ABSTRACT

A Study on the Stability of Bridge Abutment on Soil undergoing lateral movement

CHO, YONG RYANG
Department of Geotechnical
Engineering
Graduate School of Construction
Engineering Chung-Ang University
Seoul, Korea
Advisor: HONG, WON PYO

The purpose of this study is to present a criterion for the stability of bridge abutment on soil undergoing lateral movement, by analyzing the relation between the safety factor of slope and the lateral movement of the pile foundation and verifying the formulas which were reported for decision of the lateral movement, with case studies on the lateral movement of the soft ground under backfill for abutment constructed.

The pile undergoing lateral ground movement is one of the typical passive piles, however, the piles have not been considered as a passive pile in design of piles for abutments generally. Accordingly, unexpected lateral movement over designed calculation value has been occurred after backfill for abutment.

- i -

In case of adaptation to the pile foundation for abutment under soft ground, the lateral movements have been frequently occurred with ground settlement due to backfilling for abutment. Such situations have been definitely originated with backfill for abutment loading due to the underground soft clay under abutment foundation to be constructed even without any ground improvement and strength promotion.

As the results of this study, following conclusions were obtained additionally;

- 1) The safety factor for slope stability is one of the most significant factors to assess the lateral movement of abutment on soft ground.
- 2) The lateral movement of abutment was assessed to be activated definitely in case the safety factor for slope stability is less than either 1.8(with the pile effect) or 1.5(without the pile effect) by operating the computer-aided program "CHAMP", and otherwise in case the safety factor for slope stability is less than either 1.8(with Bishop method) or 1.5 (Fellenius method) by the program "SLOPE".
- 3) In case of allowable lateral movement of 5cm, the abutment was accessed to be stabilized in case the safety factor for slope stability is more than either 1.6(with the pile effect) or 1.4(without the pile effect) by using the program "CHAMP", and otherwise in case the safety factor for slope stability is more

- than either 1.6(with Bishop method) or 1.4(Fellenius method) by the program "SLOPE".
- 4) As the result of figuring the relation between safety factor for slope stability and index of lateral (ground) movement (F), the upper limit value of index of lateral movement was shown as $F=3.0 \times 10^{-2}$, but in case of its value less than the upper limit, the lateral movement was assessed to be activated.
- 5) As the result of figuring the relation between safety factor for slope stability and index for decision of lateralmovement(IL), in case its index value was shown more than 1.2, the lateral movement was assessed to be activated.
- 6) As the result of figuring the relation between safety factor for slope stability and number of stability (Ns), in case its number was shown more than 3.0, the lateral movement was assessed to be activated.
- 7) As defective influences are considerably given in case the lateral structure movement is occurred in excess due to the lateral ground movement, the potential probability of "the lateral movement" should be sufficiently assessed and the relative workmethod for countermeasure should be established before abutment construction as well.

ABSTRACT

| 1 | 1 |
|-----|----|
| 1.1 | 1 |
| 1.2 | 2 |
| | |
| 2 | 3 |
| 2.1 | 3 |
| 2.2 | 5 |
| 2.3 | 11 |
| | |
| 3 | 20 |
| 3.1 | 20 |
| 3.2 | 22 |
| 3.3 | 26 |
| | |
| 4 | 41 |
| 4.1 | 41 |
| 4.2 | 45 |

| 53 | 5 |
|-----|-----|
| 53 | 5.1 |
| 61 | 5.2 |
| 83 | 5.3 |
| 83 | 5.4 |
| | |
| 86 | 6 |
| 86 | 6.1 |
| 91 | 6.2 |
| | |
| 106 | 7 |
| | |
| 108 | |

| 2.1 | | | 6 |
|------|-----------|--------------|----|
| 2.2 | | () | 12 |
| 2.3 | Fc | | 12 |
| 2.4 | | | 13 |
| 2.5 | | (| 14 |
| 2.6 | F | | 15 |
| 2.7 | | (| 16 |
| 2.8 | I (|) | 18 |
| 2.9 | | | 19 |
| 3.1 | | | 21 |
| 3.2 | | | 23 |
| 3.3 | | | 25 |
| 3.4 | | | 26 |
| 3.5 | | | 28 |
| 3.6 | | | 29 |
| 3.7 | | | 34 |
| 3.8 | | | 35 |
| 3.9 | Fellenius | | 37 |
| 3.10 | CHAMP | | 39 |
| 5.1 | 가 | (SLOPE) | 61 |
| 5.2 | | (CHAMP) | 65 |
| 5.3 | | 가 (CHAMP) | 65 |
| 5.4 | | DATA | 66 |
| 5.5 | | (CHAMP) | 70 |
| 5.6 | | (SLOPE) | 71 |
| 5.7 | | (F) (CHAMP) | 73 |
| 5.8 | | (F) (SLOPE) | 74 |
| 5.9 | | (IL) (CHAMP) | 76 |

| 77 | (I_L) (SLOPE) | | | | 5.10 |
|-----|-----------------|---------|-----|-----------|------|
| 79 | (CHAMP) | (Ns) | | | 5.11 |
| 80 | (SLOPE) | (Ns) | | | 5.12 |
| 82 | | | (F) | | 5.13 |
| 83 | | (I_L) | (I | | 5.14 |
| 83 | (IL) | | (F) | | 5.15 |
| 90 | | | | | 6.1 |
| 92 | | | | EPS | 6.2 |
| 95 | | | | EPS | 6.3 |
| 97 | | | | SIG | 6.4 |
| 100 | | | | SIG | 6.5 |
| 101 | | | | Pile Slab | 6.6 |
| 102 | | | | Pile Slab | 6.7 |
| 105 | + | | + | | 6.8 |
| 105 | | | | | 6.9 |

| 2.1 | | 11 |
|-----|-------------|--------|
| 3.1 | | 31 |
| 3.2 | | 33 |
| 4.1 | | 41 |
| 4.2 | | 55 |
| 5.1 | | 57 |
| 5.2 | | 59 |
| 5.3 | | 62 |
| 5.4 | "SLOPE" | 67 |
| 5.5 | "CHAMP" | 84 |
| 5.6 | | 94 |
| 6.1 | | 87 |
| 6.2 | EPS | 94 |
| 6.3 | SIG | 96 |
| 6.4 | Tiltermeter | 99 |
| 65 | Slab | 99 |