

SEISMIC VULNERABILITY STUDY OF GUILLEMARD RAILWAY BRIDGE

TEOW CHING CHING

A project report submitted in fulfillment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Engineering (Civil – Structure)

Faculty of Civil Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JUNE 2008

For my beloved family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is deeply indebted to her supervisor, Prof. Dr. Azlan Adnan whose help, stimulating suggestions and encouragement helped her in all the time of the study and preparation of this project.

The author wishes to thank Mr. Meldi Suhatril, for his helpful guidance.

The author has furthermore to thank all the lecturers and staffs of Faculty of Civil Engineering UTM, for their advice and assistance throughout the study.

Sincere appreciation also extends to all her friends for their help, support, interest and valuable hints.

Last but not least, the author would like to express her deepest gratitude to her parents, Teow Ka Heng and Teoh Bee Lan, for unconditional support and encouragement to pursue her interest. Her sisters, Teow Ying Ying and Teow Pei Pei, for their understanding and love.

ABSTRACT

Malaysia is surrounded by countries that had experienced many great earthquakes. Records have shown that we do sometimes experience some off-set tremors originating from the Indonesian zone. Therefore it would be unwise to totally ignore the effects of earthquakes on structures. The purpose of this study is to present the results of the case study of the earthquake response on the Guillemard Railway Bridge. The bridge had been remodeled using SAP 2000. The behavior of Guillemard Railway Bridge under the earthquake loading can be obtained by analyzing the Free Vibration Analysis, Time History Analysis and Response Spectrum Analysis with different levels of ground acceleration (0.074g, 0.15g, 0.25g and 0.35g), in different directions (x, y, z). Moment and shear force capacities for each element are calculated to enable comparison to be made between element capacity and element loading. The purpose is to check to what extent Guillemard Railway Bridge could survive under different ground acceleration and to identify the critical part of the bridge under earthquake loading. From the results, it is noticed that the column failure could occur even in low intensity earthquake acceleration. Deck failure is caused by its inability to hold the design ultimate resistance moment of earthquake loading. Earthquake which happens in horizontal transverse direction has very little effect to the seismic performance of the bridge deck. The bridge deck may fail when earthquake happens in vertical direction, under all various earthquake intensities. For horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction, the bridge deck is safe up to 0.15g earthquake intensity. The most earthquake-vulnerable part of Guillemard Railway Bridge is the fourth span and the fourth pier. Moreover, the top chords at the highest point of the truss and the connection between the spans also most likely to be vulnerable if earthquake occur.

ABSTRAK

Malaysia dikelilingi oleh negara-negara yang kerap mengalami gempa bumi. Rekod telah menunjukkan kesan gempa bumi dari kawasan gempa bumi Indonesia kadang kala dirasakan juga. Maka, pengabaian kesan gempa bumi ke atas struktur adalah perbuatan yang kurang bijak. Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk mempersembahkan keputusan respon Guillemard Railway Bridge terhadap gempa bumi. Jambatan ini telah dimodelkan semula dengan menggunakan SAP2000. Kelakuan Guillemard Railway Bridge di bawah pembebanan gempa bumi boleh diperolehi dengan menjalankan analisis Free Vibration, analisis Time History dan analisis Response Spectra, dengan mengenakan pelbagai keamatan gempa bumi (0.074g, 0.15g, 0.25g dan 0.35g) pada arah yang berlainan (x, y, z). Kapasiti momen dan kapasiti daya ricih untuk setiap elemen telah dikira supaya perbandingan dapat dibuat antara kapasiti elemen dengan pembebanan elemen. Tujuannya untuk menyemak kepada tahap manakah Guillemard Railway Bridge sanggup bertahan di bawah pelbagai keamatan gempa bumi dan juga untuk mengenalpastikan bahagian jambatan yang paling kritikal di bawah pembebanan gempa bumi. Daripada keputusan yang diperolehi, didapati bahawa kegagalan tiang berlaku walaupun untuk gempa bumi berkeamatan rendah. Kegagalan papak pula disebabkan ketidakmampuan untuk menampung momen rintangan muktamad daripada pembebanan gempa bumi. Gempa bumi yang berlaku pada arah datar-melintang meninggalkan kesan yang sangat kecil kepada papak jambatan. Papak jambatan mungkin akan gagal apabila gempa bumi berlaku pada arah menegak, di bawah pelbagai keamatan gempa bumi. Untuk gempa bumi yang berlaku pada arah datar-membujur, papak jambatan adalah selamat sehingga 0.15g keamatan gempa bumi. Bahagian jambatan yang paling lemah ketika dikenakan gempa bumi ialah rentang keempat dan tiang keempat. Tambahan pula, bahagian atas pada titik tertinggi yang terletak pada kerangka jambatan dan sambungan antara rentang juga berkemungkinan besar gagal jika berlakunya gempa bumi.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | TITLE | PAGE |
|----------|----------------------------|--------------|
| | DECLARATION | ii |
| | DEDICATION | iii |
| | ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iv |
| | ABSTRACT | v |
| | ABSTRAK | vi |
| | TABLE OF CONTENTS | vii |
| | LIST OF TABLES | x |
| | LIST OF FIGURES | xi |
| | LIST OF APPENDICES | xvii |
| | LIST OF SYMBOLS | xviii |
| 1 | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| | 1.2 Problem Statement | 2 |
| | 1.3 Objective of the Study | 3 |
| | 1.4 Scope of the Study | 3 |
| 2 | LITERATURE REVIEW | 5 |
| | 2.1 Introduction | 5 |
| | 2.2 Basic Seismology | 5 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 2.3 | Seismic Waves | 6 |
| 2.4 | Measurement of Earthquake Magnitude and Intensity | 8 |
| 2.5 | Ground Motion | 10 |
| 2.5.1 | Peak Ground Motion | 10 |
| 2.5.2 | Duration of Strong Motion | 11 |
| 2.5.3 | Frequency Content | 11 |
| 2.6 | Dynamic Analysis of Bridge | 11 |
| 2.7 | Response Spectrum Analysis | 13 |
| 2.7.1 | Single Mode Spectral Analysis | 14 |
| 2.7.2 | Uniform Load Method | 14 |
| 2.7.3 | Multimode Spectral Analysis | 15 |
| 2.7.4 | Modal Combination | 16 |
| 2.8 | Nonlinear Analysis of Bridge Structure | 17 |
| 2.9 | Seismic Performance of Bridges | 18 |
| 2.10 | Earthquake Damage to Bridges | 20 |
| 2.10.1 | Effects of Changes in Condition | 21 |
| 2.10.2 | Effects of Structural Configuration | 22 |
| 2.10.3 | Effects of Unseating at Expansion Joints | 23 |
| 2.10.4 | Damage to Superstructures | 24 |
| 2.10.5 | Damage to Bearings | 25 |
| 2.10.6 | Damage to Columns | 26 |
| 2.10.7 | Damage to Beams | 27 |
| 2.10.8 | Damage to Abutments | 28 |
| 2.11 | Design Key Concept | 29 |
| 3 | METHODOLOGY | 31 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 31 |
| 3.2 | Bridge Description | 31 |
| 3.3 | Section Properties | 40 |

| | | |
|----------|---|--------------|
| 3.4 | Seismic Excitation | 41 |
| 3.5 | Assumptions | 42 |
| 3.6 | Dynamic Linear Analysis | 42 |
| 3.6.1 | Free Vibration Analysis | 43 |
| 3.6.2 | Response Spectrum Analysis | 44 |
| 3.6.3 | Time History | 44 |
| 3.7 | Dynamic Nonlinear Analysis | 44 |
| 3.8 | Permissible Stress Method | 45 |
| 4 | RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS | 52 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 52 |
| 4.2 | Free Vibration Analysis | 52 |
| 4.3 | Base Reaction | 58 |
| 4.4 | Deck Analysis | 68 |
| 4.5 | Column Analysis | 73 |
| 4.6 | Shear Force Diagram and Bending Moment Diagram | 77 |
| 5 | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 82 |
| 5.1 | Conclusions | 82 |
| 5.2 | Recommendations for Further Research | 83 |
| | REFERENCES | 85 |
| | Appendix A | 87-94 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|------------------|---|-------------|
| 2.1 | Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale | 9 |
| 3.1 | Section Properties | 40 |
| 4.1 | Natural Period for Guillemard Railway Bridge | 53 |
| 4.2 | Comparison between Element Loading and Element Capacity at Deck | 69 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| TABLE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|------------------|--|-------------|
| 2.1 | Epicenter | 6 |
| 2.2 | Types of seismic waves | 8 |
| 2.3 | Bull Creek Canyon Channel Bridge. Damage in the 1994 Northridge earthquake | 21 |
| 2.4 | Geometry and collapse of the route 14/5 separation and overhead in the 1994 Northridge Earthquake, (a) configuration; (b) photograph of collapse | 23 |
| 2.5 | Buckling of braces near Pier 209 of the Nanshin Expressway in the 1995 Hyogo-Ken Nanbu earthquake | 24 |
| 2.6 | Buckling of cross members in the upper chord of the Rokko Island Bridge in the 1995 Hyogo-Ken Nanbu earthquake | 25 |
| 2.7 | Hamate Bypass superstructure rotations as a result of bearing failures in the 1995 Hyogo-Ken Nanbu earthquake | 26 |
| 2.8 | Failure of columns of the route 5/210 interchange during the 1971 San Fernando earthquake | 27 |
| 2.9 | Outrigger damage in the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake | 28 |
| 2.10 | Rotation of abutment due to liquefaction and lateral spreading during the 1991 Costa Rica earthquake | 29 |

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 3.1 | Elevation | 32 |
| 3.2a | Main truss girder and representative cross section (top chord member) | 33 |
| 3.2b | Main truss girder and representative cross section (vertical member) | 33 |
| 3.2c | Main truss girder and representative cross section (bottom chord member) | 34 |
| 3.3 | Top chord | 34 |
| 3.4 | Bottom chord | 35 |
| 3.5a | Face of Pier 1 | 35 |
| 3.5b | Section of Pier 1 | 36 |
| 3.6a | Face of Pier 2 | 36 |
| 3.6b | Section of Pier 2 | 37 |
| 3.7a | Face of Pier 3 | 37 |
| 3.7b | Section of Pier 3 | 38 |
| 3.8a | Face of Pier 4 | 38 |
| 3.8b | Section of Pier 4 | 39 |
| 3.9 | Time history recorded from Kota Bahru station | 41 |
| 3.10 | Response Spectrum | 42 |
| 3.11 | Three-dimensional model | 47 |
| 3.12 | Free vibration analysis flow diagram | 48 |
| 3.13 | Response spectrum analysis flow diagram | 49 |
| 3.14 | Time history analysis flow diagram | 50 |
| 3.15 | Seismic evaluation flow diagram | 51 |
| 4.1 | Mode 1 (natural period 0.35939s) | 53 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 4.2 | Mode 2 (natural period 0.27496s) | 54 |
| 4.3 | Mode 3 (natural period 0.25135s) | 54 |
| 4.4 | Mode 4 (natural period 0.25035s) | 55 |
| 4.5 | Mode 5 (natural period 0.16596s) | 55 |
| 4.6 | Mode 6 (natural period 0.15661s) | 56 |
| 4.7 | Mode 7 (natural period 0.15529s) | 56 |
| 4.8 | Mode 8 (natural period 0.12211s) | 57 |
| 4.9 | Mode 9 (natural period 0.11938s) | 57 |
| 4.10 | Mode 10 (natural period 0.11395s) | 58 |
| 4.11a | Comparison of base shear X in horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction | 59 |
| 4.11b | Comparison of base shear X in horizontal transverse earthquake direction | 59 |
| 4.11c | Comparison of base shear X in vertical earthquake direction | 60 |
| 4.12a | Comparison of base shear Y in horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction | 60 |
| 4.12b | Comparison of base shear Y in horizontal transverse earthquake direction | 61 |
| 4.12c | Comparison of base shear Y in vertical earthquake direction | 61 |
| 4.13a | Comparison of base shear Z in horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction | 62 |
| 4.13b | Comparison of base shear Z in horizontal transverse earthquake direction | 62 |
| 4.13c | Comparison of base shear Z in vertical earthquake direction | 63 |
| 4.14a | Comparison of base moment X in horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction | 63 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 4.14b | Comparison of base moment X in horizontal transverse earthquake direction | 64 |
| 4.14c | Comparison of base moment X in vertical earthquake direction | 64 |
| 4.15a | Comparison of base moment Y in horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction | 65 |
| 4.15b | Comparison of base moment Y in horizontal transverse earthquake direction | 65 |
| 4.15c | Comparison of base moment Y in vertical earthquake direction | 66 |
| 4.16a | Comparison of base moment Z in horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction | 66 |
| 4.16b | Comparison of base moment Z in horizontal transverse earthquake direction | 67 |
| 4.16c | Comparison of base moment Z in vertical earthquake direction | 67 |
| 4.17 | Shear versus earthquake intensity (horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction) | 70 |
| 4.18 | Shear versus earthquake intensity (horizontal transverse earthquake direction) | 70 |
| 4.19 | Shear versus earthquake intensity (vertical earthquake direction) | 71 |
| 4.20 | Moment versus earthquake intensity (horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction) | 71 |
| 4.21 | Moment versus earthquake intensity (horizontal transverse earthquake direction) | 72 |
| 4.22 | Moment versus earthquake intensity (vertical earthquake direction) | 72 |
| 4.23 | N-Mx column interaction chart (0.074g horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction) | 73 |
| 4.24 | N-Mx column interaction chart (0.15g horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction) | 74 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 4.25 | N-Mx column interaction chart (0.25g horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction) | 74 |
| 4.26 | N-Mx column interaction chart (0.35g horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction) | 75 |
| 4.27 | N-My column interaction chart (0.074g horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction) | 75 |
| 4.28 | N-My column interaction chart (0.15g horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction) | 76 |
| 4.29 | N-My column interaction chart (0.25g horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction) | 76 |
| 4.30 | N-My column interaction chart (0.35g horizontal longitudinal earthquake direction) | 77 |
| 4.31a | Shear force diagram of deck at 0.074g | 78 |
| 4.31b | Shear force diagram of deck at 0.15 g | 78 |
| 4.31c | Shear force diagram of deck at 0.25 g | 78 |
| 4.31d | Shear force diagram of deck at 0.35 g | 78 |
| 4.32a | Shear force diagram of column at 0.074g | 79 |
| 4.32b | Shear force diagram of column at 0.074g | 79 |
| 4.32c | Shear force diagram of column at 0.074g | 79 |
| 4.32d | Shear force diagram of column at 0.074g | 79 |
| 4.33a | Bending moment diagram of deck at 0.074g | 80 |
| 4.33b | Bending moment diagram of deck at 0.15 g | 80 |
| 4.33c | Bending moment diagram of deck at 0.25 g | 80 |
| 4.33d | Bending moment diagram of deck at 0.35 g | 80 |
| 4.34a | Bending moment diagram of column at 0.074g | 81 |
| 4.34b | Bending moment diagram of column at 0.15g | 81 |
| 4.34c | Bending moment diagram of column at 0.25 g | 81 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 4.34d | Bending moment diagram of column at 0.35g | 81 |
|-------|---|----|

LIST OF APPENDICES

| APPENDIX | TITLE | PAGE |
|-----------------|--------------|-------------|
| A | Result Data | 87 |

LIST OF SYMBOLS

| | | |
|--------------|---|---|
| C | – | damping |
| K | – | stiffness |
| M | – | mass |
| N | – | total number of contributing nodes |
| u | – | displacement of the mass |
| \dot{u} | – | velocity of the mass |
| \ddot{u} | – | acceleration of the mass |
| \ddot{u}_g | – | ground motion acceleration |
| Z | – | maximum value of the some response quantity |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

An earthquake is produced by the sudden rupture or slip of a geological fault. Faults occur at the intersection of two segments of the earth's crust. Peninsula Malaysia lies in the Eurasian Plate and also within the Indian-Australian Plate. Geologically, small faults also exist in East Malaysia. Records have shown that we do sometimes experiences some off-set tremors originating from the Indonesian zone. Thus there is a need for some seismic checking to be incorporated in the design process so that the structures would be resistant to earthquake.

Malaysia was affected by the Indian Ocean earthquake on 26 December 2004. The worst affected areas were the northern coastal areas and outlying islands like Penang and Langkawi. The number of deaths stands at 68. Houses in fishing villages along coastal area were damaged in Penang, Kedah and Langkawi. Therefore it would be unwise to totally ignore the effects of earthquake on structures.

The Guillemard Railway Bridge was built across the Kelantan River in Kursial near Tanah Merah. Construction of the railway began in 1920 and was completed in July 1924. This bridge consists of 2 spans of 200 feet and 2 spans of 250 feet. Today, the railway bridge is used only for trains and makes up part of the Jungle Railway line. The Jungle Railway is the railway line serving the East Coast states of Kelantan and Pahang in Malaysia. Guillemard Bridge also happens to be the longest railway bridge in Malaysia. However, the design of Guillemard Bridge excluded the seismic effect, thus in this project the seismic vulnerability of the bridge will be studied.

1.2 Problem Statement

In recent years, low intensity earthquakes have been occurred in least expected places, such as Malaysia. But most of the structure designs in Malaysia do not take earthquake into consideration. Therefore, the situation where there is complete ignorance and unawareness of earthquake should be avoided.

In bridge engineering, a large amount of bridges have experienced damages at region of low to high intensity earthquake. For example, the Loma Prieta earthquake which was a major earthquake that struck the San Francisco Bay Area of California on October 17, 1989. The earthquake measured 6.9 on the Richter magnitude scale which caused one 15-meter section of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge collapsed, causing two cars to fall to the deck below, leading to the single fatality on the bridge. There was little use of nonlinear analysis in the design of bridge. In order to correctly analyze bridge performance in a major earthquake of long duration, the use of nonlinear analysis technique is important.

1.3 Objective of the Study

The objectives of the study are:

- (i) To determine the structural behaviour of Guillemard Railway Bridge under earthquake.
- (ii) To identify to what extent Guillemard Railway Bridge could survive under ground acceleration.
- (iii) To identify the critical part of the bridge under earthquake loading.

1.4 Scope of the Study

The scope of the study includes the following items:

- (i) Study the architectural and structural drawings of Guillemard Railway Bridge.
- (ii) The Guillemard Railway Bridge is modelled using SAP 2000 computer software.
- (iii) The dynamic linear analysis using SAP 2000 is divided into free vibration analysis, time history analysis and response spectrum analysis.
- (iv) The dynamic nonlinear analysis using SAP 2000 is divided into free vibration analysis and time history analysis.

- (v) Different level of earthquake intensities: 0.074g, 0.15g (low intensity), 0.25g (moderate intensity) and 0.35g (high intensity) is applied to the bridge model respectively.
- (vi) Each level of earthquake intensity is applied in x direction, y direction and z direction respectively.
- (vii) Calculate the element capacity.
- (viii) Comparison to be made between element capacity and element loading.