

**LIMIT STATES AND RELIABILITY-BASED DESIGN METHODS
APPLIED TO THE BUOYANCY ASSESSMENT
OF THE SHOAL LAKE AQUEDUCT**

by

GILBERT G. ROBINSON

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Civil and Geological Engineering
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

© June, 2002



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-76862-7

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE**

**LIMIT STATES AND RELIABILITY-BASED DESIGN METHODS APPLIED TO
THE BUOYANCY ASSESSMENT OF THE SHOAL LAKE AQUEDUCT**

BY

GILBERT G. ROBINSON

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University
of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree
of
Master of Science**

GILBERT G. ROBINSON © 2002

Permission has been granted to the Library of The University of Manitoba to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to University Microfilm Inc. to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither this thesis/practicum nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

LIABILITY DISCLAIMER

This thesis document has been prepared in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science at the University of Manitoba. The thesis is based on work completed by UMA Engineering Ltd. and CH2M_Gore and Storrie Ltd. for the City of Winnipeg, Water and Waste Department. It contains additional material that has been specifically prepared by the author to satisfy the requirements for the degree program. The ideas and views presented in this thesis are entirely those of the author and not UMA Engineering Ltd. or CH2M_Gore and Storrie Ltd. The purpose of this disclaimer is to relieve UMA Engineering Ltd. and CH2M_Gore and Storrie Ltd. of any liability that may be associated with the contents of this thesis.

ABSTRACT

An actual design example was used to demonstrate how limit states design methods and engineering judgement can be applied to solve a non-codified engineering problem. The work was focussed on the assessment of potential buoyancy during shutdowns of the eighty-three year old Shoal Lake Aqueduct that is the sole source of potable water for Winnipeg, Manitoba. Four separate buoyancy analyses of the Shoal Lake Aqueduct were completed. Three of the analyses were conducted using limit states and reliability-based design methods. For comparative reasons a fourth analysis was completed using a traditional working stress design (WSD) method. A buoyancy model was developed and used in these analyses. The first buoyancy analysis was completed using partial safety factors developed for the Ontario Highway Bridge Design Code. Because these partial safety factors were developed for use with the design code a second analysis was completed using project-specific partial safety factors. These partial safety factors were determined using Second Moment reliability techniques and measured data for the uncertainties in the buoyancy model. A third buoyancy analysis was completed using Monte Carlo simulation techniques. A fourth buoyancy analysis was completed using WSD methods to demonstrate the potential variability in the level of safety. Engineering judgement was required to develop the buoyancy model, to interpret the data obtained for each of the parameters and to provide meaningful design values for those parameters which could not be measured.

The results of the buoyancy analyses completed using limit states design and reliability-based methods were similar. Because the partial safety factors from the Ontario Highway Bridge Design Code were not based on the measured variability of different parameters, the potential for deviation from a target level of safety is significant. The target level of safety provided using project-specific partial safety factors and Monte Carlo simulation is more reliable because the results reflect the measured variability of the parameters. The target level of safety using WSD methods is not directly quantifiable. The results of this thesis show that the selection of a single factor of safety has a very significant influence on the target level of safety, that is it does not give uniform reliability.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the support of my advisor, Dr. James Graham. He encouraged me to rejoin the Master of Science program and his tireless efforts were instrumental in getting this thesis done before his retirement at the end of June 2002. His dedication to his students is remarkable and appreciated by all who have worked with Dr. Graham. Enjoy your retirement Dr. Graham, take pride in knowing how many students you have helped over the years.

I would also like to thank the three partners in the Shoal Lake Aqueduct Condition Assessment and Rehabilitation Program: the City of Winnipeg, Water and Department, CH2M_Gore and Storrie Ltd. and UMA Engineering Ltd. In particular, I would like to thank Ron Sorokowski from the City of Winnipeg; Chris Macey, Ken Skafffeld and Tom Wingrove from UMA Engineering Ltd. These organizations and people gave me full access to all the resources I needed to finish this project.

Thanks also go out to Dennis Becker of Golder Associates Ltd. who provided some input and reference material over the course of writing this thesis and to Dr. Dave Rogowsky from the University of Alberta who took time out of his busy schedule to come to Winnipeg to be part of the thesis examining committee.

Finally, I would like to express my heart-felt appreciation and love to my family who provided encouragement, understanding and support over the last year while I was writing this thesis document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIABILITY DISCLAIMER	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF APPENDICES	xviii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xix
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS	2
1.2 LIMIT STATES DESIGN IN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING	3
1.3 OBJECTIVES	5
1.4 ORGANIZATION OF THESIS	5
2.0 LIMIT STATES AND RELIABILITY-BASED DESIGN	7
2.1 INTRODUCTION	7
2.2 UNCERTAINTIES AND SAFETY IN DESIGN	8
2.2.1 Uncertainties in design	8
2.2.2 Level of safety	10
2.3 WORKING STRESS DESIGN	12
2.3.1 Background	12
2.3.2 Limitations	12
2.4 LIMIT STATES DESIGN	13
2.4.1 Definition of Limit States Design	13
2.4.2 Historical Development of Limit States Design	15
2.4.3 Current Status of Limit States Design In Geotechnical Engineering	15
2.4.4 Limit State Design Methods	17
2.4.5 General Concerns Regarding The Use Of Limit States Based Design Codes In Geotechnical Engineering	26
2.5 APPLICATION OF LIMIT STATES DESIGN METHODS TO NON-CODIFIED ENGINEERING PROBLEMS	29

3.0	SHOAL LAKE AQUEDUCT	32
3.1	BACKGROUND.....	32
3.2	AQUEDUCT CONSTRUCTION.....	35
3.2.1	Aqueduct Features.....	35
3.2.2	Shoal Lake Aqueduct Design.....	37
3.2.3	General Construction Scheme	41
3.2.4	Role of the GWWD and the Contractor	42
3.2.5	Geotechnical Considerations	43
3.3	OPERATING HISTORY OF THE SHOAL LAKE AQUEDUCT	46
3.4	SHOAL LAKE AQUEDUCT CONDITION ASSESSMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM.....	50
4.0	BUOYANCY ASSESSMENT PROGRAM	52
4.1	BUOYANCY CONCERN	52
4.2	EXISTING INFORMATION.....	53
4.3	IMPACT OF ORIGINAL DESIGN ASSUMPTIONS REGARDING BUOYANCY	55
4.4	AQUEDUCT BUOYANCY CONCEPT	59
4.5	FIELD PROGRAM.....	64
4.5.1	Detailed Test Holes.....	64
4.5.2	Backfill Test Holes	65
4.5.3	Aqueduct Shutdowns	66
4.5.4	Surveys.....	67
4.6	SITE CONDITIONS	67
4.7	SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS.....	69
4.7.1	Regional Geology	69
4.7.2	Soil Profile.....	70
4.7.2.1	Subsurface (foundation) soils.....	70
4.7.2.2	Backfill Material.....	70
4.8	LABORATORY AND FIELD TESTING RESULTS.....	71
4.8.1	Foundation Soils	71
4.8.2	Backfill Soils.....	71
4.8.3	Concrete Cores.....	72
4.8.4	Internal Dimensions	74
4.8.5	Survey Results.....	74

4.9	SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	75
4.10	REMEDIAL OPTIONS – GENERAL OVERVIEW	77
5.0	AQUEDUCT BUOYANCY ANALYSIS.....	80
5.1	PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS.....	81
5.1.1	Applicable Limit States.....	81
5.1.2	General Buoyancy Equation and Variables Affecting Analysis	82
5.1.3	Sensitivity Analysis To Determine Parameter Significance.....	86
5.1.4	Data Collection and Interpretation.....	90
5.2	LIMIT STATES DESIGN.....	92
5.2.1	General Considerations for the Boggy River Stretch (Mile 85.0 to Mile 88.5)	92
5.2.2	Target Level of Safety	94
5.2.3	Partial Safety Factor Method Using OHBDC Load and Resistance Factors	95
5.2.3.1	Buoyancy model	95
5.2.3.2	Analysis Results	98
5.2.4	Partial Safety Factor Method Using Project-Specific Partial Safety Factors.	99
5.2.4.1	Calculations of Partial Safety Factors	99
5.2.4.2	Results of Analysis.....	104
5.2.4.3	Comparison of Results.....	104
5.2.5	Limit State Design Using Monte Carlo Simulation	107
5.2.5.1	Probability Distributions	108
5.2.5.2	Buoyancy Model Set up	110
5.2.5.3	Simulation Results	113
5.2.5.4	Comparison of Methods.....	114
5.2.6	Working Stress Design.....	115
5.2.7	Discussion	117
6.0	CONCLUSIONS.....	121
6.1	INTRODUCTION.....	121
6.2	CONCLUSIONS	121
6.3	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER WORK.....	122
	REFERENCES.....	123
	TABLES.....	127

FIGURES 143

APPENDIX 4-1. Test hole logs. 208

APPENDIX 5-1. Spreadsheet model used with partial safety factors from OHBDC
(1991). 215

APPENDIX 5-2. Simulation model output for the 'BP' aqueduct section..... 221

APPENDIX 5-3. Simulation model output statistics and simulation summary for the
resisting ratio, all aqueduct section 233

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 2-1. Approximate relationship between safety index and probability of failure. (MacGregor 1975 and Becker 1996b).
- Table 3-1. Summary of aqueduct sections constructed between Mile 85.0 and the Intake.
- Table 4-1. Summary of forces for 60 percent submergence of the aqueduct. Assumes no backfill weight or backfill shear resistance.
- Table 4-2. Summary of measured concrete core thicknesses.
- Table 4-3. Summary of measured internal dimensions. Figure 4-14 shows the measurement locations inside the aqueduct.
- Table 5-1. Probability distributions used in parameter sensitivity analysis.
- Table 5-2. BO aqueduct section – Sensitivity analysis results for concrete area and total section area.
- Table 5-3. Regression and correlation analysis results for the parameter sensitivity analysis. The results indicate how strong the input variables are related to the resisting ratio.
- Table 5-4. Statistics for the input and output variables from the parameter sensitivity analysis.
- Table 5-5. Partial safety factors obtained from the OHBDC (1991).
- Table 5-6. Project-specific partial safety factors.
- Table 5-7. Summary of the buoyancy analysis parameters used with the partial safety factor methods.
- Table 5-8. Probability distributions of the input parameters used in the monte carlo simulation.

Table 5-9. Variation in the simulation results using 30,000 and 100,000 simulation cycles. Summary of probabilities for a resisting ratio less than 1.0 and the corresponding depth of ballast required to provide a resisting ratio of 1.0.

Table 5-10. Monte carlo simulation results – Initial simulation shows the probability of failure ($RR < 1.0$) that the resisting ratio is less than 1.0 and the minimum depths of ballast required to provide a resisting ratio of 1.0. The final simulation results show the probability of failure ($RR < 1.0$) for the design depth of ballast.

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 2-1 Risks for selected natural events and engineering projects designed in keeping with current practice. (from Becker 1996a)
- Figure 2-2. Possible load and resistance distributions (after Green 1989): (a) very good control of R and S; (b) mixed control of R and S; (c) poor control of R and S. (Becker 1996b)
- Figure 3-1. Map showing the location of Winnipeg, Indian Bay and the aqueduct.
- Figure 3-2. Falcon river diversion.
- Figure 3-3. Plan and profile of the aqueduct alignment.
- Figure 3-4. Pre-cast pipe segment in shored trench. (Construction Photograph No. 669)
- Figure 3-5. Cut and cover construction. (Construction Photograph No. 552)
- Figure 3-6. Pre-cast pipe segment used to construct the Branch 1 Aqueduct. (Construction Photograph No. 667)
- Figure 3-7. Aqueduct section consisting of an arch and invert.
- Figure 3-8. Inverted drainage siphon used to maintain drainage paths perpendicular to the alignment of the aqueduct. (From GWWD Drawing D-327)
- Figure 3-9. Typical arch stresses and bearing loads for the aqueduct. (from GWWD Drawing D317)
- Figure 3-10. Typical aqueduct section used in 1915. The invert is 150 millimetres thick and is non-reinforced. The invert section shown is also referred to as the standard or 'O' type invert. (from GWWD Drawing B-128)
- Figure 3-11. Widened invert slab, used in 1916, to reduce the foundation bearing pressure. This invert type was used on all solid foundations, whether compressible or not. (from GWWD Drawing D-334)

- Figure 3-12. Widened and reinforced invert slab used in 1916 on all questionable foundation soils. (from GWWD Drawing D-334)
- Figure 3-13. Invert testing program undertaken in 1916. (Construction Photograph No. 581)
- Figure 3-14. Three invert sections used for construction in 1917 and 1918 based on the results of the invert testing program from 1916. The inverts in this figure are for the 'B' aqueduct section. The same invert shapes were used for all the aqueduct section types constructed in 1917 and 1918. The 'A' invert section was used on what was considered to be the '*worst*' foundation conditions; the 'E' invert was used where the foundation conditions were considered to be '*better than the worst, but poorer than the best*'; and the 'O' invert section was used on what was considered to be the '*best*' foundation conditions. (from GWWD Drawing B-304)
- Figure 3-15. Special gravity invert used to prevent buoyancy. The thickness of the invert was sometimes reduced if a foundation soil of low permeability was encountered before the full depth of the invert was excavated. (from GWWD Drawing B-291)
- Figure 3-16. Cast-in-place inverts constructed in 4.57 metres lengths. (Construction Photograph No. 418)
- Figure 3-17. Arches cast-in-place using steel forms. The arch segments were cast in 13.7 metres lengths that covered three, 4.57 metres invert segments. (Construction Photograph No. #916)
- Figure 3-18. Compacting backfill beside the lower extremity of the arch leg. (Construction Photograph No. 629)
- Figure 3-19. Steep trench side slopes (3V:1H) were excavated where possible. Side slopes were flattened to 1V:1H when loose or soft soils were encountered. (Construction Photograph No. 919)

- Figure 3-20. Approximately 1.0 to 1.5 metres of base heave in the aqueduct trench, Mile 85.5. Note the spoil banks adjacent to the excavation. (Construction Photograph No. 334)
- Figure 3-21. Slope failure of the aqueduct trench near Mile 90. (Construction Photograph No. 360)
- Figure 3-22. Groundwater piping into the base of the aqueduct trench at Mile 97.2. (Construction Photograph No. 373)
- Figure 3-23. Method used to establish a 'firm' foundation when groundwater piping conditions were encountered. (from GWWD Drawing A-376)
- Figure 3-24. Wooden box drains installed just below grade to help control groundwater seepage. (Construction Photograph No. 442)
- Figure 3-25. Box drain and offtake to drainage sump. (Construction Photograph No. 494)
- Figure 3-26. Slope failure of the aqueduct trench near Mile 92.5. (Construction Photograph No. 920)
- Figure 3-27. Timber pile foundation used where 'flowing clays' were encountered. (from GWWD Drawing B253)
- Figure 3-28. Sand and gravel backfill used where the trench was over-excavated to remove organic soils. (Construction Photograph No. 190)
- Figure 3-29. Predicted population growth for Winnipeg in the early 1900's. (from GWWD Drawing A-700)
- Figure 3-30. Predicted versus actual population and average daily water demand (ADD). The aqueduct capacity was developed in stages as the average daily water demand increased.
- Figure 4-1. Sub-surface profile and test hole locations.
- Figure 4-2. Aqueduct profile and detailed test hole locations.

- Figure 4-3. Minimum degree of aqueduct submergence required for buoyancy to occur is about 60 percent of the maximum external height.
- Figure 4-4. Simplified force diagram showing the resisting forces and the net upward hydrostatic or buoyant force.
- Figure 4-5. The buoyant force acting on the aqueduct changes with increasing degrees of submergence. The buoyant force is approximately equal to the weight of the aqueduct when it is about 60 percent submerged. The maximum buoyant force is generated when the water level is equal to or higher than the top of the aqueduct.
- Figure 4-6. Typical locations of the backfill test holes.
- Figure 4-7. Typical site conditions in the Boggy River Stretch (Mile 85.0 to Mile 88.5).
- Figure 4-8. Typical site conditions in the Summit Stretch (Mile 88.5 to Mile 93.5). The higher ground levels on either side of the ditches are a result of not backfilling the original excavation to natural grade.
- Figure 4-9. Typical site conditions in the Snake Lake Stretch (Mile 93.5 to Mile 97.5).
- Figure 4-10. Histogram of saturated backfill unit weights measured between Mile 85.0 and Mile 95.0. These measurements were used to develop the relationship between dry unit weight and water content shown in Figure 4-11.
- Figure 4-11. Relationship between dry backfill unit weight and water content determined using non-linear regression analysis.
- Figure 4-12. Histogram of shear strengths measured in the backfill soils adjacent to the aqueduct.
- Figure 4-13. Histogram of saturated concrete unit weights measured from the concrete cores taken between Mile 85.6 and Mile 95.7.
- Figure 4-14. Diagram of the locations where internal measurements used in the buoyancy analysis work were taken.

- Figure 4-15. Histogram of the crown backfill depths determined from the profile survey of the backfill berm.
- Figure 4-16. Groundwater profile delineated from survey data taken in the Boggy River Stretch (Mile 85.0 to Mile 88.5).
- Figure 4-17. Details of the helical screw type anchors used in the soil anchor testing program.
- Figure 4-18. Typical site conditions at the trial ballasting site. Note the geotextile in the background used as a separation layer between the original backfill soils and the granular ballast.
- Figure 4-19. Placing granular ballast on the aqueduct at the trial ballasting site. Note the monitoring instrumentation located along the centreline of the aqueduct and the instrumentation offset from centreline (Section 4.10).
- Figure 4-20. Placing granular ballast in the Boggy River Stretch (Mile 85.0 to Mile 88.5). Construction was completed during the winter season due to difficult site access.
- Figure 5-1. Resisting ratio profiles with and without granular ballast determined using the partial safety factors from the OHBDC (1991).
- Figure 5-2. Profiles of the depths of granular ballast (minimum and design) determined using the partial safety factors from the OHBDC (1991).
- Figure 5-3. Histogram of measured and predicted saturated backfill unit weights used in calculating resistance factors for the unit weight of backfill.
- Figure 5-4. Histogram of measured unit weights of saturated granular ballast used in calculating resistance factors for the unit weight of ballast.
- Figure 5-5. Relationship between the reliability index, β and the calculated resistance factor, ϕ for each of the variables included in the buoyancy analysis.

- Figure 5-6. Relationship between the separation function, θ and the calculated resistance factor, ϕ for the each of the variables included in the buoyancy analysis.
- Figure 5-7. Relationship between the coefficient of variation and the resistance factor, ϕ calculated using Equations 2-7 and 2-9.
- Figure 5-8. Resisting ratio profiles with and without granular ballast determined using project-specific (P-S) partial safety factors.
- Figure 5-9. Profiles of the depths of granular ballast (minimum and design) determined using project-specific (P-S) partial safety factors.
- Figure 5-10. Comparison of the resisting ratio profiles from the two buoyancy analyses completed using partial safety factors.
- Figure 5-11. Comparison of the profiles of the minimum depths of granular ballast determined from the two buoyancy analyses completed using partial safety factors.
- Figure 5-12. Comparison of the profiles for the backfill weights calculated using the project-specific (P-S) partial safety factors and those from the OHBDC (1991).
- Figure 5-13. Comparison of the profiles for the total resistance calculated using the project-specific (P-S) partial safety factors and those from the OHBDC (1991).
- Figure 5-14. Comparison of the profiles for the depths of granular ballast selected for final design. The design depths were based on the minimum depths of granular ballast that were calculated using the project-specific (P-S) partial safety factors and those from the OHBDC (1991).
- Figure 5-15. Normal probability distribution function fitted to data for the depths of crown backfill.

- Figure 5-16. Normal probability distribution function fitted to data for the unit weight of granular ballast.
- Figure 5-17. Log-normal probability distribution function fitted to data for the unit weight of backfill.
- Figure 5-18. Normal probability distribution function fitted to data for the unit weight of concrete.
- Figure 5-19. Typical set up of a monte carlo simulation model used for the buoyancy analysis.
- Figure 5-20. Typical triangular probability distribution function used to estimate the variability of concrete area for each aqueduct section analyzed using monte carlo simulation. This distribution is for the 'BP' aqueduct section.
- Figure 5-21. Typical triangular probability distribution function used to estimate the variability of total section area for each aqueduct section analyzed using monte carlo simulation. This distribution is for the 'BP' aqueduct section.
- Figure 5-22. Distribution of resisting ratios calculated for the 'BP' aqueduct section over 30,000 simulation cycles. The probability that the resisting ratio is less than 1.0 is 33.5 percent.
- Figure 5-23. Distribution of the depths of granular ballast calculated for the 'BP' aqueduct section using 30,000 simulation cycles. The depths represent the amount of granular ballast required to provide a resisting ratio of 1.0.
- Figure 5-24. Distribution of resisting ratios calculated for the 'BP' aqueduct section including the weight of granular ballast (design depth = 0.65 metres). The probability that the resisting ratio is less than 1.0 is 0.003 percent. The target probability of failure ($P_f = 0.011\%$) corresponds to a resisting ratio of 1.017.

Figure 5-25. Comparison of the profiles of the minimum depths of granular ballast determined using project-specific (P-S) partial safety factors and Monte Carlo (MC) simulation. The depths of ballast are the minimum depths required to provide a resisting ratio of 1.0.

Figure 5-26. Comparison of the minimum depths of granular ballast calculated using the limit state design method using PSFs from the OHBDC (1991) and using the working stress design method with a global factor of safety = 1.25.

LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix 4-1. Test hole logs.
- Appendix 5-1. Spreadsheet model used with partial safety factors from OHBDC (1991).
- Appendix 5-2. Simulation model output for the 'BP' aqueduct section.
- Appendix 5-3. Simulation model output statistics and simulation summary for the resisting ratio, for all aqueduct sections.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
ADD	average daily demand
BR1	Branch 1 Aqueduct
BR2	Branch 2 Aqueduct
CHBDC	Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code
GFS	global factor of safety
GWWD	Greater Winnipeg Water District
LF	load factor
LRFD	load and resistance factor design
LSD	limit states design
MLD	millions of litres per day
NBCC	National Building Code of Canada
OHBDC	Ontario Highway Bridge Design Code
PDF	probability density function
P_f	probability of failure
P-S	project-specific
PSF	partial safety factor
RBD	reliability-based design
RF	resistance factor
RR	resisting ratio
SLA	Shoal Lake Aqueduct
SLA_CARP	Shoal Lake Aqueduct Condition Assessment and Rehabilitation Program
SLS	Serviceability Limit State
ULS	Ultimate Limit State
WSD	working stress design

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In the mid-1970's, limit states design (LSD) methods were introduced to Canadian structural engineers as an alternative to working stress design (WSD) methods. (A list of abbreviations used in this thesis is given on page xi following the Table of Contents.) Since this time, LSD methods have become the general state of practice for structural design, with their objective being to provide a more quantifiable and consistent level of safety. In contrast, geotechnical engineers have been slow to adopt LSD methods to replace WSD methods. The slow progress within the geotechnical community can be attributed, at least in part, to the years of experience and level of comfort using WSD and the high degree of uncertainty associated with many geotechnical parameters.

Limit states are defined as conditions under which a structure or its component members no longer perform their intended functions (Becker, 1996a). The use of LSD methods is facilitated with the use of design codes. The objective of design codes is to ensure a minimum level of technical quality and a minimum or specified level of safety. The level of safety or reliability of a system can be defined in terms of the probability of failure. In general, this is achieved through the use of multiple load and resistance factors, specified design values for material properties and specified load combinations. The purpose of load and resistance factors, or partial safety factors (PSF), is to account for uncertainties, for example, in the measurement of material properties, uncertainties in analytical models, and uncertainties in loads that the structure is required to sustain. The PSFs can be determined directly using probabilistic or reliability methods which make use of large databases of measured values, or they can be determined by direct calibration with WSD methods.

In contrast, WSD only uses one global factor of safety (GFS) to account for all uncertainties. This GFS is almost entirely based on engineering judgement and experience and it would be extremely difficult to estimate a level of safety (or a probability of failure) for any value of the GFS.

1.1 STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS

There are two general problems. First, LSD methods are not compatible with WSD methods. Two, many classes of engineering problems are not covered by design codes based on LSD, particularly engineering problems in the general area known as geotechnical engineering.

The first problem is best explained by example. Assume a geotechnical engineer, using WSD, provides foundation recommendations for a spread footing to a structural engineer who will design a structure using LSD methods. The foundation recommendations are based on Terzaghi's bearing capacity equation, which is a strength equation. In traditional geotechnical practice, the ultimate bearing capacity calculated from this equation is reduced using a GFS ranging from 2.5 to 3. These relatively large GFSs are selected to provide not only a safety margin against catastrophic failure, but also, in a notional way, to restrict bearing pressures and limit settlements. In this example, the single GFS provides protection against exceeding both an Ultimate Limit State (ULS) and a Serviceability Limit State (SLS). The resulting "allowable bearing capacity", is the value provided to the structural engineer. Difficulties can develop when a structural engineer tries to evaluate ULSs using a value that is intended to limit settlements, which is considered to be an SLS. Obviously the two systems are not compatible and there is much potential for confusion and human error. In addition, the level of safety associated with the foundation recommendations may not be comparable with the level of safety for the structure itself. The problem arises because LSD methods provide separate evaluations of ULSs and SLSs, which are related to strength and deformation, respectively. In contrast, GFS methods combine these quite separate states through a single 'confidence' factor that is purely empirical.

The second problem, and the focus of this thesis, is that many classes of engineering problems are simply not covered by current design codes based on LSD. This is particularly true for existing infrastructure and geotechnical engineering problems. In these cases, engineers may feel that WSD methods are more attractive due to their relative simplicity. The level of safety provided by WSD would be unknown. Engineers might therefore prefer to use a Limit States approach. However, if no design code has

been prepared, it may indicate there is a lack of data that can be used to derive PSFs for many of the parameters used in geotechnical design.

1.2 LIMIT STATES DESIGN IN GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING

In 1980, an agreement was reached to draft a geotechnical design code for use across Europe (Ovesen, 1981). Some countries, such as Denmark, had been using design codes with prescribed PSFs for quite a few years. This generated quite a bit of interest from European engineers using WSD methods. Many questions were raised about the pitfalls that might be encountered using prescribed PSFs or attempting to account for the variability of geologic uncertainties using statistics and probability theory. Many felt that the use of LSD and prescribed PSFs would remove the engineer from the design process and there would be no room for engineering experience or judgement. From about 1981 to the early 1990's, there seems to be a distinct gap in published literature on the use of LSD in geotechnical engineering. Since that time a considerable amount of work has been completed and published in conference proceedings (International Limit States Design Symposium, 1993; Uncertainty in the Geologic Environment, 1996) and engineering journals such as the Canadian Geotechnical Journal and the ASCE Journal of Geotechnical Engineering. In addition, three Canadian limit states design codes now require the use of LSD for the geotechnical component of design. These codes include the Ontario Highway Bridge Design Code (OHBDC; Ministry of Transportation of Ontario, 1991), the National Building Code of Canada (NBCC; National Research Council of Canada, 1995) and the Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code (CHBDC; Canadian Standards Association, 2000). Limit States Design procedures will be introduced in the next edition of the Canadian Foundation Engineering Manual published by the Canadian Geotechnical Society. The new edition is expected in 2003-2004.

The use of LSD methods by Canadian geotechnical engineers has been initiated through the design codes mentioned above. However, many of the problems faced by geotechnical engineers do not have design codes to guide the engineer. How can engineers apply LSD methods to non-codified problems? Can engineers use prescribed PSFs from other codes? What risk would be associated with this? Do engineers need

to use PSFs or can reliability theory be used to help evaluate the level of safety? How much understanding of probability and reliability theory is required? Can engineering judgement be used in conjunction with LSD methods?

These issues are addressed in this thesis by way of an actual design example, which involved assessment of possible buoyancy of the Shoal Lake Aqueduct in eastern Manitoba. The eighty-three year old Shoal Lake Aqueduct is the sole water supply for Winnipeg, Manitoba. It was constructed between 1915 and 1919 and has been in almost continuous use since that time. Only in recent years has the aqueduct been shutdown to facilitate much needed maintenance repairs. During these shutdowns, there is a possibility that the aqueduct could become buoyant in areas where the aqueduct is submerged and the backfill material is mainly comprised of light-weight organic soils. No design code exists to evaluate the potential for buoyancy of a structure like the aqueduct. One of the biggest advantages the engineer has is that the aqueduct has already been constructed. This permits direct measurement for many of the parameters or uncertainties involved in assessing buoyancy potential. Direct measurement was necessary because there is no database available that can be used to determine appropriate design parameters or PSFs that can be used in design.

This LSD example is a case study of a unique and rare engineering problem involving a very critical component of civil engineering infrastructure. There is no design code directly applicable to buoyancy assessment and there is minimal engineering experience. The amount of field information that was required to solve this problem is not ordinarily available to students and therefore the work in this thesis represents a unique opportunity to show how LSD methods can be applied outside of design codes. This work is not simply the application of probabilistic and reliability methods. It involves a significant component of engineering judgement to develop the buoyancy model and to interpret the data used in the model.

HYPOTHESIS:

A combination of limit states design (including reliability-based design methods) and good engineering judgement can provide technically sound, economic solutions to many classes of engineering problems, particularly problems involving remediation of existing infrastructure.

1.3 OBJECTIVES

The objectives to be met in this thesis include the following.

1. To show that LSD methods can be successfully applied to non-codified engineering problems.
2. To show why PSFs from non-related design codes may not be applicable.
3. To show how project-specific PSFs can be developed.
4. To show how reliability-based design methods can be used as an alternative to the PSF method and to check the results of designs completed with project-specific PSFs.
5. To demonstrate the inherent uncertainty in using WSD methods.
6. To demonstrate the importance of engineering judgement in design.

1.4 ORGANIZATION OF THESIS

Following this introduction, Chapter 2 presents a general overview of LSD. The chapter begins by outlining the various uncertainties and required level of safety that need to be identified before design begins. For comparative purposes, a brief discussion on WSD has been included. The section on LSD provides a definition and history of LSD, an overview of the various LSD methods that can be used in design and a discussion of the concerns raised by engineers regarding the use of LSD methods in geotechnical engineering. A general approach to applying LSD methods to non-codified engineering problems is included at the end of the chapter.

Chapter 3 provides an overall summary of the Shoal Lake Aqueduct. The chapter highlights the engineering challenges faced in the early 1900's by the engineers during the design and construction of the aqueduct. The operating history of the aqueduct has been included to show how the operating requirements have changed over the years and how these relate to buoyancy potential of the aqueduct. The chapter concludes by introducing the Shoal Lake Aqueduct Condition Assessment and Rehabilitation Program that was initiated by the City of Winnipeg, Water and Waste Department in the early 1990's.