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ABSTRACT

The evaluation of the dynamics of floating structures has to be investigated in order to define the operational index which is reflecting the ability to operate at certain sea state. The applications have been performed for a floating crane using a range of operational loading cases and sea states in the Black Sea coastal area. The influence of the way to evaluate the moments of inertia for the different loading cases is also systematically taken into account. The conclusions are formulated based on the comparative diagrams, incorporating the influences of the above mentioned parameters.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The ability to operate at relatively high sea states is practically defining the quality of the design of floating structures which are conceived to perform different operations at zero speed [8]. Among the parameters which have to be accurately considered are the mass distributions for all loading cases, the hydrodynamic “transparency” from the geometrical point of view, the characteristics of the location where the floating structure will operate, the wave theory to be used, etc.

The applications have been carried out for a floating crane operating in the coastal area of the Black Sea area. The sea spectrum was defined for the location called “Lebâda”.

The systematic measurements have been performed by INMH Bucharest and the spectrum definition was developed in cooperation with ICEPRONAV Galati in 1988 [2], [3].

The main characteristics of the body are: L = 64.2 m, B = 24 m, T = 3.1 m, C = 0.86 and a displacement of Δ = 4166 t. The body plan of the floating crane is presented in Figure 1 and a 3-D view in Figure 2.

Fig. 1. The body plan of the floating crane
In order to evaluate the influence of the loading cases (LC) on the general behaviour of the floating body, 4 significant ones have been analysed. An example is presented in Fig. 3.

Fig. 2. The 3D views of the floating crane

Fig. 3. Typical description of a loading case (LC1 - 98% Bunker and WB)

The detailed characteristics of the loading cases are presented in Table 1. The displacements, the positions of the centre of gravity and the vertical coordinate of the centre of the buoyancy are presented for each loading case.

Table 1. Main characteristics of the loading cases

| Items                  | LC1          | LC2          | LC3          | LC4          |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Deadweight [t]         | 2190.9       | 2145.3       | 2262.9       | 2217.3       |
| Lightship [t]          | 2000.0       | 2000.0       | 2000.0       | 2000.0       |
| Displacement [t]       | 4190.9       | 4145.3       | 4262.9       | 4217.3       |
| Xc [m]                 | 31.9         | 31.151       | 30.650       | 30.704       |
| Yc [m]                 | 0.0          | 0.007        | 0.136        | 0.130        |
| Zc [m]                 | 5.745        | 5.779        | 5.834        | 5.868        |
| Zb [m]                 | 1.620        | 1.665        | 1.648        | 1.632        |
| Draft [m]              | 3.112        | 3.085        | 3.157        | 3.127        |
| BMR [tn]               | 16.988       | 17.152       | 16.678       | 16.853       |

As compared to the ship case, when simple formulas can be used for the evaluation of the moments of inertia, for floating structures these approximations could lead to significant errors.

Table 2. Radii of inertia for each loading case

| Displacement and radii of inertia | LC1          | LC2          | LC3          | LC4          |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Displacement [t]                 | 4190.9       | 4145.3       | 4262.9       | 4217.3       |
| rxx [m]                          | 8.185        | 8.145        | 8.410        | 8.192        |
| ryy [m]                          | 25.866       | 22.234       | 25.616       | 22.587       |
| rzz [m]                          | 26.276       | 22.750       | 25.987       | 22.908       |

2. INFLUENCE OF INERTIAL CHARACTERISTICS ON THE FLOATING CRANE MOTIONS

The evaluation of influences of inertial characteristics on the Response Amplitude Operators has been performed for loading case LC1. When ship case is considered, different simple formulas are used. For roll radius of gyration a coefficient between 0.26 ÷ 0.30 B, where B is ship breadth, can be
used and this is based on quite large statistic evidence. Similarly, simple evaluations can be used for pitch and yaw radii of gyrations when a coefficient of about 0.25 L (ship length) is commonly used. It can be observed that using such formulas there are no differences between the different loading cases. Constant values of about 7.20 m for roll radius of gyration and 20.0 m for pitch and yaw ones are enough far from the values presented in Table 2 and the influences have to be taken into account.

Consequently, due to totally unusual mass distributions, when offshore floating structures or even offshore ship shaped structures are considered, weights distributions are mandatory for accurate calculations.

The influences are presented in the following figures.
3. INFLUENCES OF LOADING CASES ON THE FLOATING CRAINE MOTIONS

The Response Amplitude Operators (RAO’s) have been calculated for the above mentioned loading cases (LC) using the mass distributions as well as using the simple formulas for the moments of inertia. The results are presented in the following figures.

![Fig. 10. RAO surge as a function of the loading cases, heading 180°](image1)

![Fig. 11. RAO sway as a function of the loading cases, heading 90°](image2)

![Fig. 12. RAO heave as a function of the loading cases, heading 90°](image3)

![Fig. 13. RAO roll as a function of the loading cases, heading 90°](image4)

![Fig. 14. RAO pitch as a function of the loading cases, heading 180°](image5)

![Fig. 15. RAO yaw as a function of the loading cases, heading 180°](image6)

The calculations have been performed for a range of heading angles between $0° \div 180°$ with a step of $15°$.

4. DEFINITION OF BLACK SEA SPECTRA FOR APPLICATIONS

The evaluations were made for a range of sea states defined based on wind speed in the coastal area of Black Sea, location...
“Lebada”. Four different wind speeds have been, from 10 m/s to 25 m/s with a step of 5 m/s. The results are graphically presented in Figure 14.

Fig. 16. The sea spectra used for applications
The main characteristics of the sea states are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Wave characteristics of the sea states

| Wave circular frequency, m/s | SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 |
|-----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| HMAXPROB=                   | 1.355 | 2.812 | 4.079 | 5.296 |
| HMAXP=                      | 2.048 | 3.747 | 5.468 | 7.099 |
| HMED=                       | 0.494 | 0.887 | 1.283 | 1.643 |
| H1/3=                       | 0.780 | 1.415 | 2.052 | 2.623 |
| H1/10=                      | 1.003 | 1.901 | 2.611 | 3.338 |
| H1/100=                     | 1.315 | 2.360 | 3.422 | 6.374 |
| PERV/DE/DT=                 | 4.336 | 5.555 | 6.500 | 7.245 |
| T1/3=                       | 5.285 | 5.999 | 6.487 | 6.851 |

The notations used refer to the wave characteristics consisting in probabilistic values like significant heights, significant 1/3 period in seconds and wave heights for a certain level of probability. The symbol SS1 to SS4 represents the sea state.

5. EVALUATION OF MOTIONS AND OPERATIONAL LIMITS

Based on RAO’s calculations, as a next step the response spectra of motions and accelerations have been evaluated using the well-known expression [1]

\[ S_a(\omega) = RAO^2(\omega) \cdot S_w(\omega) \]  (1)

where, \( S_a(\omega) \) represents the generic response spectra which allow the determination of statistic values to be compared with the recommended ones [4], presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Recommended limits for different types of activities

| RMS criteria | Vertical acceleration \( (a_v) \) | Lateral acceleration \( (a_y) \) | Roll motion \( (\phi) \) | Type of activity |
|--------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 0.20 g       | 0.10 g                           | 6.0°                             | Light manual work |
| 0.15 g       | 0.07 g                           | 4.0°                             | Heavy manual work |
| 0.10 g       | 0.05 g                           | 3.0°                             | Intellectual work |

The calculations have been performed for all loading cases, the already mentioned range of wave frequencies and for two distinct situations: Beam Sea and Head Sea [6].

a) The beam sea case
For beam sea the measuring point is marked in Fig. 15.

Fig. 17. The measuring point for the beam sea case
The results are presented in the following tables for the lateral accelerations \( (a_y) \), vertical accelerations \( (a_z) \) and roll motions.

Table 5. The results for the lateral accelerations

| \( a_y \)   | SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 0.017       | 0.041 | 0.058 | 0.065 | \( a_{y1/3} \) |
| 0.022       | 0.052 | 0.074 | 0.083 | \( a_{y1/10} \) |
| 0.029       | 0.069 | 0.096 | 0.109 | \( a_{y1/100} \) |
| 0.009       | 0.022 | 0.03  | 0.034 | RMS |
Table 6. The results for the vertical accelerations

| SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 | $a_z$ |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| 0.07 | 0.161 | 0.197 | 0.205 | $a_{z,1/3}$ |
| 0.89 | 0.204 | 0.25 | 0.261 | $a_{z,1/10}$ |
| 0.117 | 0.268 | 0.328 | 0.342 | $a_{z,1/100}$ |
| **0.36** | **0.082** | **0.1** | **0.105** | **RMS** |

Table 7. The results for the roll motions

| SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 | $\phi$ |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| 0.806 | 1.89 | 2.442 | 2.65 | $\phi_{1/3}$ |
| 1.025 | 2.405 | 3.1 | 3.373 | $\phi_{1/10}$ |
| 1.343 | 3.152 | 4.072 | 4.42 | $\phi_{1/100}$ |
| **0.408** | **0.965** | **1.261** | **1.378** | **RMS** |

b) The following sea case

For the following sea case the measuring point is marked in Fig. 19.

The results are presented in the following tables in terms of vertical accelerations ($a_x$), vertical accelerations ($a_z$) and pitch motions.

Table 8. The results for the longitudinal accelerations

| SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 | $a_x$ |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| 0.003 | 0.01 | 0.18 | 0.022 | $a_{x,1/3}$ |
| 0.003 | 0.013 | 0.023 | 0.028 | $a_{x,1/10}$ |
| 0.004 | 0.017 | 0.03 | 0.036 | $a_{x,1/100}$ |
| **0.001** | **0.005** | **0.009** | **0.011** | **RMS** |

Table 9. The results for the vertical accelerations

| SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 | $a_z$ |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| 0.017 | 0.066 | 0.114 | 0.14 | $a_{z,1/3}$ |
| 0.022 | 0.084 | 0.145 | 0.178 | $a_{z,1/10}$ |
| 0.029 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.234 | $a_{z,1/100}$ |
| **0.022** | **0.034** | **0.056** | **0.072** | **RMS** |
Table 10. The results for the pitch motions

| SS1 | SS2 | SS3 | SS4 | \( \theta \) |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------|
| 0.23 | 0.858 | 1.49 | 1.848 | \( \theta_{1/3} \) |
| 0.293 | 1.092 | 1.897 | 2.351 | \( \theta_{1/10} \) |
| 0.384 | 1.431 | 2.486 | 3.082 | \( \theta_{1/100} \) |
| 0.119 | 0.445 | 0.77 | 0.952 | RMS |

Fig. 22. Vertical accelerations according to Table 9

In both cases, i.e. beam and following sea respectively, the calculations have been performed for several points due to the necessity to evaluate the accelerations in sensitive areas where the dynamic effect has to be accurately known.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The evaluation has been performed using a computer code based on the well-known theory developed by Salvesen, Tuck and Faltinsen [5]. The program is able to calculate the amplitudes and phases for all six degrees of freedom, i.e. surge, sway, heave, roll, pitch and yaw motions as well as the hydrodynamic loads for any heading angle in regular waves. The slender body theory is assumed and the three dimensional hydrodynamic quantities are expressed in terms of the solution to the sectional two-dimensional problem of a cylinder with the same shape as the individual cross-sections oscillating on the free surface. The program is using the "close fit source distribution technique" developed by Frank. The evaluation of the Response Amplitude Operators (RAO’s) of motions is performed in the frequency domain.

The first important conclusion is the linked to the necessity to use the mass distributions information in order to have enough accurate evaluation of the inertial characteristics of the body. The only motion which is not affected is heave as it can be observed in Fig. 6. Less affected are and pitch motions while sway, roll and yaw motions are dramatically influenced as depicted in Fig. 5, Fig. 7 and Fig. 9.

As regarding the influences of the loading cases, the evaluations do not show large differences. However, some significant discrepancies are mainly displayed when sway, roll and yaw motions are considered.

The evaluation of the accelerations and motions, carried out in order to observe the capability to operate from the comfort point of view, lead to the idea that there are no situations to be avoided. It has to be underlined that coastal area of the Black Sea has been considered, specifically the location Lebăda.

Mention should be made that, from the operational point of view, the “rms” values were used which means to estimate the expected motions and accelerations for short time operations limited in time to about 6 hours. If higher operational periods are required then, different approaches have to be considered [7]. To this purpose, just to give a rough idea, some other statistical values have been shown, for example 1/3, 1/10 and 1/100.
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