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Objectives

• Understand failure mechanism for piers subjected to seismic loading
• Learn analysis procedures for evaluating a seismic failure of pier
• Failure mode needs to be evaluated since analyses with large earthquake loadings have indicated potential for failure leading to modification at several dams (BOR).
Key Concepts

• Reinforced concrete failure mechanisms are well understood and documented
• There have been no known spillway pier failures resulting from seismic shaking.
• Reservoir water level on spillway crest structure is a key parameter for this potential failure mode
• Large hydrodynamic loads can be transferred from gates to piers during an earthquake (static and Hydrodynamic loading).
• Pier geometry affects seismic response; a stiffer pier may attract more load, while a flexible pier may relieve load through deflection
• Loading in cross canyon and US-DS direction.
Evaluate response of pier concrete under seismic loading

- $M > M_{cr}$
  - Concrete cracks but no crushing
  - Reinforcement response to bending
    - Yields
      - Reduced shear capacity exceeded

- No cracking or crushing of concrete
  - Shear Capacity Exceeded
  - Breach/Gate Failure

- Duration
  - $EQ \text{ Acceleration AEP}$
  - Same as above

- No breaching or exceeding of concrete
  - Breach/Gate Failure
  - Same as above

- Reducing or exceeding of concrete
  - $M = M_{cr}$
    - Breach/Gate Failure
Event Tree

1. Event Tree

2. Spillway Pier Failure

3. Pool

4. AEP

5. Evaluate response of pier concrete under seismic loading

6. M > Mcr

7. Concrete cracks but no crushing

8. Reinforcement response to bending

9. Yields

10. Reduced shear capacity exceeded

11. Evaluate if shear capacity of the section is exceeded

12. No

13. Yes

14. No

15. Yes

16. No

17. Displacement criteria exceeded

18. No

19. Yes

20. Same as above

21. Evaluation Acceleration AEP

22. Yes

23. Same as above

24. No

25. No cracking or crushing of concrete

26. Same as above

27. Shear Capacity Exceeded

28. No

29. Yes

30. Same as above

31. Breach/Gate Failure

32. No

33. Breach/Gate Failure

34. No

35. Yes

36. No

37. Yes

38. No

39. Yes

40. Yes
- Can be evaluated with pseudo-static or pseudo dynamic analysis
- Must account for amplification of seismic acceleration
- If concrete cracks and reinforcement yields, evaluate:
  1. Shear capacity in CC and US/DS direction
  2. Displacement criteria that would lead to non-linear deformation or failure of the radial gate
- Use fragility curve to evaluate probability of flexural yielding based on D/C ratio.
- Fragility curves can be created by the team based on the project
Event Tree
Event Tree

- Evaluate in both the US/DS direction and cross canyon direction.
- Shear strength dependent location in the event tree and whether the concrete has cracked or not.
- Use fragility curve to evaluate probability of shear failure based on D/C ratio.
- Fragility curves can be created by the team based on the project.

Evaluate if shear capacity of the section is exceeded:

- Yes
- No
Event Tree

- Spillway Pier Failure
  - Pool N
  - Pool 1

- Evaluate response of pier concrete under seismic loading
  - M > Mcr
  - Concrete cracks but no crushing
  - Reinforcement response to bending
  - No
  - Yes
  - Reduced shear capacity exceeded
  - No
  - Yes
  - Displacement criteria exceeded
  - No
  - Yes
  - Breach/Gate Failure

- Eq Acceleration AEP
  - No cracking or crushing of concrete
  - Same as above

- EQ Acceleration AEP
  - Duration

- EQ Acceleration AEP
  - Other
Other Failure Modes Related to Piers

- Failure of the Gate Anchorage or Local Overstressing of Concrete due to loads transmitted from the gates
  - Large hydrodynamic loads can be transferred from gates to piers during an earthquake
  - Anchorage is evaluated for static and hydrodynamic loads on gate – assuming full load is transferred to trunnion and trunnion anchorage
  - A time-history analysis may indicate that anchorage can not strain enough to fail (for anchors with unbonded free length)
Key Factors Influencing PFM Evaluation

- Reservoir Water Surface Elevation
- Pier Geometry
- Moment Capacity
- Shear Capacity
- Seismic Hazard
- Spillway Bridges
- Gate Loads
- Trunnion Anchorage
- Evaluation of Multiple Piers

Reinforced Concrete Failure Mechanisms
Pier Geometry

• Pier geometry affects seismic response
• Stiffer pier may attract more load, while a flexible pier may relieve load through deflection
• Response depends on frequency of pier and dam, and frequency content of earthquake
• Response depends on whether the crest structure is founded on rock or soil
• Configuration of an abutment slope above the spillway crest structure
• Orientation of the embankment with respect to the spillway crest structure
Moment and Shear Capacity

- Many Reclamation and USACE spillway structures have piers that were not designed for current seismic loads and don’t have shear reinforcement.
- Geometry, reinforcement and support conditions of the section
- Material properties of the reinforcement and concrete
- Type and duration of loading
- Loading in each direction (cross-canyon & u/s-d/s)
- Location of the reinforced concrete members relative to the entire structure
- Simple pseudo-static analysis can be used to evaluate moment and shears. Amplification of loading must be considered
- A time history analysis will provide a more complete picture of:
  - the extent of overstressing
  - the number of overstress excursions
- Can model non-linear behavior with finite element modeling
Seismic Hazard

- If reservoir is only up on the gates for limited durations, may be able to make the case that failure probability is remote
- Most spillway piers have some reserve capacity beyond stress levels created by static loads
- Most piers were not designed for significant seismic loading
- Some Reclamation structures currently have PHA for 10,000 year earthquake level of > 1.0g
- Level of seismic loading in combination with static loading will determine level of overstress in pier
The Impact of Spillway Bridges

- Bridges are typically provided across the top of spillway crest structures – hoist decks and highway bridges
- Bridges may serve as struts for piers but this needs to be verified
- Bridges can add inertial loads at top of piers
- Bridges can also fail during an earthquake and possibly impact gates
Gate Loads & Trunnion Anchorage

- Large hydrodynamic loads can be transferred from gates to piers during an earthquake.
- Anchorage is evaluated for static and hydrodynamic loads on gate – assuming full load is transferred to trunnion and trunnion anchorage.
- Current condition of anchorage should be evaluated.
- Pseudo-static analysis may indicate that trunnion anchorage is stressed to levels beyond ultimate capacity.
- A time-history analysis may indicate that anchorage can not strain enough to fail (for anchors with unbonded free length).
- Loads transmitted from gates into walls can lead to sliding or local overstressing of concrete.
Evaluation of Multiple Piers

- Multiple piers increase the probability of pier failure
- Failure of one pier will most likely lead to failure of two gates
- Multiple pier failure will increase the breach outflow and downstream consequences
- If multiple pier failures occur, consequences will be a function of failure configuration (series vs. staggered)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Piers Failing</th>
<th>Equation for “x” Piers Failing</th>
<th>Probability for “x” Piers Failing</th>
<th>Probability for “x” Piers Failing</th>
<th>Probability for “x” Piers Failing</th>
<th>Probability for “x” Piers Failing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1P^0(1-P)^2$</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>7.8E-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5P^1(1-P)^4$</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>6.0E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$10P^2(1-P)^5$</td>
<td>1.0E-05</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>1.9E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$10P^3(1-P)^5$</td>
<td>1.0E-08</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$5P^4(1-P)^4$</td>
<td>5.0E-12</td>
<td>3.0E-05</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1P^5(1-P)^0$</td>
<td>1.0E-15</td>
<td>3.0E-07</td>
<td>1.0E-04</td>
<td>0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Probability of One or More Piers Failing</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pier Failure – n+1 (P=0.16) Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Piers Failing</th>
<th>Probability of Failure Equations</th>
<th>Probability (P_x) of (x) Piers Failing</th>
<th>Expected Life Loss Value</th>
<th>Life Loss for (x) Piers Failing x (P_x)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$P_1 = 5(P)^4(1-P)^4$</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>16^</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$P_2 = 10(P)^2(1-P)^2$</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>23^</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$P_3 = 10(P)^2(1-P)^2$</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>30^</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$P_4 = 5(P)^4(1-P)^4$</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$P_5 = 1(P)^5(1-P)^5$</td>
<td>1.0E-04</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.58</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weighted Ave Loss of Life = 11/0.58 = 19 people**

### Pier Failure – 2n (P=0.16) Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Piers Failing</th>
<th>Probability of Failure Equations</th>
<th>Probability (P_x) of (x) Piers Failing</th>
<th>Expected Life Loss Value</th>
<th>Life Loss for (x) Piers Failing x (P_x)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$P_1 = 5(P)^4(1-P)^4$</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>16^</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$P_2 = 10(P)^2(1-P)^2$</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>23^</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$P_3 = 10(P)^2(1-P)^2$</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>30^</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$P_4 = 5(P)^4(1-P)^4$</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$P_5 = 1(P)^5(1-P)^5$</td>
<td>1.0E-04</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.58</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weighted Ave Loss of Life = 16/0.58 = 28 people**
Analysis Methodology for Screening

- If $M > M_{cr}$ develop a SRP for pool and EQ loading.
- If above TRG then go to more rigorous analysis.
- Pseudo-dynamic analysis of monolith recommended to calculate amplifications at location of failure in US/DS direction.
- Amplification of seismic accelerations of 1.5 in the cross canyon direction assumed.
- Use pseudo-static correction of $2/3$.
- FEM should be used for additional analysis due to three dimensionality of loading and structural response.
Finite Element Analysis

- Linear elastic analysis should be done first and may be enough to plot risk below TRG.
- Full nonlinear results – concrete cracking, reinforcing yielding
- Walls and piers crack and are damaged, but remain standing
Case History – Shih Kang Dam (Taiwan)

- Gravity Dam with an 18 bay gated spillway
- Located about 30 miles north of the epicenter of the Chi-Chi earthquake (9/21/99)
- Chelungpu fault passed underneath spillway and ruptured during earthquake
- Vertical offset at spillway of 32-36 feet
- PHA – 0.51g recorded 0.3 miles from dam
- But evidence that ground shaking at the site was not that intense
Shih Kang Dam
Questions or Comments?