

## Research

doi: 10.22034/JCEMA.2021.281967.1055

# Comparison of Quasi-Static and Dynamic Stress-Strain Analysis in Earth Dams (Case Study: Azadi Earth Dam)

Behrang Beiranvand\*, Mostafa Zeinolebadi Rozbahani, Ahmadreza Mazaheri

Department of Water Engineering and Hydraulic Structures, University of Ayatollah Ozma Borujerdi, Lorestan, Iran.

\* Correspondence should be addressed to Behrang Beiranvand, Department of Water Engineering and Hydraulic Structures, University of Ayatollah Ozma Borujerdi, Lorestan, Iran. Tel: +986633231711, Email: [behrang220@gmail.com](mailto:behrang220@gmail.com).

## ABSTRACT

Seismic analysis of earth and rockfill dams is generally done in two ways: quasi-static and dynamic. However, a quasi-static method with easy application and simple assumptions may lead to unsafe and uneconomical results. In the present study, two static and dynamic analyzes have been used nonlinearly using the Rayleigh Damping rule to calculate the stress and strain of Azadi Dam in the stages of the end of construction and steady-state seepage. Also, in numerical analysis, Abaqus software and a simple elastoplastic behavior model based on the Mohr-Coulomb criterion have been used. The results show that in both quasi-static and dynamic seismic analysis, the highest strain of the Azadi Dam core occurred at the upper levels of the core and the highest stress occurred at the level of the core floor. The stress in the dynamic state is higher than the quasi-static one in the directions  $\sigma_{xx}$  49%,  $\sigma_{xy}$  30%, and  $\sigma_{yy}$  28%, respectively. Also, the maximum shell stress at 1255 m, 1275 m, and 1300 m levels is 29%, 68%, and 72% higher than the core,

**Keywords:** Abaqus, quasi-static analysis, dynamic analysis, stress, strain

Copyright © 2021 Behrang Beiranvand. This is an open access paper distributed under the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#). *Journal of Civil Engineering and Materials Application* is published by [Pendar Pub](#); Journal p-ISSN 2676-332X; Journal e-ISSN 2588-2880.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Seismic design and analysis of earth and rockfill dams are done by two methods, quasi-static and dynamic. The method of dynamic analysis is mainly based on stress analysis and displacement, which is usually done with the help of finite element methods. This method is commonly used to analyze the stability of large dams in the study phase. Lack of accurate software for dynamic analysis of earth dams, the limited number of experts aware of dynamic analysis, the complexity of dynamic analysis method, expensive tests for determining dynamic soil properties, frequency, and ease of analysis with quasi-static software are the reasons for widespread use of the quasi-static method. Due to these cases, determining the accuracy of the quasi-static method and creating a relationship between the solutions of the two quasi-static and dynamic methods is of interest to earth and gravel dam design engineers. Today, the development of finite element and finite difference software has made it possible to use dynamic analysis as well as quasi-static analysis. Ambraseys and Sarma, 1967 examined the

response of earth dams to several earthquakes. They calculated the time history and distribution of earthquake acceleration in the dam body [1]. (Sarma, 1975) developed diagrams for calculating the critical horizontal acceleration in which the critical horizontal acceleration is the acceleration that can bring the soil mass limited to a landslide level into equilibrium [2]. (Wang et al., 2006) introduced a new model in FLAC software and dynamically analyzed several earth dams in the effective stress space. They compared the actual deformations of the dams with the estimated values with different models [3]. (Tsai et al., 2006) by studying the dynamic response of the Pao-Shan dam, studied the effect of core dimensions on the potential of earth dam response as well as the effect of core width and height ratio and dam length and height ratio at the first natural frequency [4]. (Tsompanakis et al., 2009) Using a neural network, evaluated the dynamic response of the sample embankment (laboratory) using the finite element method. Considering the nonlinear behavior of soil materials, he concluded that the magnification