

# Seismic Vulnerability Assessment of Adamson University Buildings' As-Built using Fragility Curves

aylon, Michael B<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Manuel Luis Quezon University

*Received: 14 December 2017 Accepted: 1 January 2018 Published: 15 January 2018*

---

## Abstract

Adamson University buildings' age ranges from 10 years to 86 years. The structures' age can be one of the factors of their vulnerability to seismic hazard. Possibility of having different damages after the event of seismic activities can be measured through structural modeling and subjecting the latter to earthquake simulation. In the field of structural reliability, fragility analysis can be used in the assessment of structures. This type of analysis can be carried out by taking the structural performance using nonlinear analyses: Pushover Analysis and Time History Analysis. Five (5) buildings in Adamson University were analyzed and modeled in a structural analysis software based from the developed as-built plans with rebound hammer test results for the compressive strength of concrete. These structural models were subjected through a total of 22 ground motion data (from both Philippine and Japan), with each ground motion data normalized from 0.1g to 1.0g of peak ground acceleration (PGA). The result of fragility analysis has some limitations such as the use of asbuilt plan of each building assessed. The lowest probability of exceedance of 9

---

**Index terms**— fragility curve, pushover analysis, time history analysis, probability of exceedance.

in the webpage of the Philippine Institute of Civil Engineers, it was stated in one of its Fundamental Canons that: "Civil Engineers shall hold paramount the safety, health and welfare of the public and shall strive to comply with the principles of sustainable development in the performance of their duties (Philippine Institute of Civil Engineers Inc., 2018)." Hazards, vulnerability, and risks affect the safety of a structure and it is a challenge to civil engineers to assess those factors to existing and developing buildings. Furthermore, hazard is the possibility that a damaging phenomenon will likely to occur. Vulnerability is the area or extent that will be subjected to damages after an occurrence of a hazard. The expected losses from the occurrence of a hazard including the property damages, injuries, and loss of lives are the risks. Nowak & Collins (2000) developed several methods in the analysis of structural reliability. These reliability methods are Monte Carlo Simulation (MCS), Latin Hypercube (LHC), First Order Reliability Method (FORM), Second Order Reliability Method (SORM), Hasofer-Lind Method of reliability index. further enhanced his fragility curves by using nonlinear static analysis and nonlinear dynamic analysis. Two years after, Requiso's research was enhanced further the development of fragility curves by using the two aforementioned nonlinear analysis plus the application of interval analysis (Baylon, 2015). It is notable that the sophistication of these assessments increases the accuracy of the results. The studies of Baylon were followed by more seismic vulnerability assessments in the succeeding years.

One of the major fault lines in the Philippines is the Valley Fault System, which is composed of two sections: the 10km East Valley Fault and the 100km West Valley Fault. The West Valley Fault System (WVFS) traverses through a large portion of Metro Manila which could definitely endanger the lives of people, infrastructures, and buildings. For the past 1400 years, the West Valley Fault has moved 4 times and has a movement interval of 400 years. The last recorded movement of WVFS was on 1658 (Solidum Jr., 2015). The PHIVOLCS warned Metro Manila that the WVFS is ripe for generating a devastating magnitude of no less than 7.2 earthquake in the Richter scale or also called as "The Big One". According to PHIVOLCS, the said earthquake could be

45 experienced in the near future. For that reason, the existing buildings must be assess for structural integrity  
46 (PHIVOLCS, JICA, & MMDA, 2004).

47 The buildings and facilities of Adamson University will be definitely affected if the "Big One" occurs. Using the  
48 PHIVOLCS' Fault Finder App, the nearest distance to the West Valley Fault System of Adamson University is 8.9  
49 km as of 2013 mapped, as can be seen in Fig. ??1 These buildings will be susceptible to such level of damage. As  
50 of this writing, a group senior civil engineering students conducted I. Introduction seismic assessment of Adamson  
51 University buildings with the use of "as-built" plans. The assessment from this study will help provide a seismic  
52 evaluation and assess the vulnerability of the structures. This study aimed to assess the seismic vulnerability  
53 of Adamson University buildings using its As-Built plan and Seismic fragility curve. Specifically, develop a set  
54 of as-built plan of the structure, generate sets of fragility curves by determining the damage indices and ranks  
55 of the structure from push over analysis and time history analysis using the following parameter: Displacement  
56 Ductility, Ultimate Ductility and Hysteretic Energy Ductility, provide with the vulnerability assessment of the  
57 structure by using the derived set of fragility curves, and evaluate the different derived seismic fragility curves of  
58 Adamson University buildings.

59 The scope of this study is to assess seismic vulnerability of Adamson University buildings. In Table 1.5, five (5)  
60 of the buildings of Adamson University was assessed. Using Microsoft Excel and Matlab, the researchers obtained  
61 the parameters needed in deriving fragility curves. Furthermore, this study limited the seismic assessment  
62 methods used in creating fragility curves to Non-linear static analysis (Push Over Analysis) and Non-linear  
63 dynamic analysis (Time History Analysis) considering only shear as the mode of failure. Additionally, the  
64 structural performance of Adamson University buildings was evaluated under the effects of numerous normalized  
65 peak ground acceleration.

66 The ground motion data were acquired from Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology (IRIS), the  
67 following data that used were listed below: Other earthquakes after effects were not within the scope of the study.  
68 The basis for selecting these ground motion data was the relative location of earthquakes. This study was also  
69 be inclusive of probable cost of damage; reconstruction costs and retrofitting costs. This portion of the study  
70 will fall under Net Present Value Approach.

71 The structural model of Adamson University Buildings was based from As-Built Plans. These plans will be  
72 obtained by conducting As-Built/Field Surveys using surveying materials from Adamson University Engineering  
73 Department. The resulted As-Built Plans and the ground motion data, which will be acquired from the databases  
74 of PHIVOLCS and IRIS, will be used for the generation of seismic analysis.

75 In connection to modeling of structures, and performing the Nonlinear Static Analysis (Push-Over Analysis)  
76 and the Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis (Time History Analysis) the structural software to be used are SAP2000  
77 to be able to determine the parameters needed such as; Ductility Factors, Damage Indices Factors, and Damage  
78 Rank, in attaining the fragility functions.

79 Thereupon, the data gathered from the analysis will then be used to finally plot the fragility curves. Using  
80 the fragility curves and by embodying the use of mathematical software, the seismic performance of the structure  
81 can be assessed.

82 This study utilized the methods of Pushover Analysis (Non-linear static analysis) and Time History Analysis  
83 (Non-linear dynamic analysis). Requiso (2013) used the methods of Pushover Analysis (non-linear static analysis)  
84 in obtaining the yield displacement and the maximum displacement of the structure. Karim & Yamazaki (2001)  
85 used the methods of Time History Analysis (non-linear dynamic analysis) in obtaining the maximum displacement  
86 of the structure and for the derivation of the fragility curve. The software used for structural analysis, simulation  
87 and design was SAP2000.

88 The ground motion data used was acquired from the databases of PHIVOLCS (The Philippine Institute of  
89 Volcanology and Seismology) and IRIS (Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology).

90 PHIVOLCS is a national institution that provides information about volcanic activities, tsunamis, and  
91 earthquakes. This institution was mandated to alleviate disasters that may arise from the said activities.  
92 While IRIS, is an educational center and a multi-institutional research having investigators from several  
93 consulting companies, universities, researchers at different state that provide contributions to; a performance-  
94 based earthquake engineering, seismology, risk management and etc., research programs.

95 This research was designed as shown in Figure ??1 which intent to generate sets of fragility curves by  
96 determining the different parameters from performing the Nonlinear Static Analysis (Push-Over Analysis) and  
97 Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis (Time History Analysis) using structural software, SAP 2000. The created As-Built  
98 plan was used as the basis for the structural model of Adamson University Buildings.

## 99 1 Fig. 3.1: Research Design

## 100 2 Global Journal of Researches in Engineering ( ) Volume XVIII 101 Issue I Version I

102 In every ground motion data's peak ground accelerations (PGA), the damage indices, one of the parameters, was  
103 obtained from 0.10g and 2.0g. In addition, the damage ranks were used as frequencies in solving the occurring  
104 probability for different peak ground acceleration (PGA) values.

---

The data gathered from the probability of occurrence and damage index were used to compute the mean and the standard deviation for the fragility analysis using the lognormal equation.

The seismic fragility curves were developed by plotting the cumulative lognormal probability versus the peak ground acceleration for every damage level.

In forming the As-Built plan for this study. The researchers used unique tools such as Total Station, a surveying measuring tool needed for the determination of the measurements needed for the As-Built Plan and Rebound Hammer to determine the compressive strength of the concrete used in the structure.

Consequently, the researcher used engineering software, Microsoft Excel, SAP2000, AutoCAD, MATLAB to generate the data and a 3D Model of the structure needed for the development of fragility curve.

A Schmidt hammer, also known as a Swiss hammer or a rebound hammer, is a device to measure the elastic properties or strength of concrete or rock, mainly surface hardness and penetration resistance. Ernst Schmidt, a Swiss engineer, invented it. Proceq and TQC worldwide distributed the Schmidt hammer. The hammer measures the rebound of a spring-loaded mass impacted against the surface of the sample. The test hammer will hit the concrete at a defined energy. Its rebound is dependent on the hardness of the concrete and measured by the test equipment. By reference to the conversion chart, the rebound value used to determine the compressive strength. When conducting the test, the hammer was held at right angles to the surface, which in turn should be flat and smooth. The rebound reading affects the orientation of the hammer, when used in a vertical position (on the underside of a suspended slab for example) gravity will increase the rebound distance of the mass and vice versa for a test conducted on a floor slab. The Schmidt hammer is an arbitrary scale ranging from 10 to 100. Schmidt hammers are available from their original manufacturers in several different energy ranges. These include: (i) Type L-0.735 Nm impact energy, (ii) Type N-2.207 Nm impact energy; and (iii) Type M-29.43 Nm impact energy.

The test is also sensitive to other factors:

? Local variation in the sample. To minimize this, it was recommended to take a selection of readings and take an average value.

? Water content of the sample, a saturated material gives different results from a dry one.

Prior to testing, the Schmidt hammer was calibrated using a calibration test anvil supplied by the manufacturer for that purpose. Twelve readings should be taken, dropping the highest and lowest, and then the average of the ten remaining has been taken. Using this method of testing classed as indirect as it does not give a direct measurement of the strength of the material. It simply gives an indication based on surface properties, it is only suitable for making comparisons between samples. This test method for testing concrete is governed by ASTM C805. ASTM D5873 describes the procedure for testing of rock.

In evaluation of the fragility curves, it was observed that there was an increase in every damage rank from various peak ground acceleration. It was also seen if there were a low, moderate or high possibility of structure to be damaged at 0.4g peak ground acceleration as the requirement of the National Structural Code of the Philippines. This also suggest if the structure can resist the different ground motion since a larger earthquake shaking is required to cause a significant damage.

This also generate a seismic report showing the possible damage that might occur within the structure. There is a recommending retrofitting scheme if the structure was subjected to 0.4g ground motion data considered it a high probability of exceedance of damage.

As shown in the Figure, the as built plan was first to establish with the used of as-built plans survey and non-destructive test to assess the seismic vulnerability of the building. These as-built plans were used in deriving fragility curves. Thereafter, the assessment of seismic vulnerability of the building has been performed.

### 3 Fig. 3.2.1.1: Research Design of As-Built Structural Modeling

The structural model of Adamson University Buildings is subjected to both nonlinear dynamic analysis and nonlinear static analysis to assess the structure by attaining the fragility curves. In this study, the ratio of normalized peak ground acceleration and the original peak ground acceleration shall be multiplied to the ground motion records. The Normalized Ground Motion data is scaled up or down from the original ground motion data. (Karim & Yamazaki, 2001). The damage ratio is the number of occurrence of each damage rank (no, slight, moderate, extensive, and complete) divided by the total number of records. It was plotted against the natural logarithm (ln) of (PGA) to determine the mean and standard deviation that will be used to construct the fragility curves.

The parameters such as the mean and standard deviation were needed to construct the fragility curves. These parameters were obtained by plotting the value of damage ratio against the natural logarithm of PGA on a lognormal probability paper. Upon obtaining the values of the standard deviation and mean, equation (3.6) was used to compute for the cumulative probability of occurrence (Pr) of the damage equal or higher than the damage rank. Maximum likelihood estimation is a method that determines values for the parameters of a model. The parameter values are found such that they maximize the likelihood that the process described by the model produced the data that were actually observed (Brooks-Bartlett, 2018).

The probability density of observing a single data point  $x$ , which is generated from a Gaussian distribution is given by:

## 5 IV. PUSHOVER CURVE

---

166 The semi colon used in the notation  $P(x; \theta, \phi)$  is there to emphasize that the symbols that appear after it are  
167 parameters of the probability distribution. So it shouldn't be confused with a conditional probability (which is  
168 typically represented with a vertical line e.g.

### 169 $P(A|B)$ .

170 This family of distributions has two parameters:  $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ ; so we maximize the likelihood,  $L$ , over both parameters  
171 simultaneously, or if possible, individually.

172 Since the logarithm function itself is a continuous strictly increasing function over the range of the likelihood,  
173 the values which maximize the likelihood will also maximize its logarithm (the log-likelihood itself is not  
174 necessarily strictly increasing). The log-likelihood can be written as follows:

175 (Note: the log-likelihood is closely related to information entropy and Fisher information.)

176 We now compute the derivatives of this loglikelihood as follows. This is solved by This is indeed the maximum  
177 of the function, since it is the only turning point in  $\theta$  and the second derivative is strictly less than zero. Its  
178 expected value is equal to the parameter  $\theta$  of the given distribution, which means that the maximum likelihood  
179 estimator is unbiased.

180 Similarly we differentiate the log-likelihood with respect to  $\theta$  and equate to zero: which is solved by It shows  
181 the structural plans, structural models, and rendered model using AutoCAD and SAP200 of Adamson University  
182 Buildings. In this floor plan, the distances of every column are shown, also the total length of the part of the  
183 building. These distances are easily measured by laser meter and every measurement, dimensions of the column  
184 are also taken. Thicknesses of the walls are also measured by the use of steel tape. These processes were repeated  
185 room by room and in every floor until all the data were completed. Using the data gathered, all the floor plans  
186 were drawn by the use of AutoCAD 2013, and the asbuilt plan was already developed.

## 187 5 IV. Pushover Curve

188 This pushover curve represents the relationship between the displacement and the base force. The following  
189 figures show that the displacement and the base force are directly proportional. The straight line represents the  
190 limit of the structure to resist the maximum base force applied. The last point before the linear graph changes into  
191 a curved graph is the yielding point. And beyond that curved graph, the structure was completely damaged. The  
192 curved part in these graphs are not noticeable because the values and differences are small. The following charts  
193 are the plots that demonstrates how the fitted fragility curves using MLE to find the statistical parameters for the  
194 lognormal distribution function. The red dots are the plot of the cumulative values of probability of occurrence  
195 based on the damage ratios. The following charts are the plot of seismic fragility curves for each building. The  
196 different damage ranks can compared. In practice, the damage rank "D" or "No Damage" must not be included  
197 in the fragility analysis. In order to compare each building's seismic performance, the following charts are needed  
198 to which structure is evaluated as least and most resilient as per damage rank. The table summarizes the  
199 values of probability of exceedance at  $PGA=0.4g$  or  $392.4 \text{ cm/s/s}$  for each building per damage rank of "C" or  
200 "Slight Damage" to "As" or "Complete Damage". In addition, the Structural Engineers Association of California  
201 (SEAOC) has the following excerpt:

202 "A structure with a 30 or more years of lifespan is NOT SAFE when subjected to a seismic event of 10%  
203 probability of exceedance of collapse or total damage. The structure being more than 50 years old is vulnerable  
204 to large magnitude earthquakes."

205 Based on the table and the SEAOC specifications, only the Father Regis Clet (FRC) Building can still  
206 withstand a  $0.4g$  PGA and meets the code specs, that is, a probability of exceedance (POE) of 9.29%. The  
207 rest of the buildings are vulnerable to a  $0.4g$  PGA, that is more than twice that of SEAOC specifications.

208 To summarize, these results indicate that the most probable damage that the structure will sustain will range  
209 from Extensive damage to Complete Damage which is significantly below the standards imposed as per NSCP  
210 2010 which states that the structural integrity of the building must withstand 40% of the gravitational acceleration  
211 as the peak ground acceleration. Based from the resulting fragility curves, the structure is unsafe for occupancy  
212 when subjected to seismic activity, considering only base shear as the mode of failure.

213 The development of as-built plan is only limited in the concrete works of the building. The developed asbuilt  
214 plan includes of elevations, floor plans and other structural plans.

215 The accuracy of the As-built plans made is mainly dependent on two factors, namely the precision and  
216 accuracy of the equipment and human errors. Usage of laser measuring devices and available digital counterparts  
217 of surveying equipment yields more reliable and consistent values thus reducing any deviation from the actual  
218 measurements.

219 Based from the ductility parameters derived from undergoing nonlinear static and nonlinear dynamic analyses,  
220 all the Damage ranks that were observed in the fragility curve along the x-axis at its longitudinal section are  
221 No damage, Slight Damage, Moderate Damage, Extensive Damage and Complete Damage. The probability of  
222 sustaining Slight Damage is small until the  $0.1g$  PGA which tends to increase well beyond it. The opposite was  
223 observed on the y-axis or transverse section of the building due to having a much steeper incline on the Slight  
224 Damage curve suggesting a high probability of transitioning to a higher damage state, making the structure more  
225 susceptible to damage when subjected to strong seismic activity along the transverse section.

---

226 From what can be gathered from the generated fragility curve, the building has a probability of exceedance  
227 for corresponding damage rank. In line with these, it can be inferred that the Adamson University Buildings did  
228 not meet the requirement that it must withstand a peak ground acceleration of about 40% of the gravitational  
229 acceleration as per National Structural Code of the Philippines 2010.

230 Using the set of data and conclusions derived from this study, the authors recommended the following:

231 This study only covers the susceptibility of members to seismic damage and does not deal with the methods to  
232 be used for retrofitting (if possible) along with the corresponding cost due to loss in serviceability of the structure  
233 and the cost of retrofitting depending on the level of damage. For this reason, incorporation of the Fragility  
234 curve reassessed from an economic point of view would develop a more conclusive set of guidelines as to how to  
235 approach this problem.

236 The researchers would recommend doing tests to determine whether the FRC building is applicable for any  
237 retrofitting measures that would allow it to withstand the level of ground motion as per NSCP 2010.

238 This type of study is only one of the other possible methods of seismic vulnerability assessment. Usage of  
239 other methods such as the Monte Carlo Simulations and Latin Hypercube Sampling would be recommended to  
240 determine the discrepancy in the results.

241 The Administrator has to expose and updates through seminars/trainings the staffs of Physical and Facility  
242 Office (PFO) on the latest technology in Structural Reliability, specifically, structural assessments of existing  
243 structures, by attending the nation's recognized organization, such as Philippine Institute of Civil Engineers and  
244 Association of Structural Engineers of the Philippines, Inc.

245 Modeling of Structural Fragility relies on damage data generated either from empirical or mechanical methods  
246 (Coburn & Spence, 2002). Damage probability functions can be derived from documented post-earthquake  
247 damage observations, as with the case in empirical methods (Rota et al, 2008). Damage estimates can also be  
248 derived using mechanical models such as the use of nonlinear analysis in the area of less earthquake prone regions  
249 due to lack of observational data (Karbassi and Nolle, 2013). As for this study, the latter was done using PGA  
250 as the primary parameter.

251 Unlike the Richter Scale or the Moment Magnitude Scale, PGA is not a measure of the total energy of an  
252 earthquake but as a measure of the intensity of the acceleration at a geographic point. Hence, PGA is not  
253 indicative of any level of magnitude but the probability of achieving higher PGA repeatedly increases as the  
254 Magnitude increases. It can be inferred that the probability of achieving a certain PGA repeatedly is directly  
255 proportional to the magnitude. Even in smaller magnitudes, high PGA's can be attained though repeated  
256 occurrence is much smaller (USGS, 1994).

## 257 6 Global Journal of Researches in Engineering ( ) Volume XVIII 258 Issue I Version I

259 All form of matter obeys the most basic fundamental principle of physics which is Inertia. Anybody will continue  
260 to perpetuate its current state unless influenced by outside force. If it is moving at a certain direction at a certain  
261 speed, it will continue to do so unless acted upon by any force and will remain still if let be. Buildings, as it is  
262 made of matter, behave in a similar manner.

263 Earthquakes do not move in one direction, relative to a particular axis. Let us say that the X-axis is  
264 the longitudinal section of the building. Ground motion is not inclined to move only at one direction of the  
265 longitudinal section may it be to the left or to the right. It goes both ways. One can illustrate it when moving  
266 a piece of string back and forth. By doing so, wave like patterns are created. The dips in the waves indicate  
267 the sudden change in the direction of the acceleration while the amplitude of the wave is an indication of the  
268 magnitude of the change. This is because of inertial lag. Inertial lag, by definition, is the delay in the response of  
269 a to the forces acting upon it. Mechanical response of any object is not instantaneous. No object is perfectly rigid.  
270 With regards to a structure, the bottom of the column is the first to respond to any form of ground movement  
271 before it reaches the top. But unlike the string, columns are sufficiently rigid and are essentially brittle. The  
272 greater the acceleration, the greater the inertial lag for every abrupt change in the direction of acceleration. The  
273 greater the inertial lag, the higher the probability of any of the structural member to break off.

274 As so, even though PGA isn't indicative of the total energy being introduced by the ground to the building,  
275 it can illustrate the level of damage the structure incurs as it achieves that level of acceleration. These damages  
276 accumulate throughout every abrupt periodic change in the direction of the ground acceleration until the  
277 accumulated damage exceeds its allowable limit subsequently causing its collapse.

278 Intensity on the other hand is essentially a qualitative scale of the level of damage which can be described in  
279 terms of perceived shaking or potential damage to manmade structures. But it does not indicate the amount of  
280 energy released during an earthquake unlike its Magnitude. Despite that, the amount damage structures sustain  
281 increases with the increasing magnitude, under the assumption of constant duration (USGS, 1994).

282 Below is an example of a proposed correlation of the Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale with PGA in Costa  
283 Rica. This correlation may serve as a good fit for structures in Costa Rica but this relationship is strictly limited  
284 to parameters obtained in that particular area. Even then, "locations within the same intensity area will not  
285 necessarily experience the same level of damage since damage depends heavily on the type of structure, the nature  
286 of the construction, and the details of the ground motion at that site" (USGS, 2012). Also, instrument-only based

287 approach for Generalized Damage Intensity relative to ground motion parameters such as PGA and PGV does  
 288 not account for the structural characteristics of buildings and, therefore, may not provide useful information  
 289 about the damage state of the built environment following an earthquake (Tan &Irfanoglu, 2012). Duration also  
 290 contributes to the damage sustained in a structure. An earthquake could be relatively weak but occur at a long  
 291 period of time effectively inducing the same amount of damage a relatively strong earthquake can cause in a  
 292 short amount of time.

293 Because of these variations, using Damage as an indicator of determining the threshold of Magnitude at which  
 294 it will be considered unsafe will only yield a probabilistic range of Magnitudes. And in doing so, requires further  
 295 study about all other parameters influencing the structural integrity of buildings in a particular area which is  
 296 outside the coverage of this study. The scope of this study is only limited to the development of Fragility Curves to  
 297 assess the seismic performance of the building in question using PGA as a parameter. That is to say, the purpose  
 298 of this study is to create a probabilistic model of the level of observational/qualitative material damage in terms  
 299 of its quantitative counterparts derived from Damage Indices using PGA and does not take in to consideration  
 300 other factors that could influence the change in the actual incurred damage relative to the theoretical damage.

301 As it is usually the case in seismic damages, failure of a member is the product of all modes of failures.  
 However, the mode of failure only considered in this study is limited to shear. 1 2 3 4 5




Figure 1: Fig. 1 . 1 :

302

<sup>1</sup>E © 2018 Global Journals Seismic Vulnerability Assessment of Adamson University Buildings' As-Built Using Fragility Curves

<sup>2</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Seismic Vulnerability Assessment of Adamson University Buildings' As-Built Using Fragility Curves

<sup>3</sup>E © 2018 Global Journals CS Annex (Meralco) Building: III. Results And Discussion Seismic Vulnerability Assessment of Adamson University Buildings' As-Built Using Fragility Curves

<sup>4</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Saint Vincent Building: Seismic Vulnerability Assessment of Adamson University Buildings' As-Built Using Fragility Curves

<sup>5</sup>E © 2018 Global Journals V. Conclusion VI. Recommendation VII. Implications Seismic Vulnerability Assessment of Adamson University Buildings' As-Built Using Fragility Curves







Figure 3:



415

Figure 4: Fig. 4 . 1 . 5 :

$$P(x; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

44126

Figure 5: Fig. 4 .Fig. 4 . 1 . 26 :

---


$$\mathcal{L}(\mu, \sigma) = f(x_1, \dots, x_n \mid \mu, \sigma)$$

4214

Figure 6: Fig. 4 . 2 . 1 :Fig. 4 .

$$\log(\mathcal{L}(\mu, \sigma)) = -\frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi\sigma^2) - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2$$

451145144

Figure 7: Fig. 4 . 5 . 1 . 1 GlobalFig. 4 . 5 . 1 . 4 GlobalFig. 4 .

$$0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \log(\mathcal{L}(\mu, \sigma)) = 0 - \frac{-2n(\bar{x} - \mu)}{2\sigma^2}.$$

42018452345244

Figure 8: Fig. 4 . 2018 EFig. 4 . 5 . 2 . 3 Fig. 4 . 5 . 2 . 4 Fig. 4 .

$$\hat{\mu} = \bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i}{n}.$$

4

Figure 9: Fig. 4 .

$$\mathbf{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \mu,$$

4

Figure 10: Fig. 4 .

$\hat{\mu}$

Figure 11:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \log \left[ \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma^2} \right)^{n/2} \exp \left( -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 + n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \left[ \frac{n}{2} \log \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma^2} \right) - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 + n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \\ &= -\frac{n}{\sigma} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 + n(\bar{x} - \mu)^2}{\sigma^3} \end{aligned}$$

Figure 12:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2.$$

Figure 13:




Figure 14:

1

Name of Building	Year Erected	Main Structural Form
1. CS Annex (Meralco Building)	1990	Reinforced Concrete Framing with Steel Roof trusses
2. Cardinal Santos Building (formerly Main Meralco Bldg)	GF & 2F 1936 3F & 4F 1967	Reinforced Concrete Framing with Timber Roof trusses
3. John Peyboyre Building	1990	Reinforced Concrete Framing with Steel trusses
4. Francis Regis Clet Building	2000, 2002, 2012	Reinforced Concrete Framing with Roofdeck
5. Saint Vincent Building	1932	Reinforced Concrete Framing with Timber Roof Trusses

Figure 15: Table 1 :

2

Province of Epicenter Location	Date	Magnitude	PGA in g
Batangas	8 April 2017	6.0	0.20
Bohol	15 October 2013	7.2	0.22
Mindoro	15 November 1994	7.1	0.26
Moro Gulf	17 August 1976	8.1	0.50
North Luzon (Baguio)	16 July 1990	7.7	0.72
The Great Hanshin	17 January 1995	6.9	0.82
Ragay Gulf	17 March 1973	7.0	0.95
The Great Tohoku Kanto	11 March 2013	9.0	2.99

Figure 16: Table 2 :

471

Building	C	B	A	As
CS Annex (Meralco) Building	74.85	71.53	46.66	29.17
CS Building	75.19	59.85	60.99	27.89
JP Building	70.03	58.72	44.58	27.93
FRC Building	20.68	40.07	46.15	9.29
SV Building	65.42	49.01	37.01	23.18

[Note: In section 2.3.2 of the National Structural Code of the Philippines (NSCP) Volume 1, the following figure is excerpted:]

Figure 17: Table 4 . 7 . 1 :

4

Intensity (MM)	PGA (cm/s <sup>2</sup> )	Max	Range	PGA Range (% g)	Max	PGA (cm/s <sup>2</sup> )	Max	Range	PGA Range (% g)	Max
II	< 4.9			< 0.5		< 5.6			< 0.6	
III	4.9-13.3			0.5-1.4		5.6-15.0			0.6-1.5	
IV	4.9-13.3			1.4-3.7		15.0-40.3			1.5-4.1	
V	36.0-80.3			3.7-8.2		40.3-84.7			4.1-8.6	
VI	80.3-146.7			8.2-15.0		84.7-139.6			8.6-14.2	
VII	146.7-268.0			15.0-27.3		139.6-230.2			14.2-23.5	

Figure 18: Table 4 .



303 [United States of America] , *United States of America* Pearson Education, Inc.

304 [Hazus-Mh (2013)] , Hazus-Mh . [http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/](http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1716-25045-6422/hazus_mr4_earthquake_tech_manual.pdf)  
305 [20130726-1716-25045-6422/hazus\\_mr4\\_earthquake\\_tech\\_manual.pdf](http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1716-25045-6422/hazus_mr4_earthquake_tech_manual.pdf) 2013. July 26. September  
306 04. 2015. (Retrieved)

307 [Ghosh and Padgett ()] ‘Aging considerations in the development of time-dependent seismic fragility curves’. J  
308 Ghosh , J Padgett . *Journal of Structural Engineering* 2010.

309 [Nielson ()] ‘Analytical fragility curves for highway bridges in moderate seismic zones’. B G Nielson . *Atlanta:*  
310 *Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation* 2005. Georgia Institute of Technology

311 [Arago et al. (2018)] B B Arago , C L Calipusan , J V Ornido , M M Vitug . *Seismic vulnerability assessment of*  
312 *Meralco Building in Adamson University based on As-Built Plan*, (Manila, Philippines) 2018. March. Adamson  
313 University. (Undergraduate Thesis)

314 [Deierlein et al. ()] *Assessing and Retrofitting*, Gregory Deierlein , Andrei Reinhorn , & Carl Willford . 2010.

315 [Baylon et al. ()] ‘Assessing the performance of a transportation lifeline in the Philippines, the light rail transit  
316 (LRT) system, under a large magnitude earthquake’. M Baylon , L E Garciano , T Koike . *Seoul: International*  
317 *Association for Bridge and Structural Engineering* 2012. IABSE Congress Report 18th Congress of IABSE.  
318 p. .

319 [Bilgin ()] H Bilgin . *Fragility Based Assessment of Public Buildings in Turkey. Engineering Structures*, 2013. p.  
320 .

321 [Chopra ()] A K Chopra . *Dynamic of Structures (Theory and Applications to Earthquake Engineering)*, 2012.

322 [Code of Ethics (2018)] *Code of Ethics*, <http://pice.org.ph/about-us/code-of-ethics/> 2018. May 25.  
323 Philippine Institute of Civil Engineers Inc. (Retrieved from Philippine Institute of Civil Engineers)

324 [Baylon ()] *Developing seismic fragility curves in assessing bridge pier*, M B Baylon . 2017. Berlin: Lambert  
325 Academic Publishing.

326 [Deodatis and Tantala ()] ‘Development of seismic fragility curves for tall buildings’. G Deodatis , M W Tantala  
327 . *15th ASCE Engineering Mechanics Conferene*, (New York) 2002. p. . Columbia University

328 [Requiso et al.] ‘Development of Seismic Fragility Curves of a’. D A Requiso , A Balili , L Garciano . *Global*  
329 *Journal of Researches in Engineering* (XVIII Issue I Version I 50. Transport Lifeline Pier in the Philippines  
330 for Flexure)

331 [Requiso et al. ()] *Development of seismic fragility curves of a transportation lifeline pier in the Philippines. 16th*  
332 *ASEP International Convention. Makati: Association of Structural Engineers of the*, D T Requiso , A Balili  
333 , L E Garciano . 2013. Philippines, Inc.

334 [Earthquake and Earthquake Hazards PHIVOLCS (2006)] ‘Earthquake and Earthquake Hazards’. [http://](http://www.phivolcs.dost.gov.ph/images/IEC/earthquake_hazards.pdf)  
335 [www.phivolcs.dost.gov.ph/images/IEC/earthquake\\_hazards.pdf](http://www.phivolcs.dost.gov.ph/images/IEC/earthquake_hazards.pdf) *PHIVOLCS* 2006. February.  
336 (Retrieved from PHIVOLCS website)

337 [Ufuk Hancilara ()] ‘Earthquake vulnerability of school buildings: Probabilistic structural fragility analyses’. N  
338 E Ufuk Hancilara . *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering* 2014. p. .

339 [Karim and Yamazaki ()] ‘Effect of earthquake ground motions on fragility curves of highway bridge piers based  
340 on numerical simulation’. K R Karim , F Yamazaki . *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 2001.  
341 30 p. .

342 [Cinitha et al. ()] ‘Enhancing the seismic response of buildings with energy dissipation methods-An overview’. P  
343 K Cinitha , Umesha , R Nagesh , Iyer . *Journal of Civil Engineering Research* 2014. 4 p. .

344 [Chopra and Goel ()] *Evaluation of Nonlinear Static Analysis for Special Moment Resisting*, & Chopra , Goel .  
345 2001. p. .

346 [Siti Nur Aqilah and Saruddina ()] ‘Fragility curves for low-and mid-rise buildings in Malaysia’. Siti Nur Aqilah  
347 , F M Saruddina . *The 5th International Conference of Euro Asia Civil Engineering Forum (EACEF-5)*, 2015.  
348 p. .

349 [Hosseinpour ()] ‘Fragility curves for RC frames under multiple earthquakes’. F Hosseinpour , AA . *Soil Dynamics*  
350 *and Earthquake Engineering* 2017. p. .

351 [Charlottesville ()] *Guideline for AS-Built Plans*, C O Charlottesville . 2014.

352 [Baylon and Garciano ()] ‘Harnessing ordinary monte carlo simulation in computing the performance of a  
353 transportation lifeline in the Philippines’. M B Baylon , L E Garciano . *st International Conference in*  
354 *Technology (InCiTe2012)*, (Manila) 2012. 1 p. . Far Eastern University East Asia College

355 [Ibarra et al. ()] ‘Hysteretic models that incorporate strength and stiffness deterioration’. L F Ibarra , R A  
356 Medina , H Krawinkler . *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 2005. 12 p. .

357 [Kafali and Grigoriu ()] C Kafali , M Grigoriu . *Seismic fragility analysis. 9th ASCE Specialty Conference on*  
358 *Probabilistic Mechanics and Structural Reliability*, (USA) 2004. ASCE.

- 359 [Garciano and Koike ( )] 'Managing the risks of a wind farm in typhoon-prone areas'. L O Garciano , T Koike .  
360 *Proceedings of the 10 th East Asia-Pacific Conference on Structural Engineering & Construction*, (the 10 th  
361 East Asia-Pacific Conference on Structural Engineering & Construction Bangkok) 2006. EASEC. p. .
- 362 [Park and Ang ( )] 'Mechanistic Seismic Damage Model for Reinforced Concrete'. Y.-J Park , A H Ang , .-S .  
363 *ASCE Journal of Structural Engineering* 1985. 111 (4) p. .
- 364 [Hazus ( )] *Multi-hazard Loss Estimation Methodology. Security Emergency Preparedness and Response Direc-*  
365 *torate FEMA Mitigation*, Hazus . 2003.
- 366 [Deirlein et al. ( )] *NEHRP Seismic Technical Brief. Nonlinear Structural Analysis: A Guide for Practicing*  
367 *Engineers*, G G Deirlein , A M Reinhorn , M R Wilford . 2010. p. .
- 368 [Ramanathan (2012)] *Next generation seismic fragility curves for california bridges incorporating the evolution*  
369 *in seismic design philosophy. A Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation*, K N Ramanathan . 2012. August. Georgia,  
370 USA. Georgia Institute of Technology
- 371 [Cinitha et al. ( )] 'Nonlinear to Static Analysis to Assess Seismic Performance and Vulnerability of Code-
- 372 Conforming'. A Cinitha , P Umesh , N R Iyer . *RC Building*, 2012. p. .
- 373 [Chopra and Goel ( )] 'Nonlinear to Static Analysis to Assess Seismic Performance and Vulnerability of Code-
- 374 Conforming RC BUILDING'. & Chopra , Goel . *Reinforced Concrete Building*, 2012. p. .
- 375 [Stefanidou and Kappos ( )] 'Optimum selection of retrofit easures for R/C bridges using fragility curves'. S P  
376 Stefanidou , A J Kappos . *th ECCOMAS Thematic Conference on Computational Methods in Structural*  
377 *Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, (Athens Greece) 2013. 2013. COMPDYN. 4.
- 378 [Pinza and Baldivicio (2018)] K M Pinza , E S Baldivicio . *Seismic vulnerability assessment of John Peyboyre*  
379 *(JP) Building in Adamson University based from As-Built Plan*, (Manila, Philipines) 2018. March. Adamson  
380 University. (Undergraduate Thesis)
- 381 [Brooks-Bartlett (2018)] *Probability concepts explained: Maximum likelihood*  
382 *estimation*, J Brooks-Bartlett . [https://towardsdatascience.com/](https://towardsdatascience.com/probability-concepts-explained-maximum-likelihood-estimation-c7b4342fdbb1)  
383 [probability-concepts-explained-maximum-likelihood-estimation-c7b4342fdbb1](https://towardsdatascience.com/probability-concepts-explained-maximum-likelihood-estimation-c7b4342fdbb1) 2018.  
384 January 3.
- 385 [Ang and Tang ( )] 'Probability Concepts in Engineering'. H Ang , W H Tang . *Emphasis on Applications to Civil*  
386 *and Environmental Engineering* 2007. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1 (2) . (nd ed.)
- 387 [Krawinkler and Seneviratna ( )] *Pros and cons of a pushover analysis of seismic performance evaluation.*  
388 *Engineering Structures*, H Krawinkler , Seneviratna . 1998. 20 p. .
- 389 [Hazus ( )] *Relationship between damage index and damage rank*, Hazus . 2013.
- 390 [Nowak and Collins ( )] *Reliability of structures*, A S Nowak , K R Collins . 2013. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC  
391 Press.
- 392 [Elnashai and Sarno ( )] 'Response of Structures'. A S Elnashai , Di Sarno , L . 10.1002/9780470024867.  
393 *Fundamentals of Earthquake Engineering*, (Chichester, UK) 2008. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- 394 [Hazus-Mh (2013)] Retrieved from A Federal Emergency Management Agency: HAZUS-MH, Hazus-  
395 Mh . [http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1716-25045-6422/hazus\\_mr4\\_](http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1716-25045-6422/hazus_mr4_earthquake_tech_manual.pdf)  
396 [earthquake\\_tech\\_manual.pdf](http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1716-25045-6422/hazus_mr4_earthquake_tech_manual.pdf) 2013. July 26. 2013.
- 397 [Evers (2015)] *Ring of Fire*, J Evers . [https://www.nationalgeographic.org/encyclopedia/](https://www.nationalgeographic.org/encyclopedia/ring-fire/)  
398 [ring-fire/](https://www.nationalgeographic.org/encyclopedia/ring-fire/) 2015. January 6.
- 399 [Baylon ( )] 'Seismic assessment of LRT Line 1 Monumento to 5th Avenue carriageway pier using fragility curve'.  
400 M B Baylon . *International journal of real estates studies* 2017. p. .
- 401 [Baylon ( )] 'Seismic assessment of transportation lifeline in Metro Manila'. M B Baylon . *2nd CAMANAVA*  
402 *Studies Conference*, (Caloocan) 2015. p. . University of the East -Caloocan
- 403 [Requiso ( )] 'Seismic Fragility of Transportation Lifeline Piers in the Philippines, under Shear Failure'. D Requiso  
404 . *Relationship between the damage index (DI) and the damage rank (DR)*. *Earthquake Engineering*, 2013. 20  
405 p. 38.
- 406 [Choi et al. ( )] *Seismic fragility of typical bridges in moderate seismic zones. Engineering Structures*, E Choi , R  
407 Desroches , B Nielson . 2004. p. .
- 408 [Ignacio et al. (2018)] *Seismic vulnerability assessment of Cardinal Santos Building in Adamson University based*  
409 *on Developed As-Built Plan*, R T Ignacio , M M Santos , P P Ulibas , E M Fenix . 2018. March. Manila,  
410 Philippines: Adamson University. (Undergraduate Thesis)
- 411 [Ang et al. (2018)] *Seismic vulnerability assessment of Father Regis Clet (FRC) in Adamson University based*  
412 *from As-Built Plan*, K P Ang , R D Valentin , A G Naval , J D Manabat . 2018. March. Manila, Philippines:  
413 Adamson University. (Undergraduate Thesis)

- 
- 414 [Arandia et al. (2018)] *Seismic vulnerability assessment of Saint Vincent Building in Adamson University based*  
415 *from developed As-Built Plans*, D M Arandia , N B Rosete , J A Santos , C S Sarmiento . 2018. March.  
416 Manila, Philippines: Adamson University. (Undergraduate Thesis)
- 417 [Shinozuka et al. ()] M Shinozuka , M Q Feng , H Kim , T Uzawa , T Ueda . *Statistical Analysis of Fragility*  
418 *Curves*. MCEER, 2003.
- 419 [Sorensen ()] J Sorensen . *Notes in Structural Reliability Theory and Risk Analysis*, 2004.
- 420 [Strong 6.2 magnitude earthquake rocks Philippines (2017)] *Strong 6.2 magnitude earth-*  
421 *quake rocks Philippines*, [http://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/](http://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/strong-6-2-magnitude-earthquake-rocks-philippines/story-ZnQyRdDbwRMIldzYW2sSCJ.html)  
422 [strong-6-2-magnitude-earthquake-rocks-philippines/story-ZnQyRdDbwRMIldzYW2sSCJ.](http://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/strong-6-2-magnitude-earthquake-rocks-philippines/story-ZnQyRdDbwRMIldzYW2sSCJ.html)  
423 [html](http://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/strong-6-2-magnitude-earthquake-rocks-philippines/story-ZnQyRdDbwRMIldzYW2sSCJ.html) 2017. August 11.
- 424 [Requiso ()] *The generation of fragility curves of a pier under high magnitude earthquakes (a case study of the*  
425 *metro rail transit-3 pier)*, D A Requiso . 2013. Manila. (Undergraduate Thesis)
- 426 [The July 16 Luzon Earthquake: A Technical Monograph ()] *The July 16 Luzon Earthquake: A Technical*  
427 *Monograph*, 2001. Philippine Institute of Volcanology and Seismology
- 428 [Quereshi and Raju ()] ‘The most sensitive and vulnerable to damage caused by horizontal forces due to  
429 earthquake’. A Quereshi , J Raju . *A Study on Earthquake Resistant Construction*, 2013. p. 261.
- 430 [The project for study on improvement of bridges through disaster mitigating measures for large scale earthquakes in the Republic  
431 ‘The project for study on improvement of bridges through disaster mitigating measures for large scale  
432 earthquakes in the Republic of the Philippines. Manila: Republic of the Philippines Department of Public  
433 Works and Highways’. *JICA* 2013.
- 434 [Volume XVIII Issue I Version I Global Journal of Researches in Engineering] ‘Volume XVIII Issue I Version I’.  
435 *Global Journal of Researches in Engineering*
- 436 [Volume XVIII Issue I Version I Global Journal of Researches in Engineering] ‘Volume XVIII Issue I Version I’.  
437 *Global Journal of Researches in Engineering*
- 438 [Yap (2012)] *What if 7.6 quake hit Metro Manila?* Retrieved from *Inquirer*, D Yap . [http://newsinfo.](http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/264258/what-if-7-6-quake-hit-metro-manila)  
439 [inquirer.net/264258/what-if-7-6-quake-hit-metro-manila](http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/264258/what-if-7-6-quake-hit-metro-manila) 2012. September 5.