Failure Mechanism and Bearing Capacity of Footings Buried at Various Depths in Spatially Random Soil

Jinhui Li

Lecturer

Centre for Offshore Foundation Systems, The UWA Oceans Institute and ARC CoE for Geotechnical
Science and Engineering

35 Stirling Highway, Crawley

Perth, WA 6009, Australia

Tel: +61 8 6488 2782 Fax: +61 8 6488 1044

Email: lisa.li@uwa.edu.au

Yinghui Tian (corresponding author)

Research Assistant Professor

Centre for Offshore Foundation Systems, The UWA Oceans Institute and ARC CoE for Geotechnical
Science and Engineering

35 Stirling Highway, Crawley

Perth, WA 6009, Australia

Tel: +61 8 6488 7076 Fax: +61 8 6488 1044

Email: yinghui.tian@uwa.edu.au

Mark Jason Cassidy

ARC Laureate Fellow

Lloyd's Register Foundation Chair of Offshore Foundations

Centre for Offshore Foundation Systems, The UWA Oceans Institute and ARC CoE for Geotechnical
Science and Engineering

University of Western Australia

35 Stirling Highway, Crawley

Perth, WA 6009, Australia

Tel: +61 8 6488 3732 Fax: +61 8 6488 1044

Email: mark.cassidy@uwa.edu.au

Submitted as a Technical Paper

Words: 3997 (excluding references and acknowledgement)

Figures: 11

Tables: 3

Failure Mechanism and Bearing Capacity of Footings Buried at Various Depths in Spatially Random Soil

Abstract:

The objective of this paper is to demonstrate how the spatial variability of random soil affects the failure mechanism and the ultimate bearing capacity of foundations buried at various depths. A non-linear finite element analysis combined with random field theory is employed to explore the vertical capacity of foundations embedded at different depths in random soil. Different possibilities of shear failures resulting from spatial patterns of soil are demonstrated and used to explain the significant discrepancy between the bearing capacity of the random soil and that of uniform soil. The effect of the spatial pattern of the soil on the development of shear planes is also investigated, with the coefficients of variation for the bearing capacity demonstrated to be closely related to the shear plane length. Results of the statistical variation in the bearing capacity are provided for different embedment depth and these are also reported as the failure probability of the footing against using the established uniform soil bearing capacity. Safety factors are proposed for foundations at different levels of failure probability. This study provides a thorough understanding of the failure mechanisms of footings in random soil, especially where structures can penetrate deeply into soil.

CE Database subject headings:

Load bearing capacity; Probability; Footings; Monte Carlo method; Clays.

Author keywords:

Bearing capacity; Random field; Failure mechanism; Buried foundation; Statistical analysis; Cohesive soil; Offshore engineering.

69 **Introduction**

70 The vertical bearing capacity of a shallow foundation is a classical geotechnical problem. When a foundation is buried
71 deeply in soil, its failure mode differs markedly from the surface footing and is characterized by a mechanism where soil
72 is free to flow around from under the footing to the top. In this case, the failure mechanism no longer extends to the soil
73 surface, as happens for a shallow foundation, and becomes fully localized around the foundation (O'Neill et al. 2003). The
74 mechanism of soil failure transforms from a general shear failure for a surface footing (Craig 2004) to a localized failure
75 for a buried footing (Hu et al. 1999; Wang and Carter 2002; Hossain and Randolph 2009, 2010; Zhang et al. 2011, 2012,
76 2014), with the ultimate bearing capacity for a deeply buried foundation demonstrated to be considerably larger than that
77 of a shallow foundation (e.g., Merifield et al. 2001, Zhang et al., 2012). One example, where understanding of the change
78 in bearing capacity at different embedment is required, is the offshore application of spudcan foundations. These large
79 footings of mobile drilling platforms regularly penetrate and bury into the seabed to depths of three diameters (Endley et
80 al. 1981; Menzies and Roper 2008; Menzies and Lopez 2011).

81 The majority of the previous studies on the bearing capacity problem of buried footings have been limited to
82 homogeneous soil or uniform soil of strength increasing linearly with depth. These have shown that, in uniform soil, a
83 symmetrical logarithmic spiral failure plane for a surface footing and a symmetrical rotational scoop mechanism for a
84 fully buried foundation are optimal (Merifield et al. 2001; Craig 2004). However, under more realistic conditions, soil
85 properties spatially vary due to a combination of geologic, environmental and physical-chemical factors. This spatial
86 variation of soil results in the reduction of the bearing capacity because the failure plane becomes asymmetric and tends to
87 follow the weakest path (e.g., Fenton and Griffiths 2003; Popescu et al. 2005; Cho and Park 2010). The influence of soil
88 spatial variation has been also found in slopes by developing different (shallow or deep) failure planes (Huang et al.
89 2013).

90 The bearing capacity of a footing can be overestimated without accounting for the inherent random heterogeneity of
91 soil. Research on the bearing capacity of a surface footing on spatially varying soil has been conducted over the past three
92 decades (e.g. Griffiths and Fenton 2001; Popescu et al. 2005; Kassama and Whittle 2011; Al-Bittar and Soubra 2013).

Nobahar and Popescu (2000) and Griffiths et al. (2002) observed that the mean bearing capacity can decrease by 20-30% for random soil compared with the corresponding bearing capacity of homogeneous soil with the same mean soil properties. Cassidy et al. (2013) observed that the mean bearing capacity for pure vertical, horizontal and moment loads decreased with increasing variability of soil strength. The results of such probabilistic studies quantify the bearing capacity reduction. However, few studies have revealed how the spatial variability of random soil affects the failure mechanism and such the bearing capacity. To the authors' knowledge there are no studies on the change in bearing capacity factor for buried footings in spatially random soil.

The objective of this research is to investigate the failure mechanisms and the bearing capacity for footings buried at various depths in random soil. A non-linear finite element analysis combined with a Monte Carlo simulation is employed to achieve the objective. The statistical properties of the bearing capacity are investigated and re-interpreted according to the corresponding failure mechanisms. Finally, the factors of safety at different levels of failure probabilities are proposed. This research provides an improved understanding of the failure mechanisms of buried footings in random soil.

Methodology

Probabilistic Characteristics of Spatially Random Soil

All soil properties in situ can vary vertically and horizontally. The spatial variation can be characterized by a trend, which describes the mean value, and a residual variation, which reflects the variability about the trend. The residuals off the trend are statistically correlated to one another in the space and are often a function of their separation distance. The correlation of residuals at two locations separated by distance δ is called the autocorrelation function. The integral of autocorrelation function results in the scale of fluctuation. The correlation for the properties at two locations within the scale of fluctuation is strong. Details on the physical meaning and characterization of these parameters can be referred to Phoon and Kulhawy (1999) and Baecher and Christian (2003). In this study, the randomness of the undrained shear strength s_u is considered and modeled as a log-normally distributed random field with a mean value μ_s , standard deviation σ_s , and scale of fluctuation θ_s . The Young's modulus E is also a random field, as it is perfectly correlated to the undrained shear

117 strength s_u with a ratio $E/s_u=500$ (Hu and Randolph 1998).

118 The statistical properties of the undrained shear strength are presented in Table 1. While the mean and standard
119 deviation are familiar concepts to most engineers, the scale of fluctuation requires more examination. Phoon and Kulhawy
120 (1999) conducted an extensive literature review and observed that the horizontal scale of fluctuation θ_h is on the order of
121 40-60 m (with a mean value from the reported literature of 50.7 m). The vertical scale of fluctuation θ_v is in the range of
122 2-6 m (with a mean value of 3.8 m). In this study, a square exponential model (Baecher and Christian 2003) is used to
123 describe the auto-correlation of the undrained shear strength. The scale of fluctuation values is taken as 50.7 m and 3.8 m
124 in the horizontal and vertical directions, respectively. The coefficient of variation of the undrained shear strength (i.e.,
125 σ_s/μ_s) is assumed to be 0.3 in the following simulations as it is reported in the range of 0-0.5 (Uzielli et al. 2005). Random
126 fields of undrained shear strength s_u have been generated using the local average subdivision algorithm (Fenton and
127 Vanmarcke 1990).

128

129 ***Random Finite Element Modeling***

130 The two-dimensional plane strain condition has been simulated using the non-linear finite element software ABAQUS
131 (Dassault Systèmes 2010). A footing (with width of B and height of h) embedded in a soil of depth D is illustrated in Fig.
132 1. The soil is modeled with a linear-elastic perfectly-plastic constitutive law. The elastic response is defined by the
133 Young's modulus and the Poisson's ratio. The Poisson's ratio is set as 0.49 to model the undrained conditions of no
134 volume change as well as to ensure numerical stability (Taiebat and Carter 2000). Soil failure is defined according to the
135 Tresca criterion, with the maximum shear stress in any plane limited to the undrained shear strength (s_u).

136 The foundation width B is 20 m, and the height h 4 m. These dimensions are typical values for a spudcan foundation
137 today (Cassidy et al. 2009). The embedment depth, D , is taken as 0, 0.5B, 1B, 2B, 3B and 4B, respectively. For a
138 foundation deeper than 4B its failure is contained in a localized area around the foundation which is not influenced by the
139 embedment depth any more (Rowe and Davis 1982; Randolph et al. 2004; Zhang et al. 2011). The foundation is
140 considered to be rigid and "wished-in-place". The soil-foundation interface is fully 'bonded', which is reasonable to

141 represent undrained soil behavior (Gourvenec and Randolph 2003). In the numerical modeling, the foundation is
142 displaced at the foundation reference point in the vertical direction until a failure load is attained.

143 The soil domain has a width of $6.4B$ and a height of $6B$, which is large enough to ensure there are no obvious
144 boundary effects. The soil domain is discretized into many zones onto which the random field is to be mapped. Hence, the
145 zone size has to be carefully examined to avoid excessive spatial averaging in the finite element modeling. Ching and
146 Phoon (2013) have investigated the effect of zone sizes and observed that the zone size should be 0.13-0.18 times the scale
147 of fluctuation when the squared exponential auto-correlation is adopted. In this case the zone sizes are set to be 2.0 m in
148 the horizontal direction and 0.5 m in the vertical direction, which can assure both a prescribed accuracy and an acceptable
149 computational time. The soil properties vary from zone to zone to reflect the spatial variability of the soil. For the majority
150 of the soil domain, a zone is represented by one finite element. However, in a region of size $3B$ by $2B$ close to the strip
151 footing (as bounded by the bold lines in Fig. 1), a zone is further discretized into four finite elements of 0.5×0.5 m. These
152 smaller elements, each with the same material properties, have been proved to be helpful in improving the numerical
153 accuracy of the simulation (Cassidy et al. 2013).

154

155 **Monte Carlo Simulation**

156 For each foundation at a specific embedment depth, Monte Carlo simulations have been performed for n realizations of
157 the soil random field and the subsequent finite element simulations of the bearing capacity. The error in the estimate of the
158 mean shear strength decreases as the number of simulations n increases. The number of simulations n that estimate the
159 mean shear strength to within an error of e with confidence $(1-\alpha)$ is (Fenton and Griffiths 2008)

$$160 \quad n \approx \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2} \sigma_s}{e} \right)^2 \quad (1)$$

161 where $z_{\alpha/2}$ is the value of the standard normal variant with a cumulative probability level $(1-\alpha/2)$. If a maximum error e of
162 $0.1\sigma_s$ is allowed on the mean value (i.e., maximum error of 3% on the mean value) of the shear strength with confidence
163 of 95%, the required number of simulations is 385. In this study, 400 simulations have been performed for each
164 foundation at a specific embedment depth. Each realization, with the same statistical properties, can lead to a quite

different spatial pattern of the shear strength in the soil. This spatial variation can, in turn, result in various failure mechanisms and bearing capacities of the foundations.

Results and Discussion

The computed bearing capacity factor for each realization, N_{ci} , can be calculated using

$$N_{ci} = \frac{q_{fi}}{\mu_s} \quad (2)$$

where q_{fi} is the bearing capacity computed for the i th realization. The mean value of the undrained shear strength μ_s is maintained at a constant value of 10 kPa, which is the undrained shear strength of the uniform soil in the deterministic analysis.

For each analysis, the bearing capacity increases with increasing applied displacement until plateauing at the failure value (which tended to be at a displacement around 6% of the footing width). The relationship between the bearing capacity factor and the normalized displacement for a surface footing is demonstrated in Fig. 2a. The 400 realization results from the Monte Carlo simulation are compared with both the corresponding deterministic analysis consisting of uniform soil and the closed form solution (e.g., Prandtl's solution). The bearing capacity factor for the deterministic finite element analysis using uniform soil strength is 5.23, which is 1.7% higher than the Prandtl solution of 5.14. The reason for this small difference is due to the mesh used, which is to balance the computation time (15 min for each buried foundation case) and accuracy. The mean value, cumulative distribution and probability distribution for the 400 realizations are showed in Fig. 2b. A majority of the bearing capacity factors obtained from the Monte Carlo simulations are smaller than that of the deterministic case using uniform soil. This trend indicates the spatial variability of a soil is prone to decrease the bearing capacity of a foundation, a result consistent with the research performed by, amongst others, Griffiths and Fenton (2001) and Kasama and Whittle (2011). The following sections will closely inspect the failure mechanisms of a footing in random soil.

Failure Mechanism of Foundations in Random Soil

The manner in which the failure plane is formed is discussed in this section. Fig. 3 shows a failure plane development of a

189 particular realization of the random field, where the blue regions indicate weaker soil and the red regions indicate stronger
190 soil. The shear strain contours (i.e., the regions in gray color) at different normalized displacements are superimposed on
191 the random field. At the initial stage (as shown in Fig. 3a), the largest strain appears at the two bottom corners of the
192 foundation. Then, the shear plane develops downwards until a weak layer of soil beneath the foundation is encountered
193 (as depicted in Figs. 3b &c). The shear plane develops further along the weak soil layer and is then restricted by an
194 overlying stronger layer (see path I in Fig. 3d). In addition, a relatively large shear strain in a weak soil layer at a smaller
195 depth emerges (see path II in Fig. 3d). The shear plane extends further along path II through a relatively weak soil region
196 and touches the soil surface. Finally, a complete failure plane forms accompanied by several other shear planes in weaker
197 soil. The failure plane for the uniform soil is also superimposed in Fig. 3f, which is the Prandtl failure mechanism.
198 Compared with the uniform case, the shear plane of this random soil is deeper and mobilized more volume of soil, and in
199 turn, led to a greater ultimate bearing capacity (6.34). It is interesting that shear planes in random soil can develop several
200 paths in weak soil instead of a single shear path in the deterministic analysis. The failure plane seems tend to find a shear
201 path that costs the least energy to extend from the corner of the foundation to the soil surface. Therefore, not only the
202 weakest soil but also their distribution within spatial pattern of the random soil will determine the failure plane and thus
203 the bearing capacity.

204 Fig. 4 illustrates the development of the shear strain for a buried foundation of 3B depth in a realization of random
205 soil. The largest strains first occur in the weakest soil surrounding the foundation. The shear plane is then developed from
206 the regions with the largest strains in a circular manner to form a back-flow mechanism, where soil flows back over the
207 upper surface of the foundation. The failure plane finally passes through a strong soil region to form a localized failure
208 instead of strictly following the weakest soil path. The failure plane for this footing in uniform soil is also superimposed in
209 Fig. 4d, which exhibits a symmetrical pattern.

210 The shear plane of different realizations can be markedly different from one another due to different spatial patterns
211 of random soil. In uniform soil, the shear plane is symmetrical for surface footing (as observed in Fig. 5a). In random soil,
212 Figs. 5b-f selectively show the failure planes for the surface footings with bearing capacity factors of 2.85, 3.94, 4.98, 5.93

213 and 6.34, which covers the full range of bearing capacities. Fig. 5b demonstrates that the failure plane is restricted to a
214 shallow and narrow area, which mobilizes a small area of soil and leads to a small resistance of the soil and thus a small
215 bearing capacity factor of 2.85. As the failure plane becomes deeper, with more soil mobilized, the bearing capacity factor
216 increases, as demonstrated in Figs. 5c-5f. Fig. 5e shows a comparable failure plane to that in Fig. 5d, while the bearing
217 capacity factor is 16% larger than that of Fig. 5d. A close examination reveals that the shear strength of the soil along the
218 shear plane in Fig. 5e is generally larger than that in Fig. 5d. Therefore, both the size of the shear plane and the soil
219 strength along the shear plane, with both of them depending on the spatial pattern of the random field, determines the
220 bearing capacity.

221 The failure planes of the embedded foundation at 3B depth are selected to show different realizations with bearing
222 capacity factors from 8.87 to 12.23 (see Figs. 6b-f). The failure plane for the footing in uniform soil is also shown in Fig.
223 6a as a comparison. Generally, the bearing capacity increases upon enlarging the shear plane. The shear plane in random
224 soil exhibits an unsymmetrical characteristic which is different from the uniform soil case. Interestingly, the figure
225 suggests that more than one failure plane may be formed, which is different from the common assumption of one failure
226 plane in previous studies (e.g., Fenton and Griffiths 2003). The shear plane in Fig. 6e is larger than that in Fig. 6a, while
227 the bearing capacity factor of the former (i.e., 11.46) is smaller than that of the latter (i.e., 11.86). The reason lies in that
228 the shear plane follows the weakest path in random soil, which has smaller shear strengths along the shear plane than
229 uniform soil.

230 The failure plane in Fig. 6f appears to be quite close to the boundary of the soil. Hence, a simulation with a larger
231 boundary (i.e., 12.8B x 6B) has been performed to investigate the boundary effect. The shear plane for this simulation is
232 shown in Fig. 7, which is similar to that in Fig. 6f. The bearing capacity for this analysis is 12.40, which is only 1% larger
233 than that of Fig. 6f. From this, the boundary size used in the simulations (especially in Fig. 6f) is therefore considered
234 appropriate.

235
236 ***Bearing Capacity Results for Foundations at Different Embedment Depths***

Based on a Monte Carlo simulation for each foundation at a specific embedment depth, the computed bearing capacity factors from Eq. (2) are plotted in the form of histogram, as presented in Fig. 8. A normal distribution is used to fit the histogram (Fig. 8). A Chi-square goodness-of-fit test (Ang and Tang 2007) is performed to verify the assumed normal distribution. Table 2 summarizes the mean value and χ^2 statistics for the foundations at six different depths. The χ^2 value is in the range of 11-37, which indicates an acceptable probability distribution in most cases (Ang and Tang 2007). This normal distribution of the bearing capacity factor has been also reported for a surface footing by Kasama and Whittle (2011).

The average bearing capacity factors are 4.71, 6.71, 7.59, 9.90, 10.84 and 11.25 for the foundations embedded at depths of 0, 0.5B, 1B, 2B, 3B and 4B, respectively (see Fig. 9a). The average bearing capacity factors increase with increasing embedment depth due to the transition of a general failure at a shallow depth to a full-flow failure at a deep depth. The standard deviations of the bearing capacity factors are spread in a narrow range of 0.47-0.74 for the foundations at different depths. The coefficient of variation of the bearing capacity factor are 0.119, 0.075, 0.062, 0.050, 0.055 and 0.060 for the foundations buried at depths of 0, 0.5B, 1B, 2B, 3B and 4B, respectively. The magnitude of coefficient of variation (COV) is closely related to the volume of soil mobilized and again to the length of the shear plane, L . The shear plane is characterized by the elements with the largest shear strain. The summation of the length values of the elements with the largest shear strain will give the length of the shear plane. The length of shear plane for a foundation buried at a certain depth in a random soil is shown to have the same order as in a uniform soil. The length of the shear plane in uniform soil is then investigated and normalized by the foundation width. The change of the shear plane length ratio, L/B , with the embedment depths is also plotted in Fig. 9b. The results indicate that when the shear plane length is larger, the COV is smaller. The reason for this finding is that a larger shear plane will pass through more soil elements, which results in a larger spatial averaging of the random soil and a smaller COV. The COV can significantly affect the failure probability and, in turn, the factor of safety of a foundation, as discussed in the following section.

Probability of Failure for Foundations at Different Embedment Depths

261 The failure of a foundation can be defined by the ultimate bearing capacity or the displacement (Rowe and Davis 1982). In
 262 this paper, we focus on the bearing capacity. According to Griffiths and Fenton (2001) the failure can be defined as the
 263 bearing capacities of the foundation being less than the corresponding deterministic values based on the uniform soil
 264 strength. The failure can then be defined as the normalized bearing capacity factor of a foundation, $N_c/N_{c,det}$, which is less
 265 than 1. The probability of failure can be easily determined from the cumulative probabilities of the normalized bearing
 266 capacity for the foundations (as illustrated in Fig. 10). The failure probabilities are 82.3%, 87.3%, 91.7%, 95.3%, 95.5%
 267 and 93.3% for the foundations buried at 0, 0.5B, 1B, 2B, 3B and 4B depths, respectively. The results demonstrate that the
 268 deeply embedded foundation generally has a larger probability of failure.

269 The probability of failure is extremely large when the ultimate bearing capacity obtained from the uniform soil case
 270 is used to define the failure criteria. In reality, the allowable load is often obtained by applying a factor of safety, FS . The
 271 probability that the bearing capacity is less than a targeted level of applied load can be determined by considering the
 272 factor of safety. The probability of failure can be defined as the bearing capacity being less than the nominated load (i.e.,
 273 $N_{c,det}/FS$). For a normally distributed bearing capacity factor, the probability of failure can then be calculated using

$$274 \quad p(N_c < N_{c,det}/FS) = \Phi\left(\frac{(N_{c,det}/FS) - \mu_{N_c}}{\sigma_{N_c}}\right) \quad (3)$$

275 where Φ is the cumulative normal function, μ_{N_c} and σ_{N_c} are the mean value and standard deviation of the bearing capacity
 276 factor N_c , and $N_{c,det}$ is the ultimate bearing capacity factor of the deterministic analysis based on uniform soil.

277 The probabilities of failure for the foundations at different factors of safety can be calculated using Eq. (3) with the
 278 parameters in Table 2. When the factor of safety is 1.2, the failure probabilities are 26.5%, 9.9%, 6.2%, 2.9%, 5.5% and
 279 9.9% for the foundations embedded at 0, 0.5B, 1B, 2B, 3B and 4B depths, respectively (as indicated in Fig. 11). A
 280 relatively larger probability of failure for the foundation buried at the 4B depth results from the relatively larger COV of
 281 the bearing capacity factor. As the target probabilities for bearing failure are generally in the range of 10^{-2} to 10^{-3} , a factor
 282 of safety of 1.2 would be not acceptable for design. The probability of failure decreases markedly with an increasing
 283 safety factor. For the surface footing, the failure probability decreases from 82.3% to 1.4% when the factor of safety
 284 increases from 1.0 to 1.5. For a foundation buried at deeper depth, the failure probabilities are all smaller than 10^{-4} when

the safety factor reaches 1.5. The failure probability is essentially reduced to nearly zero by increasing the factor of safety to 2.0 for all of the foundations. Table 3 summarizes the factor of safety for foundations at different depths which predicts failure probabilities of 10^{-2} , 10^{-3} , and 10^{-4} . The partial safety factor that accounts for the uncertainty in shear strength for buried anchors specified by DNV (2012) is 1.3. This factor of safety indicates a failure probability of 0.1%, which is at a reasonable level. Note that the failure of probability is also dependent on the degree of variation and the scale of fluctuation of the random soil, which requires further study.

291

292 **Summary and Conclusions**

293 This paper has demonstrated how the spatial pattern of random soil dominates the development of a failure plane and the
294 ultimate bearing capacity for foundations buried at different depths. Different possibilities of shear planes resulting from
295 different spatial patterns of soil are demonstrated, which can explain the significant discrepancy between the bearing
296 capacity of random soil and that of uniform soil. The following conclusions can be drawn:

297 (1) A shear plane commences at the weakest soil surrounding the foundation and extends along the weak soil path.
298 Several shear planes can be formed in random soil instead of a single shear path defined by the logarithmic spiral or
299 circular shape in uniform soil.

300 (2) Generally, the bearing capacity increases upon enlarging the shear planes, which are often unsymmetrical in random
301 soil. In addition, the shear strength values along the shear plane impose a significant effect on the bearing capacity.

302 (3) The average bearing capacity factors increase with an increasing embedment depth of the foundation due to the
303 transition of a general failure at shallow depth to a full-flow failure at deep depth. The coefficient of variation of the
304 bearing capacity factor, however, is closely related to the length of the shear plane.

305 (4) The probability of failure is larger for the foundations at deeper depths when not considering the factor of safety. The
306 probability of failure decreases markedly with an increasing safety factor for all of the foundations. The failure probability
307 is essentially reduced to nearly zero by increasing the factor of safety to 2.0 for all of the foundations at the given level of
308 variation, though different factors of safety for use defined probabilities of failure are provided (again, only relevant for

309 the spatial variation parameters calculated).

310

311 **Acknowledgments**

312 This research was undertaken with support from the Australia-China Natural Gas Technology Partnership Fund and
313 the Lloyd's Register Foundation. Lloyd's Register Foundation, a UK registered charity and sole shareholder of
314 Lloyd's Register Group Ltd, invests in science, engineering and technology for public benefit, worldwide. This
315 study comprises part of the activities of the Centre for Offshore Foundation Systems (COFS), currently supported as
316 a node of the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Geotechnical Science and Engineering.

317

318 **References**

- 319 Al-Bittar, T., and Soubra, A. H. (2013). "Bearing capacity of strip footings on spatially random soils using sparse
320 polynomial chaos expansion." *Int. J. Numer. Analyt. Meth. Geomech.*, 37(13), 2039-2060.
- 321 Ang, A. H. S., and Tang, W. H. (2007). *Probability concepts in engineering: emphasis on applications in civil and
322 environmental engineering*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- 323 Baecher, G. B., and Christian, J. T. (2003). *Reliability and Statistics in Geotechnical Engineering*. John Wiley &
324 Sons Ltd, England.
- 325 Cassidy, M. J., Uzielli, M., and Tian, Y. H. (2013). "Probabilistic combined loading failure envelopes of a strip
326 footing on spatially variable soil." *Comput. Geotech.*, 49, 191-205.
- 327 Cassidy, M. J., Quah, C. K., Foo, K. S. (2009). "Experimental investigation of the reinstallation of spudcan footing
328 close to existing footprints." *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, 135(4), 474-476.
- 329 Ching, J. Y., and Phoon, K. K. (2013). "Effect of element sizes in random field finite element simulations of soil
330 shear strength." *Comput. Struct.*, 126, 120-134.
- 331 Cho, S. E., and Park, H. C. (2010). "Effect of spatial variability of cross-correlated soil properties on bearing
332 capacity of strip footing." *Int. J. Numer. Analyt. Meth. Geomech.* 34(1), 1-26.
- 333 Craig, R. F. (2004). *Craig's soil mechanics*. Taylor & Francis, New York.

334 Dassault systèmes. (2010). *Abaqus analysis user's manual*. USA.

335 DNV. (2012). *Design and installation of fluke anchors*. Recommended practice DNV-RP-E301.

336 Endley, S. N., Rapoport, V., Thompson, P. J., and Baglioni, V. P. (1981). "Prediction of jack-up rig footing
337 penetration." *Proc. 13th Offshore Technology Conf.*, Houston, OTC 4144, 285-296.

338 Fenton, G. A., and Griffiths, D. V. (2003). "Bearing capacity prediction of spatially random c - ϕ soils." *Can.*
339 *Geotech. J.*, 40(1), 54-65.

340 Fenton, G. A., and Griffiths, D. V. (2008). *Risk Assessment in Geotechnical Engineering*, John Wiley & Sons,
341 Hoboken, NJ.

342 Fenton, G. A., and Vanmarcke, E. H. (1990). "Simulation of rand-fields via local average subdivision." *J. Eng.*
343 *Mech.*, 116(8), 1733-1749.

344 Griffiths, D. V., and Fenton, G. A. (2001). "Bearing capacity of spatially random soil: the undrained clay Prandtl
345 problem revisited." *Géotechnique*, 51(4), 351-359.

346 Griffiths, D. V., Fenton, G. A., and Manoharan, N. (2002). "Bearing capacity of rough rigid strip footing on cohesive
347 soil: Probabilistic study." *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, 128(9), 743-755.

348 Gourvenec, S., and Randolph, M. (2003). "Effect of strength non-homogeneity on the shape of failure envelopes for
349 combined loading of strip and circular foundations on clay." *Géotechnique*, 53(6), 575-586.

350 Hossain, M. S., and Randolph, M. F. (2009). "New mechanism-based design approach for spudcan foundations on
351 single layer clay." *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, 135(9), 1264-1274.

352 Hossain, M. S., and Randolph, M. F. (2010). "Deep-penetrating spudcan foundations on layered clays: centrifuge
353 tests." *Géotechnique*, 60(3), 157-170.

354 Hu, Y., and Randolph, M. F. (1998). "A practical numerical approach for large deformation problems in soil." *Int. J.*
355 *Numer. and Analytical Methods in Geomech.*, 22, 327-350.

356 Hu, Y., Randolph, M. F., and Watson, P. G. (1999). "Bearing response of skirted foundation on nonhomogeneous
357 soil." *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, 125(11), 924-935.

358 Huang, J., Lyamin, A.V., Griffiths, D.V., Krabbenhoft, K., and Sloan, S.W. (2013). "Quantitative risk assessment of
359 landslide by limit analysis and random fields." *Comput. Geotech.*, 53, 60-67.

360 Kasama, K., and Whittle, A. J. (2011). "Bearing capacity of spatially random cohesive soil using numerical limit
361 analyses." *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, 137(11), 989-996.

362 Menzies, D., and Lopez, C. R. (2011). "Four atypical jack-up rig foundation case histories." *13th International
363 Conference, The Jack up Platform*, London.

364 Menzies, D., and Roper, R. (2008). "Comparison of Jackup rig spudcan penetration methods in clay." *Proc. 40th
365 Offshore Technology Conference*, Houston, USA, OTC 19545.

366 Merifield, R. S., Sloan, S. W., and Yu, H. S. (2001). "Stability of plate anchors in undrained clay." *Géotechnique*,
367 51(2), 141-153.

368 Nobahar, A., and Popescu, R. (2000). "Spatial variability of soil properties – effects on foundation design." *Proc.
369 53rd Canadian Geotechnical Conference*, Montreal, Québec, 2, 1139-1144.

370 O'Neill, M. P., Bransby, M. F., and Randolph, M. F. (2003). "Drag anchor fluke-soil interaction in clays." *Can.
371 Geotech. J.*, 40, 78-94.

372 Phoon, K. K., and Kulhawy, F. H. (1999). "Characterization of geotechnical variability." *Can. Geotech. J.*, 36,
373 612-624.

374 Popescu, R., Deodatis, G., and Nobahar, A. (2005). "Effects of random heterogeneity of soil properties on bearing
375 capacity." *Probabilistic Eng. Mech.*, 20, 324-341.

376 Randolph, M. F., Jamiolkowski, M. B., and Zdravkovic, L. (2004). "Load carrying capacity of foundations." *377 Advances in Geotechnical Engineering: The Skempton Conference*, Thoms Telford, London. 207-240.

378 Rowe, R. K., and Davis E. H. (1982). "The behavior of anchor plates in clay." *Géotechnique*, 32(1), 9-23.

379 Taiebat, H. A., Carter, J. P. (2000). Numerical studies of the bearing capacity of shallow foundations on cohesive
380 soil subjected to combined loading. *Geotechnique*, 50(4):409–418.

381 Uzielli, M., Vannucchi, G., and Phoon, K. K. (2005). "Random field characterization of stress-normalised cone
382 penetration testing parameters." *Géotechnique*, 55(1), 3-20.

383 Wang, C. X., and Carter, J. P. (2002). "Deep penetration of strip and circular footings into layered clays." *Int. J.*
384 *Geomech.*, 2(2), 205-232.

385 Zhang, Y. H., Bienen, B., Cassidy, M. J., and Gourvenec, S. (2011). "The undrained bearing capacity of a spudcan
386 foundation under combined loading in soft clay." *Mar. Struct.*, 24, 459-477.

387 Zhang, Y., Bienen, B., Cassidy, M.J., Gourvenec, S. (2012). Undrained bearing capacity of deeply buried flat
388 circular foundations under general loading. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, ASCE.
389 Vol., 138, No. 3, pp. 385-397.

390 Zhang, Y., Wang, D., Cassidy, M.J., Bienen, B. (2014). Effect of installation on the bearing capacity of a
391 spudcan under combined loading in soft clay. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*,
392 doi:10.1061/(ASCE)GT.1943-5606.0001126.

393

394