

**DEVELOPMENT OF EARTHQUAKE RESISTANT  
DESIGN GUIDELINES  
FOR  
BRIDGES IN SRI LANKA**

**M.A.C. Kumara**

**168914B**

**Degree of Master of Science in Structural Engineering Design**

**Department of Civil Engineering**

**University of Moratuwa**

**Sri Lanka**

**May 2022**

**DEVELOPMENT OF EARTHQUAKE RESISTANT  
DESIGN GUIDELINES  
FOR  
BRIDGES IN SRI LANKA**

**M.A.C. Kumara**

**168914B**

**Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Science in Structural Engineering Design**

**Department of Civil Engineering**

**University of Moratuwa**

**Sri Lanka**

**May 2022**

## DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgment any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgment is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to the University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis, in whole or part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (Such as articles or books)

.....

Signature

.....

Date

The above candidate has carried out research for the master dissertation under my supervision. I confirm that the declaration made above by the student is true and correct.

Name of the supervisor: Prof. C.S. Lewangamage

.....

Signature of the supervisor

.....

Date

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The research on development of earthquake resistant design guideline for bridges in Sri Lanka is an achievement of hard work and dedication that was due to continuous guidance given by Prof. C.S. Lewangamage as the supervisor of the project.

I am especially grateful to Prof. C.S. Lewangamage and Dr. K. Baskaran for their dedication and commitment right through the research work as supervisor and research coordinator.

I wish to thank Dr. Mrs. Kumari Gamage, Dr. Chinthaka Mallikarachchi and Dr. Hasitha Damruwan for their support as course coordinators of the M.Sc. degree in structural engineering design who helped me to complete this research.

I would like to thank Vice chancellor, Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Head of the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa for allowing me to use the facilities available at University of Moratuwa.

I must specially thank all the lecturers of Master degree course of structural engineering design for giving their knowledge and sharing their experience which help me to complete this research with success.

Also, I am grateful to Secretary of Ministry of Highways Eng. R.W.R. Premasiri, Secretary of State Ministry of Rural Roads and Other Infrastructure Prof. Ranjith Dissanayake, Director General of RDA Eng. L.V.S. Weerakoon, former Director General RDA, Eng.D.K.R. Swarna and Eng. A.N. Abeysuriya , Chief Engineer Design, RDA Rathnapura for providing office facilities and guidance to complete this research.

Finally, I am grateful to my family for the wholehearted support given and encouraging me all the time to complete this research.

M.A.C. Kumara

May 2022

## **Abstract**

Sri Lanka is an island located on the Indo-Australian tectonic plate and the location of the country is far away from the plate boundary where inter-plate earthquakes are possible to occur. However, there are earthquake records during the recent past which have considerable magnitude. Moreover, intraplate earthquake risk is there which is possible to occur without prior warning. Therefore, Sri Lanka is no longer be considered safe from seismic threats.

With the increasing demand to improve the road network in the country, it is necessary to reconstruct existing bridge structures. However, there are no seismic design guidelines to use for bridge design procedure in Sri Lanka.

This study is therefore aims to formulate earthquake-resistant design guidelines for bridges in Sri Lanka. For the purpose of formulating the design guideline, bridge classification into three different important classes is proposed based on the relevant classifications in similar codes such as EN 1998-2:2005 , IS 1893-3:2014 and AS 5100.2-2004. Important factors and return periods are proposed based on the guideline given in EN 1998-1:2004. Further, Elastic response spectrums for rock or hard soil are selected based on the available response spectrum for Sri Lanka. However, there is no response spectrum defined for medium soil and soft soil. Therefore, it is proposed to use the response spectrum available in IS 1893-1:2002 for medium and soft soil since soil and rock types are more similar when both countries lie on the same tectonic plate.

This study proposed a seismic analysis approach for bridges using either EN 1998-2:2005 or AS 5100.2-2004. Moreover, suitable design parameters such as peak ground acceleration values are proposed to select according to the available national data.

There are three case studies carried out to illustrate the use of developed guidelines for seismic analysis of bridges in Sri Lanka. Three Case studies were carried out for bridges in the category of important class I, important class II and important class III by using the design codes of AS 5100.2-2004, IS 1893-3:2014, and EN 1998-2:2005. For case study 1, base shear values were calculated using the static lateral force method of analysis and three different design codes provided different results of 50kN, 51kN, and 36kN. For case studies 2 and 3, static analysis was carried out using selected three design codes, and response spectrum analysis was carried out according to EN 1998-2:2005 using the response spectrum defined for rock or hard soil of Sri Lanka. Base shear values of the static analysis results provide different values for three design codes. However, a comparison of the results of response spectrum analysis and fundamental mode method of analysis for Eurocode 8-part2 as the basis of analysis, provided similar fundamental period values and base shear values for both methods. Results of the case studies illustrate that when the design basis is Eurocode 8-Part 2, it provides an average or lower result of base shear value. Since Eurocode 8 provides an opportunity to use it with national choices, it is more suitable to use EN 1998-2:2005 with a national annex for bridge design. Therefore, a developed guideline with national parameters can be used for the seismic design of bridges in Sri Lanka.

# Table of Contents

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of figures.....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Objectives.....	2
1.3 Methodology .....	2
1.4 Main outcome.....	3
1.5 Outline of the thesis.....	3
1.5.1 Chapter 2 Literature review .....	3
1.5.2 Chapter 3 Selection of suitable design parameters for seismic analysis of bridges in Sri Lanka.....	4
1.5.3 Chapter 4 - Case Study .....	4
1.5.4 Chapter 5 – Conclusion and recommendations .....	4
<b>2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Bridges in national highways .....	5
2.2 Earthquakes .....	5
2.3 Bridge Failures due to seismic effects.....	6
2.3.1 Unseating of Bridge Girders .....	6
2.3.2 Damage to the substructure .....	7
2.3.3 Structural damage due to ground failure, Liquefaction .....	7
2.4 Peak ground acceleration and response spectrum .....	7
2.4.1 Peak ground acceleration.....	7
2.4.2 Response spectrum .....	8
2.5 Seismic hazard assessments for Sri Lanka .....	8
2.6 Performance based seismic design of bridges.....	10
2.7 Codes of practices/Guidelines .....	11
2.8 Seismic performance requirement in different codes.....	11
2.8.1 Eurocode 8 part 2-2005 .....	11
2.8.2 IS 1893(Part 3):2014 Indian Standard .....	12
2.8.3 Performance criteria in Transit bridge manual, 2003 second edition, New Zealand .....	12

2.9 Importance classes in different codes.....	13
2.10 Design Seismic action .....	16
2.11 Elastic response spectrum .....	16
2.11.1 Horizontal elastic response spectrum .....	18
2.12 Evaluation of seismic capacity of existing bridges .....	21
<b>3.0 SELECTION OF SUITABLE DESIGN PARAMETERS FOR SEISMIC ANALYSIS OF BRIDGES IN SRI LANKA .....</b>	<b>22</b>
3.1 Selection of suitable design code for seismic analysis of bridges.....	22
3.2 Bridge classification in to different important classes .....	22
3.3 Return period values.....	24
3.4 Importance factors for corresponding return period values .....	25
3.5 Proposed elastic response spectra for Sri Lanka .....	27
3.6 Site Dependent design spectrum for linear analysis.....	30
3.6.1 Ductile behaviour.....	31
3.6.2 Limited ductile behavior.....	31
3.7 Use of AS 5100-2-2004 for seismic analysis .....	35
3.7.1 Bridge Classification .....	35
3.7.2 Acceleration coefficient (a) & Site Factors (s).....	35
3.7.3 Bridge Earthquake Design Category .....	36
3.8 Proposed seismic analysis approach for bridges in Sri Lanka .....	37
3.9 Minimum Overlap Length.....	38
<b>4.0 CASE STUDIES.....</b>	<b>40</b>
4.1 Case study 1-Bridge in importance class I.....	40
4.2 Case Study 2- Bridge in Importance Class II.....	45
4.3 Case Study 3- Bridge in Importance Class III.....	53
<b>5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>APPENDIX -A .....</b>	<b>69</b>
Method of bridge model preparation using Csi Bridge 2016.....	69
<b>APPENDIX B .....</b>	<b>81</b>
Results of Case studies .....	81
Results of Case Study 2 .....	82
Results of Case Study 3 .....	85
<b>APPENDIX C .....</b>	<b>88</b>



Drawings of Original Design – Bridge at Mudduwa Batugedara (Non RDA) Road in Rathnapura .....	88
<b>APPENDIX D .....</b>	<b>105</b>
Drawings of Original Design- Mahaoya Bridge in Central Expressway 42+240 km .....	105

## List of figures

Figure 2.1	Unseating of Superstructure	6
Figure 2.2	Substructure Failure	7
Figure 2.3	Seismic Hazard Zonation Map for Sri Lanka	9
Figure 2.4	Peak ground acceleration Values in selected cities in Sri Lanka	10
Figure 2.5	Shape of Elastic Response Spectrum defined in EC8	18
Figure 2.6	Elastic Response Spectrum for 5% damping in IS 1893-1	20
Figure 2.7	Proposed Response Spectrum for Sri Lanka	20
Figure 3.1	Importance factor and Return period for different exponent “k”	26
Figure 3.2	Shape of Elastic Response Spectrum defined in EC8	29
Figure 3.3	Proposed Response Spectrum for different soil types in Sri Lanka	30
Figure 3.4	Elastic and Design Response Spectrum for Rock, Hard soil types in Sri Lanka	34
Figure 3.5	Elastic and Design Response Spectrum for Medium soil types in Sri Lanka	34
Figure 3.6	Elastic and Design Response Spectrum for soft soil types in Sri Lanka	35
Figure 3.7	Minimum overlap length for seating of the deck on abutment	38
Figure 4.1	Bridge in Mudduwa Batugedara road in Rathnapura	40
Figure 4.2	Bridge No. 101/6 in Colombo-Ratnapura-Wellawaya road	45
Figure 4.3	Finite Element modal of Bridge No. 101/6	51
Figure 4.4	Mode No. 03 Highest mass participated mode	51
Figure 4.5	Mahaoya Bridge at 42+040 in Central Expressway	53
Figure 4.6	Finite element modal of Mahaoya bridge-Case study 3	62
Figure 4.7	Mode No. 01 Highest mass participated mode	62
Figure A.1	Quick bridge option in the Csi bridge	70
Figure A.2	Span length & deck type definition	70
Figure A.3	Initial Modal generated in Csi Bridge	71
Figure A.4	Define Lanes	71

Figure A.5	Modify/Show bridge lane data in CSi Bridge	72
Figure A.6	Section properties –Precast girder	73
Figure A.7	Section properties -Pile	73
Figure A.8	Bridge section data	74
Figure A.9	Bridge bearing data	74
Figure A.10	Details of bridge bent	75
Figure A.11	Bridge bent column data	75
Figure A.12	Bridge abutment data	76
Figure A.13	Bridge object data	77
Figure A.14	Finite element 2D modal of the bridge	78
Figure A.15	Finite element 3D modal of the bridge	78
Figure A.16	Response spectrum used in analysis	79
Figure A.17	Load case modal	80
Figure A.18	Load case data-Response spectrum	80
Figure B.1	Finite element model of the bridge case study 2	82
Figure B.2	Modal participating mass ratios	82
Figure B.3	Deformed shape mode 3- Case study 2	83
Figure B.4	Deformed shape mode 4- Case study 2	83
Figure B.5	Deformed shape mode 6- Case study 2	83
Figure B.6	Deformed shape mode 14- Case study 2	84
Figure B.7	Base reaction for ductile behavior -Case study 2	84
Figure B.8	Base reaction for limited ductile behavior -Case study 2	84
Figure B.9	Finite element 3D model of the bridge -Case study 3	85
Figure B.10	Modal participating mass ratios- Case study 3	85
Figure B.11	Deformed shape mode 1- Case study 3	86
Figure B.12	Deformed shape mode 2- Case study 3	86
Figure B.13	Deformed shape mode 3- Case study 3	86
Figure B.14	Deformed shape mode 16- Case study 3	87
Figure B.15	Base reaction for ductile behavior- Case study 3	87
Figure B.16	Base reaction limited ductile -Case study 3	87

## List of Tables

Table 2.1	Importance factors and seismic classes as given in IS 1893-3-2014	13
Table 2.2	Importance factors and Bridge Classification as given in AS 5100-2-2004	14
Table 2.3	Importance Category and Risk Factors given in Transit Bridge Manual-2003	14
Table 2.4	Importance factors and classes given in EC8-2	15
Table 2.5	Ground Types and corresponding SPT N values given in EC8-2	17
Table 2.6	Ground Types and corresponding SPT N values given in IS 1893-3	17
Table 2.7	EN 1998-1 Table 3.2	18
Table 3.1	Proposed Bridge classification into important classes for Sri Lanka	23
Table 3.2	Proposed Return Period values for different important classes for Sri Lanka	25
Table 3.3	Proposed Importance factors for different important classes for Sri Lanka	26
Table 3.4	proposed soil types for Elastic response spectrum for Sri Lanka (As IS 1893-1:2002)	27
Table 3.5	Soil Types and parameters defining response spectra modified to Format in EC8	30
Table 3.6	Maximum Values of the behavior factor q (EC8-2)	32
Table 3.7	Site factors(s) for general structures as given in AS-1170-4	36
Table 3.8	Distance beyond ground motion considered uncorrelated	39
Table 4.1	Base shear values calculated –Case study 1	44
Table 4.2	Base shear values calculated- Case study 2	50

Table 4.3	Most important modes of case study 2	52
Table 4.4	Comparison of fundamental mode and response spectrum analysis	52
Table 4.5	Base shear Calculated – Case study 3	61
Table 4.6	Most important modes- Case study 3	63
Table 4.7	Comparison of fundamental mode and response spectrum analysis- Case study 3	63

## List of Abbreviations

$q$	-	Behavior factor
$\eta$	-	Damping correction factor with a reference value of $\eta = 1$ for 5% viscous damping,
$d_{es}$	-	$d_{Ed}$ for decks connected monolithically or through fixed bearing
$h$	-	Depth of cross section
DBE	-	Design Basis Earthquake
$d_g$	-	Design ground displacement in accordance with EC8-1 Cl. 3.2.2.4 $= 0,025 \cdot a_g \cdot S \cdot T_C \cdot T_D$
$d_E$	-	Design seismic displacement in accordance with 2.3.6.1. EC8-2
$L_s$	-	Distance from the plastic hinge to point of zero moment
$L_g$	-	Distance beyond which the ground motions may be considered as completely uncorrelated.
$d_T$	-	Displacement due to thermal movements
$d_{eg}$	-	Effective displacement of the two parts due to spatial variations of the seismic ground displacement.
$L_{eff}$	-	Effective length of deck, taken as the distance from the deck joint in question to the nearest full connection of the deck to the substructure.
$d_{es}$	-	Effective seismic displacement of the support due to the deformation of the structures
Se(T)	-	Elastic response spectrum
EC	-	Eurocode
t	-	Exposure period
Y	-	Importance Factor
$d_G$	-	Long term displacement due to permanent & quasi-permanent actions
$T_B$	-	Lower limit of the period of the constant spectral acceleration branch
MCE	-	Maximum Considered Earthquake
$l_m$	-	Minimum support length ensuring the safe transmission of the vertical reaction, but no less than 400mm
$T_n$	-	Natural Period

PGA	-	Peak Ground Acceleration
$a_g$	-	Peak Ground acceleration value
P	-	Probability of exceedance
$a_{gR}$	-	Reference peak ground acceleration
$T_{LR}$	-	Reference return period
$T_L$	-	Return Period
R	-	Risk Factor
$\alpha_s$	-	Shear Span ratio
S	-	Soil factor
$S_{a/g}$	-	Spectral Acceleration
SPT	-	Standard penetration test
$M_s$	-	Surface wave magnitude
ULS	-	Ultimate Limit State
$T_c$	-	Upper limit of the period of the constant spectral acceleration branch
$T_D$	-	Value defining the beginning of the constant displacement response range of the spectrum
T	-	Vibration period of a linear single-degree-of-freedom system