

THE BRITISH LIBRARY BRITISH THESIS SERVICE

COPYRIGHT

Reproduction of this thesis, other than as permitted under the United Kingdom Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under specific agreement with the copyright holder, is prohibited.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.



REPRODUCTION QUALITY NOTICE

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the original thesis. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction, some pages which contain small or poor printing may not reproduce well.

Previously copyrighted material (journal articles, published texts etc.) is not reproduced.

THIS THESIS HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LB/03F(E)/259

University of Moratuwa

78956

. Ali (41)

A Systems Approach to Earthquake Vulnerability Assessment

WORATUWA, CAN

By

Mauricio Sánchez-Silva



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. Electronic Theses & Dissertations www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

A thesis submitted to the University of Bristol in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering.

October 1995

Abstract

WTA Set Store and Shares

The ability to take decisions about the expected response of existing projects (i.e. buildings, lifelines, cities) to an earthquake is difficult and complex. The behaviour of a few selected parameters of the main structural system (e.g. inter-storey drift) are commonly used to make judgements. The behaviour of a project clearly depends upon the structure but it also depends upon many other factors which often are not considered. These include, safety culture, management, condition, use, construction, materials and so forth. The modelling and measurement of these factors vary in quality since they are very different in nature. A model which enables these factors to be put together to assess the proneness to failure of a particular project is proposed. The model follows a systems approach and concentrates on the modelling and management of information. The management of the uncertainty, which is classified into fuzziness, incompleteness and randomness, is an important part of the model. Hierarchically arranged holons describe the processes making up the project and capture inherent fuzziness of the problem. The model includes tests (such as audits) which a project must pass in order to be declared dependably safe. Dependability is a measure of the degree to which an engineering theory has been tested in practical problems. The proposed methodology combines existing numerical models as well as ways of processing vague information and expert judgement. It is also a very flexible tool which allows the handling of various types of projects and situations which are slightly different from past experience. Experts will use linguistic assessments to measure the evidence about the dependability of processes to sustain their function during an earthquake. Linguistic assessments are matched to interval probability numbers. An interval number is used to capture, in a practical manner, features of fuzziness and incompleteness. Interval probability theory is used to combine evidential support values throughout the hierarchy. A computer implementation of the model (i.e. EVAS) was developed to show its potential for practical use. The software developed was used to apply the methodology to the Hospital Regional de Buenaventura in Colombia. Further testing of the proposed model and EVAS in practical applications should be carried out to ensure their dependability.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. C.A. Taylor and Professor D.I. Blockley for their guidance, advice and encouragement during the course of this research. I would also like to thank all people in the systems and earthquake groups during these years for the enriching discussions and for their great support and friendship. I also thank Kath Lanham for her help in the transcription of the interviews.

I also wish to express thanks to the Colombian Government through the Instituto Colombiano para el Fomento de la Ciencia y la Tecnología (COLCIENCIAS), for the financial support for this study; the department of Civil Engineering at Andes University, in Bogotá Colombia; and in a very special manner to Professor A. Sarria for his guidance and encouragement during the last years.

Mostly, I would like to thank my friends and my family for their continuous and unconditional support

IN THE REAL PROPERTY OF

Declaration

This thesis entitled "A Systems Approach of for Earthquake Vulnerability Assessment", is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering at the University of Bristol.

The research on which this thesis was based was carried out under the supervision of Doctor C.A. Taylor and Professor D.I. Blockley. It is entirely due to the author except where otherwise acknowledged in the text and has not formed the basis for the submission for any other degree. The views expressed in the dissertation are those of the author and not of the university.

The following papers are based on the work described in this thesis:

- Sánchez-Silva M., Taylor C. A., Blockley D.I. (1994) "Evaluation of Proneness to Failure of a Project in an Earthquake". Fifth US National Conference on Earthquake Engineering, 427-436, Chicago, July.
- Sánchez-Silva M., Taylor C. A., Blockley D.I. (1994) "Proneness to failure of Buildings in an earthquake: a systems approach". Proceedings of 11th European Conference on Earthquake Engineering. Vienna, September.
- Sánchez-Silva M., Taylor C., Blockley D.I. (1995) "Evaluation of Earthquake Induced Failure of Buildings in Buenaventura, Colombia". Chapter 12, Design and construction of buildings and structures to withstand earthquakes. IDNDR/ODA. Thomas Telford, London.
- Sánchez-Silva M., Taylor C. A., Blockley D.I. (1995) "Hazard management of projects in an earthquake". CERRA - ICASP 7, 7th. International Conference on Applications of Statistics and Probability in Civil Engineering. Paris, July.

- Sánchez-Silva M., Taylor C. A., Blockley D.I. (1995) "Towards an integrated model for scismic zonation". Proceedings of the 5th. International Conference on Seismic Zonation. Nice, October.
- Sánchez-Silva M., Blockley D.I., Taylor C. A. (1996) "Uncertainty Modelling of Earthquake hazards". Journal of Microcomputers in Civil Engineering. Vol. 11, No 1, January.

Signed:.....

HERE AND THE CARDENSISTER AND THE PARTY A



,

•

;

3

/ H -)

1

University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. Electronic Theses & Dissertations www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

٧

STATISTICS OF PRESERVED STATISTICS

"Now what I want is, Facts. Teach these boys and girls nothing but Facts. Facts alone are wanted in life. Plant nothing else, and root everything else. You can only form the minds of reasoning animals upon Facts: nothing else will ever be of any service to them.... We hope to have, before long, a board of fact, composed by commissioners of fact, who will force people to be a people of fact, and nothing but fact..."

"Hard Times" Charles Dickens

"Many years later, as he faced the firing squad, Colonel Aureliano Buendia was to remember that distant afternoon when his father took him to discover ice... The world was so recent that many things lacked names, and in order to indicate them it was necessary to point...."

"A hundred years of solitude" Gabriel García Marquez



) |-||

•

)

University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. Electronic Theses & Dissertations www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

To my father, my mother and my sister

an and a second and a second secon



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. Electronic Theses & Dissertations www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

vii

CONTENTS

a de la companya de estado de la desenverta de la companya de la companya de la secondada de la companya de la

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Abstract | ü |
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Declaration | iv |
| Contents | viii |
| List of Figures | xv |
| List of Tables | xvii |
| Notation | xix |
| Glossary | xxii |
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Background | 1 |
| 1.2 Objectives of the thesis | 2 |
| 1.3 Layout of the thesis | 3 |
| University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. Electronic Theses & Dissertations | |
| 2 Earthquake disasters www.lib.mrt.ac.lk | 5 |
| 2.1 Objectives | 5 |
| 2.2 What is a disaster? | 5 |
| 2.3 "Natural Disasters" | 8 |
| 2.4 Modelling disasters | 10 |
| 2.4.1 General aspects | 10 |
| 2.4.2 Existing models of disasters | 11 |
| 2.4.3 Characteristics of disaster models | 16 |
| 2.4.4 Cultural, social and environmental aspects of disasters | 18 |
| 2.5 Earthquake disaster system | 19 |
| 2.5.1 The customers | 21 |
| 2.5.2 The actors | 22 |
| 2.5.3 The transformation processes | 22 |
| 2.5.4 The world view | 24 |
| 2.5.5 The owner | 24 |

| 2.5.6 The environmental constrains | 25 |
|--|----|
| 2.5.7 Definition of the system | 26 |
| 2.6 Conclusions | 27 |
| 3 Earthquake vulnerability assessments | 29 |
| 3.1 Objectives | 29 |
| 3.2 General aspects | 29 |
| 3.3 Existing methodologies | 31 |
| 3.3.1 Classification of methodologies | 32 |
| 3.3.2 Type of projects | 32 |
| 3.3.3 Type of information and resources | 34 |
| 3.4 Discussion of existent methods | 36 |
| 3.5 Expert view of the problem | 39 |
| 3.5.1 Interviews and Grounded theory | 39 |
| 3.5.2 Considerations in the development of a new model | 42 |
| 3.5.2.1 The project | 42 |
| 3.5.2.2 The customer | 43 |
| 3.5.2.3 Objectives leses & Dissertations | 44 |
| 3.5.2.4 Relationship between ground motion and project | 45 |
| 3.5.2.5 Expected characteristics of a new methodology | 45 |
| 3.6 A new interpretation of the problem | 47 |
| 3.6.1 Systems thinking | 47 |
| 3.6.2 The model | 49 |
| 3.6.2.1 Organisation of information | 49 |
| 3.6.2.2 Hazard analysis | 50 |
| 3.6.2.3 Procedure | 50 |
| 3.6.3 Characteristics of the proposed approach | 51 |
| 3.6.4 Summary | 53 |
| 3.7 Conclusions | 54 |

| 4 Earthquake damage uncertainty | 56 |
|---|----|
| 4.1 Objectives | 56 |
| 4.2 Damage | 56 |
| 4.2.1 What is damage? | 56 |
| 4.2.2 Safety and damage | 57 |
| 4.2.3 Code of practice and damage criteria | 58 |
| 4.2.4 Measurement of damage | 61 |
| 4.3 Measurement of earthquake damage | 63 |
| 4.3.1 Potential damage of the ground motion | 63 |
| 4.3.2 Structural damage | 64 |
| 4.3.3 Damage to non-structural systems | 66 |
| 4.3.4 Social damage | 67 |
| 4.3.6 Recovery | 68 |
| 4.4 Uncertainty | 69 |
| 4.4.1 What is uncertainty? | 69 |
| 4.4.2 Types of uncertainty | 69 |
| 4.4.3 System modelling uncertainty | 70 |
| 4.5 Earthquake disuster system uncertainty | 71 |
| 4.5.1 Ground motion | 72 |
| 4.5.2 Uncertainty of the ground motion | 72 |
| 4.5.3 Project | 74 |
| 4.5.4 Uncertainty of the project | 75 |
| 4.6 Conclusions | 77 |
| 5 Model of proneness to failure | 79 |
| 5.1 Objectives | 79 |
| 5.2 General aspects | 79 |
| 5.3 Systems Approach | 80 |
| 5.3.1 Complexity | 80 |
| 5.3.2 Systems Thinking | 82 |
| 5.3.3 Dependability | 83 |
| 5.4 Organisation of Information | 85 |
| | |

х

an and a standard and a standard and a standard water and the standard of the standard and a standard and a standard a

| 5.4.1 Basic concepts | 85 |
|---|-----|
| 5.4.2 Hierarchical organisation of information | 88 |
| 5.4.3 Interacting Objects Process Model (IOPM) | 91 |
| 5.4.4 Holons as interactive objects | 92 |
| 5.4.5 Summary of basic concepts | 94 |
| 5.5 Purpose of the Model | 95 |
| 5.6 The methodology | 95 |
| 5.6.1 Definition of the system | 96 |
| 5.6.2 Development of the hierarchy | 96 |
| 5.6.2.1 Basic concepts for developing a hierarchy | 96 |
| 5.6.2.2 Basic hierarchical arrangement | 99 |
| 5.6.3 Collecting evidence | 100 |
| 5.6.4 Evaluation of evidence | 101 |
| 5.6.4.1 Nature of information | 101 |
| 5.6.4.2 Assessment of holons | 102 |
| 5.6.5 Calculation of proneness to failure | 103 |
| 5.6.6 Identification of critical aspects | 104 |
| 5.6.7 Monitoring the project | 105 |
| 5.7 Conclusions | 105 |
| 6 Assessment of the project | 107 |
| 6.1 Objectives | 107 |
| 6.2 General aspects | 107 |
| 6.3 Aims and scope of the assessment | 108 |
| 6.4 Collecting evidence | 110 |
| 6.5 Assessment | 112 |
| 6.5.1 Expert judgement of evidence | 112 |
| 6.5.2 Membership function and confidence | 114 |
| 6.5.3 Confidence | 117 |
| 6.5.4 Linguistic representation | 118 |
| 6.5.4.1 Methods for selecting fuzzy numbers | 118 |
| 6.5.4.2 Selection of fuzzy variables | 119 |

120.00.00 1000.340

A Second Sta

and the second states

SETA . STRACTORS

and an and the second secon

| 6.5.5 Selection of assessment values | 121 |
|---|-----|
| 6.5.6 Importance | 123 |
| 6.5.7 Summary | 124 |
| 6.6 Conclusions | 125 |
| 7. Numerical model to assess proneness to failure | 127 |
| 7.1 Objectives | 127 |
| 7.2 General aspects | 127 |
| 7.3 Aim and scope of the calculation | 128 |
| 7.3.1 Summary of results from the assessment | 128 |
| 7.3.2 Management of information | 128 |
| 7.4 Interval probability theory | 130 |
| 7.4.1 Basic concepts | 130 |
| 7.4.2 Degree of dependence | 131 |
| 7.4.3 What is dependence? | 132 |
| 7.4.4 Logical connectors and Dependence | 133 |
| 7.4.5 Extension to interval numbers Sri Lanka | 136 |
| 7.4.6 Combination of information | 138 |
| 7.5 Analysis of results | 140 |
| 7.5.1 Evidential support | 140 |
| 7.5.2 Critical aspects of the project | 142 |
| 7.6 Procedure | 143 |
| 7.7 General Methodology | 145 |
| 7.8 Conclusions | 147 |
| 8. Computer implementation of the model | 149 |
| 8.1 Objectives | 149 |
| 8.2 General aspects | 149 |
| 8.3 Object Oriented programming | 150 |
| 8.3.1 What is Object Oriented Programming? | 150 |
| 8.3.2 Philosophy of OOP | 150 |
| 8.3.3 Basic concepts | 151 |

Der sterner programme generaliseren in der sinder der sonder sinder sinder sinder sinder sinder in der sinder S

xii

the tradition of the home of the home of the measure of the transmission of the second states of the second of the second s

1

Addited to present the work of a factor of

14 24 60L 1/ 5C 82 4 16(11) 10

| | 8.3.4 Properties of object-oriented systems | 152 |
|----|---|-----|
| | 8.4 Systems approach and object oriented programming | 153 |
| | 8.5 Implementation | 155 |
| | 8.5.1 Spreadsheets | 155 |
| | 8.5.2 OOP systems | 158 |
| | 8.6 EVAS | 159 |
| | 8.6.1 Structure of the programme | 160 |
| | 8.6.1.1 Basic considerations | 160 |
| | 8.6.1.2 Development of the hierarchy | 160 |
| | 8.6.1.3 Assessment | 162 |
| | 8.6.1.4 Results | 162 |
| | 8.6.2 Programme functionality | 163 |
| | 8.6.2.1 Hierarchy Manager window | 164 |
| | 8.6.2.2 Description window | 166 |
| | 8.6.2.3 Assessment window | 167 |
| | 8.6.2.4 Results window | 169 |
| | 8.7 Conclusions University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka, Electronic Theses & Dissertations www.lib.mrt.ac.lk | 170 |
| Ho | ospital Regional de Buenaventura a case study | 172 |
| | 9.1 Objectives | 172 |
| | 9.2 General aspects | 172 |
| | 9.3 Buenaventura | 173 |
| | 9.3.1 Economic aspects | 173 |
| | 9.3.2 Social aspects | 174 |
| | 9.3.3 Seismic background | 174 |
| | 9.4 Building construction characteristics in Buenaventura | 175 |
| | 9.4.1 General aspects | 175 |
| | 9.4.2 Hospital Regional de Buenaventura | 176 |
| | 9.5 Aim of the study | 177 |
| | 9.6 Hierarchical representation of the system | 177 |
| | 9.6.1 Definition of the problem | 178 |
| | 9.6.2 The Ground Motion | 180 |

9.

,

)

| 9.6.3 The Project | 183 |
|--|-----|
| 9.7 Assessment of the system | 184 |
| 9.7.1 Assessment of the Ground Motion | 185 |
| 9.7.1.1 Collecting evidence | 185 |
| 9.7.1.2 Assessment | 186 |
| 9.7.1.3 Calculation of evidential support | 187 |
| 9.7.1.4 Analysis of the results and evidence | 188 |
| 9.7.2 Assessment of the Hospital Project | 190 |
| 9.7.2.1 Assessment | 190 |
| 9.7.2.2 Analysis of the results | 193 |
| 9.7.2.3 Identification of critical aspects | 196 |
| 9.8 Summary of the analysis | 200 |
| 9.9 Main features of the model | 201 |
| 9.10 Conclusions | 203 |
| | |
| 10. Conclusions and Recommendations | 209 |
| 10.1 Conclusions University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. | 209 |
| 10.2 Recommendations for further work | 212 |
| | |
| 11. References | 215 |
| | |
| Appendix A | |
| Seismic Information about the Hospital Regional de Buenaventura | 234 |
| | |
| Appendix B | |
| Calculation of proneness to failure of the Hospital regional de Buenaventura | 244 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Second to every and state parts for

. . .

 1 424 atres 6 100

the state and the state of the

Figures

| 2.1 Basic accident representation | 11 |
|--|-----|
| 2.2 Typical event fault tree representation | 12 |
| 2.3 Loss Causation Model representation | 12 |
| 2.4 Turner's model of incubating disasters | 13 |
| 2.5 Pressure and Release Model (PRM) | 15 |
| 2.6 The reflective practice loop | 20 |
| 2.7 Description of the system | 21 |
| | |
| 3.1 Procedure of Grounded Theory Analysis | 41 |
| 3.2 Typical hierarchical representation | 49 |
| | |
| 4.1 Damage to social environment | 61 |
| | |
| 5.1 The reflective practice loop | 80 |
| 5.2 Hierarchical organisation of information. Dissertations | 90 |
| 5.3 Examples of the hierarchical organisation of information | 91 |
| 5.4 Representation of a holon | 92 |
| 5.5 Hierarchical representation of an Earthquake Disaster System | 99 |
| 5.6 Description of the process to assess the proneness to failure of a project | 104 |
| | |
| 6.1 Interval representation of the assessment | 114 |
| 6.2 Examples of intervals | 115 |
| 6.3 Membership function and confidence | 116 |
| 6.4 Confidence ranges | 117 |
| 6.5 Convex fuzzy numbers representation | 120 |
| 6.6 Representation of linguistic terms | 122 |
| 6.7 Numerical interpretation of the assessment | 125 |
| | |
| 7.1 Hierarchy | 129 |
| 7.2 Role of logical connectors | 134 |
| | |

| 7.3 Venn diagram representation of dependence | 135 |
|--|-----|
| 7.4 Result from the combination of evidence | 141 |
| | |
| 8.1 Example of the implementation using a spreadsheet | 157 |
| 8.2 Kappa-PC Main menu | 159 |
| 8.3 Example of a hierarchy of holons generated | 161 |
| 8.4 Hierarchy Manager window | 165 |
| 8.5 Description window | 166 |
| 8.6 Assessment window | 168 |
| 8.7 Assessment and State windows | 168 |
| 8.8 Results window | 169 |
| | |
| 9.1 Representation of a holon | 178 |
| 9.2 Hierarchical representation of the system | 205 |
| 9.3 First levels of the hierarchy | 180 |
| 9.4 Hierarchical representation of the Ground Motion | 181 |
| 9.5 Representation of the support interval for the Ground Motion | 189 |
| 9.6 Results for the design of the Hospital Project | 196 |

्रम्

Tables

| 2.1 Different disaster models | 16 |
|---|-----|
| 2.2 CATWOE Summary | 26 |
| | |
| 3.1 Classification of methodologies | 32 |
| 3.2 Summary of the methodology proposed | 51 |
| | |
| 4.1 Linguistic description of earthquake damage | 62 |
| 4.2 Damage capacity measures of the ground motion | 64 |
| 4.3 Structural damage indices | 66 |
| 4.4 Relationship between damage and casualties | 68 |
| 4.5 Uncertainty of the ground motion | 73 |
| 4.6 Uncertainty of the project | 76 |
| | |
| 5.1 Description of the main attributes of a holon | 93 |
| 5.2 Description of Function | 94 |
| 5.3 Summary of the methodology proposed & Dissertations | 96 |
| 5.4 Analogy between biological and structural systems | 98 |
| 5.5 Relationship between the attributes of Function and the assessment | 103 |
| | |
| 6.1 Relationship between attributes of Function and the assessment | 108 |
| 6.2 Confidence ranges and mean values | 118 |
| | |
| 8.1 Analogy between OOP and the system approach | 153 |
| 8.2 Description of the main aspects of the spreadsheet implementation | |
| shown in Figure 8.1 | 156 |
| 8.3 Description of different windows | 164 |
| 8.4 Function of every button in the Hierarchy Manager | 165 |
| | |
| 9.1 Description of the Ground Motion at different levels of definition | 182 |
| 9.2 Description of the Hospital Project at different levels of definition | 183 |
| 9.3 Evidence associated to the Ground Motion process | 185 |
| | |

The second states of the states of the second state

| 9.4 Assessment of the Ground Motion | 186 |
|---|-----|
| 9.5 Calculation of support for the Ground Motion | 187 |
| 9.6 Type of evidence collected about the Ground Motion | 189 |
| 9.7 Assessment at level 3 of the hierarchy | 191 |
| 9.8 Assessment at level 4 of the hierarchy. | 193 |
| 9.9 Summary of assessments at different levels of the hierarchy | 194 |
| 9.10 Main factors influencing proneness to failure at level 4 | 197 |
| 9.11 Main factors influencing proneness to failure at level 6 | 198 |
| 9.12 Main factors influencing proneness to failure at level 9 | 199 |
| 9.13 Summary of results | 201 |



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. Electronic Theses & Dissertations www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

xviii

Notation

如此此,你们还不是我们的你的?""你是我们的你们的你们的你们的你们的你们的你们的你们的你们的你们的?"

| a(τ) | - Ground acceleration during the earthquake (Arias (Husid 1973)). |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Ams | - Root mean square of the ground acceleration (Wen et al. 1988). |
| AND | - Logical operator for the intersection of sets. |
| App _{B/R} | - Applicability of B for the rule R. |
| Bi | - A component holon of B. |
| Conf | - Confidence. |
| c/cc | - Viscous damping ratio (Arias (Husid 1973)). |
| D | - Damage Index (Stephens and Yao 1987 and Park and Ang 1985). |
| Di, | - Damage Index |
| dE | - Dissipated hysteretic energy (Park and Ang 1985). |
| Dcp _R | - Dependability value of the rule R . |
| (Dcp _R) _I | - Necessary support value of the Dependability of the rule R. |
| (Dep _R) _u | - Possible support value of the Dependability of the rule R. |
| g | - Acceleration of gravity |
| I _{Bi} | - Importance value of B_i where $B_i \in B = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n\}$. |
| I | - Importance |
| I | - Ground motion intensity measure (Housner 1952, Husid 1973, Fajfar 1990). |
| Ic | - Characteristic Intensity of the ground motion (Wen et al. 1988). |
| Indep | - Independence. |
| к | - Flexural damage ratio (Banon and Veneziano 1982). |
| m | - Constant (Powell et al. 1988). |
| Maxdep | - Maximum dependence. |
| Mindep | - Minimum dependence. |
| Ms | - Magnitude of an earthquake in the Richter scale. |
| Mutexc | - Mutual exclusive. |
| N | - Normalised cumulative rotation (Banon and Veneziano 1982). |
| OR | - Logical operator for the union of sets. |
| P(A) | - Probability of A. |

xix

| $[S_n(A),S_p(A)]$ | - Interval probability number, where $S_p(A)$ and $S_p(A)$ are defined as the |
|--|---|
| | lower and upper bounds of the probability $P(A)$ for any event or |
| | proposition A. |
| $P(A \cap B)$ | - Intersection between events A and B. |
| $P(A \cup B)$ | - Union between events A and B. |
| Qу | - Static yield strength (Park and Ang 1985). |
| Si | - Demand (Bertero and Bresler 1971). |
| $S_n(A)$ | - Necessary support for the proposition A. |
| $S_n(A_i)_w$ | - Weighted necessary support for the proposition A. |
| $S_p(A)$ | - Possible support for the proposition A. |
| $S_p(A_i)_w$ | - Weighted possible support for the proposition A. |
| ri | - Capacity (Bertero and Bresler 1971). |
| 1o | - Strong motion duration (Arias (Husid 1973) and Wen et al. 1988). |
| t _D | - Duration of the ground motion after Trifunac and Brady (1975). |
| Vς | - Pseudo-velocity spectrum (Housner 1952). |
| v _g | - Ground velocity (Fajfar et al. 1990). |
| w, | - Weights (Bertero and Brester 1971). |
| W'Bi | - Weight value of B_i where $B_i \in B = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n\}$. |
| $(w_{B_i})_i$ | - Necessary support value of the weight of B_i where $B_i \in B = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n\}$. |
| (<i>WBi</i>) _u | - Possible support value of the weight of B_i where $B_i \in B = \{B_1, B_2,, B_n\}$. |
| α | - Constant (Stephens and Yao 1987). |
| β | - Constant (Park and Ang 1985). |
| $\Delta \delta_{p}$ | - Positive change in plastic deformation (Stephens and Yao 1987). |
| $\Delta \delta_{\mu \nu}$ | - Positive change in plastic deformation at failure (Stephens and Yao 1987). |
| ρ | - Degree of dependence. |
| ρ _{<i>B1B2Bm</i>·<i>I.Bm</i>} | - Dependence relationship between B_1, B_2, \dots, B_{m-1} and B_m |
| ρι | - Necessary support value of the dependence. |
| ρ " | - Possible support value of the dependence. |
| рлв | - Dependence relationship between A and B. |
| δ | - Damage parameter $\delta = 1 - (\delta_u / \delta_o)$. |
| Sterlero | - Damage Index (Bertero and Bresler 1971). |



δс - Calculated value of the damage parameter (Powell et al. 1988). δh - Cumulative damage (Powell et al. 1988). δd - Value of structural property in damaged state (Powell et al. 1988). - Maximum response deformation (Newmark and Rosenblueth 1974 and δmax Park and Ang 1985). - Value in undamaged state (Powell et al. 1988). δο - Threshold value of the damage parameter (Powell et al. 1988). δι - Ultimate value of the damage parameter (Powell et al. 1988). δu δ, - Ultimate elastic deformation (Park and Ang 1985) - Yielding deformation (Newmark and Rosenblueth 1974). δ, - Ductility factor (Newmark and Rosenblueth 1974). μ η_i and γ_i - Service factors that model the cumulative nature of damage (Bertero and Bresler 1971).



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. Electronic Theses & Dissertations www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

xxi

Glossary

Some of the main concepts used in this thesis are defined in this section⁴.

| Accident | an unplanned failure event (Blockley 1994). |
|---------------|--|
| Construction | implementation of the design to create an artefact that is fit for its intended use (Dester 1992). |
| Culture | is a shared set of beliefs, norms, attitudes, roles and practices (Comerford and Blockley 1993). |
| Damage state | a particular level of loss of value or fitness for purpose of a project. A damage state may be personal harm or loss to property, plant, or a loss of business opportunity (Blockley 1993). cronic floses & Dissertations |
| Danger | liability or exposure to an accident (Blockley 1993). |
| Dependability | is the extent to which an engineering theory has been tested in practical decisions (Blockley 1980) |
| Design | is the process that transforms the conceptual design into a form which can be directly developed into an artefact (Dester 1992). |
| Expert | is a person who has detailed knowledge and experience of a topic, situation or activity (Dester 1992). |

¹ Italies denote a term that has also been defined in this section.

| Event | is some occurrence that may cause the state of a system to change (Booch 1994). |
|------------------------|--|
| Failure of an artefact | is the lack of correspondence between a required state of the world and the actual state of the world (Blockley 1992). |
| Failure event | is one in which an artefact or project is <i>damaged</i> (Blockley 1993) |
| Form | is the "essence" as initially defined by Plato. (i.e. What it is). |
| Function | fitness for purpose (Blockley 1992). |
| Fuzziness | imprecision of definition (Blockley 1993). |
| Hazard Hierarchy | is a set of incubating preconditions for failure (Blockley 1993). University of Moretuwa, Sri Lanka, Electronic These & Discentions is a ranking or ordering of concepts logically connected at |
| | different levels of definition. |
| Holon | is both a whole and a part (Koestler 1967). Holons exhibit emergent properties. These are not properties of any of the parts but emerge from the co-operation of the parts. |
| Model | is a representation of a defined system for a purpose (Blockley 1993). |
| Operation | is a process which encompasses all activities, systems and procedures that are necessary for the use of an artefact. This includes maintenance, repairs and modifications (Dester 1992) |
| Parent holon | is the holon in the immediate upper level of the hierarchy |

1

ı.

ххііі

Process a series of actions which produce a change or development. This is a transformation of a initial state into a final state. Processes are defined by needs and objectives. Project is a set of facilities and activities which may be defined in terms of processes at varying levels of definition. Facilities consist of elements such as buildings, the ground, the foundation, the lifelines and so on. The project may be defined at the level of a specific building (or indeed a specific element within the building) or at the level of a city, region or country. The activities with the processes are those which define the purpose of the project, for example a hospital. Proneness to failure is a measure of the available evidence concerning the hazard that an artefact might suffer a failure event (Blockley 1993). University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka, s the lack of a specific pattern in a set of data (Blockley 1993). Randomness Risk is the combined effect of the chances of occurrence of some failure and its consequences in a given context (Blockley 1993). Reliability is a measure of the chances that an artefact or project will not suffer an accident (Blockley 1993). Safety is freedom from unacceptable risk (Blockley 1993). Society the system of interrelationships which connects together the individuals who share a common culture (Giddens 1989).

HI YO'S STREET ON S

xxiv

| Sufficient refinement | is the extent to which the dependability of the result is |
|-----------------------|---|
| | appropriate. The appropriateness of the result may be defined by |
| | external restrictions such as the requirements of the client, law |
| | regulations, the quality of information or the grounding of the |
| | model. |
| System | is defined as a structured set of objects and/or attributes together |
| - | with the relationships between them (Wilson 1984). The concept |
| | system embodies the idea of a set of elements connected together |
| | which form a whole, showing emergent properties which are |
| | properties of the whole which result from the co-operation of the |
| | component parts. |
| Uncertainty | is lack of knowing (Blockley 1993). |
| Vulnerability | is defined as the susceptibility to failure of an artefact (structure, |
| ģ | facility and so forth) under any arbitrary action (Wu et al. 1993). Electronic Theses & Dissertations www.lib.mrt.ac.lk |

🖅 year and a nanangan an anayaratan a statistik nangaratan nangara sanan sangaran 1. Kangaran 1. Kangaratan si sangaratan sa

1. 160 St 400

STATE STREAM TO THE ADDRESS OF STREAMS

The second se

entral since conversions from sizes of

Managaran wang baranting di salawala di wasa terrati da marang