# **Tsunami Load Determination for On-Shore Structures**

Harry Yeh Oregon State University

# **Building** survival









# Vertical Evacuation to Tsunami Shelters









# How can we estimate the tsunami forces on such onshore structures?

**Force Category in the Present Codes** City and County of Honolulu Building Code (2000)

- Hydrostatic Forces
- Buoyant Forces
- Hydrodynamic Forces
- Surge Forces
- Impact Forces
- Breaking Wave Forces

# Wave breaking at the shore



A collapsing breaker resulted from an undular bore. (Yeh, et al. 1989) Typical when:

- steep beach slope
- narrow continental shelf



A sketch of Scotch Cap Lighthouse (1946 Aleutian Tsunami)

# **Some Considerations**

Tsunami shelters are located on land some distance away from the shoreline.

Tsunami shelters are needed in the areas of relatively flat terrain where natural high-ground safe havens are not accessible.

- Formation of a surge may be the most likely flow condition.
- Wave breaking takes place offshore. The only exception is the collapsing breaker type, which occurs right at the shoreline on a steep-slope beach.

# We will not consider wave-breaking force

# Force Category in the Present Codes

- Hydrostatic Forces
- Buoyant Forces
- Hydrodynamic Forces
- Surge Forces
- Impact Forces
- Breaking Wave Forces

## Hydrostatic Force

It is usually important for a 2-D structure such as seawalls and dikes, or for evaluation of an individual wall panel, but not for buildings

$$F_{h} = p_{c} A_{w} = \rho g \left( h_{\max} - \frac{h_{w}}{2} \right) b h_{w} \quad \text{for } h_{\max} > h_{w},$$
  
else  $h_{\max} \to h_{w}$ 

- $p_c$  is the hydrostatic pressure at the centroid of the wetted portion of the wall panel,
- $A_w$  is the wetted area of the panel
- $h_{max}$  is the maximum water height above the base of the wall
- $h_w$  is the height of wall panel



# **Buoyant Force**

The buoyant forces act vertically through the center of mass of the displaced volume

$$F_B = \rho g V$$



- Buoyant forces are a concern for wood frame buildings, empty above-ground and below-ground tanks.
- and, for evaluation of an individual floor panel where the water level outside is substantially higher than the level inside. (Lesson learned from Hurricane Katrina)

- Case-by-case evaluation for hydrostatic force and buoyancy forces on an individual wall panel and a floor panel and alike.
- We only need the water depth *h* to compute the hydrostatic forces, which is readily estimated from the inundation maps



# Force Category in the Present Codes

- Hydrostatic Forces
- Buoyant Forces
- Hydrodynamic Forces
- Surge Forces
- Impact Forces
- Breaking Wave Forces

# Hydrodynamic Force

When "steady" water flows around a building (or structural element or other object) hydrodynamic loads are applied to the building

$$F_D = \frac{1}{2} \rho C_D A u^2$$
 Drag Force

Width to Depth Ratio (w/ds or w/h)	Drag Coefficient Cd	
From 1 - 12	1.25	
13 - 20	1.3	
21 - 32	1.4	
33 - 40	1.5	
41 - 80	1.75	
81 - 120	1.8	
> 120	2	

(FEMA CCM)

## Hydrodynamic Force

$$Force = \frac{1}{2} C_d \rho A_f u^2 \propto b h u^2$$

h: water depthu: flow velocityb: breadth

Laboratory Data of Tsunami Force on a Squire Column:  $C_d$ 



# Force Category in the Present Codes

- Hydrostatic Forces
- Buoyant Forces
- Hydrodynamic Forces
- Surge Forces
- Impact Forces
- Breaking Wave Forces



# Surge Force (present codes)

Surge forces are caused by the leading edge of a surge of water impinging on a structure

$$F_s = 4.5 \rho g h^2 b$$

$$\frac{F_s}{b} = \frac{1}{2}\rho g h^2 + \rho u^2 h: \quad u = 2\sqrt{gh}$$

The identical approach by the Building Center of Japan

*h* is the surge height -- how can we determine?





#### Ramsden, 1993





Comparison of the experimental a) wave profile; b) runup; c) pressure head; and d) force due to a strong turbulent bore and a dry bed surge (after Ramsden, 1993)

# Force Category in the Present Codes

- Hydrostatic Forces
- Buoyant Forces
- Hydrodynamic Forces
- Surge Forces
- Impact Forces
- Breaking Wave Forces



# Impact Force

Impact loads are those that result from debris such as driftwood, small boats, portions of houses, etc., or any object transported by floodwaters, striking against buildings and structures

## Lincoln City, Oregon

# Driftwood becomes hazardous



## Impact Force (present codes)

$$F_I = m \frac{du}{dt} = m \frac{u_I}{\Delta t}$$

Type of construction	Duration (t) of Impact (sec)	
	Wall	Pile
Wood	0.7 - 1.1	0.5 - 1.0
Steel	NA	0.2 - 0.4
Reinforced Concrete	0.2 - 0.4	0.3 - 0.6
Concrete Masonry	0.3 - 0.6	0.3 - 0.6

#### (FEMA CCM)

This is based on the impulse-momentum approach:

$$I = \int_0^\tau F \, dt = d(m \, u); \quad \tau \to 0$$

# Relevant Literature

- ASCE 7-02
  - ASCE Standard. 2003. Minimum design loads for buildings and other structures. SEI/ASCE 7-02.
- City and County of Honolulu Building Code (CCH, 2000)
- Matsutomi
  - J. Hydr., Coastal, Envr. Engrg., 621, 1999 & Tsunami Engineering Tech. Rep., 13, 1996
- Ikeno, et al.
  - 2001, 2003. Impulse Force of Drift Body
- Haehnel and Daly
  - 2002. USACOE Report, ERDC/CRREL TR-02-2

## ASCE 7-02 (2003)

$$F = \frac{\pi m u C_I C_O C_D C_B R_{\max}}{2\Delta t}$$

- *m*: the debris mass,
- *u:* the impact velocity of object,
- $C_i$ : the importance coefficient,
- $C_o$ : the orientation coefficient,
- $C_D$ : the depth coefficient,
- $C_B$ : the blockage coefficient,
- $R_{max}$ : the maximum response ratio for impulsive load
- $\Delta t$ : the impact duration:  $\Delta t = 0.03$  sec is recommended
  - City and County of Honolulu Building Code (2000) recommends  $\Delta t = 1.0$  sec for wood construction,  $\Delta t = 0.5$  sec for steel construction, and  $\Delta t = 0.1$  sec for reinforced concrete
  - FEMA CCM,  $\Delta t = 0.2 \sim 1.1$  sec

#### Matsutomi: J. Hydr., Coastal, Envr. Engrg., 621, 1999 & Tsunami Engineering Tech. Rep., 13, 1996

• Impact force evaluation:  $F = -M \frac{dV}{dt} \qquad \int_{0}^{\Delta t} F(t) dt = C_M M V_0$ 

$$\frac{F}{\gamma_w D^2 L} = 1.6 C_M \left(\frac{u}{\sqrt{g D}}\right)^{1.2} \left(\frac{\sigma_f}{\gamma_w L}\right)^{0.4}$$

- Specifically for lumber impact
- Using small-scale laboratory experiments,  $C_M = 1.7$  ( $C_M = 1.9$  for steady flows)
- Use large-scale "dry" experiments,
  - u: impact velocity
  - $-\gamma_w$ : specific weight of lumber
  - $\sigma_{\rm f}$ : yield stress of lumber ( $\approx$  compressive strength) ~ 20 MPa
  - D: diameter of lumber
  - L: length of lumber

## Matsutomi's work



**表一2** 流木諸元

D (cm)	L (cm)	L/D	W (gf)
4.8~12	38.4~160	8, 12, 16	305~8615



図-3 空中での流木衝突実験装置の概略

## Haehnel and Daly, 2002

Lumber impact



$$m_1 \ddot{x} + \hat{k} x = 0 \implies x = u \sqrt{m/\hat{k}} \sin\left(t \sqrt{\hat{k}/m}\right)$$

$$F = \hat{k} x$$
  $F_{\text{max}} = Max. \langle \hat{k} x \rangle = u \sqrt{\hat{k} m}$ 







Experiments by Haehnel & Daly

Figure 3. Load frame used in the basin tests.

Constant Stiffness Approach:

$$F_{\max} = Max.\langle \hat{k}x \rangle = u\sqrt{\hat{k}m} \approx 1550 u\sqrt{m}$$

From their experiments, the effective constant stiffness is **2.4 MN/m** (but no flow in their experiments)

Impulse-Momentum Approach:

$$F_{\rm max} = \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{u m}{\Delta t} \approx 90.9 u m$$

The impulse-momentum approach reduces to the constant stiffness approach by setting

$$\Delta t = \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{\frac{m}{\hat{k}}}$$

Work-Energy Approach:

$$F_{\max} = \frac{u^2 m}{\Delta x} \approx 125 m u^2 + 8000$$

The work-energy approach reduces to the constant stiffness approach by setting

$$x = u \sqrt{\frac{m}{\hat{k}}}$$

Λ

# Comments

- Uncertainty may be resulted from the fact that the prediction models are based on the empirical scaled-down (and small) data.
- All of the previous works are for impact of a relatively small water-borne missile, e.g. a lumber log.
- No consideration was made for impact of a large missile such as a ship.

# Comments

- Different relations based on the model:
  - Constant Stiffness Approach  $\Rightarrow F \propto u \sqrt{m}$  n = 0.50
  - Impulse-Momentum Approach  $\Rightarrow F \propto u m$
  - Work-Energy Approach  $\Rightarrow$   $F \propto u^2 m$
  - Ikeno et al. (2003)  $\Rightarrow$   $F \propto u^{2.5} m^n$   $n \approx 0.58$
  - Matsutomi (1999)  $\Rightarrow$   $F \propto u^{1.2} m^n$   $n \approx 0.66$

Impulse-Momentum Approach: $\Delta t = \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{\frac{m}{\hat{k}}}$ Work-Energy Approach: $\Delta x = u \sqrt{\frac{m}{\hat{k}}}$ 

# Summary & Recommendations

- Forces on a building examined for a tsunami shelter.
  - Hydrodynamic force with  $C_D = 2$ .
  - Surging force may not be important, but if we consider bore formation, this can be taken into account by using  $C_D = 3$  instead of 2.

$$F_D = \frac{1}{2}\rho C_D b h u^2$$

- Impact force can be evaluated by the "modified" constant stiffness approach with an appropriate value of effective stiffness k, and the added mass coefficient  $C_M (\approx 2)$ . k = 2.4MN/m was recommended for a lumber

$$F_{\max} = C_M u \sqrt{\hat{k} m}$$

## **Recommendations - continue**

- Need the design values of h, u,  $hu^2$  at the site of interest. Note that: Max ( $hu^2$ )  $\neq$  Max (h) × Max ( $u^2$ )
  - Obtain the data from detailed numerical simulations with a very fine grid size in the runup zone ( $\Delta < 10$  m).
  - As for a guideline, use of the analytical solutions for 1-D runup on a uniformly sloping beach.



A snap shot of numerical simulation

#### Available inundation map

# Maximum hu<sup>2</sup> distribution in the runup zone

(analytic solution for 1-D runup on a uniformly sloping beach)



To obtain the design values of h, u,  $hu^2$  at the site of interest

## Long-Wave Runup on a Plane Beach Nonlinear Problem

- Carrier and Greenspan (1958)
- Carrier, Wu, and Yeh (2003) -- Analytic-Numeric Hybrid Approach



# The fully nonlinear shallow-water wave $\begin{bmatrix} u' (\alpha x' + \eta') \end{bmatrix}_{x'} + \eta'_{t'} = 0,$ $u'_{t'} + u' u'_{x'} + g \eta'_{x'} = 0,$

Scaling:

$$u' = \sqrt{g\alpha L} u; \quad \eta = \alpha L \eta; \quad x' = L x; \quad t' = \sqrt{L \alpha g} t$$
$$\left[ u \left( x + \eta \right) \right]_x + \eta_t = 0,$$
$$u_t + u u_x + \eta_x = 0.$$

Introducing the distorted coordinates q and  $\lambda$  such that:

$$\lambda = t - u; \quad q = x + \eta$$

The transformation yields:

$$\begin{cases} (q u)_q + \left(\eta + \frac{u^2}{2}\right)_{\lambda} = 0, \\ u_{\lambda} + \left(\eta + \frac{u^2}{2}\right)_q = 0. \end{cases}$$

$$\psi = \eta + \frac{u^2}{2}$$
  $\sigma = \sqrt{q} = \sqrt{x + \eta}$ 

$$4\sigma\psi_{\lambda\lambda} - (\sigma\psi_{\sigma})_{\sigma} = 0$$
 where  $\psi = \eta + \frac{u^2}{2}$ 

The same form as the one by Carrier-Greenspan (1958). For convenience, we introduce the variable  $\varphi$ :

$$\psi = \eta + \frac{u^2}{2} = \varphi_{\lambda}; \quad u = -\frac{\varphi_{\sigma}}{2\sigma}; \quad \eta = \varphi_{\lambda} - \frac{\varphi_{\sigma}^2}{8\sigma^2}$$

$$4\sigma\varphi_{\lambda\lambda}-(\sigma\varphi_{\sigma})_{\sigma}=0$$

Initial Conditions at  $\lambda = t - u = 0$ :

$$\varphi(\sigma, 0) = P(\sigma),$$
  

$$\varphi_{\lambda}(\sigma, 0) = F(\sigma),$$
  

$$P(\sigma) = -\int_{0}^{\sigma} 2\sigma' u(\sigma', 0) d\sigma', \text{ and } F(\sigma) = \eta(\sigma, 0) + \frac{u^{2}(\sigma, 0)}{2}.$$

# Summary

$$4\,\sigma\varphi_{\lambda\lambda}-(\sigma\varphi_{\sigma})_{\sigma}=0$$

$$\varphi(\sigma,\lambda) = 2\left\{\int_{0}^{\infty} F(b) G(b,\sigma,\lambda) db + \int_{0}^{\infty} P(b) G_{\lambda}(b,\sigma,\lambda) db\right\}$$
  
With ICs:  $P(\sigma) = -\int_{0}^{\sigma} 2\sigma' u(\sigma',0) d\sigma'$ , and  $F(\sigma) = \eta(\sigma,0) + \frac{u^2(\sigma,0)}{2}$ .

$$\psi = \eta + \frac{u^2}{2} = \varphi_{\lambda}; \quad u = -\frac{\varphi_{\sigma}}{2\sigma}; \quad \eta = \varphi_{\lambda} - \frac{\varphi_{\sigma}^2}{8\sigma^2}$$

$$\lambda = t - u; \quad \sigma = \sqrt{x + \eta}$$

## The initial wave form of a Gaussian shape



## $\phi(\sigma, \lambda)$ for the Gaussian shaped initial displacement



Water-surface plot for the Gaussian shaped initial displacement



Water-surface profile at t = 1.0

![](_page_43_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Water-depth variations: q

![](_page_44_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Water velocity: u

![](_page_45_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Momentum Flux (Fluid Force) $\propto h u^2$

![](_page_46_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Initial Waveforms

![](_page_47_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Fluid Forces

![](_page_48_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Maximum force distribution from the maximum runup

![](_page_49_Figure_1.jpeg)

X/L from the maximum runup

# Maximum hu<sup>2</sup> distribution in the runup zone

(analytic solution for 1-D runup on a uniformly sloping beach)

![](_page_50_Figure_2.jpeg)

# Hydrodynamic and Surge Forces

- Hydrodynamic force with  $C_D = 2$ .
- Surging force may not be important, but if we consider bore formation, this can be taken into account by using  $C_D = 3$  instead of 2.

![](_page_51_Figure_3.jpeg)

## Impact Force – max. u

Impact force can be evaluated by the "modified" constant stiffness approach with an appropriate value of effective stiffness k, and the added mass coefficient C<sub>M</sub> (≈ 2). k = 2.4MN/m was recommended for a lumber.

$$F_I = C_M u \sqrt{\hat{k}m}$$

Bore Runup Process

![](_page_53_Picture_1.jpeg)

## Analytical Solution to Determine u<sub>max</sub>

Maximum flow-speed *u* distribution in the runup zone: at the leading tongue of a surge front where the depth d = 0.

![](_page_54_Figure_2.jpeg)

# Floating debris with a finite draft

![](_page_55_Picture_1.jpeg)

Nagappattinam, India, 2004

# Analytical solution to determine $u_{max}$ for a floatable debris with a finite draft

The upper limit of flow-speed u for the depth d: d can be the draft of a floating debris.

For bore runup, based on Shen and Meyer (1963), Peregrine and Williams (2001) presented:

$$\begin{cases} \eta = \frac{1}{36\tau^2} \left( 2\sqrt{2}\tau - \tau^2 - 2\zeta \right)^2 \\ \upsilon = \frac{1}{3\tau} \left( \tau - \sqrt{2}\tau^2 + \sqrt{2}\zeta \right) \end{cases}$$

where 
$$\eta = d/R$$
;  $\upsilon = \frac{u}{\sqrt{2gR}}$ ;  $\tau = t \alpha \sqrt{g/R}$ ;  $\zeta = Z/R$ 

![](_page_57_Figure_0.jpeg)

- R = maximum runup elevation.
- z = ground elevation
- d =flow depth
- d/R = (1) 0, (2) 0.0025, (3) 0.01, (4) 0.02, (5) 0.04, (6) 0.06, (7) 0.08,(8) 0.10, and (9) 0.12.

# Example

- Maximum runup height R = 10 m.
- Beach slope = 1/50 (= 0.02)
- Location of the shelter 100 m from the shoreline (z = 2 m), and the shelter breadth b = 10 m.
- Drift wood -- mass = 450 kg; effective stiffness  $k = 2.4 \times 10^6$  N/m
- Shipping container -- mass = 30,000kg; 12.2m  $\times 2.44$  m  $\times 2.59$ m
- $h_{max} = 8 \text{ m}$
- $\rho = 1025 \text{ kg/m}^3$  for sea water

![](_page_58_Figure_8.jpeg)

• Hydrodynamic and surge forces:

$$(hu^{2})_{\max} = g R^{2} \left( 0.125 - 0.235 \frac{z}{R} + 0.11 \left( \frac{z}{R} \right)^{2} \right) = 80.8 m^{3} / \sec^{2}$$

$$F_{d} = \frac{1}{2} \rho C_{d} B \left( hu^{2} \right)_{\max}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left( 1025 kg / m^{3} \right) (3.0) (10 m) \left( 80.8 m^{3} / \sec^{2} \right)$$

$$= 1240 kN$$

• Impact forces (drift wood):

$$u_{\rm max} = \sqrt{2 g R \left(1 - \frac{z}{R}\right)} = 12.5 \, m/{\rm sec}.$$

$$F_{i} = C_{m} u_{\max} \sqrt{km}$$
  
= 2.0(12.5 m/sec) $\sqrt{(2.4 \times 10^{6} N/m)(450 kg)}$   
= 822 kN

• Impact force (shipping container):

draft *d* is: 
$$d = \frac{W}{\rho A_{box}}$$
  
=  $\frac{30000 \, kg}{(1025 \, kg/m^3)(12.2 \, m \times 2.44 \, m)} = 0.98 \, m$ 

At the location of the shelter site,  $\zeta = z/R = 0.2$ , and the flow depth, d/R = 0.098. The figure shows  $u_{max}$  along the limit curve at  $\zeta = 0.18$ . Hence, the maximum velocity is:

$$u_{\rm max} = 0.18 \sqrt{2 g R} = 2.5 \, m/{\rm sec}$$
.

$$F_{i} = C_{m} u_{\max} \sqrt{km}$$
  
= 2.0(2.5 m/sec)  $\sqrt{(2.4 \times 10^{6} N/m)(30000 kg)}$   
= 1340 kN

![](_page_61_Figure_0.jpeg)

1) d/R = 0, 2, 0.0025, 3, 0.01, 4, 0.02, 5, 0.04, 6, 0.06, 7, 0.08, 8, 0.10, and 9, 0.12