**Zeitschrift:** IABSE reports = Rapports AIPC = IVBH Berichte

**Band:** 51 (1986)

**Artikel:** Optimum aseismic design of structures

Autor: Kawamura, Hiroshi / Teramoto, Takeshi / Tani, Akinori

**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-39571

# Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

## **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

### Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

**Download PDF:** 01.12.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch



# **Optimum Aseismic Design of Structures**

# Dimensionnement optimal de structures vis-à-vis des séismes

# Optimale Bemessung von Bauwerken auf Erdbeben

#### Hiroshi KAWAMURA

Associate Professor Kobe University Kobe, Japan

Hiroshi Kawamura, born 1941, obtained B. Eng. and M. Eng. at Kobe University and D. Eng. at Nagoya University.

#### **Akinori TANI**

Research Associate Kobe University Kobe, Japan

Akinori Tani, born 1955, obtained B.Eng. and M.Eng. at Kobe University.

#### Takeshi TERAMOTO

Structural Engineer Daiken Sekkei Architects Tokyo, Japan

Takeshi Teramoto, born 1961, obtained B. Eng. and M. Eng. at Kobe University. His master's thesis covers the topic of this paper.

#### Minuro YAMADA

Prof. Dr.-Ing. Kobe University Kobe, Japan

Minuro Yamada, born 1930, has been professor of structural engineering at Kobe University, Japan, since 1964. Member, IABSE.

#### **SUMMARY**

A comprehensive and systematic procedure for optimum aseismic design of structures based on fuzzy set probabilistic theories is proposed. A case study is performed on an actual typical school building in reinforced concrete, at Kobe, Japan.

# RÉSUMÉ

La contribution propose une procédure globale et systématique pour le dimensionnement optimal de structures, vis-à-vis des séismes, sur la base de la théorie probabiliste «Fuzzy Set». Une étude a été réalisée pour un bâtiment scolaire typique, en béton armé, à Kobe, Japon.

#### ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Es wird ein umfassendes und systematisch aufgebautes Verfahren für die Bemessung von erdbebensicheren Bauwerken vorgestellt, welches auf der «fuzzy set»-Theorie beruht. Als Beispiel dient das Projekt eines typischen Schulhauses aus Stahlbeton in Kobe, Japan.



#### 1. INTRODUCTION

The aseismic safety and quality of architectural structures should be assured from a comprehensive viewpoint. The Authors have already proposed an evaluation flow chart for seismic damages of structures [1] which is composed of three parts, i.e., EARTHQUAKE, STRUCTURE and DAMAGE as shown in Fig.1. By using this chart, the followings have become able to be performed easily; regional evaluation of seismic damages [1], aseismic reliability analysis [2] and fuzzy optimum aseismic design [3] of structures. The third fuzzy optimum design was carried out based on fuzzy set theory [4] and maximizing decision method [5] which enabled us to employ rationally multi-objective functions and subjective evaluations in the optimum aseismic design of structures [6][7].

In this paper, to make the fuzzy optimum design method mentioned above more real and practical, probabilistic expressions are applied to EARTHQUAKE in Fig.1, because occurrences and intensities of earthquakes belong essentially to natural scientific phenomena beyond human control. On the other hand fuzzy set conceptions are suitable to STRUCTURE and DAMAGE, because the design of structures and the evaluation of structural damages belong essentially to human decision making problems. The purpose of this paper is to propose such a new optimum aseismic design method of structures and to present a case study on a real type R/C building.

#### 2. FUNDAMENTAL THEORY AND PROCEDURE

A probabilistic expression of EARTHQUAKE is able to be given by probabilistic density function of magnitude M and epicentral distance  $\Delta [\rm km]$ ,  $f_e(M,\Delta)$ , which is induced from the past observed earthquake occurrences [2]. When STRUCTURE is defined deterministically by a design parameter,  $\gamma$ , DAMAGE is calculated by a passage probability,  $p_x$ , which indicates the probability that a damage parameter, x, exceeds a critical one,  $x_C$ , more than one time in the future, i.e.,

$$p_{x} = p_{r} (x \ge x_{c} | \gamma).$$
 (1)

In this paper, the damage parameter, x , is calculated through the earthquake limit response analysis proposed by the Authors [1], and the passage probability,  $p_{\rm X}$  , is computed by the following two methods for comparison:

(1) Method based on classical probability theory The passage probability at the next earthquake,  $p_{\mathbf{X}}^{\,\bullet}$  , is given by

$$p_{X}' = \iint_{\Omega} f_{e}(M, \Delta) dM d\Delta, \qquad (2)$$

where  $\Omega$  is the region with M above and  $\Delta$  below the critical M- $\Delta$  curve on which x = x<sub>c</sub> as shown in Fig.2. When n<sub>O</sub> is the expected number of earthquake occurrences in the next t<sub>O</sub> years, the passage probability in the next t<sub>O</sub> years, p<sub>X</sub>, is given by

$$p_{x} = 1 - (1-p_{x}^{T})^{n_{0}},$$
 (3) in which  $n_{0} = n t_{0} / t$ ,

where n is the total number of earthquake occurrences in the past t years.

(2) Method based on Benjamin's probabilistic model By using Bayesian theorem Benjamin proposed a probability of observing  $n_0$  future Poission events in time  $t_0$  having observed n events in time t,  $p[n_0|t_0,n,t]$  [8]. When zero is substituted into  $n_0$  in it, the non-passage probability in the region  $\Omega$  where  $x \ge x_C$  (See Fig.2) in the next  $t_0$  years becomes  $p[0|t_0,np_X^i,t]$ . Therefore, the passage probability in the next  $t_0$  years is given by

$$p_{x}=1-p[0 t_{o},np_{x}',t]=1-(1+t_{o}/t)^{-(np_{x}'+1)}.$$
(5)

Finally, an optimum aseismic design of structures is able to be performed by the following maximizing decision equation as shown in Fig. 3:

$$m_D(\gamma^*) = \max_{\gamma} (m_{\gamma} \Lambda m_{px}),$$
 (6)



where  $m_\gamma$  and  $m_{px}$  are the membership functions of design parameter  $\gamma$  and passage probability  $p_x$ , respectively. Here, the membership functions are supposed to be the satisfaction degrees from architectural, structural and economical points of view. In the case study, here, number of shear walls  $\gamma$  is adopted as a structural design parameter, and damage factor DF, the maximum response displacement  $x_m$  and duration until fracture  $t_f$  are employed as damage parameters. The physical meanings of these characters will be explained later. Consequently, the total procedure of the proposed optimum aseismic design of structures is able to be shown in Fig. 4. The maximizing decision is performed by means of and/or tree as shown in Fig. 5 [3].

#### 3. STRUCTURE

A case study is carried out in regard to the first story of a typical R/C school building at Kobe in Hyogo prefecture, Japan, which is the same structure as adopted in the past evaluation studies [1][2][3] (See Figs.6,7), and is idealized to be a one degree of freedom system. The calculation conditions are given as follows: yield shear force  $T_y$ , slipping shear force  $T_s$ , yielding lateral displacement  $x_y$  and hysteresis loop area  $A(x_a)$  are calculated as follows [2][3];

$$T_{y} = [(1-x_{1})x_{1} + 2\beta_{s}p_{a}(1-2d_{1})]\sigma_{bo}bh^{2}/H, \quad x_{y} = \epsilon_{y}/3(1-2d_{1})h, T_{s} = (2\beta_{s}p_{a}-x_{1})(1-2d_{1})\sigma_{bo}bh^{2}/H, \quad A(x_{a}) = (5T_{y}+9T_{s})(x_{a}-x_{y})/4,$$

$$(7)$$

where 
$$x_1=N/\sigma_{bo}bh$$
, (8)  $\beta_s p_a=\sigma_{ay}bh/\sigma_{bo}a$ . (9)

The restoring force characteristic of shear walls is considered as shown in Fig.9. Ultimate shear force  $T_u$ , displacement  $x_u$  and the i-th hysteresis loop area  $A(x_i)$  are calculated as follows:

$$T_u = \sigma_{bo}Lt \sin\theta\cos\theta/2$$
,  $x_u = 0.002L/\cos^2\theta$ ,  $A(x_i)/T_ux_u = (x_i/x_u)^2 - (x_{i-1}/x_u)^2/2$ . } (10)

Design parameter,  $\gamma$  ,i.e., the number of shear walls is counted by a unit shear wall within a span between  $C_1,C_2$  and  $C_3$  columns in the span and ridge directions.

#### 4. EARTHQUAKE

# 4.1. Earthquake Ground Motion Spectrum [1][2][3]

When M,  $\!\!\Delta$  and predominant period  $T_G$  of surface ground are given, earthquake ground motion spectra are given as shown in Fig.10, and ground motion duration  $t_0[s]$  is calculated by  $t_0 = 10^{0.5 M-2.28}$ . The average slip velocities faults of interplate- and intraplate-type earthquakes are assumed to be  $\overline{d}$  =15 and 50[cm/s], respectively. Out of the source region, the earthquake ground motion spectra are calculated by multiplying the values in Fig.10 by  $(\Delta_B/\Delta)^2$ .

# 4.2. Probabilistic Expression of Earthquake Occurrences

Cumulative distribution functions are approximated to the distributions of observed interplate- and intraplate-type earthquakes within the circles with radii 2000 and 200 [km] round Kobe City in Japan, respectively. By differentiating them probability density distributions  $f_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathtt{M},\Delta)$  are calculated as follows [2]:

$$f_e(M, \Delta) = 0.1583(e^{-M} - e^{-9}) - 1.322 \cdot 10^{-7} (\Delta - 2000)$$
 for interplate-type, (11)

$$f_e(M,\Delta)=1.778\cdot10^{-6}(8-M)^6+1.573\cdot10^{-8}\Delta^2$$
 for intraplate-type, (12)

and shown in Fig.11. Numerical calculations of M and  $\Delta$  are carried out by the following meshes;  $\Delta M=0.1$ ,  $\Delta \Delta=100[km]$  for interplate-type earthquakes and  $\Delta M=0.1$ ,  $\Delta \Delta=10[km]$  for intraplate-type earthquakes.



#### 5. DAMAGE

# 5.1. Earthquake Limit Response Analysis [1][2][3]

According to the principle of the maximum response, the momotonic maximum displacement  $x_m$  is given, when velocity and acceleration pulse spectra (v-pulse and  $\alpha$ -pulse spectra) are in contact with the ground motion spectrum as shown in Fig. 12, where the approximated bi-linear pulse response spectra are used for simplicity.  $T_1, T_2, v_{m1}$  and  $v_{m2}$  at the corners are calculated as follows:

Elastic response displacement:

T<sub>1</sub>=4/
$$\omega$$
, v<sub>m1</sub>= $\omega$ x<sub>p</sub>/2, (13) T<sub>2</sub>=2/ $\omega$ , v<sub>m2</sub>= $\pi\omega$ x<sub>p</sub>/2, (14) Plastic response displacement: T<sub>1</sub>=4 $\mu$ <sub>u</sub> $\sqrt{\omega/2\mu$ <sub>u</sub>-1, v<sub>m1</sub>= $\omega$ x<sub>y</sub> $\sqrt{2\mu$ <sub>u</sub>-1/2,(15) T<sub>2</sub>=2 $\mu$ <sub>p</sub>/ $\omega$  $\sqrt{2\mu$ <sub>p</sub>-1, v<sub>m2</sub>= $\pi\omega$ x<sub>y</sub> $\sqrt{2\mu$ <sub>p</sub>-1/2.(16)

$$T_1=4\mu_u\sqrt{\omega/2\mu_u-1}$$
,  $v_{m1}=\omega x_v\sqrt{2\mu_u-1}/2$ ,(15)  $T_2=2\mu_p/\omega\sqrt{2\mu_p-1}$ ,  $v_{m2}=\pi\omega x_v\sqrt{2\mu_p-1}/2$ .(16)

where  $\omega = \sqrt{k/m}$ , (17)  $T = 2t_p$ , (18); k is modulus of elasticity; m is mass; (19) in the velocity pulse spectrum, and  $\mu_u = x_m / x_y$  $\mu_{\rm p} = x_{\rm m}/x_{\rm v}$ in the acceleration one. The physical meanings of these characters are shown graphically on the left hand side in Fig. 12.

Response displacement  $x_a$  and the number of response cycles  $N_c$  are given at the crossing point of a finite resonance response acceleration capacity spectrum  $C_{RA}^{\dagger}$  and the earthquake ground motion spectrum (See Fig.13) as follows [1][3]:

$$C_{RA}^{\dagger} = A(x_a)/1.2\pi + 2T_a/3\pi$$
, (21)  $N_c = t_o/T_e$ , (22)

where  $T_{
m e}$ =2 $\pi/\sqrt{mx_{
m a}/T_{
m a}}$  is equivalent elastic natural period and  $T_{
m a}$  is restoring force amplitude.

### 5.2. Damage Parameters and Critical Values

One of damage parameters, the maximum displacement  $\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{m}}$  is able to be calculated as the larger of the ones by pulse response analyses. Damage factor DF is calculated as follows [1][3]:

In the case of monotonic responses by pulse response analysis;

(1) DF of columns; 
$$DF_{mc}=x_m/x_u$$
, (23)

where 
$$x_u = \Phi_y H^2/6 + hH(\Phi_B - \Phi_y)/2$$
, (24)  $\Phi_y = 2\epsilon_y/(1-2d_1)h$ , (25)

$$\Phi_B = 0.004/(x_1 - d_1)h, \qquad \qquad \text{(for concrete)}$$
 (26) 
$$\Phi_B = 150\Phi_y/(1 - x_1 - d_1)h, \qquad \qquad \text{(for reinforcing bar)}$$
 (27)

$$\Phi_{\rm B}$$
=150 $\Phi_{\rm y}$ /(1-x<sub>1</sub>-d<sub>1</sub>)h, (for reinforcing bar)

(2) DF of shear walls;  $DF_{mw}=x_m/x_u$ (28)

In the case of cyclic response by finite resonance response analysis;

DF of columns; 
$$DF_{cw} = N_c/N_B$$
 (29)

(1) DF of columns; 
$$DF_{cw} = N_c/N_B$$
 (29)  
where  $N_B = 10^{8[1-x_1h\Phi_a(0.004+d_1h\Phi_a)]}$ , (for concrete) (30)

$$N_B = [300\Phi_y \times 0.5^{3/4} / \{(1-2d_1)h\Phi_a - 2\epsilon_y\}]^{4/3},$$
 (for reinforcing bar) (31)

$$\Phi_{a} = 2(x_{a} - x_{y}) hH + \Phi_{y}.$$
 (32)

(2) DF of shear walls;  $DF_{cw}=x_m/x_B$ , (33) where  $x_m=Max(x_i)$ .

In the both monotonic and cyclic cases, DF is assumed to be zero for elastic range of columns  $x_m$ ,  $x_a < x_y (=\Phi_y H^2/6)$ , and non-cracked range of shear walls  $x_m$ ,  $x_1 \le x_{cr} (= 2(1+1/6)\sigma_{bo} H/2 \cdot 10^6)$ . In the each case of monotonic or cyclic response the maximum values of DF is adopted as  $DF_m$  or  $DF_c$ , respectively. The duration until fracture  $t_f$  is calculated as follows:

$$t_f = \infty$$
 for DF < 1,  $t_f = N_R T_\rho$  for DF  $\geq 1$ . (34)

The effect of to derived from pulse response analysis on tf are neglected here.

The critical values of  $DF_m$ ,  $DF_c$ ,  $x_m$  and  $t_f$  are assumed to be 1.0,1.0,H/100 and



300[s], respectively. H is the clear height of columns. DF=1.0 means the fracture of structures. At the displacement,  $x_m$ =H/100, window glasses surrounded by alminium sashes are cracked. It is supposed that 300[s] is sufficient for refuge time.

# 5.3. Passage Prbability

The passage probabilities of DF<sub>m</sub>, DF<sub>c</sub> and  $x_m$ , i.e.,  $p_{DFm}$ ,  $p_{DFc}$  and  $p_{xm}$  are able to be derived from Eqs.(3),(5). As for  $t_f$ , the non-passage probability  $p_{tf}$  ( $t_f \le 300[s]$ ) is also able to be given by using Eqs.(3),(5). Supposing that DF<sub>m</sub> and  $\mathrm{DF}_{\mathbf{C}}$  are statistically independent, the passage probability of the damage factor  $p_{DF}$  is calculated as follows [2]:

$$p_{DF} = p_{DFm} + p_{DFc} - p_{DFm} \cdot p_{DFc}$$
 (35)

# 6. FUZZY OPTIMUM ASEISMIC DESIGN

# 6.1. Membership Functions of Satisfaction Degree [3]

According to the architectural demand that buildings without shear walls are prefered and reffering to the real number of shear walls in the typical R/C school building shown in Fig.7, the satisfaction degree of the number of shear walls  $m_{\gamma}$  is supposed as the following membership function (See Fig.14): for span direction;  $\gamma \le 6$ :  $m_{\gamma} = 0$ ,  $6 < \gamma \le 13$ :  $m_{\gamma} = 1.24 (\gamma - 13)^2$ ,  $\gamma > 13$ :  $m_{\gamma} = 1$ . (36) for ridge direction;  $\gamma = 0$ :  $m_{\gamma} = 0$ ,  $0 < \gamma < 4$ :  $m_{\gamma} = 12.76 (\gamma - 4)^2$ ,  $\gamma > 4$ :  $m_{\gamma} = 1$ . (37) According to economic and mental demands, the satisfaction degrees of the passage probabilities,  $m_{
m DF}$ ,  $m_{
m xm}$  and  $m_{
m tf}$  are supposed to have several patterns as shown in Fig.15 (a)-(e), which reflect the mentalities of cool, pessimistic, optimistic, emotional and ordinary man, respectively. The Authors adopted the satisfaction degree type in Fig.15 (e) and the following is assumed in this paper:

$$m_{xm} = -4(p_x - 0.5)^3 + 0.5$$
, (38) where  $p_x = p_{xm}$ ,  $p_{DF}$  and  $p_{tf}$ 

# 6.2. Maximizing Decision

Now, using the and/or tree such as shown in Fig.5, the maximum satisfaction degree  $m_D(\gamma^*)$  has become able to be calculated. Calculations are performed in the following 16 cases: (1) Ridge and span directions of the building shown in Fig.7, (2) Interplate- and intraplate-type earthquakes, (3) Predominant natural periods of surface groud,  $T_G=0.1$  and 0.8[s], (4) Classical probability theory and Benjamin's probabilistic model for passage probability. Figs.16,17 show the total distributions of satisfaction degrees of  $\gamma,~p_{\mbox{DF}},~p_{\mbox{xm}}$  and  $\overline{p_{\mbox{tf}}}$  with respect the number of shear walls, y. The peak values of m in the hatched zone is  $m_D(\gamma *)$  and  $\gamma$  at the point is  $\gamma *$  which are shown in Table 1.

# 7. DISSCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

As the result of applying fuzzy set and probability theory to the optimum aseismic design of a typical R/C school building, the following are made clear.

 Using the simple evaluation procedure for aseismic damages of structures proposed by the Authors, it is possible to show clearly the relations among the satisfaction degrees of  $\gamma$ , DF,  $x_m$  and  $t_f$  by scanning the design parameter,  $\gamma$ . 2)In the cases of hard surface ground ( $T_{G}=0.1[s]$ ), span direction and interplate earthquake, the maximum satisfaction degree is higher than in the case of soft surface ground  $(T_{G}=0.8[s])$ , ridge direction and intraplate earthquake, respectively. This tendency is reasonable and the same as the ones of the different type evaluations which the Authors have already carried out [1][2][3]. 3)The final satisfaction degree is almost decided by the ones of the number of shear walls and the duration until fracture. 4) In the local range of  $\gamma$ , the satisfaction degree of the damage factor of the building decreases as y increases. This tendency is against our experimental

ones. This reason is that the damage factor is decided by two different damage factors of columns and shear walls, DFc and DFw.



5)In the case of the interplate-type earthquake the satisfaction degrees of the maximum displacement, and the duration until fracture by the method based on Benjamin's probabilistic model are lower than by the method based on classical probability theory, because the passage probabilities based on Benjamin's probabilistic model are higher than the ones based on the classical probability theory (See Figs.16,17). Even if zero is substituted into n in Eq.(6), there exist the passage probabilities  $p_{\rm XM}$ ,  $p_{\rm DF}$  and non-passage probability  $\overline{p_{\rm tf}}$ . 6)The reason why the number of shear walls in the ridge direction at the maximizing decision point is nearly zero is that its satisfaction degree is supposed according to the architectural demand that very few shear walls are prefered in the ridge direction.

#### 9. REFERENCES

- [1]KAWAMURA, H., YAMADA, M., TANI, A. and FUJITANI, H.: Regional Evaluation of Seismic Damages of Reinforced Concrete Buildings, Proc. 8WCEE, Vol. IV, 1984, pp. 647-654.
- [2]KAWAMURA, H., YAMADA, M., TANI, A. and TERAMOTO, T.: Aseismic Reliability of Buildings, Proc. ICOSSAR'85, Vol. II, May, 1985, pp. II-187-196.
- [3]KAWAMURA, H., TERAMOTO, T., TANI, A. and YAMADA, M.: Aseismic Design of Reinforced Concrete Buildings Based on Fuzzy Set Theory, Journal of Structural Engineering, Vol. 32 B, A.I.J., March, 1986, (in Japanese) (to be published).
- [4]ZADEH, L.A.: Fuzzy Sets, Information and Control, 8, 1965, pp. 338-353.
- [5] BELLMAN, R.A. and ZADEH, L.A.: Decision Making in a Fuzzy Environment, Management Science, Vol.17, No.4, Dec. 1970, pp. B-141-164.
- [6] FURUKAWA, K. and FURUTA, H.: A New Formuration of Optimum Aseismic Design Using Fuzzy Mathmatical Programing, Proc. 8WCEE, Vol. V, 1984, pp. 443-450.
- [7]WANG,G. and WANG,W.:Fuzzy Optimum Design of Aseismic Structures, Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics, Vol.13, 1985, pp. 827-837.
- [8] BENJAMIN, J.R.: Probabilistic Models for Seismic Design, Journal of Structural Division, ASCE, 94, May, 1968, pp. 1175-1196.




Fig. 3 Maximizing Decision Fig. 4 Flow Chart of Optimum Design of Buildings

