

Advanced Earthquake-Resistant Structures

Bruno Crump



Advanced Earthquake-Resistant Structures

Edited by **Bruno Crump**

NYRESEARCH
P R E S S

New York

Published by NY Research Press,
23 West, 55th Street, Suite 816,
New York, NY 10019, USA
www.nyresearchpress.com

Advanced Earthquake-Resistant Structures

Edited by Bruno Crump

© 2015 NY Research Press

International Standard Book Number: 978-1-63238-014-2 (Hardback)

This book contains information obtained from authentic and highly regarded sources. Copyright for all individual chapters remain with the respective authors as indicated. A wide variety of references are listed. Permission and sources are indicated; for detailed attributions, please refer to the permissions page. Reasonable efforts have been made to publish reliable data and information, but the authors, editors and publisher cannot assume any responsibility for the validity of all materials or the consequences of their use.

The publisher's policy is to use permanent paper from mills that operate a sustainable forestry policy. Furthermore, the publisher ensures that the text paper and cover boards used have met acceptable environmental accreditation standards.

Trademark Notice: Registered trademark of products or corporate names are used only for explanation and identification without intent to infringe.

Printed in China.

Preface

This book focuses on earthquake-resistant structures which can withstand major earthquakes. It comprises of research works contributed by various experts and researchers in the field of earthquake engineering. The book provides an overview of latest developments and advances related to earthquake-resistant structures. The book discusses seismic-resistance design of masonry and reinforcement of concrete structures and safety measurements, strengthening and rehabilitation of existing structures against earthquake loads. It also covers topics dedicated to seismic bearing capacity of shallow foundations, seismic behavior and retrofits of infilled frames, and also provides case studies related to seismic damage estimation in Mexico and vulnerability of buildings in western China. The book should be useful to graduate students, researchers and practicing structural engineers.

This book has been the outcome of endless efforts put in by authors and researchers on various issues and topics within the field. The book is a comprehensive collection of significant researches that are addressed in a variety of chapters. It will surely enhance the knowledge of the field among readers across the globe.

It is indeed an immense pleasure to thank our researchers and authors for their efforts to submit their piece of writing before the deadlines. Finally in the end, I would like to thank my family and colleagues who have been a great source of inspiration and support.

Editor

Contents

	Preface	VII
Chapter 1	Compound Stochastic Seismic Vulnerability Analysis and Seismic Risk Evaluation for Super Large Cable-Stayed Bridge Feng Qing-Hai, Yuan Wan-Cheng and Chih-Chen Chang	1
Chapter 2	Recent Advances in Seismic Response Analysis of Cylindrical Liquid Storage Tanks Akira Maekawa	17
Chapter 3	Seismic Reliability Analysis of Cable Stayed Bridges Against First Passage Failure Rehan Ahmad Khan	47
Chapter 4	Seismic Strengthening of Reinforced Concrete Buildings Hasan Kaplan and Salih Yilmaz	75
Chapter 5	Assessment and Rehabilitation of Jacket Platforms Mohammad Reza Tabeshpour, Younes Komachi and Ali Akbar Golafshani	97
Chapter 6	Electromagnetic Sensing Techniques for Non-Destructive Diagnosis of Civil Engineering Structures Massimo Bavusi, Romeo Bernini, Vincenzo Lapenna, Antonio Loperte, Francesco Soldovieri, Felice Carlo Ponzo, Antonio Di Cesare and Rocco Ditommaso	123
Chapter 7	Steel Building Assessment in Post-Earthquake Fire Environments with Fiber Optical Sensors Genda Chen, Ying Huang and Hai Xiao	149
Chapter 8	Bond-Based Earthquake-Proof of RC Bridge Columns Reinforced with Steel Rebars and SFCBs Mohamed F.M. Fahmy and Zhishen Wu	175

Chapter 9	Response of Underground Pipes to Blast Loads	201
	A.J. Olarewaju, R.N.S.V. Kameswara and M.A. Mannan	

Permissions

List of Contributors

Compound Stochastic Seismic Vulnerability Analysis and Seismic Risk Evaluation for Super Large Cable-Stayed Bridge

Feng Qing-Hai^{1,2}, Yuan Wan-Cheng¹ and Chih-Chen Chang³

¹State Key Laboratory of Disaster Reduction in Civil Engineering,
Tongji University, Shanghai

²CCCC Highway Consultants CO., Ltd. Beijing

³Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Hong Kong University of
Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong,
China

1. Introduction

Previous seismic disasters indicate bridge structures are the most vulnerable component of the road transportation system in seism, such as the Haiti earthquake and Tohoku earthquake. Bitter lesson of bridge damage leads to the development of seismic analysis theories for bridge such as seismic vulnerability analysis.

Generally, seismic vulnerability is the probability of different damage in different seismic levels, which combines the intensity measure of seism with damage index for bridge structure. Methods of seismic vulnerability analysis include expert vulnerability analysis, experience vulnerability analysis and theory vulnerability analysis. Nevertheless, only seismic randomness has been taken into account in most seismic vulnerability analysis (e.g. Shinozuka et al. 2000; Kiremidjian et al. 1997; Basoz et al. 1997; Yamazaki et al. 2000). Apart from seismic randomness, bridge structure parameters are also stochastic, such as material properties, bridge geometry, boundary condition and so on, which cause the randomness of structure seismic response. Therefore, seismic vulnerability for bridge structure should be determined by both the randomness of seism and that of structure parameters. Due to the complexity of bridge structure system, it is very difficult to gain the analytic solution of seismic response for stochastic structure. Since the stochastic numerical simulation is time consuming and inefficient, this method is suspended at the threshold of thought.

Now, based on traditional seismic vulnerability analysis method, Artificial Neural Network (ANN), Monte Carlo (MC) technologies combining with Incremental Dynamic Analysis (IDA) and PUSHOVER method, Compound Stochastic Seismic Vulnerability Analysis (CSSVA) method is developed to take both randomness of material and that of seism into account from the point of total probability, which not only gives full play to the ANN, MC, IDA and PUSHOVER, but also increases the efficiency of analysis greatly (Feng Qing-hai 2009).

Generally, the damage of bridge might lead to more serious results and secondary damage than that of road, and the seismic risk level of bridge determines that of the whole road transportation system. Due to the above mentioned reasons, more and more scholars pay attention to the bridge seismic risk evaluation.

Safety is relative, risk is absolute. So far, bridge structure risk evaluation is only limited to that of transportation, maintenance, management and so on. Since paper or reports for seismic risk evaluation for bridge structure performance is few, the only essential aspect for bridge seismic risk evaluation by those paper or reports is the seismic risk according to the damage probability of a determined bridge structure (e.g. Furuta et al. 2006; Hays et al. 1998; Padgett et al. 2007). However, that is unilateral. The truth is the randomness of material and that of seism exist at the same time. Moreover, the bridge damage probability according to the seismic vulnerability is gained within seism happening. In order to overcome this shortage, a method of seismic risk evaluation based on IDA and MC is presented, which has taken the difference of site type, randomness of time, space and intensity into consideration. It has indeed reflects the seismic risk situation within any years. So, by the aforementioned method for seismic vulnerability and risk assessment, more real performance state and seismic risk lever are gained, which are good for design, maintenance and earthquake insurance of long span bridge.

2. Method of compound stochastic seismic vulnerability analysis

2.1 Basic theory

The Damage Index(DI) of bridge is affected by many uncertainties such as randomness of parameters of structure, seism and so on, which makes it a complicated process in gaining the seismic vulnerability curve. The capability of bridge structure could be expressed in the form of $R(M,G,C,.....)$, M,G,C stand for variety of material, size and calculation methods, respectively. At the same time, the seismic response could be expressed as $P(IM)$. So, DI is the systemic combination of $R(M,G,C,.....)$ and $P(IM)$, which is shown as following.

$$DI = f(R(M,G,C,.....),P(IM)) \quad (1)$$

Clearly, DI is also variable.

Easy to see, the calculation of DI for bridge structure is divided into several parts, the first is the statistic for capability of bridge structure itself, the second is the statistic for seismic response of bridge structure, and the final is the combination of them. The flow chart is shown in Figure 1.




Fig. 1. Flow Chart for Compound Stochastic Seismic Vulnerability Analysis

2.2 Statistic for capability of bridge structure

Statistic for capability of bridge structure is analyzed based on method of PUSHOVER combining ANN and MC. The analysis process is shown in the following. Radial Basic Function Neural Network (RBFNN) is adopted in this method according to the conclusion of reference (Feng Qing-hai 2007).

- 1. Main parameters which affect the capability of bridge structure most are analyzed. Distributions for each parameter are determined, too.
- 2. By the method of orthogonal design, A+B groups of finite element models of bridge structures are built.
- 3. The response of capability is derived by the method of PUSHOVER.
- 4. RBFNN is built, and trained by responses of A groups and checked by that of B groups.
- 5. Go on if the result of Step 4 is successful, or rebuild RBFNN from Step 4.
- 6. Plenty of responses of capability are simulated by inputting large number of structure model parameters generated by the method of MC and RBFNN.
- 7. The characteristic of capability of bridge structure is gained by statistics on all those responses of capability.

The analysis flow chart is shown in Figure 2.




Fig. 2. Flow Chart for Stochastic Structure Capacity analysis

2.3 Statistic for seismic response of bridge structure

Seism is a ground motion of great randomness which might happen at anytime and anywhere. Therefore, it is very necessary to analyze the seismic response from the view of probability. While, the variability of bridge structure itself has a small effect on the seismic response when the randomness of both structure and ground motion are considered (Hu Bo 2000). In order to simplify the calculation method and reduce calculation time, only seismic randomness is taken into account in the statistic for seismic response of bridge structure in this paper.

Statistic analysis of seismic response is performed based on the method of IDA under multi-earthquake waves. The analysis process is shown in the following.

1. The finite element model of bridge structure is built.
2. Multi-earthquake waves are selected, and scaled to different intensities by scale factors (SF).
3. IDA is performed. Plenty of seismic responses are gained.
4. The characteristic of seismic responses of bridge structure is gained by statistic analysis on all those seismic responses.

The analysis flow chart is shown in Figure 3.




Fig. 3. Flow Chart for Stochastic Seismic Response Analysis

2.4 Methodology of CSSVA for bridge structure

Based on the theories mentioned in above sections, the distribution characteristic of capability and seismic response of bridge structure, CSSVA is performed combining with ANN-MC technology. The analysis process is shown in the following.

1. Get the distributions of capability and seismic responses of bridge structure, respectively.
 2. Generate adequate numbers of capability and seismic responses by the method of MC and orthogonal design based on the distribution characteristic got in Step 1.
 3. Two RBFNN are built, one for capability and the other for seismic response, then trained and checked by the data gained in Step 2.
 4. Go on if the result of check is successful, or rebuild RBFNN from Step 3.
 5. A large number of DI are gained according to Equation 1.
 6. Select the damage criterion.
 7. Compare DI with the damage criterion. The probability of damage is calculated at each IM.
 8. The seismic vulnerability curves of bridge structure are drawn.
- The analysis flow chart is shown in Figure 4.




Fig. 4. Flow Chart for Compound Stochastic Seismic Vulnerability Analysis

2.5 Effect on seismic vulnerability by compound stochastic

Based on CSSVA, some examples are performed. For the limited space of paper, only part of results is drawn to display the effect on seismic vulnerability by compound stochastic. Seismic vulnerability curve of determination structure and that of compound stochastic are shown in Figure 5.

Easy to see, when structure stochastic are neglected, seismic vulnerability curves, which are gained by the method of two order spline curve fittings, are folded. Meanwhile, the curve deviate to the vulnerability point distinctly. By comparison, vulnerability curves of compound stochastic are smooth, and are getting through every vulnerability point. For the two curves, the PGA for beginning damage is the same. However, when damage probability is less than 80%, vulnerability value of determination structure is bigger than that of compound stochastic. When damage probability ranges from 80% to 95%, the contrary is the case.

In all, vulnerability curve of determination structure spreads around that of compound stochastic. Besides, the structure stochastic indeed affects the seismic vulnerability, although not too enormous. Compound stochastic reflects the seismic vulnerability of bridge structure better.




Fig. 5. Effect on Seismic Vulnerability by Compound Stochastic

3. Seismic risk probability evaluation for long span bridge

3.1 Concept for probability evaluation of seismic risk

Bridge seismic risk analysis involves two aspects, namely the probability of event occurrence and that of event consequence. The consequence mainly describes the damage severity and has no relationship with structure analysis. Risk analysis, usually said, is the probability of event occurrence without considering the consequence.

Seismic risk probability evaluation for bridge is one of the basis of risk analysis, which also involves two aspects, namely seismic risk and structure seismic vulnerability. Seismic risk probability evaluation for bridge could be expressed as following: the probability of different damage states with consideration of earthquake dangerous. It indicates that the reliability of bridge is threatened by both seism and structure seismic vulnerability during the same determined period.

Seism is regarded as a risk event, the sign is H . According to structure reliability thought, limit state function could be expressed as following (Alfredo H-S. ANG & Wilson H.Tang, 2007).

$$Z = R - S \quad (2)$$

in which, Z is the performance function, R is the comprehensive resistance, S is comprehensive response on structure induced by risk events. Then, the damage probability is expressed by expression as following.

$$P = P(R < S) = \int_R^{\infty} f(S) dS \quad (3)$$

in which, $f(S)$ is the probability density function of comprehensive effect induced by risk events. Clearly, S is closely related to H . The $f(S)$ should be expressed in the form of $f(S, H)$, namely the joint density function.

$$f(S, H) = f(S | H) f(H) \quad (4)$$

in which, $f(S | H)$ is the conditional probability density function for different damage states under given risk event H . $f(H)$ is the probability density function of risk event H . So, $f(S)$ is expressed as following.

$$f(S) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(S | H) f(H) dH \quad (5)$$

then, the expression combining Equation 5 and Equation 3 is as following.

$$P = p(R < S) = \int_R^{+\infty} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(S | H) f(H) dH \right] dS = \int_0^{+\infty} \left[\int_R^{+\infty} f(S | H) dS \right] f(H) dH \quad (6)$$

$$P = \int_0^{+\infty} F_S(H) f(H) dH \quad (7)$$

briefly,

$$P = \int_0^{+\infty} F_S(H) f(H) dH \quad (8)$$

in which, $F_S(H)$ stands for $\int_R^{+\infty} f(S|H)dS$.

3.2 Method of seismic risk probability evaluation for bridge based on IDA-MC

In order to avoid complicated calculation, IDA is applied in association with MC. The specific procedure is interpreted at the following sections.

3.2.1 Probability distribution of seismic intensity and according PGA

Seismic dangerous analysis is the basis of seismic risk probability evaluation, which reflects the probable maximum effect of seismic damage for a bridge in a district within determined coming period. The effect could be depicted in many ways. Since bridges designed in China are based on the design criterion of seismic intensity, probability distribution of seismic intensity introduced in reference (Gao Xiao-wang et al. 1986) is adopted as the seismic dangerous, namely:

$$F_{III}(x) = \exp\left(-\left(\frac{\omega - x}{\omega - \varepsilon}\right)^K\right) \quad (9)$$

in which, ω is the upper limited value of intensity, usually equals to 12. ε usually satisfied with the equation of $1 - e^{-1} = 0.632$. K is form parameter. From the point of engineering application, K equals to the value of intensity according to the seismic probability of 10%.

If the probability distribution of seismic intensity for 50 years is determined, then the probability distribution in any limited period could be expressed as the following.

$$F_i(i) = [F_T(I)]^{t/T} = \left[\exp\left(-\left(\frac{\omega - i}{\omega - \varepsilon}\right)^K\right)\right]^{t/T} = \exp\left(-\frac{t}{T}\left(\frac{\omega - i}{\omega - \varepsilon}\right)^K\right) \quad (10)$$

According to the existing seismic records, PGA according to a determined intensity are of big discreteness. In order to be convenient for calculation, A has the relationship to I as following.

$$A = 10^{(I - \text{Log} 2 - 0.01)} \quad (11)$$

in which, A and I is the value of PGA and seismic intensity, respectively. The unit for A is *gal*. Here, it is very necessary to illuminate that, A is a continuous value only for the necessary of statistic.

3.2.2 Method and steps

1. To build a finite element analysis model of bridge structure, and choose enough seismic waves.
2. IDA is performed. Seismic response according to every wave is recorded to form IDA curve.
3. Determine design reference period (prior to a small one) and the probability distribution.
4. According to MC, a great lot of I are generated.
5. According to Equation 11, the same number of A are gained based on Step 4.

- 6. Based on A , corresponding seismic responses are gained from the IDA curve.
 - 7. Structure damage probability is gained by statistics based on damage criterion.
- The analysis procedures are shown in Figure 6.




Fig. 6. Seismic risk probability evaluation for bridge

3.3 Example analysis

3.3.1 Analysis model for floating system cable-stayed bridge

According to reference (Yan Hai-quan and Wang Jun-jie 2007), floating cable-stayed bridge could be simplified to a main tower with a lumped mass on the top of main tower, and the tolerance of results are acceptable. In this section, simplified models are adopted and only longitudinal cases are analyzed. The refined finite element model for main tower is built by OpenSees as shown in Figure 7, main tower is divided into 3 parts, namely upper tower, middle tower and low tower. In consideration of the strengthening at the upper tower by steel pile casting, the upper tower is regarded elastic. Fiber element is adopted in middle tower and low tower.

Main tower is 300m in height, 90m for upper tower, 150m for middle tower and 60m for low tower, respectively. Tower is divided into 30 elements of 10 meters in vertical direction, and every element and joint is numbered from 1 to 30 and 1 to 31, respectively. The bridge site belongs to 3rd type, the seismic intensity is 8 and design period is 50 years.




Fig. 7. Finite element model for main tower

3.3.2 Damage criterion

Double control damage criterion put forward by Park and Ang are adopted, which is shown as following:

$$DI = f\left(\delta_m, \delta_u, Q_y, \int dE_h, \beta\right) = \frac{\delta_m}{\delta_u} + \frac{\beta}{\delta_u Q_y} \int dE_h \tag{12}$$

in which, the signal and suggestion value are illuminated particularly in reference (Fan Li-chu and Zhuo Wei-dong 2001). The relationship between damage levels, damage state and DI described by Park, Ang and Wen (H. Hwang et al. 2001) is shown in Table 1.

Damage level	Damage character	Park-Ang DI
1 no damage	Some slight fracture at local part	$DI < 0.1$
2 slight damage	Slight fracture distributed widely	$0.1 \leq DI < 0.25$
3 medium damage	Serious fracture or spall partly	$0.25 \leq DI < 0.4$
4 serious damage	Concrete crushed or steel break	$0.4 \leq DI < 0.8$
5 collapse	collapse	$DI \geq 0.8$

Table 1. Damage Character and Damage Index at Each Level

3.3.3 IDA for main tower

Only longitudinal case is studied. IDA is performed with PGA being scaled from 0.1g to 1.0g with step of 0.1g. Seismic responses such as moment, curvature, hysteretic energy are recorded. Representative response distributions along main tower are described in Figure 8, 9,10, respectively..




Fig. 8. Moment distribution along vertical tower




Fig. 9. Curvature distribution along vertical tower