when water depth ranges from 10 m to 30 m.

For monopile the lateral loads like wind and wave loads acting on turbine tower and the overturning moment due to these loads are resisted by horizontal soil reactions on monopile. Alternate degradation and stiffening of soil will be more due to dynamic and cyclic loading, which may affect soil stiffness [1]. This may leads to permanent deformation of tower and monopile and wind turbine cannot tolerate more than 0.5 degree tilt.

Offshore wind turbines supported on monopile foundations are dynamically sensitive because the overall natural frequencies of these structures are close to the forcing frequencies imposed upon them due to lateral loads [1]. Change of soil stiffness due to dynamic loading leads to changes in the natural frequency of the system, this may cause unplanned system resonances and excessive cyclic displacements. Hence a modal analysis of tower and monopile of OWT is taken under consideration [1].

#### 2. SITE AND SOIL CHARACTERISTICS

A location at Rameswaram, Tamil Nadu has been selected based on environmental data obtained. All the wind data, wave data and soil data were obtained from National Institute of Ocean Technology (NIOT) Chennai [2]. The actual water depth of the selected location is approximately 10 m, hence monopile foundation is selected. The Basic wind and wave data depend on the site conditions is collected by NIOT [2]. The soil condition for the selected location is obtained from NIOT, Chennai [2]. Soil material properties depend upon soil type and soil depth shown in Table 1 [2].

| Table -1: | Soil | Characteristics |
|-----------|------|-----------------|
|-----------|------|-----------------|

| Soil description                                       | Depth(m)  | Internal<br>friction( <sup>0</sup> ) |
|--|-----------|--------------------------------------|
| Grey fine sand   | 0 – 3     | 32-33                                |
| Grey silty fine sand                                   | 3- 7.5    | 33-39                                |
| Grey silty clay with<br>calcareous sand stone          | 7.5-10.5  | 33-34                                |
| Crushed pieces of rock<br>and calcareous sand<br>stone | 10.5-12   | 34-44                                |
| Silty fine sand  | 12-13.5   | 31-44                                |
| Fine sand with white color small stone                 | 13.5-16.5 | 31-41                                |
| Fine silty sand  | 16.5-30   | 34-42                                |

# 3. TURBINE TOWER AND MONOPILE CHARACTERISTICS

Steel turbine tower with height 80 m and diameter 4.5 m is selected as per NIOT Chennai [2]. Steel monopile diameter ranges from 4 to 6 m and corresponding embedded length ranges from 7D to 8D [2].

## 4. LATERAL LOADS ON MONOPILE

## 4.1 Wave Load

For slender structures, Morison's equation can be applied to calculate the wave loads [3], [4], [5], [6], [7] which is the sum of drag and inertia forces shown in equation (1).

IRJET Volume: 05 Issue: 05 | May-2018

www.irjet.net

Wave force = Drag force + inertia force

 $F = C_D \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \rho \cdot D \cdot |U| \cdot U + \rho \cdot C_I \cdot \pi D^2 / 4 \cdot a_x$ (1)

C<sub>D</sub> = Drag coefficient

 $\rho$  = mass density of sea water

D = projected area normal to cylinder axis/unit length

C<sub>I</sub> = inertia coefficient for smooth circular cylinder

U = component of velocity vector of water due to wave normal to axis of the member in m/s

|U| = absolute value of U in m/s

#### 4.2 Wind Load

Wind load on turbine blades is shown in equation (2).

 $F_{b} = 0.5 \ \rho_{a}. R_{T}^{2}.V^{2}.C_{T}.(\lambda_{S})$ (2)

 $F_b$  = the wind load acting on the hub in N

V = the wind speed at the hub height in m/s

 $R_T$  = the rotor radius in m

 $\rho_a$  = the air density

C<sub>T</sub> = force coefficient depend on shape of structure

 $C_T(\lambda_S)$  = is the thrust coefficient which is a function of the tip speed ratio ( $\lambda_S$ )

# **5. SOIL MONOPILE INTERACTION**

Monopile under lateral external loading the response of soil is described in terms of p - y curve which relates the soil resistance to the pile deformation at various depths below the ground surfaces. These curves are Non-linear in nature and depend on several parameters, including depth and soil material properties [6]. For different soil material properties and soil depth the p-y curve vary shown in Figure 1 based on the equation below (3),(4),(5).

Ultimate bearing capacity;

 $P_{us} = [C_1 . H + C_2 . D] . \gamma. H$ (3)

 $P_{ud} = C_3 \cdot D \cdot \gamma \cdot H$ 

where,

 $P_u$  = ultimate resistance (kN/m)

 $\gamma$ = effective soil weight (KN/m<sup>3</sup>)

H = depth(m)

 $\phi$ = angle of internal friction of sand

D = average pile diameter from surface to depth (m)

Soil resistance;

 $P = A \cdot P_u \cdot \tan h[\{(k \cdot H)/(A \cdot P_u)\}.y]$ 

A = factor to account for cyclic or static loading condition.

 $P_u$  = ultimate bearing capacity at depth H (kN/m)

(4)

(5)

y = lateral deflection (m)

H = soil depth (m)

p-y curve at different soil depth is shown in Chart 1 below.



**Chart -1:** p-y curve at different soil depth

# 6. FINITE ELELMENT MODELLING IN ANSYS WORKBENCH

A 3 dimension finite element model of tower, monopile and surrounding soil is modeled in Ansys. Soil modeled as layers of different depth and different material properties like modulus of elasticity, poisons ratio and density. Modulus of elasticity is increases with increase in depth. Structural steel material property is assigned to both tower and monopile. Soil is behaved as nature of a non-linear inelastic material hence soil is modeled as Drucker-Prager model. Soil is modeled as a rectangular solid cube of 20 m around the pile. A fixed boundary condition is provided at the bottom of soil solid cube and at the lateral sides of soil solid cube, soil free to move in the corresponding direction. Contact friction is provided at pile-soil interface [8]. Soil is modeled as an explicit material, since soil behavior is elasto plastic in nature. All the dynamic loads wind loads, wave loads are applied as static load in the model shown in Fig 1.





Embedment length depends upon soil properties and for sand soil it lies between 7D-8D is the safe limit where D is the diameter of pile [9]. Various pile diameter and corresponding embedded length is shown in Table 2.

Table -2: Various pile diameter and pile embedded length

| Diameter of<br>pile (d) (m) | Embedded length<br>of pile (l) (m) | l/d ratio |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| 4.2                         | 30                                 |           |
| 4.5                         | 32.14                              | 7.14      |
| 5                           | 35.7                               |           |
| 5.3                         | 37.84                              |           |

#### 7. MODAL ANALYSIS

The first natural frequency of the foundation structure is a very important parameter as it determines the dynamic behaviour of the offshore wind turbine [10]. If the frequency of excitation is near the natural frequency, resonance occurs and it will lead to higher stresses in the monopile structures [10].

As the offshore wind turbine rotates, creating vibrations to which the offshore wind turbine is sensitive due to the reason that it is a slender structure. When a three bladed rotor encounters a turbulent eddy it resists peak forces at frequencies of 1P and 3P, where P is the blade passing frequency [11]. For a typical variable speed turbine, the blade passing frequency is in between an approximate range of 0.15 Hz and 0.3 Hz, and rotation frequency, which is between about 0.44 Hz and 0.92 Hz [11]. The cyclic loading from sea waves typically occurs at a frequency between 0.04 Hz and 0.29 Hz [11].

Therefore, to avoid resonance, the offshore wind turbine (turbine, tower, monopile) have to be designed with a natural frequency that is different from the forced frequencies like blade passing frequency, rotor frequencies and wave frequencies. Forced frequencies on offshore wind turbine are shown in the Fig 2.



Fig -2: Forced frequencies on offshore wind turbine

#### 8. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

From Fig 3 to Fig 8 shows the  $1^{st}$  to  $6^{th}$  frequencies and the mode shape of vibration of the model and are tabulated in Table 3.



Fig -3: Natural frequency - mode shapes 1



Fig -4: Natural frequency - mode shapes 2



Fig - 5: Natural frequency - mode shapes 3



Fig -6: Natural frequency - mode shapes 4



Fig -7: Natural frequency - mode shapes 5



**Fig -8:** Natural frequency – mode shapes 6

© 2018, IRJET | Impact Factor value: 6.171 | ISO 9001:2008 Certified Journal

 Table -3: Natural Frequency for 6 mode shapes

| Mode No: | Natural Frequency (Hz) |
|----------|------------------------|
| 1        | 1.1958                 |
| 2        | 1.21                   |
| 3        | 2.7013                 |
| 4        | 2.873                  |
| 5        | 2.884                  |
| 6        | 3.267                  |

From the modal analysis in Ansys the calculated natural frequencies are far away from frequency of excitations. Hence all the mode shapes are in the acceptance level. As explained above,  $1^{st}$  mode shape of vibration is the fundamental mode, since about 80% of acceptance belongs to  $1^{st}$  mode shape.

## 9. CONCLUSIONS

From the free vibration analysis, natural frequencies obtained at various initial modes are far away from forcing frequencies like rotor frequency, blade passing frequency, wind-wave frequency. Thus all mode shapes are in acceptance level and there is no other chance of resonance. 80% of acceptance belongs to first natural frequency and it is the fundamental mode. The fundamental mode is in acceptance level and there is no chance of resonance.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The work was supported by Department of Civil Engineering, Mar Athanasius College of Engineering, Kothamangalam. The source of support from second author is greatly appreciable. Authors are thankful to the reviewers for their critical comments which have been helpful to complete the work.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Domenico Lombardi, Subhamoy Bhattacharya and David Muir Wood, "Dynamic soil–structure interaction of monopile supported wind turbines in cohesive soil", Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, vol. 49, Jan. 2013, pp 165–180.
- [2] Dr. M.V.Ramana Murthy and Dr. M.A.Atmanand, "Feasibility Studies on Offshore Wind Development in India", National Institute of Ocean Technology, Ministry of Earth Sciences, Chennai.
- [3] Swagata Bisoi and Sumanta Haldar, "Dynamic analysis of offshore wind turbine in clay considering soilmonopile-tower interaction", Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, vol. 63, 2014, pp. 19–35.

IRIET Volume: 05 Issue: 05 | May-2018

www.irjet.net

- [4] Robert G. Dean and Robert A. Dalrymple, "Wave Water Mechanics for Engineers and Scientist", Advanced Series of Ocean Engineering, Vol. 2, World Scientific Publication.
- [5] Robert M. Sorensen, "Basic Costal Engineering", AWiley – Inter science Publication.
- [6] American Petroleum Institute, Recommended Practice for Planning, Designing and Constructing Fixed Offshore Platforms – working Stress Design, API recommended practice 2A-WSD (RP2AWSD), 21<sup>st</sup> edition, Dec. 2000.
- [7] Thomas H Dawson, "Offshore Structural Engineering", second edition, Prentice Hall Publication, 1990.
- [8] Neenu Maria Jose and Alice Mathai, "A study on Lateral Displacement of Monopile of Offshore Wind Turbine in a Layered Soil", International Journal of Engineering Research and science & Technology, Vol. 3, April 2016, No. 1, pp. 105-110.
- [9] M. Damgaard, M. Bayat, L.V. Andersen, L.B. Ibsen, "Assessment of the dynamic behaviour of saturated soil subjected to cyclic loading from offshore monopile wind turbine foundations", Computers and Geotechnics, vol. 61, June 2014, pp. 116–126.
- [10] W.E. de Vries and V.D. Krolis, "Effects of Deep Water on Monopile Support Structures for Offshore Wind Turbines Duwind", Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Delft University of Technology Stevinweg 1, 2628 CN Delft, The Netherlands.
- [11] Sanjeev Malhotra, "Selection, Design and Construction of Offshore Wind Turbine Foundations", PE, GE Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. United States of America.