

**Effect of Dynamic Soil-Pile-Structure Interaction on
Seismic Response of Mid-Rise Moment Resisting Frames**

By

Aslan Sadeghi Hokmabadi

A thesis submitted in fulfilment
of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology
University of Technology Sydney (UTS)

June 2014

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Candidate

(Aslan Sadeghi Hokmabadi)

Sydney, June 2014

Sincerely Dedicated to
My Father and Mother
Samad and Sorayyah

ABSTRACT

Seismic behaviour of structures built on soft soils is influenced by the soil properties and the foundation type, where the response is significantly different from the fixed base condition owing to the interaction between the ground and the structure. Soil-Structure Interaction (SSI) reduces the natural frequency of the system and increases the effective damping ratio of the system, for typical soils and foundations, in comparison with the fixed-base structure. This can considerably alter the response of the building frames under the seismic excitation by influencing the structural demand of the building as well as amplifying the lateral deflections and inter storey drifts of the superstructure. This amplification of lateral deformations due to SSI may change the performance level of buildings in the performance based design approach, which should be considered with great rigor accounting for the influence of SSI significantly influenced by the foundation type (i.e. shallow and deep foundation), in order to provide safe and cost effective design against the natural disasters such as earthquake.

In this study, in order to provide a benchmark to verify and calibrate the numerical model as well as experimentally investigate the influence of SSI on the seismic response of buildings, a series of shaking table tests on the soil-foundation-structure models are conducted at the University of Technology Sydney (UTS) structures laboratory. Different foundation types such as shallow foundation, floating pile foundation, end-bearing pile foundation as well as fixed base condition, excluding SSI interaction, are physically modelled. A laminar soil container is designed and constructed to simulate the free field soil response by minimising boundary effects. Simulating the superstructure as a multi-storey frame during the shaking table tests makes experimental data unique. Accordingly, in the current shaking table tests, by adopting the same soil properties, same superstructure, same input motions, and same test setup, a clear comparison is provided between the structural responses for different types of foundations. The experimental results indicate that soil-structure interaction amplifies the lateral deflections and inter-storey drifts of the structures supported by different types of foundations. However, the choice of the foundation type influences the structural performance significantly and should be addressed carefully in investigating the influence of SSI on the superstructure response during shaking excitations.

A fully nonlinear three-dimensional numerical model employing FLAC3D is developed to perform time-history analysis and simulate the performance of the superstructure considering the seismic soil-structure interaction. Hysteretic damping of the soil is implemented to represent the variation of the shear modulus reduction factor and the damping ratio of the soil with the cyclic shear strain. Free field boundary conditions are assigned to the numerical model and appropriate interface elements, capable of modelling sliding and separation between the pile and soil elements, are considered. The developed numerical model is verified and validated against the conducted shaking table results. Comparison of the numerical predictions and the experimental data shows a good agreement confirming the reliability of the numerical model. Consequently, the proposed numerical model is a reliable method of simulation which can be employed for further numerical investigations concerning the dynamic soil-structure interaction. Practicing engineers can adopt this verified numerical modelling procedure in the design to consider the effect of SSI.

Furthermore, in order to investigate the different characteristics of SSI and its influence on the seismic response of superstructures, parametric studies with respect to different types of foundations are conducted employing the previously verified three-dimensional numerical modelling procedure. A full scale fifteen storey structure (prototype) with four different types of foundations, namely, (i) fixed-base structure representing the situation excluding the soil-structure interaction, (ii) structure supported by a shallow foundation, (iii) structure supported by a pile-raft foundation in soft soil, and (iii) structure supported by a floating (frictional) pile foundation in soft soil, are simulated. According to the results of the numerical investigations, the properties of the in situ soil influence the characteristics of the excitation in terms of peak acceleration and frequency content. Moreover, the reduction ratio of the shear forces of superstructure due to SSI is a function of the foundation type, while the magnitude of this reduction is different for different levels in the superstructure. Accounting for the rocking-dissipation concept, results of this study can help the practicing engineers in selecting the proper foundation type for the structures. The foundation types experiencing considerable amount of rocking during an earthquake, dissipate significant amount of earthquake energy in comparison with the other types of foundations, and this rocking-dissipation in turn results in directing less shear forces to the superstructure and reducing the structural demand of the superstructure.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to the individuals who supported me during my PhD studies. This research work could have not been possible without their support and guidance. I would particularly like to thank my principal supervisor, Dr. Behzad Fatahi, who has provided me with intellectual guidance, encouragement, limitless support, and were always available to discuss this work. I greatly appreciate my co-supervisor, Professor Bijan Samali, for his mentorship and unfailing assistance throughout the course of this research. The author gratefully acknowledges the financial support provided by the University of Technology Sydney (International Research Scholarship) and Centre for Built Infrastructure Research (CBIR) of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology, UTS.

I am appreciative to all my friends and co-workers at CBIR, particularly Mohammadreza Hassani, Saad Mahbube Subhani, and Chij Shrestha, for their invaluable friendships and help. Special thanks to Dr. Seyed Hamid Reza Tabatabaeifar (former PhD candidate at UTS) for his collaboration and kind assistance during the experimental phase of the project. Hamid and I conducted the experimental part of this research together to be used in our theses. Furthermore, I owe my gratitude to the staff of the UTS soils and structures laboratories for their extensive assistance in conducting the laboratory experiments. Particularly, I want to thank Peter Brown, for his commitment and remarkable help in technical matters concerning the experimental shaking table tests.

My appreciation is also extended to Professor Ali Fakher and Senior Engineer Jamal Peymani for their guidance, support, and encouragement to continue my postgraduate studies in Australia.

I wish to take the opportunity to express my heartfelt gratitude to my family for their priceless support and confidence in me without which I would never achieve this moment. To my father for instilling in me the value of learning and providing me the outstanding opportunities to follow my dreams. To my mother for every single day that she did not have me nearby, but encouraged me in my endeavour. To my brothers for their countless support, sacrifices, and friendship throughout all these years, and to my beautiful partner for her patience, love, and support.

LIST OF REFEREED PUBLICATIONS BASED ON THIS RESEARCH

Journal Articles

1. **HOKMABADI, A. S.**, FATAHI, B. & SAMALI, B. 2014. Physical modelling of seismic soil-pile-structure interaction for buildings on soft soils. *International Journal of Geomechanics*, (DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)GM.1943-5622.0000396).
2. **HOKMABADI, A. S.**, FATAHI, B. & SAMALI, B. 2014. Seismic Response of Mid-rise Buildings on Shallow and End-bearing Pile Foundations in Soft Soils. *Soils and Foundations*, 54 (3), 345-363.
3. **HOKMABADI, A. S.**, FATAHI, B. & SAMALI, B. 2014. Assessment of soil-pile-structure interaction influencing seismic response of mid-rise buildings sitting on floating pile foundations. *Computers & Geotechnics*, 55, 172–186.
4. **HOKMABADI, A. S.**, FATAHI, B. & SAMALI, B. 2012. Recording inter-storey drifts of structures in time-history approach for seismic design of building frames. *Australian Journal of Structural Engineering*, 13 (2), 175-179.

Peer-reviewed Conference Papers

5. FATAHI, B., **HOKMABADI, A. S.** & SAMALI, B. 2014. Seismic Performance Based Design for Tall Buildings Considering Soil-Pile-Structure Interaction. *International Conference on Geotechnical Engineering, ASCE, Geoshanghai2014*. Shanghai, China, 333-342.
6. **HOKMABADI, A. S.**, FATAHI, B. & SAMALI, B. 2013. Seismic Response of Superstructure on Soft Soil Considering Soil-Pile-Structure Interaction. In: DELAGE, P., DESRUES, J., FRANK, R., PUECH, A. & SCHLOSSER, F. (eds.) *proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering*. Paris, France, 547-550.
7. **HOKMABADI, A. S.**, FATAHI, B., TABATABAIEFAR, H. R. & SAMALI, B. 2012. Effects of soil-pile-structure interaction on seismic response of moment resisting buildings on soft soil. In: ATALAR, C., CINICIOGLU, F., DAS, B. M.,

SAGLAMER, A. & TOGROL, E. (eds.) *proceeding of the third International Conference on New Developments in Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering*. Nicosia, North Cyprus: Near East University Press, 377-384.

8. FATAHI, B., TABATABAIEFAR, H. R., **HOKMABADI, A. S.** & SAMALI, B. 2012. Significance of bedrock depth in dynamic soil-structure interaction analysis for moment resisting frames. In: MAUGERI, M. & SOCCODATO, C. (eds.) *proceeding of the second International Conference on Performance-Based Design in Earthquake Geotechnical Engineering*. Taormina, Italy: Associazione Geotecnica Italiana, 1396-1406.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	vi
LIST OF REFEREED PUBLICATIONS BASED ON THIS RESEARCH	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF TABLES	xxiv
LIST OF NOTATIONS	xxvi
Chapter 1- INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 General	1
1.2 Significance of This Study	2
1.3 Objectives and Scope of This Study.....	4
1.4 Organisation of the Thesis.....	6
Chapter 2- LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
2.1 General	8
2.2 Free Field Ground Motion.....	9
2.3 Concept of the Seismic Soil-Structure Interaction	11
2.4 Dynamic Behaviour of Soils	17
2.4.1 Backbone Curves for Cohesive Soils	20
2.4.2 Backbone Curves for Cohesionless Soils	21
2.5 Lessons Learned from Previous Earthquakes.....	22
2.5.1 1985 Mexico City Earthquake, Mexico.....	23
2.5.2 1995 Kobe Earthquake, Japan	25
2.5.3 Recent Earthquakes and Observations.....	26
2.6 Modelling Techniques to Simulate SSPSI	27
2.6.1 Beam-on-Elastic Foundation Methods (Winkler methods).....	27
2.6.2 Elastic Continuum Methods.....	30

2.6.3 Numerical Methods.....	31
2.7 Effects of SSPSI on Behaviour of Buildings.....	35
2.8 Building Codes Concerning Seismic Soil-Structure Interaction	39
2.8.1 American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE 7-10)	40
2.8.2 National Earthquake Hazard Reductions Program (NEHRP)	43
2.8.3 New Zealand and Australian Codes.....	43
2.9 Previous Experimental Investigations on SSPSI.....	45
2.10 Summary	51
Chapter 3- NUMERICAL MODELLING	53
3.1 General	53
3.2 Governing Equation of Motion for Soil-Structure Systems.....	54
3.3 Three-dimensional Finite Difference Software, FLAC3D.....	55
3.4 Soil Elements.....	57
3.4.1 Implementation of Soil Backbone Curves in FLAC3D.....	58
3.5 Pile Elements	60
3.6 Structural Elements	63
3.6.1 Properties of Beam Structural Elements	64
3.7 Interface Elements	66
3.8 Boundary Conditions.....	70
3.8.1 Quiet (viscous) Boundaries.....	71
3.8.2 Free Field Boundaries.....	72
3.8.3 Bedrock Boundary Condition and Size of the Numerical Model	74
3.9 Dynamic Loading	75
3.10 Summary	80
Chapter 4- SHAKING TABLE EXPERIMENTS	82
4.1 General	82
4.2 Prototype Characteristics.....	83
4.3 Scaling Factors for Shaking Table Tests	86
4.4 Model Components of Shaking Table Tests	89

4.4.1 Model Structure	89
4.4.2 Model Pile Foundation	91
4.4.3 Soil Mix	92
4.4.5 Shaking Events	96
4.4.6 Laminar Soil Container.....	99
4.5 Instrumentation and Data Acquisition System	105
4.6 Shaking Table Tests on the Fixed-base Model Structure.....	107
4.6.1 Damping Ratio of the Model Structure.....	112
4.7 Shaking Table Tests on Model Structure supported by Shallow Foundation	112
4.8 Shaking Table Tests on Model Structure supported by Floating Pile Foundation.....	118
4.9 Shaking Table Tests on Model Structure supported by End-bearing Pile Foundation.....	123
4.10 Discussion on the Results.....	128
4.11 Shaking Table Tests on Five and Ten Storey Model Structures	132
4.11.1 Results and Discussion on the Model Structures with Various Heights.....	138
4.12 Summary	150
Chapter 5- VERIFICATION OF THE DEVELOPED 3D NUMERICAL MODEL ...	153
5.1 General	153
5.2 Numerical Model Setup.....	153
5.3 Results and Discussion.....	167
5.4 Summary	175
Chapter 6- INFLUENCE OF FOUNDATION TYPE ON SEISMIC PERFORMANCE OF STRUCTURES	177
6.1 General	177
6.2 Characteristics of Adopted Soil-Foundation-Structure Systems.....	178
6.2.1 Characteristics of Adopted Superstructure	178
6.2.2 Characteristics of Adopted Soil and Foundations	181
6.3 Utilised Parameters for Soil-Pile-Structure Model in FLAC3D	183
6.4 Results and Discussion.....	188

6.4.1 Settlement of Superstructure under Gravity Loads.....	188
6.4.2 Site Effect and Soil Amplification.....	191
6.4.3 Influence of SSI on Generated Shear Forces in Superstructure.....	196
6.4.4 Rocking of the Fifteen Storey Superstructure.....	200
6.4.5 Lateral Deflection and Inter-storey Drifts of Superstructure.....	203
6.4.6 Rocking-dissipation due to SSI	210
6.5 Summary	211
Chapter 7- CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	214
7.1 Conclusions	214
7.1.1 Conclusions based on the Conducted Experimental Shaking Table Tests ...	214
7.1.2 Conclusions based on the 3D Numerical Investigations	216
7.2 Recommendations for Future Works	219
REFERENCES.....	220

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 (a) Complete ground response analysis and the resultant vertical wave propagation near the ground surface; (b) free field ground motion	10
Figure 2.2 Average normalised response spectrum (5%) for different local site conditions. (Seed et al., 1976)	11
Figure 2.3 Soil-structure interaction model including SDOF structure and idealised discrete system to represent the supporting soil (after Wolf, 1985)	12
Figure 2.4 Equivalent soil-structure interaction model (after Wolf, 1985).....	13
Figure 2.5 Equivalent one degree of freedom system (after Wolf, 1985).....	14
Figure 2.6 Response of the equivalent soil-structure system: (a) maximum structure demand; (b) maximum total displacement of the structure relative to the free field ground motion (after Wolf, 1985).....	16
Figure 2.7 (a) hysteretic stress-strain relationship; (b) backbone curve; (c) typical Modulus reduction curve for soils.....	18
Figure 2.8 Relations between G/G_{max} versus cyclic shear strain for cohesive soils (after Sun et al., 1988)	20
Figure 2.9 Relations between damping versus cyclic shear strain for cohesive soils (after Sun et al., 1988).....	21
Figure 2.10 Relations between G/G_{max} and cyclic shear strain for cohesionless soils (After Seed et al., 1986)	22
Figure 2.11 Relations between damping ratio and cyclic shear strain for cohesionless soils (After Seed et al., 1986).....	22
Figure 2.12 Ten storey building supported by pile foundation on soft soils during the 1985 Mexico City Earthquake; (a) geotechnical conditions of the site (modified after Meymand, 1998); (b) overturned structure (modified after Mendoza and Romo, 1989)24	

Figure 2.13 (a) Collapse of Hanshin Expressway during 1995 Kobe earthquake; (b) recorded response spectrum during 1995 Kobe earthquake (After Gazetas & Mylonakis, 1998)	25
Figure 2.14 Modelling a single pile using Beam on elastic foundation method.....	28
Figure 2.15 An element representation of the proposed model based on the subgrade reaction methods to simulate SSPSI (after Mostafa and El Naggar, 2002)	30
Figure 2.16 Components of Soil-structure Interaction problem used in Substructure approach	34
Figure 2.17 Employed pile foundation configurations to study the seismic soil-pile-structure interaction by Chu and Truman (2004): (a) 2×2 end-bearing pile foundation; (b) 3×3 end-bearing pile foundation	37
Figure 2.18 (a) Maximum response value of shear force for structure with and without uplift; (b) developed two-dimensional FEM (after Hayashi and Takahashi, 2004)	38
Figure 2.19 Comparison of (a) the free field ground motion, and (b) the simulated motion employing rigid soil container on shaking table.....	48
Figure 2.20 Flexible cylindrical soil container (Meymand, 1998).....	49
Figure 2.21 Schematic view of the laminar soil container developed by Taylor (1997).....	50
Figure 3.1 Tetrahedron shape elements employed in FLAC3D to discretise the continuous medium	57
Figure 3.2 Pile structural elements (pileSEs) in FLAC3D	61
Figure 3.3 Simulating pile elements in this study for SSPSI analysis	62
Figure 3.3 Simulating the inelastic behaviour of pile elements	62
Figure 3.4 Developed twelve degrees-of-freedom beam structural element for the 3D numerical simulation (after Itasca 2009).....	63
Figure 3.5 Cross-section of the beam structural element cross-section in y-z plane (after Itasca, 2009)	64
Figure 3.6 Elastic-perfectly plastic behaviour of beam structural elements.....	65
Figure 3.7 Interface elements adopted in this study: (a) interface elements between the shallow foundation and the soil element; (b) interface elements at the outer perimeter	

and tip of the floating piles and surrounding soil; (c) Interface elements at the outer perimeter of the end-bearing piles and surrounding soil.....	67
Figure 3.8 components of the interface constitutive model adopted in this study	69
Figure 3.9 Preliminary boundary conditions for the static analysis under the gravity loads	70
Figure 3.10 Simulating boundary conditions for the dynamic analysis of the soil-pile-structure interaction system.....	72
Figure 3.11 Adopted boundary conditions, main grid, and boundary grid for the dynamic analysis of SSPSI in this study	74
Figure 3.12 (a) Unfiltered acceleration records of scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake subjected to the 50 Hz low-pass filter; (b) filtered acceleration records of scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake subjected to the 50 Hz low-pass filter.....	76
Figure 3.13 (a) Unfiltered frequency content of scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake subjected to the 50 Hz low-pass filter; (b) filtered frequency content of scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake subjected to the 50 Hz low-pass filter.....	77
Figure 3.14 (a) time-history velocity record of scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake; (b) time-history displacement record of scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake.....	78
Figure 3.15 Low frequency velocity wave for baseline correction.....	79
Figure 3.16 (a) time-history velocity record of scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake after baseline correction; (b) time-history displacement record of scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake applying baseline correction	79
Figure 4.1 (a) Prototype fixed-base structure; (b) prototype structure supported by shallow foundation	84
Figure 4.2 (a) Prototype structure supported by floating (frictional) pile foundation; (b) prototype structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation	85
Figure 4.3 The completed model structure for shaking table tests.....	91
Figure 4.4 Soil mix cylindrical test specimen; (b) placing the mixtures into the mould with palette knives.....	94

Figure 4.5 (a) Bender element test setup; (b) schematic graphical signal processing to measure the shear wave travel time between the sender and receiver bender elements .	95
Figure 4.6 Average shear wave velocity for three mixes obtained from bender element test	96
Figure 4.7 Utilised earthquake records in this study: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	97
Figure 4.8 Scaled shaking events adopted in the shaking table experimental tests: (a) scaled 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) scaled 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) scaled 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	99
Figure 4.9 Exponential sine sweep wave adopted in the shaking table experimental tests	99
Figure 4.10 3D numerical predictions versus experimental measurements of the maximum lateral deformation of the soil container under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	102
Figure 4.11 Numerical grid and model components of laminar soil container in FLAC3D.....	103
Figure 4.12 Components of the constructed laminar soil container on the shaking table	104
Figure 4.13 Utilised measuring instruments in the shaking table tests: (a) displacement transducer; (b) accelerometer; (c) strain gauge	105
Figure 4.14 (a) sensors connection to the data acquisition system; (b) calibration of the sensors prior to the shaking table test	107
Figure 4.15 Shaking table tests on the fixed-base model structure.....	108
Figure 4.16 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fixed-base fifteen storey model structure under the influence of scaled 1994 Northridge earthquake	109
Figure 4.17 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fixed-base fifteen storey model structure under the influence of scaled 1995 Kobe earthquake	110

Figure 4.18 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fixed-base fifteen storey model structure under the influence of scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake.....	110
Figure 4.19 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fixed-base fifteen storey model structure under the influence of scaled 1968 Hachinohe earthquake.....	111
Figure 4.20 Sample experimental time-history displacement results for the fixed-base fifteen storey model structure under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake	111
Figure 4.21 Placing the fifteen storey model structure on top of the soil mix for the shaking table tests	113
Figure 4.22 Shaking table tests setup and connections for model shallow foundation	114
Figure 4.23 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fifteen storey model structure supported by shallow foundation under the influence of scaled 1994 Northridge earthquake	115
Figure 4.24 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fifteen storey model structure supported by shallow foundation under the influence of scaled 1995 Kobe earthquake	115
Figure 4.25 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fifteen storey model structure supported by shallow foundation under the influence of scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake	116
Figure 4.26 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fifteen storey model structure supported by shallow foundation under the influence of scaled 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	116
Figure 4.27 Sample experimental time-history displacement results for the fifteen storey model structure supported by shallow foundation under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake	117
Figure 4.28 Sample experimental time-history results of the vertical displacement of the base plate for the fifteen storey model structure supported by shallow foundation under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake.....	118
Figure 4.29 Connection details for the pile foundation cases	119

Figure 4.30 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fifteen storey model structure supported by floating pile foundation under the influence of scaled 1994 Northridge earthquake	120
Figure 4.31 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fifteen storey model structure supported by floating pile foundation under the influence of scaled 1995 Kobe earthquake	120
Figure 4.32 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fifteen storey model structure supported by floating pile foundation under the influence of scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake	121
Figure 4.33 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fifteen storey model structure supported by floating pile foundation under the influence of scaled 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	121
Figure 4.34 Sample experimental time-history displacement results for the fifteen storey model structure supported by floating pile foundation under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake.....	122
Figure 4.35 Sample experimental time-history results of the vertical displacement of the base plate for the fifteen storey model structure supported by floating pile foundation under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake	123
Figure 4.36 Various components of the shaking table tests for the structure with pile foundation adopted in this study	124
Figure 4.37 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fifteen storey model structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation under the influence of scaled 1994 Northridge earthquake	125
Figure 4.38 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fifteen storey model structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation under the influence of scaled 1995 Kobe earthquake	125
Figure 4.39 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fifteen storey model structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation under the influence of scaled 1940 El Centro earthquake	126

Figure 4.40 Recorded maximum lateral deflections of fifteen storey model structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation under the influence of scaled 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	126
Figure 4.41 Sample experimental time-history displacement results for the fifteen storey model structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake.....	127
Figure 4.42 Sample experimental time-history results of the vertical displacement of the base plate for the fifteen storey model structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake	128
Figure 4.43 Comparing the maximum lateral deflection of the fifteen storey model structure from the shaking table tests for the fixed-base, shallow foundation, floating pile foundation, and end-bearing pile foundation cases under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	130
Figure 4.44 (a) Prototype fixed-base five storey building; (b) prototype five storey building supported by end-bearing pile foundation	134
Figure 4.45 (a) Prototype fixed-base ten storey building; (b) prototype ten storey building supported by end-bearing pile foundation	134
Figure 4.46 Ten storey fixed-base model structure for shaking table tests.....	136
Figure 4.47 Five storey fixed-base model structure for shaking table tests.....	136
Figure 4.48 Shaking table tests for the ten storey model structure with end-bearing pile foundation.	137
Figure 4.49 Shaking table tests for the five storey model structure with end-bearing pile foundation.	138
Figure 4.50 Recorded maximum lateral deflection of the five storey model structure from the shaking table tests under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	140
Figure 4.51 Sample experimental time-history displacement results for the fixed-base five storey model structure under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake.....	141

Figure 4.52 Recorded maximum lateral deflection of the five storey model structure from the shaking table tests under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	143
Figure 4.53 Sample experimental time-history displacement results for the fixed-base ten storey model structure under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake	143
Figure 4.54 (a) Plan of the pile group foundation for the shaking table tests; (b) Location of the installed strain gauges on the pile elements	146
Figure 4.55 Recorded bending moment distribution along the pile number 1 supporting five storey, ten storey, and fifteen storey model structures under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	147
Figure 4.56 Recorded maximum lateral deflection of the five storey model structure from the shaking table tests under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	148
Figure 4.57 Recorded maximum lateral deflection of the ten storey model structure from the shaking table tests under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	149
Figure 4.58 Recorded maximum lateral deflection of the fifteen storey model structure from the shaking table tests under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	149
Figure 5.1 Numerical grid and model components of fixed-base fifteen storey model structure in FLAC3D	155
Figure 5.2 3D numerical predictions versus experimental measurements of the maximum lateral deformation of the fixed-base fifteen storey model structure under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	157

Figure 5.3 Numerical grid and model components of the model structure supported by the shallow foundation in FLAC3D	158
Figure 5.4 Adopted fitting curve for fine grained soil in this study (after Sun et al. 1998): (a) relations between G/G_{max} and cyclic shear strain; (b) relations between damping ratio and cyclic shear strain	159
Figure 5.5 3D numerical predictions versus experimental measurements of the maximum lateral deformation of the fifteen storey model structure supported by shallow foundation under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	162
Figure 5.6 Numerical grid and model components in FLAC3D for: (a) structure supported by floating (frictional) pile foundation; (b) structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation	163
Figure 5.7 3D numerical predictions versus experimental measurements of the maximum lateral deformation of the fifteen storey model structure supported by floating pile foundation under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	165
Figure 5.8 3D numerical predictions versus experimental measurements of the maximum lateral deformation of the fifteen storey model structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake	167
Figure 5.9 history acceleration records at top of the 15-storey model structure under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake for: (a) fixed-base structure; (b) structure supported by shallow foundation; (c) structure supported by floating (frictional) pile foundation; (d) structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation	169
Figure 5.10 Maximum base shear of the model structure obtained from 3D numerical analysis for: fixed-base structure; structure supported by shallow foundation; and structure supported by floating (frictional) pile foundation	171
Figure 5.11 Average 3D numerical values of maximum lateral displacements for: (a) fixed-base structure; (b) structure supported by shallow foundation; (c) structure	

supported by floating pile foundation; (d) structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation	172
Figure 5.12 Average 3D numerical inter-storey drifts for: (a) fixed-base structure; (b) Structure supported by shallow foundation; (c) structure supported by floating pile foundation; (d) structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation	173
Figure 5.13 Developed shear stress versus shear strain in the soil medium at Point A for the case of end-bearing pile foundation record at the soil surface bellow the foundation under the influence of El Centro earthquake.....	174
Figure 6.1 Designed concrete sections for the adopted fifteen storey superstructure..	181
Figure 6.2 Adopted interface elements in the 3D numerical simulation for: (a) superstructure supported by shallow foundation; (b) superstructure supported by 18m long floating (frictional) pile foundation; (c) superstructure supported by 9m long pile-raft foundation.....	186
Figure 6.3 Numerical grid and model components in FLAC3D for prototype structure supported by floating (frictional) pile foundation.....	188
Figure 6.4 Settlements of the fifteen storey structure supported by: (a) shallow foundation; (b) pile-raft foundation; (c) floating pile foundation under the gravity loads	190
Figure 6.5 (a) Bedrock record and the amplified free field soil surface record under the influence of 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) acceleration response spectrum with 5% damping ratio for the structure	191
Figure 6.6 (a) Bedrock record and the amplified free field soil surface record under the influence of 1995 Kobe earthquake; (b) acceleration response spectrum with 5% damping ratio for the structure	192
Figure 6.7 (a) Bedrock record and the amplified free field soil surface record under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake; (b) acceleration response spectrum with 5% damping ratio for the structure	193
Figure 6.8 (a) Bedrock record and the amplified free field soil surface record under the influence of 1968 Hachinohe earthquake; (b) acceleration response spectrum with 5% damping ratio for the structure	193

Figure 6.9 Acceleration response spectrum with 5% damping ratio for the structure with different foundation types under the influence of: (a) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake.....	196
Figure 6.10 Maximum shear force distribution for the fixed base, shallow foundation, floating pile foundation, and pile-raft cases under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake.....	198
Figure 6.11 Sample of numerical prediction of time-history shear force generation in corner columns for the fixed base model under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake on levels 1, 7, and 15.	199
Figure 6.12 Maximum base shear of the structure for the fixed base, shallow foundation, floating pile foundation, and pile-raft foundation cases under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake.....	199
Figure 6.13 Sample of numerical prediction of rocking component (rocking angle) for shallow foundation, pile foundation, and pile-raft foundation cases under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake	201
Figure 6.14 Maximum Rocking of the structure for the fixed base, shallow foundation, floating pile foundation, and pile raft foundation cases under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake.....	202
Figure 6.15 Maximum lateral deflection of the structure for the fixed base, shallow foundation, floating pile foundation, and pile-raft cases under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake.....	206
Figure 6.16 Sample of numerical prediction of time-history deflection for the fixed base model under the influence of 1940 El Centro earthquake in levels 1,7, and 15.	206
Figure 6.17 Maximum inter-storey drifts of the structure for the fixed base, shallow foundation, floating pile foundation, and pile-raft cases under the influence of: (a) 1994 Northridge earthquake; (b) 1995 Kobe earthquake; (c) 1940 El Centro earthquake; (d) 1968 Hachinohe earthquake.....	209

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Values of G/G_0 and V_s/V_{so} considering strain compatibility (ASCE7-10, 2010)	41
Table 2.2 Past performed shaking table tests on soil-structure systems using various types of soil containers	46
Table 3.1 Numerical fitting parameters in FLAC3D for implementing soil backbone curves	60
Table 4.1 UTS shaking table specifications	83
Table 4.2 Scaling relations in terms of geometric scaling factor (λ)	88
Table 4.3 Characteristics of the model pile built from Polyethylene pressure pipe	92
Table 4.4 Proportion of different components for the examined mixtures	93
Table 4.5 Properties of the soil mix on the second day of curing	96
Table 4.6 Characteristics of the utilised earthquake base motions	98
Table 4.7 Characteristics of the fifteen storey model structure	108
Table 4.8 Maximum vertical displacement and rocking angle of the base plate obtained from shaking table tests for the model structure supported by shallow foundation	117
Table 4.9 Maximum vertical displacement and rocking angle of the base plate obtained from shaking table tests for the model structure supported by floating pile foundation	122
Table 4.10 Maximum vertical displacement and rocking angle of the base plate obtained from shaking table tests for the model structure supported by end-bearing pile foundation	127
Table 4.11 Maximum vertical displacement of the base plate obtained from shaking table tests	131
Table 4.12 Maximum rocking angle of the base plate obtained from shaking table tests	131
Table 4.13 Characteristics of the model structures	135

Table 4.14 Maximum vertical displacement of the base plate obtained from shaking table tests.....	144
Table 4.15 Maximum rocking angle of the base plate obtained from shaking table tests	144
Table 5.1 Adopted parameters for 3D numerical simulation of the model structure...	154
Table 5.2 Properties of the adopted soil properties in 3D numerical simulation	160
Table 5.3 Properties of the adopted interface elements in 3D numerical simulation...	160
Table 5.4 Mechanical characteristics of the model piles adopted in the 3D numerical simulation.....	164
Table 5.5 Maximum vertical displacement of the base plate obtained from 3D Numerical model.....	170
Table 5.6 Maximum rocking angle of the base plate obtained from 3D Numerical model.....	170
Table 6.1 Adopted characteristics of column sections for 3D numerical simulation of the prototype soil-foundation-structure system.....	184
Table 6.2 Adopted characteristics of slabs for 3D numerical simulation of the prototype soil-foundation-structure system.....	184
Table 6.3 Adopted soil parameters for 3D numerical simulation of the prototype soil-foundation-structure system.....	185
Table 6.4 Properties of the adopted interface elements.....	186
Table 6.5 Maximum rocking angle of foundations obtained from 3D numerical simulation.....	202

LIST OF NOTATIONS

A	Area
A_{loop}	Area of the hysteresis loop
a	foundation width
c	damping coefficient of the structure
C	cohesion
$[C]$	damping matrix
c_h	horizontal damping coefficient of the subsoil
c_θ	rocking damping coefficient of the subsoil
C_s	seismic design coefficient of the fixed-based structure
\tilde{C}_s	seismic design coefficient of the flexible-based structure
D	dilation angle
E	modulus of elasticity (Young modulus)
E_s	soil subgrade reaction
f	natural frequency of fixed base structure
\tilde{f}	natural frequency of soil-structure system
f'_c	specified compressive strength
f_m	natural frequency of the model
f_p	natural frequency of the prototype
F_s	shear force
F_n	normal force
F_x	unbalanced forces in x direction from the free-field grid
F_y	unbalanced forces in y direction from the free-field grid
F_z	unbalanced forces in z direction from the free-field grid
F_x^{ff}	free-field grid point forces in x direction
F_y^{ff}	free-field grid point forces in y direction
F_z^{ff}	free-field grid point forces in z direction
$\{F_v\}$	force vector
G	shear modulus of the soil
G_0	shear modulus of the soil at small strains
G_{max}	largest value of the shear modulus

G_{sec}	secant shear modulus
G_{tan}	tangent shear modulus
g	gravity
h	height of the structure
$h\theta$	lateral displacement at the top of the structure due to rotation of the base
I	moment of inertia
I_c	flexural rigidity of the building columns
I_x	second moment of inertia with respect to x-axis
I_y	second moment of inertia with respect to y-axis
I_z	second moment of inertia with respect to z-axis
J	polar moment of inertia
I_r	moment of inertia for rocking motion
k	stiffness of the structure
k_s	shear spring stiffness
k_n	normal spring stiffness
k_y	lateral stiffness of foundation
k_θ	rocking stiffness of foundation
k_h	horizontal stiffness coefficient of the subsoil
\bar{k}	stiffness of a fixed-base structure
K	bulk modulus
$[K]$	stiffness matrix
K_h	horizontal stiffness coefficient of the subsoil
K_r	rocking stiffness coefficient of the subsoil
k_x	lateral stiffness of the subsoil foundation
L	effective contact length
m	mass of the structure
$[M]$	mass matrix
M_p	plastic moment capacity
M_0	overturning moment
M_s	secant modulus
M_t	tangent modulus
P_x	axial load on pile
r	radius of the foundation base
S	slider

S_u	shear strength
S_p	performance factor
S_u	soil shear strength
S_{DS}	design earthquake motion
T	natural period of fixed-base structure
\tilde{T}	natural period of soil-structure system
T_s	tensile strength
u	lateral displacement at the top of the structure due to structural distortion
u_n	incremental relative displacement vector in normal direction
u_s	incremental relative displacement vector in shear direction
u_0	lateral displacement at the top of structure due to translation of the base
u_t	total displacement of the base
u_g	horizontal seismic excitation
\tilde{u}^g	effective input motion
$\{u\}$	nodal displacement
$\{\dot{u}\}$	nodal velocity
$\{\ddot{u}\}$	nodal acceleration
V	base shear of fixed base structure
\tilde{V}	base shear of the structure in soil-structure system
ΔV	decrease in the base shear due to SSI
V_p	compression wave velocity of the soil
V_s	shear wave velocity of the soil
V_{s0}	shear wave velocity of the soil at small strains
W_D	dissipated energy in one hysteresis loop
W_S	maximum strain energy
\bar{W}	effective seismic weight of structure
y	lateral deformation of pile at point x
Δz_{min}	smallest width of the adjacent zone in the normal direction
γ	shear strain
γ_{ref}	numerical fitting parameter
δ	maximum lateral deflection of fixed base structure
$\tilde{\delta}$	maximum lateral deflection of the structure in soil-structure system

Δt	time-step
ΔS_y	mean vertical zone size at boundary grid point
η	material viscosity
θ	foundation rotation
λ	geometric scaling factor
λ_p	density scaling factor
λ_ε	strain scaling factor
ν	Poisson's ratio
v_x^m	x-velocity of the grid point in the main grid
v_y^m	y- velocity of the grid point in the main grid
v_z^m	z- velocity of the grid point in the main grid
v_x^{ff}	x-velocity of the grid point in the free-field grid
v_y^{ff}	y- velocity of the grid point in the free-field grid
v_z^{ff}	z- velocity of the grid point in the free-field grid
ξ	equivalent viscous damping ratio
$\tilde{\xi}$	effective damping ratio
ξ_g	hysteretic material damping of the soil
ρ	soil density
σ_y	yield stress
σ_{xx}^{ff}	mean horizontal free-field stress at the grid point
σ_{xy}^{ff}	mean free-field shear stress at the grid point
ϕ	friction angle
$\tilde{\omega}$	effective natural frequency
ω_0	natural frequency of the fixed base structure
τ	shear stress
$\bar{\tau}$	normalised shear stress