Abstract

The earthquake at Pedernales in April 16 2016, of magnitude 7.8, caused too much damage in the structures of the provinces of Manabi and Esmeraldas in Ecuador, and marked the beginning of a new way of construction using passive control systems, such as seismic isolators or energy dissipators.

At Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas ESPE, located in the Valley of Los Chillos in Ecuador, five structural blocks with triple friction pendulum seismic isolators are being built.

This paper describes the results of tests conducted to 61 isolators of this construction project, subjected to vertical loads of 250 tonf. In each test, three load cycles were applied at a rate of 12 seconds each, with a maximum amplitude of 30 cm. The friction coefficients obtained in each cycle and in each isolator were recorded. On this basis, three sets of data for the coefficient of friction of the plates of the isolation system were selected: one data base with maximum values, other with minimum values and another with nominal values.

With these values, a seismic analysis was performed on the ESPE structural blocks using the simplified analysis model in ASCE 7, the Mc Vitty and Constantinou (2015) three-stages model and the Fenz and Constantinou (2007) five-stages model. The results are compared in terms of displacements and forces.

Finally, the force and displacement results were compared at each level of friction coefficients: maximum, minimum and nominal values.

Keywords: Triple friction pendulum seismic systems (FPT), Maximum value of frictional coefficient, Minimum value of frictional coefficient and Nominal value of frictional coefficient.
1. INTRODUCCIÓN

At the Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas ESPE, located in the Valley of Los Chillos in Ecuador, five steel framed building blocks with seismic triple friction pendulum isolators are being built. The isolator used is of the type FTP8833 / 12-12 / 8-6, shown in Figure 1. (Constantinou et al. 2016; Aguiar et al 2016).

![Fig. 1 - Geometry of the triple friction pendulum isolator FTP8833 / 12-12 / 8-6](source)

Figure 2 shows the structural blocks being built at Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas ESPE. In the structural blocks 1 and 8, the isolators are placed on pedestals just above the concrete footings. At blocks 2 and 3, which have an underground story, the isolators are placed on top of reinforced concrete columns. Finally, at structural block 6-7 a mix of the previous solutions was employed.

![Fig. 2 - Overview of the Structural Blocks at Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas ESPE](source)

Details of these solutions are presented in Fig.3. To the left, the isolation system on top of the column is shown. Observe that a 120/120 cm concrete basket allows that the isolator is fully supported at its base. To the right of Figure 3 the other type of isolator, on top of a pedestal, is also shown.
This paper describes the structural seismic analysis of the structural block 3. Three constitutive models for the isolators are considered. They are described in the next paragraphs. They are the linear model of ASCE 7-10, the 5-stages model of Fenz and Constantinou (2007, 2008) and the three-stages model proposed by McVitty and Constantinou (2015).

The coefficients of friction are experimentally obtained in 61 isolators with a vertical load of 250 tonf (EPS, 2015). Maximum, nominal and minimum values are applied to the 3-stages, 5-stages and the simplified linear method of the ASCE 7-10 and analyzed using the spectral method (Aguiar, 2012).

2. CONSTITUTIVE MODEL

Using the simplified linear model of ASCE 7-10, the effective stiffness of the isolators $k_{ef}$, the damping factor $\xi_{ef}$, the vibration period of the isolated structure $T$, and the displacements and forces in the center of mass (CM) were found. In contrast, in the 3-stages and 5-stages models only $k_{ef}$ and $\xi_{ef}$ were determined. The isolator was modeled as a short element (Almazan, 2001; Fenz y Constantinou et al., 2006).

2.1 ASCE 7-10 Model

Figure 4 shows the constitutive model that ASCE 7-10 considers to define the behavior of a FPT isolator. Based on this model, the following parameters are determined:

\[
 k_{ef} = \frac{W}{R} + \frac{\mu W}{D} \tag{1}
\]

\[
 \xi_{ef} = \frac{2}{\pi} \left[ \frac{\mu}{\mu + \frac{D}{R}} \right] \tag{2}
\]

\[
 \mu W = \left[ \mu_1 - (\mu_1 - \mu_2) \frac{R_{2ef}}{R_{1ef}} \right] W \tag{3}
\]

\[
 R_{ief} = R_i - h_i \quad \rightarrow i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \tag{4}
\]
Where $\mu_1, \mu_4$ are the friction coefficients of the plates with radius $R_1, R_4$ (outside radius), $\mu_2, \mu_3$ are the coefficients of friction of the inner plates of radius $R_2, R_3$ (see Figure 1), $h_i$, for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4,$ is the height of the isolator defined in Figure 1, $\mu$ is the equivalent coefficient of friction, $W$ is the total weight on the isolator, $D$ is the expected lateral displacement in the isolator, $R$ is the radius of curvature of the isolator equal to the sum of $R_{1ef} + R_{2ef}$. (Constantinou, M. C, Whittaker, A. S., Kalpakidis, Y., Fenz, D. M. and Warn G. P. 2007).

![Bilineal constitutive model for the FPT isolator. Source: Mc Vitty y Constantinou (2015)](image)

Fig. 4 - Bilineal constitutive model for the FPT isolator. Source: Mc Vitty y Constantinou (2015)

On the other hand, the period $T$ and the displacement $D$ of a system of one degree of freedom are calculated using the following equations:

$$T = 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{W}{k_{ef} g}}$$

(5)

$$D = \left(\frac{S_1 * g}{4 \pi^2}\right) \frac{T}{B}$$

(6)

Additional variables are $g$ as the gravity acceleration, $S_1$ is the coefficient of $g$ found in the elastic design spectrum for a period of 1 second, $B$ is the factor that allows to obtain spectra for any damping value. The recommended values of $B$ by the ASCE 7-10 are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\xi_{ef}$ (%)</th>
<th>$\leq 2$</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>$\geq 50$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - $B$ values for damping other than 5%. Source: ASCE 7-10

The shear force in the isolated system $V_b$ is calculated with the following equations:

$$V_b = \frac{\sum k_{ef} D}{R_D}$$

(7)

$$V_s = \frac{\sum k_{ef} D}{R_S}$$

(8)

$$F_x = V_s \frac{W_x h_x}{\sum_i W_i h_i}$$

(9)

Where $R_D, R_S$, are the reduction factors for the infra and superstructure forces (this study considered $R_D = 1; R_S = 1.4$), $F_x, W_x, h_x$, are strength, weight and height measured from the base of the structure to the level of any floor respectively.
As indicated above, the effective stiffness is calculated with maximum, nominal and minimum friction coefficients.

2.2 Three-stages model

The three-stages model (Mc Vitty and Constantinou, 2015) applies when the external surface radius are equal, \( R_1 = R_4 \); as well as the internal surfaces \( R_2 = R_3 \). Similar simplifications are possible with heights and coefficients of friction. In this case, the geometrical properties are reduced from 12 to 6 and the friction coefficients of 4 to 2. The three phases of the model are indicated below, noting that all variables have been already defined.

In the first phase, displacement occurs only in the plates 2 and 3.

\[
0 \leq u \leq u^* \\
u^* = 2 (\mu_1 - \mu_2) R_{2,ef} \\
F = \frac{w}{2 R_{2,ef}} u + \mu_2 W
\]  

(10)  

(11)

To the left of Figure 5, it can be seen the inner-isolator-moving-surfaces 2 and 3; to the right, the corresponding displacement vs. lateral force graph.

![Graph of Isolator performance in Regime I](image)

**Fig. 5 – Isolator performance in Regime I. Source: Mc Vitty y Constantinou (2015)**

In the second phase, the movement in the interior isolator reaches the stops and surfaces 1 and 4 start moving on. Normally, is in this regime that the isolator is working under an earthquake of moderate and high intensity. The equations are shown below and in Figure 6 the corresponding displacement vs. lateral force graph.

\[
u^* \leq u \leq u^{**} \\
u^{**} = u^* + 2 d_1^* \\
F = \frac{w}{2 R_{1,ef}} (u - u^*) + \mu_1 W
\]  

(12)  

(13)
The third phase is when the earthquake is extremely strong and the inner isolator meets the outer stops. In these conditions, the inner isolator surfaces 2 and 3 begin to slide, see Figure 7.

\[ u^{**} \leq u \leq u_{cap} \]

\[ u_{cap} = 2d_1^* + 2d_2^* \]  \hspace{1cm} (14)

\[ F = \frac{w}{2R_{2,eff}}(u - u^{**}) + \frac{w}{2R_{1,eff}}(u^{**} - u^*) + \mu_1 W \]  \hspace{1cm} (15)

### 2.3 Five-stages model

This model was proposed by Fenz and Constantinou (2007, 2008) and Fadi and Constantinou (2010). It is described below according to the nomenclature shown in Figure 1.

In the first phase, the isolator slides on surfaces 2 and 3; the lateral force \( F \) and lateral displacement \( q \) are defined by the following equations.

\[ 0 \leq q \leq q^* \]

\[ F = \frac{w}{R_{2,eff} + R_{3,eff}} q + \frac{F_{2,f} R_{2,eff} + F_{3,f} R_{3,eff}}{R_{2,eff} + R_{3,eff}} \]

\[ q^* = (\mu_1 - \mu_2)R_{2,eff} + (\mu_1 - \mu_3)R_{3,eff} \]  \hspace{1cm} (16)

\hspace{1cm} (17)
In the second phase, the inner isolator slippage occurs on surfaces 1, 2 and 3, as a second generation isolator in which the bearing is the inner isolator. The lateral force $F$ and displacement $q$ are:

$$q^* \leq q \leq q^{**}$$

$$F = \frac{W}{R_{1,eff} + R_{3,eff}} q + \frac{F_{1,f}(R_{1,eff} - R_{2,eff}) + F_{2,f}R_{2,eff} + F_{3,f}R_{3,eff}}{R_{1,eff} + R_{3,eff}}$$

(19)

$$q^{**} = q^* + (\mu_4 - \mu_3)(R_{1,eff} + R_{3,eff})$$

(18)

All variables have already been defined. Figure 8 shows the constitutive curves corresponding to phases I and II.

![Fig. 8 – Constitutive curves corresponding to stages I and II. Source: Fenz and Constantinou model (2007, 2008)](image)

The third phase begins when the lateral displacement exceeds $q^{**}$ and starts at $F_{4f}$. In this regime all four surfaces are sliding. Figure 9 shows the constitutive curve in stage III. The equations that define force and displacement are:

$$q^{**} \leq q \leq q_{dr1}$$

$$F = \frac{W}{R_{1,eff} + R_{4,eff}} q + \frac{F_{1,f}(R_{1,eff} - R_{2,eff}) + F_{2,f}R_{2,eff} + F_{3,f}R_{3,eff} + F_{4,f}(R_{4,eff} - R_{3,eff})}{R_{1,eff} + R_{4,eff}}$$

(20)

$$q_{dr1} = q^{**} + d_1 \left(1 + \frac{R_{4,eff}}{R_{1,eff}}\right) - (\mu_4 - \mu_3)(R_{1,eff} + R_{4,eff})$$

(21)

![Fig. 9 – Constitutive curve in stage III. Source: Modelo de Fenz y Constantinou (2007, 2008)](image)
In stage IV, the inner isolator reaches one edge and starts with a force $F_{dr1} = \frac{W}{R_{1,eff}} d_1 + F_{1,f}$, associated with a displacement $q_{dr1}$. The lateral force and displacement are given by the following equations:

$$q_{dr1} \leq q \leq q_{cap}$$

$$F = \frac{W}{R_{2,eff} + R_{4,eff}} (q - q_{dr1}) + \frac{W}{R_{1,eff}} d_1 + F_{1,f} \quad (22)$$

$$q_{cap} = 2 d_1^* + 2 d_2^* \quad (23)$$

In Figure 10 corresponding to the phase IV curve and previous constitutive presented, until this phase can be considered that the insulator is operable.

Finally, there is a stage V, which is related to the impact of the internal isolator against the stop caps, usually drawn with broken lines to indicate its existence but should not be considered for the structural design.

![Figure 10 – Diagrama de histéresis en Fase IV. Source: Mc Vitty y Constantinou (2015)](image)

### 3. FRICTION COEFFICIENTS

Sixty-one FTP8833/12-12/8-6 isolators were tested under vertical loads of 250 tonf. Three harmonic cycles with displacement up to 30 cm were applied, in 12 seconds. The results of the friction coefficient are shown in Figure 11, EPS (2015).

Each graph has three curves: maximum, nominal and minimum. These values are shown in Table 2.

![Figure 11 – Friction coefficients for 250 tonf: a) Exterior surfaces ($\mu_1$): maximum, nominal and minimum values, b) Interior surfaces ($\mu_2$): maximum, nominal and minimum values.](image)
4. STRUCTURE ANALYSIS

The seismic analysis of the Structural Block 3 (See Figure 2), where the isolators are placed on reinforced concrete columns, was performed. The columns are 550/550/20 mm tubular sections and the beams are type I 550/300/25/12 sections. The steel used is the A572, with a yielding stress of 45700 MPa. In Figure 12 a) a 3D view of the structure is presented and in Figure 12 b), the degrees of freedom which were considered.

A model of three degrees of freedom per floor, two horizontal displacements and a rotation of the floor was used. (Aguiar, 2012; Retamales, R., Bonelli, P., Boroschek, R. y Carvallo, J., 2015; Chistopoulius,C. and Filiatraul, A.,2006).

The structure has 5 stories plus a short element representing the isolators. The spectral method was used for the analysis; with effective stiffness values calculated using the 3- and 5-stage models. The ASCE 7-10 model was worked with the simplified linear method. (Chopra A. K.,2001).

The analysis earthquake is defined by the design spectrum of the Ecuadorian Construction Norm NEC-15, to the Valley of Los Chillos where $z = 0.4$, in a profile type C. The seismic force reduction factor was $R = 1.4$.

![Fig. 12 – Structural Block 3; a) Geometry and frame identification; b) Degrees of freedom used for the seismic analysis](image)

5. RESULTS

The seismic analysis was performed with dead load $D = 0.8 \, T/m^2$ for intermediate floors, and $D = 0.6 \, T/m^2$ for the roof; likewise the live load is $L = 0.25 \, T/m^2$ for intermediate floors and $L = 0.125 \, T/m^2$ for the roof. To determine the seismic effective weights of each floor, 25% of the live load was considered. In Table 3 the total weight at each isolator for the load combination $D + 0.25 \, L$ is shown, as well as the effective stiffness found with 3 analytical models and for 3 friction coefficients.
Tabla 3: Effective stiffness using three analytical models and maximum, nominal and minimum friction coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISOLATOR</th>
<th>W (tonf)</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>NOMINAL</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modal-</td>
<td>Modal-</td>
<td>ASCE 7-10</td>
<td>Modal-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spectral</td>
<td>spectral</td>
<td></td>
<td>spectral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3 Stages)</td>
<td>(5 Stages)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 Stages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14a</td>
<td>85,6</td>
<td>36,270</td>
<td>39,340</td>
<td>38,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>141,1</td>
<td>59,770</td>
<td>64,830</td>
<td>64,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>55,5</td>
<td>23,490</td>
<td>25,480</td>
<td>25,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14a</td>
<td>202,2</td>
<td>85,660</td>
<td>92,910</td>
<td>91,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>333,2</td>
<td>141,130</td>
<td>153,080</td>
<td>151,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>130,8</td>
<td>55,420</td>
<td>60,120</td>
<td>59,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14a</td>
<td>228,7</td>
<td>96,860</td>
<td>105,070</td>
<td>103,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>302,0</td>
<td>127,920</td>
<td>138,750</td>
<td>137,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>73,3</td>
<td>31,050</td>
<td>33,680</td>
<td>33,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14a</td>
<td>115,5</td>
<td>48,910</td>
<td>53,050</td>
<td>52,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>115,5</td>
<td>48,910</td>
<td>53,050</td>
<td>52,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that the 5-stages model has the highest effective stiffnesses and that the three-stages model has the lowest values. Furthermore, there is considerable variation between the stiffnesses calculated with the maximum values of the friction coefficient, compared to those found with the nominal and minimum values.

Tabla 4: Damping factors in three analytical models for maximum, nominal and minimum friction coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISOLATOR</th>
<th>W (tonf)</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>NOMINAL</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modal-</td>
<td>Modal-</td>
<td>ASCE 7-10</td>
<td>Modal-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spectral</td>
<td>spectral</td>
<td></td>
<td>spectral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3 Stages)</td>
<td>(5 Stages)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 Stages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14a</td>
<td>85,6</td>
<td>0,2993</td>
<td>0,3256</td>
<td>0,3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>141,1</td>
<td>0,2993</td>
<td>0,3256</td>
<td>0,3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>55,5</td>
<td>0,2993</td>
<td>0,3256</td>
<td>0,3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14a</td>
<td>202,2</td>
<td>0,2993</td>
<td>0,3256</td>
<td>0,3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>333,2</td>
<td>0,2993</td>
<td>0,3256</td>
<td>0,3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>130,8</td>
<td>0,2993</td>
<td>0,3256</td>
<td>0,3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14a</td>
<td>228,7</td>
<td>0,2993</td>
<td>0,3256</td>
<td>0,3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>302,0</td>
<td>0,2993</td>
<td>0,3256</td>
<td>0,3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>73,3</td>
<td>0,2993</td>
<td>0,3256</td>
<td>0,3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14a</td>
<td>115,5</td>
<td>0,2993</td>
<td>0,3256</td>
<td>0,3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>115,5</td>
<td>0,2993</td>
<td>0,3256</td>
<td>0,3078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows the damping factors found with three analytical models. Again the 5-stages model is reporting higher damping factors and the three-stages model gives the lowest values.

Table 5 and Table 6 show the lateral forces and displacements calculated with the three models, respectively. Note that the forces are similar between the 3- and 5-stages models, but they are always higher in the 3-stage model.
Tabla 5 Lateral forces calculated using three analytical models and maximum, nominal and minimum friction coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCK 3</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>NOMINAL</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modal-Spectral (3 Stages)</td>
<td>Modal-Spectral (5 Stages)</td>
<td>ASCE 7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>40,4612</td>
<td>37,5946</td>
<td>66,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 1</td>
<td>42,2892</td>
<td>38,3212</td>
<td>24,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 2</td>
<td>46,1185</td>
<td>43,0132</td>
<td>48,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 3</td>
<td>50,0517</td>
<td>44,0163</td>
<td>72,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 4</td>
<td>10,3652</td>
<td>6,4248</td>
<td>20,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tabla 6 Lateral displacements using analytical models and maximum, nominal and minimum friction coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCK 3</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>NOMINAL</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modal-Spectral (3 Stages)</td>
<td>Modal-Spectral (5 Stages)</td>
<td>ASCE 7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>0,3308</td>
<td>0,3508</td>
<td>0,3136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 1</td>
<td>0,3509</td>
<td>0,3746</td>
<td>0,3323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 2</td>
<td>0,3682</td>
<td>0,3953</td>
<td>0,3501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 3</td>
<td>0,3793</td>
<td>0,4088</td>
<td>0,3629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 4</td>
<td>0,3607</td>
<td>0,4099</td>
<td>0,3755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Figure 13 and 14, the displacement and force results are presented for structural block 3 with maximum, minimum and nominal values:

Fig. 13 – Story displacements with maximum, nominal and minimum friction coefficient values
6. CONCLUSIONS

At Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas ESPE in Ecuador, five structural blocks with seismic isolators are being built. The isolation systems were tested to obtain the friction coefficients and other parameters that define the constitutive model relating lateral force vs displacement.

61 isolators were analyzed, with a vertical load of 250 T, each test with three harmonic load cycles with a maximum displacement of 30 cm. The maximum friction coefficient values found for the outer and inner plate are: 0.015672 and 0.068541, respectively. The nominal values are 88.64% and 79.27% of the maximum values and the minimum friction coefficient are 79.86% and 63.07% of the maximum values.

With these values, a seismic analysis was performed on the ESPE structural blocks using the simplified analysis model in ASCE 7, the Mc Vitty and Constantinou (2015) three-stages model and the Fenz and Constantinou (2007) five-stages model.

By working with maximum values of friction coefficient, the lateral forces are greater than those obtained with nominal and minimal friction coefficients, but the difference is around 1%.

Using minimum friction coefficient values, maximum displacements are obtained. In this case, the difference with the other groups of data is around 30%.

On the other hand, the simplified method ASCE 7-10 produced the greatest forces.

Finally, it is important to note that the experimentally found friction coefficients are similar to the maximum, minimum and nominal values given by the manufacturer.
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