

AD-A038 655

ARMY ENGINEER WATERWAYS EXPERIMENT STATION VICKSBURG MISS F/G 13/13
ENGINEERING CONDITION SURVEY AND STRUCTURAL INVESTIGATION OF MO--ETC(U)
MAR 77 C E PACE, J T PEATROSS

UNCLASSIFIED

WES-MP-C-77-2

NL

1 OF 3
AD
A038655



M. P. C-77-2 ENGINEERING CONDITION SURVEY & STRUCTURAL INVESTIGATION, MONTGOMERY LOCKS & DAM, OHIO RIVER MAR. 1977

ADA 038655



2
NW



MISCELLANEOUS PAPER C-77-2

ENGINEERING CONDITION SURVEY AND STRUCTURAL INVESTIGATION OF MONTGOMERY LOCKS AND DAM OHIO RIVER

by


Carl E. Pace, James T. Peatross, Jr.

Concrete Laboratory
U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station
P. O. Box 631, Vicksburg, Miss. 39180

March 1977
Final Report

Approved For Public Release; Distribution Unlimited

DDC
RECEIVED
APR 27 1977
A



AD NO. _____
DDC FILE COPY

Prepared for U. S. Army Engineer District, Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222

**Destroy this report when no longer needed. Do not return
it to the originator.**

cont'd p 1473A)

Unclassified
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

cracking in the lock walls is caused by barge impact.) The longitudinal crack parallel to the lock in the middle wall of Montgomery Lock is hypothesized to be caused by barge impact; therefore, this can be a source of deterioration which increases with lock use. The sonoscope study indicates that the cracking along the center of the middle wall does not worsen with depth. The concern of the cracks and spalled areas, in the concrete surface, is that they will allow the access of water; thereby causing an increased rate of deterioration due to freezing and thawing. Maintenance of the surface cracks and spalled areas is, therefore, essential.

In relation to present-day criteria, almost all of the monoliths on the land wall are inadequate in their resistance to overturning and base pressures. In general, the monoliths in middle and river walls are inadequate in their resistance to overturning. This is especially true for the middle wall monoliths in the dewatered case. The miter sills are inadequate for sliding if the locks are dewatered.

The stress in the culvert wall of monolith M-8 is greater than 800 psi tension. This tensile stress is too large and will crack the concrete. This allows a stress flow up through the center of the monoliths, thereby causing cracking. This hypothesized condition for cracking should be checked by inspecting the culvert walls as soon as possible.

From the deteriorated condition of the surface of the lock monoliths, it is evident that some action must be initiated. Since corrective action is needed, a feasibility study should be made to determine what action is necessary which will provide the most economical and adequate lock usage over a period of 30 to 50 years. For this reason, it is recommended that a feasibility study be made considering the following alternatives:

- a. Minimum maintenance and protection of the locks and dam from weathering with expected replacement when needed as determined by periodic inspection.
- b. Rehabilitation of locks and dam.
- c. Replacement of locks and dam.

The above recommendations may be affected by a total structural and operational evaluation. In fact, this study does not evaluate the foundation, steel gates, bridgework, lock gates, or appurtenant mechanical or electrical facilities. These will be considered by the Pittsburgh District in the overall evaluation of the locks and dam.

1473B

Unclassified
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

THE CONTENTS OF THIS REPORT ARE NOT TO BE
USED FOR ADVERTISING, PUBLICATION, OR
PROMOTIONAL PURPOSES. CITATION OF TRADE
NAMES DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN OFFICIAL EN-
DORSEMENT OR APPROVAL OF THE USE OF SUCH
COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS.

ADDRESS FOR	
RTM	Waite Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DD	Def Section <input type="checkbox"/>
ANNOUNCES	<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION	
BY	
DISTRIBUTION, RESTRICTIONS, CODES	
Date, Hour, and Signature	
A	

PREFACE

The work of an engineering condition survey and structural investigation for Montgomery Locks and Dam located on the Ohio River was conducted for the US Army Engineer District, Pittsburgh, Corps of Engineers, by the Concrete Laboratory (CL) of the US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES).

The contract was monitored by the Pittsburgh District Office with main assistance from Messrs. J. Colletti, H. Ferguson, J. Gribar, and S. Long.

The cooperation and assistance of all personnel at the District Office were greatly appreciated.

The study was performed under the direction of Messrs. B. Mather, J. M. Scanlon, and J. E. McDonald, CL. The structural analysis was performed by Dr. C. E. Pace, Messrs. R. L. Campbell, E. F. O'Neil, and J. T. Peatross, and Major H. Beardslee. The material properties were obtained by Messrs. R. L. Stowe, F. S. Stewart, and J. B. Eskridge. The report was prepared by Dr. Carl E. Pace and J. T. Peatross.

The Commanders and Directors of WES during the conduct of the program and the preparation and publication of this report were COL G. H. Hilt, CE, and COL J. L. Cannon, CE. Mr. F. R. Brown was Technical Director.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION -----	1.1
Location of Study Area -----	1.1
Purpose and Approach -----	1.1
Historical Construction -----	1.2
SECTION 2: SURFACE CONCRETE DETERIORATION AND CRACKING -----	2.1
Introduction -----	2.1
Results of Monitoring Cracks for Movement -----	2.1
Crack Survey -----	2.3
Pulse Velocity Investigation -----	2.7
Background -----	2.7
Land Wall Measurements -----	2.8
Middle Lock Wall Measurements -----	2.10
River Wall Measurements -----	2.11
Conclusions -----	2.11
Surface Condition -----	2.12
SECTION 3: CONCRETE INTEGRITY -----	3.1
SECTION 4: LABORATORY TESTS -----	4.1
Material Properties -----	4.1
SECTION 5: STABILITY ANALYSIS -----	5.1
Introduction and Problem Statement -----	5.1
Results -----	5.3
SECTION 6: STRESS ANALYSIS -----	6.1
Introduction and Problem Statement -----	6.1
Finite Element Analysis -----	6.1
SECTION 7: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS -----	7.1
REFERENCES -----	R.1
APPENDIX A: STABILITY ANALYSIS -----	A-1
Introduction -----	A-1
Applied Loads -----	A-1
Design Criteria -----	A-3
Stability Computations -----	A-6

CONVERSION FACTORS, US CUSTOMARY TO METRIC (SI) UNITS OF MEASUREMENT

US customary units of measurement used in this report can be converted to metric (SI) units as follows:

<u>Multiply</u>	<u>By</u>	<u>To Obtain</u>
inches	2.540000 E-02	metres
feet	3.048000 E-01	metres
miles (US statute)	1.6093 E+03	metres
pounds (mass)	4.535924 E-01	kilograms
pounds (force)	4.448222 E+00	newtons
pounds (force) per square foot	4.788026 E+01	pascals
pounds (mass) per cubic foot	1.601846 E+01	kilograms per cubic metre
pounds (force) per square inch	6.894757 E+03	pascals
kips (force) per square inch	6.894757 E+06	pascals
feet per second	3.048000 E-01	metre per second

ENGINEERING CONDITION SURVEY AND STRUCTURAL
INVESTIGATION OF MONTGOMERY LOCKS AND DAM
OHIO RIVER

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report contains the results of an engineering condition survey and a structural analysis of Montgomery Locks and Dams (Figures 1.1 and 1.2) on the Ohio River. The investigation was conducted from October 1974 to February 1976 by the Waterways Experiment Station (WES) for the U. S. Army Engineer District, Pittsburgh (ORP). Authorization for the investigation was given in DA Form 2544, dated 23 October 1974, issued by ORP.

1.2 ORP initiated the investigation of Montgomery Locks and Dam by their Periodic Inspection Report.¹ The report reviews the construction and the general condition of the locks and dam with attention to specific problem areas. The results of the periodic report warranted further study. A condition survey² was conducted by WES for ORP and was accomplished for the dam. This survey determined the concrete quality and location of cracks that could affect the structural integrity of the dam. The present project was initiated to determine if a need exists for a study to consider the rehabilitation or replacement of the locks and dam. If such a need is found, a separate study will be initiated to evaluate the feasibility of rehabilitation or replacement.

Location of Study Area

1.3 Montgomery Locks and Dam are located on the Ohio River in Beaver County, Pennsylvania, 31.7 miles downstream of Pittsburgh.

Purpose and Approach

1.4 The purpose of this report is to present the findings and conclusions drawn from the condition survey and structural investigation

of Montgomery Locks and Dam. This study does not evaluate the foundation, steel gates, bridge work, lock gates, or appurtenant mechanical or electrical facilities which will be considered by ORP when the overall condition of the locks and dam is evaluated.

1.5 This investigation is limited to:

- a. A crack survey of the locks.
- b. Examination of major cracks under load.
- c. Soniscope investigation of several major cracks.
- d. Structural property determination of foundation and concrete.
- e. Stability analysis of locks and dam monoliths.
- f. Stress analysis of selected monoliths.

The evaluation of the structures, as given in this report, is relative to these specific studies; although concrete integrity, concrete deterioration, conditions which may cause immediate failure, existence and extent of structural cracking, and the alignment or settlement of the various structural monoliths were given consideration.

Historical Construction

1.6 A detailed history of the locks and dam features and construction is presented in Reference 1; therefore, only a general description of the locks and dam is given below.

1.7 Montgomery Locks and Dam were constructed under two contracts, from June 1932 to June 1936. They replace single 110- by 600-ft locks and original movable wicket dams No. 4, 5, and 6 which were built in 1898-1908, 1889-1907, and 1892-1904, respectively. The pool extends to Dashields Locks and Dam, river mile 13.3.

1.8 Montgomery Dam is a non-navigable high-lift gated structure. The dam is comprised of a controlled spillway consisting of 10 vertical-lift gated sections, each 100 ft in length having a full vertical travel of 40.25 ft above the sill which is at elevation 667.0. It has an uncontrolled spillway consisting of two fixed weir sections, one 109.5 ft in length adjacent to the abutment and the other 109.25 ft in length

adjacent to the river wall, both with a crest at elevation 680.33. The overall length of the dam between the river wall and the abutment is 1,378.75 ft, including the fixed weir sections and the gated spillway.

1.9 The locks consist of two adjacent parallel lock chambers located along the left bank of the river, a landward 110- by 600-ft main chamber, and a 56- by 360-ft auxiliary chamber.

1.10 The upper guard wall is 403.96 ft long and the upper guide wall is 1080.94 ft long measured from the upstream nose of the middle wall, respectively. The lower guard wall is 180.33 ft long and the lower guide wall is 490.33 ft long measured from the downstream nose of the middle wall, respectively. The upper and lower service gates are of the mitering type and are hydraulically operated. The floors within both chambers are paved.


1.11 The elevation of the top of lock walls, guide, and guard walls is 692.0 ft msl, except at the areas adjacent to the miter gate recesses of the main chamber; here the top of land wall is at elevation 694.0 ft msl.

1.12 Vertical lift from the lower pool, elevation 664.5, to the upper pool, elevation 682.0, is 17.5 ft. Controlling depth in the lower lock approach is governed by the poiree dam foundation which is located 14.6 ft below lower pool.

1.13 The filling and emptying of the lock chambers is accomplished through longitudinal culverts in all three walls.

1.14 Provisions are made for closures of both chambers. These closures cannot be classed as emergency type closures; in the 56-ft chamber a cofferbeam and needle type closures are used and in the 110-ft chamber trestles are raised up out of recesses provided in the bottom of the chamber upstream of the miter gates, and bulkheads are fitted in between each of the trestles. Embedded metal anchorages are provided in the lower guard sill of both chambers for installation of a poiree trestle type dam to permit unwatering of the lock chambers for maintenance and repair work on the lower lock gates. All the necessary materials needed to make the closures are stored at ORP's Warehouse and Boatyard located on Neville Island on the Ohio River at river mile 7.5.

1.15 The above description gives an overall idea of the construction and if more details are desired, they can be found in Reference 1.



25 JUNE 1963



5 AUG. 1963

Figure 1.1. Aerial view of Montgomery Locks and Dam.




Figure 1.2. Plan and sections of Montgomery Locks and Dam.

SECTION 2: SURFACE CONCRETE DETERIORATION
AND CRACKING

Introduction

2.1 An overall view of Montgomery Locks reveals general spalling, leaching and cracking of the concrete surfaces. The surface condition is to the point where accelerated deterioration will occur.

2.2 In certain lock monoliths there are wide cracks (5/32 in.) which are clearly structural and need to be examined. This examination will try and determine the extent and cause of the cracks. These studies will involve:

- a. Logical deductions from physical observations of the structure.
- b. Instrumenting and monitoring major cracks for movement when the locks are exposed to various combinations of moving and static loads under normal operating conditions.
- c. A crack survey (mapping of cracks onto scaled drawings) not only to serve as a record and a means of communication concerning existing cracks but also to establish trends and patterns of cracking.
- d. Soniscope examination of major cracks to determine their extent.
- e. Stress analysis studies.

2.3 In the dam there exists, as it does in the locks, a lot of leaching and cracking. Much of the surface cracking is found in the upper three lifts of the dam piers.

2.4 In the locks and dam, there are groups of parallel cracks and leaching which indicate deterioration due to freezing and thawing and render the areas highly susceptible to water penetration and future freezing and thawing action. The surface cracks will be discussed in detail in the remainder of this chapter.

Results of Monitoring Cracks for Movement

2.5 In the lock walls, the cracks which are of apparent concern are:

- a. Numerous transverse and some longitudinal cracks in the guide and guard walls.
- b. Major cracking showing in the upstream land wall butterfly valve and bulkhead shafts and significant cracking appearing in the downstream shafts.
- c. A predominate crack which extends along the center of the lock chamber middle wall parallel to the lock.
- d. Cracking in the upper gate monoliths of both the middle and river walls.

The monolith numbering and stationing is shown in Figure 2.1 It was decided to first monitor the cracks in:

- a. The upstream land wall butterfly valve monolith. Cracks and gage locations are shown in Figure 2.2.
- b. The upstream middle wall gate monolith. Crack and gage locations are shown in Figure 2.3.
- c. The upstream river wall gate monolith. Crack and gage locations are shown in Figure 2.4.

2.6 These major cracks were monitored to see if there was any movement when changes in loadings were imposed upon the locks. Combinations of loading were induced by:

- a. Changing pool levels.
- b. Opening and closing gates.
- c. Opening butterfly valves allowing water to enter the lock.

The checking for crack movement under combinations of water, gate and butterfly valve loadings helps in considering the cause and importance of the cracks.

2.7 The crack in the upstream land wall butterfly-valve monolith was monitored from the top of the monolith and also from the vertical face within the butterfly-valve shaft. The other two cracks were monitored only from the top of the monolith.

2.8 The measurements determining crack movement under water, gate, and valve loadings were accomplished with a Dimic Gage having a 0.00001 in. accuracy. There was no detectable crack movement under any combination of loading. The relative movement across the cracks were monitored by the principles given in ETL 1110-2-118 except a more precise instrumentation was used which would detect movement of

0.00001 in. No detectable crack movement implies that the gate and valve loadings are not significantly affecting the existing cracks. The stress analysis of loaded monoliths is another means by which the cause of the cracking can be considered. The stress analysis implies the causes of certain cracks; this discussion is given in Section 7.

Crack Survey

2.9 An important indication of the condition of the locks and dam is the degree, extent, and cause of surface cracking. The surface cracks on Montgomery Locks were mapped onto scaled drawings and are presented in Figures 2.5 through 2.13.

2.10 The cracking in the locks will be discussed and correlated starting with the upstream land side monoliths except when general trends are observed; they will then be discussed in relation to the other portions of the locks which establish the trend.

2.11 As the cracks were studied, it became apparent that a distinction between their degree and importance needed to be delineated. The delineation as given in Table 2.1 was used to categorize the cracks by width and extent. This in effect classified the cracks according to importance as they appeared from the surface observations.

2.12 The upper guide wall extension is in good condition and only has surface cracking in the upstream end monolith. The original upper guide wall has significant transverse cracking much of which extends to a considerable depth as can be seen on either side of the monoliths. A trend of cracking becomes apparent in the guide and guard walls. The extent of cracking in guide and guard walls may be rated from the most to the least, both in number and degree, as follows: upper guide wall, lower guide wall, upper guard wall, and lower guard wall. There is a lot of cracking in the lower guard wall but the cracks are smaller in width and less in extent. The main cracks in these walls are located close to the middle half of the monolith and extend from the water line on river side to the water or fill line on land side. This total trend of cracking leads to the hypothesis that

their origin is probably due to barge impact loads. The frequency and the intensity of barge impact are both important in affecting the monoliths. This leads to the conclusion that the smaller lock which carries light traffic and is next to the guard walls should be subjected to lighter impact loads than the guide walls. Also, seemingly a barge headed downstream would create a larger impact than one headed upstream due to the greater momentum caused by the current. This logic makes the ranking of cracking from most to less severe in the upper guide wall, lower guidewall, upper guard wall and the lower guard wall. This is the case (except the cracking in the lower guide and upper guard wall is about the same) and fits the trend that the origin of the cracks is barge impact.

2.13 Now, considering the cracking in the land wall, the most severe cracking is in the upper portion of the wall. This trend is continued across the three walls in that the most severe cracking is in their upper ends. Again a barge headed downstream would create a larger impact than one headed upstream; therefore, the impact force would tend to be larger and cracking more significant on the upstream portion of the lock walls. This could well be the reason the most significant cracks exist in the upstream portion of the lock walls at Montgomery Locks and Dam.

2.14 In the stress analysis given in Section 6, it is seen that the barge impact can cause the center line cracking parallel to the lock due to excessive tensile stress and cracking in culvert walls allowing stress flow upward through the center of the monolith. The impact stresses were relieved by transverse cracking in the guide and guard walls but due to stress concentrations at changes in geometry of culverts and block outs it is relieved by longitudinal cracking in the lock chamber monoliths.

2.15 Center-line cracks in the lock walls exist mostly in their upstream half; except, the land wall also has significant center-line cracks in its downstream butterfly-valve and bulkhead shafts. In the shafts where center-line cracking is significant the cracks can be seen to extend to and below the water line at el 664.5. The trend is that cracks seen in the monolith surface which extend into the pipe-gallery

ceiling and vertical walls can not be seen in the floor. An exception to this is seen in monolith M-8 of the middle wall where a center-line crack exists in the floor of the pipe gallery. These center-line cracks could be related to impact loads causing high stress concentrations to develop around openings, storage bays, pipe galleries, and conduits.

2.16 The cracking in the structural slab over the storage area in the upper land wall is longitudinal down its center, extends down the face of the end walls and continues into the bulkhead recess. This cracking cannot be seen in the floor of the storage pits.

2.17 The cracks seen in the tunnels of the land wall monoliths are shown in Figures 2.7 and 2.8. Some transverse cracking in monolith L-17 shows on the surface and also in the pipe gallery. The center-line cracking in the land wall butterfly-valve monolith L-19 shows up in the pipe gallery ceiling and walls and in the butterfly-valve recess. This cracking extends back into monolith L-18. One transverse crack can be seen across the floor which indicates there could be some depth to this cracking. This is one of the cracks studied by pulse velocity work and will be discussed later in this section. The cracking in the end of the butterfly-valve monolith is not surprising because of the large cut out which leaves only a small longitudinal thickness of concrete to carry any stresses induced perpendicular to the center line. In monolith L-29 and L-30 the cracks in the top surface can be correlated with those in the ceiling and walls of the pipe gallery and in the faces of the bulkhead shaft.

2.18 The downstream bulkhead has cracking which extends to some depth as can be seen in the bulkhead recess. There is cracking in the rest of the land wall but as mentioned earlier it is less severe than that in the upper half of this wall.

2.19 The lower guide wall has significant cracking as can be seen from Figure 2.6 but it is less severe than that in the upper guide wall. The main cracking is in its lower end where it experiences the worse impact loadings.

2.20 The predominate cracking in the middle wall is along its center parallel to the lock. In Section 6 the reason for this cracking

is hypothesized as being caused by barge impact. This idea is substantiated by the fact that the longitudinal crack is not predominate in the gate bay monoliths. The monoliths could still get impact from the river-side lock but the river lock handles lighter traffic. These longitudinal cracks show in the ceiling but not in the floor except in monolith M-8. Transverse cracking occurs in most upper guard wall monoliths. These cracks are usually located close to the middle half of the monolith, with the more significant cracks extending down to the water surface and ranging in width up to $5/32$ of an inch.

2.21 A transverse crack similar to those on the upper guide wall exists near the midpoint of monolith L-9. This crack is less than $5/32$ of an inch in width and extends down to the water surface on both sides.

2.22 Significant cracks are in the upper end of the river wall (monoliths R-10, R-11, R-12, and R-13). Some of these cracks reach widths in excess of $5/32$ in. and extend down to the water surface in the shafts.

2.23 In summary the significant transverse cracks in the lock walls correlate with those in the ceiling and walls of the pipe galleries. The longitudinal cracks correlate with cracks in the ceilings of the galleries but are not seen (except in M-8) in the floors. There is strong evidence that much of the cracking is caused by barge impact. Barge impact would not necessarily have to cause cracking in the center of the gallery floors but could be relieved by cracking the ceilings mainly in the center because of the comparatively thin slab of concrete above the gallery. Many of these cracks discussed above appear in the pipe gallery and in the land and river faces of the monoliths which will allow freezing and thawing action to deteriorate the monoliths to a considerable depth. The cracks should be sealed from the weather and some of the larger ones monitored to see if they become worse; barge impact could cause the cracks to progressively become worse and deteriorate the monoliths.

2.24 A pulse velocity study was made to determine the depth of the cracks beyond that which is apparent from the surface and from observations within tunnels and other blockouts within monoliths.

Pulse Velocity Investigation

Background

2.25 The ultrasonic pulse velocity technique is an accepted technique for nondestructively studying the integrity of concrete structures. It can give useful information regarding the quality of the concrete and in many instances, the severity of cracking.

2.26 In surveying a structure using this technique, it is desirable to send a pulse through a wall, or walls, in as many areas as accessibility will permit. At selected points along a wall the transmitter and receiver transducers are placed opposite each other on either side of the wall and a pulse imparted to the concrete. If the concrete is of good quality, the signal will be picked up after passing through the wall. A mass of concrete of excellent quality will have high pulse-velocity magnitudes while poor quality will yield low velocities. Cracks will significantly reduce both the velocity and the strength of the signal. Experience in ultrasonic testing indicates that the relation between velocity and quality of concrete of normal density is approximately as shown in the following tabulation. It should be noted, however, that these values are only typical and cannot be expected to apply in all instances.

<u>Pulse Velocity,</u> <u>fps</u>	<u>Condition</u>
Above 15,000	Excellent
12,000 - 15,000	Generally good
10,000 - 12,000	Questionable
7,000 - 10,000	Generally poor
Below 7,000	Very poor

2.27 Ultrasonic pulse-velocity measurements were made in the lock land wall, middle wall, and river wall at Montgomery Locks and Dam on the Ohio River, Pittsburgh District. The primary objective of this study was to attempt to determine the depth of several visible surface cracks at specific locations on the lock walls. One borehole was drilled on each

lock wall in the vicinity of the cracks of interest. These boreholes were drilled through the wall to the base of the structure.

2.28 Most of the measurements were made using borehole transducers in conjunction with the soniscope. These transducers require water as a couplant to the structure; therefore, the transducers are used only in situations where areas of interest are below water level. One transducer was inserted in the water-filled borehole and the other along the side of the lock wall below water level.

Land Wall Measurements

2.29 The first set of measurements on the land wall was from the borehole which was 20.25 ft from the lock wall in monolith No. 19 at station 3 + 39.25A. Measurements were begun with both transducers located 15 ft below the deck and continued at 5-ft intervals to a depth of 40 ft. Both gages were then lowered to the bottom of the lock pool, 42 ft below deck, and a velocity measurement was made. The pool-side transducer was held at -42 ft and the borehole transducer was lowered at 5-ft intervals to -75 ft, and velocity measurements were made at each location. An additional measurement was made with the borehole transducer at -78 ft.

2.30 The pulse velocity range was from 13,720 to 14,411 fps with an average velocity of 14,110 fps. Three data points were not included (between 25 and 40 ft) because the path was through a 13-ft gallery filled with water. The average velocity for these three points was 6060 fps. These and other velocity data are shown in Table 2.2.

2.31 The second set of measurements on the land wall was from the borehole which was 25.3 ft from the lock chamber in monolith No. 18 at station 3 + 13.95A. Measurements were begun with both transducers located 15 ft below the deck and continued at 5-ft intervals to a depth of 40 ft. Both gages were again lowered to 42 ft and measurements were continued holding the flooding chamber transducer at 42 ft and lowering the borehole transducer to a depth of 78 ft in increments of 5 ft. The pulse velocities ranged from 13,177 fps to 14,560 fps with an average velocity of 14,054 fps.

2.32 The preceding two sets of measurements did not show any strong evidence of excessive cracking below the water level. However, small- to medium-size cracks which are filled with water would not affect the velocity

magnitude significantly unless they are numerous. The velocities obtained between the borehole and the lock chamber were, in some cases, sufficiently low to allow a classification of "suspect area."

2.33 A third set of measurements was taken from the top surface of the land wall, 14.7 ft to the lock wall, across a visible crack in the butterfly valve monolith. The transducer on the top surface was held in place while the wall transducer was moved downward in 7 steps from 1 ft to 42 ft from the surface. Only two successful measurements were obtained. At 15 ft down the lock wall, a velocity of 7368 fps was obtained and at 25 ft down, a velocity of 7702 fps was obtained. It can then be concluded that this crack most likely extends to, or nearly to, a depth of 42 ft.

2.34 Measurements were also made from the borehole to the lock wall face at a depth of 25 ft below the deck. The lock wall transducer was moved at 6-ft intervals upstream along the lock walls. Velocity measurements were made at every 6-ft interval. The first 3 measurements gave velocities of 13,846 to 14,585 fps, which would show no significant cracking. The additional measurements were across monoliths and gave unacceptable data.

2.35 Measurements were taken with a surface transmitter placed 8 ft below the top deck on the vertical face of the butterfly valve wall at station 3 + 56.0A and with the borehole receiving transducer located at 8 depths in the lock pool ranging from 11.6 ft to 42 ft. No data were obtained at depths 35 and 42 ft. The data for the remaining six locations ranged from 11,817 to 13,112 fps with an average velocity of 12,449 fps. These values indicate that the crack does extend to a depth of at least 42 ft.

2.36 The final ultrasonic pulse velocity measurements on the land wall were taken across the surface from the vicinity of the borehole across several cracks to the vertical wall at station 3 + 21.2A. The transmitter was positioned 1.25 ft below the monolith surface on the vertical wall and the receiver on the monolith surface across from the transmitter. The pulse velocities for the two positions were 9,885 and 9,224 fps, confirming that the cracks are more than just surface cracks.

Middle Lock Wall Measurements

2.37 Pulse-velocity tests were conducted from the borehole which is 14.8 ft from the face of the large lock chamber at station 3 + 00A. Measurements were begun with both transducers located 15 ft below the deck and continued at 5-ft intervals to a depth of 42 ft. The pool-side transducer was held at -42 ft and the borehole transducer was lowered at 5-ft intervals to -75 ft, and velocity measurements were made at each location.

2.38 The pulse-velocity range was from 13,307 to 16,426 fps with an average velocity of 14,587 fps. Four data points were not included (between 30 and 42 ft) because the path was through a gallery filled with water. The average for these four locations was 6328 fps. The magnitude of the pulse-velocity signals were of sufficient magnitude to indicate that there is no severe cracking below water level (12 ft below deck) at this particular station.

2.39 Pulse-velocity measurements were made from the borehole to the wall of the flooding chamber a distance of 11.5 ft across a visible surface crack. Measurements beginning at a point 12 ft below the deck to a depth of 25 ft showed no severe cracking. The velocities ranged from 14,650 fps to 15,092 fps. Measurements were inconclusive from the bottom of the gallery to the bottom of the borehole because of insufficient signal strength to resolve the first arrival.

2.40 Pulse-velocity measurements were made from the borehole to the wall of the small lock through a distance of 8.6 ft. Measurements were begun with both transducers located 12 ft below the deck and continued at 5-ft intervals to a depth of 20 ft (bottom of small lock). The pool-side transducer was held at -20 ft and the borehole transducer was lowered at 5-ft intervals to a depth of 60 ft, and velocity measurements were attempted at each location. To a depth of 25 ft, the velocities ranged from 14,751 fps to 15,237 fps, indicating no severe cracks. Measurements below 30 ft were not successful, indicating possible cracking or lift-joint separations.

2.41 Measurements were made at two locations on the middle lock wall with the borehole transducer located on the opposite sides of the wall. Measurements were made from a depth of 12 ft to 42 ft. The path length for the ultrasonic pulse was 24 ft. There were visible surface cracks at

these locations, but apparently did not extend to a depth of 12 ft because velocities which ranged from 14,414 fps to 15,738 fps did not show significant cracking. At one of the locations, velocity measurements were made close to the top surface of the wall. The signal strengths were very poor, and the velocities were 11,137 fps. These data indicated that the cracks did have a depth of at least 1-1/2 ft.

River Wall Measurements

2.42 Velocity tests were made from a borehole at station 2 + 32.5, monolith No. 12, to the small lock walls at increments similar to previous lock walls. The lock wall transducer was lowered to 24 ft. Because of interference of the lower gallery, measurements could not be made at borehole depths greater than 30 ft. The velocities ranged from 13,616 fps to 13,969 fps. These data do not indicate severe cracking.

2.43 Similar measurements were made with the lock wall transducer moved 13.9 ft downstream. The pulse velocities ranged from 12,926 fps to 14,350 fps. These data, again, do not indicate severe cracking; however, the signal strengths were sufficiently low so as to make this a suspect area.

2.44 Velocity measurements were taken between the borehole and the river wall at depths of 12 ft, 20 ft, and 30 ft with a path length of 2.08 ft. The velocities ranged from 13,506 fps to 14,751 fps, indicating no severe cracking.

Conclusions

2.45 The ultrasonic pulse-velocity tests do indicate in some instances cracking down into the structure. Pulse velocity tests through saturated concrete below water level do not always show cracks because the water fills the space. In some instances the signal strength or transmission time will not be significantly affected by the water-filled cracks, although if the cracks are large or numerous, the pulse velocity will usually be reduced significantly.

2.46 The main concerns for the large cracks at Montgomery Lock and Dam (except for the cracks along the middle lock wall) should be satisfied by instrumenting and keeping a systematic weekly record of the surface crack widths. If the cracks do not increase in width, there is no problem; if

they do, further study is necessary at that time. The crack down the middle lock wall should also be instrumented and weekly records kept of the surface crack width. The lower culvert wall should be checked for cracking and the hypothesis that barge impact caused this crack investigated.

Surface Condition

2.47 The land-, middle-, and river-wall monoliths are cracked, spalled, and in general show signs of progressive deterioration due to weathering. The concrete is nonair entrained which will allow progressive damage due to freezing and thawing. Many open cracks allow water penetration which results in accelerated deterioration due to freezing and thawing.

2.48 The surface condition and the extent of cracking suggests that some action must be taken. As a minimum, the concrete surfaces must be rehabilitated to check accelerated deterioration. It is not possible to recommend the most feasible action without a feasibility study considering the total lock and dam operational and maintenance costs over an extended period of time (30 to 50 years).

2.49 The next step in the evaluation of Montgomery Locks and Dam is to make a feasibility study of rehabilitation or replacement.

STA 16+77.73A

STA 16+42.5A

STA 16+07.5A

STA 15+72.5A

STA 15+37.5A

STA 15+02.5A

STA 14+67.5A

STA 14+32.5A

STA 13+97.5A

STA 13+62.5A

STA 13+27.5A

STA 12+92.5A

STA 12+57.5A

STA 12+22.5A



L-N5

L-N10

STA 10+74.5A

STA 10+34.0A

STA 9+85.0A


STA 9+40.0A

STA 8+95.0A


STA 8+50.0A

STA 8+26.0A

STA 7+82.0A



L-5






Figure 2.1





Figure 2.1 Montgomery Lock - monolith and station numbering

3



STA 1 + 88.04B

STA 2 + 33.04B

STA 2 + 69.04B

STA 3 + 14.21B

STA 3 + 56.21B

STA 3 + 98.21B

STA 4 + 40.21B

STA 4 + 83.71B

STA 5 + 15.19B

STA 5 + 52.0B

R - 25

R - 30

R - 32

M - 24

L - 35

L - 40

STA 1 + 90.52B

A 2 + 35.55

STA 2 + 82.0B

STA 3 + 23.25B

STA 3 + 65.25B

STA 4 + 07.25B

STA 4 + 51.0B

STA 4 + 97.25B

STA 5 + 41.00B

STA 5 + 86.0B

STA 6 + 34.0B

STA 6 + 82.0B

-20

STA 2 + 36.05B



STA 2 + 81.05B

STA 3 + 26.0B

STA 3 + 71.6B

STA 7 + 90.0B

-24



5





Figure 2.2. Crack and gage locations for strain instrumentation in the land wall butterfly valve monolith, L-19.

STA 4+23.73A
(MONOLITH JOINT)



STA 3+75.73A
(MONOLITH JOINT)





Figure 2.3. Crack and gage locations for strain instrumentation in the middle wall gate bay monolith, M-5.

STA 2+53.00A
(MONOLITH JOINT)



STA 2+11.95A
(MONOLITH JOINT)




Figure 2.4. Crack and gage locations for strain instrumentation in the river wall gate bay monolith, R-12.




Figure 2.5. Crack survey, extension to upper guide wall, Montgomery Locks and Dam, Ohio River.





Figure 2.6. Crack survey, land and guide walls, Montgomery Locks and Dam, Ohio River.



FLOW




Figure 2.9. Crack survey, middle wall, Montgomery Locks and Dam, Ohio River.




Figure 2.10. Crack survey, middle wall--upper half, tunnels and shafts, Montgomery Locks and Dam, Ohio River.




Figure 2.11. Crack survey, middle wall--lower half, tunnels and shafts, Montgomery Locks and Dam, Ohio River.




Figure 2.12. Crack survey, river and guard walls, Montgomery Locks and Dam, Ohio River.




Figure 2.13. Crack survey, river wall, tunnels and shafts, Montgomery Locks and Dam, Ohio River.

Table 2.1
Surface Crack Delineations

<u>Designation</u>	<u>Surface Width, in.</u>	<u>Depth as Can be Seen at the Concrete Surface</u>
.....	Width < 1/32	No extent could be seen
-----	Width \geq 1/32 < 5/32	No extent could be seen
-----	Width < 5/32	Extent seen
-----	Width \geq 5/32	Extent seen

Table 2.2

Pulse Velocity Test Results, Montgomery Locks and Dam

Test Location	Vertical Distance From Top of Lock Surface (ft)		Path Length (ft)	Pulse Velocity (fps)
	Borehole	Pool		
Landside Wall -	12	12	20.1	None
Borehole to Lock wall	15	15	"	14,056
"	20	20	"	13,720
"	25	25	"	14,205
"	30	30	"	Thru
"	35	35	"	Gallery
"	40	40	"	"
"	42	42	"	14,155
"	45	"	20.32	14,411
"	50	"	21.63	14,184
"	55	"	23.94	14,166
"	60	"	26.98	14,052
"	65	"	30.55	14,176
"	70	"	34.47	14,127
"	75	"	38.64	14,076
"	78	"	41.23	14,000
Landside Wall -	15	15	25.3	14,213
Borehole to Flooding Chamber	20	20	"	13,863
"	25	25	"	13,978
"	30	30	"	13,386
"	35	35	"	13,386
"	40	40	"	13,171
"	45	42	25.48	14,560
"	50	"	26.53	14,418
"	55	"	28.44	14,305
"	60	"	31.05	14,375
"	65	"	34.19	14,276
"	70	"	37.74	14,268
"	75	"	41.58	14,264
"	78	"	44.0	14,239
Landside Wall -	Top Surface	15	21	7,368
Top surface to lock wall across crack on butterfly valve wall	"	20		None
"	"	25	29	7,702
"	"	30		None
"	"	42		None

(Continued)

Table 2.2 (Continued)

Test Location	Vertical Distance From Top of Lock Surface (ft)		Path Length (ft)	Pulse Velocity (fps)
	Borehole	Pool		
Landside Wall -	25	25	20.1	14,010
Borehole to lock face.	25	25	20.98	13,846
(First Measurement -	25	25	23.41	14,585
straight thru.	25	25	26.98	None
Additional measure- ments - Pool transducer moved upstream in 6 ft increments.	25	25	31.31	None
Landside Wall -	8' below	42		None
Surface of vertical	deck on	35		None
butterfly valve wall	vertical	30	27.47	13,112
across crack	face of	27	25.13	12,888
	butterfly	25	23.66	12,583
	valve wall	20	20.36	12,378
	"	15	17.88	11,918
	"	11.6	16.84	11,817
Landside Wall -				
Deck surface close	On	1.25	17.74	9,885
to borehole across	surface	on vertical	15.45	9,224
visible cracks to	near	wall		
vertical wall at	borehole			
station 3 + 21.2A				

(Continued)

Table 2.2 (Continued)

Test Location	Vertical Distance From Top of Lock Surface (ft)		Path Length (ft)	Pulse Velocity (fps)
	Borehole	Pool		
Middle Wall - Borehole to large lock wall	12	12	14.8	None
	15	15	"	14,095
	20	20	"	16,424
	25	25	"	15,417
	30	30	"	Thru
	35	35	"	Gallery
	40	40	"	"
	42	42	"	"
	45	"	15.1	14,733
	50	"	16.82	14,566
	55	"	19.7	14,379
	60	"	23.3	14,296
	65	"	27.35	14,062
70	"	31.671	13,307	
Middle Wall - Borehole to the wall of Flooding Chamber	12	12	11.5	15,092
	15	15	"	14,781
	20	20	"	14,896
	25	25	"	14,650
	30	30	"	Thru
	35	35	"	Gallery
	40	40	"	"
	42	42	"	"
	45	"	11.88	None
	50	"	14.01	"
	55	"	17.36	"
	60	"	"	"
	70	"	"	"
Middle Wall - Borehole to small lock wall	12	12	8.6	15,168
	15	15	8.6	14,751
	20	20	8.6	14,905
	25	"	9.95	15,237
	30	"	13.19	Thru
	35	"	"	Gallery
	40	"	"	"
	50	"	"	None
60	"	"	None	

(Continued)

Table 2.2 (Continued)

Test Location	Vertical Distance From Top of Lock Surface (ft)		Path Length (ft)	Pulse Velocity (fps)
	Pool	Pool		
Middle Lock Wall - Across Lock Wall	12	12	24	None
	15	15	"	14,414
	20	20	"	15,738
	25	25	"	17,266
	30	30	"	Thru
	35	35	"	Gallery
	40	40	"	
Middle Lock Wall - Across Lock Wall (36 ft upstream from Gate house)	12	12	24	None
	15	15	"	None
	20	20	"	14,634
	25	25	"	14,634
	30	30	"	Thru
	35	35	"	Gallery
	40	40	"	"
42	42	"	14,545	
Middle Lock Wall - Across Lock Wall (36 ft upstream from Gate house) using surface transducers	1	1	24	11,137
	1 1/2	1 1/2	24	11,137

(Continued)

Table 2.2 (Concluded)

Test Location	Vertical Distance From Top of Lock Surface (ft)		Path Length (ft)	Pulse Velocity (fps)
	Borehole	Pool		
River Wall - Borehole to small Lockwall	12	12	17.95	None
	15	15	"	13,969
	20	20	"	13,915
	24	24	"	13,750
	30	"	18.93	13,616
	35	"		Gallery
	40	"		Interfer-
	45	"		ence
	50	"		"
	55	"		"
	60	"		"
70	"		"	
River Wall - Borehole to small lock wall downstream from above 13.9'	12	12	25.4	14,350
	15	15	"	13,730
	20	20	"	12,926
	25	25	"	13,368
	30	30	"	14,350
	35	35	"	Thru
	40	40	"	Gallery
	42	42	"	13,730
	45	"	25.58	13,938
	50	"	26.63	13,870
	55	"	28.53	13,850
60	"	31.13	13,624	
65	"	34.27	13,957	
70	"		None	
River Wall - Borehole to River Wall	12	12	2.08	14,751
	20	20	2.08	14,751
	30	30	2.08	13,506

SECTION 3: CONCRETE INTEGRITY

3.1 The main concern at Montgomery Locks and Dams is that barge impact will structurally deteriorate the monoliths by cracking. The second concern is the many longitudinal and transverse cracks and the many spalled areas which will allow access of water to some depth into the concrete thereby causing more and more deterioration by freezing and thawing.

3.2 Some measures need to be taken to allow the most economical and best operational use of the Locks and Dam for an extended period of time (30 to 50 yr). The action to take will depend upon the most feasible alternative of rehabilitation or replacement by considering the total locks and dam situation.

3.3 In any case, if the locks and dam are to be operational for over 6 to 8 yr, the cracks, spalled areas, and deteriorated concrete surfaces should immediately be sealed from the weather or deterioration will progressively cause problems which will make early replacement necessary.

3.4 Monitoring plugs should be placed across some of the major cracks to see if there is any movement as the operation of the locks is continued. The more predominate cracks in the land wall upstream butterfly-valve monolith, cracks along the center of the middle wall, and cracks in the upstream river-wall monoliths should be monitored.

3.5 One of the main concerns is the major longitudinal crack down the middle wall which is hypothesized to be formed by barge impact. While this may cause the cracking to be isolated to the height above the filling and emptying culverts, the cracks can progressively become worse, cause the upper part of these monoliths to deteriorate structurally, and cause operation problems. The pulse velocity work indicates that the longitudinal cracking in the middle wall is probably confined to the upper part of the monoliths.

3.6 The main question is whether to replace the locks and dam, make permanent repairs, or to merely repair the surfaces to protect subjacent concrete from the weather. This consideration can only be answered by a feasibility study of either:

- a. Maintenance with expected replacement when needed as determined by periodic inspection.
- b. Complete rehabilitation.
- c. Replacement of the structure.

It may be more economical to repair the deteriorated surfaces in order to add life to the structures and delay replacement until periodic inspections show that the feasibility breakpoint has been reached and replacement is necessary.

3.7 Any final decision concerning remedial measures for the locks and dam should be deferred until the feasibility study has been made.

SECTION 4: LABORATORY TESTS

Material Properties

4.1 The gravity walls are supported on competent rock; therefore, the "at rest" pressure coefficient should be used for obtaining horizontal pressures. It may be that the actual horizontal pressure coefficient is lower than the "at rest" value, but the only way to get actual values is to make a number of tests at the lock and dam site. The scope of this work in time and funding is not such that this type of testing is possible. More discussion concerning the selection of the horizontal pressure coefficient is given in Appendix A. The unit weight of the backfill is given in Table 4.1.

4.2 The concrete properties were obtained from cores. The tests yielded the following information:

- a. Compressive strength, q_u , and densities.
- b. Modulus of elasticity, E .
- c. Poisson's ratio, ν .
- d. Shear modulus, G .

4.3 The densities for the foundation rock cores were obtained using measured volumes and weights. The average value is given in Table 4.1. The unconfined and triaxial compression test specimens were prepared according to standard method of test for triaxial strength of undrained rock core specimens, CRD-C 147.³ The specimens were cut with a diamond-blade saw and the cut surfaces were ground flat to 0.001 in.; specimens were checked for parallel ends and the perpendicularity of ends to the axis of the specimen. Two vertically and three horizontally mounted linear potentiometers, respectively, were used to measure the vertical and diameter change during compression testing. The displacement measurements were then used to calculate the axial strain, ϵ_a , and the diametric strain, ϵ_d . The modulus of elasticity, Poisson's ratio, and shear modulus were calculated from the stress-strain data. Axial specimen load was applied with a 440,000-lb-capacity universal testing machine. Confining pressure for the triaxial compression test was applied by a hand-operated electrohydraulic pump.

4.4 The direct shear test specimens were prepared according to applicable portions of the standard method of test for shear strength, CRD-C 90.³ The direct shear tests on intact shale were conducted using normal loads, σ_n , of 33, 66, and 100 psi. Tensile test specimens were prepared according to standard method of test for splitting tensile strength of concrete specimens, CRD-C 77.³

4.5 At the concrete-foundation rock interface it is required to know the coefficient of sliding friction and the cohesion. A multistage triaxial test was conducted to obtain these values.


4.6 The multistage triaxial test was run in the same pressure chamber as the standard triaxial tests. The weights of the piston, swivels, and specimen end platens were accounted for in obtaining the axial load on the specimen. Seven stages were run, including confining (σ_3) pressures of 10, 35, 65, 105, 150, 200, and 300 psi. The sawed surfaces were oriented at an angle of 45 deg from the longitudinal axis of the core.

4.7 Figure 4.1a depicts the orientation of the cores and the method used to cut the cores to insure that the surfaces would reasonably match. The cores were aligned parallel to each other and located relative to each other such that the required portions of the concrete and rock would be obtained. They were then hydrostoned in a wooden box. Figure 5.1b shows the two cores after the 45-deg saw cut was made. When the specimens were removed from the hydrostone, the concrete and shale surfaces were checked for alignment and found to match quite well; when held to the light, you could only see through about 10 percent of the contact area.

4.8 Some concrete and rock core logs are given in Reference 2 along with a discussion of the petrographic analysis of the concrete and rock material.



a. Core layout.



b. Cut cores matched.

Figure 4.1. Orientation of cores for cutting parallel surfaces.

Table 4.1 Material Parameters

	<u>Foundation</u>	<u>Concrete</u>	<u>Backfill</u>
Index Properties			
Drained Density, lb/ft ³			120.7
Saturated Density, lb/ft ³	163.4	151.3	137.9
Submerged Density, lb/ft ³			75.4
Compressive Strength, psi	3150	6700 ⁺	
Tensile Strength, psi	340		
Shear Strength, psi			
Intact	C = 0 psi φ = 71°		
Concrete on Rock	C = 0 psi = 30° 30'		
Modulus of Elasticity x 10 ⁶ psi	0.667	5.0	
Poisson's Ratio	0.24	0.25	
Shear Modulus x 10 ⁶ psi	0.269* 0.377**	1.82	

+ From 1974 Condition Survey Report

* $G = \frac{E}{2(1+\nu)}$

** From TX Data

SECTION 5: STABILITY ANALYSIS

Introduction and Problem Statement

5.1 One main consideration in determining the structural adequacy of the locks and dam is the stability of the various monoliths when subjected to possible loading conditions. The stability study involved analyzing selected monoliths of the locks and dam to determine if there is adequate resistance against overturning, sliding, and base pressures. In this study, only one monolith of each typical configuration and loading was analyzed. The conclusions determined from these data are adequate for an evaluation of all monoliths.

5.2 In addition to the condition survey report,² a field survey and examination of Montgomery Locks and Dam were conducted. From the field survey and examination, no relative settlement or misalignment of monoliths was detected. Bench marks and alignment plugs have recently been installed on the locks; therefore, alignment and settlement can be monitored and any movement detected. The resurfacing on most of the monoliths is deteriorating and in many places it is already absent from the concrete surface. The concrete surfaces are badly deteriorated and will be a concern in areas of stress concentrations which will be discussed in the next section.

5.3 The objective of the stability analysis is to determine whether or not the monolith of this old structure meets the present day criteria of desired safety against overturning, sliding, and excessive base pressures. The present day criteria is set forth by the Office of the Chief of Engineers in their Engineering Manuals and Technical Letters. These are the standards which are set forth to reflect the current state of art for the design or analysis of civil works structures. Any advance in the state-of-art reflecting needed changes in these criteria is a separate consideration and is to be used only by approval of the Office of the Chief of Engineers. Even with the criteria from the Engineering Manuals and Technical Letters engineering judgment will have to be used in certain aspects of the analysis. In these considerations

it is important not to relax engineering concepts to include variables which are not dependable because during infrequent but special conditions they could cause failure.

5.4 The first information needed in order to start a stability analysis is the physical geometry of the various monoliths. This is needed in the actual analysis as well as in the selection of the monoliths to be analyzed. When analyzing an old lock, it is important to determine the as-built construction. In this case no as-built plans were available; therefore, other means had to be used to determine construction variations from that planned. Construction photographs and borehole data were used to help establish any construction variations from that which was planned.

5.5 After the monoliths for analysis have been selected and their geometry determined, possible loading conditions must then be determined. A summary of the loading and criteria used in the stability analysis is given below and a more detailed explanation is given in Appendix A.

5.6 The surface elevations of normal upper and lower pools are 682.0 and 664.5, respectively. The saturation levels in the backfill were used as given in Table A-2. These are the levels which have been used as design standards by the Pittsburgh District. The density of backfill material was 120.7 and 137.9 lb/ft³ for the drained and saturated weights, respectively. The horizontal force expected by the backfill material on the land-wall monoliths was used as a coefficient times the vertical soil pressure at that depth. A lower bound "at-rest" coefficient of 0.5 was used. The location of the resultant soil pressure was considered to be as suggested in Engineer Manual EM 1110-2-2602 for walls supported on rock foundations:

- a. 0.38H above the base for horizontal or downward sloping backfill.
- b. 0.45H above the base for upward sloping backfill.

5.7 The density of concrete was used as 151.3 lb/ft³ which was an average of many measurements obtained from cores. The beat impact was:

- a. Lock chamber wall: 800 lb/ft but not less than 40,000 lb per monolith.
- b. Other walls: 2500 lb/ft but not less than 120,000 lb per monolith.

The hawser pull was considered as 24,000 lb distributed over a monolith of 30 ft length. The boat impact and hawser pull is considered as acting 5 ft above the waterline and is combined with the most severe normal loading conditions.

5.8 An allowable base pressure of 20 K/ft² was used. This allowable value was used because it is that which has become acceptable by the Pittsburgh District. A wind loading of 30 lb/ft² was used when applicable. For sliding the cohesion value (C) was 0 and the angle of sliding friction (ϕ) between the concrete and foundation was 30.5 deg.

5.9 Resistance to overturning was considered adequate if the resultant fell outside the kern but within the middle half of the base for both the normal operation and extreme maintenance cases using "at rest" earth pressure coefficients.

5.10 The criteria for determining resistance to sliding are given in ETL 1110-2-184 and the safety factors are listed in ETL 1110-2-22.

Results

5.11 A summary of the results analysis is given in Table 5.1. A discussion of the stability of the individual monoliths will be given below. Since the inadequacy of the monoliths is the factor which is significant, the monoliths which are inadequate in stability are the only ones which will be discussed.

- a. Monolith L-17 is very inadequate for overturning and base pressures for both the normal operation and maintenance cases.
- b. Monolith L-19 is very inadequate for overturning and base pressures for both the normal operation and maintenance cases.
- c. Monolith L-25 is very inadequate for overturning and base pressures for both the normal operation and maintenance cases.
- d. Monolith L-33 is very inadequate for overturning and base pressures for both the normal operation and maintenance cases.

- e. Monolith L-42 is supported by a piling foundation which is inadequate in design. The horizontal loads per pile are 14.14K which is greater than 8K allowable. The vertical load per pile is 136.7K which is greater than 100K allowable.
- f. Monolith M-5 is inadequate for sliding in the normal operation case. It is inadequate for sliding and base pressure in the dewatered case.
- g. Monolith M-7 is inadequate for overturning in both the normal operation and maintenance cases. It is inadequate for base pressures in the maintenance case.
- h. Monolith M-10 is inadequate for overturning and base pressures in the maintenance case.
- i. Monolith M-13 is inadequate for overturning in both the normal operation and maintenance cases. It is inadequate for base pressures in the maintenance case.
- j. Monolith M-22 is somewhat inadequate for overturning in the normal operation case.
- k. Monolith R-12 is inadequate for overturning and base pressures in the maintenance case. It is very inadequate for sliding in the maintenance case.
- l. Monolith R-13 is inadequate for overturning in both the normal operation and maintenance cases. It is inadequate for base pressures in the maintenance case.
- m. Monolith R-15 is inadequate for overturning for the normal operation and maintenance cases. Base pressure is a little high for the dewatered case.
- n. Monolith R-20 is inadequate for overturning in the normal operation case and is a little inadequate for sliding in the maintenance case.
- o. Monolith R-23 is a little inadequate for overturning in the normal operation case.
- p. The lower miter sills are inadequate for sliding in the maintenance cases.

5.12 An analysis of typical dam piers is given in Reference 1 which shows that they are stable; these results are not reproduced in this report.

5.13 Almost all of the monoliths in the land wall are inadequate in their resistance to overturning and base pressures. Under unfavorable conditions this could cause problems.

5.14 In general the monoliths in the middle and river walls are inadequate in their resistance to overturning. This is especially true for the middle wall monoliths in the dewatered case. If the locks are dewatered, precautions would have to be taken to keep the middle wall monoliths stable.

5.15 Monoliths M-5, M-10, and R-12 are inadequate for sliding in the normal operation case which could allow them to experience movement when subjected to unfavorable conditions.

5.16 The miter sills are inadequate for sliding if the locks are dewatered.

5.17 The middle and river wall monoliths are close enough to be considered adequate for base pressures.

5.18 There are two acceptable approaches to this situation when considering only the stability of monoliths. One approach is to say the monoliths do not meet the criteria and examine the feasibility of modifying the construction or replacing the locks and dam. The other approach is to give consideration to the length of time the monoliths have been in service without excessive relative settlement or misalignment, and to schedule periodic inspections of the locks and dam so that any potential trouble can be detected and corrective action taken. The periodic inspection has merit because minimum maintenance can be performed to protect the monoliths from weathering, and decisions of replacement made when conditions warrant such action. Rehabilitation or replacement should be considered, taking into account the total condition (operational and structural) of the locks and dam.

Table 5.1

Summary of Stability Analysis Results

Monolith	Cases Considered	Percent Effective Base		Sliding Safety Factor		Foundation Pressure, k/sf	
		Minimum Allowable	Actual	Minimum Allowable	Actual	Allowable	Actual
L-5	Normal operation with impact Normal operation with hawser	75	11	4	1.65	20	120
L-17	Normal operation with gate load Maintenance	75	0	2-2/3	1.09	20	∞
L-19	Normal operation Maintenance	75	16	4	1.66	20	81
L-25	Normal operation Maintenance	75	0	2-2/3	1.31	20	∞
L-33	Normal operation Maintenance	75	16	4	1.66	20	80
L-42	Normal operation	75	2	2-2/3	1.30	20	765
		75	0	4	1.47	20	∞
		75	0	2-2/3	1.07	20	∞

Pile loads are below allowables (see Detail Calculations in Appendix A)

Pile loads are above allowables (see Detail Calculations in Appendix A)

(Continued)

Table 5.1 (Continued)

Monolith	Cases Considered	Percent Effective Base		Sliding Safety Factor		Foundation Pressure, k/sf	
		Minimum Allowable	Actual	Minimum Allowable	Actual	Allowable	Actual
M-5	Normal operation Maintenance	100 75	100 47	4 2-2/3	9.03 1.24	20 20	8.7 27.4
M-7	Normal operation Maintenance	100 75	76 44	4 2-2/3	2.67 1.12	20 20	13.7 28.0
M-10	Normal operation Maintenance	100 75	100 58	4 2-2/3	3.68 1.24	20 20	11.2 22.7
M-13	Normal operation Maintenance	100 75	75 45	4 2-2/3	1.83 1.06	20 20	13.7 28.6
M-20	Normal operation Maintenance	100 75	100 77	4 2-2/3	2.36 1.21	20 20	9.4 16.5
M-22	Normal operation Maintenance	100 75	71 100	4 2-2/3	1.89 2.44	20 20	15.9 11.7

(Continued)

Table 5.1 (Concluded)

Monolith	Cases Considered	Percent Effective Base		Sliding Safety Factor		Foundation Pressure, k/sf	
		Minimum Allowable	Actual	Minimum Allowable	Actual	Allowable	Actual
R-6	Normal operation	100	100	4	11.10	20	5.7
R-12	Normal operation Maintenance	75	55	2-2/3	1.10	20	23.5
R-13	Normal operation Maintenance	100	82	4	2.96	20	13.8
R-15	Normal operation Maintenance	75	48	2-2/3	1.30	20	28.3
R-20	Normal operation Maintenance	100	88	4	2.61	20	11.2
R-23	Normal operation Maintenance	75	47	2-2/3	1.13	20	25.3
R-29	Normal operation	100	71	4	1.33	20	15.2
		75	100	2-2/3	3.06	20	12.8
		100	90	4	1.55	20	12.6
		75	92	2-2/3	2.90	20	15.0
		Pile loads are below allowable (see Detail Calculations in Appendix A)					
Lower miter Sill (110' lock)	Normal operation	100	100	4	2.71	20	3.8
	Maintenance	75	100	2-2/3	6.82	20	7.8
Lower miter Sill (56' lock)	Normal operation	100	99	4	1.97	20	5.0
	Maintenance	75	100	2-2/3	5.95	20	5.5

SECTION 6: STRESS ANALYSIS

Introduction and Problem Statement

6.1 In the structural evaluation of Montgomery Locks, a two-dimensional plane strain finite-element analysis was used to determine stresses within selected structural monoliths.

6.2 It is becoming increasingly important to understand the phenomenon of stress distribution in structures and not depend entirely on average stress approximations as has been done in conventional design. Knowledge of the total stress field is important in order that stress concentrations and decisions for concrete reinforcement can be handled wisely and economically. This is especially important when considering that raw materials are being depleted and should be used wisely and not at a rate in excess of that which is absolutely necessary. Conventional analysis usually leads to a safe but overly conservative design because the whole stress field is not known and observations of stress concentrations cannot be delineated, studied, and adequately reinforced. The finite-element analysis adds a new dimension or advantage in this respect. Finite-element studies do not make conventional design obsolete; in fact, it is a supplement, making a combination which is much better than either separately. It is important to consider stress distribution in areas of stress concentration when evaluating old structures which have cracked and are deteriorating.

Finite Element Analysis

6.3 The finite-element analysis is used to get some idea of the magnitude of compressive- and tensile-stress concentrations within the monoliths under normal operation and maintenance conditions. The finite-element solution gives good results as long as the model adequately represents the actual situation and as long as any assumptions made can logically be seen or proven to be adequate. In the following analysis, elements were made continuous under the monolith which allows tension

between the base and foundation which is, of course, unrealistic. The tension effect dissipates rapidly but will decrease the compressive stresses at the base-foundation interface on the opposite side of the monolith. This effect can be eliminated but the time and funding required to do this trial and error solution are beyond the scope of this project.

6.4 The loads applied on the two-dimensional sections are presented in Figures 6.2, 6.9, 6.15 and 6.19. In a two-dimensional analysis of the monoliths, such factors as changes in geometry and loading along the monoliths lengths can only be approximated. Localized loading (gate anchorages, impact, hawser, etc.) will not give realistic stresses if applied on a one-foot length of monolith. In order to obtain more realistic stress values, concentrated loadings were considered by using a per foot load obtained from distributing the total load over a length or a portion of the length as given by a 45° distribution. The 45° distribution originates at the point of load concentration and extends in the direction of loading until its sides intersect the outer edge of the monolith. This can be done in both the horizontal and vertical planes with the shortest distance between intersections being the more critical. The distance between intersections in the more critical plane was used as the length over which to distribute the concentrated compressive loads and one-half this type distribution was used for concentrated tensile loads. The maximum compressive values were at the intersection of the base and foundation and a 45° distribution will give as reasonable a spread of the load to the foundation as any assumed distribution.

6.5 The maximum tensile stresses are around culverts at changes in geometry, at hawser locations, and at anchorages. The maximum is rather localized at the point of application and will only be relieved by deformation tending to spread the load over the section of concrete which is being separated from the monolith by tension. A 45° distribution of this tensile load will give concentrated stresses which are too low; therefore, an approximation of one-half the 45° distribution was used in the analysis.

6.6 An important concept is that changes in geometry and loading along the monolith length make the problem a three-dimensional analysis and approximations have to be made in a two-dimensional analysis. In the following work, the two-dimensional analysis is used to obtain some idea of maximum stresses in the monoliths. Three-dimensional analysis should be used in a detailed evaluation of stress distribution which is not the objective of this study.

6.7 Average elevations of soil behind the monoliths were considered as was done in the stability analysis. In making stress and displacement calculations, the backfill was not used as part of the grided medium. There were two reasons for this:

- a. Many elaborate tests of backfill material would be required to define the backfill properties precisely. This was not done because the vertical and horizontal backfill loads, which are obtained by using unit weights and coefficient of at-rest-earth pressure, are within the accuracy of the study.
- b. The finite-element grid would become very large.

The density of the backfill material was used to get vertical loads. The coefficient of at-rest-earth pressure and the density of the backfill material were used to obtain the horizontal loads. The water pressure from saturation level was taken into account. The loads are then applied at node points of the finite-element grid.

6.8 One consideration which must be made in the stress analysis is the effect of uplift on the base of the monolith. In certain cases the effect will be negligible, but in others it could be substantial; therefore, the effect must be included. The important concept concerning uplift is that it is a support condition, and its effect (small or large) is dependent on its distribution. Specific loadings on a structure cause a specific distribution of pressure under the monolith base. The uplift will change this distribution, thereby affecting the support condition of the monolith. It can be seen that the pressure distribution under the monolith affects the stress in the structure only by deformations resulting from the support condition. By looking at free body force diagrams of a monolith, in fact, a section an infinitesimal distance above the base (in rigid body analysis), can be taken and the

upper part of the monolith considered as a free body. The analysis will then not even see the pressure distribution at the base; therefore, the distribution affects the stress analysis through deformations which are taken into account in the finite-element study. Uplift could have significant effect where there are large culverts close to the base of the monolith and the distribution is such as to load the slab to increase stresses. A reasonable way to handle the uplift is to put a slit of foundation material below the structure of thickness such that the deflection of the monolith at the base is less than the slit thickness in order that problems in code solutions, such as negative element areas, and aspect ratio, will not be encountered.

6.9 The stresses given in the finite-element computations follow the nomenclature given in Figure 6.1 below.




Figure 6.1. Stress nomenclature.

6.10 The stress distributions in this section of the report show the major and minor principal stresses in their respective directions at the centroid of the element. The arrows denote tension if directed toward the centroid, and compression if directed away from it. The values printed on the stress plot are the element number, minimum principal stress, and maximum principal stress. A positive sign indicates tension and a negative sign indicates compression.

6.11 Monoliths within the lock which will have maximum tensile and compressive stresses were selected for analysis.

6.12 Cracking in concrete is a stress problem and in general is not an important factor in the stability of a structure. With this in mind, the most important thing to do is to determine the cause of the cracking and from this, decide if the region of overstressing will continue to exist. This will allow a determination of the importance of the crack and what remedial measures are applicable. For example, the crack may have been caused by past temperature variations and will be significant only in that they should be sealed and protected from the weather. In other cases the cause of cracking may continue and will be a definite threat to the structural integrity of the structure.

6.13 As has been discussed in Section 2 much of the cracking, especially the longitudinal crack down the center of the middle wall, is probably caused by barge impact. Barge impact will continue to be applied to the monoliths even more severely than in the past because of the trend to push heavier loads. This can have a significant effect on the structural integrity of the lock monoliths. The stress analysis results can now be studied and their impact on the cracking assessed. Stress analysis was performed on monoliths L-17, M-8, M-10, and R-12. L-17 is a landside gate bay monolith which, in the dewatered case, will have soil and gate loads producing stresses. Monoliths M-8 and M-10 are in the region of the middle wall where the predominate crack extends down the center of the wall parallel to the lock chamber. R-12 was selected to examine the cracks in a river wall gate bay monolith.

6.14 The loadings for monolith L-17 are given in Figure 6.2. The total stress plots for the normal operation and dewatered cases are

given in Figures 6.3 and 6.4, respectively. The monolith section depicting the area of stress concentration (Area "A") is given in Figure 6.5. The areas showing the stress concentration plates for the normal operating and dewatered cases are given in Figures 6.6 and 6.7, respectively. The concern which first comes to mind is that there could be excessive tensile stresses due to the gate and horizontal soil loads acting on the monolith simultaneously. The gate loads do not predominate; especially, if they are applied over half of a 45° distribution across the section on which they act. In reality at the concentrated position of the anchors, there may be higher tensile stresses than the distribution indicates but as the concrete strains the loads will distribute over a wider area allowing a decrease in maximum stresses. The values obtained are about as good of an approximation as can be obtained without doing a three-dimensional analysis of the monolith.

6.15 The largest tensile stresses are obtained at locations of stress concentration which are around the culverts and at positions of change of shape (where the monolith is stepped). The maximum tensile stresses around the circular culverts are approximately 120 and 290 psi for the normal operational and dewatered cases, respectively; therefore, they are excessive for unreinforced concrete. At the step in the monolith the maximum tensile stresses are about 125 and 150 psi for the normal operational and dewatered cases, respectively, and are also excessive. The analysis shows that the stresses attenuate rapidly as the distance from the area of stress concentration increases. This means that properly placed reinforcement around areas of stress concentration is very important and can eliminate concrete cracking.

6.16 The maximum compressive stresses at the base of the monolith are in excess of 600 and 1250 psi for the normal operational and dewatered cases, respectively.

6.17 The loadings for monolith M-8 are given in Figure 6.8. The total stress plot for the normal operating case is given in Figure 6.9. The monolith section depicting the area ("B") of stress concentration is given in Figure 6.10. The depicted areas of stress concentration are given in Figure 6.11. The tensile stresses for the normal operating

case are as large as those for the dewatered case; therefore, the areas of stress concentration are only shown for the normal operating case. Monolith M-8 is a middle lock wall monolith in the region where the wall is cracked along its center parallel to the lock. The maximum tensile stresses are around the filling and emptying culverts and at the step where the monolith changes shape. The maximum tensile stress around the culvert is somewhat larger than 800 psi. This stress is too large and will crack the concrete. From Figure 6.11 it can be seen that when the concrete cracks tensile stresses are allowed to distribute upward through the center of the monolith. This distribution can distribute through the pipe gallery and generally cause center line cracking down the center of the middle wall. The loads are instantaneous and will have a dynamic load factor in relation to static loads; this will make the instantaneous loading more damaging than a static loading. Computer computations were made with and without barge impact. From a comparison of the stress plots it was seen that barge impact was what substantially causes the large tensile stresses.

6.18 The compressive stresses at the base of M-8 are over 1200 psi and can cause problems in fragmented or deteriorated concrete or foundation material. The foundation material under the lock is fragmented.

6.19 The loadings for monolith M-10 are given in Figure 6.12. The total stress plot for the normal operating case is given in Figure 6.13. The monolith section depicting the areas ("C" and "D") of stress concentration is given in Figure 6.14. The depicted areas of stress concentration are given in Figures 6.15 and 6.16. Monolith M-10 does not have the impact load applied and the tensile stresses can be seen to be decreased considerably. The maximum tensile stresses are approximately 130 psi and the maximum compression about the same which is much lower than those present when boat impact loads are applied.

6.20 The loadings for monolith R-12 are given in Figure 6.17. The total stress plot for the normal operating case is the more critical and is given in Figure 6.18. The monolith section depicting the areas ("E" and "F") of stress conditions is given in Figure 6.19. The depicted

areas of stress concentration are given in Figures 6.20 and 6.21. The stresses due to gate and other loadings do not produce excessive stresses in this monolith. The cracking in this monolith is small and is at discontinuities or cutouts.




Figure 6.2. Loading, monolith L-17.

MONTGOMERY L405117-2:2D PLAIN STRAIN ANALYSIS




Figure 6.3. Monolith L-17, total stress distribution normal operating case.

MONTGOMERY L40:L17:::2D:PC6IN STRAIN ANALYSIS




Figure 6.4. Total stress distribution L-17 dewatered.




Figure 6.5. Monolith L-17 depicting area of stress concentration ("A") for both the normal operating and dewatered cases.




Figure 6.6. Monolith L-17, area of stress concentrations as by area "A" normal operating case.

48.7	-66.0	-61.1	64.8	-63.7	-58.5	-39.8	-22.1	-11.3	6.2	4.3	8.8	-12.8	-19.3	-26.1	-38.8
-11.9	-12.8	-11.9	-11.7	-8.0	-8.5	-6.9	-2.4	1.7	9.0	5.9	2.0	2.9	-1.1	-0.1	-11.3
51.5	55.9	58.4	50.0	-8.2						51.7	51.8	51.5	52.1	52.1	52.1
-10.4	-15.8	-18.4	-10.2							-0.8	4.3	7.8	-17.3	-29.8	40.0
										21.1	7.8	2.0	-5.5	-9.3	-11.9
61.1	79.8	86.7	120.6							53.4	53.5	53.8	53.4	53.8	53.2
-15.3	-21.8	-10.7	10.5							2.0	3.6	13.1	-30.4	50.2	
										28.4	2.4	-8.0	-9.7	-12.4	
71.1	90.8	79.9								54.5	50.0	56.1	55.5	55.8	55.8
-19.0	-21.6	-18.9								36.7	3.9	-10.5	-30.9	-53.2	-12.8
										15.0	15.0	-5.0	9.5		
76.8	110.5	147.7									64.4	64.5	64.6	64.6	64.6
-19.0	-15.9	-15.9									-4.9	-13.8	-31.7	-52.8	-13.2
											23.8	-0.4	-8.4		
81.9	111.9										67.1	67.6	67.6	67.6	67.6
-13.2	-12.9										-6.3	-19.4	-33.5	-49.8	-13.6
											15.7	2.7	-6.4		
87.0	98.2										69.0	69.1	69.2	69.2	69.2
-4.3	-11.3										-12.3	-26.8	-36.2	-41.1	-13.8
											2.4	2.3	-4.9		
88.4	80.1	80.1									60.4	60.6	60.6	60.6	60.6
6.9	-70.1	-80.1									-26.5	-34.8	-34.9	-32.1	-32.1
	-2.3	-9.2									-4.6	-0.7	5.3	-14.0	-14.0
89.8	81.1	81.1									60.6	60.6	60.6	60.6	60.6
14.9	12.8	6.8									-49.0	-44.0	-37.2	-32.4	-24.2
											-11.8	-7.2	5.4	-8.3	-13.7
91.5	85.8	85.8									60.6	60.6	60.6	60.6	60.6
18.1	23.8	28.2	68.0								-80.9	-48.3	-37.2	-27.8	-20.3
											-18.8	-8.5	-11.2	-12.8	-13.1
93.0	83.2	83.2	82.0	85.0							-142.2	87.3	87.8	85.4	85.8
18.1	21.1	29.5	42.1	121.8							-26.3	9.0	-16.0	-12.0	-14.9
94.4	81.0	81.0	80.1	80.1	82.0	87.0	87.0	87.0	87.0	87.0	87.0	87.0	87.0	87.0	87.0
8.7	8.6	13.3	21.6	53.9	108.7	101.4	101.4	101.4	101.4	101.4	101.4	101.4	101.4	101.4	101.4
95.8	84.5	84.5	80.9	80.9	80.9	80.9	80.9	80.9	80.9	80.9	80.9	80.9	80.9	80.9	80.9
-7.6	-8.6	-12.9	-17.4	-18.1	1.1	35.8	54.8	47.3	13.4	-5.5	-0.7	0.2	-29.8	-32.3	-33.8
97.2	74.8	74.8	74.4	74.4	74.4	74.4	74.4	74.4	74.4	74.4	74.4	74.4	74.4	74.4	74.4
12.8	-27.5	-31.4	-32.5	-14.5	-31.4	9.3	72.0	72.2	72.2	72.2	72.2	72.2	72.2	72.2	72.2
98.6	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2
-24.3	-28.3	-33.5	-23.8												
99.0	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8
-18.8	-22.5	-27.2	-20.9												
100.4	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2	78.2
-18.7	-17.3	-18.8													
101.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8
-8.0	-14.2														
103.2	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8
3.3	-5.8														
104.6	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8
12.4	12.3														
106.0	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8
-19.7	19.8														
107.4	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8
11.6	21.4														
108.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8
20.9	30.9														
110.2	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8
18.8	27.8														
111.6	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8	78.8
11.3	15.4														

X(STRESS) L17.MONTGOMERY L.O.NORMAL OPERATION

Monolith L-17, area of stress concentrations as depicted by area "A" normal operating case.

2




Figure 6.7. Monolith L-17, area of stress concentrations as by area "A" dewatered case.

0M0000




Figure 6.7. Monolith L-17, area of stress concentrations as depicted by area "A" dewatered case.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED




Figure 6.8. Loading, monolith M-8.

MONTGOMERY L-0; MR : : : 2D; PCB; N STRAIN ANALYSIS




Figure 6.9. Monolith M-8, total stress distribution, normal operating case.





Figure 6.11. Monolith M-8, area of stress distribution as area "B."

00000



(X(STRESS)) MB.MONTGOMERY L+D.NORMAL OPERATION

Monolith M-8, area of stress distribution as depicted by area "B."

2

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED




Figure 6.12. Loading, monolith M-10.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

MONTGOMERY L+D:M10:::2D:PLAIN:STRAIN:ANALYSIS




Figure 6.13. Monolith M-10, total stress distribution normal operating case.




Figure 6.14. Monolith M-10 depicting areas of stress concentration ("C" and "D") for the normal operating case.

Y(STRESS) M10.MONTGOMERY L+D.NORMAL OPERATION

MONTGOMERY L+D.M10 - 2D PLAIN STRAIN ANALYSIS

000000

7390.0
7405.0
7420.0
7435.0
7452.0
7465.0
7480.0
7495.0
7510.0
7525.0
7540.0
7555.0
7570.0
7585.0

192.0 207.0 222.0 237.0 252.0 267.0 282.0 297.0 312.0 327.0 342.0 357.0 372.0






Figure 6.15. Stress concentration as depicted by area "C."

2

1181 -80.3 -0.1	1182 -89.2 -0.0	1183 -89.3 0.1	1184 -94.2 0.0	1185 -98.7 -0.1				
1188 -84.5 -2.1	1189 -90.9 -1.9	1190 -94.0 -1.4	1191 -101.8 -0.7	1192 -104.2 -0.5				
1195 -87.3 -5.2	1196 -95.8 -5.3	1197 -104.8 -4.0	1198 -110.0 -2.7	1199 -118.9 -0.8				
1172 -88.4 -9.8	1173 -97.6 -10.9	1174 -111.8 -10.2	1175 -116.6 -5.2	1176 -124.2 -3.7				
1189 -87.9 -14.9	1190 -96.8 -17.7	1191 -104.7 -20.7	1192 -111.2 -18.8	1193 -118.2 -2.2				
1206 -88.1 -18.3	1207 -94.3 -25.0	1208 -104.3 -28.6	1209 -114.6 -39.6	1210 -122.7 -41.7				
1203 -90.0 -18.9	1204 -87.1 -23.0	1205 -114.9 -23.1	1206 -84.7 -26.9	1207 -23.3 -57.8				
1274 -87.9 -22.6	1275 -94.2 -29.6	1276 -100.6 -27.1	1277 -110.1 -30.7	1278 -118.2 -25.5	1279 -124.0 -10.2	1280 -85.9 -10.3	1281 -45.5 -10.9	

537.0 552.0 567.0 582.0 597.0 612.0 627.0 642.0 657.0 672.0 687.0 702.0 717.0 732.0


3

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Y(STRESS) M10.MONTGOMERY L+D.NORMAL OPERATION

MONTGOMERY L+D.M10 - 2D PLAIN STRAIN ANALYSIS

000000



000000



6.16. Stress concentration as depicted by area "D."

2

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED




Figure 6.17. Loading, monolith R-12.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

MONTGOMERY L4012: II PLAIN STRAIN ANALYSIS




Figure 6.18. Monolith M-10, total stress distribution, normal operating case.




Figure 6.19. Monolith R-12 depicting area of stress concentration ("E" and "F") for the normal operating case.




Figure 6.20. Stress concentrations

AD-A038 655

ARMY ENGINEER WATERWAYS EXPERIMENT STATION VICKSBURG MISS F/G 13/13
ENGINEERING CONDITION SURVEY AND STRUCTURAL INVESTIGATION OF MO--ETC(U)
MAR 77 C E PACE, J T PEATROSS
WES-MP-C-77-2

UNCLASSIFIED

NL

2 of 3
AD
A038655



106	1067	1068	1069	1070	1071	1072	1073	1074	1075	1076
-35.7	-34.5	-34.4	-34.8	-35.1	-35.1	-34.6	-34.7	-34.4	-31.1	-30.2
-21.5	-21.4	-20.6	-19.7	-18.9	-18.5	-18.3	-18.4	-18.6	-18.9	-19.1
1084	1085	1086	1087	1088	1089	1090	1091	1092	1093	1094
-38.7	-37.3	-36.8	-36.6	-36.6	-36.5	-36.1	-35.5	-34.7	-34.7	-34.0
-22.5	-22.4	-21.9	-21.2	-20.6	-20.1	-19.8	-19.7	-19.7	-19.9	-19.9
1122	1123	1124	1125	1126	1127	1128	1129	1130	1131	1132
-41.2	-39.8	-39.0	-38.6	-38.4	-38.2	-37.9	-37.5	-36.9	-36.3	-35.7
-25.4	-25.3	-22.9	-22.4	-21.9	-21.5	-21.1	-20.9	-20.8	-20.8	-20.8
1140	1141	1142	1143	1144	1145	1146	1147	1148	1149	1150
-45.4	-42.1	-42.2	-40.6	-40.2	-40.0	-39.8	-39.6	-39.3	-38.9	-38.5
-24.3	-24.1	-25.9	-25.5	-25.1	-22.7	-22.4	-22.1	-21.8	-21.7	-21.7
1168	1169	1170	1171	1172	1173	1174	1175	1176	1177	1178
-45.4	-44.2	-43.2	-42.6	-42.1	-41.8	-41.7	-41.7	-41.7	-41.6	-41.3
-26.1	-24.9	-24.6	-24.3	-24.1	-23.8	-23.5	-23.2	-22.9	-22.6	-22.5
1196	1197	1198	1199	1200	1201	1202	1203	1204	1205	1206
-45.4	-44.2	-43.3	-41.6	-41.0	-40.7	-40.6	-40.8	-41.2	-41.5	-41.4
-25.6	-25.4	-25.2	-25.0	-24.9	-24.7	-24.5	-24.2	-23.9	-23.6	-23.4
1224	1225	1226	1227	1228	1229	1230	1231	1232	1233	1234
-45.4	-43.3	-42.4	-41.6	-40.9	-40.5	-40.3	-40.8	-41.7	-41.6	-41.0
-26.8	-26.6	-26.4	-26.4	-26.4	-26.5	-26.5	-26.4	-24.9	-24.6	-24.2
1242	1243	1244	1245	1246	1247	1248	1249	1250	1251	1252
-51.4	-50.5	-49.6	-48.7	-48.9	-47.2	-46.9	-46.2	-45.2	-44.1	-43.3
-26.7	-26.5	-26.4	-26.7	-26.7	-26.0	-26.3	-26.6	-26.6	-26.4	-26.3
1270	1271	1272	1273	1274	1275	1276	1277	1278	1279	1280
-50.7	-51.8	-51.8	-50.9	-50.0	-49.1	-48.5	-48.4	-47.6	-46.9	-46.5
-26.2	-26.1	-26.2	-26.3	-26.6	-26.9	-26.5	-24.4	-28.2	-28.0	-26.1
1298	1299	1300	1301	1302	1303	1304	1305	1306	1307	1308
-50.0	-49.1	-48.2	-47.2	-46.2	-45.3	-44.4	-43.7	-43.7	-43.7	-43.7
-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4
1328	1329	1330	1331	1332	1333	1334	1335	1336	1337	1338
-50.0	-49.1	-48.2	-47.2	-46.2	-45.3	-44.4	-43.7	-43.7	-43.7	-43.7
-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4	-24.4
1367	1368	1369	1370	1371	1372	1373	1374	1375	1376	1377
-29.9	-29.0	-28.1	-27.1	-26.2	-25.1	-24.2	-23.4	-23.4	-23.2	-23.2
-10.1	-9.9	-9.7	-9.5	-9.3	-9.0	-8.8	-8.5	-8.5	-8.9	-9.8
1391	1392	1393	1394	1395	1396	1397	1398	1399	1400	1401
-50.4	-49.6	-48.7	-47.7	-46.7	-45.7	-44.7	-43.8	-42.9	-42.0	-41.0
-18.9	-18.7	-18.5	-18.3	-18.0	-17.7	-17.5	-17.1	-17.3	-17.5	-17.5
1429	1430	1431	1432	1433	1434	1435	1436	1437	1438	1439
-49.9	-49.0	-48.1	-47.2	-46.2	-45.2	-44.2	-43.2	-42.3	-41.4	-40.5
-18.2	-18.1	-18.9	-18.6	-18.3	-18.2	-18.2	-18.2	-18.2	-18.9	-18.5

0 349.7 368.4 387.1 405.8 424.5 443.2 461.9 480.6 499.3 518.0 536.7 555.4 574.1 592.8 611.5 630.2

RESS) R12.MONTGOMERY L+D.NORMAL OPERATION

ess concentrations as depicted by area "E."

12

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Y(STRESS) R12.MONTGOMERY L+D.NORMAL OPERATION
 7985.9
 7967.2
 7949.5
 7929.8
 7911.1
 7892.4
 7873.7
 7855.0
 7836.3
 7817.6
 7798.9
 7780.2
 7761.5
 7742.8
 7724.1
 7705.4
 7686.7
 7668.0

MONTGOMERY L+D.R12 - 2D PLAIN STRAIN ANALYSIS

000000

625	626	628	629	630	631	632	633	634	635	636	637	638	639	640	641	642	643	644	645	646	647	648	649	650	651	652	653	654	655	656	657	658	659	660	661	662	663	664	665	666	667	668	669	670	671	672	673	674	675	676	677	678	679	680	681	682	683	684	685	686	687	688	689	690	691	692	693	694	695	696	697	698	699	700	701	702	703	704	705	706	707	708	709	710	711	712	713	714	715	716	717	718	719	720	721	722	723	724	725	726	727	728	729	730	731	732	733	734	735	736	737	738	739	740	741	742	743	744	745	746	747	748	749	750	751	752	753	754	755	756	757	758	759	760	761	762	763	764	765	766	767	768	769	770	771	772	773	774	775	776	777	778	779	780	781	782	783	784	785	786	787	788	789	790	791	792	793	794	795	796	797	798	799	800	801	802	803	804	805	806	807	808	809	810	811	812	813	814	815	816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000	1001	1002	1003	1004	1005	1006	1007	1008	1009	1010	1011	1012	1013	1014	1015	1016	1017	1018	1019	1020	1021	1022	1023	1024	1025	1026	1027	1028	1029	1030	1031	1032	1033	1034	1035	1036	1037	1038	1039	1040	1041	1042	1043	1044	1045	1046	1047	1048	1049	1050	1051	1052	1053	1054	1055	1056	1057	1058	1059	1060	1061	1062	1063	1064	1065	1066	1067	1068	1069	1070	1071	1072	1073	1074	1075	1076	1077	1078	1079	1080	1081	1082	1083	1084	1085	1086	1087	1088	1089	1090	1091	1092	1093	1094	1095	1096	1097	1098	1099	1100	1101	1102	1103	1104	1105	1106	1107	1108	1109	1110	1111	1112	1113	1114	1115	1116	1117	1118	1119	1120	1121	1122	1123	1124	1125	1126	1127	1128	1129	1130	1131	1132	1133	1134	1135	1136	1137	1138	1139	1140	1141	1142	1143	1144	1145	1146	1147	1148	1149	1150	1151	1152	1153	1154	1155	1156	1157	1158	1159	1160	1161	1162	1163	1164	1165	1166	1167	1168	1169	1170	1171	1172	1173	1174	1175	1176	1177	1178	1179	1180	1181	1182	1183	1184	1185	1186	1187	1188	1189	1190	1191	1192	1193	1194	1195	1196	1197	1198	1199	1200	1201	1202	1203	1204	1205	1206	1207	1208	1209	1210	1211	1212	1213	1214	1215	1216	1217	1218	1219	1220	1221	1222	1223	1224	1225	1226	1227	1228	1229	1230	1231	1232	1233	1234	1235	1236	1237	1238	1239	1240	1241	1242	1243	1244	1245	1246	1247	1248	1249	1250	1251	1252	1253	1254	1255	1256	1257	1258	1259	1260	1261	1262	1263	1264	1265	1266	1267	1268	1269	1270	1271	1272	1273	1274	1275	1276	1277	1278	1279	1280	1281	1282	1283	1284	1285	1286	1287	1288	1289	1290	1291	1292	1293	1294	1295	1296	1297	1298	1299	1300	1301	1302	1303	1304	1305	1306	1307	1308	1309	1310	1311	1312	1313	1314	1315	1316	1317	1318	1319	1320	1321	1322	1323	1324	1325	1326	1327	1328	1329	1330	1331	1332	1333	1334	1335	1336	1337	1338	1339	1340	1341	1342	1343	1344	1345	1346	1347	1348	1349	1350	1351	1352	1353	1354	1355	1356	1357	1358	1359	1360	1361	1362	1363	1364	1365	1366	1367	1368	1369	1370	1371	1372	1373	1374	1375	1376	1377	1378	1379	1380	1381	1382	1383	1384	1385	1386	1387	1388	1389	1390	1391	1392	1393	1394	1395	1396	1397	1398	1399	1400	1401	1402	1403	1404	1405	1406	1407	1408	1409	1410	1411	1412	1413	1414	1415	1416	1417	1418	1419	1420	1421	1422	1423	1424	1425	1426	1427	1428	1429	1430	1431	1432	1433	1434	1435	1436	1437	1438	1439	1440	1441	1442	1443	1444	1445	1446	1447	1448	1449	1450	1451	1452	1453	1454	1455	1456	1457	1458	1459	1460	1461	1462	1463	1464	1465	1466	1467	1468	1469	1470	1471	1472	1473	1474	1475	1476	1477	1478	1479	1480	1481	1482	1483	1484	1485	1486	1487	1488	1489	1490	1491	1492	1493	1494	1495	1496	1497	1498	1499	1500	1501	1502	1503	1504	1505	1506	1507	1508	1509	1510	1511	1512	1513	1514	1515	1516	1517	1518	1519	1520	1521	1522	1523	1524	1525	1526	1527	1528	1529	1530	1531	1532	1533	1534	1535	1536	1537	1538	1539	1540	1541	1542	1543	1544	1545	1546	1547	1548	1549	1550	1551	1552	1553	1554	1555	1556	1557	1558	1559	1560	1561	1562	1563	1564	1565	1566	1567	1568	1569	1570	1571	1572	1573	1574	1575	1576	1577	1578	1579	1580	1581	1582	1583	1584	1585	1586	1587	1588	1589	1590	1591	1592	1593	1594	1595	1596	1597	1598	1599	1600	1601	1602	1603	1604	1605	1606	1607	1608	1609	1610	1611	1612	1613	1614	1615	1616	1617	1618	1619	1620	1621	1622	1623	1624	1625	1626	1627	1628	1629	1630	1631	1632	1633	1634	1635	1636	1637	1638	1639	1640	1641	1642	1643	1644	1645	1646	1647	1648	1649	1650	1651	1652	1653	1654	1655	1656	1657	1658	1659	1660	1661	1662	1663	1664	1665	1666	1667	1668	1669	1670	1671	1672	1673	1674	1675	1676	1677	1678	1679	1680	1681	1682	1683	1684	1685	1686	1687	1688	1689	1690	1691	1692	1693	1694	1695	1696	1697	1698	1699	1700	1701	1702	1703	1704	1705	1706	1707	1708	1709	1710	1711	1712	1713	1714	1715	1716	1717	1718	1719	1720	1721	1722	1723	1724	1725	1726	1727	1728	1729	1730	1731	1732	1733	1734	1735	1736	1737	1738	1739	1740	1741	1742	1743	1744	1745	1746	1747	1748	1749	1750	1751	1752	1753	1754	1755	1756	1757	1758	1759	1760	1761	1762	1763	1764	1765	1766	1767	1768	1769	1770	1771	1772	1773	1774	1775	1776	1777	1778	1779	1780	1781	1782	1783	1784	1785	1786	1787	1788	1789	1790	1791	1792	1793	1794	1795	1796	1797	1798	1799	1800	1801	1802	1803	1804	1805	1806	1807	1808	1809	1810	1811	1812	1813	1814	1815	1816	1817	1818	1819	1820	1821	1822	1823	1824	1825	1826	1827	1828	1829	1830	1831	1832	1833	1834	1835	1836	1837	1838	1839	1840	1841	1842	1843	1844	1845	1846	1847	1848	1849	1850	1851	1852	1853	1854	1855	1856	1857	1858	1859	1860	1861	1862	1863	1864	1865	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870	1871	1872	1873	1874	1875	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881	1882	1883	1884	1885	1886	1887	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892	1893	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	---

000000

636	637	638	639	640	641	642	643	644	645	646	647	648	649	650	651	652	653	654	655	656	657	658	659	660	661	662	663	664	665	666	667	668	669	670	671	672	673	674	675	676	677	678	679	680	681	682	683	684	685	686	687	688	689	690	691	692	693	694	695	696	697	698	699	700	701	702	703	704	705	706	707	708	709	710	711	712	713	714	715	716	717	718	719	720	721	722	723	724	725	726	727	728	729	730	731	732	733	734	735	736	737	738	739	740	741	742	743	744	745	746	747	748	749	750	751	752	753	754	755	756	757	758	759	760	761	762	763	764	765	766	767	768	769	770	771	772	773	774	775	776	777	778	779	780	781	782	783	784	785	786	787	788	789	790	791	792	793	794	795	796	797	798	799	800	801	802	803	804	805	806	807	808	809	810	811	812	813	814	815	816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000	1001	1002	1003	1004	1005	1006	1007	1008	1009	1010	1011	1012	1013	1014	1015	1016	1017	1018	1019	1020	1021	1022	1023	1024	1025	1026	1027	1028	1029	1030	1031	1032	1033	1034	1035	1036	1037	1038	1039	1040	1041	1042	1043	1044	1045	1046	1047	1048	1049	1050	1051	1052	1053	1054	1055	1056	1057	1058	1059	1060	1061	1062	1063	1064	1065	1066	1067	1068	1069	1070	1071	1072	1073	1074	1075	1076	1077	1078	1079	1080	1081	1082	1083	1084	1085	1086	1087	1088	1089	1090	1091	1092	1093	1094	1095	1096	1097	1098	1099	1100	1101	1102	1103	1104	1105	1106	1107	1108	1109	1110	1111	1112	1113	1114	1115	1116	1117	1118	1119	1120	1121	1122	1123	1124	1125	1126	1127	1128	1129	1130	1131	1132	1133	1134	1135	1136	1137	1138	1139	1140	1141	1142	1143	1144	1145	1146	1147	1148	1149	1150	1151	1152	1153	1154	1155	1156	1157	1158	1159	1160	1161	1162	1163	1164	1165	1166	1167	1168	1169	1170	1171	1172	1173	1174	1175	1176	1177	1178	1179	1180	1181	1182	1183	1184	1185	1186	1187	1188	1189	1190	1191	1192	1193	1194	1195	1196	1197	1198	1199	1200	1201	1202	1203	1204	1205	1206	1207	1208	1209	1210	1211	1212	1213	1214	1215	1216	1217	1218	1219	1220	1221	1222	1223	1224	1225	1226	1227	1228	1229	1230	1231	1232	1233	1234	1235	1236	1237	1238	1239	1240	1241	1242	1243	1244	1245	1246	1247	1248	1249	1250	1251	1252	1253	1254	1255	1256	1257	1258	1259	1260	1261	1262	1263	1264	1265	1266	1267	1268	1269	1270	1271	1272	1273	1274	1275	1276	1277	1278	1279	1280	1281	1282	1283	1284	1285	1286	1287	1288	1289	1290	1291	1292	1293	1294	1295	1296	1297	1298	1299	1300	1301	1302	1303	1304	1305	1306	1307	1308	1309	1310	1311	1312	1313	1314	1315	1316	1317	1318	1319	1320	1321	1322	1323	1324	1325	1326	1327	1328	1329	1330	1331	1332	1333	1334	1335	1336	1337	1338	1339	1340	1341	1342	1343	1344	1345	1346	1347	1348	1349	1350	1351	1352	1353	1354	1355	1356	1357	1358	1359	1360	1361	1362	1363	1364	1365	1366	1367	1368	1369	1370	1371	1372	1373	1374	1375	1376	1377	1378	1379	1380	1381	1382	1383	1384	1385	1386	1387	1388	1389	1390	1391	1392	1393	1394	1395	1396	1397	1398	1399	1400	1401	1402	1403	1404	1405	1406	1407	1408	1409	1410	1411	1412	1413	1414	1415	1416	1417	1418	1419	1420	1421	1422	1423	1424	1425	1426	1427	1428	1429	1430	1431	1432	1433	1434	1435	1436	1437	1438	1439	1440	1441	1442	1443	1444	1445	1446	1447	1448	1449	1450	1451	1452	1453	1454	1455	1456	1457	1458	1459	1460	1461	1462	1463	1464	1465	1466	1467	1468	1469	1470	1471	1472	1473	1474	1475	1476	1477	1478	1479	1480	1481	1482	1483	1484	1485	1486	1487	1488	1489	1490	1491	1492	1493	1494	1495	1496	1497	1498	1499	1500	1501	1502	1503	1504	1505	1506	1507	1508	1509	1510	1511	1512	1513	1514	1515	1516	1517	1518	1519	1520	1521	1522	1523	1524	1525	1526	1527	1528	1529	1530	1531	1532	1533	1534	1535	1536	1537	1538	1539	1540	1541	1542	1543	1544	1545	1546	1547	1548	1549	1550	1551	1552	1553	1554	1555	1556	1557	1558	1559	1560	1561	1562	1563	1564	1565	1566	1567	1568	1569	1570	1571	1572	1573	1574	1575	1576	1577	1578	1579	1580	1581	1582	1583	1584	1585	1586	1587	1588	1589	1590	1591	1592	1593	1594	1595	1596	1597	1598	1599	1600	1601	1602	1603	1604	1605	1606	1607	1608	1609	1610	1611	1612	1613	1614	1615	1616	1617	1618	1619	1620	1621	1622	1623	1624	1625	1626	1627	1628	1629	1630	1631	1632	1633	1634	1635	1636	1637	1638	1639	1640	1641	1642	1643	1644	1645	1646	1647	1648	1649	1650	1651	1652	1653	1654	1655	1656	1657	1658	1659	1660	1661	1662	1663	1664	1665	1666	1667	1668	1669	1670	1671	1672	1673	1674	1675	1676	1677	1678	1679	1680	1681	1682	1683	1684	1685	1686	1687	1688	1689	1690	1691	1692	1693	1694	1695	1696	1697	1698	1699	1700	1701	1702	1703	1704	1705	1706	1707	1708	1709	1710	1711	1712	1713	1714	1715	1716	1717	1718	1719	1720	1721	1722	1723	1724	1725	1726	1727	1728	1729	1730	1731	1732	1733	1734	1735	1736	1737	1738	1739	1740	1741	1742	1743	1744	1745	1746	1747	1748	1749	1750	1751	1752	1753	1754	1755	1756	1757	1758	1759	1760	1761	1762	1763	1764	1765	1766	1767	1768	1769	1770	1771	1772	1773	1774	1775	1776	1777	1778	1779	1780	1781	1782	1783	1784	1785	1786	1787	1788	1789	1790	1791	1792	1793	1794	1795	1796	1797	1798	1799	1800	1801	1802	1803	1804	1805	1806	1807	1808	1809	1810	1811	1812	1813	1814	1815	1816	1817	1818	1819	1820	1821	1822	1823	1824	1825	1826	1827	1828	1829	1830	1831	1832	1833	1834	1835	1836	1837	1838	1839	1840	1841	1842	1843	1844	1845	1846	1847	1848	1849	1850	1851	1852	1853	1854	1855	1856	1857	1858	1859	1860	1861	1862	1863	1864	1865	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870	1871	1872	1873	1874	1875	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881	1882	1883	1884	1885	1886	1887	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892	1893	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

X(STRESS) R12.MONTGOMERY L+D.NORMAL OPERATION

21. Stress concentration as depicted by area "F."

2

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

SECTION 7: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 There is general spalling, leaching, and cracking of the concrete surfaces of Montgomery Locks and Dam. The crack survey implies that a majority of the cracking in the lock walls is caused by barge impact. The longitudinal crack parallel to the lock in the middle wall of Montgomery Lock is hypothesized to have been caused by barge impact; therefore, this can be a source of deterioration which increases with lock use. The pulse velocity study indicates that the cracking along the center of the middle wall does not worsen with depth. The concern of the cracks and spalled areas, in the concrete surface, is that they will allow the access of water; thereby causing an increased rate of deterioration due to freezing and thawing. Maintenance of the surface cracks and spalled areas is, therefore, essential.

7.2 In relation to present criteria, almost all of the monoliths on the land wall are inadequate in their resistance to overturning and base pressures. In general, the monoliths in middle and river walls are inadequate in their resistance to overturning. This is especially true for the middle-wall monoliths in the dewatered case. The miter sills are inadequate for sliding if the locks are dewatered.

7.3 The stress in the culvert wall of monolith M-8 is greater than 800 psi tension. This tensile stress is too large and will crack the concrete. This allows a stress flow up through the center of the monoliths, thereby causing cracking. This hypothesized condition for cracking should be checked by inspecting the culvert walls as soon as possible.

7.4 From the deteriorated condition of the surface of the lock monoliths, it is evident that some action must be initiated. Since corrective action is needed, a feasibility study should be made to determine what action is necessary which will provide the most economical and adequate lock usage over a period of 30 to 50 years. For this reason, it is recommended that a feasibility study be made considering the following alternatives:

- a. Minimum maintenance and protection of the locks and dam from weathering with expected replacement when needed as determined by periodic inspection.
- b. Rehabilitation of locks and dam.
- c. Replacement of locks and dam.

7.5 The above recommendations may be affected by a total structural and operational evaluation. In fact, this study does not evaluate the foundation, steel gates, bridge work, lock gates, or appurtenant mechanical or electrical facilities. These will be considered by the Pittsburgh District in the overall evaluation of the locks and dam.

REFERENCES

1. Periodic Inspection and Continuing Evaluation of Completed Civil Works Structures; Montgomery Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Pennsylvania, Pre-Inspection Data, First Periodic Inspection, US Army Engineer District, Pittsburgh, Corps of Engineers, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
2. Condition of Piers at Montgomery Locks and Dam, Ohio River, US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss., Apr 1974.
3. US Army Rngineer Waterways Experiment Station, Corps of Engineers, Handbook for Concrete and Cement, with quarterly supplements, Vicksburg, Miss., Aug 1949.

APPENDIX A: STABILITY ANALYSIS

Introduction

A.1 In the stability analysis, the monoliths of the locks and dam were checked for adequacy against overturning, sliding, and excessive base pressures.

A.2 In general, the stability study was done in accordance with the applicable portions of the following Engineer Manuals and Engineer Technical Letters.

- a. EM 1110-2-2502, Retaining Walls.
- b. EM 1110-2-2602, Planning and Design of Navigation Lock Walls and Appurtenances.
- c. EM 1110-2-2607, Navigation Dam Masonry.
- d. ETL 1110-2-22, Design of Navigation Lock Gravity Walls.
- e. ETL 1110-2-184, Gravity Dam Design Stability.

A.3 The summary sheets and stability computations are given in Table A.1, and Figures A-1 through A-21, respectively.

Applied Loads

A.4 The lock and dam monoliths were investigated for two case loadings as given below:

- a. Normal operating condition:
 - (1) Upper guide, land, and lower guide wall monoliths: the most critical loadings of upper pool, lower pool, and saturation level in backfill. Also, dead load, uplift, tow impact, hawser pull, wind, and gate loads were used when applicable.
 - (2) Middle and river wall monoliths: Normal lower and upper pools, uplift, impact, hawser pull, wind, and gate loads as applicable were considered in this case.
- b. Maintenance or dewatered condition: Backfill, gate, dead loads, and uplift were considered. The saturation levels in the backfill were used as given in Table A.2. Impact, hawser pull, and wind loads were applied according to the situation.

A.5 The standard procedure was to analyze three-dimensional monoliths unless the geometry was uniform enough or could be closely approximated in order that a two-dimensional section of unit depth could be used to represent the stability of the total monolith. All sections were viewed from upstream looking downstream. Forces acting toward the right, downward, and clockwise moments are considered positive. In all cases, the lower left-hand corner of the monolith was used as the center of moments.

A.6 Approximations were necessary concerning several significant factors which affect the stability analysis; these approximations are discussed below.

A.7 The location of the resultant soil pressure was considered to be as suggested in Engineer Manual EM 1110-2-2602 for walls supported on rock foundations:

- a. 0.38H above the base for horizontal or downward sloping backfill.
- b. 0.45H above the base for upward sloping backfill.

It was concluded from EM 1110-2-2502, that the magnitude of horizontal soil force on the landside of the monolith can be computed by using a linear distribution of earth pressure.

A.8 In the case of Montgomery Locks and Dam, with the gravity walls supported on component rock, the "at-rest" pressure coefficient is used as the coefficient of horizontal pressure. A lower bound coefficient of at-rest pressure was used. The only way to get experimental values would be to make a number of tests at the lock and dam site using the actual backfill material. The scope of this work in time and funding was not such that this type of testing was possible. On this basis, it was decided to estimate a lower bound value. This lower bound was obtained by considering the value for sand (from dense to loosely compacted) as 0.45 to 0.55; for silt, 0.6; and for clay, from 0.7 to 1.0. It is reasonable, therefore, to use a lower bound at-rest earth coefficient of 0.5.

A.9 The unit weight of concrete, drained backfill material, and saturated backfill material was used as 151.3 lb/ft^3 , 120.7 lb/ft^3 , and 137.9 lb/ft^3 , respectively.

A.10 Barge impact loads were applied on the basis of design loads used for locks previously constructed with considerations given in EM 1110-2-2602. The loads which were used are:

- a. Lock chamber walls: 800 lb/ft but not less than $40,000 \text{ lb}$ per monolith.
- b. Other walls: 2500 lb/ft but not less than $120,000 \text{ lb}$ per monolith.

The barge impact was considered as acting 5 ft above the waterline and was combined with the most severe normal loading conditions.

A.11 A hawser pull of $24,000 \text{ lb}$ was applied 5 ft above pool height and was considered distributed over a monolith length of about 30 ft.

A.12 When considering gate load, hawser pull, impact loads, etc., which act on a localized area of the monolith, the loads were distributed on a per foot basis when a two-dimensional stability analysis was made. This is accurate enough for stability analysis but is not accurate enough when considering localized stresses.

A.13 Ice loads would make some case loadings more critical.

Design Criteria


A.14 The monoliths were checked for overturning by considering where the resultant intersected the monolith base. These results were expressed as a percent of effective base.

A.15 Resistance to overturning was considered adequate if the resultant fell outside the kern but within the middle half of the base for normal operation cases using "at-rest" earth pressure coefficients. The resultant for the extreme maintenance condition using "at-rest" earth pressures was considered adequate if it fell outside the kern but within the middle half of the base.

A.16 The criteria for determining resistance to sliding are given in ETL 1110-2-184 and the safety factors are listed in ETL 1110-2-22.

A.17 There are no problems in engineering concepts if the total base pressure is compressive because for massive-rigid structures it can be obtained rather accurately by $f = P/A \pm Mc/I$ considering the total area of the base. The problem arises when the monolith just rests on a foundation and part of the base is in tension, which in reality cannot exist. If the total base is used in the analysis when part of the area is noneffective (shows tension), the equilibrium equations are not even satisfied. The way to determine the base pressures is to consider only the effective part of the monolith base--that which is in compression. This will be done and the effective area for a rectangular base is derived below.

A.18 Consider the resultant force "x" distance from the left toe of the monolith and solve the equation $f = P/A - Mc/I$ when the stress (f) equals zero.



$$\frac{P}{A} - \frac{Mc}{I} = 0$$

$$\frac{P}{d} - \frac{\frac{d}{2} - x}{\frac{d^3}{12}} P = 0$$

solving $d = 3x$ valid for $b > d > 0$.

A.19 The above derivation is for a two-dimensional section with a unit depth of 1 ft. The stress is then:

$$P_y(x) = \frac{f(3x)}{2} \frac{1}{3} (3x)$$

$$f = \frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{x}$$

If the resultant falls outside the base, the monolith should begin to overturn. By conventional design, the resultant falls outside the base for some of the lock monoliths. This is, in reality, not the case because the monoliths are in relatively good alignment.

A.20 In as many years as the lock has been in operation, the monoliths have not shown excessive settlement or misalignment; therefore, the resultant of all forces acting on them must fall within the base. This means that the conventional analysis is not considering some factor or factors. These factors are probably ones which are not dependable enough at this point of study to be justified in good engineering design. For example, such factors could be:

- a. The force required to shear a failure wedge from behind the monolith as would have to happen for tilting of the monolith to begin.
- b. The degree of uplift, which we are using in the design, may be greater than the actual situation.
- c. A refinement in parameters and calculation methods is needed to more accurately obtain a horizontal soil force against the monoliths.

A.21 There are no criteria for calculating pressures when the resultant falls outside the base; all the pressure would be on the toe of the monolith giving large pressures; therefore, a value of " ∞ " is given for these base pressures in Table A.1.

A.22 The above is supplemental information for stability considerations and makes no analyses or conclusions concerning the monoliths of Montgomery Locks and Dam. The analyses and conclusions are given in Section 5.

Stability Computations

A.23 Stability computations are shown in the following tables and figures.

Table A.1
Summary of Stability Analysis Results

Monolith	Cases Considered	Percent Effective Base		Sliding Safety Factor		Foundation Pressure, k/sf	
		Minimum Allowable	Actual	Minimum Allowable	Actual	Allowable	Actual
L-5	Normal operation with impact Normal operation with hawser	75	11	4	1.65	20	120
L-17	Normal operation with gate load Maintenance	75	0	2-2/3	1.09	20	∞
L-19	Normal operation Maintenance	75	16	4	1.66	20	81
L-25	Normal operation Maintenance	75	0	2-2/3	1.31	20	∞
L-33	Normal operation Maintenance	75	16	4	1.66	20	80
L-42	Normal operation	75	2	2-2/3	1.30	20	765
		75	0	4	1.47	20	∞
		75	0	2-2/3	1.07	20	∞

Pile loads are below allowables

Pile loads are above allowables

(Continued)

Table A.1 (Continued)

Monolith	Cases Considered	Percent Effective Base		Sliding Safety Factor		Foundation Pressure, k/sf	
		Minimum Allowable	Actual	Minimum Allowable	Actual	Allowable	Actual
M-5	Normal operation Maintenance	100	100	4	9.03	20	8.7
		75	47	2-2/3	1.24	20	27.4
M-7	Normal operation Maintenance	100	76	4	2.67	20	13.7
		75	44	2-2/3	1.12	20	28.0
M-10	Normal operation Maintenance	100	100	4	3.68	20	11.2
		75	58	2-2/3	1.24	20	22.7
M-13	Normal operation Maintenance	100	75	4	1.83	20	13.7
		75	45	2-2/3	1.06	20	28.6
M-20	Normal operation Maintenance	100	100	4	2.36	20	9.4
		75	77	2-2/3	1.21	20	16.5
M-22	Normal operation Maintenance	100	71	4	1.89	20	15.9
		75	100	2-2/3	2.44	20	11.7

(Continued)

Table A.1 (Concluded)

Monolith	Cases Considered	Percent Effective Base		Sliding Safety Factor		Foundation Pressure, k/sf		
		Minimum Allowable	Actual	Minimum Allowable	Actual	Allowable	Actual	
R-6	Normal operation	Pile loads are below allowables						
R-12	Normal operation	100	100	4	11.10	20	5.7	
	Maintenance	75	55	2-2/3	1.10	20	23.5	
R-13	Normal operation	100	82	4	2.96	20	13.8	
	Maintenance	75	48	2-2/3	1.30	20	28.3	
R-15	Normal operation	100	88	4	2.61	20	11.2	
	Maintenance	75	47	2-2/3	1.13	20	25.3	
R-20	Normal operation	100	71	4	1.33	20	15.2	
	Maintenance	75	100	2-2/3	3.06	20	12.8	
R-23	Normal operation	100	90	4	1.55	20	12.6	
	Maintenance	75	92	2-2/3	2.90	20	15.0	
R-29	Normal operation	Pile loads are below allowables						
Lower miter Sill (110' lock)	Normal operation	100	100	4	2.71	20	3.8	
	Maintenance	75	100	2-2/3	6.82	20	7.8	
Lower miter Sill (56' lock)	Normal operation	100	99	4	1.97	20	5.0	
	Maintenance	75	100	2-2/3	5.95	20	5.5	

Table A.2
Saturation Levels to Use in the Backfill
of the Land Wall Monoliths

Sections of Land Side Lock Wall	Saturation Elevations for Normal Operating Conditions	Saturation Elevations for Extreme Maintenance Conditions
Upper guide wall monolith	One-half way between upper pool and the top of lock wall	--
Upper gate monoliths	Upper pool elevation	Upper pool elevation
Lock chamber monoliths	One-half way between upper pool and lower pool elevations	Three-fourths way between upper pool and lower pool elevations
Lower gate monoliths	One-half way between upper pool and lower pool elevations	Three-fourths way between upper pool and lower pool elevations
Lower guide wall monoliths	One-half way between upper pool and lower pool elevations	One-half way between upper pool and lower pool elevations

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE	L-5

LAND WALL - UPPER GUARD WALL

STATION 8+95.0 A TO 8+50.0 A




FIGURE A-1 LAND WALL - UPPER GUARD WALL NONDUTCH L-5

SUBJECT		COMPUTED BY		DATE	
LAND WALL - UPPER WALL L-5		CHECKED BY		DATE	
ITEM		F _V	F _H	AREA	MOMENT
W LONG		90.3		10.46	945
W WATER RIVER SIDE		4.4		19.53	86
W WATER LAND SIDE		2.7		2.36	6
P WATER RIVER			-28.1	10.00	-28.1
P WATER LAND			28.1	10.00	28.1
P EARTH			6.1	7.00	43
UPLIFT		-39.4		10.50	-41.4
HAWSER			0.8	35.00	28
IMPACT			-2.5	35.00	-87
		58.0	+3.6		579
		58.0	+6.9		694

NOT TO SCALE


NORMAL OPERATIONS
UPPER POOL IN RIVER
FILL ELEV (AT MOUTH FACE) 670.00

$e_1 = \frac{579}{58.0} = 9.98$ PERCENT ACTIVE BASE = 100% (COMPRESSION)
 $e_2 = \frac{694}{58.0} = 11.96$ PERCENT ACTIVE BASE = 100% (COMPRESSION)

$FS_1 = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{1377}{738} = 1.87$
 $FS_2 = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{1290}{766} = 1.68$

① WITH IMPACT
② WITH HAWSER

FIGURE A-1 LAND WALL - UPPER WALL MOUTH L-5

SUBJECT	LAND WALL - UPPER WALL L-5	COMPUTED BY	DATE
		CHECKED BY	DATE
<p>HORIZONTAL PILE LOADS</p>  <p>ALLOWABLE HORIZONTAL LOAD PER PILE = 8k</p> <p>NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> <p>CASE I WITH IMPACT</p> $F_H = \frac{3.6(45)}{53} = 3.06 \text{ k/pile} < 8 \text{ k}$ <p>CASE II WITH HAMMER</p> $F_H = \frac{4.9(45)}{53} = 5.86 \text{ k/pile} < 8 \text{ k}$	<p>BASE PILE PRESSURE</p> <p>NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> <p>I PILE GROUP = 1529.4 FT⁴</p> <p>CASE I WITH IMPACT</p> $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{M \cdot c}{I}$ $= \frac{45(58)}{7854(53)} + \frac{45(58)(10.5-10)(9)}{1529.4}$ $= 62.7 + 7.68$ $= 70.38 \text{ KSF}$ <p>70.38 $\frac{\text{k}}{\text{ft}^2} \times 7854 \frac{\text{ft}^4}{\text{pile}}$ = 55.3 $\frac{\text{k}}{\text{pile}}$</p> <p>ALLOWABLE = 100 $\frac{\text{k}}{\text{pile}}$</p> <p>CASE II WITH HAMMER</p> $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{M \cdot c}{I}$ $= \frac{45(58)}{7854(53)} + \frac{45(58)(11.98-10.5)(9)}{1529.4}$ $= 62.7 + 22.73$ $= 85.43 \text{ KSI}$ <p>85.43 $\frac{\text{k}}{\text{ft}^2} \times 7854 \frac{\text{ft}^4}{\text{pile}}$ = 68.1 $\frac{\text{k}}{\text{pile}} < 100 \frac{\text{k}}{\text{pile}}$ OK</p>		
	FIGURE 4-1 LAND WALL - UPPER 6	WALL MONOLITH L-5	PAGE 3 OF 3

SUBJECT LAND WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH	L-17	COMPUTED BY CHECKED BY 	DATE DATE
--	------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------




FIGURE A-2 LAND WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH L-17


WIS. 253A
 253A

SUBJECT: LAND WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH L-17

COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____

CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____

NOT TO SCALE



CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS
UPPER POOL IN LOCK
LOWER POOL ABOVE LOCK

ITEM	FACTOR	F _V	F _H	ARM	MOMENT
W CONC	[.1513] [(20)(44.25)(47.25) + (47.25)(29.25)(38) + (5)(8)(47.25) - (5.5)(20)(31) - (2)(17)(5.5)(47.25) - (3)(47.25)(5)]	13311.5		18.48	245997
W WATER, LOCK	[.0625] [(82-66.5)(5)(20) + (64.5-64.75)(3)(27.25)]	130.6		29.25	3820
W WATER, LAB	[.0625] [(682-649.75)(8)(47.25) + (64.5-64.75)(3)(27.25)]	196.3		33.50	6576
W WATER, CRUISE	[.0625] [(2)(17)(35)(47.25) + (1207)(694-682)(8)(47.25) + (.0754)(682-649.75)(8)(47.25)]	761.9		4.00	3048
W WATER	[.0754] [(682-649.75)(8)(47.25) + (64.5-64.75)(3)(27.25)]	561.0		17.25	9677
P WATER, LOCK (IN LOCK)	[.0625] [(1/2)(644.5-621)(27.25) + (.0625)(1/2)(682-621)(20.0)]		-1611.4	14.50	-23365
P WATER, LAB	[.0625] [(1/2)(682-621)(27.25) + (.0625)(1/2)(682-621)(20.0)]		-2325.6	20.33	-47279
P WATER	[.1207] [(1/2)(694-682)(47.25) + (.0754)(1/2)(682-621)(5) + (.0754)(1/2)(682-621)(5)]		5494.5	20.33	111699
P WATER, CRUISE (IN LOCK)	[.1513] [(649.75-647.75)(5)(647.75-621)(47.25) + (.0754)(47.25) + (.0754)(47.25)]		5406.8	27.74	155533
P WATER, CRUISE (IN LOCK)	[.0625] [(682-621)(35)(20) + (.0625)[(64.5-621)(35)(27.25) + (1/2)(682-644.5)(35)(27.25)]]		-2668.8	17.50	-44704
GATE S				16.52	-51465
GATE V			-142.8	71.67	-10234
GATE M		160.0		29.33	4693
		10804.6	6192.7		364453

$e = \frac{364453}{10804.6} = 33.73$

PERCENT ACTIVE BASE = $\frac{(35-33.73)(3)(100)}{35} = 10.88\%$

$FS = \frac{\sum STABILIZING M}{\sum OVERTURNING M} = \frac{390017}{376321} = 1.04$


FIGURE A-2 LAND WALL- UPPER GATE MONOLITH L-17

SUBJECT: LAND WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH L-17

COMPUTED BY: DATE:

CHECKED BY: DATE:

NOT TO SCALE



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
SATURATION ELEVATION 682
LOCK DEWATERED

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _t	AREA	MOMENT
W/CONC		13311.5		18.48	245907
W/WATER, SAND		761.9		4.00	3048
M/GRN		1466.7		4.00	5806
P/WATER, SAND			5494.3	20.33	111699
PEARTH			5406.8	27.74	155533
PEARTH & CONC			-828.6	9.94	-8236
UPLIFT		-3152.5		11.67	-36779
GATE V		160.0		29.33	4693
GATE M		12547.6	10272.5		486648

$[0.635] (682 - 621) (35) (47.25)$

$e = \frac{486648}{125476} = 38.78$

Resultant falls outside of base

$FS = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{298136}{343607} = 0.86$

FIGURE A-2 LAND WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH L-17

SUBJECT:	COMPUTED BY:	DATE
<p>LAND WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH L-17</p>	<p>COMPUTED BY: _____ CHECKED BY: _____</p>	<p>DATE: _____ DATE: _____</p>
<p>SLIDING</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{key Resistance}$ $= (10804.6)(5658) + (8)(47.25)(44)(0.75)$ $= 6113.2 + 4082.4$ $= 10195.6$ $SF = 10195.6 / 6192.7$ $= 1.65$	<p>BASE PRESSURE</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $f = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right) \left(\frac{e}{L}\right) / L$ $= \frac{(2)(10804.6)}{(3)(35-37.75)} / 47.25$ $= 120.0 \text{ KSF}$	<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = (12547.6)(5658) + 4082.4$ $= 7099.4 + 4082.4$ $= 11181.8$ $SF = 11181.8 / 10272.5$ $= 1.09$ <p>Base Pressures are Very Large</p>

FIGURE A-2 LAND WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH L-17

SUBJECT: LAND WALL - UPPER VALVE MONOLITH L-19




FIGURE A-3 LAND WALL - UPPER VALVE MONOLITH L-19

SUBJECT: LAND WALL - UPPER VALVE MONOLITH L-19

COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____


CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____

ITEM	FACTORS	F _V	F _H	AREA	MOMENT
W CONC.	[1513] [(24)(71) + (8)(28.15) + (3)(28.15) + (8)(5) - (13)(3.23 + 77) - (27.8)(13)(6)/4]	277.0		18.57	51.44
W WATER, LOCK	[0625] [(664.5 - 649.75)(3)	7.8		33.80	94
W WATER, UMB	[0425] [(673.25 - 649.75)(8)	11.7		4.00	47
W WATER, CENTER	[0625] [(4)(13)	11.4		20.00	228
W EARTH, UMB	[1207] [(692 - 673.25)(8) + [0154] [(673.25 - 649.75)(8)	52.3		4.00	12.9
P WATER, LOCK	[0625] [(1/2)(664.5 - 621) ²		-59.1	14.50	-857
P WATER, UMB	[0425] [(1/2)(673.25 - 621) ²		85.3	17.42	(486)
P EARTH, UMB	[1207] [(1/2)(692 - 673.25)(5) + (692 - 673.25)(5)(673.25 - 621) + [0154] [(1/2)(673.25 - 621)(5) + (673.25 - 621)(5)(647.15 - 621) + [0154] [(1/2)(647.15 - 621)(5) + (647.15 - 621)(5)(673.25 - 621) + [0645] [(664.5 - 621)(35) + (673.25 - 644.5)(35)(4)]		121.2	26.98	3270
P EARTH, LOCK			-17.5	9.04	-174
UP LIFT		-104.7		16.97	-1777
HANSEER	0.8 kips/ft	230.5	130.7	48.50	39
					7629

$e = \frac{7629}{230.5} = 33.10'$

PERCENT ACTIVE BASE = $\frac{(35 - 33.1)(3)(100)}{35} = 16.29\%$

$FS = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{7121.3}{6482.7} = 1.07$



CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS
 SATURATION ELEV 673.25
 LOWER POOL IN LOCK

FIGURE A-3 LAND WALL - UPPER VALVE MONOLITH L-19

SUBJECT: LAND WALL - UPPER VALVE MONOLITH L-19

COMPUTED BY: DATE:

CHECKED BY: DATE:


ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	AREA	MOMENT
W CONC.		277.0		18.57	5144
W WATER, UND	$[0425] (664.5 + (1/4)(682-664.5) - 649.75)(8)$	13.9		4.00	56
W SAND, UND	$[1207] (692 - 677.62)(8) + [0764]$	30.7		4.00	123
P WATER, UND	$[0425] (1/4)(664.5 + (1/4)(682-664.5) - 621)$		86.1	21.36	1840
P SAND, UND	$[1207] [(1/2)(692-677.62)(5) + (692-677.62)(5)(677.62-621)] + [0754] (677.62-621)(1/2)(5)$		110.0	26.98	2968
P SAND CONC. UND			-17.5	9.94	-174
U PWT	$[0425] (1/4)(677.62-621)(35)$	-61.9		11.67	-722
		259.7	178.6		9235

$$e = \frac{9235}{259.7} = 35.56'$$

Resultant falls outside the base

$$F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{6107.7}{6252.1} = .98$$

NOT TO SCALE



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
SATURATION ELEVATION 677.62
LOCK DEWATERED

FIGURE A-3 LAND WALL - UPPER VALVE MONOLITH L-19


SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY:	DATE	CHECKED BY:	DATE
LAND WALL - UPPER VALVE MONOLITH L-19				
<p>SLIDING</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{KEY RESISTANCE}$ $= (230.5)(.5638) + (8)(1)(.075)(144)$ $= 130.4 + 86.4$ $= 216.8$ $SSF = 216.8 / 130.7$ $= 1.66$	<p>BASE PRESSURE</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $f = \frac{2}{3} \bar{p}$ $= \frac{(2)(230.5)}{(3)(35-33.1)}$ $= 80.9 \text{ KSF}$			<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = (259.7)(.5658) + 86.4$ $= 233.3$ $SSF = 233.3 / 178.6$ $= 1.31$
	<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> <p>Base Resistance are very large</p>			

FIGURE A-3 LAND WALL- UPPER VALVE MONOLITH L-19

SUBJECT: LAND WALL TYPICAL CHAMBER MONOLITH L-25

COMPUTED BY: DATE: _____
 CHECKED BY: DATE: _____

NOT TO SCALE



CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS

SATURATION ELEV = 673.25
 LOWER POOL IN LOCK

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	ARM	MOMENT
W CONC.	$[1518] [(649.75 - 621)(35) + (5)(8) + (669 - 649.75)(24) + (675 - 669)(9) + (692 - 675)(10) - (4)(6) - (14)(1)]$	244.3		19.19	4687
W WATER LOCK	$[0625] (664.5 - 649.75)(3)$	28		33.50	94
W WATER LAND	$[649.75](8)$	13.1		4.66	61
W WATER CUR	$[0625](1)(4)$	9.6		20.00	192
W EARTH	$[1207] [(692 - 673.25)(5) + (692 - 673.25)(9)] + [0194] [(673.25 - 649.75)(8) + (673.25 - 669)(5)]$	68.7			
P WATER LOCK	$[0825](1/2)(664.5 - 621)$		-59.1	9.24	589
P WATER LAND	$[0825](1/2)(673.25 - 621)$		85.3	14.50	-857
P BURN	$[1207] [(692 - 673.25)(1/2)(5) + (692 - 673.25)(5)(673.25 - 621)] + [0194] [(673.25 - 621)(1/2)(5)]$			17.42	1486
P RETURN CONC	$[1513] [(649.75 - 647.75)(5)(647.75 - 621) + [0194] [(647.75 - 621)(1/2)(5)]$		121.2	24.08	3270
Upurt	$[0625] [(664.5 - 621)(35) + (1/2)(673.25 - 664.5)(35)]$	-104.7	-17.5	9.94	-174
		228.6	129.9	16.97	-1777

$$e = \frac{757}{2288} = 33.09$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(35 - 33.09)(3)(100)}{35} = 16.37\%$$

$$FS = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{7079.9}{6643.7} = 1.07$$

FIGURE A-4 LAND WALL TYPICAL CHAMBER MONOLITH L-25


SUBJECT: LAND WALL - TYPICAL CHAMBER MONOLITH L-25

ITEM	FACTORS	F _y	F _x	ADM	MOMENT
W/CONC		244.3		19.19	4687
W/WATER, LAMP		13.1		4.66	61
W/EARTH		63.7		9.24	589
P/WATER, LAMP			85.3	17.42	1456
P/EARTH			121.2	26.98	3270
P/EARTH CONC			-25.6	9.82	-246
Uplift		-57.1		11.67	-666
		264.0	180.9		9181

$$e = \frac{9181}{264} = 34.77'$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(35 - 34.77)(3)(100)}{35} = 1.97\%$$

$$\text{F.S.} = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{6146.7}{6088.1} = 1.01$$



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
 SATURATION ELEV = 673.25
 LOCK DEWATERED

FIGURE A-4 LAND WALL - TYPICAL CHAMBER MONOLITH L-25

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE
LAND WALL TYPICAL CHAMBER MONOLITH L-25		
<p>SLIDING</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{Key Resistance}$ $= (228.8)(.5658) + (8)(.0715)(144)$ $= 129.5 + 86.4$ $= 215.9$ $SSF = 215.9 / 127.9$ $= 1.66$	<p>BASE PRESSURE</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $f = \frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{E}$ $= \frac{(2)(228.8)}{(3)(55-33.09)}$ $= 79.8 \text{ KSF}$	
<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = (264)(.5658) + 86.4$ $= 149.4 + 86.4$ $= 235.8$ $SSF = 235.8 / 120.9$ $= 1.90$	<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $f = \frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{E}$ $= \frac{(2)(264)}{(3)(35-3.77)}$ $= 765.2 \text{ KSF}$	

FIGURE A-4 LAND WALL- TYPICAL CHAMBER MONOLITH L-25




FIGURE A-5 LANDWALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH L-33


SUBJECT: LAND WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH L-33

COMPUTED BY: DATE: CHECKED BY: DATE:

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	ARM	MOMENT
W LOCK	[1513] [(694-621)(18.54)(46.53) + (28.75)(8)(46.53) + (26.75)(8)(46)(46.53) + (5.44)(46.53)(19.85) + (5)(8)(46.53) + (3)(2)(19.85) - (5)(7)(3.5)(46.53) - (4)(6)(46.53)]	12290.6		18.22	223985
W WATER LOCK	[0625] [(664.5-647.75)(8)(46)(26.7) + (664.5-649.75)(3)(19.86)]	234.5		30.77	7277
W WATER, UND	[0625] [(678.25-649.75)(8)(46.53) + (678.25-649.75)(3)(19.86)]	546.7		33.50	1836
W WATER, UND	[1207] [(694-678.25)(8)(46.53) + (694-678.25)(3)(19.86)]	1591.9		4.00	2187
W WATER, UNDER	[0685] [(2)(7)(5.9)(46.53) + (2)(7)(5.9)(46.53)]	552.7		4.00	6368
W WATER, LOCK	[0625] [(1/2)(678.25-621)(46.53) + (1/2)(678.25-621)(46.53)]		-2751.4	17.25	9334
W WATER, UND	[1207] [(694-678.25)(1/2)(46.53) + (694-678.25)(1/2)(46.53)]		3949.7	14.50	-39895
W WATER, UNDER	(5) + (694-678.25)(5)(678.25-621)(46.53) + [0.754] [(1/2)(678.25-621)(46.53) + (1/2)(678.25-621)(46.53)]		6043.5	27.74	167647
W WATER, UNDER	[1513] [(647.75-645.75)(26.7)(645.75-621) + [0.754] [(645.75-621)(5)(19.86) + (645.75-621)(5)(19.86)]]		-408.3	9.26	-3781
W WATER, UNDER	[0625] [(664.5-621)(35)(46.53) + (678.25-664.5)(35)(46.53)]	-4872.9		16.97	-82693
W WATER, UNDER		2800		29.33	8212
W WATER, UNDER		10680.3	683.5		8448
W WATER, UNDER					378277

$e = \frac{378277}{10680.3} = 35.42$

$F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{328699.5}{324657.4} = 1.01$



CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS
LOWER POOL BELOW AND IN LOCK
SAT. ELEV. = 673.25


FIGURE A-5 LAND WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH L-33

SUBJECT: LAND WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH L-33

COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____

CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____

NOT TO SCALE



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
 LOCK DEWATERED
 SATURATION ELEVATION 677.62

ITEM	FACTORS	F _V	F _H	ARM	MOMENT
W _{CONC}		12290.6		18.22	223785
W _{WATER, UMB}	[0.625] (677.62 - 649.75) (8) (46.53)	648.5		4.00	2594
W _{WATER, UMB}	[1.207] (694 - 677.62) (8) (46.53) +				
W _{WATER, UMB}	[0.758] (677.62 - 649.75) (8) (46.53)	1518.0		4.00	6072
P _{WATER, UMB}	[0.625] (1/2) (677.62 - 621) (46.53)		442.3	18.87	8300.1
P _{WATER, UMB}	[1.207] [(1/2) (694 - 677.62) (-5)				
P _{WATER, UMB}	(46.53) + (694 - 677.62) (5) (677.62 -				
P _{WATER, UMB}	621) (46.53) + [0.158] (1/2)				
P _{WATER, UMB}	(677.62 - 621) (-5) (46.53)		5192.5	27.74	140685
P _{WATER, UMB}	[0.625] (677.62 - 621) (35) (46.53)	-7881.8	-408.3	9.26	-3781
P _{WATER, UMB}		2800		11.67	-33630
P _{WATER, UMB}				29.93	8212
P _{WATER, UMB}					8448
P _{WATER, UMB}		11855.3	10046.5		440586

$$e = \frac{46086}{11835.3} = 38.85$$

Percent active base. Resultant falls outside base


$$F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{278766}{315918} = 0.88$$

FIGURE A-5 LAND WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH L-33

SUBJECT:	LAND WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH L-33	COMPUTED BY: CHECKED BY:	DATE: DATE:
<p>SLIDING</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{Key Resistance}$ $= (10680.3)(.5658) + (8)(46.53)(144)(.075)$ $= 6042.9 + 4020.2$ $= 10063.1$ $SSF = 10063.1 / 6853.5 =$ $= 1.47$ <p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = (11855.3)(.5658) + 4020.2$ $= 6707.7 + 4020.2$ $= 10727.9$ $SSF = 10727.9 / 10046.5$ $= 1.07$	<p>BASE PRESSURE</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>Base Pressures Very Large</i></p> <p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>Base Pressures Very Large</i></p>		

FIGURE A-5 LAND WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH L-33

SUBJECT	LAND WALL - LOWER GUIDE WALL MONOLITH L-42		COMPUTED BY	DATE
	STATION 6+82.00 B TO 6+34.00 B		CHECKED BY	DATE



692.00

665.00

651.00

650.00

646.00


FIGURE A-6 LAND WALL - TYPICAL LOWER GUIDE WALL MONOLITH L-42

SUBJECT: LAND WALL - LOWER GUIDE WALL MONOLITH L-42

COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____

CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____

NOT TO SCALE



CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS
 LOWER POOL IN RIVER
 SATURATION ELEVATION 673.25

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	ARM	MOMENT
W CONE	$[1513] [(5)(46) + (1/2)(13)(21) + (19)(13) + (4)(3) + (1/2)(1)(3)]$	100.7		10.44	1051
W WATER RISE	$[0.625] [(644.5 - 651)(3) + (651 - 650)(1/2)(3)]$	2.6		19.51	51
W WATER AND W EARTH, LAND	$[0.625] [(1/2)(673.25 - 665)(3.97) + (677.8 - 673.25)(2.19)] + [0.184] (1/2)(673.25 - 644.5)(3.97)$	1.0		1.32	1
P WATER, RIVER P WATER, LAND	$[0.625] [(1/2)(644.5 - 646) + (673.25 - 673.25)(1/2)(5) + (677.8 - 673.25)(3.97) + (1/2)(673.25 - 646)(1/2)(5) + [0.154] [(673.25 - 646)(1/2)(5) + [0.625] [(644.5 - 646)(2.1) + (1/2)(673.25 - 644.5)(2.1)]$	4.0	-10.7 23.2	2.52 9.08	10 -66 2.11
UPLIFT		-30.0	22.1	12.08	267
IMPACT		78.3	-2.5	23.20	2.95 -59
			32.1		(76)

$\sigma = \frac{1761}{78.3} = 22.49$

FIGURE A-6 LAND WALL - TYPICAL LOWER GUIDE WALL MONOLITH L-42

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE
LAND WALL - LOWER GUIDE WALL MONOLITH L-42	CHECKED BY	DATE
<p>HORIZONTAL PILE LOADS</p>  <p>ALLOWABLE LOAD PER PILE IN HORIZONTAL = 8 K</p> <p>$F_H = 32.1 \text{ per foot}$ $(32.1)(48) = 1540.8 \text{ K} = F_{H \text{ TOTAL}}$</p> <p>load per pile = $1540.8 / 109 = 14.14 \text{ K} > 8 \text{ K}$</p>	<p>BASE PILE PRESSURE</p> <p>I of the pile group about x x axis is 3115.5 ft⁴</p> $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{M_c}{I}$ $= \frac{(78.3)(48)}{(7854)(109)} + \frac{(78.3)(48)(22.49 - 10.5)(9)}{3115.5}$ $= 43.9 + 130.2$ $= 174.1 \text{ K/ft}$ <p>ALLOWABLE PER PILE = 100 K/pile</p> <p>$174.1 \frac{\text{K}}{\text{ft}} \times 7854 \frac{\text{ft}^2}{\text{pile}} = 136.7 \text{ K/pile} > 100 \text{ K/pile}$</p>	<p>FIGURE A-6 LAND WALL - TYPICAL LOWER GUIDE WALL MONOLITH L-42</p>





FIGURE A-7 MIDDLE WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH (600' LOCK) M-5

ITEM	FACTORS	F _V	F _H	ARM	MOMENT
W/CONC	$[.1513] [(24)(48)(44.25) - (5.44)(20.98)(31) + (35)(48)(29.75) - (2)(17)(5.5)(48)]$	13357.1		17.59	234951
W/WATER, RIVER (ABOVE GATE)	$[.0625] (682 - 649.75)(5.5)(48)$	532.1		32.25	17160
W/WATER, LOCK (ABOVE GATE)	$[.0625] (682 - 649.75)(5.5)(20.98)$	136.0		8.23	1119
W/WATER, RIVER (IN LOCK)	$[.0625] (664.5 - 649.75)(5.5)(21.02)$	137.0		2.75	377
W/WATER, LOCK (IN LOCK)	$[.0625] (2)(17)(5.5)(48)$	570.2		20.25	11547
W/WATER, RIVER (ABOVE GATE)	$[.0645] (42)(682 - 620)(35)(20.98)$	2520.2		20.67	52093
W/WATER, LOCK (ABOVE GATE)	$[.0645] (12)(664.5 - 620)(27.02)(5)$	1672.1		14.83	24797
W/WATER, RIVER (IN LOCK)	$[.1513] [(649.75 - 647.75)(5)(647.75 - 620) + (.0754)(647.75 - 620)(.5)(48)]$		898.6	10.18	9238
W/WATER, RIVER (IN LOCK)	$[.0645] (682 - 620)(35)(20.98)$	-2845.4		17.50	-49795
W/WATER, RIVER (IN LOCK)	$[.0625] [(664.5 - 620)(35)(27.02) + (12)(682 - 644.5)(35)(27.02)]$	-3147.5		18.46	-58103
W/WATER, RIVER (IN LOCK)		160.0	142.8	72.67	10377
W/WATER, RIVER (IN LOCK)			-40.0	8.30	1328
W/WATER, RIVER (IN LOCK)		9132.1	-572.3	67.00	-2680
W/WATER, RIVER (IN LOCK)					728138

$e = \frac{128138}{9132.1} = 14.03$

PERCENT ACTIVE BASE = $\frac{(4.03)(3)(100)}{35} = 100\%$

F.S. = $\frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{363427}{235489} = 1.54$



CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS

UPPER POOL IN RIVER

UPPER POOL ABOVE LOCK


LOWER POOL IN LOCK

FIGURE A-7 MIDDLE WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH (600' LOCK) M-5

SUBJECT: MIDDLE WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH (600' LOCK) M-5

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	ARM	MOMENT
W. CONC.		13357.1		17.59	234951
W. WATER RIVER		532.1		32.25	17160
P. WATER RIVER			-5766.0	20.67	-119183
PEARL CONC.			898.6	10.28	9238
UPLET	[.0625](682-620)(1/2)(35)(48)	-3255.0		23.33	-75939
GATE V		160.0		8.30	1328
GATE M			-40.0	67.00	-5728
IMPACT RIVER		10794.2	-4907.4		59147

$e = \frac{59147}{10794.2} = 5.48'$
 PERCENT ACTIVE BASE $\frac{(5.48)(3)(100)}{35} = 46.97\%$
 $F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{262677}{203530} = 1.29$



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
 LOCK DEWATERED
 UPPER POOL IN RIVER

FIGURE A-7 MIDDLE WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH (600' LOCK) M-5

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE
<p>MIDDLE WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH (600' LOCK) M-5</p>	<p>COMPUTED BY: _____ CHECKED BY: _____</p>	<p>DATE: _____ DATE: _____</p>
<p>SLIDING</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{Key Resistance}$ $= (9132.1)(5658) + 0$ $= 5166.9$ $\text{SSF} = 5166.9 / 572.3$ $= 9.03$	<p>BASE PRESSURE</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{M_c}{I}$ $= \frac{9132.1}{(35)(48)} + \frac{(9132.1)(17.5 - 14.03)(17.5)(12)}{(48)(35)^3}$ $= 5.44 + 3.23$ $= 8.67 \text{ KSF}$	<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $f = \left(\frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{e} \right) / L$ $= \frac{(2)(10794.2)}{(3)(548)} / 48$ $= 27.36 \text{ KSF}$
<p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{Key Resistance}$ $= (9132.1)(5658) + 0$ $= 5166.9$ $\text{SSF} = 5166.9 / 572.3$ $= 9.03$	<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = (10794.2)(5658) + 0$ $= 6107.4$ $\text{SSF} = 6107.4 / 4907.4$ $= 1.24$	<p>FIGURE A-7 MIDDLE WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH (600' LOCK) M-5</p>




FIGURE A-8 MIDDLE WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH M-7

SUBJECT: MIDDLE WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH M-7

COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____

CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____


ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	ARM	MOMENT
W CONC	[1513] [(24)(42.25) + (35)(29.75) - (6)(4) - (13)(14) - (27.75)(5)(6)/(4.94)]	270.8		17.41	47.15
W WATER IN RIVER	[0625] (682 - 649.75)(5.5)	11.1		32.25	55.8
W WATER IN LOCK	[0625] (644.5 - 649.75)(5.5)	5.1		2.75	14
W WATER IN CHAMBER	[0625] (14)(13)	11.4		17.50	200
P CONC & EARTH	[1513] (649.75 - 647.75)(5) (647.75 - 620)(1) + [0754] (647.75 - 620) ² (5) (1/2)	22.9	22.9	10.95	25.1
P WATER IN RIVER	[0625] (682 - 620) ² (1/2)	-120.1	-120.1	20.67	-2482
P WATER IN LOCK	[0625] (644.5 - 620) ² (1/2)	61.9	61.9	14.83	91.8
U PLUFI	[0625] [(649.5 - 620)(3.5) + (1/2)(682 - 644.5)(3.5)]	-116.4		18.46	-2149
HAWSER	0.8 KIIPS / FT		-0.8	49.50	-40
IMPACT	2.5 KIIPS / FT		-2.5	67.00	-168
		182.0	-38.6		1617

$e = \frac{1617}{182} = 8.88'$

PERCENT ACTIVE GASE = $\frac{8.88(3)(100)}{35} = 76.11\%$

$FS = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{6456}{4839} = 1.33$

NOT TO SCALE



CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS
 LOWER POOL IN LOCK
 UPPER POOL IN RIVER

FIGURE A-3 MIDDLE WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH M-7

SUBJECT: MIDDLE WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH M-7

COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____

CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____


ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _w	ARM	MOMENT
W CONC		2708		17.40	4712
W WATER IN RIVER		11.1		32.25	358
P BENTONITE			22.9	10.95	251
P WATER IN RIVER			-120.1	20.67	-2482
UP LIFT	[0.625] (1/2)(682-620)(35)	-678		23.35	-1582
IMPACT		214.1	-99.7	67.00	1089

$e = \frac{1089}{214.1} = 5.09'$

PERCENT ACTIVE BASE = $\frac{5.09(3)(100)}{35} = 43.63\%$

$FS = \frac{\sum STAB M}{\sum OVRT M} = \frac{5321}{4237} = 1.26$

NOT TO SCALE



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
UPPER POOL IN RIVER
LOCK DEWATERED

FIGURE A-8 MIDDLE WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH M-7

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	CHECKED BY	DATE	DATE
MIDDLE WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH M-7				
<p>SLIDING</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{KEY RESISTANCE}$ $= (182.0)(.5658) + 0$ $= 103.0$ $SSF = 103.0 / 38.6 = 2.67$	<p>BASE PRESSURES</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $f = \frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{e}$ $= \frac{(2)(182.0)}{(3)(8.88)}$ $= 13.67 \text{ KSF}$			
<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = \frac{(214.1)(.5658)}{112.1} + 0$ $SSF = 112.1 / 99.7 = 1.12$	<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $f = \frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{e}$ $= \frac{(2)(214.1)}{(3)(5.09)}$ $= 28.04 \text{ KSF}$			

FIGURE A-B MIDDLE WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH M-7

SUBJECT: MIDDLE WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH (360' LOCK) M-10

COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____

CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____

STATION 2+53.0 A TO 2+11.95 A





FIGURE A-9 MIDDLE WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH (360' LOCK) M-10

SUBJECT: MIDDLE WALL - UPPER GATE MOUNDTH (360' LOCK) M-10		COMPUTED BY:	DATE:		
NOT TO SCALE		CHECKED BY:	DATE:		
ITEM	FACTORS	F _V	F _H	ARM	MOMENTS
W CONC	[1513] [(20)(41)(402.25) + (38)(41)(29.75) + (669 - 649.75)(55)(41 - 11.91) - (3.40)(20.42)(27) - (11)(14)(41) - (9.5)(6)(41)]	11653.2		17.76	20696.1
W WATER, LOCK	[0625] [(64.5 - 64.975)(5.5)(41) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	207.9		2.75	572
W WATER, RAMP (Above gate)	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	230.1		30.65	7290
W WATER, GATE	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	63.4		32.25	2045
W WATER, LOCK	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	394.6		16.50	6511
W WATER, RAMP (Above gate)	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	2537.2		14.83	37627
W WATER, GATE	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	-2813.3		20.47	-5815.1
W WATER, LOCK	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	-1087.9		14.83	-16134
W WATER, RAMP (Above gate)	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	498.3		10.63	4659
W WATER, GATE	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	-2718.1		18.46	-5036.1
W WATER, LOCK	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	-1711.3		17.50	-29948
W WATER, RAMP (Above gate)	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	-24.0		49.50	-1188
W WATER, GATE	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	-308.4		50.47	-15627
W WATER, LOCK	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	81.0		2.652	2148
W WATER, RAMP (Above gate)	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]	8198.8	-1258.1		97767
W WATER, GATE	[0625] [(64.5 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (682 - 663)(23.42)(5.5) + (64.5 - 663)(7.58 - 11.94)(5.5)]				



CASE I NORMAL OPERATION
 UPPER POOL ABOVE
 LOWER POOL IN 360' AND 600' LOCKS

$$C = \frac{97767}{8198.8} = 11.93$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(11.93)(3)(100)}{35} = 100\%$$

$$FS = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{269196}{171409} = 1.57$$

FIGURE A-9 MIDDLE WALL - UPPER GATE MOUNDTH (360' LOCK) M-10

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	CHECKED BY	DATE
MIDDLE WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH (360' LOCK) M-10			
<p>SLIDING CASE I</p> <p>NORMAL OPERATION</p> $R = \sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{Key Resistance}$ $= (8198.8)(.5658) + 0$ $= 4638.9$ <p>SSF = $\frac{4638.9}{1258.1}$</p> <p>= 3.68</p>	<p>BASE PRESSURE CASE I</p> <p>NORMAL OPERATION</p> $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{M_c}{I}$ $= \frac{8198.8}{(4)(35)} + \frac{(8198.8)(17.5 - 11.93)}{(4)(35)^3} (17.5)(12)$ $= 5.71 + 5.46$ $= 11.17 \text{ KSF}$	<p>MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = (9362.2)(.5658) + 0$ $= 5297.1$ <p>SSF = $\frac{5297.1}{4192.6}$</p> <p>= 1.24</p>	<p>MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{M_c}{I}$ $= \frac{(2)(9362.2)}{(5)(6.72)} + \frac{41}{41}$ $= 22.65 \text{ KSF}$

FIGURE A-9 MIDDLE WALL UPPER GATE MONOLITH (360' LOCK) M-10





FIGURE A-10 MIDDLE WALL TYPICAL CHAMBER MONOLITH M-13

SUBJECT: MIDDLE WALL TYPICAL CHAMBER MONOLITH M-13

COMPUTED BY: DATE:

CHECKED BY: DATE:

NOT TO SCALE



CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS
 UPPER POOL IN INNER LOCK
 LOWER POOL IN OUTER LOCK

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	AREA	MOMENT
W CONC	$[151.3] [(24)(42.25) + (35)(29.75) - (13)(14) - (3)(3)(4)(6.5)] / (44.63)$	282.6		17.53	4954
WATER LOCK	$[0.625] (664.5 - 649.75)(5.5)$	5.1		32.25	164
WATER LOCK	$[0.625] (682 - 649.75)(5.5)$	11.1		2.75	31
WATER LOCK	$[0.625] [(13)(14) + (3)(3)(4)(6.5)] / (44.63)$	11.7		17.24	202
PRESS. LOCK	$[0.625] (664.5 - 620)^2 / (12)$		-61.9	14.83	-918
PRESS. LOCK	$[0.625] (682 - 620)^2 / (12)$		120.1	20.67	2482
THE PRESSURES CANCEL EACH OTHER					
UPURT	$[0.625] [(664.5 - 620)(35) + (14)(682 - 649.5)(35)]$	-116.4		16.54	-1926
HAWSER	0.8 K/FT		0.8	49.50	40
IMPACT	40 / 43.63 = 0.92		0.9	67.00	60
		194.1	59.9		5089

$e = \frac{5089}{194.1} = 26.22$

PERCENT ACTIVE BASE = $\frac{(35 - 26.22)(3)(100)}{35} = 75.26\%$

$FS = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{6627}{4923} = 1.35$

FIGURE A-10 MIDDLE WALL - TYPICAL CHAMBER MONOLITH M-13

SUBJECT: MIDDLE WALL - TYPICAL CHAMBER MONOLITH M-13

COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____


CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	ARM	MOMENT
W CONE	[0.625](682-649.75)(5.5)	282.6		17.53	4954
W WATER, OUTER LOCK	[0.625](682-620) ² (1/2)	11.1	-120.1	32.25	358
F WATER, OUTER LOCK (INNER CHAMBER)	THE PRESSURES CANCEL EACH OTHER			20.67	-2482
UP-LIFT	[0.625](1/2)(682-610)(35)	-67.8		23.33	-1582
IMPACT		225.9	-121.0	67.00	60
					1188

$$e = \frac{1188}{2259} = 5.26'$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(5.26)(3)(100)}{35} = 45.08\%$$

$$FS = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{5204}{4124} = 1.26$$



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
 UPPER POOL IN OUTER LOCK
 INNER LOCK DEWATERED

FIGURE A-10 MIDDLE WALL - TYPICAL CHAMBER MONOLITH M-13

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE
<p>MIDDLE WALL - TYPICAL CHAMBER MOUNDTH M-13</p>	<p>COMPUTED BY</p>	<p>DATE</p>
<p>SUDING</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum F U \tan \phi + \text{Key Resistance}$ $= (194.1)(.5658) + 0$ $= 109.8$ $SSF = 109.8 / 59.9$ $= 1.83$	<p>BASE PRESSURE</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $f = \frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{C}$ $= \frac{(2)(194.1)}{(3)(878)}$ $= 14.73 \text{ KSF}$	<p>DATE</p>
<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = (225.9)(.5658) + 0$ $= 127.8$ $SSF = 127.8 / 121.0$ $= 1.06$	<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $f = \frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{C}$ $= \frac{(2)(225.9)}{(3)(526)}$ $= 28.63 \text{ KSF}$	<p>DATE</p>

FIGURE A-10 MIDDLE WALL - TYPICAL CHAMBER MOUNDTH M-13





FIGURE A-11 MIDDLE WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH (360' LOCK) M-20

SUBJECT: MIDDLE WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH (360' LOCK) M-20		COMPUTED BY:	DATE:		
NOT TO SCALE		CHECKED BY:	DATE:		
ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	AREA	MOMENT
W CONC	[1515] [(29.75)(5.5)(40.19) + (20.54)(72)(40.19) + (44.25)(3.44)(18.04) + (8.96)(27.75)(40.19) + (5.5)(18.04)(1.23)(2)(17.4)(11)(40.19) - (3.5)(6)(40.19)]	10652.5		17.05	18162.5
W WATER (RIVER SIDE)	[664.5 - 648.98] (5.5)(18.04)	521.1		50.67	5190.2
W WATER (M LOCK)	[0625] [(664.5 - 649.75)(5.5)(40.19)]	203.8		2.75	560
W WATER (GATE)	[0625] [(2)(17.4)(11)(40.19)]	477.4		16.50	7877
P WATER, URB SIDE	[0625] [(1/2)(664.5 - 620)(40.19)]		2487.1	14.83	36884
P WATER, RIVER SIDE	[0625] [(1/2)(664.5 - 620)(18.04) + (1/2)(682 - 620)(12.15)]		-3777.1	18.94	-11538
P GRAIN & CONC	[1515] [(649.75 - 647.15)(5)(647.15 - 620)(18.04) + [07548] [(647.15 - 620)(5)(18.04)]		337.6	10.29	3474
U PLIFT (M LOCK)	[0625] [(664.5 - 620)(35)(22.15) + (1/2)(62 - 64.5)(35)(22.15)]	-2580.2		18.46	-47430
GATE V (BELOW GATE)	[14] [(62 - 64.5)(35)(22.15)]	-1756.1		17.50	-30732
GATE V	[0625] [(664.5 - 620)(35)(18.04)]	111.0		2.777	3082
GATES			-877.8	42.05	-36911
GATE M					188.5
		7129.5	-1830.2		100558



CASE I MAINTENANCE CONDITION
 UPPER POOL IN 360' LOCK
 LOWER POOL IN 600' LOCK
 LOWER POOL BELOW 360' LOCK

$$e = \frac{100558}{76295} = 13.18$$


$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BARGE} = \frac{(13.18)(3)(100)}{35} = 100\%$$

$$F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{287369}{186811} = 1.54$$

FIGURE A-11 MIDDLE WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH (360' LOCK) M-20

SUBJECT: MIDDLE WALL - LOWER GATE MONDLITH (360' LOCK) M-20
 COMPUTED BY: DATE: _____
 CHECKED BY: DATE: _____

NOT TO SCALE



ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	ARM	MOMENT
W CONC		10652.5		17.05	181625
WATER SIDE		5211		30.67	51982
UPLIFT			-3772.1	18.94	-71538
(N LOCKS)			494.9	9.95	4924
GATE V	[513](3)(27.15)(18.04) + [100](27.15)(3)(5)(8.4)				
GATE S	[0625](682-620)(35)(1/2)(21.15)	-1502.0		23.93	-35042
GATE M	[0625](64450-620)(95)(1/2)(18.04)	-877.0		23.33	-20484
		1100		27.77	3082
			-877.8	42.05	-36911
					1885
		8903.6	-4160		79513

$$e = \frac{79513}{8903.6} = 8.93$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(8.93)(3)(100)}{35} = 76.54\%$$


$$F.S. \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{243499}{163975} = 1.48$$

CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
 600' LOCK DEWATERED
 UPPER POOL IN 360' LOCK

FIGURE A-11 MIDDLE WALL - LOWER GATE MONDLITH (360' LOCK) M-20


SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	CHECKED BY	DATE
MIDDLE WALL	LOWER GATE MONOLITH (360' LOCK)	M-20	
SLIDING	<p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum FV \tan \phi + \text{Key Resistance}$ $= (7629.5)(5458) + 0$ $= 4316.8$ $SSF = 4316.8 / 1830.2$ $= 2.36$	<p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{M_c}{I}$ $= \frac{7629.5}{(35)(40.19)} + \frac{(7629.5)(17.5 - 13.18)(17.5)(12)}{(40.19)(35)^3}$ $= 5.42 + 4.02$ $= 9.44 \text{ KSF}$	<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = (8903.6)(5458) + 0$ $= 5037.7$ $SSF = 5037.7 / 4160.0$ $= 1.21$
BASE PRESSURE	CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION		
	$f = \left[\frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{Q} \right] \div L$ $= \left[\frac{(2)(8903.6)}{(3)(8)} \right] \div 40.19$ $= 16.53 \text{ KSF}$		

FIGURE A-11 MIDDLE WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH (360' LOCK) M-20



SUBJECT MIDDLE WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH M-22	COMPUTED BY CHECKED BY DATE DATE
---	---

NOT TO SCALE



CASE I: NORMAL OPERATIONS
 UPPER POOL IN LOCK
 LOWER POOL IN RIVER

ITEM	FACTORS	F _V	F _H	ARM	MOMENT
W CONC	$[157(24)(45)(14) + (2975)(45)(5.5) + (1096 - 542)(2775)(24.2) + (44898 - 620)(3)(188) - (494 - 64775)(26.2)(5.4) - (5)(7)(5.5)(45) - (4)(6)(45)]$	11600.4		18.25	211707
W WATER IN LOCK	$[0.625][(482 - 64775)(26.2)(0.94) + (664.5 - 64898)(188)(3)]$	678.4		6.36	3636
W WATER IN RIVER	$[0.625][(664.5 - 64975)(45)(5.5)]$	228.2		32.25	7359
W WATER IN RIVER	$[0.625][2(5.5)^2(77)(45)]$	534.3		20.25	10820
P WATER IN LOCK	ABOVE GATE $(1/2)(682 - 620)(26.2)(0.625)$ BELOW GATE $(1/2)(6415 - 620)(188)(0.625)$	3147.3		20.67	65055
P WATER IN RIVER	$(1/2)(664.5 - 620)(45)(0.625)$	1163.4		14.83	17253
P WATER IN RIVER	$(64775 - 64575)(26.2)(5)(5)(0.755) - (620) + 1/2(64775 - 620)(26.2)(5)(0.755)$	-2784.7		14.83	-41297
Uplift	ABOVE GATE $[0.625][(664.5 - 620)(35)(26.2) + (1/2)(682 - 644.5)(35)(26.2)]$ BELOW GATE $[0.625][(6475 - 620)(31.5)(188) - (8)(45)]$	-3651.9	429.5	14.54	-50478
HANGER PULL		-1699.3		18.75	-31862
GATE S			36.0	49.50	1782
GATE V		2800.2	569.2	72.67	41364
GATE M				8.12	2174
		8570.1	2560.7		231324

$$C = \frac{231324}{8570.1} = 26.99'$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(35 - 26.99)(3)(45)(100)}{(35)(26.2) + (31.5)(188)} = 70.77\% \text{ ACTIVE BASE}$$

$$FS = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{201496}{213091} = 1.32$$


FIGURE A-12 - MIDDLE WALL LOWER GATE MONOLITH M-22

MIDDLE WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH M-22

COMPUTED BY: _____
CHECKED BY: _____

DATE: _____
DATE: _____

NOT TO SCALE



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION

LOWER POOL IN RIVER
LOCK DEWATERED

ITEM	F _V	F _H	ARM	MOMENT
W CONC	11600.4		18.25	21170.7
W WATER IN RIVER	228.2		82.65	7859
P WATER IN RIVER Uplift		-2784.7	14.83	-4129.7
HANGER			22.67	-48.171
GATE V	-2124.9	36.0	49.00	1782
GATE H	280.0		8.72	2374
PARTIAL CONC IN LOCK		489.5	8.58	-9974
	9983.7	-2319.2		12736.5

$$[0.625] \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} \right) (644.5 - 620) (35) (24.2) + \right. \\ \left. \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) (644.5 - 620) (37.5) (18.8) \right]$$

$$e = \frac{12736.5}{9983.7} = 12.75$$

PERCENT ACTIVE BASE = 100% because resultant acts within the middle third

$$F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STAB. M.}}{\sum \text{OVERT. M.}} = \frac{226607}{99442} = 2.28$$

FIGURE A-1/2 MIDDLE WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH M-22

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE	CHECKED BY	DATE
MIDDLE WALL - LOWER GATE MONDULITH M-22				
<p>SLIDING</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{KEY RESISTANCE}$ $= 8570.1(5658) + 0$ $= 48489$ $SSF = 48489 / 25607 = 1.89$ <p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = 9983.7(5658) + 0$ $= 56488$ $SSF = 56488 / 23192 = 2.44$	<p>BASE PRESSURE</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $e = 35 - 26.99 = 8.01$ $f = \frac{2}{3} \frac{p}{e}$ $= \frac{(2)(8570.1)}{(3)(8.01)} + 45 = 15.85 \text{ KSF}$ <p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{Mc}{I}$ $= \frac{9983.7}{(32.5)(4.8)(55)(24)} + \frac{(9983.7)(17.5)(12.75)(17.5)}{140781.2}$ $= 6.55 + 5.16$ $= 11.69 \text{ KSF}$		<p>MIDDLE WALL LOWER GATE MONDULITH M-22</p>	

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE
	CHECKED BY	DATE

RIVER WALL - UPPER GUARD WALL MONOLITH R-6

STATION 4+88.23 A TO 4+4 23 A





FIGURE A-13 RIVER WALL - UPPER GUARD WALL MONOLITH R-6

SUBJECT: RIVER WALL - UPPER GUARD WALL MONOLITH R-6
 COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____
 CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____

NOT TO SCALE

EL 692.00
 U.P. 682.00
 EL 671.96
 EL 650.00
 EL 644.00



NORMAL OPERATIONS
 UPPER POOL BOTH SIDES
 OF MONOLITH

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	ARM	MOMENT
W CONC	$[1513] [(10)(48)(48) - (1/2)(18)(64) - (48) - (10)(18)(16)(2) - (3/4)(15)(96) - (16)(3) - (1/2)(3/4)(2.15)(15)(2)] / 48$	67.7		7.42	502
W WATER	$[0.625] [(21.96)(15.85)(32) + (2.15)(682 - 682 - 1.96) + (1/2)(1.15)(682 - 682 - 1.96) + (1/2)(682 - 671.96)(48)(5.44)] / 48$	19.6		10.01	196
WATER BULK PUNTER LOCK UPLIFT IMPACT	HORIZONTAL WATER FORCES CANCEL $[0.625] (682 - 644)(18)$ 2.5 KIPS/FT	-42.8	2.50	9.00 43.00	-385 108
		44.5	2.50		421


$$e = \frac{421}{445} = 9.46$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(3)(9.46)(100)}{18} = 100\%$$

$$SF = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{873}{493} = 1.77$$

FIGURE A-13 RIVER WALL - UPPER GUARD WALL MONOLITH R-6

HORIZONTAL PILE LOADS



ALLOWABLE HORIZONTAL LOAD PER PILE = 8*

NORMAL OPERATIONS

$$F_H = \frac{25(48)}{75} = 16 \text{ KIPS/PILE} < 8*$$

BASE PILE PRESSURE

I pile group = 1540.28 FT⁴

NORMAL OPERATIONS

$$f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{M_c}{I}$$

$$= \frac{(44.5)(48)}{.7854(75)} + \frac{(44.5) \left(\frac{10}{2} - 9.46 \right) \left(\frac{10}{2} \right)}{1540.28}$$

$$= 36.76 + 0.12$$

$$= 36.88 \text{ KSF}$$

$$36.88 \text{ KSF} \times .7854 \text{ SF/pile} = 28.57 \text{ KIP/pile} < 100 \text{ K/pile allowable}$$

FIGURE A-13 RIVER WALL - UPPER GUARD WALL MOUNDOUTH R-6





FIGURE A-1/4 RIVER WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH R-12

SUBJECT: RIVER WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH R-12

NOT TO SCALE



CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS
UPPER POOL ABOVE LOCK
LOWER POOL IN LOCK

FIGURE A-14 RIVER WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH R-12

COMPUTED BY: DATE: CHECKED BY: DATE:

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	ARM	MOMENT
W CONC.	[1513] [(3)(30.75)(41.05) + (73)(24)(41.05) + (8)(30.75)(41.05) - (3.44)(23.42)(29) - (6)(6)(41.05) - (10)(11.5)(41.05)]	11489.0		18.80	219753
W WATER RIVER	[0423] (682-649.75)(3)(41.05)	248.2		33.50	8315
W WATER LOCK	[0625] [(8)(17.63)(664.5-649.75) + (8)(682-649.75)(23.42) + (3.44)(682-663)(23.42)]	603.8		4.91	2965
W WATER CURTAIN	[0675] (10)(11.5)(41.05)	295.0		20.00	5900
P WATER RIVER	[0625] [(1/2)(682-619)(23.42)		-5091.5	21.00	-106922
P WATER LOCK (IN LOCK)	[0425] [(1/2)(664.5-619)(17.63)		2904.8	21.00	61001
P WATER LOCK (IN LOCK)	[1513] [(649.75-647.75)(5)(647.75-619)(17.63) + [0154] (647.75-619)(5)(1/2)(17.63)]		1140.6	15.17	17303
U PLATE (ABOVE GATE)	[0425] (682-619)(35)(23.42)		351.4	10.63	3735
GATE V	[0625] [(664.5-619)(35)(17.63) + (1/2)(682-644.5)(35)(17.63)]		-3227.6	17.50	-56483
GATE S		81.0	308.4	9.73	188
GATE M				51.67	15935
		7597.3	-386.3		-1238
					136451

$e = \frac{136451}{75973} = 17.96$

PERCENT ACTIVE BASE = $\frac{(17.96)(3)(100)}{35} = 100\%$

F.S. = $\frac{\sum STABILIZING M}{\sum OVERTURNING M} = \frac{335695}{199344} = 1.68$

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE
RIVER WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH R-12		
<p>SLIDING</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{key Resistance}$ $= (7597.3)(0.5658) + 0$ $= 4298.6$ $SSF = 4298.6 / 386.3$ $= 11.1$	<p>BASE PRESSURE</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{M_c}{I}$ $= \frac{7597.3}{(35)(41.05)} + \frac{(7597.3)(17.96 - 17.5)(17.5)(12)}{(41.05)(35)^3}$ $= 5.29 \quad 0.42$ $= 5.71 \text{ KSF}$	
<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = (9189.6)(0.5658) + 0$ $= 5199.5$ $SSF = 5199.5 / 4740.1$ $= 1.1$	<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $f = \frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{C} / L$ $= \frac{(2)(9189.6)}{(3)(6.36)} / 41.05$ $= 23.47 \text{ KSF}$	

FIGURE A-14 RIVER WALL - UPPER GATE MONOLITH R-12

RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-15

SUBJECT


COMPUTED BY

DATE

CHECKED BY

DATE

NOT TO SCALE



CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS

UPPER POOL IN RIVER
LOWER POOL IN LOCK

ITEM	FACTORS	F _V	F _H	AREA	MOMENT
W CONC	$[15.5] [(24)(7.5) + (8)(30.75) + (8)(30.75) - (10)(11.5) - (6)(2.25) - (1)(9)]$	290.0		16.46	4773
W WATER IN RIVER	$(5)(69.2 - 6.6)(6.5)/43.95$	16.1		31.00	499
W WATER IN LOCK	$[0.675] (8)(682 - 649.75)$	2.8		1.50	4
W WATER IN CURB	$[0.675] (5)(664.5 - 649.75)$	7.2		15.00	108
P CONC EMBR	$[15.13] (649.75 - 647.75)(5)(647.75 - 619) + [0.154] (647.75 - 619)(1/2)(5)$		19.9	10.62	2.11
P WATER IN RIVER	$[0.675] (1/2)(682 - 619)^2$		-124.0	21.00	-2604
P WATER IN LOCK	$[0.675] (1/2)(664.5 - 619)^2$		64.7	15.17	98.1
Uplift	$[0.675] [(664.5 - 619)(35) + (1/2)(35)(682 - 649.5)]$	-118.7		18.44	-2189
IMPACT	0.9 KIPS/FT		0.9	50.50	45
HANGER	0.8 KIPS/FT		0.8	68.00	54
		197.4	-37.7		1882

$$e = \frac{1882}{1974} = 9.53'$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{9.53(9)(100)}{35} = 8.69\%$$


$$F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{6675}{4793} = 1.39$$

FIGURE A-15 RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-15

SUBJECT: RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-15

ITEM	FACTORS	F _V	F _H	ARM	MOMENT
W/CONC W/WATER IN ROSE		290.0 16.1		16.46 31.00	4773 499
Pressure in ROSE P _{CONC} & WATER			-124.0 19.9	21.00 10.62	-2604 211
UPJET HANGER	[0.025][482-619](55)	-689	0.8	23.33	-1607
		237.2	-103.3	68.00	1526

$e = \frac{1526}{237.2} = 6.43'$
 PERCENT ACTIVE BASE = $\frac{5.59(3)(100)}{35} = 47.91\%$
 $F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STAB M}}{\sum \text{OVERT M}} = \frac{5537}{4211} = 1.31$



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
UPPER POOL IN RIVER
LOCK DEWATERED

FIGURE A-15 RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-15

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE	CHECKED BY	DATE
RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MOUNDLITH	R-13			
SLIDING	BASE PRESSURE			
CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS	CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS			
$R = \sum FV \tan \phi + \text{KEY RESISTANCE}$ $= \frac{(1974)(.5658)}{111.7} + 0$ $= 10.0$ $SSF = 111.7 / 377 = 2.96$	$f = \frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{e}$ $= \frac{(2)(1974)}{(3)(953)}$ $= 13.81 \text{ KSF}$			
CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION	CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION			
$R = \frac{(2372)(.5658)}{134.2} + 0$ $= 10.0$ $SSF = 134.2 / 103.3 = 1.30$	$f = \frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{e}$ $= \frac{(2)(2372)}{(3)(659)}$ $= 28.29 \text{ KSF}$			

FIGURE A-15 RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MOUNDLITH R-13

SUBJECT: RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-15

COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____
 CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____

STATION 1+22.67A TO 0+91.35A





FIGURE A-16 RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-15

SUBJECT		COMPUTED BY		DATE	
RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH		R-15			
ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _a	ARM	MOMENT
W CONC	$[.1513] [(42.25)(24) + (30.75)(35) - (16)(692 - 666.75)(4) - (6)(6) - (10)(11.5) - (3)(4)(7)(2)/31.32]$	2659		17.87	47152
WATER RIVER	$[.0625] [(682 - 666.75)(3) + (1/2)(8.46)(682 - 666.75)]$	101		31.77	321
WATER, LOCK	$[.0425] (664.5 - 649.75)(8)$	74		4.00	30
WATER IN CHAMBERS	$[.0625] [(10)(11.5) + (3)(4)(7)(2)/31.32]$	75		19.61	147
P WATER, RIVER	$[.0625] [(682 - 619)(12)$		-124.0	21.00	-2604
P WATER, LOCK	$[.0625] (664.5 - 619)(7/2)$		64.7	15.17	981
P PARTIAL LOCK	$[.1513] (649.75 - 647.75)(5)(497.75 - 619) + [0759] (647.75 - 619)(1/2)(5)$		199	10.63	212
UPLIFT	$[.0625] [(664.5 - 619)(35) + (1/2)(35)(682 - 666.75)]$	-118.7		18.44	-2189
IMPACT			13	50.50	66
HAMMER			0.8	68.00	54
		172.2	-37.3		1770

$Q = \frac{1770}{172.2} = 10.28$
 PERCENT ACTIVE BASE = $\frac{(0.28)(3)(100)}{35} = 88.11\%$
 $F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{6563}{4793} = 1.37$




NOT TO SCALE

CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS
 UPPER POOL IN RIVER
 LOWER POOL IN LOCK

FIGURE A-16 RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-15

SUBJECT: RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-15

NOT TO SCALE



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
UPPER POOL IN RIVER
LOCK DEWATERED

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	ARM	MOMENT
W.C.M.C.		265.9		17.87	4752
WATER RIVER		10.1		31.77	321
P. WATER RIVER			-124.0	21.00	-2604
P. EARTH & CONC.			19.9	10.63	212
UPPER HAUSER	[0.655] (682-619) (10)(35)	-68.9	0.8	23.33	-1607
		207.1	-103.3	68.00	54
					112.8

$$e = \frac{112.8}{207.1} = 5.45$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(5.45)(3)(100)}{35} = 46.71\%$$

$$F.S. \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{5339}{4211} = 1.27$$

FIGURE A-12 RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-15

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE
RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-15 SLIDING CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS $R = \sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{KEY RESISTANCE}$ $= (172.2)(56.58) + 0$ $= 97.4$ $SSF = 97.4 / 37.3$ $= 2.61$	BASE PRESSURE CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS $f = \frac{2}{3} \bar{p}$ $= \frac{(2)(172.2)}{(3)(10.28)}$ $= 11.17 \text{ KSF}$	DATE DATE
CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION $R = (207.1)(56.58) + 0$ $= 117.2$ $SSF = (117.2) / 103.3$ $= 1.13$	CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION $f = \frac{2}{3} \bar{p}$ $= \frac{(2)(207.1)}{(3)(5.45)}$ $= 25.33 \text{ KSF}$	DATE DATE

FIGURE A-16 RIVER WALL - TYPICAL UPPER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-15




FIGURE A-17 RIVER WALL - TYPICAL LOWER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-20

SUBJECT: RIVER WALL - TYPICAL LOWER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-20


COMPUTED BY: DATE: _____
 CHECKED BY: DATE: _____

ITEM	FACTORS	F _V	F _H	ARM	MOMENT
W. CONC	[1515] [(42.75)(24) + (35)(40.75) - (6)(10) - (10)(11.5) - (3)(4)(7)(3)/44.55 - (4)(11)(30.55)/44.55]	284.6		16.62	4730
W. WATER RIVER	[0625] (664.5 - 649.75)(8)	7.4		31.00	229
W. WATER LOCK	[0615] (682 - 649.75)(8)	6.0		15.0	9
W. WATER IN CHAMBERS	[0665] [(10)(11.5) + (3)(4)(7)(3)/44.55 + (682 - 661.45)(4)(11)/44.55]	8.7		14.67	128
W. WATER ENBER	[0625] (664.5 - 619)(7)(42)		-64.7	15.17	-981
W. WATER LOCK	[0625] (682 - 619)(7)(42)		124.0	21.00	2604
W. WATER & CONC IN LOCK	[1513] [(649.75 - 647.75)(3)(47.75 - 619) + (0.75)(4)(619)(3)(42) + (619) + (0.75)(4)(619)(35) + (682 - 664.5)(12)(35)]		19.9	10.63	212
UPLIFT		-118.7		16.56	-1965
IMPACT		188	80.1	68.00	61

$e = \frac{502.7}{188} = 2.674$

PERCENT ACTIVE BASE $\frac{(35 - 24.74)(3)(100)}{35} = 70.8$

$F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{6619}{5064} = 1.31$



NOT TO SCALE

CASE I: NORMAL OPERATIONS
 UPPER POOL IN LOCK
 LOWER POOL IN RIVER

FIGURE A-17 RIVER WALL - TYPICAL LOWER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-20


SUBJECT: RIVER WALL - TYPICAL LOWER CHAMBER MONOLITH R-20

COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____
 CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	A.R.M.	MOMENT
Weight		284.6		16.62	4730
Water end		7.4		31.00	229
Pressure above			-64.7	15.17	-98.1
Pressure below			19.9	10.65	212
Uplift			-49.8	23.33	-116.1
	$[0.675] \left[\frac{1}{2} (64.5 - 6.0) (35) \right]$		242.2	-44.8	3029

$e = \frac{3029}{242.2} = 12.51$
 $\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(2.5)(3)(100)}{35} = 100\%$
 $\text{F.S.} = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{5171}{2142} = 2.41$

NOT TO SCALE



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
 LOWER POOL IN RIVER
 LOCK DEWATERED

FIGURE A-17 RIVER WALL - TYPICAL LOWER CHAMBER MONOLITH - R-20

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	CHECKED BY	DATE	DATE
RIVER WALL - TYPICAL LOWER CHAMBER MOUND LITH R-20				
SLIDING CASE I NORMAL OPERATION $R = \sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{KEY RESISTANCE}$ $= (188)(5658) + 0$ $= 1064$ $SSF = 106.4 / 80.1$ $= 1.33$	BASE PRESSURE CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS $f = \frac{2}{3} \frac{P}{e}$ $= \frac{(2)(188)}{(3)(35-26.74)}$ $= 15.2 \text{ KSF}$	CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION $R = (242.2)(5658) + 0$ $= 1370$ $SSF = 137.0 / 44.8$ $= 3.06$	CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{M_c}{I}$ $= \frac{242.2}{55} + \frac{(242.2)(\frac{35}{2} - 12.5)(\frac{35}{2})(12)}{55^3}$ $= 6.92 + 5.92$ $= 12.8 \text{ KSF}$	

FIGURE A-17 RIVER WALL - TYPICAL LOWER CHAMBER MOUND LITH R-20

SUBJECT: RIVER WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH R-23
 COMPLETED BY: _____ DATE: _____
 CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____

STATION 1+88.04 B TO 1+470 B





FIGURE A-18 RIVER WALL-LOWER GATE MONOLITH R-23

RIVER WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH R-23

COMPUTED BY: DATE: CHECKED BY: DATE:

NOT TO SCALE



CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS
 LOWER POOL IN RIVER
 LOWER POOL BELOW LOCK
 UPPER POOL IN LOCK

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	ARM	MOMENT
W.C.M.C.	[1515] [(2A)(4.04)(73) + (8)(41.04) (30.75) + (2)(41.04)(28.75) - (3.44) (23)(44.25) - (10)(115)(41.04) - (6)(3.5)(41.04)]	115645		16.85	194862
WATER RIVER	[0625] (664.5 - 649.75)(41.04)(8)	302.7		31.00	9384
WATER LOCK (ABOVE GATE)	[0625] (682 - 647.75)(44)(23)	318.1		3.23	1027
WATER LOCK (BELOW GATE)	[0625] (664.5 - 647.75)(3)(18.04)	56.7		1.50	85
WATER UPLIFT	[0625] (10)(115)(41.04)	295.0		16.75	4941
WATER RIVER (ABOVE GATE)	[0625] (664.5 - 619)(12)(41.04)	-2655.1	21.00		-5577
WATER LOCK (ABOVE GATE)	[0625] (682 - 619)(11)(23)	2852.7	21.00		59907
WATER LOCK (BELOW GATE)	[0625] (664.5 - 619)(11)(18.04)	1167.1	15.17		17705
WEIGHT CONC	[1515] [(647.75 - 645.75)(5)(645.75 - 619) + (0754)(645.75 - 619)(1/2)(5) (41.04)]		719.8	9.94	7155
UPLIFT (ABOVE GATE)	[0625] [(664.5 - 619)(35)(23) + (1/2) (682 - 664.5)(35)(23)]	-2729.5		16.56	-45200
UPLIFT (BELOW GATE)	[0625] (664.5 - 619)(35)(18.04)	-1795.5		17.50	-31421
GATE V		111.0		4.29	476
GATE S			871.8	43.05	37769
GATE M					-1697
		812.3	2962.3		199256

$$e = \frac{199256}{8123} = 24.53'$$


$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(35.00 - 24.53)(3)(100)}{35} = 89.74\%$$

$$F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{287338.6}{254309.2} = 1.14$$

FIGURE A-18 RIVER WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH R-23

SUBJECT		COMPUTED BY		DATE			
RIVER WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH		R-23					
ITEM		FACTORS		F _y	F _x	ARM	MOMENT
W/CONC.				11564.5		16.85	194862
W/WATER RIVER				502.7		21.00	9584
P/WATER RIVER					-2655.1	21.00	-55757
P/RAILS & CONC.					719.8	9.94	7155
U/PAVEMENT				-2042.4		23.33	-47649
GATE V				111.0		4.29	476
GATE M				9935.8	-1935.3		-1697
							106774

NOT TO SCALE



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
 LOCK DEWATERED
 LOWER POOL IN RIVER

$$e = \frac{106774}{9935.8} = 10.75$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(0.75)(3)(100)}{35} = 92.14\%$$

$$F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{211877}{105103} = 2.02$$

FIGURE A-18 RIVER WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH R-23

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE
RIVER WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH R-23		
<p>SLIDING</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \frac{\sum F_v \tan \phi + \text{KEY RESISTANCE}}{4596}$ $= \frac{(8123)(.5658)}{4596}$ $= 1.55$ <p>SSF = 4596 / 2962.3 = 1.55</p>	<p>BASE PRESSURE</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $f = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)\left(\frac{P}{e}\right)$ $= \frac{(2)(8123)}{(3)(35-24.53)} \div 41.04$ $= 12.60 \text{ KSF}$	
<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = \frac{9935.8 (.5658)}{5621.7}$ $= 2.9$ <p>SSF = 5621.7 / 1935.3 = 2.9</p>	<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $f = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)\left(\frac{P}{e}\right)$ $= \frac{(2)(9935.8)}{(3)(10.75)} \div 41.04$ $= 15.01 \text{ KSF}$	

FIGURE A-18 RIVER WALL - LOWER GATE MONOLITH R-23

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY:	DATE
	CHECKED BY:	DATE

RIVER WALL - LOWER GUARD WALL R-29

STATION 3+98.21 B TO 4+40.21 B





FIGURE A-1-7 RIVER WALL - LOWER GUARD WALL MONOLITH R-29

SUBJECT: RIVER WALL LOWER GUARD WALL R-29

COMPUTED BY: DATE: _____
 CHECKED BY: DATE: _____

NOT TO SCALE



CASE I NORMAL OPERATION

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	ARM	MOMENT
WEING	[158] (18)(44) - (12)(692-657)(9)	85.4	7.12	608
WATER IN RIVER	[0625] (664.5-657)(2.79)(1/2)	0.7	17.07	12
WATER RUBER	Horizontal water pressures cause			
WATER LOCK	[0625] (664.5-648)(18)	-18.6	9.00	-167
UPLIFT	0.8 KIPS/FT		21.50	-17
HOUSER	120/42 = 2.86		21.50	-62
IMPACT		67.5	-3.7	347

$$e = \frac{347}{67.5} = 5.14$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{5.14(8)(100)}{18} = 92.33\%$$

$$F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING MOMENTS}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING MOMENTS}} = \frac{620}{246} = 2.52$$

FIGURE A-19 RIVER WALL - LOWER GUARD WALL MONOLITH R-29




SUBJECT: RIVER WALL - LOWER GUARD WALL R-29	COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____ CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____
<p>HORIZONTAL PILE LOADS</p>  <p>ALLOWABLE HORIZONTAL LOAD PER PILE = 8.0K</p> <p>NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $F_H = \frac{3.7(42)}{81} = 1.92K/pile < 8K$	<p>BASE PILE PRESSURE</p> <p>NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{Mc}{I}$ $= \frac{(675)(42)}{7854(81)} + \frac{(675)(42)\left(\frac{18}{2} - 5.54\right)\left(\frac{18}{2}\right)}{1673.93}$ $= 44.56 + 52.74$ $= 97.30 \text{ KSF}$ <p>97.30 KSF x 7854 SF/pile = 764.2 K/pile < 100 K/pile</p> <p>I pile group = 1673.93 ft⁴</p>

FIGURE A-19 RIVER WALL - LOWER GUARD WALL MONOLITH R-29

SUBJECT: LOWER MITER SILL (110' LOCK)

COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____

CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____



649.76
648.94
648.46

633.00

620.00

SECTION AA

FIGURE A-2.0 LOWER MITER SILL (110' LOCK)

LOWER MITER SILL (110' LOCK)

COMPUTED BY: _____ DATE: _____

CHECKED BY: _____ DATE: _____


ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _h	ARM	MOMENT
W LOCK WEARING LOCK IN LOCK	[151] (647.75 - 645.75) (57.84) (15.75) (2) + [120] (2) (1/2) (645.75 - 620) (57.84) (35.75)	2772.5		-23.52	-510.913
PUMP & LOCK IN LOCK	[151] (2) (647.75 - 645.75) (5) (645.75 - 620) (57.84) + [120] (2) (1/2) (5) (645.75 - 620) (57.84)	3193.4		-41.22	-314.825
		2765.2	2765.2	9.18	25661
		24915.9	2765.2		-80007.7

$$C = \frac{-80007.7}{24915.9} = -32.11$$

ANALYSIS SHOWS THAT FOR A BASE OF THESE DIMENSIONS SUBJECTED TO THIS LOADING IF THE RESULTANT FALLS WITHIN 9.37' FROM THE CENTER OF GRAVITY THE ENTIRE BASE IS IN COMPRESSION. C.G. IS 26.52' FROM THE CENTER OF MOMENTS. $32.11 - 26.52 = 5.59 < 9.37$

PERCENTAGE ACTIVE BASE = 100%

$$F.S. = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING } M}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING } M} = \frac{825738}{25661} = 32.18$$



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
LOCK DEWATERED

FIGURE A-2.0 LOWER MITER SILL (110' LOCK)

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE
<p>LOWER MITER SILL (110' LOCK)</p> <p>SLIDING</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum Fv \tan \phi + \text{Key Resistance}$ $= (15802.6)(5658) + (4)(110)(015)(144)$ $= 8941.1 + 4752$ $= 13693.1$ <p>SSF = 13693.1 / 5049.7</p> $= 2.71$	<p>BASE PRESSURES</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATION</p> $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{Mc}{I}$ $= \frac{15802.6}{5777.8} + \frac{(15802.6)(26.52 - 21.92)(26.52)}{1409872}$ $= 2.74 + 1.07$ $= 3.81 \text{ KSF}$	<p>DATE</p>
<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = (24915.9)(5658) + 4752$ $= 140974 + 4752$ $= 18849.4$ <p>SSF = 18849.4 / 2765.2</p> $= 6.82$	<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $f = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{Mc}{I}$ $= \frac{24915.9}{5777.8} + \frac{24915.9(32.11 - 26.52)(6147 - 26.52)}{1,409,872}$ $= 4.31 \quad 3.46$ $= 7.77 \text{ KSF}$	<p>DATE</p>
<p>NOTE THE ANALYSIS FOR THE UPPER MITER SILL (110' LOCK) WAS FOUND TO BE ADEQUATE AND STABLE AND HAS NOT BEEN PRESENTED HERE.</p> <p>FIGURE A-20 LOWER MITER SILL (110' LOCK)</p>		





FIGURE A-21 LOWER MITER SILL (56' LOCK)

LOWER MITER SILL (56' LOCK)

NOT TO SCALE



CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS

UPPER POOL IN LOCK
LOWER POOL BELOW LOCK

ITEM	FACTORS	F _v	F _H	ARM	MOMENT
W CONC	$[1512] [(647.75 - 620)(39.69)(56) + (649.75 - 647.75)(14.5)(56) + (648.46 - 647.75)(5)(56) + (42)(649.75 - 647.75)(0.19)(56) + (3)(3)(56)]$	9195.7		7.013	1972.85
W WATER LOCK	$[0625] [(682 - 647.75)(0)(56) + (16)(682 - 647.75)(0.19)(56)]$	18095		7.84	14186
W WATER LOCK	$[0625] [56] [(1/2)(645 - 649.75)(0.19) + (649.75 - 648.46)(5)]$	1292.3		2739	35396
P WATER LOCK	$[0625] [56] [(649.75 - 620)(39.69) + (1/2)(649.75 - 620)]$		4904.9	13.31	65311
P WATER LOCK	$[0425] [56] [(648.46 - 620)(16.04) + (1/2)(648.46 - 620)]$		-3015.2	12.00	-36182
P WATER LOCK	$[1518] [(5)(647.75 - 645.75)(56)(645.75 - 620) + (0.75)(5)(645.75 - 620)]$		9181	9.60	8814
UPLIFT	$[0625] [56] [(645 - 620)(39.69) + (16)(620 - 645.5)(39.69)]$	-7397.2		18.75	-128698
		55003	28091.8		146112

$$e = \frac{146112}{55003} = 26.56'$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(39.69 - 26.56)(3)(100)}{39.69} = 99.24\%$$

$$FS = \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{301314}{229022} = 1.32$$

FIGURE A-21 LOWER MITER SILL (56' LOCK)

SUBJECT: LOWER MITER SILL (56' LOCK)

COMPUTED BY: DATE:


CHECKED BY: DATE:

ITEM	FACTORS	F _V	F _H	ARM	MOMENT
W _{CONC} PARTS (CONC AND)	$[153](64715 - 61515)(5)(64515 - 620)(56)$ $+ [120](15)(64515 - 620)(5)(56)$	97957		20.13	197285
		97957	1338	9.18	12411
			1338		209706

$$e = \frac{209706}{97957} = 21.41$$

$$\text{PERCENT ACTIVE BASE} = \frac{(39.69 - 21.41)(3)(100)}{29.69} = 100\%$$

$$F.S. \frac{\sum \text{STABILIZING M}}{\sum \text{OVERTURNING M}} = \frac{191603}{12411} = 15.43$$



CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION
LOCK DEWATERED

FIGURE A-21 LOWER MITER SILL (56' LOCK)

SUBJECT	COMPUTED BY	DATE
	CHECKED BY	DATE
<p>LOWER MITER SILL (56' LOCK)</p>		
<p>SLIDING</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $R = \sum FV \tan \phi + \text{KEY RESISTANCE}$ $= (5500.3)(.5658) + (4)(56)(.075)(144)$ $= 3112.1 + 2419.2$ $= 5531.3$ $SSF = 5531.3 / 2809.8$ $= 1.97$	<p>BASE PRESSURE</p> <p>CASE I NORMAL OPERATIONS</p> $f = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)\left(\frac{P}{L}\right) / L$ $= \frac{(2)(5500.3)}{(3)(13.13)} / 56$ $= 4.98 \text{ KSF}$	
<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $R = (9795.7)(.5658) + 2419.2$ $= 5542.4 + 2419.2$ $= 7961.6$ $SSF = 7961.6 / 1338.6$ $= 5.95$	<p>CASE II MAINTENANCE CONDITION</p> $F = \frac{P}{A} + \frac{M^2}{I}$ $= \frac{9795.7}{(37.69)(56)} + \frac{(9795.7)\left(\frac{39.69}{2} - 2.4\right)(19.84)(2)}{(56)(39.69)^3}$ $= 4.41 + 1.04$ $= 5.45 \text{ KSF}$	

FIGURE A-2/ LOWER MITER SILL (56' LOCK)

AD-A038 655

ARMY ENGINEER WATERWAYS EXPERIMENT STATION VICKSBURG MISS F/G 13/13
ENGINEERING CONDITION SURVEY AND STRUCTURAL INVESTIGATION OF MO--ETC(U)
MAR 77 C E PACE, J T PEATROSS

UNCLASSIFIED

WES-MP-C-77-2

NL

3 of 3
AD
A038655



END

DATE
FILMED
5-77

In accordance with ER 70-2-3, paragraph 6c(1)(b), dated 15 February 1973, a facsimile catalog card in Library of Congress format is reproduced below.

Pace, Carl E

Engineering condition survey and structural investigation of Montgomery Locks and Dam, Ohio River, by Carl E. Pace and James T. Peatross, Jr. Vicksburg, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, 1977.

1 v. (various pagings) illus. 27 cm. (U. S. Waterways Experiment Station. Miscellaneous paper C-77-2)

Prepared for U. S. Army Engineer District, Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Includes bibliography.

1. Condition survey. 2. Dams. 3. Montgomery Locks and Dam. 4. Stability analysis. 5. Stress analysis. 6. Structural evaluation. I. Peatross, James T., joint author. II. U. S. Army Engineer District, Pittsburgh. (Series: U. S. Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss. Miscellaneous paper C-77-2)
TA7.W34m no.C-77-2