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Abstract

During the last strong earthquakes, the impact between closely adjacent structures was reported as one of the major causes of collapse in buildings and bridges. This impact is also called seismic pounding and is due to the different dynamic characteristics of those neighboring structures that make them to vibrate out of phase and become them in potentially dangerous. In the case of bridges, seismic pounding is the impact produced between deck-deck and deck-abutment. In the common engineering practice, bridges are designed with expansion joints or gaps to allow the expansion of the deck because of temperature, shrinkage or creep of concrete. Since this gap cannot be removed generally, it is a vulnerable part of the bridge when earthquake occurs. In addition, seismic pounding produces severe damage in bridges and even collapse.

In this study, a detailed overview of the last strongest earthquakes since San Francisco earthquake in 1906 until Tohoku earthquake in 2011 is presented focusing on different types of damages produced in bridges. Within all these different ways of failure and unlike other types of damages, seismic pounding has been less studied although it was demonstrated to be one of the main causes of damages in bridges during the last great earthquakes. Unidirectional and bidirectional seismic pounding are distinguished and a deep review in the literature is provided to know what has been done so far in the field of seismic pounding simulation in bridges. After that, a brief introduction of physical nature of impact as well as the main existing impact force models divided into linear and non-linear are presented. Then, a proposed impact force model based on a modified Kelvin-Voigt model where frictional forces are involved is developed. This proposed contact element is implemented as a biaxial contact element in an open-source computer program called OpenSees. This computer program was developed at University of Berkeley (California) and is based on the Finite Element Method. It is widely used in earthquake research because of is a powerful tool to deal with dynamic problems where non-linearity’s are involved. Moreover, the new contact element was validated for unidirectional directional using an experiment carried out at Harbin Institute of Technology (China) with encouraging results.

Finally, three real and different bridges located in California are taken as seed bridges to study seismic pounding in bridges. Furthermore Kobe, Loma Prieta, Chi-Chi and Landers earthquake are chosen as input ground motions in order to have two pulse-like (Kobe and Loma Prieta) and two far-field (Chi-Chi and Landers) earthquakes. The isolated bridges are modeled in OpenSees and subjected to 2,688 non-linear time history analysis simulations where the gap and the skew angle of decks are the parameters used to study the seismic bridge response. The results show how important the skew angle is and its influence in the performance of the bridge being 45° the worse scenario when pounding occurs.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Since long time ago, earthquakes have been one of the most unknown natural disasters for the human beings due to the uncertainty of occurrence and high damage produced. In fact, the first seismic excitations were studied by a Chinese philosopher called Chang Heng in 132 B.C inventing the earliest known seismoscope (Dewey and Byerly 1969). This first seismoscope was intended to record both the occurrence of earthquakes and the azimuths of their origins from the observer. During the following centuries the seismic technology enhanced through the inventions such as the first seismoscope to record the time of small earthquakes invented by Palmieri in the middle of nineteenth century and the first seismograph of low intensity developed by Cecchi in 1875. Thanks to that, nowadays the newest seismographs are equipped with electromagnetic sensors that can record the ground motions with high accuracy and digitally. In addition, the launch of the first computers in the middle of twentieth century led to suppose a significant stride for the earthquake research. Hence, the modern earthquake engineering was born based on numerical methods and the high speed of processing supplied by the computers.

In the past, several strong earthquakes produced a relevant damage in buildings and civil structures. The largest earthquake ever recorded was the Chile earthquake \( M_w = 9.5 \) in 1960 with a material damage estimated at 700 million dollars, many structures collapsed and however only dozens of people died because of earthquake, surprisingly. This was essentially due to the warning given by small shock that preceded the main earthquake by about 15 minutes (Rosenblueth 1960, 1961). Nevertheless, the Great San Francisco earthquake \( M_w = 7.6 \) in 1906 and the Great Kanto earthquake \( M_w = 8.3 \) in 1923 can be considered the first strong ground motions well documented. In Japan, around 694,000 houses were partially or completely collapsed (James 2011). The earthquake devastated Kanto region, specially Tokyo and Yokohama city (Fig. 1.1(a), (b)) killing thousands of people.

![Damage produced by Great Kanto earthquake in (a) Tokyo and (b) Yokohama in 1923.](http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/EERC_2002_0712/IMG0020.jpg)  
Since Great Kanto earthquake, there were several strong earthquakes in different points around
the world. However, All these points are mostly concentrated in a particular region called
Circum-Pacific Seismic Belt and widely known as Ring of Fire (Fig. 1.2). About 90 % of the
world’s earthquakes and 81 % of the largest world’s earthquakes occur there (Kious and
Tilling 2001). It has horseshoe shape and belongs to the basin of Pacific Ocean.

![Ring of Fire](http://earthquake.usgs.gov/learn/glossary/images/ringoffire.gif)

Most of the last strongest earthquakes took place in this region. For instance, in 1989 Loma Prieta
earthquake \( M_w = 6.9 \) provided some interesting insights into the effects of a great earthquake in an
urban setting (EERI 1989). Unlike other very damaging California earthquakes, such as San Fernando,
Coalinga or Whittier events (Priestly and Eeri 1988), Loma Prieta earthquake distributed damaged
throughout many counties. It was the largest earthquake occurred on the San Andreas Fault since the
Great San Francisco earthquake \( M_w = 7.9 \) in 1906. Some years later, Northridge earthquake \( M_w = 6.7 \)
damaged about 12,500 structures in 1994. Of 66,545 buildings inspected, 6 % were severely damaged
and 17 % were moderate damaged (EQE 1994). Collapses and other severe damage forced closure of 11
major roads (Fig. 1.3(a), (b)) to downtown Los Angeles such as I-5, SR-14, I-10 and SR-118 (ITS 2002).
The next year, the Kobe earthquake \( M_w = 6.8 \) shook the southern side of the main island of Honshu
(Japan) in 1995. After this earthquake 5,000 people were reported killed, more than 26,000 were injured
and over 300,000 were left homeless (Comartin et al. 1995). Kobe, Ashiya and Nishinomiya (Fig. 1.4(a))
areas were specially destroyed and therefore their transportation system. The Hanshin expressway (Fig.
1.4(b)) through the city was closed by transverse overturning and collapsed section of 18 spans (630 m of
total length) due to flexural and shear mode damage (Hashimoto et al. 2005). A number of major
expressways, rail lines and bridges, some of very modern design, were severely damaged. However, the
Akashi Kaikyo bridge, the longest suspension bridge in the world, was still under construction when
Kobe earthquake struck the city and the towers were moved by one meter increasing the main span from
1990 m to 1991 m and the change was easily accommodated in the slightly altered final design because of
only the towers were erected at the time. On the other hand, the Port of Kobe, much of which was new,
was also devastated by widespread and severely liquefaction and permanent ground deformations, which
destroyed more than 90 % of the port’s 187 berths and damaged or destroyed most large cranes (EQE
Moreover, the damage to the capital stock, expressed at commercial exchange rates, was estimated at US$114 billion, three times the recorded cost of any previous natural disaster in the history (Horwich 2000).

Fig. 1.3. Collapse of (a) I-5 at Gavin Canyon (Los Angeles county) and (b) a highway bridge in Granada Hills (California) produced by Northridge earthquake.

(a) http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/5074_1631_0650/IMG0003.jpg, (b) http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/5076_1631_2251/IMG0046.jpg

Taiwan is also a seismically zone located in the Ring of Fire and therefore not exempt to suffer strong earthquakes frequently. Hence, in 1999 the Chi-Chi earthquake \((M_w = 7.7)\) devastated Taiwan and Taichung and Nantou counties specially. On one hand, over 2,400 lives were lost, more than 10,000 people were injured and left and estimated 100,000 people homeless. On the other hand, over 10,000 buildings collapsed and more than 7,000 suffered damage (Lee and Loh 2000). Moreover, highway damage was widespread throughout Taichung and Nantou counties due to fault rupturing, collapsed or crippled bridges, landslides, soil settlement and slope failures. Regarding traffic infrastructures, thirty of 590 inspected bridges on the island sustained damage. Of those, 5 bridges collapsed, 9 bridges required major emergency repairs to sustain traffic and 16 bridges were damaged but rated safe (Dong et al. 2000).

Fig. 1.4. Collapse of (a) approach span of Nishinomiya-ko bridge and (b) Hanshin Expressway toppled to the north (from Kawashima) produced by Kobe earthquake.

(a) http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/6324_3122_2969/IMG0054.jpg, (b) http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/6317_3071_0981/IMG0026.jpg
In addition, those most seriously affected range from 3-span to 28-span. From the economic point of view, the economic losses were around US$12 billion. Most of the collapsed bridges (Fig. 1.5(a), (b)) were located on the highway Tai-3 which runs north south through Taichung and Nantou counties and coincides with the Chelungpu fault rupture.

![Fig. 1.5. Collapse of (a) the Shih-Wui bridge and (b) the Wu-His bridge in highway Tai-3 produced by Chi-Chi earthquake.](http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/0021_3292_3456/IMG0032.jpg, http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/9187_3302_4395/IMG0068.jpg)

There have been several strong ground motions around the world after Chi-Chi earthquake and every year a strong earthquake occurs (Fig. 1.6). According to United States Geological Survey’s (USGS), the largest earthquake since year 2000 was the west coast of northern Sumatra earthquake \(M_w = 9.1\) in 2004 when a big tsunami destroyed the coasts of Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Thailand and India. The last significant seismic excitation due to nuclear troubles related to the earthquake was the Tohoku earthquake \(M_w = 9.0\) off the east coast of Japan in 2011.

![Fig. 1.6. List of the strongest earthquakes year by year since 2000.](http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/0021_3292_3456/IMG0032.jpg, http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/9187_3302_4395/IMG0068.jpg)

The Tohoku earthquake is known as Great East Japan earthquake and triggered extremely destructive tsunami waves that reached height over 39 m (Mimura 2011). The earthquake and tsunami destroyed an important number of buildings and infrastructures in northeast Japan. The Japan National Police Agency confirmed 15,550 deaths, 5,688 injuries and 5,344 people missing as well as 224,798 housing units collapsed, 434,327 housing units partially damaged and 32,443 non-residential buildings damaged. Moreover, infrastructure damage was also widespread with 3,546 areas along roads, 71 bridges and 26 parts of the railway system. The tsunami waves played a crucial role in the damage of the structures as
Kosa (2012) concluded. The outflow of superstructures occurred to more than 300 bridges during the Tohoku earthquake. Among those 300 bridges, 9 national way bridges, 14 prefectural road bridges and 101 railway bridges suffered losses. In addition, Bricker et al. (2012) carried out field surveys and numerical modeling to show the influence of the deck inclination, flow speed and tsunami surge in the deck failure. Curiously most of the bridges designed by post-1990 code were not damaged however in some bridges designed by 1995 code rubber bearings and dampers were severely damaged (Takahashi 2012) contributing to the total damage of the bridge. The tsunami inundated area of 400 km² and the area affected by the earthquake is still under reconstruction and the Japan Government estimates the final cost between 16 and 25 trillion yen.

After doing a review of the largest earthquakes in the world in the last hundred years, it can be noticed the importance of correct seismic design in the structures in order to avoid collapse and severely damage produced by the ground motions. Conceptually, bridges are simpler structures rather than other structures such as, for example, buildings, tunnels or dams. Nevertheless, because of this conceptual simplicity and therefore its limited redundancy unlike buildings, bridges are more sensitive to be affected by earthquakes. Therefore, a deep knowledge of the failures produced by strong earthquakes is needed in order to avoid them in the future.

1.1 Damage to Bridges in the Past Earthquakes

Past earthquakes showed the limitations of the structural design of some bridges under strong ground motions. These limitations cause different types of failure making evidence the weak points of the seismic bridge design. According Priestley et al. (1996), three different structural deficiencies can be identified in different forms causing the main failures in bridges and are direct consequence of the elastic design philosophy. The first deficiency is seismic deflection based on the specified lateral force levels that are seriously underestimated because of the elastic design. The second deficiency is based on the first one since seismic force levels were artificially low, the ratio to gravity load to seismic force adopted for design was incorrect. Finally, inelastic structural actions and associated concepts of ductility and capacity design are crucial to the survival of inelastic systems under severe seismic response and were not considered in the elastic design process.

Because of these three deficiencies in the seismic bridge design, Priestley et al. (1996) divide the potential failures of bridges into seven categories depending on the affected structural component:

1. **Abutment slumping:** The earth pressures increase under longitudinal response due to the acceleration of the ground. Moreover, if impact occurs between the deck and backfill generates and the soil is not well compacted an increment of pressure in the low level pushing inwards and rotating the abutment. Costa Rica earthquake (EQE 1991) showed several examples of this type of failure (Fig. 1.7(a), (b)).
2. Column failures: the columns failures can be divided into two different groups, a) flexural strength and ductility failures and b) column shear failures.

a) Flexural strength and ductility failures. Until the middle of twentieth century, bridge designers were generally unaware about ductility capacity what caused some troubles. The typical ductility failures are:

- **Inadequate flexural strength.** The elastic design assumed a low seismic lateral force (6 % of dead weight in California) what underestimated a lot the real seismic forces. In fact, empirical elastic response exceeded 100 % this value. However, despite this large discrepancy the real strength difference was much less due to the nature of the conservative analysis adopted (Fig. 1.8(a)).

- **Undependable column flexural strength.** The insufficient splice length above the foundation does not allow to develop the strength of the reinforcing bars and make the joint column-foundation a weak point under strong ground motions (Fig. 1.8(b)).

- **Inadequate flexural ductility.** Ductility is the property of being able to deform through several cycles of displacements much larger than the yield displacement without significant strength degradation. Therefore, in order to survive intense seismic attack, structures must possess ductility. The lack of ductility in the bridges was observed in past earthquakes (Fig. 1.8(c)) and caused severely damage.

- **Premature termination of column reinforcement.** The lack of the length enough for the reinforcing bars along the column may cause the failure of the whole column at the point where the reinforcement is missing. Kobe earthquake caused this drawback especially in 1995 (Fig. 1.8(d)).

b) Column shear failures. Shear failure is a brittle failure and involves rapid strength degradation. Short columns are particularly susceptible to shear failure as consequence of the high shear/moment ratio and conservatism in the flexural strength design of older columns (Fig 1.9(a), (b)).

3. Cap beam failures: Last earthquakes as Loma Prieta earthquake (1989) and Kobe earthquake (1995) made clear three relevant deficiencies regarding cap beams. (i) Shear capacity, (ii) premature termination of cap beam negative moment reinforcement and (iii) insufficient anchorage of cap beam reinforcement into the end regions. This failure produces flexural and shear cracks that decrease the strength of the cap beam (Fig. 1.10(a)).
4. **Joint failures**: Inappropriate shear reinforcement in joints between cap beams and piers may produce the shear failure. In the past, several bridge designers did not consider these shear forces to design the knee joints what means unsuitable shear reinforcement in that area (Fig. 1.10(b)).

5. **Footing failures**: In spite of the difficult of checking footings after an earthquake, some failures were reported in the last earthquakes such as San Fernando earthquake in 1971 (Fig. 1.10(c)). Basically, the main deficiencies of footings are: (i) footing flexural strength, (ii) footing shear strength, (iii) joint shear strength in the region immediately below the column, (iv) anchorage and development of column reinforcement and (v) inadequate connection between tension piles and footings.

6. **Failures of steel bridge components**: Steel bridge components are also susceptible to damage although are lighter than equivalent concrete component (by about 30%). For instance, Kobe earthquake showed many examples of buckling of steel I-beam girders as result of inadequate bracing. In addition, steel piers were also damaged (Fig. 1.10(d)).

7. **Seismic displacements**: Last earthquakes provided an important list of damage due to underestimated seismic displacements as consequence of the elastic theory used for the bridge design. The main failures related to seismic displacements are as defined below.

   a) **Span failures due to unseating at movement joints**. Strong ground motions may produce large displacements of spans in the direction of the earthquake and therefore to exceed the seating width in joints between either deck-deck or deck-abutment. This failure was reported in the most of past earthquakes (Fig. 1.4(a), Fig. 1.5(a) and Fig. 1.11(a)).

   b) **Amplification of displacements due to soils effects**. Soil where the bridge is built has a crucial role in the displacements of the spans. Soft soils will generally result in amplification of structural vibration response increasing the probability of unseating. Moreover, if soil is composed of saturated sandy silts or silty sands, liquefaction of the ground may occur. Bridges with simple supported span are particularly susceptible to span failure due to liquefaction (Fig. 1.11(b)).

   c) **Pounding of bridge structures**. Pounding between adjacent structures may occur when the distance is insufficient. These unpredictable impacts produce high pounding forces that can affect the behavior of the bridge and increase the seismic displacements. In addition, pounding can also increase the shear forces of the piers as well as acceleration response of bents (Fig. 1.14(a-f)).
Fig. 1.7. (a) Abutment slid towards river showing the movement of the Rio Viscaya bridge footings and piles during the Costa Rica earthquake and (b) the relative rotation between abutment and deck of the same bridge.

(a) http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/1351_3163_3946/046.jpg, (b) http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/1351_3163_3946/044.jpg

Fig. 1.8. (a) Heavy flexural cracking on south face of pier #38 and (b) failed splices and layered longitudinal steel of southeast corner of pier #45 (Hanshin expressway), (c) plastic hinge developed at about one third above the ground level (Niigata earthquake, 2004) and (d) failure of the column (Hanshin expressway, Kobe earthquake 1995).

Fig. 1.9. Close-up view of shear failure of (a) highway pier in Granada Hills (California) and (b) La Cienaga - Venice highway bridge pier showing cracked and spalled concrete cover produced by Northridge earthquake (1994).

(a) http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/5076_1631_2251/IMG0036.jpg, (b) http://nisee.berkeley.edu/jpg/EERC_2010_1906/Caltrans-NR-La-Cienaga4.jpg

Fig. 1.10. (a) Damage to cap beam of supporting east span of cable-stayed bridge (Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999), (b) knee joint failure of Cypress Street Viaduct (California 1989), (c) reinforced concrete abutment footings of Rio Cuba highway bridge badly cracked (Costa Rica, 1991) and (d) northeast corner of steel pier #55 (Hanshin expressway, 1995).

Among all the different types of failure, this study is focused on pounding in highway bridges due to strong ground motions.

1.2 Seismic Pounding in Bridges

Pounding is a complex phenomenon that occurs when two structures impact to each other due to insufficient separation under strong ground motion and has been identified as cause of damage and collapse (Anagnostopoulos 1994). Due to function requirements, highway bridges are set up a distance to allow the out-of-phase displacement as consequence of temperature effects, creep or shrinkage of concrete. This distance is also known as either gap or expansion joint and is located between deck-deck and deck-abutment. On one hand, the difference of dynamic characteristics of neighboring structures as well as asynchronous seismic excitation due to the length of the bridge may induce pounding. Because of forces induced by pounding bridges can be severely damaged or even collapse. Three different kind of gaps that can be distinguished in a common isolated highway bridge and are (i) gap between left abutment and deck, (ii) gap between decks and (iii) gap between deck and right abutment as shown Fig. 1.12.

Fig. 1.12. Sketch of two-span highway bridge supported on bearings at middle pier and abutments without pounding.
On the other hand, impact occurs when the distance of the joint expansion (gap) becomes zero as a consequence of relative displacement of the bodies involved. Assuming decks as rigid bodies, pounding can occur in either (i) left abutment (Fig. 1.13(a)), (ii) middle expansion joint (Fig. 1.13(b)), (iii) right abutment (Fig. 1.13(a)) or (iv) different places simultaneously depending on the dynamic characteristics of bridge system (piers, bearings and decks) as well as gaps in each location (left abutment, expansion joint and right abutment). These impacts may change the dynamic behavior of the whole bridge and cause severely concentrated damage because of pounding produces high forces in a short period of time. Moreover, bridges are large linear infrastructures with principal axes defined clearly along lanes. Therefore, bridges are sensitive structures to the direction of the seismic excitation.

![Diagram of impact between decks and abutments when decks move outwards and impact between decks when decks move inwards.](image1)

Fig. 1.13. (a) Impact between decks and abutments when decks move outwards and (b) impact between decks when decks move inwards.

Pounding is a common phenomenon when bridges are shaken by strong earthquakes and have been widely reported during the last earthquakes. According to the National Information Service for Earthquake Engineering (NISEE) by the Civil and Environmental Engineering Department of the University of California (Berkeley), several highway bridges suffered as deck-abutment pounding as well as deck displacement induced by pounding that caused unseating of some bents during Northridge and Kobe earthquake. In the case of Northridge earthquake, the Interstate-5/Hwy 14 interchange (Los Angeles county) suffered severely damaged as consequence to pounding between deck and abutment (Fig. 1.14(a)) what caused unseating and collapse of deck. On the other hand, Interstate-5/210 interchange (abutment 9), showed vertical and horizontal offset and damage along the expansion joint (Fig. 1.14(b)). Regarding seismic displacements, Interstate-10/Fairfax Ave.-Washington Blvd rotated at hinge between bents 3 and 4 (Fig. 1.14(c)) and an expansion joint of the Interstate-10/14th St. bridge opened by 19 mm and moved to the side by 13 mm (Fig. 1.15(a)). During Kobe earthquake, several pounding cases were reported. For example, the impact between steel deck and RC abutment (Fig. 1.14(d)), the off-ramp movement at abutment near bent #80 (Fig. 1.14(e)), deck displacement in (Fig. 1.14(f)) and deck displacement at pier #30 (Hanshin expressway) as shown in Fig. 1.15(b).
Fig. 1.14. Pounding between (a) deck-abutment, (b) deck-deck and (c) rotation between two bents during Northridge earthquake. Pounding between (d) deck-abutment, (e) rotation deck-abutment and (f) relative displacement between decks in Nishinomiya-ko bridge during Kobe earthquake.

As it has been shown in the previous section, failures as consequence of pounding are as common as other failures in bridges and the damage produced by this phenomena cannot be neglected. Therefore, a deep study is needed in order to assess the pounding forces and its influence in the total bridge behavior. However, before going ahead it is mandatory to review the relevant previous studies to know what have been done until now.

1.3 Review of Previous Studies

Relevant previous studies about pounding in bridges as well as buildings are basically classified in two main groups depending on the type of contact. The first group is unidirectional pounding and is defined by unidirectional ground motion where the contact points (plane of impact) are known before contact (Fig. 1.16(a)). Generally, it is considered unidirectional pounding when the direction of propagation of seismic wave coincides with the longitudinal axis of the bridge. The second group is bidirectional pounding and unlike unidirectional pounding, the contact points are unknown before impact due to the relative displacement between the contact bodies (Fig. 1.16(b)) and it is defined by bidirectional ground motion. It is widely established the longitudinal and transverse axis of the bridge as main axis to define the components of the input earthquake. While unidirectional pounding has been
widely studied by researchers due to its easy implementation in computer programs, bidirectional pounding deals with the difficulty that the contact points are unknown \textit{a priori} and deck rotation and friction force are also involved. In addition, pounding in bridges has not been as studied as pounding in buildings. Nevertheless, much of the strides achieved in the field of buildings (base-isolated and fixed-base buildings) are also used in bridge pounding. Furthermore, unlike unidirectional pounding, the potential contact area in bidirectional pounding is a point if there is deck rotation. This contact point is unknown because depends on the relative displacements that depends on the input ground motions and dynamic properties of the bridge. Fig. 16(a) shows a typical unidirectional pounding between two adjacent decks of base-isolated bridge along the longitudinal axis of the bridge while Fig. 16(b) shows a typical bidirectional pounding of the same bridge produced by bidirectional earthquake. Note the rotation of bearings.

![Plane of impact](image)

(a)

![Impact](image)

(b)

Fig. 1.16. Top view of (a) unidirectional pounding and (b) bidirectional pounding of base-isolated bridge.
1.3.1 Unidirectional Pounding

There are few studies about unidirectional pounding of bridges unlike unidirectional pounding of buildings that is phenomena widely studied. However most of the studies related to buildings can be also used for bridges. One of the earliest studies about pounding was conducted by Wolf and Shrikerud (1980) modeling pounding using a non-linear 1-Degree Of Freedom (DOF) system and an impact spring-dashpot mechanism. In addition, they also studied pounding of typical reactor building by adjacent auxiliary building during an earthquake using 2-DOF as well as an aircraft impact. After that, Maison and Kasai (1990) conducted the formulation and solution of multi DOF equations of motion for a type of structural pounding through the analysis of 15-stores building. In 1992, Anagnostopoulos studied mutual pounding effect between two adjacent buildings modeled as lump masses using MDOF and bilinear force-deformation characteristics for the impact model.

Pounding in bridges gained attention in 90s by researchers and in 1998 Tanabe et al. were some of the first researchers who found pounding as cause of collapse in bridges. At the end of this decade, the first studies that tried to explain the pounding phenomena in bridges appeared. On one hand, Pantelides and Ma. (1998) conducted a study about the interaction between decks taking account the gap and impact parameters. Furthermore, Malhotra (1998) developed a collinear impact between concrete rods with the same cross-section but different lengths in order to use these results to formulate a realistic model for concrete bridges. This study concluded that (i) seismic pounding generally reduces the pier forces, (ii) large impacts forces generated in the superstructure are not transmitted to the bridge columns and foundations and (iii) pounding does not increase the longitudinal separation at the hinges.

A more accurate numerical experiment was carried out by Kim et al. (2000a) modeling 6-span bridge as 3-DOF (translational motion of superstructure along the main bridge axis and translational and rotational motion of foundations). Kim et al. found pounding to affect the global motion of the bridge and may increase or decrease the relative motions between adjacent bents according to the given conditions. Since the beginning of pounding studies in bridges, researchers tried to avoid the pounding effect using dissipating devices. For example, Kim et al. (2000b), Won et al. (2008) and Abdel Raheem (2009) investigated the efficacy of using energy dissipating restrainers at expansion joints for preventing collapse of highway bridges. In addition, Jankowski et al. (2000) analyzed several methods of reduction of the negative effects of collision induced by pounding. The results showed that the influence of pounding on structural response was significant in the longitudinal direction and significantly depended on the gap size between decks. Further studies indicated that the bridge behavior could be effectively improved by placing hard rubber bumpers between segments and by stiff linking those segments. DesRoches and Muthukumar (2002) carried out a similar study to determine the effects of frame stiffness ratio, ground motions characteristics, frame yielding and restrainers on the pounding response of bridge frames. In addition, a semi-active control using dampers were implemented to mitigate the non-linear response of bridges under pounding effect by Ruangrassamee and Kawashima (2003).

During the following years, researchers adopted more complex models in order to investigate the unidirectional pounding effect. In 2005, Chouw and Hao studied the effect of spatial variations of ground motions with different wave propagation apparent velocities in soft and medium soil as well as the influence of the soil structure interaction (SSI) on pounding response of two adjacent bridge frames. A response spectra approach was presented by Jankowski (2006) in order to investigate pounding showing peaks of pounding forces as functions of the natural structural vibration periods. A more complex
approach using dimensional analysis was conducted by Dimitrakopoulos et al. (2009) in order to determine the dynamic response of several pounding oscillators subjected to pulse-type excitations. Hence, the study showed that pounding structures such as colliding buildings or interacting bridge segments may be most vulnerable for excitations with frequencies very different from their natural frequencies. Moreover, one of the few experimental and analytical studies about pounding in bridges was carried out by Guo et al. (2009) to reduce the pounding effect using magnetorheological (MR) dampers. Once pounding phenomenon was understood better, researchers started to carry out parametric studies in order to determine the effect of those parameters in the bridge response. For example, Bi et al. (2010) investigated the minimum total gap that modular expansion joint (MEJ) had to have to avoid pounding at abutments and between decks and Li et al. (2013) considered the effect of abutment motion on bridge pounding response.

1.3.2 Bidirectional Pounding

Regarding bidirectional pounding, the number of published studies is much less than unidirectional pounding due to the difficulty of modeling. On one hand, Jankowski et al. published one of the first studies about bidirectional pounding in 1998. They presented an analysis of pounding between superstructure segments of base isolated bridge induced by propagating seismic wave in both directions (longitudinal and transverse direction) using high-damping rubber bearing (HDRB) as isolation device. Although this study takes account frictional forces, does not consider rotation of decks.

On the other hand, the 3D friction-model developed by Zhu et al. (2002) can be considered the biggest stride in the last ten years because of led the transition from simplified bidirectional models to general 3D model that can handle with non-linear materials and geometries. This 3D model included Mohr-Coulomb friction and allows overlapping material. In addition, it utilizes Lagrange multiplier method to impose restrictions. Nevertheless, it is incapable of dealing with non-linear materials during contacts. The authors implemented the model in Dynamic Analysis if Bridge Systems (DABS), computer program developed by themselves. Two years later, the same authors (Zhu et al. 2004) utilized DABS in order to evaluate the effectiveness of pounding countermeasures and the serviceability of elevated bridges subjected to severe ground motions. The peak and residual magnitude of gaps between girders as well as maximum shear deformations of bearings were used to determine the serviceability.

When bidirectional ground motion is considered and the mass center and shear center does not coincide, the rotation of decks play a crucial role in the pounding response. In that sense, the work of Watanabe and Kawashima (2004) clarify the mechanism of rotation of skewed bridges. Skewed bridges show particular structural response as result of poundings of the decks to the substructures and the effect of restrainers. As occurred in the case of unidirectional pounding, the influence of the abutment during pounding was also studied for bidirectional pounding and therefore the abutment behavior was also included in the simulations when the phenomenon. For example, Aviram et al. (2008) evaluated the sensibility of bridge seismic response with respect to three different abutment modeling approaches. An interesting study about seismic torsional pounding between an asymmetric single story tower and neighboring barrier under harmonic ground excitation was carried out by Wei et al. (2009). The numerical simulations revealed that torsional pounding tended to be much more complex and unpredictable than unidirectional pounding. Unlike Wei et al. (2009) that induced rotational pounding through the offset
between mass center and shear center applying harmonic ground excitation along one direction (perpendicular to the barrier used for the study), Pant and Wijeyewickrema (2013) proposed a new approach to evaluate the pounding response between a building and retaining wall subjected to bidirectional earthquake. Hence, Pant and Wijeyewickrema concluded that considering unidirectional excitation instead of a bidirectional excitation under strong near-fault motions provides highly unconservative estimates of superstructure in some instances.

As occurred in the unidirectional pounding, Guo et al. (2011) carried out one of the few experiments taking account bidirectional pounding. They presented an analytical model and pounding experiment of highway bridge, especially focused on the point-to-surface pounding of bridge decks due to torsional rotation, when subjected to extreme bidirectional earthquake excitations. The results showed that highway bridge was vulnerable to deck rotation and point-to-surface pounding should be considered in the structural design to lighten the pounding damage of the highway bridge under strong ground motion excitations.

### 1.4 Objectives and Scope

The main objective of this study is to develop and implement a new contact element in order to overcome the limitations of the previous studies discussed previously and assess the bridge response under strong ground motions when pounding is induced.

On one hand, a new impact force model is presented based on the latest impact models as well as its implementation in the open source FE program called OpenSees. An empirical validation of the proposed contact element is carried out using the experiment results provided by Guo et al. (2009). Then, three real bridges located in two different locations in California have been designed and modeled in finite elements (FE) according to AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications (2012) as well as Caltrans (2013) in order to assess the effect of unidirectional pounding and bidirectional pounding. Moreover, a detailed design of lead rubber bearings (LRB) for each bridge is also conducted.

On the other hand, three dimensional non-linear seismic pounding analysis of the three mentioned bridges are performed. Gap size and skew angle of the bridge are used for the parametric study. Design Earthquake (DE) and Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE) are also utilized in the analysis as well as the lower bound and upper bound properties of the lead rubber bearings. In total, 2,688 non-linear analysis using FEM are performed.

Finally, the response of bridges with and without pounding as well as both directions is evaluated in with the purpose of estimate the effect that pounding in (i) the relative acceleration of decks, (ii) relative displacement of decks, (iii) drift of pier, (iv) reactions on the base of pier (shear forces and moments) and (v) behavior of lead rubber bearings.
1.5 Outline of Thesis

Chapter 2: A brief introduction of physical nature of impact is given. Different impact models to simulate pounding numerically are reviewed. A new biaxial contact element to take account the deck rotation is proposed as well as its implementation in OpenSees. In addition, an experimental validation of the proposed contact element is also conducted for unidirectional pounding.

Chapter 3: Three real bridges located in two different locations in California are designed according the American and Californian code (AASHTO LRFD BDS and Caltrans). A detailed explanation about the lead rubber bearings design is given. Moreover, the scaling of the four ground motions used as earthquake input (Kobe, Loma Prieta, Chi-Chi and Landers) for the numerical simulations are also presented.

Chapter 4: Detailed finite element modeling of each part of the bridge and non-linear analysis is presented. In addition, a sensitive study is conducted to investigate the suitability of the parameters used in the parametric study (gap and skewness).

Chapter 5: Numerical results of three bridges are presented in terms of effect of unidirectional and bidirectional pounding when the gap size and skew angle change. The results are focused on the effect in (i) the relative acceleration of decks, (ii) relative displacement of decks, (iii) drift of pier, (iv) reactions on the base of pier (shear forces and moments) and (v) behavior of lead rubber bearings.

Chapter 6: Main conclusions of the present study are presented as well as several recommendations for further studies. Moreover, limitations of the proposed contact element are also discussed.
Chapter 2
Impact Force Models

Since Heinrich Hertz presented his theory to the Berlin Physical Society in January 1881 and published his classic paper On the contact of elastic bodies in 1882, the study of contact mechanics has changed substantially (Johnson 1985). Apparently, impact between two colliding bodies is a simple phenomenon that can be seen every day in many different ways such as, for instance, walking (every single step is an impact between shoe and ground), playing tennis (between ball and racket), baseball (between bat and ball) or football (between foot and ball). However, impact is a very complex phenomenon that occurs in a very brief period of time and involves many different variables what make it difficult to model mathematically. Therefore, there have been different theories along the years in order to simplify the phenomenon and make it easy to handle and useful for engineering applications.

According to the classic manuals of impact mechanics (Stronge 2000 and Goldsmith 2001), there are four different methods to classify collisions depending on the deformations developed during impact, the distribution of these deformations in each of the colliding bodies and how these deformations affect the period of contact. In general, these four types of analysis for low speed collisions are (i) particle impact, (ii) rigid body impact, (iii) transverse impact on flexible bodies and (iv) axial impact on flexible bodies. This study is focused on a particular approach of the rigid body impact theory in order to study pounding in highway bridges. To do that, the case of direct central impact is used to explain the physical nature of impact.

2.1 Physical Nature of Impact

The physical nature of impact can be easily explained using the impact between two spherical bodies. Fig. 2.1(a, b) shows a typical impact force-local deformation relationship during a direct central impact.

The different stages that can be recognized in Fig. 2.1 are detailed with several remarks in Table 2.1. The bodies approaching towards each other with certain velocity (stage I) and come in contact (stage II) with a relative velocity just before impact $\Delta v_0 = v_{\text{red}} - v_{\text{blue}}$. After this stage, if $\Delta v_0 > 0$ (assuming positive velocity along the direction of red body in stage I and negative otherwise) the contact induces an impact force which starts at point A as shown in Fig. 2.1 and depends on the overlapping of bodies (indentation) $\delta$. This contact force is applied in both colliding bodies at the same time with the same magnitude but opposite direction. In addition, the indentation $\delta$ depending on time is increasing during the stages II and IV, where it reaches the maximum value $\delta_{\text{max}}$ and $\Delta v_0 = 0$ (stage IV) marked by point B in Fig. 2.1. From stage II to stage IV the indentation is increasing due to relative movement of bodies and this phase is known as compression phase. After reaching the point B characterized by the maximum
indentation $\delta_{\max}$ and relative velocity equal to zero, the indentation $\delta_1$ starts to decrease and bodies start to separate each other due to relative velocity becomes negative (stage V). However, the path to go from stage V to stage VI in Fig. 2.1 is not the same to go from stage II to stage IV due to energy dissipation. The phase characterized by stages V and VI where colliding bodies move in opposite directions (from point B to point A) is known as **restitution phase**. The relative velocity at stage VI, just after the impact, generally it is not the same than stage II what indicates that some amount of energy is lost during the impact. The energy dissipation can be in two principal forms, one is heat/sound and another one is permanent indentation. At low velocities of impact, the permanent indentation is negligible (Lankarani and Nikravesh 1994). It is quite common to neglect this permanent indentation for seismic pounding analysis between RC building therefore this assumption is taken for this study in the case of bridges. Therefore, the bodies start to separate to each other at stage VI with $\delta = 0$ (point A in Fig. 2.1). Finally, the bodies reach stage VII considering that impact finished. During impact, the area under the $F-\delta$ curve shows the energy dissipation what means that generally the final positions of bodies should not be the same than their positions before impact.

Table 2.1. Representation of impact between two spherical bodies at various stages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodies approaching. Compression phase is imminent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodies just before impact. Compression phase is imminent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$\delta_1$</td>
<td>General step during compression phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>$\delta_{\max}$</td>
<td>Maximum indentation during compression phase. Restitution phase is imminent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$\delta_1$</td>
<td>General step during restitution phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodies just after impact. Restitution phase finished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodies after separation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the foundations of the impact mechanics (Stronge 2000 and Goldsmith 2001), the fact that relative velocity of the colliding bodies just after the impact reflects the amount of energy dissipated during the process is the basis of several impact force models. This fact allows the use of coefficient of restitution to describe the amount of energy dissipated during the impact. Coefficient of restitution is defined as the ratio of final to initial relative velocity of bodies, which is essentially the ratio of relative velocities at stages VI and II.

### 2.2 Numerical Simulation of Impact

Impact between buildings and highway bridges is a complex process with non-linear damage and energy dissipation at the contact area of structures, such as local cracking, crushing, fracturing, friction and so on. Therefore, an accurate and rigorous numerical simulation is always difficult. Nevertheless, despite this complexity there are different methods and approaches to simplify the phenomenon in order to be able to deal with it.

On one hand, the stereomechanical approach is a macroscopic attempt to model impact according to the classical impact theory which assumes that the impact is instantaneous (the impact duration is negligibly small) and the laws of momentum and energy conservation are used to determine the post-impact velocities of colliding bodies (Stronge 2000, Goldsmith 2001 and Muthukumar and DesRoches 2005). Stereomechanical approach does not considered transient stress and deformation produced during the impact and only initial and final states of colliding bodies are of interest what means that bodies go from stage II to stage VI instantly (Fig 2.1(a), (b)). This approach is not widely utilized for pounding simulation due to its limitation to simulate the transient nature of impact properly and although the basic concept of this method is applicable for pounding problems, it is unsuited in finite element analysis in general. However, its formulation is easy because of involves minimum mathematical difficulties. This approach is based on coefficient of restitution \( r \) (Eq. 2.1) to simulate the amount of energy dissipated.
during the contact. The effect of impact is accounted for by adjusting the velocities of colliding bodies after the impact (Stronge 2000) as shown in Eq. (2.2).

\[
v_1^* = v_1 - (1 + r)\frac{m_2(v_1 - v_2)}{m_1 + m_2}, \quad v_2^* = v_2 + (1 - r)\frac{m_1(v_1 - v_2)}{m_1 + m_2}
\]

(2.1)

\[
r = \frac{v_1^* - v_2^*}{v_1 - v_2}
\]

(2.2)

where \(v_1^*\) and \(v_2^*\) are the velocities of colliding bodies with masses \(m_1\) and \(m_2\) after impact while \(v_1\) and \(v_2\) are the velocities of the same bodies before impact. According to the momentum conservation principle, the range of coefficient of restitution is \(0 \leq r \leq 1\), where \(r = 0\) indicates that the velocities of both bodies are the same and therefore the 100% of the energy has been dissipated during the impact while \(r = 1\) indicates that the relative velocities after impact are exactly the same than before impact what means that there is not energy dissipation during the impact. Note that \(v_1\) cannot be equal to \(v_2\) because in that case there would not be impact and therefore the coefficient of restitution is not defined. Moreover, since this model does not trace the structural response during the pounding and assumes that the impact duration is neglected, its application is limited to the analysis of pounding between two structures modeled as single-degree-of-freedom (SDOF) systems. In cases when the structures are modeled using multi-degrees-of-freedom (MDOF), the structural response within the contact interval is important. This is because when structural members rebound after collision, they may come into contact with other members.

On the other hand, the contact element approach is a force-based approach to model the impact where contact element is activated when impact occurs (Fig. 2.2(a)). Generally, contact elements are set up between two nodes \(i\) and \(j\) and when gap becomes zero the same pounding forces are applied in both nodes but with opposite directions. Unlike stereomechanical approach, contact element approach considers the transient nature of impact what make it suitable to be utilized in order to simulation pounding in structures with MDOF. Moreover, contact element approach is used most widely for seismic pounding simulation due to its clear physical meaning and simple algorithm as well as its implementation in commercial and open-source finite element programs (for example Jankowski et al. 1998 and 2000, Zhu et al. 2002 and 2004, Abdel Raheem 2009, Guo et al. 2009 and 2011, Polycarpou and Komodromos 2012 and Pant and Wijeyewickrema 2013). Typically, this approach uses spring elements, damping elements or their combination to simulation the pounding forces involved during the impact as well as the energy dissipation. Depending on the force-deformation relationship of these elements (springs, dashpots… etc), researchers have developed different types of contact elements that can be divided into two main categories: linear and non-linear models.
2.3 Existing Impact Force Models

This study is focused on contact element approach because of its range of applicability is higher than stereomechanical approach as it has been mentioned before. However, many different contact elements have been developed during the last years where the next contact element was the improvement of the previous one. Basically, all contact elements developed until now can be divided into linear and non-linear models. In addition, these contact elements are based on the overlap indentation $\delta$ between colliding bodies what does not have physical explanation. However, it is one of the main parameters used to compute the pounding forces between structures when pounding occurs. According to the two types of pounding considered in this study, unidirectional and bidirectional pounding, the existing impact force models presented from now can be modified to be used in bidirectional pounding too. Nevertheless, from the explanation point of view, the existing impact force models are presented for unidirectional pounding.

![Nodes at contact surfaces](image)

Fig. 2.2. (a) Simulation of impact as overlap-material and (b) contact element between impacting bodies.

2.3.1 Linear models

The two basic linear models are linear spring model and Kelvin-Voigt model. These models are the simplest models and where used in 1980s by the first time (for example, Wolf and Shrikerud 1980 and Anagnostopoulos 1988).

2.3.1.1 Linear spring model

Linear spring model can be considered the simplest model and it uses linear spring (Fig. 2.4(a)) to simulate the pounding force. Therefore, the impact force $F$ (Eq. 2.3) is directly proportional to the indentation $\delta$ and energy dissipation is not considered. This model is set up between two nodes $i$ and $j$ (Fig. 2.2(b)) and the current indentation $\delta$ is given by Eq. (2.4),

$$F = \begin{cases} k_s \delta & \delta > 0 \\ 0 & \delta \leq 0 \end{cases}, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\delta = u_i - u_j - d, \quad (2.4)$$

where $k_s$ is the stiffness of the spring, $d$ is the distance between nodes at rest (gap) and $u_i$ and $u_j$ are the displacement of nodes $i$ and $j$ respectively. Fig 2.4(a) shows this force-indentation relationship.
2.3.1.2 Kelvin-Voigt model

Kelvin-Voigt model is defined by linear spring and dashpot in parallel in order to simulate the energy dissipation during the contact (Fig. 2.4(b)). The pounding force $F$ between both bodies is given by,

$$F = \begin{cases} k_i \delta + c_i \dot{\delta} & \delta > 0 \\ 0 & \delta \leq 0 \end{cases},$$  

(2.5)

where $k_i$ is the stiffness of the spring, $\delta$ is the indentation defined in Eq. (2.4), $c_i$ is damping coefficient and $\dot{\delta}$ is the relative velocity of impact defined as,

$$\dot{\delta} = \dot{u}_i - \dot{u}_j,$$  

(2.6)

where $\dot{u}_i$ and $\dot{u}_j$ are the relative velocities of nodes $i$ and $j$ respectively. Note that the overdot denotes the derivation of the variable respect to the time. A typical impact force is shown in Fig. 2.4(b). The damping coefficient $c_i$ can be expressed in terms of the coefficient of restitution $r$ to indicate the amount of energy dissipated during the impact. Different researchers proposed an expression for the damping coefficient in the Kelvin-Voigt model. For example, Anagnostopoulos (1988 and 2004) proposed an expression of damping coefficient $c_i$ that was used by other researchers such as Zhu et al. (2002), Jankowski (2005) and Muthukumar and DesRoches (2006). Hence, the damping coefficient $c_i$ is related to coefficient of restitution $r$ by equating the energy losses during the impact,

$$c_i = 2\xi \sqrt{\frac{k_i m_1 m_2}{m_1 + m_2}},$$  

(2.7)

where $k_i$ is taken as axial stiffness of colliding bodies in absence of experimental results and $\xi$ is the damping ratio defined as follows (Fig. 2.3),

$$\xi = -\frac{\ln r}{\sqrt{\pi^2 + (\ln r)^2}},$$  

(2.8)

The disadvantage of Kelvin-Voigt model is that the viscous component is active with the same damping coefficient during the entire collision. This results in uniform dissipation during approach and restitution phases which is not consistent with reality (Goldsmith 2001). In addition, this model exhibits an initial jump of the impact forces upon contact due to the damping term. Therefore, these damping forces cause negative impact forces that pull the impacting bodies together during the restitution phase instead of pushing them apart. Furthermore, another limitation of the present Kelvin-Voigt model is related with relationship between $r$ and $\xi$. For a perfect plastic impact ($r = 0$), $\xi$ should tend to infinity and for a perfectly elastic impact ($r = 1$), $\xi$ should be equal to zero. However, when $r = 0$, $\xi \to 1$ (Eq. 2.8).
In order to avoid these drawbacks associated with Kelvin-Voigt model, at least four different modifications have been proposed until now by (a) Komodromos et al. (2007), (b) Mahmoud (2008), (c) Kun et al. (2009a) and (d) Pant and Wijeyewickrema (2010).

a) Komodromos et al. (2007) proposed a modification of Kelvin-Voigt model (Fig. 2.4(c)) to eliminate the tensile forces during detachment removing the spring and dashpot as soon as the impact forces become zero in the restitution phase (Eq. 2.9). The relationship between damping coefficient $c_l$ and damping ratio $\xi$ is the same as Anagnostopoulos (Eq. 2.7, 2.8). Hence, the main drawback of Kelvin-Voigt model is overcome. Nevertheless, there is still a permanent indentation when impact forces are equal to zero (Fig. 2.4(c)) and sudden jump of the impact force at the beginning of impact ($\delta = 0$). Therefore, allowing for the permanent indentation, the relationship between $\xi$ and $r$ should be changed.

$$F = \begin{cases} 
  k_l\delta + c_l\dot{\delta} & F > 0 \\
  0 & F \leq 0 
\end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

b) Mahmoud (2008) enhanced the work of Komodromos et al. (2007) eliminating the sticky tensile force just before separation of the colliding bodies (Eq. 2.10), one of the major shortcomings of this model and reassessed the relationship between $\xi$ and $r$ (Eq. 2.11) according to stereomechanical theory (Stronge 2000 and Goldsmith 2001). To do that, they considered that the major part of the energy is dissipated during the compression phase therefore dashpot is activated this phase and removed during restitution phase. However, after this improvement respect to the Komodromos et al. (2007) modification, the sudden jump at the beginning of impact is still in the model.

$$F = \begin{cases} 
  k_l\delta + c_l\dot{\delta} & \delta > 0, \dot{\delta} > 0 \quad \text{(Compression phase)} \\
  k_l\delta & \delta > 0, \dot{\delta} \leq 0 \quad \text{(Restitution phase)} \\
  0 & \delta \leq 0 
\end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

$$\xi = \frac{1 - r^2}{\pi r} \quad (2.11)$$

c) Kun et al. (2009) proposed a linear relationship respect to the indentation between damping ratio $\xi$ and damping coefficient $c_l$ (Eq. 2.12) in order to avoid the sudden jump at the beginning of impact. The determination of $\xi$ was done according to energy loss of the stereomechanical model. However the dashpot is activated during the whole impact and this fact does not avoid the sticky forces just after impact in all the cases. In Eq. (2.12) the relative velocity just before impact is denoted as $\dot{\delta}_0$.

$$c_l = \xi \delta; \quad \xi = \frac{3k_l(1-r)}{2r\dot{\delta}_0} \quad (2.12)$$
d) Pant and Wijeyewickrema (2010) presented a linear spring and dashpot in parallel (Fig. 2.4(d)) based on the assumption that the most part of the energy is dissipated during the compression phase (Eq. 2.13). The spring is activated throughout the contact (compression and restitution phases) while dashpot is only activated during the compression phase. Unlike the modification proposed by Kun et al. (2009a), the removal of dashpot from the entire restitution phase and the linear variation of damping coefficient $c_l$ respect to the indentation $\delta$, always ensures the elimination of tensile impact force and sudden jump at the beginning of impact. To do that, the authors reevaluated the relationship between the damping ratio $\xi$ and damping coefficient $c_l$ (Eq. 2.14) using the stereomechanical model according to these assumptions.

$$
F = \begin{cases} 
    k_i \delta + c_i \dot{\delta} & \delta > 0, \; \dot{\delta} > 0 \quad \text{(Compression phase)} \\
    k_i \delta & \delta > 0, \; \dot{\delta} \leq 0 \quad \text{(Restitution phase)} \\
    0 & \delta \leq 0 
\end{cases}
$$

(2.13)

$$
c_l = \xi \delta; \quad \xi = \frac{3k_i(1-r^2)}{2r^2 \dot{\delta}_0}
$$

(2.14)

Different damping ratios $\xi$ against coefficient of restitution $r$ are compared in Fig. 2.3. Note the progressive variation of damping ratios in order to model the energy dissipation properly. Although the ratio $k_i/\dot{\delta}_0$ is bigger than one generally, in the cases of Kun et al. (2009) and Pant and Wijeyewickrema (2010), this ratio has been taken equal to 1 to be able to draw the curves.

![Graph showing damping ratio vs. coefficient of restitution](image)

Fig. 2.3. Comparison between damping ratios for linear models developed by different researchers.
2.3.2 Non-linear models

The main non-linear models are (a) Hertz model, (b) Hertz model with non-linear dashpot (known also as Hertz damping model) and (c) non-linear viscoelastic model and are characterized by non-linear relationship between indentation and pounding force.

2.3.2.1 Hertz model

Hertz model is similar to linear spring model (Fig. 2.6(a)) unlike this model has non-linear spring to model pounding forces (Eq. 2.15). The use of Hertz contact law has an intuitive appeal in modeling pounding, since one would expect the contact area between the colliding bodies to increase as to the contact force increases. The impact force $F$ is defined as,

$$
F = \begin{cases} 
    k_h \delta^n & \delta > 0 \\
    0 & \delta \leq 0
\end{cases},
$$

(2.15)
where \( k_h \) is the stiffness of the non-linear spring defined by power \( n \) that typically is taken as \( 3/2 \) and \( \delta \) is the indentation defined in Eq. (2.4). As in the linear spring model, energy dissipation does not appear in this model.

### 2.3.2.2 Hertz damping model

Hertz damping model can be considered the improved version of Hertz model to be able to represent the energy dissipation (Fig. 2.6(b)). This enhanced Hertz model is used also in other fields of study such as robotics and multi-body systems (Lankarani and Nikravesh 1990). Muthukumar and DesRoches (2006) were the first researchers who utilized this method to study pounding simulation in buildings. The impact force \( F \) given by Hertz damping model is:

\[
F = \begin{cases} 
  k_h \delta^n + c_h \dot{\delta} & \text{if } \delta > 0 \\
  0 & \text{if } \delta \leq 0 
\end{cases}
\]

(2.16)

where \( k_h \) is the stiffness of the non-linear spring, \( n \) is typically taken as \( 3/2 \) and \( c_h \) is the non-linear damping coefficient proposed by Lankarani and Nikravesh (1994) and defined as follows (Fig. 2.5),

\[
c_h = \xi \delta^n, \quad \xi = \frac{3k_h (1 - r^2)}{4\delta_0}
\]

(2.17)

According to classical impact theory, \( r = 1 \) deals with the case of a perfect elastic impact and \( r = 0 \) deals with a perfect plastic impact what indicate that for a perfect elastic impact (\( r = 1 \)) the damping ratio \( \xi \) should be equal to zero and in the case of perfect plastic impact (\( r = 0 \)), the damping ratio \( \xi \) should tend to infinite. However, the results obtained from Eq. (2.17) are non consistent with the classic impact theory because of when \( r = 0 \) (perfect plastic impact), the damping ratio \( \xi \) does not tend to infinite (Eq. 2.18). This disagreement with the physical nature of pounding indicates that to use Eq. (2.17) is not accurate to evaluate impact forces.

\[
\begin{align*}
  r = 1 & \rightarrow \quad \xi = 0 \\
  r = 0 & \rightarrow \quad \xi = \frac{3k_h}{4\delta_0} \neq \infty 
\end{align*}
\]

(2.18)

Therefore, in order to avoid this shortcoming Kun et al. (2009b) modified the damping ratio \( \xi \) of the Hertz damping model as follows (Fig. 2.5),

\[
\xi = \frac{8k_h (1 - r)}{5r\delta_0}
\]

(2.19)

where the determination of the non-linear stiffness of the spring \( k_h \) is not obvious as Guo et al. (2012) concluded after doing a comparison between the theoretical value of \( k_h \) and its experimental value.
2.3.2.3 Non-linear viscoelastic model

Jankowski (2005) proposed a non-linear viscoelastic model based on Hertz’s contact law, including a non-linear dashpot in parallel with a non-linear spring during the compression phase while during the restitution phase the energy dissipation is neglected. The pounding force $F$ is defined as,

$$
F = \begin{cases} 
    k_h \delta^n + c_h \dot{\delta} & \delta > 0, \; \dot{\delta} > 0 \quad \text{(Compression phase)} \\
    k_h \delta^n & \delta > 0, \; \dot{\delta} \leq 0 \quad \text{(Restitution phase)} \\
    0 & \delta \leq 0
\end{cases},
$$

(2.20)

where $k_h$ is the stiffness of the non-linear spring, $n$ is typically taken as $3/2$ and $c_h$ is the non-linear damping coefficient defined by Jankowski (2005) as follows,

$$
c_h = 2\sqrt{\frac{k_h}{m_1 m_2}} \xi \sqrt{\delta} \frac{m_1 m_2}{m_1 + m_2},
$$

(2.21)

where $m_1$ and $m_2$ are the masses of the colliding bodies as defined in Eq. (2.7) and $\xi$ is the damping ratio defined by Jankowski (2006). Nevertheless, Jankowski (2006) proposed two different values of $\xi$ depending on the approximation function used to figure out $\xi$ (Fig. 2.5). The first and second approaches of the damping ratio $\xi$ are $\xi_1$ and $\xi_2$ respectively defined in Eq. (2.22). However, according to the numerical experiments carried out by Jankowski (2006), $\xi_2$ matches much better with these results.

$$
\xi_1 = \sqrt{\frac{5}{2\pi}} \frac{1 - r^2}{r}; \quad \xi_2 = \frac{9\sqrt{5}}{2} \frac{1 - r^2}{r (9\pi - 16) + 16}
$$

(2.22)

This model overcomes the drawbacks of Kelvin-Voigt model such as sudden jump and tensile forces at the beginning of impact. In addition, this impact model can produce more accurate results than linear models due to simulate the non-linear behavior of impact. However, the impact force-time curve obtained from this model does not vary smoothly between the approach and restitution phases. Moreover, as mentioned before, the determination of the stiffness of the non-linear spring $k_h$ and therefore the damping coefficient $c_h$, is a source of discussions among researchers when there are not experimental results as usual occurs (Guo et al. 2012).

Linear models are specially used to investigate the pounding response of structures due to its easy implementation in commercial and open-source programs as well as the evaluation of the parameters involved in those models. Hence, Kelvin-Voigt model is the most utilized linear model to study pounding in structures. Therefore, a modification of Kelvin-Voigt model based on the model proposed by Pant and Wijeyewickrema (2010) is presented.
As mentioned in section 1.3.2, most of the studies about pounding in bridges focused on unidirectional pounding due to contact points are known before contact, its easy formulation and implementation in FE programs and the fact that frictional forces are not involved. Nonetheless, unidirectional pounding cannot catch a real pounding response of bridge under any condition because of assumes that the ground motion propagates along bridge axis and this is not always true generally. Some researchers such as Zhu et al. (2002) and Guo et al. (2011) worked on bi-directional pounding in bridges. On one hand, in the case of Zhu et al. (2002), they developed a biaxial contact element considering friction and implemented it in a general-purpose analysis program DABS that can take into account non-linear response of the structure. Nevertheless, this proposed contact element cannot handle with non-linearities material during the contact. On the other hand, Guo et al. (2011) proposed a biaxial contact element quite similar to the element of Zhu et al. (2002) and used it to formulate system of equations of motions assuming 3-DOF per deck and linear elastic response. Nonetheless, the contact elements develops by Zhu et al. (2002) and Guo et al. (2011) use a constant damping coefficient to simulate...
energy dissipation that is known to produce unrealistic tensile forces between impacting bodies just before separation. This drawback was overcome, in the case of bidirectional pounding in buildings, by Pant and Wijeyewickrema (2013) using a modified Kelvin-Voigt model (Fig. 2.4(d)) in 2D which incorporates a variable damping coefficient $c$. This bidirectional impact model proposed by Pant and Wijeyewickrema in 2013 is an extension of the modified Kelvin-Voigt model for unidirectional pounding proposed by themselves in 2010. However, this bidirectional model was developed to be used between buildings and retaining walls so it cannot handle with impact bodies when both are moving at the same time. Therefore, a new contact element is needed for bridges in order to overcome this limitation and be able to model properly the deck behaviors under bidirectional ground motions.

### 2.4 Proposed Impact Force Model

A new biaxial contact element based on the element proposed by Pant and Wijeyewickrema (2013) is presented in order to overcome the drawbacks mentioned before. This proposed contact element assumes that the major part of the energy dissipation occurs during the compression phase along both directions (normal and tangential directions) as well as friction forces along tangential direction. To this end, the new biaxial contact element is presented by a linear spring and non-linear dashpot in parallel along normal and tangential directions and, in addition, it considers friction in tangential direction. The dashpot is only used during the compression phase in order to avoid the appearance of tensile forces between impacting bodies just before separation. In addition, the friction is governed by the well known Mohr-Coulomb’s law. Decks are modeled as shown in Fig. 2.7 and defined by four nodes per deck: $L_1$, $D_1$, $D_2$, $L_2$ for deck 1 and $R_1$, $R_2$, $A_2$, $A_1$ for deck 2, respectively.

![Fig. 2.7. Model for decks.](image)

Each deck has 3-DOF as shown in Fig. 2.7 where $x_i$ and $y_i$ are the displacements of mass center of deck $i$ along the global axes $X$ and $Y$, respectively. Furthermore, $\vartheta_i$ is the rigid rotation of deck $i$ (for $i = 1, 2$). Therefore, the displacement of any point belonging decks can be known given these three coordinates ($x_i$, $y_i$ and $\vartheta_i$). The lengths of deck 1 and 2 are $2a$ and $2c$ respectively while the common
width is $2b$. The gap at rest between both decks and deck-abutment is $d$ and is measured as the initial distance between adjacent decks along $X$-axis as shown Fig. 2.7. In addition, it is common to assume $X$-axis as longitudinal axis along bridge length at initial time.

The assumptions of the proposed biaxial contact element are:

I. Both decks are considered as rigid bodies in-plane therefore the problem is governed by 3-DOF per deck.

II. Decks must have polygonal shape defined by straight lines between nodes.

III. The initial gap $d$ is defined between two parallel decks.

IV. Only the corner nodes of the attack deck ($L_1$, $L_2$ and $R_1$, $R_2$) can impact the target deck.

V. Friction is only involved along tangential direction.

VI. Vertical component $Z$ is not considered.

The assumption I indicates that there are not deformations of decks after an impact. Although this new contact element allows to change the deck shape in each iteration, it is not a realistic response of decks under seismic excitations (assumption II). Generally bridge decks are modeled using four straight lines per deck (Fig. 2.7), however for curved bridges may be interesting to be able to model a curved deck with a polygonal line to match better the shape of deck to the reality. Although the gap distance changes during the earthquake event, the initial gap $d$ must be defined when both decks are parallel as usual in common engineering practice (assumption III). As consequence of assumption I, assumption IV is quite obvious, however, it is necessary to assume it during the implementation of the model in order to avoid numerical errors. Finally, friction forces are only possible along tangential direction of decks and vertical component $Z$ is neglected in the mathematical model. It only considers bidirectional motion within $X-Y$ plane. Linear springs and non-linear dashpots in both direction as well as friction along tangential direction are depicted in Fig. 2.8.

Fig. 2.8. Sketch of the proposed contact element with linear springs and non-linear dashpots in both directions and friction in tangential direction.

Where $k_N$ and $k_T$ are the normal impact stiffness in normal and tangential direction of the linear springs; $c_N$ and $c_T$ are the damping coefficient of the non-linear dashpots in normal and tangential directions and $\mu$ is the coefficient of friction along tangential direction.
2.4.1 Mathematical formulation

The formulation of the proposed contact element is based on the contact element developed by Pant and Wijeyewickrema (2013). When impact occurs, the modulus of the pounding forces in normal direction $F_N$ (along local $x$-axis) and tangential direction $F_T$ (along local $y$-axis) are given as,

$$F_N = \begin{cases} k_N |\Delta u_N| + c_N |\Delta \dot{u}_N|, & \text{(compression phase)} \\ k_N |\Delta u_N|, & \text{(restitution phase)} \end{cases},$$

$$F_T = \begin{cases} k_T |\Delta u_T| + c_T |\Delta \dot{u}_T|, & |F_T| \leq \mu_i |F_N| \\ \mu_k |F_N|, & |F_T| > \mu_i |F_N| \end{cases},$$

(2.23) (2.24)

where $|\Delta u_N|$ and $|\Delta u_T|$ are the modulus of the relative displacement at the contact points in the normal and tangential directions defined by the normalized vectors $n_i$ and $v_i$ (Eq. 2.25 and 2.26) respectively as depicted in Fig. 2.9. The coefficients of static and kinetic friction are $\mu_s$ and $\mu_k$, respectively. The relative displacement is evaluated as $\Delta u = u_2 - u_1$ where $u_i$ is the displacement of contact point that belongs to deck $i$ (for $i = 1, 2$). The overdot denotes the derivation respect to the time. Therefore, $\Delta \dot{u}_N$ and $\Delta \dot{u}_T$ (Eq. 2.27) are the relative velocities between the contact points between attack and target deck.

$$n_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(x_{2L} - x_{2L})^2 + (y_{2L} - y_{2L})^2}} \left(1, - \frac{x_{1L} - x_{2L}}{y_{1L} - y_{2L}}\right); \quad n_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(x_{2R} - x_{2R})^2 + (y_{2R} - y_{2R})^2}} \left(-1, \frac{x_{1R} - x_{2R}}{y_{1R} - y_{2R}}\right)$$

$$v_1 = \frac{(x_{1L} - x_{2L}, y_{1L} - y_{2L})}{\sqrt{(x_{1L} - x_{2L})^2 + (y_{1L} - y_{2L})^2}}; \quad v_2 = \frac{(x_{1R} - x_{2R}, y_{1R} - y_{2R})}{\sqrt{(x_{1R} - x_{2R})^2 + (y_{1R} - y_{2R})^2}}$$

(2.25) (2.26)

Where $x_k$ and $y_k$ are the global coordinates (respect to the global reference system XOY) of node $k$ (for $k = L_1, L_2, R_1$ and $R_2$). The normal and tangential components of the relative displacement $\Delta u$ (Eq. 2.27) and the relative velocity $\Delta \dot{u}$ (Eq. 2.28) respect to the deck $i$ (defined by $n_i$) are computed using the scalar product respect to the $n_i$ and then applying the Pythagoras’ theorem (Fig. 2.9),

$$|\Delta u_N| = |\Delta u| \cdot \cos \alpha = |\Delta u| \cdot |n_i| \cdot \cos \alpha = |\Delta u \cdot n_i|$$

$$|\Delta u_T| = \sqrt{|\Delta u|^2 - |\Delta u_N|^2} = |\Delta u \cdot v_i|$$

(2.27)

$$|\Delta \dot{u}_N| = |\Delta \dot{u}| \cdot \cos \beta = |\Delta \dot{u}| \cdot |n_i| \cdot \cos \beta = |\Delta \dot{u} \cdot n_i|$$

$$|\Delta \dot{u}_T| = \sqrt{|\Delta \dot{u}|^2 - |\Delta \dot{u}_N|^2} = |\Delta \dot{u} \cdot v_i|$$

(2.28)
where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are the angles between $\mathbf{n}_1$ and $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ as well as $\mathbf{n}_2$ and $\Delta \mathbf{u}$, respectively. Note that the $x$ component of $\mathbf{n}_1$ and $\mathbf{n}_2$ are always positive and negative respectively while $\theta_i \in [-90, 90]$ degrees. This is a reasonable enough hypothesis in the case of bridges because it would not be logic to have deck rotations about up to few degrees. In addition, the normalized normal vectors $\mathbf{n}_i$ are defined to be always outwards respecting to the deck $i$. Fig 2.9 represents the relative displacements of two different periodic times (contact point 1 and 2) when the target deck is deck 1 and attack deck is deck 2 (Fig. 2.9(a)) and the when the target deck is deck 2 and attack deck is deck 1 (Fig. 2.9(b)). Note that by analogy, Fig. 2.9 can be also used to depict the relative velocities in both local directions defined by $\mathbf{n}_i$ and $\mathbf{v}_i$.

![Diagram](image)

Fig. 2.9. Relative displacements along local normal ($\mathbf{n}_i$) and local tangential ($\mathbf{v}_i$) direction when (a) deck 1 is target deck and deck 2 is attack deck and when (b) deck 2 is target deck and deck 1 is attack deck.

The damping coefficients $c_N$ and $c_T$ are the damping coefficients respecting normal and tangential direction, respectively. According to Pant and Wijeyewickrema (2013), the damping coefficients are defined as,

$$
c_N = \frac{3k_N (1 - r_N^2)}{2|\Delta \mathbf{u}_{\Delta N}| |\Delta \mathbf{u}_N|}; \quad c_T = \frac{3k_T (1 - r_T^2)}{2|\Delta \mathbf{u}_{\Delta T}| |\Delta \mathbf{u}_T|},
$$

where $|\Delta \mathbf{u}_{\Delta N}|$ and $|\Delta \mathbf{u}_{\Delta T}|$ are the modulus of the relative velocities between contact points just before the impact along normal and tangential directions, respectively. Moreover, the coefficient of restitutions in normal and tangential direction are $r_N$ and $r_T$, respectively. Hence, once the mathematical formulation is proposed and the parameters involved in the contact element are defined, it is necessary to determine
what occurs when there is impact and when impact takes place. Therefore, when there is impact, normal and tangential pounding forces (Eq. 2.23 and 2.24) are applied between decks with the same magnitude and opposite directions as depicted in Fig. 2.10. The directions of the pounding forces are given by the normal \( \mathbf{n}_i \) and tangential \( \mathbf{v}_i \) vectors of the deck which receives the impact (target deck).

Regarding when impact occurs, on one hand there are two potential contact nodes per deck. These potential contact nodes are the only nodes that may touch the opposite deck as explained in assumption IV. In the case of deck 1, the potential contact nodes that may touch deck 2 are \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) while the potential contact nodes of deck 2 are \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \). Therefore, only four different contacts are allowed as shown in Fig. 2.11.

![Fig. 2.10.](image)

Fig. 2.10. (a) Representation of pounding when L2 is the attack node and deck 2 is the target deck showing (b) the normal (\( F_N \)) and tangential (\( F_T \)) forces involved during the impact.

![Fig. 2.11.](image)

Fig. 2.11. Contact between (a) \( L_1 \) and deck 2, (b) \( R_1 \) and deck 1, (c) \( L_2 \) and deck 2 and (d) \( R_2 \) and deck 1.
The overlap area (known also as indentation region) that can be noticed in Fig. 11 when impact occurs does not have physical meaning but it is used for the contact elements to compute the pounding forces (Fig. 2.12). The area of the indentation region can be used to formulate different equations to compute the pounding forces as Polycarpou and Komodromos (2012) proposed. However, this is not the purpose of this study (see Polycarpou et al. 2013).

On the other hand, in order to detect the contact it is needed to define the contact conditions. Hence, the contact conditions for each type of contact depicted in Fig. 2.11 (a, b, c and d) are given by Eq. (2.30 a, b, c and d), respectively. Therefore, considering these four possibilities of contact between decks shown in Fig. 2.11, the contact occurs when attack node belongs to the inner region of the target deck defined by the closest two edges to the point of impact as depicted in Fig. 2.13.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(a)} \quad x_{L_1} & \geq m_2 \left(y_{L_1} - y_{R_1}\right) + x_{R_1}, \\
y_{L_1} & \leq m_5 \left(x_{L_1} - x_{R_1}\right) + y_{R_1}, \\
\text{(b)} \quad x_{R_1} & \leq m_1 \left(y_{R_1} - y_{L_1}\right) + x_{L_1}, \\
y_{R_1} & \leq m_3 \left(x_{R_1} - x_{L_1}\right) + y_{L_1}, \\
\text{(c)} \quad x_{L_2} & \geq m_2 \left(y_{L_2} - y_{R_2}\right) + x_{R_2}, \\
y_{L_2} & \geq m_6 \left(x_{L_2} - x_{R_2}\right) + y_{R_2}, \\
\text{(d)} \quad x_{R_2} & \leq m_1 \left(y_{R_2} - y_{L_2}\right) + x_{L_2}, \\
y_{R_2} & \geq m_4 \left(x_{R_2} - x_{L_2}\right) + y_{L_2}, \\
\end{align*}
\]  

Where \(m_j\) (for \(j = 1, 6\)) are the slopes of the straight lines defined by corner nodes \(L_1, D_1, D_2, L_2, R_1, R_2, A_2\) and \(A_1\) (Fig. 2.7) linked two by two and given in Eq. (2.31). Note that the denominators cannot become equal to zero due to how the nodes are located as well as the assumption that the both rotations would be \(\theta \in [-90, 90]\) as mentioned according to the common engineering practice. Furthermore, note that it is considered contact since the attack node belong to the edge of the target deck (\(\leq, \geq\)) and not only when there is overlap material (\(<, >\)).
When there is contact, the displacement and velocity of the attack node are always known in each time step because of the corner nodes of decks are inputs for the contact element. However, the contact point \((\mathbf{x}_C)\) that belongs to the target deck does not coincide with any corner deck generally. Therefore, a linear interpolation is needed in order to figure out the displacement and velocity of the contact point belonging to the target deck (Fig. 2.14). In addition, despite this target contact point \((\mathbf{x}_C)\) can be only defined at the instant of time of contact exactly due to after the first contact the indentation region starts growing and the initial contact point disappears, it is considered that remains the same point during the whole impact as depicted in Fig. 2.15. This initial contact point is defined by the distance \(l_C\) (Eq. 2.32) taken as the straight distance from the node \(L_2\) and the contact point given for deck 1 and the distance from \(R_2\) and contact point for deck 2 respectively given by Eq. 2.30. This distance \(l_C\) remains constant during the contact however it updates for each different impact. According to \(l_C\) and using a linear interpolation, the displacement and velocity of the target contact point is computed (Eq. 2.33).

\[
\begin{align*}
m_1 &= \frac{x_{L_1} - x_{L_2}}{y_{L_1} - y_{L_2}}, & m_2 &= \frac{x_{R_1} - x_{R_2}}{y_{R_1} - y_{R_2}}, & m_3 &= \frac{y_{L_1} - y_{D_1}}{x_{L_1} - x_{D_1}}, \\
m_4 &= \frac{y_{L_2} - y_{D_2}}{x_{L_2} - x_{D_2}}, & m_5 &= \frac{y_{R_1} - y_{A_1}}{x_{R_1} - x_{A_1}}, & m_6 &= \frac{y_{R_2} - y_{A_2}}{x_{R_2} - x_{A_2}},
\end{align*}
\]  

(2.31)

\[
\begin{align*}
x &= m_1(y - y_{L_1}) + x_{L_1} \\
y &= m_5(x - x_{R_1}) + y_{R_1} \\
x &= m_2(y - y_{R_2}) + x_{R_2} \quad \text{or} \quad y = m_3(x - x_{L_2}) + y_{L_2}
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 2.13. Example of pounding when attack node is \(L_2\) and deck 2 is the target deck showing the equations of the straight lines that define both decks.

\[
\begin{align*}
l_{C}^{\text{Deck 1}} &= \sqrt{(x_{L_2} - x_C)^2 + (y_{L_2} - y_C)^2} \\
l_{C}^{\text{Deck 2}} &= \sqrt{(x_{R_2} - x_C)^2 + (y_{R_2} - y_C)^2}
\end{align*}
\]  

(2.32)
Fig. 2.14. Illustration of linear interpolation for deck 1 (target deck) when $R_2$ is attack node where (a) it represents all components of displacements, (b) $x$ components and (c) $y$ components of displacements.

Hence, when impact occurs between deck 2 (attack deck) and deck 1 (target deck), the displacements ($u_C$) and velocities ($\dot{u}_C$) of the contact point $x_C$ are given by Eq. (2.33) while when impact occurs between deck 1 (attack deck) and deck 2 (target deck), the displacements and velocities of $x_C$ are given by Eq. (2.34). By analogy, Fig. 2.14 can be also used to plot interpolated velocities of contact point $x_C$.

\begin{align}
    x_C &= (x_{t_1} - x_{t_2}) \frac{L_C}{2b} + x_{t_2}; \\
    y_C &= (y_{t_1} - y_{t_2}) \frac{L_C}{2b} + y_{t_2}; \\
    x_C &= (x_{r_1} - x_{r_2}) \frac{L_C}{2b} + x_{r_2}; \\
    y_C &= (y_{r_1} - y_{r_2}) \frac{L_C}{2b} + y_{r_2}; \\
    \dot{x}_C &= (\dot{x}_{t_1} - \dot{x}_{t_2}) \frac{L_C}{2b} + \dot{x}_{t_2}; \\
    \dot{y}_C &= (\dot{y}_{t_1} - \dot{y}_{t_2}) \frac{L_C}{2b} + \dot{y}_{t_2}; \\
    \dot{x}_C &= (\dot{x}_{r_1} - \dot{x}_{r_2}) \frac{L_C}{2b} + \dot{x}_{r_2}; \\
    \dot{y}_C &= (\dot{y}_{r_1} - \dot{y}_{r_2}) \frac{L_C}{2b} + \dot{y}_{r_2};
\end{align}

(2.33) 

(2.34)

Fig. 2.15. Representation of a typical impact between deck 1 (attack deck) and deck 2 (target deck) at different time steps.
Note that the contact point characterized by Eq. 2.32 remains the same during the whole impact in Fig. 2.15. Nevertheless, the displacements $u_i$ and $u_2$ as well as the velocities $\dot{u}_i$ and $\dot{u}_2$ change at each time step $t = t^{(n)}$ because of the pounding forces applied in those nodes (attack and target node), where $N$ is the number of iterations computed during the whole simulation. The displacements $u_i$ and velocities $\dot{u}_i$ are calculated at each time step as the difference in global coordinates between the current coordinates of the attack and target nodes at time step $t^{(n+1)}$ and the previous one at $t^{(n)}$.

$$u_i^{(n+1)} = x_j^{(n+1)} - x_j^{(n)},$$

For $i = 1, 2$. $j = L_1, L_2, R_1, R_2$. $n = 1, N$. \hspace{1cm} (2.35)

Hence, the relative displacement and velocity, by analogy, are computed as (Fig. 2.16),

$$\Delta u^{(n)} = x_p^{(n)} - x_s^{(n)},$$

For $p = R_1, R_2, C$. $s = L_1, L_2, C$. ($p \neq s$). $n = 1, N$. \hspace{1cm} (2.36)

where $C$ is the contact point that can belong to deck 1 or deck 2 depending on the type of contact explained in Fig. 2.11. Note that nodes $p$ and $s$ cannot be contact nodes at the same time because it is not allowed in the code. Therefore, when there is overlap between attack nodes the code removes the pounding forces of one of them and only consider one attack node in order to avoid to apply the pounding forces twice as is exposed in section 2.4.2. In addition, the global coordinates of nodes $L_1, L_2, R_1, R_2$ as well as its velocities are known in each time step and provided by the code. However, the global coordinates and velocities of the contact point are given by Eq. (2.33) and Eq. (2.34) as mentioned before.

![Fig. 2.16. Illustration of relative displacement when deck 2 is attack deck and deck 1 is target deck at time $t^{(n)}$.](image)
Regarding the phases of contact, unlike the case of unidirectional pounding where the relative velocity along direction of earthquake is used directly to know the type of phase of the contact, in the case of bidirectional pounding this process is not obvious. On one hand, the compression and restitution phase must be defined in a different way for both decks due to each deck is defined by a normalized normal vector $\mathbf{n}$ that changes in each time step and are different by definition because the $x$ component of $\mathbf{n}_1$ is always positive while the $x$ component of $\mathbf{n}_2$ is always negative (Eq. 2.25). On the other hand, the direction of the relative velocity must be computed in order to detect in what type of phase the contact is. To this end, the scalar product between the relative velocity $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ and normalized normal vector $\mathbf{n}$ are used. Hence, this study proposes the following phase condition as shown in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2. Conditions for the identification of compression and restitution phases depending on the attack deck.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attack deck</th>
<th>Deck 1</th>
<th>Deck 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compression phase</td>
<td>$\Delta \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}_2 &gt; 0$</td>
<td>$\Delta \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}_1 &lt; 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restitution phase</td>
<td>$\Delta \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}_2 \leq 0$</td>
<td>$\Delta \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}_1 \geq 0$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the definition of $\mathbf{n}_1$, $\mathbf{n}_2$ and $\Delta \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{\dot{u}}_2 - \mathbf{\dot{u}}_1$ given in Eq. (2.25) and Eq. (2.36) respectively, two different cases are considered depending on the attack deck. In the case of deck 1 as attack deck, the compression phase is considered when the normal component of the relative velocity $\Delta \mathbf{u}_N$ is aligned with $\mathbf{n}_2$ and restitution phase otherwise (Fig. 2.17(a), (c)). In the case of deck 2 as attack deck, the restitution phase is considered when the normal component of the relative velocity $\Delta \mathbf{u}_N$ is either aligned with $\mathbf{n}_1$ or equal to zero and compression phase otherwise (Fig. 2.17(b), (d)).

Fig. 2.17. (a) Compression and (b) restitution phase when attack deck is deck 1 and 2 respectively. (c) Restitution and (d) compression phase when attack deck is deck 1 and 2 respectively.
Sign convention of normal pounding force $F_N$ is defined by the normalized normal vector $n_i$ of target deck while sign convention of tangential pounding force $F_T$ is defined by the relative $\Delta u_T$ and $v_i$. On one hand, the normal pounding force $F_N$ is always a compression force due to the nature of impact and therefore opposite to the onwards normal vectors (Fig. 2.10) as defined in Eq. (2.37) and according to the normal vector of the target deck. On the other hand, the tangential pounding force $F_T$ depends on the attack deck therefore there are two different sign conditions following the same analogy of the identification of the phase (Fig. 2.17). However, $F_T$ always is aligned with $v_i$ of the target deck. The direction of the tangential pounding force $F_T$ at attack node is given by Eq. (2.38). By equilibrium, the normal and tangential pounding forces have the same value and opposite direction in the target deck. Normal pounding force $F_N$ and tangential pounding force $F_T$ in Eq. (2.37) and Eq. (2.38) are defined for the attack node where the modulus of $F_N$ and $F_T$ are given in Eq. (2.23) and Eq. (2.24), respectively.

$$F_N = -|F_N| n_i \quad \forall \text{ Attack node, } i = \text{ Target deck} \quad (2.37)$$

$$F_T = |F_T| v_2 \quad \Delta u \cdot v_2 > 0 \quad \text{Attack node } L_1 \text{ and } L_2 \text{ (deck 1)}$$

$$F_T = |F_T| v_1 \quad \Delta u \cdot v_1 < 0 \quad \text{Attack node } R_1 \text{ and } R_2 \text{ (deck 2)} \quad (2.38)$$

In order to clarify the sign convention, Fig. 2.18 presents two typical impacts of the four potential contact nodes $L_1, L_2, R_1, R_2$. It is important to note that the Eq. (2.37) and Eq. (2.38) are the pounding forces applied in the attack node and therefore these forces have opposite sign in the target deck.

![Fig. 2.18. Sign convention when (a) deck 1 is attack deck and (b) when deck 2 is attack deck.](image)
As mentioned in section 1.3.2, the contact point in the target deck during bidirectional pounding is unknown before the impact. In addition, the decks are modeled by four corner nodes per deck as depicted in Fig. 2.7 therefore, the probability that the contact point does not coincide with one of the input points is very high. Taking into account that in FEM the forces only can be applied in a given node, it is necessary to remove the pounding forces from its original location \((F_{N}^{O}, F_{T}^{O})\) to an input node \((F_{N}, F_{T})\). To his end, it is assumed that the distance \(h_{p}\) (for \(p = 1, 2\)) that defines the contact point and depends on the attack node (Fig. 2.19) is much smaller than the deck width \(2b\) (\(h_{p} << 2b\)). Considering that there are two sets of potential contact nodes such as upper nodes \((L_{1}, L_{2})\) and bottom nodes \((R_{1}, R_{2})\), these are linked two by two between \(L_{i}\) and \(R_{i}\) (Fig. 2.19). Hence,

- When node \(L_{1}\) is attack node the pounding forces of the target deck are relocated at node \(R_{1}\) (Fig 2.19(a)).
- When node \(L_{2}\) is attack node the pounding forces of the target deck are relocated at node \(R_{2}\) (Fig. 2.19(b)).
- When node 1/20 is attack node the pounding forces of the target deck are relocated at node \(L_{1}\) (Fig. 2.19(c)).
- When node \(R_{2}\) is attack node the pounding forces of the target deck are relocated at node \(L_{2}\) (Fig. 2.19(d)).

The distance \(h_{p}\) is defined as \(h_{1} = 2b - l_{C}\) when \(L_{1}\) and \(R_{1}\) are attack nodes and as \(h_{2} = l_{C}\) when \(L_{2}\) and \(R_{2}\) are attack nodes where \(l_{C}\) is the distance from the bottom nodes to the contact point (Eq. 2.32).

Fig. 2.19. Relocation of pounding forces when the attack node is (a) node \(L_{1}\), (b) node \(L_{2}\), (c) node \(R_{1}\) and (d) node \(R_{2}\).
In fact, this assumption \((h_p \ll 2b)\) only affects the normal forces in terms of an increment of moment \(\Delta M\) applied in the mass center of the target deck (Eq. 2.39). However, since \(h_p\) is generally few centimeters in the worse scenario (under strong ground motion and both deck vibrating completely out-of-phase), a deck width of a common highway bridge measures at least several meters depending on the number of lanes (see Fig. 1.15(b) as example). Therefore, there is at least one order of magnitude less. This fact as well as the short period of time of the impact and the high torsional stiffness of the bearings (see section 3.2) legitimize this assumption. In addition, this assumption was taken in order to simplify the implementation of the contact element as explained in section 2.4.2.

\[
|\Delta M| = |F_N|h_p
\]  

(2.39)

Moreover, this increment of the moment \(\Delta M\) is directly proportional to the normal pounding force that depends on the normal impact stiffness \(k_N\). According to Guo et al. (2012), the uncertainty about \(k_N\) is very high and only can be assessed with certain reliability after carrying out several experiments in the laboratory. These kind of pounding experiments are completely unusual in the common engineering practice. Pounding forces are only relocated in one node because of implementation reasons. On one hand, the whole behavior of both decks during the impact can be modeled through four potential contact nodes \((L_1, L_2, R_1, R_2)\) and only these nodes receive the pounding forces as mentioned before. On the other hand, the proposed contact element was defined to set up between two different nodes \(i\) and \(j\) as depicted in Fig. 2.8. Therefore, four different contact elements are used in order to model all the possible pounding forces easily. The contact elements are set up between \(L_1\) and \(R_1\), \(R_1\) and \(L_1\), \(L_2\) and \(R_2\) as well as between \(R_2\) and \(L_2\) using the local \(x\) and \(y\)-axis shown in Fig. 2.20(a), (b), (c) and (d) respectively, where the red rectangle indicates the attack node.

![Fig. 2.20. Definition and location of the local axis \(x\) and \(y\) for (a) contact element 1, (b) contact element 2, (c) contact element 3 and (d) contact element 4 indicating the attack node with a red rectangle.](image-url)
2.4.2 Numerical implementation

The new contact element known as NCM3D (New Contact Material 3-Dimensional) has been implemented in OpenSees (Open System for Earthquake Engineering Simulation). OpenSees is an object-oriented open-source software framework developed at University of California, Berkeley (OpenSees 2014) and is based on Finite Element Method (FEM). It has modular structure where each modulus can be an uniaxial materials, ND materials, elements, sections... etc. Opensees was selected as software to implement NCM3D because of its powerful tools for non-linear analysis earthquake and because it is open-source framework. On one hand, unlike SAP 2000, ABAQUS or ANSYS, OpenSees does not possess GUI (Graphical User Interface) as shown in Fig. 2.21 and the scripts simulations have to be programmed in TCL (Tool Command Language) and then running them into OpenSees directly. On the one hand, OpenSees allows the user to implement a new element using different programming languages such as C, FORTRAN or C++. In this study, C++ was chosen as programming language due to its object-oriented capabilities to deal with real time problems.

Microsoft Visual Studio Ultimate 2010 is the IDE (Integrated Development Environment) used to implement NCM3D in OpenSees. In object-oriented programming, the concepts of Class and Object are very important. A Class is a user-defined data type and an object is an instance of a type (Overland 2005). Therefore, in order to implement NCM3D, it is necessary to create a new element class for it. This new class can be divided into two main files, the file with .h extension and the file with .cpp extension. Both files must have the same name than the new class, therefore they are called NCM3D.h and NCM3D.cpp. Hence, NCM3D.h defines the class and the variables used throughout the whole class and NCM3D.cpp implements the algorithms that characterized the new class. Both files, NCM3D.h and NCM3D.cpp, are given in Appendix A. Here NCM3D.cpp is discussed in detail.

Taking into account that the proposed contact element NCM3D can only be set up between two nodes (Fig. 2.8) and there are four potential contact nodes when two decks are modeled as shown in Fig. 2.7, the source code of NCM3D is divided into four different parts depending on the attack node that wants to model (Fig. 2.20) known as $WID = j$ (for $j=1,4$), where $j$ is the contact element that defines.
The first part of the code is characterized by the attack node $L_1$ (Fig. 2.20(a)) and known as $WID = 1$. The second part of the code is characterized by attack node $R_1$ (Fig. 2.20(b)) and known as $WID = 2$. The third part of the code is characterized by attack node $L_2$ (Fig. 2.20(c)) and known as $WID = 3$. Finally, the fourth part of the code is characterized by attack node $R_2$ (Fig. 2.20(d)). The differences between these different parts of the code are minimum as explained in section 2.4.1, being the main difference the contact condition for each $WID$ defined by Eq. (2.30).

```c
if (WID == 1) {
    (Main code of contact element 1)
} else if (WID == 2) {
    (Main code of contact element 2)
} else if (WID == 3) {
    (Main code of contact element 3)
} else if (WID == 4) {
    (Main code of contact element 4)
}
```

The basic flowchart of the main part of the code for each contact element at each time step is as follows,
I. **Step I.** The normalized normal and tangential vectors \( \mathbf{n}_i, \mathbf{v}_i \) are computed (Eq. 2.25 and Eq. 2.26) as well as the six slopes \( m_k \) (Eq. 2.31) in each time step.

```c
// NORMAL OF DECK 1
double NormN1 = sqrt(pow((xL(0)-xL2(0))/(xL(1)-xL2(1)),2.0)+1);
n1(0) = 1/NormN1;
n1(1) = -((xL(0)-xL2(0))/(xL(1)-xL2(1)))/NormN1;

// NORMAL OF DECK 2
double NormN2 = sqrt(pow((xR(0)-xR2(0))/(xR(1)-xR2(1)),2.0)+1);
n2(0) = -1/NormN2;
n2(1) = (xR(0)-xR2(0))/(xR(1)-xR2(1))/NormN2;

// TANGENTIAL Vector of DECK 1 (From L2 to L)
double NormV1 = sqrt(pow(xL(0)-xL2(0),2.0)+pow(xL(1)-xL2(1),2.0));
v1(0) = (xL(0)-xL2(0))/NormV1;
v1(1) = (xL(1)-xL2(1))/NormV1;

// TANGENTIAL Vector of DECK 2 (From R2 to R)
double NormV2 = sqrt(pow(xR(0)-xR2(0),2.0)+pow(xR(1)-xR2(1),2.0));
v2(0) = (xR(0)-xR2(0))/NormV2;
v2(1) = (xR(1)-xR2(1))/NormV2;
```

// Defining parameters

// Slopes of the straight lines

\[ m_1 = v1(0)/v1(1); \]
\[ m_2 = v2(0)/v2(1); \]
\[ m_3 = (xL(1)-xD(1))/(xL(0)-xD(0)); \]
\[ m_4 = (xL2(1)-xD2(1))/(xL2(0)-xD2(0)); \]
\[ m_5 = (xR(1)-xA(1))/(xR(0)-xA(0)); \]
\[ m_6 = (xR2(1)-xA2(1))/(xR2(0)-xA2(0)); \]

II. **Step II.** Before knowing if there is impact or not, the length \( l_c \) (Eq. 2.32) between the bottom nodes \( (L_2, R_2) \) and the velocity of the potential contact point is computing each time step in order to figure out the relative velocity just before impact \( \Delta \mathbf{u}_0 \). \( l_c \) and \( \Delta \mathbf{u}_0 \) are saved each time step when there is not impact and used immediately after when it is impact in order to calculate the relative displacement, relative velocities of the contact node \( x_c \) through linear interpolation (Eq. 2.33 and Eq. 2.34 respectively) and the damping coefficients (Eq. 2.29). Although the code below corresponds with \( WID=1 \), the calculus for the other contact elements are exactly the same by analogy.
// There is no contact
kvaluen = cvaluen = kvaluet = cvaluet = 0.0;

// Distance from node R to the contact point belonging deck 2
lkL0 = sqrt(pow(xL(0) - xR(0), 2.0) + pow(xL(1) - xR(1), 2.0));

// Relative velocity in X direction
IncrVelL0(0) = (velNdR2(0) - velNdR(0)) * (lkL0/NormV2) + velNdR(0) - velNdL(0);

// Relative velocity in Y direction
IncrVelL0(1) = (velNdR2(1) - velNdR(1)) * (lkL0/NormV2) + velNdR(1) - velNdL(1);

if (abs(IncrVelL0(0)) < 1.0E-21) {
    IncrVelL0(0) = 1.0E-21;  // a very small value for velocity if the vel. is zero (for convergence issues)
}
if (abs(IncrVelL0(1)) < 1.0E-21) {
    IncrVelL0(1) = 1.0E-21;  // a very small value for velocity if the vel. is zero (for convergence issues)
}

// WID = 1
// check for pounding condition
if ((xL(0) >= m2*(xL(1) - xR(1)) + xR(0)) && (xL(1) <= m5*(xL(0) + xR(0)) + xR(1))) {

// WID = 2
// check for pounding condition
if ((xR(0) <= m1*(xR(1) - xL(1)) + xL(0)) && (xR(1) <= m3*(xR(0) - xL(0)) + xL(1))) {

// WID = 3
// check for pounding condition
if ((xL2(0) >= m2*(xL2(1) - xR(1)) + xR(0)) && (xL2(1) >= m6*(xL2(0) - xR2(0)) + xR2(1))) {

// WID = 4
// check for pounding condition
if ((xR2(0) <= m1*(xR2(1) - xL(1)) + xL(0)) && (xR2(1) >= m4*(xR2(0) - xL2(0)) + xL2(1))) {

III. Step III. This is the key point that distinguishes each contact element according to Eq. (2.30). Each contact element is characterized by a double contact condition given by the semi space defined by the corner nodes of the decks (Fig. 2.7). These contact conditions are independent between them and located in a different part of the code. However, in order to summarize them in the same step, these conditions are given together as,
IV. **Step IV.** Once the contact element detects pounding though the contact conditions (Eq. 2.30), this part of the code generates all the parameters needed to calculate the normal and tangential pounding forces $F_N$ and $F_T$ respectively, as well as the sign of these forces (Eq. 2.37 and Eq. 2.38). First of all, the code computes the global coordinates and the velocity of the contact point belonging to the target deck at each time step according to the linear interpolation given in Eq. (2.33) and Eq. (2.34). Then, the relative displacement $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ and the relative velocity $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ are computed. After that, the projections of $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ and $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ along normal and tangential directions are figure out according to Eq. (2.27) and Eq. (2.28), respectively. Finally, once $\Delta u_N$, $\Delta u_T$ are known and the both components (normal and tangential) of the relative velocity just before the impact $\Delta \mathbf{u}_0$ are given in Step II, the damping coefficients $c_N$ and $c_T$ are calculated (Eq. 2.29). Hence, in the case of $WID = 1$ these calculations are computed as follow:

```csharp
// There is CONTACT

// Contact point that belongs to deck 2
xkL0(0) = (xR2(0)-xR(0))*(lkL0/NormV2) + xR(0);
xkL0(1) = (xR2(1)-xR(1))*(lkL0/NormV2) + xR(1);

// Increment of relative displacement
IncrDispL(0) = xkL0(0) - xL(0);
IncrDispL(1) = xkL0(1) - xL(1);

double IncrDL = sqrt(pow(IncrDispL(0),2.0)+pow(IncrDispL(1),2.0));
IncrDLN = abs(IncrDispL(0)*n2(0) + IncrDispL(1)*n2(1));
IncrDLT = sqrt(pow(IncrDL,2.0)-pow(IncrDLN,2.0));

// Increment of the relative velocity
double Velocity1L_x = velNdL(0);
double Velocity1L_y = velNdL(1);

double Velocity2L_x = (velNdR2(0)-velNdR(0))*(lkL0/NormV2) + velNdR(0);
double Velocity2L_y = (velNdR2(1)-velNdR(1))*(lkL0/NormV2) + velNdR(1);

IncrVell(0) = Velocity2L_x - Velocity1L_x;
IncrVell(1) = Velocity2L_y - Velocity1L_y;

double IncrVL = sqrt(pow(IncrVell(0),2.0)+pow(IncrVell(1),2.0));
double IncrVLN = abs(IncrVell(0)*n2(0) + IncrVell(1)*n2(1));
double IncrVLT = sqrt(pow(IncrVL,2.0)-pow(IncrVLN,2.0));

// Stiffness
kvaluen = KN;
cvaluen = 3.0*kvaluen*(1-pow(RN,2.0))*abs(IncrDLN)/(2.0*pow(RN,2.0)*abs(IncrVell(0)));
kvalet = KT;
cvalet = 3.0*kvalet*(1-pow(RT,2.0))*abs(IncrDLT)/(2.0*pow(RT,2.0)*abs(IncrVell(1)));
V. **Step V.** Since all the parameters involved in the pounding are known, it is time to calculate the pounding forces $F_N$ and $F_T$ defined in Eq. (2.23) and Eq. (2.24) respectively as well as the direction of those forces (Eq. 2.37 and Eq. 2.38). In order to clarify the code, both normal and tangential pounding forces are divided into its spring $F_p^s$ and dashpot $F_p^D$ components (for $p = N, T$). First, the code computes the values of the pounding forces. Then according to the sign convention, the code assigns the sign to $F_N$ and $F_T$. Finally the code checks if the attack node sticks or slides along the target deck according to Mohr-Coulomb friction’s law (Eq. 2.24).

```
// Now calculate the forces

double SpringForcen = 0.0, DampingForcen = 0.0, SpringForcet = 0.0, DampingForcet = 0.0;
SpringForcen = -kvaluen*abs(IncrDLN);

if (((xL(0)-xkL0(0))*v2(0)+(xL(1)-xkL0(1))*v2(1) > 0.0) {
    SpringForcet = -kvaluet*abs(IncrDLT);
} else {
    SpringForcet = kvaluet*abs(IncrDLT);
}

if (abs(IncrVell(0)*n2(0)+IncrVell(1)*n2(1)) < 1.0E-21) {
    DampingForcen = cvaluen*1.0E-21;
} else {
    DampingForcen = cvaluen*abs(IncrVell(0)*n2(0)+IncrVell(1)*n2(1));
}

if (abs(IncrVell(0)*v2(0)+IncrVell(1)*v2(1)) < 1.0E-21) {
    DampingForcet = cvaluet*1.0E-21;
} else {
    DampingForcet = cvaluet*abs(IncrVell(0)*v2(0)+IncrVell(1)*v2(1));
}

if (-IncrVell(0)*n2(0)-IncrVell(1)*n2(1) < 0.0) {
    DampingForcen = -DampingForcen;    //compression phase
} else {
    DampingForcen = 0.0;    //restitution phase
}

if (IncrVell(0)*v2(0)+IncrVell(1)*v2(1) < 0.0) {
    DampingForcet = -DampingForcet;
} else {
    DampingForcet = DampingForcet;
}

qb(0) = (SpringForcen+DampingForcen)*abs(n2(0)) + (SpringForcet+DampingForcet)*abs(v2(0));
qb(1) = (SpringForcen+DampingForcen)*abs(n2(1)) + (SpringForcet+DampingForcet)*abs(v2(1));
```
if \((\text{abs}(\text{SpringForcet}+\text{DampingForcet}) > \text{MUS} \times \text{abs}(\text{SpringForcen}+\text{DampingForcen}))\) {
    if \(((xL(0)-xkL(0))^2+v2(0)+(xL(1)-xkL(1))^2+v2(1) > 0.0)\) {
        \(\text{qb}(0) = (\text{SpringForcen}+\text{DampingForcen})\times\text{abs}(n2(0)) - \text{MUK}\times\text{abs}(\text{SpringForcen}+\text{DampingForcen})\times\text{abs}(v2(0))\);
        \(\text{qb}(1) = -\text{MUK}\times\text{abs}(\text{SpringForcen}+\text{DampingForcen})\times\text{abs}(v2(1)) + (\text{SpringForcen}+\text{DampingForcen})\times\text{abs}(n2(1))\);
    } else {
        \(\text{qb}(0) = (\text{SpringForcen}+\text{DampingForcen})\times\text{abs}(n2(0)) + \text{MUK}\times\text{abs}(\text{SpringForcen}+\text{DampingForcen})\times\text{abs}(v2(0))\);
        \(\text{qb}(1) = \text{MUK}\times\text{abs}(\text{SpringForcen}+\text{DampingForcen})\times\text{abs}(v2(1)) + (\text{SpringForcen}+\text{DampingForcen})\times\text{abs}(n2(1))\);
    }
}

Note that the sign convention is for the attack node therefore the other node of the contact element receives the same forces but in the opposite direction according to Eq. 2.37 and Eq. 2.38. Despite it seems more logical to set up NCM3D using the four potential contact nodes directly, the main reason is that the contact element would become less stable from the numerical point of view as was noticed during the development of NCM3D as well as would be slower in terms of computational time due to NCM3D should check all four contact conditions at each time step. After studying and implementing different versions of NCM3D using different numbers of involved nodes, it was decided to use only two nodes per contact element and to use four contact elements in order to model a general pounding between bridge decks. However, this decision has the drawback that the pounding forces can be only applied in the nodes of the contact element and therefore there is a small error in terms of equilibrium during the pounding quantified by Eq. (2.39) as explained in section 2.4.1.

Finally, there is a small part of the code to avoid the overlap of attack nodes. It may occur that both nodes of the same contact element were attack nodes as depicted in Fig. 2.22 and would apply pounding forces twice when in fact there is only one impact. In order to avoid this effect, one of the contact nodes is removed. In those cases, the removed attack nodes are \(L_1\) and \(L_2\) applying \(F_N = F_T = 0\). Fig 2.22(a) shows the overlap region between node \(L_1\) and \(R_1\) therefore when this effect occurs pounding forces related to the contact element 1 are removed. In the case of the overlap between \(L_2\) and \(R_2\) (Fig. 2.22(b)), pounding forces related to the contact element 3 are removed.

Fig. 2.22. Overlapping area between (a) \(L_1\) and \(R_1\) as well as (b) between \(L_2\) and \(R_2\).
This part of the code is implemented at the end of \( WID = 1 \) and \( WID = 3 \) using the contact condition of the opposite node of the contact element supplied by Eq. (2.30).

```c
// WID = 1
// Condition to avoid overlap between node L and node R
if ((xR(0) <= m1*(xR(1) - xL(1))+xL(0)) && (xR(1) <= m3*(xR(0) - xL(0))+xL(1))) {
    qb(0) = 0.0;
    qb(1) = 0.0;
}

// WID = 3
// Condition to avoid overlap between node L2 and node R2
if ((xR2(0) <= m1*(xR2(1) - xL(1))+xL(0)) && (xR2(1) >= m4*(xR2(0) - xL2(0))+xL2(1))) {
    qb(0) = 0.0;
    qb(1) = 0.0;
}
```

Once the algorithm of NCM3D is written in C++ and files NCM3D.h and NCM3D.cpp are generated with the new NCM3D class, it is necessary to implement the TCL commands in OpenSees in a different class in order to OpenSees was able to recognize the new element when running TCL scripts. This file is called TclNCM3DCommand.cpp and is given in Appendix A. Although NCM3D was implemented successfully in OpenSees and no logical errors were detected, it is necessary a numerical validation.

### 2.4.2 Experimental validation

Validation of NCM3D is a key point of the development process in order to ensure that there are no either logical errors or bugs. However, it is important to note the subtle difference between validation and verification. This issue has been widely discussed in the science community (Oreskes et al. 1994). Because of the proposed contact element NCM3D deals with some of the physical parameters involved in the pounding and not all of them, it should be said validation instead of verification. To this end, the pounding results carried out by Guo et al. (2009) are used to validate NCM3D according to the unidirectional and bidirectional nature of the pounding exposed in section 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 respectively.

#### 2.4.2.1 Unidirectional validation

Unidirectional validation of NCM3D is based on the results provided by Guo et al. (2009) at Harbin Institute of Technology (China) and is a particular case of bidirectional pounding. They carried out an
experiment in the laboratory about unidirectional pounding using a bridge model scaled 1/20 as shown in Fig. 2.23. The experiments were performed on a tri-axial shaking table of size 5 m×5 m at the Institute of Engineering Mechanics of China Earthquake Administration in Harbin. The payload of the shaking table is 350 kN and the working frequency ranges go from 0.5 to 40 Hz. The shaking table is capable of providing maximum accelerations of ±1.0g in both horizontal directions and ±0.7g in the vertical direction (see Guo et al. 2009 for more details). The bridge model is a two-span-isolated bridge model with different dynamics characteristics for both decks supplied by the different properties of the bearings. The natural periods of the left and right deck are 0.47 s and 0.40 s, respectively.

The bridge model has two spans with the same length of 1.80 m, width of 1.20 m and height of 1.53 m. Each deck consists of a steel plate of 1.80 m×1.20 m×0.02 m and an additional mass made of reinforced concrete embedded in the steel plate in order to increase the weight of each deck until 2,514 kg. The gap is 3.5 mm. In addition, the height and diameter of the rubber bearings used in the experiments are 97.5 and 100 mm respectively, with a shear modulus of 0.39 and 0.55 MPa for left and right decks, respectively. The schematic diagram of the data acquisition and control system is shown in Fig. 2.24 (more drawing details in Appendix B). An accelerometer was installed on the shaking table in order to measure the earthquake input. Moreover, two accelerometers are set up on the decks to measure the absolute acceleration of decks during the experiment. The relative displacement responses between the adjacent superstructures are obtained by using a Linear Variable Differential Transformer (LVDT) sensor installed over the expansion joint as depicted in Fig. 2.24. During the tests, the structural responses are measured with sampling frequency of 5000 Hz to capture the instantaneous impact between decks. Regarding ground motion inputs, Kobe earthquake (JMA Station FN component) with PGA (Peak Ground Acceleration) equal to 2825.0 cm/s² and Taft earthquake (Taf111 component) with PGA equal to 177.8 cm/s² are chosen as near-field and far-field ground motions. Time increments of the original
ground motion records are scaled using a scale factor of \(1/\sqrt{20}\) as well as the PGA of Kobe and Taft earthquake that were also scaled to 610.0 cm/s\(^2\) and 590.0 cm/s\(^2\) respectively.

The recorded acceleration responses of the free vibrations are processed to obtain the natural frequencies of the bridge model through Fourier analysis and the logarithmic decrement method is adopted to identify the damping ratios of the bridge model. Therefore, the natural frequencies of the left and right deck are 2.17 and 2.52 Hz and the corresponding damping ratios \(\xi_1\) and \(\xi_2\) are 3.0 and 2.9 \% respectively. Each deck can be modeled as one DOF using the displacement along the longitudinal axis of the bridge. Therefore, the displacements of both decks (assuming decks as rigid bodies) are governed by the dynamic equilibrium given in Eq. (2.40),

\[
M\ddot{x} + C\dot{x} + Kx = -M\ddot{\xi}_{GM},
\]

where \(x = (u_1, u_2)\) is the vector of displacements of mass centers of deck 1 and 2 along X-axis respectively as depicted in Fig. 2.7, \(\ddot{\xi}_{GM}\) is the acceleration of the input ground motion along X-axis and \(r = (1, 1)\). The mass, damping and stiffness matrices are \(M\), \(C\) and \(K\) defined by Eq. (2.41).

\[
M = \begin{bmatrix} 2,514 & 0 \\ 0 & 2,514 \end{bmatrix} \text{ kg}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} 2,055.0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2,306.9 \end{bmatrix} \text{ Ns/m}, \quad K = \begin{bmatrix} 467.0 & 0 \\ 0 & 629.8 \end{bmatrix} \text{ kN/m}
\]

Viscous damping matrix \(C\) is formulated using the Rayleigh damping approach (Chopra 2007) given by,

\[
C = a_0M + a_1K,
\]

\[
(2.42)
\]
where $a_0$ and $a_1$ are the damping coefficients. The damping ratio $\xi_n$ (Fig. 2.25) for the $n$-th mode of such a system is given by,

$$\xi_n = \frac{a_0}{2} \frac{1}{\omega_n} + \frac{a_1}{2} \omega_n,$$

(2.43)

where $\omega_n$ is the natural frequency for the $n$-th mode. The damping coefficients $a_0$ and $a_1$ can be determined from specified damping ratios $\xi_i$ and $\xi_j$ for the $i$-th and $j$-th modes respectively using Eq. (2.43). If both modes are assumed to have the same damping ratio $\xi$ which is reasonable based on the experimental data, the damping coefficients $a_0$ and $a_1$ are given by Eq. (2.44). Both modes with damping ratios $\xi_i$ and $\xi_j$ are chosen to ensure reasonable values for the damping ratios in all the modes contributing significantly to the response (Chopra 2007). Generally, $\omega_i$ and $\omega_j$ are taken as the first and higher mode, respectively.

$$a_0 = \xi \frac{2\omega_i\omega_j}{\omega_i + \omega_j}; \quad a_1 = \xi \frac{2}{\omega_i + \omega_j}.$$  

(2.44)

![Fig. 2.25. Variation of modal damping ratio $\xi_n$ with natural frequency $\omega_n$.](image)

Regarding the numerical modeling of the bridge model, both deck were modeled as lumped masses embedded on the top of elastic piers, as depicted in Fig. 2.26, allowing the displacement along X-axis (see Fig. 1 of Guo et al. 2009). The stiffness of the elastic piers is given by the equivalent stiffness of the superstructure system of the bridge mode composed by deck and bearings in the stiffness matrix $K$ in Eq. (2.41). According McGuire et al. (1999), the elastic stiffness $k_x$ along X-axis for a pier of height $L$, Young’s modulus $E$ and moment of inertia $I_x$ is given as,
\[ k_x = \frac{12EI_x}{L^3}, \]  

(2.45)

Therefore, the moment of inertia \( I_x \) can be written as follows,

\[ I_x = \frac{L^2k_x}{12E} \]  

(2.46)

Assuming the height of the piers as \( L=1 \text{ m} \), \( E=2.1\cdot10^5 \text{ MPa} \) and the equivalent stiffness \( k_x \) for both decks supplied by Guo et al. (2009) in Eq. (2.41), the moment of inertia \( I_x \) of the piers in order to have an elastic stiffness \( k_x \) is given as,

\[ I_{x_i} = \frac{(1 \text{ m})^3 \cdot 467 \text{ kN/m}}{12 \cdot 2.1\cdot10^5 \text{ N/mm}^2} = 185,317 \text{ mm}^4 \]  

(2.47)

\[ I_{x_2} = \frac{(1 \text{ m})^3 \cdot 629.8 \text{ kN/m}}{12 \cdot 2.1\cdot10^5 \text{ N/mm}^2} = 249,921 \text{ mm}^4 \]

Therefore, deck 1 and deck 2 are modeled as lumped masses \( m_1 = m_2 = 2,514 \text{ kg} \), length of piers \( L_1 = L_2 = 1 \text{ m} \), Young’s modulus \( E_1 = E_2 = 2.1\cdot10^5 \text{ MPa} \), moment of inertia along X-axis \( I_{x_1} = 185,317 \text{ mm}^4 \) and \( I_{x_2} = 249,921 \text{ mm}^4 \), respectively (Fig. 2.26). The gap between adjacent decks is 3.5 mm. Due to NCM3D needs a geometry of decks to be set up, two rectangular decks were built by four ElasticBeams elements of length 2\( a = 1 \text{ m} \) (Fig. 2.26) in OpenSees without mass. On one hand, the coefficient of restitution \( r = 0.64 \) was taken as Guo et al. (2009). Nonetheless, the impact stiffness for NCM3D was chosen \( k = 1\cdot10^5 \text{ kN/m} \) instead of \( k = 3.67^4 \text{ kN/m} \) used by Guo et al. (2009) because of the definition of the damping coefficient \( c \) in both contact elements. The impact stiffness \( k = 3.67^4 \text{ kN/m} \) was found after carrying out a parametric study in order to assess \( k \) as close as possible to the numerical solution.

Fig. 2.26. Sketch of the numerical model for unidirectional pounding validation.
On the other hand, unlike the contact element developed by Guo et al. (2009), NCM3D uses a non-linear damping coefficient $c$ (Eq. 2.29) instead of the constant damping coefficient $c$ used by Guo et al. (2009) and defined in Eq. (2.7). In addition, three years later the same authors (Guo et al. 2012) conducted a study about how to determine the impact stiffness for different impact models (see section 2.3) and concluded that the structural response may be highly influenced by the impact model used and therefore influenced by the parameters involved in those impact models.

Two contact element were set up between nodes $R_1$ and $L_1$ (contact element 2) and between $R_2$ and $L_2$ (contact element 4). Since unidirectional pounding is a particular case of bidirectional pounding, there will be also the overlap region explained and depicted in Fig 2.22. Because of this, contact element 2 ($WID = 2$) and 4 ($WID = 4$) were selected as shown in Fig. 2.26. The impact stiffness $k = 1 \cdot 10^4$ kN/m is divided into both contact elements resulting that each NCM3D has $k_c = k/2$ to respect the symmetry of the unidirectional pounding. The absolute acceleration response of the numerical model described in Fig. 2.26 was compared with the experiment before applying NCM3D (without pounding) under Taft earthquake and Kobe earthquake. The absolute acceleration of deck 1 and deck 2 match good enough as under Taft earthquake (Fig. 2.27(a), (b)) as Kobe earthquake (Fig. 2.27 (c), (d)) what indicates that the numerical model is acceptable and suitable (Fig. 2.27).

![Fig. 2.27. Absolute acceleration of (a) deck 1 and (b) deck 2 under Taft earthquake without pounding. Absolute acceleration of (c) deck 1 and (d) deck 2 under Kobe earthquake without pounding.](image-url)
After checking that the behavior of the numerical model without pounding was as expected, contact element 2 and 4 were applied with the half of the total impact stiffness. The comparison of the absolute acceleration between NCM3D and the experiment under Taft earthquake is depicted in Fig. 2.28 as well as the comparison between the same experiment and the contact element developed by Guo et al. (2009). From the impact point of view, on the one hand NCM3D was capable to detect all the impacts (18 impacts) while the contact element developed by Guo et al. (2009) was not able to detect seven impacts. On the other hand, unlike Guo et al. (2009) that detected three impacts that did not occur during the experiment, NCM3D detected four impacts incorrectly. Each sharp peak represents an instant of impact.

The sign of the peaks accelerations due to pounding between decks are coherent with the physical nature of the impact. Deck 1 received impacts from its right side therefore the peaks of acceleration because of pounding should be negative as it is shown in Fig. 2.28(a) while deck 2 received the same impacts from its left side and, by equilibrium, the peaks of acceleration should be positive as depicted in Fig. 2.28(b). The same bridge response can be seen in the simulation ran by Guo et al. (2009) in Fig. 2.28(c), (d). Nonetheless, none contact element could detect the negative peaks of acceleration produced in deck 2 (Fig. 2.28(b), (d)). By equilibrium, these peaks of acceleration should appear with positive sign in deck 1 however they do not. This fact induces to think that may be some error in the measurement
during the experiment because there is no physical explanation to this behavior. When there is unidirectional pounding between two adjacent decks, the pounding force applied in both bodies tends to change the direction of the body given by the inertia and therefore the peaks of acceleration induced by impact should contribute to this end as shown in Fig. 2.29. Nevertheless, the negative peaks of acceleration detected during the experiment does not tend to change the direction of the deck 2. Moreover, the acceleration induced by pounding must follow the same direction than pounding force \( F \) due to the second law of Newton’s laws of motion however it does not occur in this case.

\[
\begin{align*}
E_n &= \sqrt{\frac{\sum (a_i - \bar{a}_i)^2}{\sum a_i}} \\
E &= \left| \frac{a_i - \bar{a}_i}{a_i} \right|
\end{align*}
\]  

(2.48)  

(2.49)

where \( a_i \) and \( \bar{a}_i \) are the peak of acceleration experimentally obtained and numerically obtained respectively at an instant of time \( t_i \). The normalized error \( E_n \) produced by Guo et al. (2009) under Taft earthquake for deck 1 is 52.67 % and for deck 2 is 86.71 %. In the case of NCM3D, the normalized errors \( E_n \) are 33.57 % and 47.72 % for deck 1 and deck 2, respectively. In the case of Guo et al. (2009), only the peaks of acceleration detected by the contact element were taken into account for the calculation of the normalized error. On one hand, the normalized error decreases substantially when NCM3D is used. On the other hand, considering the error \( E \) (Eq. 2.49) in each single impact, the maximum error by NCM3D are also lower than those by Guo et al. (2009) in both deck as shown in Fig. 2.30. While the maximum error \( E \) of the peaks of absolute acceleration by NCM3D are 27.09 % and 78.86 % for deck 1 and deck 2 respectively, the maximum error \( E \) by Guo et al. (2009) for deck 1 and deck 2 are 149.66 % and 554.79 % respectively.
Fig. 2.30. Error $E$ of the peaks of acceleration in (a) deck 1 and (b) deck 2 under Taft earthquake.

The deck displacements and the pounding forces are coherent with the acceleration response (Fig. 2.28) as expected. The pounding force is always positive and applied during a short period of time due to the physical nature of impact (Fig. 2.31(a)). In addition, this pounding reflects in the displacements of the decks and when there is contact both decks move back as depicted in Fig. 2.31(b). Unlike bidirectional pounding, in the case of unidirectional pounding it is useful to plot the displacement response of decks to note if there was any error during the data analysis and see that the decks did what were expected to do. For instance, Fig 2.31(b) marks some of the impacts detected during the simulation using NCM3D.

Fig. 2.31. (a) Pounding force and (b) displacements of deck 1 and deck 2 under Taft earthquake.
Regarding the Kobe earthquake, the same numerical analysis was carried out in order to assess the peaks of the absolute acceleration. As occurred under Taft earthquake, NCM3D detected all the impacts (10 impacts) as shown in Fig. 3.32(a), (b) while Guo et al. (2009) detected one impact less (Fig. 3.32(c), (d)). Nonetheless, in the case of Kobe earthquake there is a small off-set between the experimental response and the numerical response in both simulation using as NCM3D as contact element developed by Guo et al. (2009). Both contact elements detected the impacts slightly before than the experimental one, curiously. In addition, the order of magnitude of this off-seat in the case of this thesis and Guo et al. (2009) is quite similar. The same phenomenon about negative peaks of acceleration in deck 2 explained in the case of Taft earthquake appears under Kobe earthquake (see Fig. 2.29).

In terms of normalized error $E_n$ of the peaks of acceleration (Eq. 2.48), the results obtained with NCM3D are comparable with the results supplied by Guo et al. (2009). On one hand, the normalized error $E_n$ of deck 1 are 53.48 % and 57.60 % using the contact element of Guo et al. (2009) and NCM3D, respectively. In the case of the deck 2, the normalized error obtained with Guo et al. (2009) and with NCM3D are 71.76 % and 66.17 %, respectively. Therefore, there is a small improvement in the deck 2 and a little lost of accuracy in the deck 1 about 4 % in both cases. On the other hand, the errors in each
single impact are also comparable. The maximum error $E$ obtained by NCM3D for the deck 1 and deck 2 are 35.61 % and 128.62 % respectively while the maximum error obtained by Guo et al. (2009) for deck 1 and deck 2 are 41.68 % and 114.04 %, respectively. As occurred in the case of Taft earthquake, the maximum error related to the deck 2 is higher than which of deck 1. Moreover, there is a small improvement of accuracy using NCM3D in deck 1 however there is a lost in deck 2. Fig. 2.33 shows the single error divided by number of impact and deck.

![Graph showing error comparison](image)

Fig. 2.33. Error $E$ of the peaks of acceleration in (a) deck 1 and (b) deck 2 under Kobe earthquake.

Finally, the displacements of both decks and the pounding force are depicted in Fig. 2.34 to note the effect of the pounding in the deck displacements. When there is contact between decks, both decks moved back due to the pounding force applied (Fig. 2.34(a)) in the decks at the same time with the same value and opposite direction. This fact can be seen clearly in Fig. 2.34(b). In addition, all pounding forces are positive (compression) and applied during short periods of time as expected because of the physical nature of impact (see section 2.1). Fig. 2.34(b) shows some impacts detected during the simulation using NCM3D.

![Graph showing displacement and pounding force](image)

Fig. 2.34. (a) Pounding force and (b) displacement of deck 1 and 2 under Kobe earthquake.
2.4.2.2 Bidirectional validation

Unlike unidirectional pounding, there are no many experimental data available about bidirectional pounding in bridges. As occurred in the case of unidirectional pounding, Guo et al. (2011) carried out one of the few experimental studies in this field. Nevertheless, the data of this study is not available. On one hand, since NCM3D was validated successfully for unidirectional pounding (see section 2.4.2.1) using the experimental data supplied by Guo et al. (2009) with encouraging results, and taking into account that the implemented code in OpenSees was the generic algorithm explained in section 2.4.1; there is no reason not to assume that bidirectional pounding using NCM3D would also provide reasonable results. In addition, from the algorithm point of view the only difference between the formulation for unidirectional and bidirectional pounding is the well known Mohr-Coulomb’s friction law. This friction model has been widely used by researchers around the world with acceptable results (see for example Zhu et al. 2002 and 2004, Guo et al. 2011, Dimitrakopoulos 2011, Polycarpou et al. 2013, Bi and Hao 2013). On the other hand, many simulations of bridges were carried out using different bridge models and the results provided by OpenSees were compared with results calculated by hand and no relevant differences were found.

Among all the simulations carried out to validate bidirectional pounding, one of them is presented in this section. The numerical bridge model for bidirectional pounding is the same than was used for unidirectional validation and depicted in Fig. 2.26. In order to simulate all the possible contacts, all four contact element were set up (see Fig. 2.20) instead of the two NCM3D used for unidirectional pounding. The static coefficient of friction $\mu_s = 0.5$ the kinetic coefficient of friction $\mu_k = 0.4$ were added in the four contact element as well as tangential coefficient of restitution taken as $r_T = 0.64$. Moreover, the value of the impact stiffness in tangential direction is $k_N = k_T = 1 \cdot 10^4$ kN/m. The moment of inertia along $Y$-axis of the pier 1 and 2 was assumed $I_{y_1} = I_{y_2}$ and $I_{y_2} = I_{y_2}$, respectively. In addition, the same ground motion is used as input (Taft earthquake) for $Y$-axis with the goal of simplifying the comparison between unidirectional and bidirectional pounding response. Once the numerical model is built, the bidirectional simulation was carried out. On one hand, the displacement along $X$-axis in the case of bidirectional pounding shown in Fig. 2.35(a) is quite similar to unidirectional pounding (Fig. 2.31(b)), however it is not exactly the same. As the input along $X$ and $Y$-axis and the moment of inertia are the same in both directions, the displacement along $Y$-axis looks the same than along $X$-axis (Fig. 2.35(b)).

![Fig. 2.35. Displacements of the deck 1 and deck 2 along (a) X-axis and (b) Y-axis using NCM3D under Taft earthquake.](image-url)
Although Fig. 2.35(a) may be interesting to compare the displacement in X direction of both decks in bidirectional pounding with the same displacement in unidirectional pounding, it does not provide useful information about what occurs with the corner nodes. Unlike unidirectional pounding where all corner nodes that belonged to the same deck moved in the same direction and with the same value of displacement, in the case of bidirectional pounding there should be a different behavior due to frictional forces involved. Those frictional forces induce rotation on both decks that can be detected looking at the displacement along X-axis of the single corner node (Fig. 2.36). The inset graph given in Fig. 2.36 shows the first impact. It is important to note how the displacement of the nodes belonging to the same deck are overlapped until the first impact when the first tangential force takes place and make decks rotate. Therefore, if decks rotate the displacement in X direction of their corner nodes cannot be the same after the first impact as shown Fig. 2.36.

![Displacement Graph](image1)

**Fig. 2.36.** Displacement of the corner nodes $L_1$, $L_2$, $R_1$ and $R_2$ under Taft earthquake.

![Rotation Graph](image2)

**Fig. 2.37.** Rotation of deck 1 and deck 2 under Taft earthquake.
Although the input acceleration is applied in both directions from the beginning, there is no rotation until the first impact because there is no offset between the mass center and the shear center. Therefore, it is sure that the first impact occurs when the \( x \) coordinates of the potential surfaces are equal (inset of Fig. 2.36). Furthermore, the negative sign of the rotation of deck 1 and deck 2 at first impact confirm this fact as depicted in Fig. 2.37. In terms of absolute accelerations, the behavior of the decks is quite the same respect to the unidirectional case as expected and as shown in Fig. 2.38.

![Fig. 2.38. Absolute acceleration in X direction of (a) deck 1 and (b) deck 2. Absolute acceleration in Y direction of (c) deck 1 and (d) deck 2. NCM3D is used.](image)
the normal and tangential forces of the four different contact elements used in the simulation. The normal pounding forces (Fig. 2.39(a)) are always positive (compression) and tangential pounding forces are positive and negative (Fig. 2.39(b)). The insets depicted in Fig. 2.39 show the typical shape of the normal and tangential pounding force at the same instant of time ($t = 7.85 \text{ s}$). The bubble shape of the normal pounding force is given by the compression and restitution phase (see Table 2.1). The same bubble shape is also found when the tangential pounding force is only either positive or negative.

![Diagram of contact elements and forces](image)

Fig. 2.39. (a) Normal pounding force and (b) tangential pounding force using NCM3D under Taft earthquake.

On one hand, note that the tangential pounding forces are lower than normal pounding forces but are not negligible and have the same order of magnitude. On the other hand, the rotation induced by bidirectional pounding cannot be neglected as shown in Fig. 2.37 and demonstrated in section 1.2.

In terms of absolute acceleration response, it is interesting to compare the absolute acceleration response with and without pounding to determine how the bridge was influenced by the bidirectional pounding. To this end, Fig. 2.40 shows a comparison between the absolute acceleration in both directions and both decks with pounding and without pounding. Taking into account that the simple example presented in this section is based on the bridge scaled 1/20, the influence of the pounding is significant. The peaks of acceleration induced by pounding multiply the absolute acceleration several times respect to the bridge response without pounding. In the case of study, the acceleration in Y direction of deck 2 (Fig. 2.40(c)) is the less influenced by bidirectional pounding while the acceleration response of deck 1 and deck 2 along X-axis are highly influenced when the normal pounding forces are higher, as depicted in Fig. 2.40(a), (b). In addition, the high rotation observed (Fig. 2.37) when there is pounding (the rotation is almost zero when there is no pounding if there is no offset between mass center and shear center) should...
be taken into consideration because there may be other adjacent structures to impact with such as the wings of the abutments.

![Comparison of acceleration response with and without pounding](image)

Fig. 2.40. Comparison between absolute acceleration response with and without pounding of (a) deck 1 and (b) deck 2 along X-axis and (c) deck 1 and (d) deck 2 along Y-axis under Taft earthquake.

### 2.5 Conclusions

A brief introduction of the physical nature of impact was presented. On one hand, stereomechanical approach and contact element approach were introduced. However, contact element approach is more suitable to simulate pounding in structures due to does not neglect the time of impact as occurred with stereomechanical approach. On the other hand, different impact models were reviewed in detail and the main studies about unidirectional and bidirectional pounding were exposed. Then, a new biaxial contact element called NCM3D was proposed to study pounding in highway bridges with deck rotation. NCM3D was implemented in an open-source finite element program OpenSees using the programming language C++. NCM3D was validated for unidirectional pounding using the experimental data supplied by Guo et al. (2009) with good level of accuracy. Finally, a logical explanation and numerical example was given to demonstrate the validation of NCM3D for bidirectional pounding.
Chapter 3

Bridge Description and Design

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the bridge descriptions and the design details of the bridges used for the numerical simulation carried out in Chapter 5. Three real highway bridges located in two different places in California (US) with different configurations are chosen for this study. In addition, four different ground motions are selected and scaled in order to fulfill the requirements of the code in each location. In addition, the detailed designs of the lead rubber bearings of the bridges are also provide.

3.1 Bridges Selection and Locations

Three real highway bridges used by Kaviani et al. (2010 and 2012) and located in two different places in Southern California (which is a region with high seismicity) are selected for this study. These bridges were recently designed (after 2000) and are called Bridge A, Bridge B and Bridge C, respectively. On one hand, Bridge A is a two span-single column bent bridge and corresponds with the Jack tone Road On-Ramp Overcrossing bridge (Fig. 3.1 and Fig. 3.2) located in city of Ripon in California with coordinates 37° 45' 12" N, 121° 08' 30" W. Bridge B is a two span-multi column bent bridge and corresponds with La Veta Avenue Overcrossing bridge (Fig. 3.3) located in city of Tustin in California with coordinates 33° 46' 51.08" N, 117° 49' 51.43" W. Bridge C is a three span-multi column bent bridge and corresponds with the Jack Tone Road Overhead bridge (Fig. 3.4) located close to Bridge A therefore from now it is considered both bridges have the same coordinates.

The three bridges used in this study are based on the real bridges used by Kaviani et al. (2010 and 2012) but do not have the same features exactly. The only modification in all the bridges is the introduction of lead rubber bearings between the substructure (piers and abutments) and the superstructure (decks). The reason is to extend as much as possible the results provided by the present study. Nowadays, most of the pounding studies in bridges consider base-isolated bridges (see for example Watanabe and Kawashima 2004, Wang 2007, Nielson and DesRoches 2007, Aviram et al. 2008, Guo et al. 2009 and 2011, Bi and Hao 2013).

Fig. 3.1. Bridge A located in city of Ripon in California with coordinates 37° 45' 12" N, 121° 08' 30" W. Picture taken from Google Maps.
Fig. 3.2. Single pier of the Bridge A.

Picture taken from Google Maps.

Fig. 3.3. (a) General view, (b) piers and (c) abutment of Bridge B located in city of Tustin in California with coordinates 33° 46' 51.08" N, 117° 49' 51.43" W.

Pictures taken from Google Maps.
Although all bridges possess a small curvature in the reality, Bridges A, B and C are considered straight bridges in this study. Moreover according to Kaviani et al. (2010 and 2012), the main features of the three bridges are listed in Table 3.1 and are as follow:

- **Bridge A:** The Jack Tone Road On-Ramp bridge is a two-span bridge with 67 m of total length, left and right (respect to Fig. 3.1) spans of 33 m and 34 m, respectively. The superstructure is a three-cell reinforced concrete box-girder supported by a cap beam located between decks. This cap beam is supported on a single reinforced concrete (RC) circular pier in the middle. The diameter and the height of the pier are 1.7 m and 6 m respectively, while the longitudinal reinforcing steel ratio of the pier is approximately 2 %. The deck width is 8.3 m and the deck depth is 1.4 m. In addition, the deck centroid is located to 75 cm from the top of the cap beam. The abutments (left and right) as well as the cap beam are seat-type with two circular bearings per abutment and cap beam.

- **Bridge B:** The La Veta Avenue Overcrossing bridge is a two-span bridge with 91 m of total length, left and right (respect to Fig. 3.3(a)) spans of 47 m and 44 m respectively. The superstructure is a six-cell RC box-girder supported by a cap beam located between decks. This cap beam is supported on two RC circular piers located symmetrically respect to the longitudinal axis of the bridge. The diameter and the height of the piers are 1.7 m and 6.7 m respectively, while the longitudinal reinforcing steel ratio of the pier is approximately 1.9 %. The deck width is 23 m and the deck depth is 1.9 m. In addition, the deck centroid is located to 1.04 m from the top of the cap beam. The abutments (left and right) as well as the cap beam are seat-type with three circular bearings per abutment and cap beam.

- **Bridge C:** The Jack Tone Road Overhead bridge is a three-span with 127.5 m of total length divided into three spans: the left span of 47.5 m, the middle one of 44 m and the right one of 36. The superstructure is a seven-cell RC box-girder supported by two cap beams located between left and middle deck and between middle and right deck. These cap beams are

Fig. 3.4. Bridge C located in city of Ripon in California with coordinates 37° 45' 12" N, 121° 08' 30" W.

http://www.biggscardosa.com/home/images/stories/transportation/proj_trans_jacktone.jpg
supported on three RC circular piers per cap beam located symmetrically respect to the longitudinal axis of the bridge as shown in Fig. 3.4. The diameter and the height of the piers are 1.7 m and 7.5 m respectively, while the longitudinal reinforcing steel ratio of the pier is approximately 2.2%. The deck width is 23.5 m and the deck depth is 1.92 m. In addition, the deck centroid is located to 1 m from the top of the cap beam. The abutments (left and right) as well as the cap beams are seat-type with three circular bearings per abutment and cap beam.

### Table 3.1. General properties of the seed bridges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Bridge A</th>
<th>Bridge B</th>
<th>Bridge C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Span lengths (m)</td>
<td>33 + 34</td>
<td>47 + 44</td>
<td>47.5 + 44 + 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deck width (m)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deck depth (m)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deck centroid (m)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piers per bent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier height (m)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier diameters (m)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal reinforcement steel ratio (%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of Bridge A and Bridge C is known as location I (37° 45' 12" N, 121° 08' 30" W) while the location of Bridge B is location II (33° 46' 51.08" N, 117° 49' 51.43" W). Once the bridges for the numerical simulations are selected and presented, the next step is to design those bridges according to the US code and the code of California. Nevertheless, it is necessary to determine the design response spectrum for location I and location II before because the design of some parts of the bridges such as the bearings depend on the design response spectrum.

### 3.2 Ground Motion Selection and Scaling

Each location is characterized by design response spectrum that depends basically on the seismicity of the region and the type of soil. For the case under study, a soil type D (stiff soil) is assume for location I and the soil type C (very dense soil and soft rock) is assume for location II. Given the coordinates of the location and the type of soils, the code AASHTO Guide Specifications for LRFD Seismic Bridge Design 2009 provides all the parameters required to calculate the spectrum design. The first step is to figure out the PGA (Peak Ground Acceleration) of the region under study with 7% probability of exceedance in 75 years given by the Fig. 3.4.1-2 of code AASTHO LRFD SBD 2009. Then, the horizontal spectra response acceleration of the period 0.2 s ($S_f$) and 1.0 s ($S_1$) for 5% of critical damping is computed using the Fig. 3.4.1-3 and Fig. 3.4.1-4 of the same code, respectively. The next step is to find the site coefficient ($F_{PGA}$) according to the type of soil and the PGA computed before.
The final value of $F_{PGA}$ will be an intermediate value between the closest values in the Table 3.4.2.3-1 of the AASHTO LRFD SBD 2009 using a linear interpolation. The same procedure is used to compute the spectral response acceleration parameter at short periods ($F_a$) using the same Table 3.4.2.3-1. After that, the mapped spectral response acceleration coefficient at 1 s period ($F_o$) is calculated from Table 3.4.2.3-2 using the same methodology than $F_{PGA}$ and $F_a$. Finally, using the equations (3.4.1-1, 3.4.1-12, 3.4.1-3) provided by the code the parameters needed to define the design response spectrum $A_s$, $S_{DS}$ and $S_{DI}$ are computed as given in Eq. (3.1) as well as $T_0$ and $T_1$, and depicted in Fig. 3.5. Table 3.2 summarizes these values for location I and II.

$$A_s = F_{PGA}$$,  
$$S_{DS} = F_a S_S$$,  
$$S_{DI} = F_v S_1$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.1)$$

Seismic hazard in California is governed by shallow crustal tectonics, with the sole exception of the Cascadia subduction zone along California’s northern coastline (Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria 1.7). According to the state agency responsible for highway, bridge, and rail transportation planning, construction, and maintenance of California (Caltrans), seismic demand for structural applications is represented using an elastic 5 % damped response spectrum. In general, according to Caltrans SDC 1.7 the design response spectrum is defined as:

1) A probabilistic spectrum based on a 5 % in 50 years probability of exceedance (or 975-years return period).
2) A deterministic spectrum based on the largest median response resulting from the maximum rupture of any fault in the vicinity of the bridge site.
3) A statewide minimum spectrum defined as the median spectrum generated by a magnitude 6.5 earthquake on a strike-slip fault located to 12 km from the bridge site.

![Design Response Spectrum](image-url)
The state of California has taken a modified approach in which the design response spectrum is specified to be the largest of (a) a probabilistic response spectrum calculated in accordance with the 2008 USGS National Hazard Map for a 5% probability of being exceeded in 50 years (or 975 years return period, which is equivalent to a 7% probability of being exceeded in 75 years spectrum) and (b) a deterministic median response spectrum calculated based on the “Next Generation Attenuation” project of the PEER-Lifelines program. Spectra for this design earthquake are available online through the Caltrans Acceleration Response Spectra (ARS) website (Constantinou et al. 2011). Since Design Earthquake (DE) is the earthquake that match with the design response spectrum given by the code, the Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE) have to match the design response spectrum multiply by a factor of 1.5 to be on the safety side. The Design Earthquake (DE) and the Maximum considered Earthquake (MCE) for location I and II are depicted in Fig. 3.6(a), and Fig. 3.6(b), respectively, in Fault-Normal direction (FN) and in Fault-Parallel direction (FP). From now, all the FN components will be considered as components along X-axis and FP components as Y-axis.

Table 3.2. Parameters of the design response spectrum (DE) for location I and II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Location I</th>
<th>Location II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil type</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA (g)</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_s$ (g)</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_1$ (g)</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_s$ (g)</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{DS}$ (g)</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{D1}$ (g)</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_0$ (s)</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_1$ (s)</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3.6. Design response spectrum along FN and FP of (a) location I and (b) location II.
Kobe, Loma Prieta, Chi-Chi and Landers are the four earthquakes chosen to study the effect of the unidirectional and bidirectional pounding on the three seed bridges. On one hand, Kobe (January 17, 1995) and Loma Prieta (October 17, 1989) earthquake represent a pulse-like ground motion while Chi-Chi (September 21, 1999) and Landers (June 28, 1992) earthquake represent far-field ground motions. All these earthquakes were taken from the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER Center 2013). Table 3.3 summarizes the main parameters of the original earthquakes considered in this study. PGA represents Peak of Ground Acceleration, PGV denotes Peak of Ground Velocity, PGD means Peak of Ground Displacement, $M_w$ the moment magnitude and the epicentral distance is $R_e$.

Table 3.3. Summary of the original ground motions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earthquake</th>
<th>No. EQ</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>$M_w$</th>
<th>PGA (g)</th>
<th>PGV (cm/s)</th>
<th>PGD (cm)</th>
<th>$R_e$ (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kobe</td>
<td>FN 1</td>
<td>Takarazuka</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>72.54</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP 2</td>
<td>Saratoga Aloha Ave</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>55.53</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>FN 3</td>
<td>CHY019</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP 4</td>
<td>Mission Creek Fault</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>23.16</td>
<td>24.32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The acceleration time histories of the original ground motions shown in Table 3.3 are plotted in Fig. 3.8. The 5 % damped elastic pseudo acceleration response spectra of the original ground motions for FN and FP directions as well as the design response spectrum (DE) of both locations for (a) Fault Normal (FN) and (b) Fault Parallel (FP) directions are shown in Fig. 3.7(a) and Fig. 3.7(b), respectively.

![Fig. 3.7](image-url)
Fig. 3.8. Acceleration time histories of original ground motions: (a) Kobe (FN), (b) Kobe (FP), (c) Loma Prieta (FN), (d) Loma Prieta (FP), (e) Chi-Chi (FN), (f) Chi-Chi (FP), (g) Landers (FN) and (h) Landers (FP).
The ground motions are matched to the design response spectrum at 5% damping using wavelet adjustment using the computer program RspMatch2005 (Hancock et al. 2006) for location I and II as well as for FN and FP. A comparison between the design response spectrum and the matched pseudo accelerations are depicted in Fig. 3.9. Note the accuracy of the matched response spectra using the improved method developed by Hancock et al. (2006).

![Comparison between 5% damped elastic pseudo acceleration response spectra of matched ground motions and the design response spectrum](image)

Fig. 3.9. Comparison between 5% damped elastic pseudo acceleration response spectra of matched ground motions and the design response spectrum for (a) location I and FN, (b) location I and FP, (c) location II and FN, (d) location II and FP.

Table 3.4 shows a comparison of PGA, PGV and PGD between the original ground motions (FN and FP) and the matched ground motions for location I and II. Hence, once all earthquakes are matched to their corresponding locations, the design of bearings of the bridges is possible. Each bearing is designed for a given particular location as well as particular deck because of depends on the mass of the structure, basically.
Table 3.4: Comparison of PGA, PGV and PGD between original and matched ground motions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. EQ</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Location I</th>
<th>Location II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGA (g)</td>
<td>PGV (cm/s)</td>
<td>PGD (cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>82.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>55.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>43.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>23.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Seismic Isolators Design

Seismic isolators are a fundamental part of the bridge design because are the responsible devices to reduce forces and dissipate energy during a seismic excitation in form of hysteretic energy dissipation providing additional horizontal flexibility to the superstructure. Seismic protective systems (isolators and damping devices) were developed to mitigate the effects of the earthquake shaking and are used on bridges and buildings. In the case of bridges, seismic isolators are set up typically between substructure and superstructure what means between cap beams and decks and between abutments and decks. The goal of installing seismic isolator devices on bridges are basically two:

a) Reduction of acceleration and therefore forces in the superstructure and substructure.
b) Redistribution of forces between the piers and the abutments.

Nowadays, seismic isolation systems in bridges allow (i) to isolate superstructure from the effects of the earthquake in terms of horizontal accelerations and (ii) to reduce displacements dissipating energy through hysteresis, friction and any inelastic response. On one hand, to fulfill the requirement of reduction of accelerations, typically seismic isolators systems shift the fundamental period of the structure to make it larger (Chen and Scawthorn 2003, Chopra 2007, Constantinou et al. 2011) and therefore reducing the acceleration induced by the earthquake (Fig. 3.10(a)). On the other hand, this increment of the fundamental period of the structure imply and increment of the displacement demand of the superstructure what would suppose higher pounding damage (Fig. 3.10(b)). In addition, seismic isolators concentrate the major part of the damage during seismic excitation into a few mechanical elements that may be easily checked and replaced, if need be. Seismic isolators are also used to redistribute the stiffness selecting the parameters involved in the seismic isolator devices such as stiffness, yield strength and ultimate elongation capacity as function of the desired protection and of the seismic intensity expected (Priestley et al. 1996).
According to Priestley et al. (1996), the main parameters in a seismic isolator system to have to be considered are: (i) deformability under frequent quasistatic load, (ii) yielding force and displacement, (iii) ultimate displacement and post-ultimate behavior, (iv) capacity for self-centering after deformation (restoring force) and finally (v) vertical stiffness. Within all the possible devices, the most commonly used and available seismic isolators are: Natural Rubber Bearings (NRB), Lead Rubber Bearings (LRB) and Sliding Bearings (Friction Pendulum System). The main features of these devices are as follows:

a) **Natural Rubber Bearings (NRB):** NRB uses natural rubber (elastomeric material) layers with small damping in cylindrical or rectangular block and constitutes the simplest isolator for bridges. The insertion of horizontal steel plates increase the vertical stiffness and improve the stability of the whole system. (Fig. 3.11(a)). The linear response of NRB is governed by the properties of the natural rubber.

b) **Lead Rubber Bearings (LRB):** LRB are basically NRB with a lead plug. The insertion of the lead plug provides a better energy dissipation and increment of stiffness for static loads (Fig. 3.11(b)). The energy dissipation is because of the deformation of the lead, basically.

c) **Sliding Bearings (Friction Pendulum System):** Friction Pendulum System (FPS) combines friction action due to sliding and restoring force by geometry (Fig. 3.11(c)). The concept of FPS is based on the pendulum equation considering no friction. Hence, the deck weight is supported on rollers sliding on a spherical surface. This type of isolator is commonly used combined with other centering devices.

In this thesis, LRB was chosen as seismic isolator system for the seed bridges under consideration because LRB are widely used in a seismic bridge design due to its damping properties and effectiveness to mitigate hazard of earthquakes. The design of the LRB for all three bridges is based on the technical report written by Constantinou et al. (2011) and according to AASHTO LRFD SBD 2009. All the calculations needed to get the final results are not given in this study.
Fig. 3.11. (a) Natural Rubber Bearing (NRB), (b) Lead Rubber Bearing (LRB) and (c) Friction Pendulum System (FPS).

Pictures from Chen and Scawthorn (2003).
3.3.1 Lead Rubber Bearings Design

According to Constantinou et al. (2011), analysis of seismically isolated bridges should be performed for Design Earthquake (DE) for two different sets of mechanical properties of the LRB: Lower Bound (LB) and Upper Bound (UB) properties. The definitions of LB and UB provided by Constantinou et al. (2011) are as follow,

a) Upper bound (UB) properties are defined to be the lower bound values of characteristic strength and post-elastic stiffness that can occur during the lifetime of the isolators and considering the effects of aging, contamination, temperature and history of loading and movement. Typically, the upper bound values describe the behavior of aged and contaminated bearings, following movement that is characteristic of substantial traffic loading, when temperature is low and during the first high cycle of seismic motion. The upper bound values of properties usually in the largest force demand on the substructure elements.

b) Lower bound (LB) properties are defined to be the lower bound values of the characteristic strength and post-elastic stiffness that can occur during the lifetime of the isolators. Typically, the lower bound values describe the behavior of fresh bearings, at normal temperature and following the initial cycle of high speed motion. The lower bound values of properties usually result in the largest displacement demand on the isolators.

Lead Rubber Bearings (LRB) have bilinear force-displacement response on the horizontal plane as shown in Fig. 3.12. The objective of the LRB design for each type of bound (lower or upper bound) is to find (i) initial stiffness, (ii) post-elastic stiffness and (iii) yield strength to determine when pass from the first initial branch to the post-elastic branch. Fig. 3.12 shows the initial stiffness $k_i$, post-elastic stiffness $k_d$, yield strength $F_y$ and corresponding yield displacement $D_y$, displacement demand $D_D$ and finally the residual strength $F_0$.

Fig. 3.12. Typical bilinear force-displacement relationship for Lead Rubber Bearing (LRB).
Fig. 3.13 clarifies the concept of upper and lower bound. Typically, the yield displacement in UB is considered to be equal to LB and the displacement demand $D_D$ is generally lower in UB as mentioned before. The area closed by the lines represents the energy dissipation through hysteresis.

![Graph showing upper and lower bound forces and displacements](image)

Fig. 3.13. Comparison between lower and upper bound values for LRB in unidirectional motion.

Note that as Fig. 3.12 as Fig. 3.13 are the bilinear force-displacement relationship for unidirectional motions. In the case of bidirectional motions the relationship force-displacement changes getting a irregular curve. Fig. 3.14 shows a comparison of the force-displacement relationship for LRB between unidirectional and bidirectional motions after carrying out a numerical simulation under Loma Prieta earthquake of Bridge A using UB values for the LRB in OpenSees. Note the differences of regularity between unidirectional and bidirectional motions along the X-axis in both cases.

![Comparison of force-displacement relationship for LRB](image)

Fig. 3.14. Comparison of force-displacement relationship of LRB with UB values between (a) unidirectional and (b) bidirectional motions.
According to the technical report called *LRFD-based Analysis and Design Procedures for Bridge Bearings and Seismic Isolators* written by Constantinou et al. (2011), as well as AASHTO LRFD SBD 2009, the main properties of the three bridges considered in this study were calculated. A detailed procedure of these calculations are not given in this study. From the design point of view, all parameters needed to model the bridge numerically are listed in Table 3.5. Spans 1, 2 and 3 are enumerated from left to right side respect to the pictures of Bridge A, B and C given in Fig. 3.1, Fig. 3.3(a) and Fig. 3.4, respectively. The ratio $\gamma$ indicates the post-elastic ratio between the post-elastic stiffness $k_d$ and the initial stiffness $k_i$. Typically, the values of the vertical and torsional stiffness of LRB are much higher than the initial and post-elastic stiffness for horizontal displacements. Note that torsional stiffness $k_T$ is specially high in all bridges because it comes out as consequence of fulfilling all the requirements for horizontal displacements provided by the code. In addition, each deck has different properties for LRB because those depend on the mass of decks, therefore although the specific weight of all spans are the same, they have different lengths as shown in Table 3.1. For all spans, the live loads are assumed as the 15% of the dead loads defined by the dead weight of each span.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Span 1</th>
<th>Span 2</th>
<th>Span 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Bound (LB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial stiffness $k_i\times10^3$ (kN/m)</td>
<td>3.9331</td>
<td>5.2409</td>
<td>5.8695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield strength $F_y$ (kN)</td>
<td>98.33</td>
<td>235.84</td>
<td>264.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical stiffness $k_V\times10^5$ (kN/m)</td>
<td>6.8467</td>
<td>19.234</td>
<td>24.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torsional stiffness $k_T\times10^6$ (kN/m)</td>
<td>1.7627</td>
<td>1.2747</td>
<td>1.7148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio $\gamma=k_d/k_i$</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Bound (UB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial stiffness $k_i\times10^3$ (kN/m)</td>
<td>4.7244</td>
<td>6.2996</td>
<td>7.0574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield strength $F_y$ (kN)</td>
<td>118.11</td>
<td>283.48</td>
<td>317.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical stiffness $k_V\times10^5$ (kN/m)</td>
<td>6.8467</td>
<td>19.234</td>
<td>24.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torsional stiffness $k_T\times10^6$ (kN/m)</td>
<td>1.7627</td>
<td>12.747</td>
<td>17.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio $\gamma=k_d/k_i$</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The LRB chosen are circular bearings with circular lead in the core. Hence, the LRB for Bridge A, B and C with the bounding properties listed in Table 3.5, have the following geometric properties showed in Fig. 3.15 and listed in Table 3.6. Although the bounding properties of bearings are different for each span, in the case of Bridge A and B the same LRB sizes were chosen in order to simplify the bridge design and always from the safety side point of view. In the case of Bridge C, each span has different LRB sizes as listed in Table 3.6. The height of the bearing without cover plates is \( H_B \), \( D_L \) is the lead diameter, \( D_B \) is the bonded diameter of the rubber, \( t_c \) is the thickness of the cover plates, \( t_s \) is the thickness of the steel shims layers and finally \( w \) and \( h \) are the width and height of the cover plates (see Fig. 3.11(b)).

![Fig. 3.15. Typical circular Lead Rubber Bearing (LRB) with its main geometric parameters.](image)

| Table 3.6. Summary of geometric properties of LRB. |
|---|---|---|---|
| (mm) | Bridge A | Bridge B | Bridge C |
| | Span 1 | Span 2 | Span 3 |
| \( D_B \) | 608 | 908 | 958 | 908 | 858 |
| \( D_L \) | 105 | 115 | 160 | 160 | 160 |
| \( H_B \) | 455 | 517 | 409 | 409 | 409 |
| \( t_c \) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| \( t_s \) | 6 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| \( w \) | 650 | 950 | 1000 | 950 | 900 |
| \( h \) | 650 | 950 | 1000 | 950 | 900 |

3.4 Design of Bridge A

The Jack Tone Road On-Ramp Overcrossing bridge shown in Fig. 3.1 Fig. 3.2 (Bridge A) is a two span-single column bent with the main geometric properties listed in Table 3.1. The superstructure is a three-cell RC box-girder with a centroid of the deck \( y_G = 0.75 \text{ m} \) from the cap beam as shown in Fig. 3.16. Knowing the deck centroid, the geometry of each span and the number of cells of the RC box-girder, several trials were needed before reaching the final cross-section of the RC box-girder in order to possess the same deck centroid as the Jack Tone Road On-Ramp Overcrossing bridge. The geometry of the cap beam was fitted to the deck geometry according to the common engineering practice. Two circular LRB as described in Fig. 3.15 were installed to 3.7 m between each other and symmetrically respect to the central pier. In addition, two more circular LRB with the same properties were installed on the right and left abutment accordingly. Fig. 3.16 shows the proposed scaled cross-section of Bridge A, cross-section A hereafter, with all the distances defined.
Cross-section A has an area $A_c = 4.2421 \text{ m}^2$ and the length of left and right spans are 33 and 34 m, respectively. Therefore, assuming that the whole section is made only by concrete with a density of $\rho_c = 2,500 \text{ kg/m}^3$, the weight (dead load) is computed as $W = \rho_c V g$ where $V$ is the volume of the rigid body defined by the deck edges and $g$ is the gravity acceleration equal to 9.81 m/s$^2$. In addition, the live load is assumed to be a 15 % of the dead load and uniform distributed on the deck in order to take into account the random traffic load. Hence, the final vertical loads for the right and left decks are 3,948.22 and 4,067.87 kN, respectively.

Regarding the single pier, it may be considered the central part of the bridge design because unlike decks, the pier has to support the flexural actions induced by the earthquake while decks behave like a rigid body. Therefore, the final behavior of deck will be governed by the central pier. The pier was designed according to the only two parameters provided by Kaviani et al. (2010 and 2012) what means the diameter of 1.70 m and longitudinal reinforcement steel ratio equal to 2 %. From this point, all the parameters needed to the proper design of the pier were based on the Caltrans SDC 1.7, Caltrans Bridge Design Specifications 2003 and AASHTO LRFD SBD 2009. An iterative procedure was carried out using an Excel spreadsheet in order to find a suitable solution from the code viewpoint. After several trials, as occurred with the shape of the cross-section $A_c$, it was found the number of steel reinforcing bars and its area. First of all, given the total cross-section area of the pier ($A = 2.27 \text{ m}^2$) and knowing the longitudinal reinforcement steel ratio, the total area of reinforcement $A_r$ comes out as,

$$A_r = 0.02 \cdot 2.27 \text{ m}^2 = 0.0454 \text{ m}^2$$

\[ (3.2) \]
It was assumed to have 60 longitudinal reinforcing bars what means one reinforcing bar each 6 degrees. Therefore, it is possible to assess the area for a single reinforcing bar as given in Eq. (3.3). In addition, according to the section 8.22 of Caltrans BDS 2003, a cover of 60 mm is considered in order to protect the reinforcement steel against corrosion.

\[ A_y = 60 A_{sb} \rightarrow A_{sb} = \pi R_{sb}^2 = 756.60 \text{ mm}^2 \rightarrow R_{sb} = 15.52 \text{ mm} \]  

(3.3)

The reinforcing bars used for Bridge A are those called Metric #32 which have a diameter equal to 32.3 mm and are those standard reinforcing bars closest to the minimum required of \( R_{sb} = 15.52 \text{ mm} \). The section 8.21.1 of Caltrans BDS 2003 provides a minimum lateral distance between reinforcing bars defined as well as section 8.18.1.2 that provide the condition for the number of reinforcing bars and their sizes.

- **8.21.1.** For cast-in-place concrete, the clear distance between parallel bars in a layer shall not be less than \( 1\frac{1}{2} \) bar diameters, \( 1\frac{1}{2} \) times the maximum size of the coarse aggregate, or \( 1\frac{1}{2} \) inches.

- **8.18.1.2** The minimum area of longitudinal reinforcement shall not be less than 0.01 times the gross area, \( A_g \), of the section. When the cross section is larger than that required by consideration of loading, a reduced effective area may be used. The reduced effective area shall not be less than that which would require one percent of longitudinal reinforcement to carry the loading. The minimum number of longitudinal reinforcing bars shall be six for bars in a circular arrangement and four for bars in a rectangular arrangement. The minimum size of bars shall be No. 5.

Therefore the spacing between reinforcing bars \( d_b \) is between upper and lower limitations and fulfills the requirement (Eq. 3.4). In addition, the number of reinforcing bars are 60, much more than the minimum provided by the code and the total area of longitudinal reinforcing bars are given by Eq. (3.2) and bigger than 1 %. Once it has been checked that to set up one reinforcing bar each 6 degrees (60 in total) with a diameter of 32.3 mm is allowed by the code, the design related to the longitudinal reinforcing bars is finished as shown in Fig. 3.17.

![Figure 3.17. Cross-section of the pier of Bridge A with the 60 reinforcing bars. Units in meters.](image)
Regarding lateral reinforcement, it was chosen a standard Metric #25 (29.9 mm of diameter) as reinforcing bar for the stirrups spacing 20 cm along the height of the pier, according to the section 8.3 of Caltrans BDS 2003. Therefore, the lateral reinforcing steel ratio is 0.91 %. The design of the abutments is based on the section 7.8. of the code Caltrans SDC 1.7. The backfill passive pressure force resisting movement at the abutment varies non-linearly with the longitudinal abutment displacement and is dependent upon the material properties of the backfill. Hence, the bilinear demand model provided by Caltrans SDC 1.7 include an effective abutment stiffness that accounts for expansion gaps, and incorporates a realistic value for the embankment fill response. The initial stiffness $K_i$ for embankment fill material provided by Caltrans SDC 1.7 is as given,

$$K_i \approx \frac{28.7 \text{ kN/mm}}{m}$$

(3.5)

The initial stiffness $K_i$ must be adjusted proportional to the back wall/diaphragm height, as given in Eq. 3.6,

$$K_{abut} = K_i w_{abut} \left( \frac{h_{abut}}{1.7 \text{ m}} \right).$$

(3.6)

where $w_{abut}$ is the projected width of the back wall or diaphragm for seat and diaphragm abutments. In the case of Bridge A, $w_{abut} = 8.3$ m and $h_{abut} = 1.855$ m therefore the stiffness of the abutment is $K_{abut} = 2.60 \cdot 10^5 \text{ kN/m}$. Based on a bilinear idealization of the force-displacement relationship depicted in Fig. 3.18, the passive pressure force at the abutment is calculated according to Eq. (3.7).

$$P_{bw} = A_e \cdot 239 \text{ kPa} \left( \frac{h_{abut}}{1.7 \text{ m}} \right).$$

(3.7)

where $A_e$ is the effective abutment wall area defined as $A_e = h_{abut} w_{abut}$. Hence, the passive pressure force $P_{bw}$ is 4,015.27 kN.

Fig. 3.18. Force-displacement relationship of passive pressure force in abutments.
3.5 Design of Bridge B

The La Veta Avenue Overcrossing bridge shown in Fig. 3.3 is a two-span bridge supported on two piers per cap beam. The geometric parameters of the bridge B are given in Table 3.1. The superstructure is a six-cell RC box-girder and the piers are supposed to be circular with a 1.7 m diameter. The procedure to design Bridge B is exactly the same as followed to design Bridge A, therefore the first step was to draw in Autocad several decks model until reach a deck with the same deck centroid \( y_G = 1.04 \text{ m} \) than the real bridge provided by Kaviani et al. (2010 and 2012). After several trials, the final deck shape is given in Fig. 3.19 as well as the cap beam and the bearings. In the case of Bridge B, three circular Lead Rubber Bearings (LRB) are used and located symmetrically respect to the center of the cap beam and separated 5.85 m. All the circular bearings used in Bridge B have the same size as listed in Table 3.6.

Cross-section B has an area \( A_{cs} = 16.559 \text{ m}^2 \) and the length of left and right spans are 47 and 44 m, respectively. Therefore, assuming a density of concrete \( \rho_c = 2,500 \text{ kg/m}^3 \), the weight of the left and right span is 19,087.15 and 17,868.82 kN, respectively. As occurred in the design of Bridge A, a 15 % of dead load is supposed to be live load to take into account the traffic load. Hence, the final vertical load applied on left and right decks are 21,950.22 and 20,549.14 kN, respectively.

Regarding the piers of the Bridge B, the longitudinal reinforcing steel ratio is approximately 1.9 % therefore the total steel area is,

\[
A_s = 0.019 \cdot 2.27 \text{ m}^2 = 0.0431 \text{ m}^2, \quad \text{(3.8)}
\]

and assuming 60 reinforcing bars as was assumed in Bridge A, the area of a single reinforcing bar is given by,

\[
A_s = 60 \times A_{sb} \rightarrow A_{sb} = \pi R_{sb}^2 = 718.77 \text{ mm}^2 \rightarrow R_{sb} = 15.13 \text{ mm} \quad \text{(3.9)}
\]

According to the common engineering practice, a standard Metric #32 (32.3 mm of diameter) was chosen as reinforcing bars. On one hand, the minimum lateral distance between reinforcing bars defined in section 8.21.1 of Caltrans BDS 2003 and the condition for the number of reinforcing bars and their sizes given in section 8.18.1.2 are fulfilled as occurred in Bridge A. The lateral distance between reinforcing bars \( d_b \) is given in Eq. (3.10). Moreover, according to the section 8.22 of Caltrans BDS 2003, a cover of 60 mm is considered in order to protect the reinforcement steel against corrosion. Therefore, the cross-section of Bridge B is the same than Bridge A as depicted in Fig. 3.17.

\[
45.38 \text{ mm} < d_b = 131.96 \text{ mm} < 203.20 \text{ mm} \quad \text{(3.10)}
\]

On the other hand regarding the lateral reinforcing bars, it was chosen a standard Metric #25 (29.9 mm of diameter) as reinforcing bar for the stirrups spacing 20 cm along the height of the pier, according to the section 8.3 of Caltrans BDS 2003. Therefore, the lateral reinforcing steel ratio is 0.91 %. The design of the abutments is based on the section 7.8. of the code Caltrans SDC 1.7. The width and the height of the abutment are 23 and 2.417 m, respectively. According to Eq. (3.5), Eq. (3.6)
Fig. 3.19. Cross-section of Bridge B. Units in meters.
and Eq. (3.7), the stiffness of the both abutments are $K_{abut} = 9.39 \times 10^5$ kN/m and the passive pressure force shown in Fig. 3.18 is $P_{bw} = 18,894.39$ kN.

3.6 Design of Bridge C

The Jack Tone Road Overhead bridge is a three-span bridge supported on three piers per cap beam. The superstructure is a seven-cell RC box-girders and the diameter of each pier is 1.7 m. The rest of the geometric properties are listed in Table 3.1. As mentioned in section 3.5, the procedure to design the Bridge C is exactly the same than used for Bridge A. On one hand, the final shape of the seven-cell RC box girder was found taking into consideration the deck centroid ($y_G = 1$ m) as main parameter. Hence, after several trials using Autocad and according to common engineering practice for bridge design, the final shape of Bridge C is depicted in Fig. 3.20. Three circular LRB were installed symmetrically respect to the central pier on the cap beams and on the abutments with the sizes listed in Table 3.6 and separated 7.6 m. In the case of Bridge C, each deck has different LRB due to seismic design criteria suggested by Constantinou et al. (2011) and explained in detail in Appendix C.

On the other hand, cross-section C has an area $A_{cs} = 17.269$ m$^2$ and the length of left, middle and right spans are 47.5, 44 and 36 m, respectively. Therefore, assuming a density of concrete $\rho_c = 2,500$ kg/m$^3$, the weight of the left, middle right span is 20,117.31, 18,634.98 and 15,246.80 kN, respectively. As occurred in the design of Bridge A and B, a 15 % of dead load is supposed to be live load to take into account the traffic load. Hence, the final vertical load applied on left, middle and right decks are 23,134.90, 21,430.22 and 17,533.82 kN, respectively.

Regarding the piers, the longitudinal reinforcing steel ratio is 2.2 %. Therefore, the total steel are is given by,

$$A_s = 0.022 \times 2.27 \text{ m}^2 = 0.0499 \text{ m}^2,$$

Assuming that there are 60 reinforcing bars, the area of the single reinforcing bar is,

$$A_s = 60 A_{sb} \rightarrow A_{sb} = \pi R_{sb}^2 = 832.26 \text{ mm}^2 \rightarrow R_{sb} = 16.28 \text{ mm}$$

According to the common engineering practice, a standard Metric #36 (35.8 mm of diameter) was chosen as reinforcing bars unlike Bridge A and B. On one hand, the minimum lateral distance between reinforcing bars defined in section 8.21.1 of Caltrans BDS 2003 and the condition for the number of reinforcing bars and their sizes given in section 8.18.1.2 are fulfilled as occurred in Bridge A and B. The lateral distance between reinforcing bars $d_b$ is given in Eq. (3.13). Moreover, according to the section 8.22 of Caltrans BDS 2003, a cover of 60 mm is considered in order to protect the reinforcement steel against corrosion. Hence, the cross-section of single pier of Bridge C is depicted in Fig. 3.21.

$$48.83 \text{ mm} < d_b = 129.42 \text{ mm} < 203.20 \text{ mm}$$
Fig. 3.20. Cross-section of Bridge C. Units in meters.
Regarding the lateral reinforcing bars, it was chosen a standard Metric #25 (29.9 mm of diameter) as reinforcing bar for the stirrups spacing 20 cm along the height of the pier, according to the section 8.3 of Caltrans BDS 2003. Therefore, the lateral reinforcing steel ratio is 0.91 % as Bridge A and B. The design of the abutments is based on the section 7.8. of the code Caltrans SDC 1.7. The width \( w_{abut} \) and the height \( h_{abut} \) of the abutment are 23.5 and 2.329 m, respectively. Therefore, according to Eq. (3.5), Eq. (3.6) and Eq. (3.7), the stiffness of the both abutments are \( K_{abut} = 9.24 \times 10^5 \) kN/m and the passive pressure force shown in Fig. 3.18 is \( P_{bw} = 17,924.58 \) kN.

![Cross-section of a pier of Bridge C with the 60 reinforcing bars. Units in meters.](image)

**Fig. 3.21.** Cross-section of a pier of Bridge C with the 60 reinforcing bars. Units in meters.

### 3.7 Conclusions

Three real bridges located in California and based on the three seed bridges used by Kaviani et al. (2010 and 2012) have been selected to study the pounding effect under bidirectional seismic excitations using the proposed contact element NCM3D. Bridge A and C are located in *location I* while Bridge B is located in *location II*. Hence, the design response spectrum for each location was calculated according to AASTHO LRFD SBD 2009 and Caltrans SDC 1.7. In addition, Kobe, Loma Prieta, Chi-Chi and Landers earthquake were chosen from PEER database (2013) as input ground motions along Fault Normal (FN) and Fault Parallel (FP). Then, these earthquake were scaled using the computer program RspMatch2005 (Hancock et al. 2006) for both locations. Once the design response spectrum was known, the Lead Rubber Bearings (LRB) were design according to Constantinou et al. (2011) for each bridge individually. Finally, a brief design description was given for each bridge based on AASTHO LRFD SBD 2009, Caltrans BDS 2003 and Caltrans SDC 1.7.
Chapter 4
Finite Element Modeling and Analysis

The study of pounding phenomenon in highway bridges in this thesis is based on numerical simulations using Finite Element Method (FEM) through the contact element NCM3D developed for the computer program OpenSees. In order to achieve accurate results, the finite element model should represent as realistic as possible all the mechanical properties of the structure. To this end, three detailed finite element models were built in OpenSees. The different elements, the materials for those elements and the type of analysis used to perform the numerical solution are discussed in depth in this chapter. Furthermore, a sensitive study about the impact stiffness and the time step of the simulations are carried out to determine its influence when pounding occurs.

4.1 Finite Element Modeling of Bridges

The main components of a finite element model of a bridge are (i) decks, (ii) piers, (iii) bearings, (iv) cap beams and (v) abutments. Within these components, those that govern the behavior of the bridge are piers and bearings basically. On one hand, the finite element modeling of bridges is based on the recommendations provided by Guidelines for Non-linear Analysis of Bridge Structures in California (2008) and the same modeling criteria is used for the three bridges under consideration. On the other hand, the bridge modeling is performed according to the elements and materials available in OpenSees (2013).

4.1.1 Decks

Decks are modeled as depicted in Fig. 2.7, using four corner nodes and adding other intermediate nodes and mass center node. These nodes are linked between each other through Elastic Beam Column elements without mass as shown in Fig. 4.1. In addition, a Rigid Diaphragm is used on the top and on the bottom level between all these nodes using the mass center as the master node and the other ones as slave nodes. The intermediate nodes are added to simulate better the geometry of decks in terms of location of bearings. A rigid diaphragm is used to force the deck to behave as rigid body. Because of this, it does not matter the material properties of these elastic beam column elements. The total mass of the decks (see sections 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6) is divided into the mass center (MC) and the four corner nodes assigning the 60% to the mass center and the 10% to each single corner node because convergence issues. Moreover, rotational inertia is applied to the mass center according to Eq. 4.1, where \( m \) is the total mass, \( a \) and \( b \) are the semi length and semi width of the deck defined in Fig. 2.7.

\[
I_0 = \frac{1}{3} m (a^2 + b^2) \quad (4.1)
\]
The vertical elastic beam column elements between the top level and the bottom level of the deck are linked using *Rigid Link* constraining all six degrees of freedom. Hence, the whole deck behaves as a rigid body. The length of the vertical elastic beam column elements coincide with the deck centroid $y_G$. In the case of Bridge A where only two bearings are installed, the middle node on the bottom level is removed (see Fig. 3.16) due to the bottom nodes are set up exactly on the same location where the bearings are installed to connect the deck with the cap beams through the lead rubber bearings defined in Table 3.6.

### 4.1.2 Piers

Piers are modeled using *Non-Linear Beam Column* elements available in OpenSees in order to simulate the non-linear geometry and non-linear material behavior. On one hand, the geometric non-linearity is modeled through $P-\Delta$ transformation which performs a linear geometric transformation of beam stiffness and resisting force from the basic system to the global coordinate system, considering second-order $P-\Delta$ effects. On the other hand, the non-linear material is handled using Euler-Bernoulli fiber beam column elements with distributed plasticity based on the work of Spacone et al. (1996a, b). The constitutive behavior of the section is modeled discretizing the section into fibers that can take into consideration the axial force-moment coupling as well as the interaction between steel and concrete. This element is based on the classical beam Euler-Bernoulli’s theory that assumes that the cross-section remains perpendicular to the axis of the beam after deformation, what implies constant shear strain distribution along the length of the beam. Despite this element uses distributed plasticity, the strains are only evaluated at certain point known as integration points. In this thesis, ten integration points along the length are used per pier in all three seed bridges (Fig. 4.2). The integration along the element is based on Gauss-Lobatto quadrature rule (two integration points at the end of the element). Although usually four integration points are used and there are some studies suggesting that more integration points not always means more accurate results (for example, Fragiadakis and Papadrakakis 2008), this study utilizes ten integration points because different number of integration points were used to study the response of the FE models and ten points provided a good response in terms of convergence.
The section of the pier is discretized into three different *Uniaxial Materials* available in OpenSees as depicted in Fig. 4.3: unconfined concrete for the cover ring, confined concrete for the core of the pier and steel for the reinforcing bars.

![Integration points diagram](image)

**Fig. 4.2.** Sketch of fiber beam column element with some integration points.

These uniaxial materials have different non-linear constitutive relationships. On one hand, the unconfined and confined concrete are modeled using the model proposed by Yasin (1994) in his PhD dissertation at University of California at Berkeley that takes into consideration the concrete damage and hysteresis of concrete under cyclic loading as shown in Fig. 4.4. This concrete model is available in OpenSees as *Uniaxial material Concrete02* and is based on the experimental results by Sinha et al. (1964) and Karsan and Jirsa (1969). This concrete constitutive law can model the initial cracking of the concrete modeling the tension branch. In this concrete model, according to Yasin (1994), the parameters for unconfined concrete are:

\[
f_c = f'_c, \quad \varepsilon_{c0} = \varepsilon_0, \quad f_{cu} = f'_u = 0, \quad \varepsilon_{cu} = \varepsilon_u, \quad f_t = f'_t, \quad E_{ts} = 0.5E_c, \quad \tag{4.2}
\]
And for confined concrete:

\[
f_c = Kf'_c, \quad \varepsilon_{e0} = K\varepsilon_0, \quad f_{cu} = 0.2Kf'_c, \quad \varepsilon_{cu} = \frac{0.8}{Z} + K\varepsilon_0, \quad f_t = f'_t, \quad E_{ts} = 0.1E_c
\]

\[
K = 1 + \frac{\rho_t f_{yh}}{f_c}, \quad E_c = \frac{2f_c}{\varepsilon_{e0}}, \quad Z = \frac{0.5}{\frac{3 + 0.29f'_c}{145f'_c - 100} + 0.75\rho_t \sqrt{\frac{h}{s_h}}} - 0.002K
\]

where \(\varepsilon_{e0}\) is the concrete strain at maximum stress, \(\varepsilon_0\) is the strain at maximum stress in unconfined concrete taken as 0.002 in this study, \(f_{cu}\) is the residual stress and \(f_u\) is the crushing strength of the concrete where \(\varepsilon_{cu}\) is its corresponding strain, \(\varepsilon_u\) is the strain at crushing strength in unconfined concrete taken as 0.004 in this study, \(f_t\) is the maximum tensile stress and \(f'_t\) is the tensile strength of the concrete taken as \(f'_t = 0.556\sqrt{f'_c}\) according to the code, \(E_{ts}\) is the softening branch slope in tension, \(E_c\) is the tangent modulus at origin, \(K\) is a factor which accounts for the strength increase due to the confinement, \(Z\) is the strain softening slope, \(f_c\) is the concrete compressive cylinder strength in MPa taken as 40 MPa, \(f_{yh}\) is the yield strength of stirrups in MPa taken as 350 MPa in this study, \(\rho_t\) is the ratio of volume of hoop reinforcement to the volume of concrete core measured to outside of stirrups, \(h\) is the width of concrete core measured to outside of stirrups and finally \(s_h\) is the center to center spacing of stirrups or hoops sets (Yassin 1994). The stress-strain relationship of the uniaxial material \textit{concrete02} available in OpenSees and based on the constitutive law for confined and unconfined concrete developed by Yassin (1994) is depicted in Fig. 4.4. Table 4.1 summarizes all the input parameters used for \textit{concrete02} model.

\[\text{Fig. 4.4. Stress-strain relationship of the \textit{concrete02} model available in OpenSees.}\]
Table 4.1. Summary of the input parameters used for concrete02 model in OpenSees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Bridge A</th>
<th>Bridge B</th>
<th>Bridge C</th>
<th>Bridge A</th>
<th>Bridge B</th>
<th>Bridge C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$f_c$ (MPa)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>43.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon_{c0}$</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.00216</td>
<td>0.00216</td>
<td>0.00216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{cu}$ (MPa)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon_{cu}$</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.00970</td>
<td>0.00970</td>
<td>0.00971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_t$ (MPa)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_s$ (MPa)</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding reinforcing steel fibers in longitudinal direction, the Uniaxial material Steel02 available in OpenSees is based on the Menegotto and Pinto (1973) constitutive law and improved by Filippou et al. (1983) including isotropic strain-hardening effect. This model is governed by the yield stress $f_y$ taken as 420 Mpa and the modulus of elastic of the steel $E_s$ taken as $2 \cdot 10^5$ MPa. The transition region between the initial slope and the post-elastic slope is governed by three parameters taken by default in OpenSees and allow to represent properly the Bauschinger effect. Fig. 4.5 shows the constitutive law of the uniaxial material steel02 available in OpenSees used for the reinforcing steel bars.

![Stress-strain relationship](image)

Fig. 4.5. Stress-strain relationship of the steel02 model available in OpenSees.

In the three seed bridges, the non-linear beam column elements are used with mass density per unit length. This mass density is calculated taking into consideration the volume of concrete and the volume of...
steel in each pier and their corresponding densities as well as the height of the piers. Therefore, assuming a density of steel equal to 7,850 kg/m$^3$ and a density of concrete equal to 2,500 kg/m$^3$, the mass density for Bridge A, B and C is 5.91, 5.89 and 5.93 kN$^2$/m$^2$, respectively.

### 4.1.3 Lead Rubber Bearings

The Lear Rubber Bearings (LRB) used to isolate the superstructure (decks) and the substructure (piers) are governed by bilinear stress-strain relationship depicted in Fig. 3.12. In order to model these LRB, Elastomeric Bearings elements available in OpenSees are used. These elements are used with the input parameters according to the lower and upper bounding defined and listed in Table 3.5. As shown in Fig. 4.6, LRB are installed between the cap beam and the bottom plane of the deck.

![Fig. 4.6. Schematic representation of the bearings of Bridge A, B and C.](image)

Although the Elastomeric Bearing elements can be used as Zero Length element in OpenSees, the total height of the bearing $H_B$ of each bridge defined in Table 3.6 is chosen in order to simulate better the real bridges. The input parameters needed for lower and upper bounding are: The initial stiffness $k_i$, the yield strength $F_y$, the vertical stiffness $k_V$, the torsional stiffness $k_T$ and the ratio $\gamma$ between the post-elastic stiffness $k_d$ and the initial stiffness $k_i$ (see Table 3.5).

### 4.1.4 Cap Beams

Cap beams are modeled using Elastic Beams elements available in OpenSees without mass and forced to work as a rigid body through the command RigidLink Beam available in OpenSees that constraint the 6 degrees of freedom between two nodes using a master node. This master node is the joint between the cap beam and the pier as shown Fig. 4.7. The code Caltrans SDC 1.7 as well as the technical report Guidelines for Non-Linear Analysis of Bridge Structures in California provided by PEER Center,
allow to take this assumption. In addition, it is a common practice in numerical simulations of bridges (see for example Jankowski et al. 1998, Abdel Raheem 2009, Eröz and DesRoches 2013).

4.1.5 Abutments

The abutments are modeled according to the technical report used in the case of cap beams (see section 4.1.4) and the contribution on the X-Y plane of the abutments only appear when there is pounding. Hence, when there is pounding abutments becomes another adjacent structure where decks may impact with. Therefore, abutments are modeled with the proposed contact element NCM3D developed and implemented in OpenSees in this study. The impact stiffness in normal and tangential direction are assumed to be the same and equal to the stiffness of the abutment provided by section 7.8 of Caltrans SDC 1.7 and computed in section 3.4 (Bridge A), section 3.5 (Bridge B) and section 3.6 (Bridge C) and summarized in Table 4.2, the normal and tangential coefficient of restitution is \( r_N = r_T = 0.64 \) and the static and kinetic coefficient of friction are assumed to be \( \mu_s = 0.5 \) and \( \mu_k = 0.4 \), respectively. From the vertical point of view, the vertical stiffness of the abutments is given by the vertical stiffness of the LRB (see Table 3.5) installed due to the abutments are assumed to be fixed during the earthquake as shown in Fig. 4.7.

Table 4.2. Summary of the impact stiffness for the abutments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Bridge A</th>
<th>Bridge B</th>
<th>Bridge C</th>
<th>Bridge A</th>
<th>Bridge B</th>
<th>Bridge C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stiffness ( k_{abut} ) (( 10^5 ) kN/m)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>9.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive force ( P_{bw} ) (kN)</td>
<td>4,015.27</td>
<td>18,894.39</td>
<td>17,924.58</td>
<td>4,015.27</td>
<td>18,894.39</td>
<td>17,924.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the passive force listed in Table 4.2 and provided the section 7.8 of Caltrans SDC 1.7 is not respected when NCM3D is used due to NCM3D does not use a linear relationship between displacements and forces, the maximum values of pounding force along normal direction are close to the passive force values. Therefore, in order to take into consideration the friction forces as well, NCM3D is used instead of an uniaxial contact element with the force-displacement relationship given by the code and showed in Fig. 3.18.

Fig. 4.7. Schematic representation of abutments.
In addition, the stiffness of the abutment given by the same code are not considered as impact stiffness, however in this study are taken as impact stiffness because of the order of magnitude of those stiffness is quite similar un many pounding studies and realistic.

4.2 Parametric Study

In order to summarize the global behavior of the three seed bridges under pounding phenomena, two parameters were used: the expansion joint (gap) and the skewness (angle). On one hand, the gap is defined as the distance between two adjacent decks as well as the distance between a deck and an abutment as shown in Fig. 1.12. On the other hand, the skew angle is defined as the angle between the expansion joint and the lateral edge of the deck as depicted in Fig. 4.8. The range of the gap $d$ is taken as the 10, 30, 50, 70, 90 and 100% of the displacement demand $D_{D}$ of the LRB using Upper Bound properties (see Table 4.3). Therefore, each bridge has a different range for the gap. Unlike the gap, the range of the skew angle goes from 0 to 45 degrees using 15 degrees step between them (0°, 15°, 30° and 45°).

Table 4.3. Gaps (d) used for the simulations for each bridge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gap (mm)</th>
<th>Bridge A</th>
<th>Bridge B</th>
<th>Bridge C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$d/D_{D} = 0.1$</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d/D_{D} = 0.3$</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d/D_{D} = 0.5$</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d/D_{D} = 0.7$</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d/D_{D} = 0.9$</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>136.8</td>
<td>102.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d/D_{D} = 1.0$</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.8. Skewness.

Different combinations of the gap, skewness, direction of the ground motion (unidirectional and bidirectional),pounding and no pounding as well as both bounding properties of the LRB (lower and upper) were used in order to perform 2,688 non-linear time history FEM analysis using OpenSees.
4.3 Sensitive Study

Pounding is complex phenomenon acting in a short period of time with several parameters involved that cannot be determined easily. Therefore, it can be imagined this phenomena may be sensitive to some of those parameters and modify the final response of the bridge under seismic excitation. Since pounding is only produced during a short period of time (in the order of milliseconds) and the impact stiffness has a high uncertainty (Guo et al. 2011) and only can be computed experimentally, the time step $dt$ and the impact stiffness $k$ are used to check out the sensitivity of the numerical modeling of bridges. The bridge model used to carry out this sensitive study was the same as used for bidirectional validation in Section 2.4.2.2.

4.3.1 Influence of Time Step

![Graph showing displacements for different time steps](image)

Fig. 4.9. Displacements of deck 1 along (a) X direction and (b) Y direction using NCM3D under Taft earthquake for different time steps.
Because of the duration of the pounding, the time step $dt$ used to discretized the time may be a crucial parameter in order to perform a good FEM analysis as well as change the bridge response during the earthquake. Therefore, different time steps were used to determine their influence during pounding. Unlike the displacements along $X$ and $Y$-axis as shown in Fig. 4.9, the accelerations in those directions are quite sensitive to the different time steps (Fig. 4.10).

The displacements of deck 2 are quite similar to the deck 1 and therefore are not reported in this study. While the influence of the time step in terms of displacements is not relevant and does not seem that changes the bridge response significantly, the acceleration response is highly influenced by the time step as depicted in Fig. 4.10. On one hand, it changes the number and the time of the impacts as well as the value of those impacts. On the other hand, the response of the deck in terms of accelerations (normal and tangential) does not change a lot when there is no pounding. That may be why the bridge model used in the sensitive study is an isolated bridge through LRB between cap beam and decks. Therefore, both decks are very sensitive to the accelerations but low sensitive in terms of displacements.

![Graphs showing acceleration vs. time for different time steps](image)

**Fig. 4.10.** Accelerations of deck 1 along (a) normal and (b) tangential direction using NCM3D under Taft earthquake for different time steps.
Focusing on the acceleration response, zooming in the first impact at time 1.44 s and a random impact during the earthquake at time 5.75 s approximately, the main differences such as the shape of the impact force relationship and the dissipated energy can be compared. Fig. 4.11(a, c) shows the force-time relationship at the first impact for normal and tangential direction. As it can be seen, the initial contact takes place at the same time with all four different time steps and the peak value of those are quite similar. Obviously, the shape produced by \( dt = 0.01 \) s is sharper than the other ones as expected.

Nonetheless, the area under the curve, what means the dissipated energy, remains almost the same as shown in Fig. 4.11 (a, c) and the differences are not significant. However, looking at the normal and tangential forces produced at time 5.75 s, the influence of the time step becomes relevant and modify the exact time of the impact as well as its peak value and dissipated energy as depicted in Fig. 4.11(b, d). The error of the dissipated energy in a random time during the contact respected to the initial impact is due to the accumulative error. However, as it said before, the influence of the time steps in terms of displacement may be neglected while the effect in terms of acceleration is relevant.

Fig. 4.11. Normal force of (a) the first impact and (b) a random impact. Tangential force of (c) the first impact and (d) random impact for different time steps.
In both cases, the $dt = 0.01$ s is when more energy is dissipated while the dissipated energy in the initial impact is the same for $dt = 0.001$ s and $dt = 0.0005$ s what means that $dt = 0.001$ s is a good assessment for the further time step. However, in the random impact all the dissipated energies are different due to the accumulative error mentioned above. Finally, the rotation of both decks was studied showing a slightly difference of behavior but less chaotic than the acceleration response. As it can be seen in both decks in Fig. 4.12, there is no difference of response during the first contact and this difference is growing up along the time due to the accumulative error produced by the time step.

4.3.2 Influence of Impact Stiffness

According to Guo et al. (2010), the impact stiffness $k$ used in the mathematical model in both directions (see Section 2.4.1) is one of the most significant parameters in pounding modeling. Despite the right assessment of the impact stiffness would need to carry out several experiments in the laboratory, this procedure is not common in the normal engineering practice. Therefore, it is needed to estimate a value of the impact stiffness $a$ priori, before knowing anything else. Some years ago, this impact stiffness was taken as the normal stiffness taking account the axial deformation of both colliding bodies. Nevertheless, Guo et al. (2010) demonstrated there was a huge gap between the real value computed experimentally and the theoretical axial value. Hence, different impact stiffness’s were taken to study the influence of this parameter in the bridge response based on the published literature.

As occurred during the assessment of the influence of the time step, the influence of the impact stiffness in terms of displacements is reduced. Fig. 4.13 shows the small variations of the displacement
along X and Y-axis of deck 1 according to the different values of the impact stiffness. However, the differences are bigger than those related to the time step as expected.

As expected, the influence in the acceleration response is much higher than displacement response. In addition, because of the impact stiffness is directly proportional to the normal and tangential pounding force and therefore to the acceleration of decks, the increment of the acceleration when the impact stiffness is also incremented is evident. The normal and tangential acceleration of deck 1 are depicted in Fig. 4.14(a) and Fig. 4.14(b), respectively. However, due to the scale necessary to draw the different accelerations related to different impact stiffness’s in the same plot is not possible to understand it clearly and therefore Fig. 4.15 is provided.
Finally, the rotation of both decks are compared for different values of impact stiffness’s as shown in Fig. 4.16. As expected, the influence of the impact stiffness in the rotation of decks is much higher than the influence of the time step. Nevertheless, although the rotation response is completely different according to different values of the impact stiffness, it seems as constrained between the same positive and negative values of rotation. In other words, the absolute value of the peak rotations do not change significantly as shown in Fig. 4.16.
4.4 Analysis Method

Non-linear time-history analysis procedures are widely recognized as the most accurate way of simulating the seismic response of structure and especially when pounding is involved. Time integration of equations of motion is accomplished using Newmark’s method of constant acceleration $\beta = 0.5$, $\gamma = 0.25$ and the time step of 0.001 s. As it was mentioned in Section 4.3.1, a time step of 0.001 s provided good enough results in terms of displacement, energy dissipation and convergence. Among the 2,688 non-linear time history analysis, only few simulations are carried out using a time step of 0.0005 s due to convergence troubles.

The non-linearity of the problem demands an iterative solution procedure. At the beginning of each time step modified Newton-Raphson method is employed for the iterative solution and the method is changed if the convergence is not achieved in the time step. This procedure is done through a script written in TCL and added in each bridge model. The wide library of solvers in OpenSees supplies algorithms such as Newton with line search, Krylov-Newton, Secant Newton, BFGS and Broyden method. The convergence of the solution is based on energy increment and the Rayleigh damping used in this study is stiffness proportional.

4.5 Pre-processing and Post-processing

The open-source computer program OpenSees does not have GUI (Graphical User Interface) as shown in Fig. 2.21 and therefore is not user-friendly. The powerful of OpenSees for dynamic problems
contrast with the lack of tools regarding pre and post-processing. On one hand, in order to overcome this drawback, all the TCL scripts of the three seed bridges needed to the numerical simulations were written using the computer program TCL editor and then loaded in OpenSees through the command source script.tcl. On the other hand, the output files from OpenSees came out in .txt format. A Matlab script was created to be able to read, summarize and screen all the significant data to study the bridge responses. The Matlab script is not provided in this thesis because is unnecessary and does not contribute in the understanding of the problem. Finally, once all the recorded parameters of the bridges were filtered and screened in a legible file, the final results were plotted using OriginLab (as all the graphs presented in this study).

4.6 Conclusions

Three real bridges were modeled in OpenSees according to the common engineering practice in non-linear analysis recommended in Guidelines of nonlinear analysis in bridge structures in California (Aviram et al. 2008b). Basically, the main parts of the bridge which were modeled were: decks, piers, lead rubber bearings (LRB), cap-beams and abutments. Then, the expansion joint (d) and the skewness of the bridge were taken as the main parameters needed to carry out a parametric study. Different values of gaps and skew angles were taken and combined in order to simulate as scenarios as possible. In this study, 2,688 non-linear time-history analysis were computed. In addition, a sensitive study related to the most two sensitive parameters regarding pounding phenomena such as time step and impact stiffness were considered. Finally, the analysis method used during the numerical simulations as well as the computers programs used during the pre and post-processing were explained.
Chapter 5

Numerical Results and Discussion

This chapter presents the results of all numerical simulations of the seed bridges considered in Chapter 3. The same type of simulations are done in the three bridges. This means to figure out a combination of unidirectional and bidirectional seismic excitation, pounding and no pounding, lower bound (LB) and upper bound (UB), four ground motions (Kobe, Loma Prieta, ChiChi and Landers earthquake), six different gaps depending on the bridge (see Table 4.3) and finally four different skew angles (0°, 15°, 30° and 45°) in each case. Combining all these cases implies 2,688 non-linear time history analysis. Fig. 5.1 shows, as example, a flowchart of the combination of simulations mentioned before.

Fig. 5.1. Flowchart of all possible combinations used in the non-linear time history simulations in OpenSees.
In the three bridges are used the same impact parameters as input of NCM3D. The normal and the tangential impact stiffness is taken as $k = 1 \times 10^3$ kN/m, the coefficient of restitution along normal and tangential direction is taken $r_N = r_t = 0.64$ while the static and kinetic coefficient of friction $\mu_s$ and $\mu_k$ are taken as 0.5 and 0.4 respectively. Due to the huge amount of output data of each bridge, 896 non-linear time history analysis for each bridge with a lot of parameters recorded in each simulation, is not possible to show all the results supplied by OpenSees. Nonetheless, there is a correlation between some of those results which allow to understand good enough the seismic response of the bridge only focusing on in several parameters. Therefore, although all the results were recorded, only the relative acceleration of one deck, the displacement of the same deck as well as the reaction of one of the piers (in the case there were more than one) is shown in this study.

It is also important to explain the way of how these results are shown. Unlike the results regarding the seismic behavior of bridges plotted previously in this study, the results of Section 5 are more concentrated and concise due to the huge amount of data to deal with. In order to do that, a new template of graph is created for this Section 5. The new graph used to plot as much information as possible is based on the base of this study: the pounding and no pounding behavior and both parameters used in the parametric study (gap and skewness). The circle is divided into two semicircles where the left one shows all the results related to unidirectional ground motion while the left side of the circle shows the results related to the bidirectional ground motion. At the same time, each semicircle is divided into two portions where the upper one concentrates all the results along X-axis while the lower portion summarizes the results along Y-axis. As occurred in the unidirectional semicircle (left one), the bidirectional semicircle (right one) is also divided into two portions where the upper one summarizes the results along X-axis and the lower one the results along Y-axis. Each portion is painted with a different color in order to be distinguished clearly. In addition, each portion is also divided into four different areas representing the four different skew angles used in the simulations ($0^\circ$, $15^\circ$, $30^\circ$ and $45^\circ$) and each of these areas is divided into six smaller areas which represent the six different gap sizes used (10, 30, 50, 70, 90 and 100% of the displacement demand provided in Table 4.3). Hence, the results of the unidirectional and bidirectional ground motions can be compared easily for the different parameters.

### 5.1 Results of Bridge A

The bridge A (The Jack Tone Road On-Ramp bridge) is a two-span bridge with 67 m of total length, left and right spans of 33 m and 34 m respectively and one pier between decks (Fig. 3.1 and 3.2). The first result studied is the acceleration of deck 2 in the case of Design Earthquake (DE) for the different ground motions as well as the lower (LB) and upper (UB) bound properties of the LRB. As can be seen in the fig. 5.2, the peak accelerations are quite chaotic and do not follow any perceptible path. However, the point is not only how the peak accelerations change for the different gaps and the different skew angles. It should be also noted the increment of the peak accelerations in the case of pounding respect to when there is no pounding. As shown in Fig. 5.2, the peak accelerations when there is pounding are around ten times higher than when there is no pounding. As it will see after, the peak accelerations are the most chaotic measurement to study and provide information about local damages due to the isolation of the bridge.
Fig. 5.2. Peak accelerations of deck 2 of Bridge A when (a) there is no pounding and (b) pounding.
Fig. 5.3. Maximum displacements of deck 2 of bridge A for (a) DE and (b) MCE in the case of LB.
Fig. 5.4. Maximum reaction force in the base of the pier of bridge A for (a) DE and (b) MCE in the case of LB.
The acceleration along $Y$-axis when applied unidirectional ground motion and there is no pounding is zero, as expected (Fig. 5.2(a)). Nevertheless, when there is pounding these accelerations become bigger than zero in the case of the skew angle is bigger than zero also. This effect also appears in terms of displacements (Fig. 4.3) and reactions (Fig. 5.4) and can be explained physically due to the slipping of both decks in the plane of contact even when the ground motions is only applied along $X$-axis. Moreover, the bigger is the skew angle the bigger are the displacements, as expected.

On one hand, regarding the maximum displacements of deck 2, the behavior for Design Earthquake (DE) and Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE) are analogous apart from the value of the measurement. In the case of unidirectional ground motion, the maximum displacements along $X$-axis when there is are always lower than those when there is no pounding except when the skew angle is 45°. In addition, the maximum displacements along $Y$-axis become larger than zero when the skew angle is bigger than 0° as commented in the previous paragraph. In the case of bidirectional ground motion it can be seen the same behavior. Basically, the response of the bridge in terms of maximum displacements can be summarized as: the bigger is the skew angle the higher are the differences between pounding and no pounding. These differences between the maximum displacements with and without pounding are growing up with the skew angle.

On the other hand, the reaction on the base of the pier along $X$-axis in the case of unidirectional earthquake and pounding seem to be constrained to be lower than the reaction when there is no pounding. Only when the skew angle is 45° the reaction with pounding become larger than without pounding. As it is depicted in Fig. 5.4(a), there is a convergence trouble in the case of unidirectional ground motion, 45° of skew angle and 30% of displacement demand in both directions. The reactions do not tend to infinite but are much larger than expected. Nevertheless, although a smaller time step of 0.0001 s was used, it came out the same result. In addition, this trouble does not appear when MCE is applied what means it is a numerical problem in that particular case. Regarding the reaction along $Y$-axis, the maximum reaction is 400 kN for 45° and therefore not negligible. In the case of bidirectional pounding, the same path observed for the displacement can be distinguished now. The reactions of the pier with pounding in both directions are lower than those without pounding when the skew angle is 0°. However for 15°, 30° and 45° the reactions with pounding are increasing respect to those without pounding. Regarding the reactions along $Y$-axis with pounding are always lower than those without pounding. Moreover, all reactions recorded for the four different earthquakes are quite similar. There are not significant differences between results using pulse-like ground motions and far-field ground motions.

5.2 Results of Bridge B

The bridge B (La Veta Avenue Overcrossing bridge) is a two-span bridge with 91 m of total length, left and right spans of 47 m and 44 m respectively and two piers between decks (Fig. 3.3). As occurred in the bridge A, despite the peaks of accelerations of deck 2 do not follow any logical path and therefore it is difficult to extract conclusions directly about the bridge response, those are around ten times larger when there is pounding respect to when there is no pounding. The graph is not provided in this study because of does not contribute in the knowledge of the bridge response as occurred in the bridge A.
Fig. 5.5. Maximum displacements of deck 2 of bridge B for (a) DE and (b) MCE in the case of LB.
Fig. 5.6. Maximum reaction force in the base of the pier of bridge B for (a) DE and (b) MCE in the case of LB.
Unlike the bridge A, in the case of unidirectional ground motion and DE only the Kobe earthquake does not increase the displacement along X-axis when there is pounding. On one hand, as occurred in all the parameters studied in the bridge A, the slipping effect is also seen in the displacement of bridge B. The displacements along Y-axis for 0º are zero but when the skew angle is larger the displacements increase until not negligible values. Furthermore the larger is the skew angle the higher is the different between the displacement with and without pounding. In the case of MCE, pounding reduces the displacement in the most of the cases as depicted in Fig. 5.5(b) for the unidirectional ground motion. On the other hand, the same behavior is noted. For a low value of the skew angle the maximum displacements when there is no pounding seem to be larger than those with pounding. However, when the skew angle is larger than 30º and the gap is larger than 50-70% of the displacement demand, pounding causes larger displacements for DE. In addition, the same response is observed along Y-axis. Curiously, when the earthquake applied is MCE, the displacement along X-axis follows the same path than DE but not along Y-axis, where it seems to have an upper limit displacement when there is no pounding (Fig. 5.5(b)). Again, the highest difference of displacement between pounding and no pounding take place for the skew angle equal to 45º in the case of unidirectional and bidirectional ground motion as well.

Regarding the reaction on the base of the pier, the pier taken to measure the reaction is the closest to the corner L1 (see Fig. 2.7). On one hand, in the case of unidirectional ground motion the reactions related to the different earthquakes are quite similar when there is pounding and not so equal without pounding. In all the cases except for 45º, the reaction with pounding is lower than without pounding. In the case of bidirectional as DE as MCE follows the same path until 30º, the larger is the gap the higher is the reaction as shown in Fig. 5.6. However, up to 30º this path disappears and the reactions follow the same path than the displacement in the same range of skew angles. In addition, the reaction of the pier when there is not pounding is not constant for the different skew angles due to the two piers instead of one as in the case of bridge A. This effect due to the mass distribution is clearer for MCE (Fig. 5.6(b)). Finally, the cases where the reaction of the pier with and without pounding are exactly the same means that there was not contact between decks.

### 5.3 Results of Bridge C

The bridge C (Jack Tone Road Overhead bridge) is a three-span with 127.5 m of total length divided into three spans: the left span of 47.5 m, the middle one of 44 m and the right one of 36 m (Fig. 3.4). As occurred in bridge A and B, the slipping effect is also noted in this case as in terms of displacements as in terms of reactions of the middle pier. Regarding the peak of accelerations when there is pounding, in the bridge C are around five times larger than without pounding. The maximum displacement of the deck 2 (middle one) of bridge C, as in the case of unidirectional as well as bidirectional ground motion DE along X-axis, the maximum displacements increase with the displacement demand. In addition, for a high displacement demand (up to 50%) the displacements with pounding are larger than those without pounding (Fig. 5.7(a)). However, in the case of MCE the maximum displacement along X-axis under unidirectional ground motion are lower when there is pounding apart from 45º when, again, pounding effect contributes to increase the displacement. When bidirectional ground motions are used, the same behavior is observed along X-axis. Nonetheless, the maximum displacement along Y-axis remains quite similar with and without pounding for DE.
Fig. 5.7. Maximum displacements of deck 2 of bridge C for (a) DE and (b) MCE in the case of LB.
Fig. 5.8. Maximum reaction force in the base of the pier of bridge C for (a) DE and (b) MCE in the case of LB.
The reaction of the pier is taken in the middle pier on the base. As occurred in bridge B, the reaction of the pier changes for each skew angle even if there is no pounding under unidirectional earthquake. The reason is that the skew angle changes the shape of the deck and therefore the mass distribution. On one hand, the maximum reactions along X-axis under unidirectional earthquake, DE and pounding are always equal or lower than without pounding. However, in the case of MCE the reactions with pounding are much lower than those with pounding except when the skew angle is 45º, as shown in Fig. 5.8(a).

On the other hand, the reactions under bidirectional ground motion along X-axis behave quite similar to unidirectional ground motion been the reactions with pounding lower than those without pounding in the most of the cases. Only when the skew angle gets close to 45º, this kind of behavior changes as depicted in Fig. 5.8. In the case of the reactions along Y-axis, as under DE as MCE, the reactions with pounding are always equal or lower than without pounding.

5.4 Conclusions

The responses of the peak accelerations and maximum displacements of deck 2 as well as the maximum reactions on the base of the pier of bridge A, B and C are given in this chapter. Despite all three bridges are different, there is a common path in all of them: the larger is the skew angle the larger are the displacements and reactions. Nonetheless there is a range of skew angles where the reactions when there is pounding are lower than there is no pounding. This range varies from each bridge but on average goes from 0º to 30º approximately. Furthermore, the reduction of reaction force on the base of the pier increased when the number of piers increased as well. While the reduction of the reaction in the bridge A with pounding is minimum, the reduction in the same case in bridge C is significant. Therefore, the influence of the skewness is much relevant than other parameters as the gap, for instance. The gap also influences the response of the bridge but in most of the cases the parameters under study are lower with pounding than without pounding. Hence, it can be concluded that the worse combination may be a skew angle of 45º and there are information enough to propose the worse gap in terms of increment of acceleration, displacement and reactions on the base of the pier. However, to use a small gap means to restrict the displacements and the reactions as shown the results showed previously.
Chapter 6
Conclusions and Recommendations

This study evaluates the effect of the seismic pounding in typical highway bridges with deck rotation. A bilinear contact element based on modified Kelvin-Voigt model which takes into account the relative displacement between deck and frictional forces involved was developed and implemented in an open-source computer program OpenSees based on Finite Element Method. The contact element was validated for unidirectional direction using an experiment carried out at Harbin Institute of Technology in 2009. Hence, the bidirectional validation was done by analogy due to the lack of available data. Once it was verified that the developed contact element worked as expected, three real bridges located in California were chosen as seed bridges in order to apply the proposed contact element. Four different ground motions were taken as input seismic excitation (Kobe, Loma Prieta, Chi-Chi and Landers earthquake) for the numerical simulations in OpenSees. After that, the gap and the skewness were chosen as the main parameters of the parametric study. Therefore, 2688 non-linear time history analysis were simulated.

6.1 Conclusions

After carrying out all the simulations, several conclusions can be drawn from this study:

1. The impact stiffness is maybe the most relevant variable involved in the pounding phenomenon and the assessment of its value is crucial to provide good results. The most common impact stiffness used in the literature for highway bridges of concrete is $k = 1 \cdot 10^3$ kN/m. Larger impact stiffness might cause convergence troubles.

2. Due to the short period of time of the pounding between adjacent structures, the selection of an appropriate time step becomes an important issue in seismic pounding simulation. An adequate time step for this kind of problems may be $dt = 0.001$ s.

3. The typology of the bridge as well as the number of piers and spans under consideration may influence significantly the whole bridge response.

4. Unlike it was expected, pounding phenomenon restricts the displacement of decks as well as the reaction on the base of the pier, generally. However, it makes increase the relative accelerations of decks in the order of magnitude from five to ten times more approximately what may mean local damages on the top surface of the bridge. The isolation between deck and cap-beam minimize somehow these accelerations on the pier.

5. The skew angle was detected as a main parameter of the bridge response when pounding occurs. The higher skew angle the larger displacements of decks and reactions of piers appear. In this study, the worse skew angle detected was 45° for unidirectional and bidirectional earthquake.
6. It was observed that the gap size limit the displacements and the reactions forces. Therefore, a gap as small as possible is recommended in order to avoid the pounding effects. However, the gap has to fulfill several requirements such as dilation, creep of concrete, shrinkage… etc.

7. Finally, increasing the number of piers the differences of displacements and reaction forces with and without pounding was also increased. That means a relevant reduction of displacements and reaction forces when the number of piers increased.

Taking account the large number of non-linear time history analysis carried out in this study, it makes a good approach to the real response of a bridge under seismic pounding. A lot of different variables were taking into consideration in order to simulate a situation as real as possible and find real results to be considered in the bridge design in the future.

6.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

On one hand, for the modified Kelvin-Voigt impact force model, the transition between compression and restitution phases of impact is not smooth. Therefore, the improvement of the model could be proposed in further studies. On the other hand, the assumption of rigid body for decks can be removed and to assume an elastic body. In addition, the hypothesis of neglecting the increment of moment due to the point of impact given by Eq. 2.39 can be removed and taken into consideration. Finally, the vertical component of the ground motions could be also used in the mathematical model in order to simulate a real 3D pounding as well as to consider fixed bridges and not only isolated bridges in further studies.
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