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ABSTRAK

The storm water management and road tunnel (SMART) project in Kuala Lumpur (KL) involves the design and construction of a road and drainage tunnel. A portion of tunnel is designed and constructed for dual purpose; firstly, a double deck road tunnel to serve the increasing volume of traffic in the busiest district of KL city and also to alleviate floods. The tunnel were constructed using several techniques such as bored and cut & cover tunneling. There are also two underground junction boxes to allow vehicle entry and exit from the motorway tunnel and two ventilation shafts. Tunnels as one of the biggest underground structures are well known as the safest structures during earthquakes. In theory, tunnel has the lower rate of damage compared than other surface structures. Even though tunnel are much safer compared than surface structures, this study are important to enhance awareness of seismic hazards for tunnel especially in Malaysia. The existing structural analysis application called SAP 2000 has been used in this study based on the theory of finite element method. The analyses are conducted in linear time history and response spectrum analysis. For checking purposes, the result from finite element analysis will be compared with tunnel design capacity.
CONTENTS

CHAPTER ITEM PAGE

TITLE PAGE i
DECLARATION ii
DEDICATION iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT iv
ABSTRAK v
ABSTRACT vi
CONTENTS vii
LIST OF TABLES x
LIST OF FIGURES xiii

I INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction 1
1.1 Tunnel Segment Smart Tunnels 3
1.2 Problem Statement 3
1.3 Objectives 4
1.4 Scope Of Study 4
1.5 Research Methodology 5

II LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction 6
2.1 Some Tunneling Problems 8
2.1.1 Geological Condition
2.1.2 Land Subsidence/Sinkholes
2.1.3 Gas Problems
2.1.4 Ground Stresses

2.2 Smart Tunnels Design Components

2.3 Effect Of Sumatran Earthquake Of 29th March 2005 On Smart Tunnel

2.4 Seismic Hazards For Underground Structures

2.4.1 Earthquake Effect On Underground Structure
2.4.1.0 Ground Failure
2.4.1.1 Liquefaction
2.4.1.2 Fault Displacement
2.4.1.3 Slope Instability

2.4.2 Types of Deformation

III THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

3.0 Introduction
3.1 Tunnel Analysis Procedure
3.2 Tunnel Assumption
3.3 Process Of Analysis
3.4 Non Linear Analysis
3.5 Basic Principles Of TBM And Definitions
3.6 Basic Principles And Construction

3.6.1 Open TBM.
3.6.2 TBM With Roof Shield
3.6.3 TBM With Roof Shield And Side Steering Shoes.
3.6.4 TBM With Cutter Head Shield.
3.6.5 Single Shield TBM.
3.6.6 Double Shield Or Telescopic Shield TBM.
3.6.7 Closed Systems.

3.7 Seismic Hazards
3.7.1 Ground Shaking
3.7.2 Liquefaction
3.7.3 Retaining Structure Failures
3.7.4 Lifeline Hazards

3.8 Practical Guide To Grouting Of Underground Structures
3.9 Grouting Method

IV RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction
4.1 Tunnel Structure
4.2 SAP 2000 Analysis Software
4.3 Tunnel Model
4.4 Two Dimensional Tunnel
4.5 Material Properties
4.6 Free Vibration Analysis
4.7 Time History Analysis (Model A)
4.8 Response Spectrum Analysis (Model A)
4.9 Time History Analysis (Model B)
4.10 Response Spectrum Analysis (Model B)
4.11 Time History Analysis (Model C)
V CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.0 Introduction 68
5.1 Time History Analysis 68
5.2 Response Spectrum Analysis 70
5.3 Conclusion 71
5.4 Recommendation 72

REFERENCES

APPENDIX A-G
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLES</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1.1</td>
<td>Tunneling Activities From 1995 To 2005</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.1</td>
<td>Coordinates Of SMART Tunnel Lining</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.2</td>
<td>Material Properties For Soil Data</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.3</td>
<td>Material Properties Tunnel Lining</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.4</td>
<td>Period With Various Mode Shapes</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.5</td>
<td>Maximum Lining Member Forces Value For Time History (Model A)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.6</td>
<td>Maximum Upper Deck Forces Value For Time History (Model A)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.7</td>
<td>Maximum Lower Deck Forces Value For Time History (Model A)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.8</td>
<td>Maximum Lining Member Forces Value For Response Spectrum (Model A)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.9</td>
<td>Maximum Upper Deck Forces Value For Response Spectrum (Model A)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.10</td>
<td>Maximum Lower Deck Forces Value For Response Spectrum (Model A)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.11</td>
<td>Maximum Lining Member Forces Value For Time History (Model B)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.12</td>
<td>Maximum Upper Deck Forces Value For Time History (Model B)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.13</td>
<td>Maximum Lower Deck Forces Value For Time History (Model B)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.14</td>
<td>Maximum Lining Member Forces Value For Response Spectrum (Model B)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.15</td>
<td>Maximum Upper Deck Forces Value For Response Spectrum (Model B)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.16</td>
<td>Maximum Lower Deck Forces Value For Response Spectrum (Model B)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.17</td>
<td>Maximum Lining Member Forces Value For Time History (Model C)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.18</td>
<td>Maximum Upper Deck Forces Value For Time History (Model C)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.19</td>
<td>Maximum Lower Deck Forces Value For Time History (Model C)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.20</td>
<td>Maximum Lining Member Forces Value For Response Spectrum (Model C)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.21</td>
<td>Maximum Upper Deck Forces Value For Response Spectrum (Model C)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.22</td>
<td>Maximum Lower Deck Forces Value For Response Spectrum (Model C)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.23</td>
<td>Design Capacity Of The SMART Tunnel Analysis (Lining)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.24</td>
<td>Design Capacity Of The SMART Tunnel Analysis (Deck)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.25</td>
<td>Lining Moment Capacity – 0.38g</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.26</td>
<td>Deck Moment Capacity – 0.38g</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.27</td>
<td>Lining Moment Capacity – 0.57g</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.28</td>
<td>Deck Moment Capacity – 0.57g</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.29</td>
<td>Lining Moment Capacity – 0.76g</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.30</td>
<td>Deck Moment Capacity – 0.76g</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.1</td>
<td>Summary Of Lining Member Forces For Time History Analysis</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.2</td>
<td>Summary Of Upper Deck Member Forces For Time History Analysis</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.3</td>
<td>Summary Of Lower Deck Lining Member Forces For Time History</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 5.4</strong></td>
<td>Summary Of Lining Member Forces For Response Spectrum Analysis</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 5.5</strong></td>
<td>Summary Of Upper Deck Member Forces For Response Spectrum Analysis</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 5.6</strong></td>
<td>Summary Of Lower Deck Lining Member Forces For Response Spectrum</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURES</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1.6.1</td>
<td>Process Of The Research</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.1.1.1 &amp; 2.1.1.2</td>
<td>Heavy Steel Sets In Highly Sheared Granite, Sg. Selangor Dam Diversion Tunnel.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.1.2.1</td>
<td>Schematic Section of Kuala Lumpur Limestone Formation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.1.2.2</td>
<td>Karstic Limestone Bedrock Pinnacles Exposed During Mining, Sungai Way (Now Bandar Sunway In Petaling Jaya), A Former Suburb Kuala Lumpur.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.2.1</td>
<td>SMART Tunnel Component.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.2.2</td>
<td>Motorway Tunnel Cross Section</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.2.3</td>
<td>Three Mode Operation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.3.1</td>
<td>Map Of Earthquake Zone</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.4.1</td>
<td>Deformation Modes Of Tunnels Due To Seismic Waves (After Owen And Scholl, 1981)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.4.1  Concrete Stress-Strain Curve  

Figure 4.4.1  Model A  

Figure 4.4.2  Model B  

Figure 4.4.3  Model C  

Figure 4.4.4  Legend  

Figure 4.6.1  Mode Shapes On Model A  

Figure 4.7.1  Ground Acceleration Of Rapid KL  

Figure 4.7.2  The Maximum Axial Force Of The Deck And Lining (Model A)  

Figure 4.7.3  Axial Force Of The Tunnel (By Time Period Of The Earthquake) At Frame 19,26 (Model A)  

Figure 4.7.4  Axial Force Of The Tunnel (By Time Period Of The Earthquake) At Frame 52 (Model A)  

Figure 4.7.5  Axial Force Of The Tunnel (By Time Period Of The Earthquake) At Frame 53 (Model A)  

Figure 4.7.6  The Maximum Shear Force Of The Deck And Lining (Model A)  

Figure 4.7.7  Shear Force Of The Tunnel (By Time Period Of The Earthquake) At Frame 16,30 (Model A)
Figure 4.7.8  The Maximum Moment Of The Deck And Lining (Model A)  44

Figure 4.8.1  Response Spectrum Of Rapid KL  46

Figure 4.8.2  The Maximum Axial Force Of The Deck And Lining (Model A)  46

Figure 4.8.3  The Maximum Shear Force Of The Deck And Lining (Model A)  47

Figure 4.8.4  The Maximum Moment Of The Deck And Lining (Model A)  47

Figure 4.9.1  The Maximum Axial Force Of The Deck And Lining (Model B)  49

Figure 4.9.2  Axial Force Of The Tunnel (By Time Period Of The Earthquake) At Frame 7,14 (Model B)  49

Figure 4.9.3  Axial Force Of The Tunnel (By Time Period Of The Earthquake) At Frame 52 (Model B)  50

Figure 4.9.4  Axial Force Of The Tunnel (By Time Period Of The Earthquake) At Frame 53 (Model B)  50

Figure 4.9.5  The Maximum Shear Force Of The Deck And Lining (Model B)  51

Figure 4.9.6  Shear Force Of The Tunnel (By Time Period Of The Earthquake) At Frame 16,30 (Model B)  51
Figure 4.9.7 The Maximum Moment Of The Deck And Lining (Model B) 52

Figure 4.10.1 The Maximum Axial Force Of The Deck And Lining (Model B) 54

Figure 4.10.2 The Maximum Shear Force Of The Deck And Lining (Model B) 54

Figure 4.10.3 The Maximum Moment Of The Deck And Lining (Model B) 55

Figure 4.11.1 The Maximum Axial Force Of The Deck And Lining (Model C) 56

Figure 4.11.2 Axial Force Of The Tunnel (By Time Period Of The Earthquake) At Frame 19,26 (Model C) 57

Figure 4.11.3 Axial Force Of The Tunnel (By Time Period Of The Earthquake) At Frame 52 (Model C) 57

Figure 4.11.4 Axial Force Of The Tunnel (By Time Period Of The Earthquake) At Frame 53 (Model C) 57

Figure 4.11.5 The Maximum Shear Force Of The Deck And Lining (Model C) 58

Figure 4.11.6 Shear Force Of The Tunnel (By Time Period Of The Earthquake) At Frame 16,30 (Model C) 58

Figure 4.11.7 The Maximum Moment Of The Deck And Lining (Model C) 59
Figure 4.12.1  The Maximum Axial Force Of The Deck And Lining (Model C)  61

Figure 4.12.2  The Maximum Shear Force Of The Deck And Lining (Model C)  61

Figure 4.12.3  The Maximum Moment Of The Deck And Lining (Model C)  62

Figure 4.14.1  0.38g Simulated Of Rapid KL Time History  64

Figure 4.14.2  0.57g Simulated Of Rapid KL Time History  65

Figure 4.14.3  0.76g Simulated Of Rapid KL Time History  65
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 tunnels and structures would be resistant to earthquake.

Tunnelling activities in Malaysia are related to a number of applications such as for civil engineering constructions like tunnels for highways and railways, and diversion tunnels in water supply and pressure tunnels in hydro power generation, underground mining and quarrying; storage facilities, etc. and of late sewage tunnels. Ting et al. (1995) summarized the tunnelling activities in Malaysia up to 1995.
Table 1 summarizes the tunnelling activities during the last decade (1995-2005) for various rock formations in Peninsular Malaysia. It can be seen that most of the tunnels use the drill and blast method. The significant advancement made is the innovative use of TBM technique in the SMART tunnel construction to overcome the problems posed by the treacherous Kuala Lumpur Limestone Formation.

**Table 1.1 Tunneling Activities From 1995 To 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NAME OF THE PROJECT</th>
<th>APPLICATIONS</th>
<th>GEOLOGY</th>
<th>OBSERVATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sg. Selangor Dam (water supply)</td>
<td>Division Tunnel</td>
<td>Granite / faulting</td>
<td>Excessive overbreak D &amp; B, completed 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Dual Flood Mitigation/Roadway</td>
<td>Limestone / Alluvium</td>
<td>Sinkholes, etc. TBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kelinci Dam (water supply)</td>
<td>Water Transfer Tunnel</td>
<td>Granite / fault</td>
<td>TBM, 1996.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pergau Dam (hydroelectric)</td>
<td>Division &amp; Pressure Tunnels, Powerhouse</td>
<td>Granite mostly, minor metasediments</td>
<td>Low ground stresses, Hydrothermal alteration D &amp; B, 1997.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beris Dam (water supply)</td>
<td>Division Tunnel</td>
<td>Sedimentary</td>
<td>5m Dia x 200m long diversion tunnel D &amp; B, 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kinta Dam (water supply)</td>
<td>Division Tunnel</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>D &amp; B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bakun Dam (hydroelectric)</td>
<td>Division &amp; Pressure Tunnels</td>
<td>Sandstone / shale</td>
<td>D &amp; B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Interstate Water Transfer Scheme</td>
<td>Water Transfer Tunnel</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>45km long tunnel connecting new dam in Pahang to Langat dam in Selangor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1 TUNNEL SEGMENT SMART TUNNELS

SMART is an acronym for Stormwater Management and Road Tunnel, a project under the Federal Government initiated to alleviate the flooding problem in the city centre of Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. The project is implemented through a joint venture pact between MMC Berhad and Gamuda Berhad with Department of Irrigation And Drainage Malaysia and the Malaysian Highway Authority as the executing government agencies. (SMART, 2006)

The SMART tunnel is an innovative and cost-effective solution that combines two distinct problems in Kuala Lumpur which is the major floods that caused by heavy rains during the monsoon season and severe traffic congestion along city streets during peak hours.

The SMART tunnel is a dual-purpose tunnel designed to cater for flow of water and ease traffic congestion in the Kuala Lumpur city. The total storm water tunnel length is 9.7km with 3km of motorway having two levels of traffic deck within the storm water tunnel. The upper deck provided traffic lanes flowing South while the lower deck provided traffic lanes flowing North.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

For along time, we have known that Malaysia are safe from earthquake disaster since Malaysia were in the earthquake-free zone. Eventough Malaysia is regarded as stable but still face slow magnitude earthquake in Bukit Tinggi, Pahang and it’s have reveal that Malaysia are not free from seismic activity.
Furthermore, if earthquake occur in the nearby country such as Indonesia, Malaysia will also get the impact. Azlan (2007) stated that Peninsular Malaysia does lie on faults but have been known to be non-active faults. Malaysia is located in low seismic activity area but the active earthquake fault line through the centre of Sumatera just lies 350 km from peninsular.

Therefore when the earthquake occurs, the building or any structures face some unpredicted risk from earthquake hazards. Since most of the building in Malaysia does not include earthquake factor in their design consideration, this study is important to increase the awareness of earthquake design consideration.

1.3 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this study are:

1. To study the dynamic characteristics of SMART Tunnel
2. To determine the behaviour of SMART Tunnel when earthquake occur.
3. To compare performance of structure under seismic loading with the design capacity of SMART Tunnel.

1.4 SCOPE OF STUDY

The scope of this study are:

1. Study architecture, structural and detailed drawing of SMART Tunnel.
2. Study the Soil Investigation Report of SMART Tunnel
3. SMART Tunnel is modelled using SAP 2000 computer software.
4. Modelling the tunnel using plane strain modeling
5. Perform dynamic loads from earthquake loads using non linear analysis.
1.5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research has been done based on the Figure 1.6.1. Before modelling the tunnel using SAP 2000 program, data from SMART Tunnel such as detailed drawing and soil investigation report have been collect. The others parameter needs in SAP 2000 program like material properties, dimension, load acting on tunnel lining, tunnel shape and other control data have to be identify. After the tunnel is model, it been analyze with earthquake loading from actual ground acceleration. Then tunnel model will be compare with design capacity to check the performance of the tunnel during earthquake.

![Figure 1.6.1: Process Of The Research](image)

The analysis that will be do in this research are response spectrum analysis, time history analysis and dynamic non linear analysis. Response spectrum analysis is performed to study the peak response of structures under earthquake loading. The earthquake responses studied include shear forces and axial force. For the time history analysis, the actual time history is taken as the earthquake ground motion.

For dynamic non linear analysis, since damage potential and ultimate failure can usually be directly related to the inelastic displacement capacity of the structure, in recent years there has been a shift of attention away from linear methods of seismic analyses to nonlinear methods which put emphasis on the displacements within the structure. Thus, nonlinear methods of analysis that are capable of realistically predicting the deformations imposed by earthquakes on structures are needed. In response to this need, SAP 2000 computer software is used to evaluate dynamic nonlinear analysis of the structure.