

**SEISMIC ISOLATION OF TORSIONALLY COUPLED
MACHINE FOUNDATION CONSIDERING
SOIL-STRUCTURE INTERACTION**

RAJKUMAR K



**DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

MAY, 2020

**SEISMIC ISOLATION OF TORSIONALLY COUPLED
MACHINE FOUNDATION CONSIDERING
SOIL-STRUCTURE INTERACTION**

by

RAJKUMAR K

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING

Submitted

in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

MAY, 2020

Dedicated to my family and friends

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis titled, “**SEISMIC ISOLATION OF TORSIONALLY COUPLED MACHINE FOUNDATION CONSIDERING SOIL-STRUCTURE INTERACTION**” being submitted by **Mr. Rajkumar K** to the Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Delhi for the award of the degree of **DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY** is a record of the bonafide research work carried out by him. He worked under our supervision for the submission of thesis, which to our knowledge has reached the requisite standard as demonstrated by excellent international publications in journals and conferences.

Further, the contents of his research work, in full or in parts, have not been submitted to any other institute or university for the award of any degree or diploma to the best of our knowledge and belief.



New Delhi

04th May, 2020

Dr. Vasant A. Matsagar

(Dogra Chair Professor)

Department of Civil Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi,
Hauz Khas, New Delhi – 110 016,
India.

Dr. R. Ayothiraman

(Professor)

Department of Civil Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi,
Hauz Khas, New Delhi – 110 016,
India.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of the PhD thesis was an unforgettable and unexpected journey that would not have been achievable without the support and encouragement of my supervisors, family and friends. First and foremost, my greatest appreciation and gratitude goes to my PhD supervisors Dr. Ayothiraman and Dr. Vasant Matsagar, Professor, IIT Delhi for their trust and support. I would like to thank both of my supervisors for advising me not only during all phases of my PhD, but also for giving me the motivation for conducting research to find my ways in other research project outside of the main focus of the doctoral research work. I am also thankful to Professor G. V. Ramana, Professor A. K. Mittal, and Professor A. K. Darpe who served in my doctoral research committee, spent their time, shared their views, experience, and vast knowledge in several technical discussions. Thank you very much for guiding me through this important phase of my life. Also, I would like thank all faculty and staff in the Civil Engineering Department at IIT Delhi. Also, I am thankful for the support received from Vice President and colleagues of SNC-Lavalin Engineering India Private Limited, for their support and encouragement during my initial stage of PhD.

In addition, I would like to thank my friends namely, Mr. Naseef, Mr. M. Sathish, Ms. Aruna, Mr. Tathagata Roy, Mr. V. Sathish, Mr. Pravin, Mr. Ankit, Ms. Arundhuti, Mr. Jishnu and Mr. Ashwin. During my PhD research days at the MHPSL in the Civil Engineering Department at IIT Delhi I have had the pleasure of interacting with a number of great colleagues and students some of which became precious friends for lifetime. I am grateful to three of you for proofreading parts of my PhD thesis and for being really excellent companion and trustworthy lab-mates. It was a great pleasure working with you; I wish you all the best in your future endeavours!

Finally, I would like to express sincere gratitude towards my wife, parents, brothers and sister for their sincere love and prayers and for always being there for me. Thank you all for your invaluable love, help, and your patience.

ABSTRACT

Machine foundations are inevitable components of any industrial infrastructure which helps in distribution of the machine loads and mitigation of vibrations developed due to the rotating machine parts. Soil conditions and the types of foundation which support these machines play an important role in ensuring safe design and performance of different machines. Framed-type machine foundations also known as turbo-generator (TG) foundations are the common supporting system for rotary machines of medium to high-speed (Barkan, 1962; Arya et al., 1979; BIS, 1992; Srinivasulu and Vaidyanathan, 1980; Bhatia, 2008). In general, the permissible displacement amplitude of vibration for the framed-type machine foundations supporting rotary machine is very low (Blake, 1964; Baxter and Bernhard, 1967; Richart et al., 1970; Prakash and Puri, 1988; BIS, 1992; ACI, 2004; Das and Ramana, 2010). When vibration control devices (base isolation techniques) are used, the design approaches for the machine foundations considering torsional effects (due to eccentricities between center of rigidity and center of mass) are still in the development stage. Especially, the effects of flexibility of underlying soil in combination with torsional coupling is ignored in the designs. In machine foundations, dynamic loads always exist and the energy content of this force is transmitted to the supporting soil through foundation system. This energy travels in all directions into the soil and part gets absorbed by the soil itself, part reflects back to the foundation and thereby into the machine. This cyclic process initiates Soil-Structure Interaction (SSI), which significantly influences the dynamic response of the machine foundation (Mayerhof, 1953; Gazetas, 1983; Wolf, 1997; Biswas and Manna, 2018). The present research work investigates the effects of base isolation devices used in torsionally coupled machine foundations while duly considering SSI in to account.

Observations of damages on structures after recent earthquakes have shown the importance of torsional vibrations, induced by lateral seismic ground motions. Eccentricity between the center of mass (CM) and the center of rigidity (CR) may lead to torsional coupling in framed structures (Danisch and Labes, 1976; Reinhorn et al., 1977; Eisenberger and Rutenberg, 1985; Chandler and Hutchinson, 1986; Kelly, 1986; Rutenberg and Pekau, 1987; Chandler and Hutchinson, 1992; Jiang and Hutchinson, 1993; Jangid and Datta, 1995; Jangid and Kelly, 2000; Kilar and Koren, 2009; Matsagar and Jangid, 2010; Trifunac, 2013). Asymmetries are quite common in framed-type machine foundations supporting

rotary machines as it consists many cut-outs (openings) in deck slab. Also, the layout of equipment and its accessories (such as heavy turbine, generator, gear box, equipment oil system, condenser etc.) on deck slab are quite complex and its arrangement are also not symmetrical. This would lead to prevalence of torsional coupling in most turbine machine foundations. In addition, geometrical imperfections in the form of initial curvature or bend, i.e. out-of-plumb are possible during construction of slender columns. Slender columns are very common in the framed-type machine foundations supporting rotary machines, and hence the imperfections in the form of initial bend are possible. These initial geometrical imperfections in general, reduce the load-carrying capacity of the structure/foundation under static loads. In addition, these imperfections may alter the stiffness of columns, which may eventually affect the dynamic response of structures/foundations (Chajes, 1974; Celep, 1985; Souza, 1987; Yaoshun et al., 1998; Dubina and Ungureanu, 2002; and Sovizi et al., 2010; Sharma et al., 2014; Jain and Rai, 2014; Shayan et al., 2014; Cardoso and Rasmussen, 2016; Monsalve-Giraldo et al., 2017; Marinca and Herisanu, 2018; De Domenico et al., 2018; Dhar et al., 2018). Hence, the main sources of asymmetries in framed-type machine foundation considered here are due to variation in the stiffness provided by columns (construction defects) and due to uneven distribution of machine mass on the deck slab.

Improper functioning of sensitive equipments, disturbances to people and visible structural damage may occur due to dynamic effects of machines, especially in industries (ACI, 2004). The base isolation concept is mainly used to decouple the machine vibrations and seismic ground motion from its foundation. Using the base isolation technique, the structure is isolated from the vibrations by insertion of flexible layer, which is formed by elastomeric and/or sliding bearings. Such flexibility elongates time period, thereby reduce seismic forces. Moreover, the bearings provide additional means of energy dissipation through high damping (Jangid and Datta, 1995; Jangid and Kelly, 2000; Matsagar and Jangid, 2005; Bhat and Paul, 2016; Konstantinidis, 2018; Terazawa and Takeuchi, 2018). The aim of vibration isolation of machine foundation is to prevent transmission of vibrations from the machine or from ground. The foundation is designed to avoid resonance with the machine vibrations and also against seismic ground motions. However, in most cases, the effect of soil flexibility and torsional effects are ignored in the machine foundation design. The proposed doctoral research will greatly contribute in the advancement of current knowledge in the design of machine foundations and vibration mitigation therein, considering the effects of torsional coupling, geometrical imperfection and SSI.

सार

मशीन की नींव किसी भी औद्योगिक अवसंरचना के अपरिहार्य घटक हैं जो घूमने वाली मशीन के पुर्जों के कारण विकसित किए गए कंपन के मशीन भार और शमन के वितरण में मदद करते हैं। मिट्टी की स्थिति और नींव के प्रकार जो इन मशीनों का समर्थन करते हैं, विभिन्न मशीनों के सुरक्षित डिजाइन और प्रदर्शन को सुनिश्चित करने में महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका निभाते हैं। फ्रेम-टाइप मशीन फ़ाउंडेशन जिन्हें टर्बो-जनरेटर (टीजी) फ़ाउंडेशन के रूप में भी जाना जाता है, मध्यम से हाईस्पीड (बार्कन, 1962; आर्य एट अल, 1979; 1979; बीआईएस, 1992; श्रीनिवासुलु और वैद्यनाथन, 1980; भाटिया, 2008) की रोटरी मशीनों के लिए सामान्य सहायक प्रणाली है। सामान्य तौर पर, अनुमेय विस्थापन आयाम कंपन के लिए रोटरी मशीन का समर्थन करने वाले फ्रेम-प्रकार की मशीन नींव बहुत कम है (ब्लेक, 1964; बैक्सटर और बर्नहार्ड, 1967; रिचर्ड एट अल, 1970; प्रकाश और पुरी, 1988; बीआईएस, 1992; एसीआई; 2004; दास और रमना, 2010)। जब कंपन नियंत्रण उपकरणों (आधार (बेस) अलगाव (आइसोलेशन) तकनीकों) का उपयोग किया जाता है, तो मशीन नींव के लिए डिज़ाइन दृष्टिकोण टॉर्सनल प्रभाव (कठोरता के केंद्र (सेंटर) और द्रव्यमान के केंद्र के बीच विलक्षणता (एक्सट्रिंसिटीस) के कारण) के विकास के चरण में होते हैं। विशेष रूप से, मरोड़ वाले (टॉर्स्ीओनल) कपलिंग के साथ अंतर्निहित मिट्टी के लचीलेपन (फ्लेक्सिबिलिटी) के प्रभावों को डिजाइनों में अनदेखा किया जाता है। मशीन नींव में, गतिशील भार (डाइनमिक लोड्स) हमेशा मौजूद होता है और इस बल की ऊर्जा सामग्री नींव प्रणाली के माध्यम से सहायक मिट्टी में संचारित होती है। यह ऊर्जा मिट्टी में सभी दिशाओं में यात्रा (ट्रैवेलज़) करती है और भाग मिट्टी से ही अवशोषित (अब्ज़ॉर्ड) हो जाता है, भाग नींव (फाउंडेशन) में और इस तरह मशीन में वापस आ जाता है। यह चक्रीय प्रक्रिया मृदा-संरचना सहभागिता (सोइल-स्ट्रक्चर इंटरैक्शन) (एसएसआई) की शुरुआत करती है, जो मशीन नींव की गतिशील प्रतिक्रिया को काफी प्रभावित करती है (मेयरहोफ, 1953; गज़ेटास, 1983; वुल्फ; 1997; विश्वास और मन्ना, 2018)। वर्तमान शोध कार्य एसएसआई को ध्यान में रखते हुए विधिवत रूप से युग्मित मशीन नींव (टॉर्स्ीओनल कपल्ड मशीन फाउंडेशन्स) में उपयोग किए गए आधार अलगाव (बेस आइसोलेशन) उपकरणों के प्रभावों की जांच करते हैं।

हाल के भूकंपों के बाद संरचनाओं पर नुकसान की टिप्पणियों ने टॉर्सनल कंपन (वाइब्रेशन्स) के महत्व को दर्शाया है, जो पार्श्व भूकंपीय गति (लैटरल सेसमिक ग्राउंड मोशन्स) से प्रेरित है। द्रव्यमान के केंद्र (सीयेम) और कठोरता के केंद्र (सीआर) के बीच विलक्षणता फ्रेमयुक्त संरचनाओं में मरोड़ वाले युग्मन को जन्म दे सकती है (डैनिश एंड लेबल्स, 1976; आइनेहॉर्न एट अल, 1977; ईसेनबर्गर एंड रुटेनबर्ग, 1985; चैंडलर और हचिंसन, 1986; केली, 1986; रुटेनबर्ग और पेकाऊ, 1987; चैंडलर और हचिंसन, 1992; जियांग और हचिंसन, 1993;

जांगिड और दत्ता, 1995; जांगिड और केली, 2000; किलर और कोरेन, 2009; मतसागर और जांगिड, 2010; ट्रिफुनाक, 2013)। रोटरी मशीनों का समर्थन करने वाले फ्रेम-प्रकार की मशीन नींव में असममितता (एसिमेट्रीस) काफी आम है क्योंकि इसमें डेक स्लैब में कई कट-आउट (उद्घाटन/ओपनिंग्स) होते हैं। इसके अलावा, डेक स्लैब पर उपकरण और उसके सामान (जैसे भारी टरबाइन, जनरेटर, गियर बॉक्स, उपकरण तेल प्रणाली (एक्विपमेंट आयिल), कंडेनसर आदि) का लेआउट काफी जटिल है और इसकी व्यवस्था भी सममित (सिमेट्रिकल) नहीं है। यह सबसे टरबाइन मशीन नींव में मरोड़ युग्मन का प्रसार होगा। इसके अलावा, प्रारंभिक वक्रता (इनिशियल कर्वचर) या मोड़ (बेंड) के रूप में ज्यामितीय खामियां (जियोमीट्रिकल इम्पर्फेक्शन्स), यानी पतले स्तंभों (स्लेंडरर कॉलम्स) के निर्माण के दौरान आउट-ऑफ-प्लंब संभव है। रोटरी मशीनों का समर्थन करने वाले फ्रेम-प्रकार की मशीन नींव में पतले स्तंभ बहुत आम हैं, और इसलिए प्रारंभिक मोड़ के रूप में खामियां संभव हैं। सामान्य रूप से ये प्रारंभिक ज्यामितीय खामियां, स्थिर भार (स्टैटिक लोड्स) के तहत संरचना / नींव की भार-वहन क्षमता (लोड-कॅरीयिंग कैपैसिटी) को कम करती हैं। इसके अलावा, ये खामियां स्तंभों की कठोरता (स्टिफनेस) को बदल सकती हैं, जो अंततः संरचनाओं / नींव की गतिशील प्रतिक्रिया (डाइनमिक रेस्पॉन्स) को प्रभावित कर सकती हैं (चेज़्स, 1974; सेलेप; 1985; सूजा; 1987; यशुन एट अल, 1998; डबीना और उनगुरानू, 2002; और सोविज़ी एट अल, 2010; शर्मा एट अल, 2014; जैन और राय, 2014; श्यान एट अल, 2014; कार्डसो और रासमुसेन, 2016; मोनसालवे-गिराल्डो एट अल, 2017; मारिका और हरिसनू, 2018; डी डोमिनिको एट अल, 2018; धार एट अल, 2018)। इसलिए, फ्रेम-प्रकार की मशीन में असममितता के मुख्य स्रोत हैं यहां माना जाने वाला आधार स्तंभों (निर्माण दोष) द्वारा प्रदान की गई कठोरता में भिन्नता के कारण और डेक स्लैब पर मशीन द्रव्यमान के असमान वितरण के कारण होता है।

संवेदनशील उपकरणों (सेन्सिटिव एक्विपमेंट्स) के बेहतर कामकाज, लोगों को गड़बड़ी और दिखाई संरचनात्मक क्षति (स्ट्रक्चरल डैमेज), मशीनों के गतिशील प्रभावों के कारण हो सकती है, विशेष रूप से उद्योगों (इंडस्ट्रीस) (एसीआई, 2004) में। आधार अलगाव (बेस आइसोलेशन) अवधारणा का उपयोग मुख्य रूप से मशीन कंपन और भूकंपीय जमीन की गति को इसकी नींव से अलग करने के लिए किया जाता है। बेस आइसोलेशन तकनीक का उपयोग करते हुए, संरचना को लचीली परत (फ्लेक्सिबल लेयर) के सम्मिलन से कंपन से अलग किया जाता है, जो इलास्टोमेरिक द्वारा बनाई जाती है और / या फिसलने (स्लाइडिंग) बीयरिंग। इस तरह की लचीलापन समय अवधि (टाइम पीरियड) को बढ़ाती है, जिससे भूकंपीय बलों को कम किया जा सकता है। इसके अलावा, बीयरिंग उच्च भिगोना (हाइ ड्रिपिंग) के माध्यम से ऊर्जा अपव्यय (एनर्जी डिडिपेशन) के अतिरिक्त साधन प्रदान करते हैं (जांगिड और दत्ता, 1995; जांगिड और केली, 2000; मतसागर और जांगिड, 2005; भट

और पॉल, 2016; कॉस्टेंटिनिडिस, 2018; तराज़वा और टेकुची, 2018)। मशीन फाउंडेशन के कंपन अलगाव का उद्देश्य मशीन से या जमीन से कंपन के संचरण को रोकना है। नींव को मशीन के कंपन के साथ गूंज (रेज़नेन्स) से बचने के लिए और भूकंपीय जमीन की गति के खिलाफ भी बनाया गया है। हालांकि, ज्यादातर मामलों में, मशीन नींव डिजाइन में मिट्टी के लचीलेपन और मरोड़ वाले प्रभावों की अनदेखी की जाती है। प्रस्तावित डॉक्टरेट अनुसंधान मशीन नींव और कंपन शमन के डिजाइन में वर्तमान ज्ञान की उन्नति में बहुत योगदान देगा, जो टॉर्सनियल युग्मन, ज्यामितीय अपूर्णता और एसएसआई के प्रभावों पर विचार करेगा।

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
1.1	General	1
1.2	Machines	1
1.3	Types of Machines	2
1.3.1	Rotary machines	2
1.3.2	Reciprocating machines	3
1.3.3	Impulsive machines	4
1.4	Types of Machine Foundations	5
1.4.1	Block foundation	5
1.4.2	Framed-type machine foundation	6
1.5	Design of Machine Foundations	7
1.6	Machine Foundation Subjected to Earthquake Loads	9
1.7	Need of the Present Work	10
1.8	Objectives of the Present Study	11
1.9	Organization of the Thesis	12
2	Literature Review	15
2.1	General	15
2.2	Framed-Type Machine Foundation	16
2.3	Design Criteria	18
2.4	Design Loads	20
2.4.1	Static loads	20
2.4.2	Dynamic loads	22
2.4.3	Temperature loads	23
2.4.4	Special loads	24
2.5	Design Methods	24

2.5.1 Simplified methods	24
2.5.2 Rigorous methods	26
2.6 Effect of Soil-Structure Interaction (SSI) on Machine Foundation	27
2.6.1 SSI under static loads	28
2.6.2 SSI under dynamic loads	29
2.7 Geometrical Imperfections	34
2.8 Influence of SSI on Torsionally Coupled Structures	35
2.9 Influence of SSI on Torsionally Coupled Base-Isolated Structures	38
2.9.1 Elastomeric bearing systems	41
2.9.2 Sliding isolation systems	42
2.10 Summary	44
3 Dynamic Analysis of Framed-Type Machine Foundation Considering Initial Geometrical Imperfections in Columns	45
3.1 General	45
3.2 Finite Element Modeling	46
3.2.1 Continuum elements	47
3.2.2 Material modeling	47
3.2.3 Boundary condition	47
3.2.4 Loading Steps	48
3.3 Validation of Finite Element (FE) Model	48
3.4 TG Foundation with Single Bay	49
3.5 Effect of Geometrical Imperfections	53
3.5.1 Natural frequency	54
3.5.2 Displacement amplitude	56
3.6 Dynamic Analysis of TG Foundation	65
3.7 Effect of Geometrical Imperfections on TG Foundation	69
3.7.1 Natural frequency	69
3.7.2 Displacement amplitude	70
3.8 Conclusions	75

4	Dynamic Analysis of Machine Foundation Considering Geometrical and Material Nonlinearities	77
4.1	General	77
4.2	Finite Element Analysis	78
4.2.1	Continuum elements	78
4.2.2	Material modeling	78
4.2.3	RC elements and rebar interface	79
4.3	Validation of Finite Element (FE) Model	79
4.3.1	Behavior of column with geometrical nonlinearity	79
4.3.2	Behavior of column with material nonlinearity	79
4.3.3	Dynamic response of RC column with geometrical and material nonlinearities	81
4.4	Dynamic Analysis of RC Column	82
4.5	Effect of Geometrical Imperfections	84
4.5.1	Natural frequency	84
4.5.2	Displacement amplitude	84
4.6	Dynamic Analysis of Framed-Type Machine Foundation	86
4.7	Effect of Geometrical Imperfections	88
4.7.1	Natural frequency	89
4.7.2	Displacement amplitude	92
4.8	Effect of Flexibility of Machine Foundation	94
4.9	Conclusions	99
5	Soil-Structure Interaction Effects on Machine Foundation Resting on Raft and Pile Foundation	101
5.1	General	101
5.2	Simplified Modeling	101
5.2.1	Modeling of frame	102
5.2.2	Modeling of foundation-soil system	102
5.2.3	Governing equations of motion	104
5.2.4	Solution of equations of motion	105

5.3	Finite Element Modeling	105
5.3.1	Continuum elements	106
5.3.2	Material modeling	106
5.3.3	Soil-pile interface	107
5.3.4	Damping	107
5.3.5	Boundary conditions	107
5.3.6	Loading steps	108
5.4	Validation of FE Model	108
5.4.1	Dynamic analysis of framed-type machine foundation resting on rock	108
5.4.2	Soil-pile interaction under static loading	109
5.4.3	Soil-pile interaction under dynamic loading	109
5.5	Numerical Study	111
5.5.1	Effect of SSI on natural frequency	112
5.5.2	Effect of SSI on time-history response	113
5.5.3	Effect of SSI on frequency response curve	114
5.5.4	Bending stress	116
5.6	Conclusions	117
6	Effect of Soil-Structure Interaction on Base-Isolated Machine Foundations	119
6.1	General	119
6.2	Modeling of Base-Isolated Machine Foundation	120
6.2.1	Modeling of superstructure	121
6.2.2	Modeling of substructure and soil	121
6.2.3	Modeling of base isolator	122
6.2.4	Governing equations of motion	124
6.2.5	Solution of equations of motion	124
6.3	Validation	125
6.4	Numerical Study	127
6.5	Conclusions	136
7	Effect of Torsional Coupling on Base-Isolated Machine Foundation Supporting Rotary Machines	139

7.1	General	139
7.2	Modeling of Base-Isolated Machine Foundation	140
7.2.1	Modeling of superstructure	140
7.2.2	Modeling of base isolators	142
7.2.3	Governing equations of motion	143
7.2.4	Solution of equations of motion	146
7.3	Parametric Study and Discussion of Results	146
7.3.1	Effects of torsional coupling on natural frequency	147
7.3.2	Effects of torsional coupling on frequency response curves	148
7.3.3	Effect of torsional coupling under earthquake ground motions	152
7.3.4	Effect of torsional coupling on base-isolated machine foundation	157
7.3.5	Effect of superstructure flexibility	158
7.4	Conclusions	161
8	Seismic Isolation of Torsionally Coupled Machine Foundation Considering Soil-Structure Interaction	163
8.1	General	163
8.2	Finite Element Modeling	163
8.2.1	Continuum elements	165
8.2.2	Material modeling	165
8.2.3	Damping	166
8.2.4	Boundary conditions	166
8.2.5	Loading steps	167
8.3	Validation of FE Model	167
8.3.1	Base-isolated structure under earthquake loading	167
8.3.2	Soil-structure interaction under earthquake loading	167
8.4	Numerical Study	168
8.4.1	Effect of torsional coupling on natural frequency	168
8.4.2	Effect of SSI on natural frequency	169
8.4.3	Effect of SSI on torsionally coupled framed-type machine foundation	170
8.4.4	Effect of SSI on torsionally coupled base-isolated machine foundation	176
8.5	Conclusions	181

9	Summary and Conclusions	183
9.1	General	183
9.2	Summary	183
9.3	Conclusions	184
9.4	Limitations and Suggestion for Future Research	186
10	References	187
11	Appendix: Sensitivity Analysis on FE Models	201
A1.1	General	201
A1.2	Sensitivity Analysis for Frame	201
A1.3	Sensitivity Analysis for Soil Continuum	203
A1.4	Steady-State Analysis	205
A1.5	Test on Infinite Elements	206
	List of Publications	209
	Bio-data	211

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1.	Unbalanced dynamic force from rotary machines.	2
Figure 1.2.	Typical arrangement of a steam turbine.	3
Figure 1.3.	Typical arrangement of a reciprocating machine.	4
Figure 1.4.	Typical impact type machine arrangement	5
Figure 1.5.	Schematic representation of block foundation resting on: (a) raft, and (b) piled-raft foundation.	6
Figure 1.6.	Schematic representation of framed-type machine foundation resting on: (a) raft, and (b) piled-raft foundation.	7
Figure 2.1.	Typical TG foundation supporting steam turbine.	16
Figure 2.2.	Typical power house building: (a) cross-section, (b) longitudinal elevation, and (c) plan at deck level (units are in mm).	18
Figure 2.3.	Permissible amplitudes of vibration.	20
Figure 2.4.	(a) Transverse frame, and (b) idealized SDOF model.	25
Figure 2.5.	(a) Transverse frame, and (b) idealized 2DOF model.	26
Figure 2.6.	Three-dimensional FE model of framed-type machine foundation resting on soil medium.	27
Figure 2.7.	Schematic representation of seismic response of the structure founded on elastic soil: (a) free-field response, (b) kinematic interaction, and (c) inertial interaction.	29
Figure 2.8.	Schematic representation of (a) actual structure founded on elastic soil medium, and (b) the finite element model.	30
Figure 2.9.	Schematic representation of (a) actual structure founded on elastic soil medium, and (b) the substructure method of analysis.	31
Figure 2.10.	Schematic representation of (a) actual structure-foundation-soil system, and (b) the corresponding equivalent spring-dashpot model.	32
Figure 2.11.	Schematic representation of spring isolation system supporting deck slab.	38
Figure 2.12.	Schematic representation of base-isolated framed-type machine foundation: (a) isolators located at foundation level, and (b) isolators located at deck slab level.	39
Figure 2.13.	Schematic representation of (a) laminated rubber bearing, and (b) lead rubber bearing or New-Zealand rubber bearing (N-Z) system.	41

Figure 2.14.	Schematic representation of (a) electricite-de-France (EDF) system, and (b) resilient-friction base isolation (RFBI) system.	42
Figure 3.1.	Validation on behavior of column with geometrical nonlinearity: (a) schematic representation of initially bent column, (b) corresponding FE model, and (c) results comparison.	48
Figure 3.2.	Details of TG foundation with single bay: (a) plan, and (b) elevation.	51
Figure 3.3.	Different orientations of initial geometrical imperfection considered for the present study.	52
Figure 3.4.	(a) Finite element model of TG foundation with single bay, (b) mode shape profile in lateral mode, (c) torsional mode, and (d) vertical mode.	53
Figure 3.5.	Dynamic response of TG foundation with single bay without considering initial geometrical imperfections.	54
Figure 3.6.	Increase in vertical displacement amplitude considering geometrical imperfections.	58
Figure 3.7.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-1A, Type-1B, and Type-1C model.	59
Figure 3.8.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-2A, Type-2B, and Type-2C model.	60
Figure 3.9.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-3A, Type-3B, and Type-3C model.	61
Figure 3.10.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-4A, Type-4B, and Type-4C model.	62
Figure 3.11.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-5A, Type-5B, and Type-5C model.	63
Figure 3.12.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-6A, Type-6B, and Type-6C model.	64
Figure 3.13.	Variation in horizontal displacement amplitudes considering initial geometrical imperfections.	65
Figure 3.14.	Typical TG foundation-Plan at deck level.	66
Figure 3.15.	(a) Finite element model of TG foundation with straight columns, (b) mode shape profile in lateral mode, (c) vertical mode, and (d) torsional mode.	68
Figure 3.16.	Dynamic response of TG foundation without considering initial geometrical imperfections.	69
Figure 3.17.	Different orientations of the initial imperfection considered.	70

Figure 3.18.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-11A, Type-11B, and Type-11C model.	72
Figure 3.19.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-12A, Type-12B, and Type-12C model.	73
Figure 3.20.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-13A, Type-13B, and Type-13C model.	74
Figure 4.1.	Validation on behavior of RC beam with material nonlinearity: (a) mode shape profile obtained from the FE results for first mode, (b) second mode, and (c) results comparison.	80
Figure 4.2.	Validation on behavior of RC Column with both geometrical and material nonlinearities: (a) mode shape profile obtained from the FE results for first mode without initial geometrical imperfection, and (b) with initial geometrical imperfection.	81
Figure 4.3.	Mode shape profile obtained from the finite element (FE) model of RC column, (a) 1 st mode, (b) 2 nd mode, and (c) 3 rd mode from free-vibration analysis.	82
Figure 4.4.	Different orientations of the initial imperfection considered for the present study: (a) Type-1, (b) Type-2, and (c) Type-3.	83
Figure 4.5.	Frequency response curve obtained from the dynamic analysis of RC column without considering initial geometrical imperfections.	84
Figure 4.6.	Variations in axial displacements considering columns with geometrical imperfections.	85
Figure 4.7.	Variations in transverse displacements considering columns with geometrical imperfections.	86
Figure 4.8.	Typical framed-type machine foundation considered for the present study.	87
Figure 4.9.	Finite element model of framed-type machine foundation, (a) RC frame (600-C3D20 elements), and (b) steel rebars (1183-T3D2 elements).	88
Figure 4.10.	Free-vibration response of framed-type machine foundation, (a) fundamental horizontal mode, (b) torsional mode, and (c) vertical or axial mode.	88
Figure 4.11.	Dynamic response of framed-type machine foundation without considering initial geometrical imperfections.	89
Figure 4.12.	Different orientations of initial geometrical imperfection considered.	91
Figure 4.13.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-1 to Type-3 model.	95

Figure 4.14.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-4 to Type-6 model.	96
Figure 4.15.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-1 to Type-3 model for rigid frame.	97
Figure 4.16.	Increase in deck displacement amplitudes considering geometrical imperfections for Type-4 to Type-6 model for rigid frame.	98
Figure 5.1.	Typical framed-type machine foundation supported by: (a) raft, (b) piles, and (c) idealized model.	102
Figure 5.2.	Three-dimensional FE model of framed-type machine foundation resting on soil medium.	106
Figure 5.3.	Frequency response curve obtained from simplified model and FE model.	109
Figure 5.4.	Response of single socketed pile under static loads.	110
Figure 5.5.	Free-field response obtained from the FE model.	110
Figure 5.6.	Pile head response under a base excitation.	111
Figure 5.7.	Mode shape profile in fundamental mode of vibration for the framed-type machine foundation resting on firm rock in (a) horizontal, (b) torsional, and (c) vertical direction.	112
Figure 5.8.	Time-history response of framed-type machine foundation supported by raft.	114
Figure 5.9.	Frequency response curve for framed-type machine foundation supported by raft for hard rock and dense soil conditions.	115
Figure 5.10.	Frequency response curve for framed-type machine foundation supported by raft for stiff and soft soil conditions.	115
Figure 5.11.	Frequency response curve for framed-type machine foundation resting on soft soil.	116
Figure 5.12.	Frequency response curve for framed-type machine foundation supported by raft.	116
Figure 5.13.	Variation of bending stress in base raft.	117
Figure 6.1.	Schematic diagram of base-isolated machine foundation resting on homogeneous soil medium.	120
Figure 6.2.	Schematic representation of lead rubber bearing (LRB).	123

Figure 6.3.	Comparison of base shear variation for rigid framed structures considering SSI: (a) published results by Wu (1997), and (b) present study.	126
Figure 6.4.	Comparison of base shear variation for flexible framed structures considering SSI: (a) published results by Wu (1997), and (b) present study.	126
Figure 6.5.	Variations of natural frequency and peak deck acceleration of machine foundation under different frequencies of harmonic excitation ($T_b = 2.5$ sec, $\zeta_b = 0.1$, $F_0 = 0.05$, and $q = 2.5$ cm).	129
Figure 6.6.	Deck acceleration and bearing displacement of a base-isolated machine foundation under the Imperial Valley, Array #5 (1979) earthquake ($T_s = 0.1$ sec, $T_b = 2.5$ sec, $\zeta_b = 0.1$, and $q = 2.5$ cm).	131
Figure 6.7.	Deck acceleration and bearing displacement of a base-isolated machine foundation under the Kobe (1995) earthquake ($T_s = 0.1$ sec, $T_b = 2.5$ sec, $\zeta_b = 0.1$, and $q = 2.5$ cm).	131
Figure 6.8.	Variations of peak deck acceleration and deck displacement of different non-isolated machine foundations.	132
Figure 6.9.	Variations of peak deck acceleration and deck displacement of different base-isolated machine foundations ($T_b = 2.5$ sec, $\zeta_b = 0.1$, and $q = 2.5$ cm).	133
Figure 6.10.	Variations of peak deck acceleration and bearing displacement of base-isolated machine foundation against normalized yield strength ($T_s = 0.1$ sec, $T_b = 2.5$ sec, and $\zeta_b = 0.1$).	134
Figure 6.11.	Variations of peak deck acceleration and bearing displacement of base-isolated machine foundation against normalized yield strength ($T_s = 0.5$ sec, $T_b = 2.5$ sec, and $\zeta_b = 0.1$).	135
Figure 6.12.	Variations of peak deck acceleration and bearing displacement of base-isolated machine foundation against normalized yield strength ($T_s = 0.1$ sec, $q = 2.5$ cm, and $\zeta_b = 0.1$).	136
Figure 7.1.	Schematic diagram of base-isolated machine foundation: (a) three-dimensional view, (b) plan view at deck level, (c) plan view at base raft level, (d) idealized lumped-mass model under unbalanced dynamic force from rotary machine, and (e) idealized lumped-mass model under earthquake ground motion.	141
Figure 7.2.	Effect of torsional coupling on natural frequency.	148
Figure 7.3.	Frequency response curve of torsionally uncoupled and coupled framed-type machine foundation of frequency ratio 0.8.	150
Figure 7.4.	Frequency response curve of torsionally uncoupled and coupled framed-type machine foundation of frequency ratio 1.0.	150

Figure 7.5.	Frequency response curve of torsionally uncoupled and coupled framed-type machine foundation of frequency ratio 1.2.	151
Figure 7.6.	Frequency response curve of torsionally uncoupled and coupled framed-type machine foundation of frequency ratio 1.5.	151
Figure 7.7.	Time-history response of torsionally uncoupled and coupled framed-type machine foundation of frequency ratio 1.5 under the Imperial Valley (1979) earthquake.	154
Figure 7.8.	Time-history response of torsionally uncoupled and coupled framed-type machine foundation of frequency ratio 1.5 under the Northridge (1994) earthquake.	154
Figure 7.9.	Time-history response of torsionally uncoupled and coupled framed-type machine foundation of frequency ratio 1.5 under the Kobe (1995) earthquake.	155
Figure 7.10.	Time-history response of torsionally uncoupled and coupled base-isolated framed-type machine foundation of frequency ratio 1.5 under the Northridge (1994) earthquake ($T_b = 2.5$ sec, $\xi_b = 0.05$, and $q = 2.5$ cm).	157
Figure 7.11.	Time-history response of torsionally uncoupled and coupled base-isolated framed-type machine foundation of frequency ratio 1.5 under the Kobe (1995) earthquake ($T_b = 2.5$ sec, $\xi_b = 0.05$, and $q = 2.5$ cm).	158
Figure 7.12.	Effect of superstructure flexibility on the dynamic response of torsionally uncoupled and coupled framed-type machine foundation under the Imperial Valley (1979) earthquake.	159
Figure 7.13.	Effect of superstructure flexibility on the dynamic response of torsionally uncoupled and coupled framed-type machine foundation under the Northridge (1994) earthquake.	160
Figure 7.14.	Effect of superstructure flexibility on the dynamic response of torsionally uncoupled and coupled framed-type machine foundation under the Kobe (1995) earthquake.	161
Figure 8.1.	Schematic diagram of base-isolated machine foundation: (a) three-dimensional view, (b) plan view at deck level, and (c) plan view at base raft level.	164
Figure 8.2.	Three-dimensional FE model of framed-type machine foundation resting on soil medium.	166
Figure 8.3.	Comparison of deck acceleration for base-isolated structures.	167
Figure 8.4.	Effect of torsional coupling on natural frequency.	169
Figure 8.5.	Acceleration time-history response under the Imperial Valley (1979) earthquake.	172

Figure 8.6.	Acceleration time-history response under the Northridge (1994) earthquake.	172
Figure 8.7.	Acceleration time-history response under the Kobe (1995) earthquake.	173
Figure 8.8.	Displacement time-history response under the Imperial Valley (1979) earthquake.	173
Figure 8.9.	Displacement time-history response under the Northridge (1994) earthquake.	174
Figure 8.10.	Displacement time-history response under the Kobe (1995) earthquake.	174
Figure 8.11:	Displacement time-history response under the Imperial Valley (1979) earthquake.	175
Figure 8.12.	Displacement time-history response under the Northridge (1994) earthquake.	175
Figure 8.13.	Displacement time-history response under the Kobe (1995) earthquake.	176
Figure 8.14.	Acceleration time-history response under the Imperial Valley (1979) earthquake.	178
Figure 8.15.	Acceleration time-history response under the Northridge (1994) earthquake.	178
Figure 8.16.	Acceleration time-history response under the Kobe (1995) earthquake.	179
Figure 8.17.	Displacement time-history response under the Imperial Valley (1979) earthquake.	179
Figure 8.18.	Displacement time-history response under the Northridge (1994) earthquake.	180
Figure 8.19.	Displacement time-history response under the Kobe (1995) earthquake.	180
Figure A11.1.	Variation in horizontal deflection with respect to distance from fixed base; (a) results for different finite element types (with $0.5 \text{ m} \times 0.5 \text{ m}$ mesh size), and (b) results for different mesh sizes (with C3D20 type element).	202
Figure A11.2.	Variation in horizontal deflection with respect to load at pile top; (a) results for different finite element types (with $0.5 \text{ m} \times 1.0 \text{ m}$ mesh size), and (b) results for different mesh sizes (with C3D8 type element).	204

Figure A11.3. Variation in vertical displacement with respect to different forcing frequency; (a) results from steady-state dynamic response, and (b) direct analysis. 206

Figure A11.4. Displacement time-history response; (a) results at node 13, and (b) results at node 103. 207

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1.	Permissible amplitudes of vibration (BIS, 1979 and 1992)	19
Table 3.1.	Modal participation in first mode obtained from the dynamic analysis of frame	55
Table 3.2.	Peak deck displacements obtained for medium-speed rotary machine of 35 Hz	57
Table 3.3.	Modal participation in first mode obtained from the dynamic analysis	71
Table 4.1.	Natural frequencies obtained from the dynamic analysis of RC column	83
Table 4.2.	Natural frequencies obtained from the dynamic analysis of framed-type machine foundation	90
Table 4.3.	Peak deck displacements obtained for framed-type machine foundation under operating frequency of 34 Hz	92
Table 5.1.	Soil properties	104
Table 5.2.	Dynamic response of the framed-type machine foundation	113
Table 6.1.	Input properties for validation	125
Table 6.2.	Soil properties	127
Table 6.3.	Earthquake ground motions	127
Table 7.1.	Peak response of torsionally uncoupled and coupled framed-type machine foundation under harmonic vibration	152
Table 7.2.	Input earthquake ground motions	153
Table 7.3.	Peak response of torsionally uncoupled and coupled framed-type machine foundation under earthquake excitation	156
Table 8.1.	Natural frequency obtained from the FE analysis	169
Table 8.2.	Input earthquake ground motions	170
Table 8.3.	Peak deck acceleration and displacement obtained from the FE analysis of non-isolated machine foundation	171
Table 8.4.	Peak deck acceleration and displacement obtained from the FE analysis of base-isolated machine foundation	177
Table A1.1.	Sensitivity analysis results for RC column	202
Table A1.2.	Soil parameters considered for the sensitivity analysis	203

Table A1.3.	Sensitivity analysis results for the soil continuum	204
Table A1.4.	Free vibration analysis response	205
Table A1.5.	Forced vibration analysis results for the infinite elements	207

MATHEMATICAL NOTATIONS

$[C]$	Damping matrix
$[K]$	Stiffness matrix
$[M]$	Mass matrix
$\{\ddot{z}\}$	Acceleration vector in vertical direction
$\{\dot{z}\}$	Velocity vector in vertical direction
$\{z\}$	Displacement vector in vertical direction
A	Dimensionless parameter used in Wen's model
A_p	Cross-sectional area of pile
E_p	Modulus of elasticity of the pile
F_0	Normalized yield strength of the base isolator or unbalanced dynamic force from rotary machine
$F(t)$	Unbalanced dynamic force
F_b	Restoring force of the base isolator
F_u	Unbalanced vertical force
F_{xb}	Restoring force of the base isolator in x -direction
F_{yb}	Restoring force of the base isolator in y -direction
$F_{\theta b}$	Torsional force in isolation system
F_y	Bearing yield strength of the base isolator
G	Shear modulus of the soil
I_f	Moment of inertia of the foundation raft
I_u	Kinematic displacement factor
K	Stiffness of column
K_{xs}	Stiffness of superstructure in x -direction

K_{ys}	Stiffness of superstructure in y-direction
$K_{\theta s}$	Torsional stiffness of superstructure
L	Length of column
M	Total mass of the base-isolated machine foundation
N	Operating speed of rotary machine
N	Load from longitudinal beam
P	Concentrated machine load or applied axial load
P_0	Initial axial load
P_E	Euler buckling load
$P_z(t)$	Unbalanced vertical dynamic force
Q	Self-weight of the beam
Q_0	Initial transverse load
T_b	Time period of the base isolator
T_s	Time period of the framed-foundation
U_p	Pile response at top
U_{ff}	Amplitude of free-field motion
W	Total weight of the base-isolated machine foundation
Z	Non-dimensional hysteretic displacement
a	Equivalent radius of circular footing and initial imperfection amplitude
a_0	Dimensionless frequency ratio
a_{01}	Dimensionless frequency ratio factor
a_{02}	Dimensionless frequency ratio factor
a_p	Pile diameter
d	Diameter of column or pile
c_1	Damping of beam or damping of first degree of freedom

c_2	Damping of column or damping of second degree of freedom
c_b	Damping of the base isolator in horizontal direction
c_h	Damping of the foundation-soil in horizontal direction
c_s	Damping of the superstructure in horizontal direction
c_z	Damping of the foundation-soil in vertical direction
c_θ	Damping of the foundation-soil in rocking direction
e	Eccentricity
e_r	Eccentricity ratio
e_{xb}	Eccentricity between the center of mass and the center of rigidity of the isolation system in x -direction
e_{xs}	Eccentricity between the center of mass and the center of rigidity of the column in x -direction
e_{yb}	Eccentricity between the center of mass and the center of rigidity of the isolation system in y -direction
e_{ys}	Eccentricity between the center of mass and the center of rigidity of the column in y -direction
f_m	Operating frequency
f_n	Natural frequency
f_1	Stiffness parameter for homogeneous soil
f_2	Damping parameter for homogeneous soil
f_{n1}	Natural frequency in lateral mode
f_{n2}	Natural frequency in torsional mode
f_{n3}	Natural frequency in vertical mode
f_{xbj}	Isolation force in j^{th} bearing developed in x -direction
f_{ybj}	Isolation force in j^{th} bearing developed in y -direction

h	Foundation to deck height or height of column
k_1	Flexural stiffness of beam or stiffness of first degree of freedom
k_2	Axial stiffness of column or stiffness of second degree of freedom
k_b	Post-yield stiffness of the base isolator in horizontal direction
k_h	Stiffness of the soil in horizontal direction
k_s	Stiffness of the frame in horizontal direction
k_z	Stiffness of the foundation-soil in horizontal direction
k_θ	Stiffness of the foundation-soil in rocking direction
k_{xi}	Lateral stiffness of i^{th} column in x-direction
k_{yi}	Lateral stiffness of i^{th} column in y-direction
m	Mass
m_0	Lumped mass of raft foundation
m_1	Lumped mass of beam or first degree of freedom
m_2	Lumped mass of column or second degree of freedom
m_u	Unbalanced mass
m_b	Lumped mass of the base raft including base isolator
m_f	Lumped mass of the foundation raft
m_r	Mass moment of inertia of the foundation raft
m_s	Lumped mass of the deck including machine
m_t	Total mass
n	Integer constant controlling nonlinearity
q	Bearing yield displacement of the base isolator
r_0	Radius of the pile
r_s	Radius of gyration of deck
r_s	Radius of gyration of base raft

t	Time
u_x	Lateral displacement at deck level in x -direction
u_{xb}	Lateral displacement at base isolator level in x -direction
u_{xs}	Lateral displacement at deck level in x -direction
u_y	Lateral displacement at deck level in y -direction
u_{yb}	Lateral displacement at base isolator level in y -direction
u_{ys}	Lateral displacement at deck level in y -direction
u_θ	Torsional displacement at deck level
$u_{\theta b}$	Torsional displacement at base isolator level
$u_{\theta s}$	Torsional displacement at deck level
v_s	Shear wave velocity of the soil
x	Peak axial displacement of column or horizontal deck displacement in x -direction
x'	Increase in horizontal displacement with respect to straight column in x -direction
x'_c	Increase in horizontal displacement with respect to straight column at corner nodes in x -direction
x_b	Lateral displacement at base isolator level
x_c	Corner horizontal displacement in x -direction
x_f	Lateral displacement at foundation level
x_i	Distance of i^{th} column from center of mass in x -direction
x_s	Lateral displacement at deck level
y	Horizontal deck displacement in y -direction
y'	Increase in horizontal displacement with respect to straight column in y -direction

y'_c	Increase in horizontal displacement with respect to straight column at corner nodes in y -direction
y_c	Corner horizontal displacement in y -direction
y_i	Distance of i^{th} column from center of mass in y -direction
z	Peak transverse displacement of column or vertical deck displacement
z_1	Vertical displacement of deck slab or displacement in first degree of freedom
z_2	Vertical displacement of column or displacement in second degree of freedom
z_m	Vertical displacement at center of bearing
z'	Increase in vertical displacement
z'_m	Increase in vertical displacement with respect to straight column at middle of beam
α	Ratio of post to pre-yielding stiffness or percentage of initial bend with respect to column height
β	Dimensionless parameter used in Wen's model
β_0	Damping coefficient
δ	Column mid-height deflection
ξ	Material damping ratio
ξ_b	Critical damping ratio of isolation system
ξ_s	Critical damping ratio of superstructure
λ_s	Superstructure frequency ratio
λ_{n1}	Natural frequency ratio in first mode
λ_{n2}	Natural frequency ratio in second mode
ν	Poisson's ratio of the soil

ρ	Density of the soil
τ	Dimensionless parameter used in Wen's model
ω	Ratio between forcing frequency to the natural frequency
ω_0	Predominant frequency of loading
ω_b	Natural frequency of the base isolator
ω_m	Operating frequency of the rotary machine
ω_n	Natural frequency
ω_{n1}	Natural frequency in first mode
ω_{n2}	Natural frequency in second mode
ω_{xb}	Natural frequency of the of isolation system for torsionally uncoupled system in x -direction
ω_{xs}	Natural frequency of the torsionally uncoupled superstructure in x -direction
ω_{yb}	Natural frequency of the of isolation system for torsionally uncoupled system in y -direction
ω_{ys}	Natural frequency of the torsionally uncoupled superstructure in y -direction
$\omega_{\theta s}$	Torsional frequency of the torsionally uncoupled superstructure
$\omega_{\theta b}$	Torsional frequency of the isolator for torsionally uncoupled system
$\ddot{u}_{xb}$	Lateral acceleration at base isolator level in x -direction
$\ddot{u}_{xg}$	Earthquake ground acceleration in x -direction
$\ddot{u}_{xs}$	Lateral acceleration at deck level in x -direction
$\ddot{u}_y$	Deck lateral acceleration in y -direction
$\ddot{u}_{yb}$	Lateral acceleration at base isolator level in y -direction
$\ddot{u}_{yg}$	Earthquake ground acceleration in y -direction

$\ddot{u}_{ys}$	Lateral acceleration at deck level in y -direction
$\ddot{u}_{\theta b}$	Torsional acceleration at base isolator level
$\ddot{u}_{\theta s}$	Torsional acceleration at deck level
$\ddot{x}_b$	Lateral acceleration at base isolator level
$\ddot{x}_f$	Lateral acceleration at foundation level
$\ddot{x}_s$	Lateral acceleration at deck level
$\ddot{\theta}_b$	Rotational acceleration at base isolator level
$\ddot{\theta}_f$	Rotational acceleration at foundation level
$\ddot{\theta}_s$	Rotational acceleration at deck level
$\dot{x}_b$	Lateral velocity at base isolator level
$\dot{x}_f$	Lateral velocity at foundation level
$\dot{x}_s$	Lateral velocity at deck level
$\dot{Z}$	Non-dimensional hysteretic velocity
Δt	Time interval of input acceleration

ABBREVIATIONS

FEM	Finite Element Method
BEM	Boundary Element Method
FDM	Finite Difference Method
SDOF	Single degree of freedom
SSI	Soil-structure interaction
SSC	Soft soil creep
LNG	Liquified natural gas
LRB	Lead rubber bearing
N-Z	New-Zealand rubber bearing
RFBI	Resilient friction-based isolator
EDF	Electricite-de-France system
CM	Center of mass
CR	Center of rigidity
RC	Reinforced concrete
TG	Turbo-generator