

BALLOT AGENDA ITEM 653 - 150: 2nd ballot – January, 2008

Background and Rationale

The current API 653 Appendix B methodology for evaluating the FFS of a storage tank for out-of-plane settlement does not differentiate between types of tank roof construction; covers only tanks whose settlement includes a plane of rigid tilt that follows a cosine (sine) wave; permits only one goodness of fit (R^2) methodology; permits data to be ignored; and penalizes the use of more closely spaced of settlement readings.

A new methodology is proposed that addresses these issues. It has been developed based on a parametric FEA research study, documented in separate reports and briefs. The proposed methodology can be used on API 650 carbon steel and stainless steel tanks, but is not applicable to aluminum tanks. A separate document includes several solved examples.

Economic Impact

The limitations of the current methodology in API 653 Appendix B, particularly the dependence of permissible out-of-plane settlement on a settlement measurement spacing limit, may result in tanks requiring expensive shell re-leveling or more rigorous analyses. Additionally there are tanks that can not be evaluated with current methods. The proposed FFS approach should reduce the number of tanks needing expensive repairs or more rigorous analyses.

Proposed Revisions

Proposed revisions to API 653 Section 12 and Appendix B are given. Current API 653 text that has been *relocated is given in italics*, **new text is bold**, and deletions are indicated with a ~~strike-through~~.

SECTION 12 - EXAMINATION AND TESTING

12.5.1.2

Tank settlement shall initially be surveyed with the tank empty using ~~the~~ **an even** number of ~~bottom plate projection~~ elevation measurement points, N, uniformly distributed around the circumference. **The minimum number of elevation measurement points shall be** as indicated by the following formula:

$$N = \frac{D}{10}$$

where:

- N= minimum required number of settlement measurement points, but no less than eight. All ~~fractional~~ values shall be rounded to the next higher **even** whole number. The maximum spacing between settlement measurement points shall be 32 ft
- D= tank diameter, in ft.

APPENDIX B – EVALUATION OF TANK BOTTOM SETTLEMENT

B.1 UNCHANGED

B.2.1 SETTLEMENT ELEVATION MEASUREMENTS

Measurements ~~for out-of-plane~~ of tank settlement must be taken carefully. These measurements should be performed by personnel experienced in the types of measurement procedures being performed, and using equipment designed for the intended purpose. Tank settlement measurements should be taken with instruments capable of sufficient accuracy to be able to distinguish settlement differences.

The principle types of tank settlement consist of settlements that relate to the tank shell and bottom plate. These settlements can be recorded by taking elevation measurements around the tank circumference and across the tank diameter. Figures B-1 and B-2 show **minimum** recommended locations on a tank shell and bottom plate for settlement measurements. Data obtained from such measurements should be used to evaluate the tank structure. Additional settlement readings may be required to **better** define local **bottom** depressions **or edge settlements, to refine shell settlement measurements in areas suspected to have local out-of-plane settlements, or to otherwise improve bottom or shell settlement evaluation. Settlement measurement locations should be re-used in any future settlement surveys and evaluations.**

*In cases of distortion or corrosion of the tank bottom extending beyond the shell, **shell settlement** measurements taken near lap welds in the tank bottom can result in significant errors in measured elevation. Repaired or replaced bottom plates, or new slotted-in bottoms may not have been installed parallel to the bottom shell course. In some cases, more consistent and accurate results may be obtained by surveying the elevation of the weld between the first and second courses.*

*Measure **bottom and edge settlement** carefully, taking into account ~~the following:~~ **that** measurements taken when the bottom is not in contact with the soil or foundation under the tank can overestimate or underestimate edge **or bottom** settlement significantly. If the measured settlement is near the maximum allowable settlement, consider repeating the measurement with the bottom forced down to the soil, e.g., standing on it, or take an additional set of measurements in the same area, where the bottom is in firm contact with the soil.*

B.2.2 THROUGH B.2.2.2 UNCHANGED

B.2.2.3

Due to the fact that a tank is a rather flexible structure, ~~chances are great that the tank will~~ **may** settle in a nonplanar configuration, inducing additional stresses in the tank shell. The out-of-plane settlements **of the shell can** ~~at the bottom edge~~ lead to **out-of-roundness** ~~a lack of circularity~~ at the top of the **shell tank, and depending on** ~~in the case of a floating roof tank,~~ the extent of the induced **out-of-roundness** ~~equality~~ may impede the proper functioning of the floating roof in such a way that re-leveling is required. **The out-of-roundness caused by settlement may also affect internal roof support structures such as columns, rafters,**

BALLOT AGENDA ITEM 653 - 150: 2nd ballot – January, 2008

and girders. Also, such settlements may cause flat spots to develop in the tank shell. This type of settlement could affect tank nozzles that have piping attached to them.

B.2.2.4

While uniform settlement and rigid body tilt of a tank may cause problems as described in **B.2.2.1 and B.2.2.2** above, the out-of-plane settlement is the important component to determine and evaluate in order to ensure the structural integrity of the shell and bottom. Based on this principle, a common approach is to determine the magnitudes of the uniform **settlement** and rigid body tilt ~~component~~ (if ~~any a rigid tilt plane exists or can be identified~~) for each data point on the tank periphery. ~~Once this is carried out, the~~ **If a plane of rigid tilt can be distinguished, it becomes** is then important as a datum from which to measure the magnitudes of the out-of-plane settlements. **When the out-of-plane settlement pattern of a tank has an easily distinguishable plane of rigid tilt, the methodology in this paragraph can be used to evaluate the acceptability of the tank's out-of-plane settlement. If a rigid tilt plane can not be readily determined, the methodology in B.2.2.5 can be used to evaluate the acceptability of the tank's out-of-plane settlement.**

A graphical representation illustrating ~~the effect of tank shell settlement components~~ **with a rigid tilt plane well-defined by a cosine curve fit** is shown in Figure B-3. The construction of this settlement plot has been developed in accordance with the following:

- a. The actual edge settlement (in most cases an irregular curve) is plotted using points around the tank circumference as the abscissa.
- b. The vertical distance between the abscissa and the lowest point on this curve (point 22) is the minimum settlement, and it is called the uniform settlement component. A line through this point, parallel to the abscissa, provides a new base or datum line for settlement measurements called adjusted settlements.
- c. The plane of rigid tilt settlement, **if well-defined**, is represented by the optimum cosine curve ~~between the maximum and minimum values of actual edge settlements~~. Several methods exist for determining the optimum cosine curve. The least accurate method is by free hand drawing techniques, a kind of trial and error procedure to fit the best cosine curve through the data. A better method is to use the mathematical and graphical capabilities of a computer.
- d. The vertical distances between the irregular curve and the cosine curve represent the magnitudes of the out-of-plane settlements (U_i at data point i).
- e. ~~The most~~ **A** commonly used and accepted method is to use a computer to solve for constants a , b , and c , to find the optimum cosine curve of the form:

$$Elev_{pred} = a + b \times \cos(\theta + c)$$

Where $Elev_{pred}$ is the elevation predicted by the cosine curve at angle theta. A typical starting point for a computer best-fit cosine curve is a least-square fit where a , b , and c are chosen to minimize the sum of the square of differences between the measured and predicted elevations. The optimum cosine curve may be ~~is only~~ considered valid (i.e., accurately fits the measured data) if the value R^2 is greater than or equal to 0.9.

BALLOT AGENDA ITEM 653 - 150: 2nd ballot – January, 2008

$$R^2 = \frac{(S_{yy} - SSE)}{S_{yy}}$$

where:

- S_{yy} = the sum of the squares of the differences between average measured elevation and the measured elevations,
SSE= Sum of the square of the differences between the measured and predicted elevations.

Linear least square fitting and the R^2 goodness of fit parameter are basic statistical tools. The use of a more rigorous statistical method to determine the optimum cosine curve, such as non-linear or iterative procedures, may be used by those experienced in their use.

Obtaining a statistically valid cosine curve may require taking more measurements than the minimums shown in Figure B-1. In many cases, the out-of-plane settlement may be concentrated in one or more areas. **In such cases, and the least-squares fit approach may under predicts the local out-of-plane settlement and is not conservative. In these cases, R^2 will typically be less than 0.9, and more rigorous curve-fitting procedures should be considered. Alternatively, the settlement may not indicate a well-defined rigid tilt plane and the procedure in B.2.2.5 should be considered.** Appropriately selecting a, b, and c will result in very little difference between predicted and measured elevation at all but one or two measurement points, and R^2 will be greater than 0.9. One method of selecting a, b, and c in these cases is to ignore one or two points that do not appear to fit the initially calculated cosine curve, and recalculate the optimum cosine curve. The remaining points will show a good estimate of the true out-of-plane settlement at the worst point. Figure B-4 shows an example where one point at 135 degrees is well off the initial curve, R^2 is 0.87, and S is just less than the maximum allowed. By ignoring the point at 135 degrees, and recalculating the optimum cosine curve, R^2 is increased to 0.98 (very good) and the out-of-plane settlement at the point at 135 degrees is just above the maximum allowed.

f. The vertical distances between the irregular curve and the optimum curve represent the magnitudes of the out-of-plane settlements (U_i at data point i). S_i is the out-of-plane deflection at point i. Refer to Figure B-3.

Note: When ~~using~~ **determining** the optimum cosine curve described in B.2.2.4e, taking additional measurements around the shell will result in a more accurate cosine curve fit. However, using all of the measurement points in the equation shown in B.3.2.1 will result in very small allowable **out-of-plane** settlements, S_{max} , since the arc length L between measurement points is small. It is acceptable to use ~~as many all~~ measurement points ~~as needed~~ to develop the optimum cosine curve, but only use a subset of these points spaced **no further than approximately 30 32 ft (8 minimum)** when calculating S_i and S_{max} . The points used must include the points furthest from the optimum cosine curve. For example, if 8 points are required, but 16 measurements are taken, and the arc length between measurement points is only 15 ft, calculate the optimum cosine curve using all 16 points, but use only 8 points to calculate S_i . The equations in Figure B-3 would be revised to read:

BALLOT AGENDA ITEM 653 - 150: 2nd ballot – January, 2008

$$S_i = U_i - \left(\frac{1}{2} U_{i-2} + \frac{1}{2} U_{i+2} \right)$$

$$S_{11} = U_{11} - \left(\frac{1}{2} U_9 + \frac{1}{2} U_{13} \right)$$

~~h. If out-of-measured out-of-plane settlement exceeds the limits described in B.3.2.1 using the optimum cosine curve method, a more rigorous evaluation may be performed in lieu of repairs. This evaluation must be done by an engineer experienced in tank settlement analysis.~~

B.2.2.5

If a well-defined rigid tilt plane can not be determined or the maximum out-of-plane settlement determined in accordance with B.3.2.1 is exceeded, the procedures given in this paragraph may be used in lieu of more rigorous analysis or repair.

B.2.2.5.1

For settlement profiles without a well-defined rigid tilt plane, the settlement arc length, S_{arc} , and out-of-plane settlement at the point under consideration, S_i , must be determined from a plot of the measurement data. Figure B-4a illustrated the various measurement terms and procedures for determining estimates of the settlement arc length and the corresponding out-of-plane settlement, including the refinement of measurements, when needed.

B2.2.5.2

If a valid cosine fit of the rigid tilt plane can be determined, but the maximum out-of-plane settlement determined in accordance with B.3.2.1 is exceeded, the procedure in B.3.2.2 may be used to evaluate the settlement. In this case, refer to Figure B-4b for an illustration of the determination of the settlement arc length and the corresponding out-of-plane settlement.

B2.2.5.3

If an examination of the measured settlement plot indicates a fold pattern about a diameter of the tank, the maximum out-of-plane settlement should be determined using a settlement arc length of 50% of the tank's circumference.

B.2.3.1 UNCHANGED

B.2.3.2

The formula given in B.3.4 can be used to evaluate edge settlement. Alternatively, a rigorous stress analysis can be carried out for the deformed profile. **The determination of the deformed profile should take into consideration:**

~~a. Measurements taken when the bottom is not in contact with the soil or foundation under the tank can overestimate or underestimate edge settlement significantly. If the measured settlement is near the maximum allowable settlement, consider repeating the measurement with the bottom forced down to the soil, e.g., standing~~

BALLOT AGENDA ITEM 653 - 150: 2nd ballot – January, 2008

~~on it, or take an additional set of measurements in the same area, where the bottom is in firm contact with the soil.~~

~~b.~~ a. Locating the breakover point where the settled area begins requires some judgment. Placing a straight edge on the unsettled bottom as shown in Figure B-5, and observing where the bottom separates from the straight edge will help define the breakover point.

~~e.~~ b. If the tank bottom is cone up or cone down, the settlement B, should be measured from a projection of the unsettled bottom, not from level. See Figure B-6.

B.2.3.3 THROUGH B.3.1 UNCHANGED

B.3.2 Permissible Out-of-Plane Settlement

From the measurements **procedures** described in ~~B.2~~ **B.2.2.4 and B.2.2.5**, determine the maximum out-of-plane deflection **settlement**. **The magnitude (absolute value) of the maximum settlement shall be compared to the permissible values given in B.3.2.1 or B.3.2.2, as applicable.** Use the following formula to calculate the maximum permissible out-of-plane deflection (see note ~~below~~): **The permissible out-of-plane settlement given in B.3.2.1 and B.3.2.2 do not take into consideration abrupt changes in shell elevation (ridges) or discontinuities near the bottom of the tank in the settled region, such as low nozzles. They are also not applicable to fold patterns in cone roof tanks when the fold line is adjacent to or through a line of one or more roof columns, or to patterns of settlement that include combined shell and edge settlements. The permissible settlement criteria in B.3.2.2 are applicable to API 650 carbon steel and stainless steel tanks and diameter ranges given in B.3.2.2. Out-of-plane settlement that does not meet these limitations should be further examined by a more rigorous engineering assessment in lieu of repairs.**

B.3.2.1

When using the procedure with an optimal cosine curve approach defined in B.2.2.4 to determine out-of-plane settlement, the permissible out-of-plane settlement is given by the following formula (see note below):

$$S_{max, ft} = \frac{(L^2 \times Y \times 11)}{2[(E \times H)]}$$

Where:

$S_{max, ft}$ = **permissible out-of-plane settlement** deflection, in ft (out-of-plane distortion),

L = arc length between measurement points, in ft,

Y = yield strength, in lbf/in.²,

E = Young's Modulus, in lbf/in.²,

H = tank height, in ft.

Note: This formula is based on "Criteria for Settlement of Tanks," W. Allen Marr, M. ASCE, Jose A. Ramos, and T. William Lambe, F. ASCE, Journal of Geotechnical Engineering Division, Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Vol. 108, August, 1982.

BALLOT AGENDA ITEM 653 - 150: 2nd ballot – January, 2008

B.3.2.2

When using the procedure in B.2.2.5 to determine out-of-plane settlement, the permissible out-of-plane settlement is given by the following formula (see note below):

$$S_{max,in} = \min \left[K \times S_{arc} \times \left(\frac{D}{H} \right) \times \left(\frac{Y}{E} \right), 4.0 \right]$$

Tank Diameter	<i>K</i> , Open (external floating roof) Tanks	<i>K</i> , Cone (internal floating roof) Tanks
$D \leq 50 \text{ ft}$	28.7	10.5
$50 \text{ ft} < D \leq 80 \text{ ft}$	7.8	5.8
$80 \text{ ft} < D \leq 120 \text{ ft}$	6.5	3.9
$120 \text{ ft} < D \leq 180 \text{ ft}$	4.0	2.3
$180 \text{ ft} < D \leq 240 \text{ ft}$	3.6	Not applicable
$240 \text{ ft} < D \leq 300 \text{ ft}$	2.4	Not applicable
$300 \text{ ft} < D$	Not applicable	Not applicable

where:

$S_{max,in}$ = permissible out-of-plane settlement, in inches,

S_{arc} = effective settlement arc, see B.2.2.5.1, in ft,

D = tank diameter, in ft,

Y = yield strength, in lbf/in.²,

E = Young's Modulus, in lbf/in.²,

H = tank height, in ft.

Note: This formula is based on "Final Report on the Study of Out-of-Plane Tank Settlement," J. Andreani, N. Carr, report to API SCAST, May, 2007.

B.3.2.3


Serviceability may also be a concern for tanks with significant out-of-plane settlement. Out-of-roundness can impede floating roof operation and also affect internal roof support structures. The out-of-roundness that a tank experiences with out-of-plane settlement is fairly sensitive to the actual pattern of settlement. The Owner may wish to specify additional inspection or a more rigorous assessment of the tank's out-of-roundness.

B.3.2.4

If measured out-of-plane settlement exceeds the applicable limits described in B.3.2.1 or B.3.2.2, a more rigorous evaluation may be performed in lieu of repairs. This evaluation should be done by an engineer experienced in tank settlement analysis.

CHANGES TO FIGURES

Figures B-1, B-2 UNCHANGED



Out-of-plane deflection for point "i" is $S_i = U_i - (1/2 U_{i-1} + 1/2 U_{i+1})$, for example $S_{11} = U_{11} - (1/2 U_{10} + 1/2 U_{12})$

U_i = out-of-plane settlement of point "i",
 (+) when above cos. curve,
 (-) when below cos. curve, for example:
 $U_{11} = (+)$
 $U_{13} = (-)$

Note: See 12.5.1.2 for definition of "N."

Figure B-3—Graphical Representation of Shell Settlement per B.2.2.4

(New Title, Figure B-3 itself UNCHANGED)

BALLOT AGENDA ITEM 653 - 150: 2nd ballot – January, 2008




Figure B-4a–Graphical Representation of Shell Settlement per B.2.2.5 (Tilt Plane Not Described by an Optimal Cosine Curve)

Notes:

The settlement arc length shall be taken as the circumferential length between points on either side of the maximum out-of-plane settlement point under consideration.

An initial estimate of settlement arc length and maximum settlement should be determined then, additional settlement measurement points may be taken halfway between the points indicating a change in direction of the settlement slope to further refine the settlement arc length and location and magnitude of the maximum settlement.

Depending on location of the new settlement points relative to the initial points, a further refinement of the measurement spacing may be needed.

The best estimate of the settlement arc length and maximum settlement shall be considered in the procedure given in B.3.2.2.




Figure B-4b—Graphical Representation of Shell Settlement per B.2.2.5 (Tilt Plane Described by Optimal Cosine Curve)

**END OF REVISIONS
(ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES IN SEPARATE DOCUMENT)**