Performance of Buildings under the Coming Mid-size Earthquake beneath Tokyo Metropolitan Area

> Yozo Shinozaki Taisei Corporation Tokyo/Japan

History of Earthquakes around Tokyo



The coming mid-size Tokyo Metro. EQ for disaster prevention (2004)





140°





市原市直下 139°

140°









The Central Disaster Prevention Council 2004 (like FEAMA) is performing assessment of damage by each earthquake supposing 18 kinds of earthquakes.



Prediction for EQ. intensity





都心東部直下(2004)



Intersection for 3-Plates



two plates have sunk beneath Tokyo area, the occurring earthquake can conside various types.

Fault model spec.

The main specifications of the set-up fault model are shown below.

Earthquake size: Mw7.3 Tomographic-layer product: 63 km x 32 km Strike of a fault: 296 degrees Inclination of a fault: 23 degrees Slide angle: 138 degrees Mean-stress descent: 3MPa fmax: 6Hz Rupture-propagation speed: 2.5 km/s

This study has done based on the northern Tokyo Bay earthquake which is expected to have the largest number of victims or the greatest economic impact among 18 scenarios.



About the rupture starting point, Three different type were considered. Case-1:from center of the fault, Case-2:from east part of the fault and Case-3:from west part of the fault





Site Spec.



Example of Acceleration on the ground level & at the level of the seismic bedrock at SITE-S





1) Comparison of ACC. Response spectra (h=5%) on bed-rock (Vs>400m/s) for 5-site depend on Case-1,2,3 including design-earthquake force 2) Comparison of ACC. Response spectra (h=5%) on the ground level •h=5% & 20% 3) Comparison of VELOCITY Response spectra (h=5%) •bed-rock & on the ground level 4) Responses of 15 sample buildings by results of non-linear time history analysis with the effect of dissipation damping for 5-site

Response spectra for Acceleration on bedrock h=5% SITE-S(SHINJUKU)



Basically there are not so much differences for CASE-1,2,3. Response for period of 1~1.5 exceed in CASE-1.

Response spectra for Acceleration on bedrock h=5% SITE-K(KASUMIGASEKI)



Basically there are not so much differences for CASE-1,2,3. Response for period of 1~1.5 exceed in CASE-2 than CASE-1.

Response spectra for Acceleration on bedrock h=5% SITE-U(URAYASU)



Response for period of 0.5~1.5 exceed in CASE-1,3 than CASE-2.

Response spectra for Acceleration on bedrock h=5%

SITE-M (MAKUHARI)



Response for period of 1.0~2.0 exceed in CASE-2,3 than CASE-1.

Response spectra for Acceleration on bedrock h=5%

SITE-Y (YOKOHAMA)



Response for period of 1.0~2.0 exceed in CASE-1,2 than CASE-3.

Response spectra for Acceleration on the bedrock level h=5%



Response for period of 1.0~1.5 exceed in SITE-Y than others.

工学的基盤 加速度応答スペクトル 5%減衰

Response spectra for Acceleration on the ground level h=5%



Response for period of 0~0.5 exceed in SITE-S,K than others. For period of 1.0~2.0, SITE-U,Y than others.

地衣回 加还反心合へつファル い滅え

Response spectra for Acceleration on the ground level h=20%



Taking into consideration about dissipation damping, The response of buildings will not so large.

Response spectra for velocity on the bedrock level h=5%



工学的基盤 疑似速度応答スペクトル 5%減衰

Response spectra for velocity on the ground level h=5%



地表面 疑似速度応答スペクトル 5%減衰

15 sample buildings

	Story			Height	Length	Width	
		Basement	Ground	Rooftop	(m)	(m)	(m)
HIGH-RISE	Steel 1	4	35	3	163.0	61.6	51.6
	Steel 2	3	31	1	139.9	70.5	45.7
	RC	—	30	—	93.1	31.8	27.6
	Base Isolation	1	42	2	144.1	39.5	39.5
MIDDLE-RISE	Steel 1	—	10	1	40.3	32.6	20.2
	Steel 2	1	14	1	58.0	32.0	18.6
	RC	—	15	_	43.9	45.0	14.0
	SRC	1	9	2	30.5	31.5	23.5
	Base Isolation	1	8	1	29.9	72.3	29.9
LOW-RISE	Steel 1	—	5	1	20.5	33.6	20.2
	RC 1	1	6	1	20.2	18.4	13.5
	RC 2	1	2	—	10.3	18.8	13.8
	SRC	1	5	1	19.9	36.0	27.0
	Base Isolation 1	—	4	1	12.3	24.8	14.0
	Base Isolation 2	2	3	_	9.5	32.9	30.8

non-linear time history analysis with the effect of dissipation damping for 5-site





--●--NS Case1

▲ NS Case3

♦−NS Case2

---EW Case1

EW Case2

EW Case3

Response of 6F-RC (at site-K) T1=0.4

Response of 10F-RC (at site-S) T1=1.47s





Response of 30RC (at site-S) T1=1.99s





Max. Acceleration of 15 buildings



Maximum acceleration

Max. story drifts of 15 buildings



Assessment of response based on experimental results



Assessment of response based on experimental results



Floor response (frequency)

2

3

4

High rise

31S(20-31F)

0

1

conclusion

- The response of the low-mid rise building may become larger than the design force depending on a site, while the response for high rise buildings may be smaller.
- The simulation for the ground motion at particular earthquake still have indefinite uncertainty.
- Structural engineers should understand there are still the uncertainties for artificial ground motion.
- Earthquake motion prediction and earthquake motion input evaluation are the information which should be made the big ground of a designer's judgment in the proper design of a building, and the designer needs to judge those information humbly and needs to make it reflected in a design.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The contents of this paper summarize the details of research of the exchange meeting for the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology "task force about the promotion of utilization of Mid-size Earthquake ground motion beneath Tokyo metropolitan area." Gratitude is expressed here at the researchers concerned.