

**EARTHQUAKE BASE ISOLATION OF  
SECONDARY SYSTEMS USING ELASTOMERIC  
AND SLIDING SYSTEMS**

**PRAVIN JAGTAP**



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

**MAY, 2020**

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2020

**EARTHQUAKE BASE ISOLATION OF  
SECONDARY SYSTEMS USING ELASTOMERIC  
AND SLIDING SYSTEMS**

*by*

**PRAVIN JAGTAP**

**Department of Civil Engineering**

*Submitted*

**in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

*to the*



**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

**MAY, 2020**

*Dedicated to all nears and dears for their  
complete faith, encouragement and love.*

## CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled, “**EARTHQUAKE BASE ISOLATION OF SECONDARY SYSTEMS USING ELASTOMERIC AND SLIDING SYSTEMS**” being submitted by **Mr. Pravin Shivaji JAGTAP** 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 my supervision for the submission of thesis, which to my 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 my knowledge and belief.

New Delhi

Monday, 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2020.

**Prof. Vasant A. MATSAGAR**

(Dogra Chair Professor)

Department of Civil Engineering,  
Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Delhi,  
Hauz Khas, New Delhi - 110 016, India.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

At this point of time, towards the accomplishment of this PhD marathon as I sit-down to mention my vote of thanks to all who have helped me directly and indirectly, I found myself spellbound to express the words of gratitude towards all of them. The exceptional peoples who came across this journey made me capable to achieve this target.

My first and foremost gratitude from bottom of my heart (very difficult to put in limited words) goes to the PhD supervisor Prof. Vasant A. Matsagar for trusting and giving me a chance to work under his multidimensional guidance. During this research journey his immense knowledge, support and motivation stood very lucrative for me. His guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. Being fountain-head of brainstorming ideas he enhanced my approach to look towards a research problem. If I play a flashback of this marathon from entry towards exit, the exit door is giving me a bundle of achieved strengths which are of lifetime help and crucial for me to achieve future endeavours, and of course Prof. Matsagar is a stakeholder of these fully developed strengths within me. Thank you so much Sir for indelibly shaping my growth as a researcher and inculcating the qualities of good human being within me.

In addition to my PhD supervisor, my heartfelt thanks also goes to the student research committee (SRC) members Prof. G. V. Raman, Prof. G. S. Benipal, Prof. Suhail Ahmad and the then SRC member Prof. Santosh Kapuria for their invaluable suggestions leading towards important directions in all stages of this work. My sincere thanks also go to Prof. T. K. Datta, Prof. D. R. Sahoo, Prof. A. K. Jain, Prof. R. Ayothiraman and Prof. T. Chakraborty for their endless support and encouragement which helped me greatly while completing the research work. I am indebted to Prof. C. T. Dhanya for her initiative, encouragement and support towards holistic and successful completion of my Thesis requirements, without her interest and help it could have been a daunting task to deal with towards closure.

I would like to thank my fellow research scholars and colleagues at IIT Delhi, Dr. Sandip Kumar Saha, Dr. Aruna Rawat (nee Gupta), Dr. Said Elias Rahimi, Dr. Arundhuti Banerjee, Dr. Sharad Ghodke, Dr. Pankaj Munjal, Mr. Ankit Bhardwaj, Mr. Naseef Ummer, Mr. M. Sathish, Mr. Rohit Tiwari, Mr. Pratik Bhatt, Ms. Sunita Mishra, Mr. Tathagata Roy, Ms. Harshada Sharma, Mr. Daniel Habtamu, Mr. Rajkumar K., Mr. Anil Kumar, Mr. Ali Alraie, Mr. Sharang Totekar and Ms. Kavita Ganorkar for their feedback, cooperation and of course friendship with kind support and help in many ways

during my research work carried out at the Multi-Hazard Protective Structures (MHPS) Laboratory. I also would like to thank all of them for the stimulating technical discussions, insightful comments, for the sleepless nights we were working together before deadlines, and for all the fun we have had in the last few years. My special thanks to Dr. M. D. Goel for his generous support and help extended during the PhD tenure. Also my thanks to Ms. Sangita Goel while showing curiosity in my work. I am also thankful to Mr. Niranjana Muley, Mr. Prathamesh Khorgade, Mr. Alok Pradhan, Mr. Vivek Prasad, Mr. Abhishek Arunachalam, Mr. D. Hari Hara Rohit, Mr. Perumalla V. Mallikarjun Rao, Ms. Stuti Mondal, Mr. Shashi Jaiswal, Mr. Pritam Singh, Mr. Rudroneel Manna, Mr. Lalit Bhardwaj, Lt. Col. Vijay Singh, Mr. Bharat Chalise, Mr. Prabhakar Roy and Mr. Anoop Kodakkal, for their help during this work. I also want to thank Mr. Jitendra Prajapati, Mr. Nitin Chourasia, Ms. Pushpa Sharma and Mr. Devesh Dubey for providing me help in various stages of my experimental investigations. The quality time spent at the MHPS Laboratory will be my lifetime fond memories to cherish.

My sincere acknowledgement and thanks to Prof. S. K. Deb and his team at Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Guwahati for extending the generous help and kind guidance during our visits to IIT Guwahati campus for conducting the experimental works.

My love, my stress-busters, my dear, Vihaan and Manasvi. It's very emotional and tough to write for both of you. Your entry boosted the scenario of this journey. Thanks to Almighty for this wonderful present. Innocence within you both always motivated and supported me to work harder and remain greedy to achieve the targets. Your ever-smiling faces embraced the time-born stresses and anxieties within me and remained always a source of encouragement and happiness. My shower of love for both of you and God bless you both!

My dear Geeta, a perfect wife (wify!), close friend and a consistent co-passenger along such a long journey of PhD, without your presence and immense support it would have been a dream to accomplish this task. You are a tower of strength and the moral support provided by you during my PhD work cannot be mentioned in words. Thank you for your invaluable love, patience and help.

By birth, I am blessed with very supportive parents, my dear Mom and Papa, despite from all your emotions you always have prioritized and believed in my decisions which encourage me to move forward. Without your generous support and belief it would have been almost impossible to nail down the achievements. Your thoughts always motivated

me throughout the life while dealing and handling with the hard-hitting situations. I cannot finish this paragraph without acknowledging all other family members who all have unique source of motivations within them. My immediate cousin Pramod, sister-in-law Swati and a hyper-active nephew, Ishaan, who were with me throughout the PhD tenure with their super-support and motivations, I really enjoyed spending good time with these guys here in the IIT Delhi campus. I am also grateful to all my siblings who have motivated me through their moral and emotional support all through the way. My heartfelt gratitude towards my in-laws, Mr. and Mrs. Aher, for motivating, showing faith and trust on me and always extending kind support in whatever possible manner. Without this support and trust, completing the task of PhD might have been very scary.

Besides all this, I extend my sincere gratitude to Prof. Bhim Singh, Dean, Academics, Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Delhi for his encouragement and guidance while submitting this thesis report. My sincere thanks to all faculty and staff of the department and IIT Delhi. Moreover, I am also grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their constructive suggestions and critical comments which has really enhanced the quality of this Thesis document further.

The financial aid provided by Bhabha Atomic Research Centre (BARC), Mumbai for completing the experimental components of this study is gratefully acknowledged. Moreover, the financial support extended by IIT Delhi for attending the international conference is also gratefully acknowledged.

New Delhi

Monday, 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2020.

**Pravin JAGTAP**



## ABSTRACT

In most industrial facilities, multi-storeyed structures, and nuclear power plants relatively lighter structures/ secondary systems (SS) are attached to the walls or housed on certain floors of the heavier structures/ primary structures (PS). Different types of failure of the SS are noticed during past earthquakes; namely, failure of the fire-fighting facilities, elastic buckling of liquid storage tank walls, failure of library book shelves, HVAC systems, chemical storage containers, connections failure of water supply pipes, etc. Safety of the SS is vital for proper functioning of the power plants, industrial facilities, hospitals, and other important structures under some catastrophic events of earthquakes. Failure of the SS may pose life hazards in addition to economical and building functioning loss. Seismic performance of the SS can be improved and those also can be safeguarded effectively from the disastrous effects of earthquake-borne vibrations by using the seismic base isolation technology. From the review of the literature, it is found that, base isolation in case of SS is not thoroughly investigated yet for its effectiveness in earthquake response reduction, despite from the overall effectiveness of the base isolation in protecting the PS. Most importantly, there is no investigation that clarifies upon the choice of isolation system and its dynamic parameters to be used for isolation of the SS installed in PS. In view of the unavailability of experimental data and lack of information on the dynamic performance of various types of base isolation systems used in practice, this research focuses on addressing these two issues first and furthers the efforts by investigating the base isolation used for SS. The aim of this research is to assess effectiveness of base isolation for use in protection of the SS housed within primary system under earthquakes. Moreover, investigating comparative performance of various types of base isolation systems, viz. (a) elastomeric bearings and (b) sliding systems is aimed. Based on the existing knowledge for manufacturing of the bridge bearings in India elastomeric and sliding bearings are designed, manufactured and characterized at laboratory. Stability analysis of the elastomeric bearings are conducted by developing its 3D finite element (FE) models in a commercially available software ABAQUS®. These bearings are currently manufactured and used in India; and, in this context, the present study is useful for the development of indigenous isolation systems and their implementations for safeguarding the SS.

Effect of the dynamic properties of the SS and their housing elevations (levels) within the PS on the response of both the multi-storied PS and SS are investigated experimentally

(shake table investigations) and numerically. Additionally, an experimental study, using shake-table, on base-isolated and non-isolated anchored SS is also conducted. In the current practice of seismic design of the PS or SS, interaction between the two is often ignored. This interaction effect is studied through the present investigations. Moreover, a mathematical model of a five-storied PS housing a single-storied SS at different floor elevations is developed and verified with experimental results.

Experimental investigations on response of the SS while housing them in two adjacent demonstration buildings at IIT Guwahati campus is set by developing a programme for real time event monitoring. A continuous real-time response monitoring of the instrumented SS setup using a computer-aided data-acquisition system helps in study of the SS response under real earthquake event. Furthermore, the response of SS is also studied while modelling them in two real-life RCC building one supported with the combination of elastomeric and sliding isolators and another supported on double concave friction pendulum bearing. The studies have showed the effectiveness of PS base-isolation for protecting the SS.

Deterministic and stochastic response study for piping type SS are further conducted and comparative assessment of response of piping type SS is made between fixed-base and base-isolated structures. The stochastic response of the base-isolated PS with SS and fixed-base PS with secondary system are computed in a polynomial chaos framework and the details of the stochastic framework are presented in details. The seismic response of the floor mounted liquid storage tank type SS with and without isolation system are further studied. A new isolation system for the light-weight SS is devised and proposed herein.

Based on the aforementioned comprehensive, FE, experimental, and numerical studies conducted on fixed-base and base-isolated SS it is observed and concluded that, in case of the SS equipments design forces should be calculated based on coupled analysis than cascading analysis. Floor response spectra govern the design of isolation systems for SS. The sliding isolators being highly nonlinear imparts more acceleration while moving from stick condition to slip condition. This type of behaviour is detrimental for the acceleration-sensitive type of the SS. The elastomeric isolators are the smooth-type systems; hence, the floor accelerations in this type of isolation system are less which is beneficial in safeguarding the acceleration-sensitive SS. Base-isolated PS helps in reducing its inter-story drift, which benefits to safeguard piping-type displacement-sensitive SS.

## सार

अधिकांश औद्योगिक सुविधाएं, बहु-मंजिला संरचनाएं, और परमाणु ऊर्जा संयंत्रों में अपेक्षाकृत हल्की संरचनाएं / माध्यमिक प्रणाली (एसएस सिस्टम) ज्यादा करके दीवारों पर या भारी संरचनाओं / प्राथमिक संरचनाओं (पीएस) के कुछ मंजिलों पर रखे जाते हैं। पिछले भूकंपों के दौरान हल्की संरचनाओं (एसएस) की विभिन्न प्रकार की विफलताएं देखी गयी हैं; अर्थात्, अग्नि-भयावह सुविधाओं की विफलता, तरल भंडारण टैंक की दीवारों की लोचदार बकलिंग, पुस्तकालय की बुक अलमारियों की विफलता, एचवीएसी सिस्टम की विफलता, रासायनिक भंडारण कंटेनर की विफलता, पानी की आपूर्ति पाइप की कनेक्शन विफलता आदि। भूकंप की कुछ भयावह घटनाओं के तहत बिजली संयंत्रों, औद्योगिक सुविधाओं, अस्पतालों और अन्य महत्वपूर्ण संरचनाओं के समुचित कार्य के लिए एसएस की सुरक्षा महत्वपूर्ण है। एसएस की विफलता आर्थिक और इमारत के कामकाज के नुकसान के अलावा जीवन के लिए खतरा पैदा कर सकती है। एसएस के भूकंपीय प्रदर्शन में सुधार किया जा सकता है और भूकंपीय आधार (बेस) अलगाव (आइसोलेशन/ विलगता) प्रौद्योगिकी का उपयोग करके भूकंप-जनित कंपन के विनाशकारी प्रभावों से भी उन्हें प्रभावी ढंग से सुरक्षित किया जा सकता है। अभी तक के साहित्य की समीक्षा से यह पाया गया है कि, प्राथमिक संरचनाओं (पीएस) की रक्षा में आधार अलगाव तकनीक की समग्र प्रभावशीलता के बावजूद, भूकंप की प्रतिक्रिया में कमी करने के लिए आधार अलगाव की प्रभावशीलता एसएस के मामले में अभी तक पूरी तरह से जांची नहीं गई है। सबसे महत्वपूर्ण बात यह है कि, ऐसी कोई जांच नहीं है जो पीएस में स्थापित एसएस के अलगाव के लिए अलग-थलग प्रणाली और उसके गतिशील मापदंडों के विकल्प पर स्पष्ट करती है। प्रायोगिक डेटा की अनुपलब्धता और व्यवहार में उपयोग किए जाने वाले विभिन्न प्रकार के बेस आइसोलेशन सिस्टम के गतिशील प्रदर्शन पर जानकारी की कमी को देखते हुए, यह शोध पहले इन दो मुद्दों को संबोधित करने पर ध्यान केंद्रित

करता है और एसएस के लिए इस्तेमाल किए गए आधार अलगाव प्रणाली की जांच करके प्रयासों को विफल करता है। इस शोध का उद्देश्य भूकंप के तहत प्राथमिक प्रणाली के भीतर स्थित एसएस के संरक्षण में उपयोग के लिए आधार अलगाव की प्रभावशीलता का आकलन करना है। इसके अलावा, विभिन्न प्रकार के बेस आइसोलेशन सिस्टम के तुलनात्मक प्रदर्शन की जांच करना। (अ) इलास्टोमेरिक बियरिंग्स और (ब) स्लाइडिंग (सरकन) प्रणाली का उद्देश्य है। भारत में ब्रिज बियरिंग के निर्माण के लिए मौजूदा ज्ञान के आधार पर एलास्टोमेरिक और स्लाइडिंग बियरिंग को प्रयोगशाला में डिजाइन, निर्मित और विशेषता बनाया गया है। इलास्टोमेरिक बियरिंग्स का स्थिरता विश्लेषण व्यावसायिक रूप से उपलब्ध सॉफ्टवेयर अबाकस में इसके त्रि-आयामी (3-डी) परिमित तत्व (फई) प्रतिमान (मॉडल) विकसित करके किया जाता है। ये बियरिंग वर्तमान में भारत में निर्मित और उपयोग किए जाते हैं; और, इस संदर्भ में, वर्तमान अध्ययन स्वदेशी अलगाव प्रणालियों के विकास और एसएस की सुरक्षा के लिए उनके कार्यान्वयन के लिए उपयोगी है।

एसएस के गतिशील गुणों और उनके आवास उन्नयन (स्तरों) का प्रभाव बहु-मंजिला पीएस और एसएस दोनों की प्रतिक्रिया पर पीएस के भीतर प्रयोगात्मक रूप से (शेक टेबल जांच) और संख्यात्मक रूप से जांच की गई है। इसके अतिरिक्त, बेस-पृथक (बेस-) और गैर-पृथक लंगर एसएस पर शेक-टेबल का उपयोग करके एक प्रयोगात्मक अध्ययन भी आयोजित किया गया है। पीएस या एसएस के भूकंपीय डिजाइन के मौजूदा अभ्यास में, दोनों के बीच बातचीत को अक्सर अनदेखा किया जाता है। यह अंतःक्रियात्मक (इंटरैक्शन) प्रभाव वर्तमान जांच के माध्यम से अध्ययन किया गया है। इसके अलावा, पांच मंजिला पीएस आवास के एक गणितीय मॉडल को अलग-अलग मंजिल की ऊंचाई पर एकल-मंजिला एसएस विकसित और प्रयोगात्मक परिणामों के साथ सत्यापित किया गया है।

एसएस की प्रतिक्रिया पर प्रायोगिक जाँच, आई आई टी गुवाहाटी कैंपस में दो आसन्न (एडजसेन्ट) प्रदर्शन भवनों में आवास करते हुए, रियल टाइम इवेंट मॉनिटरिंग के लिए एक कार्यक्रम विकसित करके निर्धारित किया गया है। कंप्यूटर-एडेड डेटा-अधिग्रहण प्रणाली का उपयोग करके इंस्ट्रुमेंटेड एसएस सेटअप की निरंतर वास्तविक समय की निगरानी वास्तविक भूकंप की घटना के तहत एसएस प्रतिक्रिया के अध्ययन में मदद करती है। इसके अलावा, रियल आरसीसी बिल्डिंग में भी एसएस की प्रतिक्रिया का अध्ययन किया गया है, जहा पर उन्हें दो वास्तविक रियल आरसीसी बिल्डिंग में मॉडलिंग करते हैं, जो इलास्टोमेरिक और स्लाइडिंग आइसोलेटर्स के संयोजन के साथ समर्थित है और दूसरा आरसीसी बिल्डिंग डबल अवतल घर्षण पेंडुलम असर पर समर्थित है। अध्ययनों ने एसएस की रक्षा के लिए पीएस आधार-अलगाव की प्रभावशीलता को दिखाया है।

पाइपिंग प्रकार एसएस के लिए नियतात्मक (डेटर्मीनिस्टिक) और स्टोकेस्टिक प्रतिक्रिया अध्ययन आगे आयोजित किए गए हैं और पाइपिंग प्रकार एसएस की प्रतिक्रिया का तुलनात्मक मूल्यांकन निश्चित-आधार और आधार-पृथक संरचनाओं के बीच किया गया है। एसएस के साथ बेस-पृथक पीएस और माध्यमिक प्रणाली के साथ फिक्स्ड-बेस पीएस की स्टोकेस्टिक प्रतिक्रिया को एक बहुपद अराजकता (पोलीनोमिअल चाओस) ढांचे में गणना की जाती है और स्टोकेस्टिक ढांचे के विवरण में विवरण प्रस्तुत किए जाते हैं। इसके अलावा, फर्श पर तरल भंडारण टैंक प्रकार के भूकंपीय प्रतिक्रिया एसएस के साथ और बिना अलगाव प्रणाली का अध्ययन भी किया गया है। लाइट-वेट एसएस के लिए एक नई अलगाव (आइसोलेशन) प्रणाली तैयार की गई है और यहां प्रस्तावित है।

पूर्व-आधार पर व्यापक, एफई, प्रयोगात्मक और संख्यात्मक-आधार पर किए गए अध्ययनों के आधार पर, फिक्स्ड-बेस और बेस-आइसोलेटेड एसएस का व्यवहार देखते हुए यह निष्कर्ष निकाला गया है कि एसएस उपकरणों के डिजाइन के मामले में कैस्केड विश्लेषण की तुलना में युग्मित विश्लेषण के आधार पर गणना की जानी चाहिए। तल प्रतिक्रिया स्पेक्ट्रा एसएस के

लिए अलगाव प्रणालियों के डिजाइन को नियंत्रित करती है। स्लाइडिंग आइसोलेटर्स अत्यधिक नॉनलाइनियर होने के कारण स्टिक कंडीशन से स्लिप कंडीशन की ओर बढ़ते हुए अधिक त्वरण प्रदान करता है। इस प्रकार का व्यवहार एसएस के त्वरण-संवेदनशील प्रकार के लिए हानिकारक है। इलास्टोमेरिक आइसोलेटर्स सुचारू प्रकार की प्रणाली (सिस्टम) हैं; इसलिए, इस तरह के अलगाव (आइसोलेशन) प्रणाली में मंजिल त्वरण (फ्लोर एक्सीलरेशन) कम होते हैं जो त्वरण- प्रणाली (एक्सीलरेशन-सैंसिटिव) एसएस की सुरक्षा में फायदेमंद है। बेस-पृथक (बेस-आइसोलेटेड) पीएस अपने इंटर- मंजिला अभिप्राय (इंटर-स्टोरी ड्रिफ्ट) को कम करने में मदद करता है, जो पाइपिंग-प्रकार के विस्थापन-संवेदनशील एसएस को सुरक्षित करने के लिए लाभ देता है।

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	<b>Abstract</b>	vii
	<b>Abstract (संक्षेप)</b>	Ix
	<b>Table of Contents</b>	xiii
	<b>List of Figures</b>	xxiii
	<b>List of Tables</b>	xlvii
	<b>Notations Abbreviations</b>	liii
	<b>Abbreviations</b>	lv
<b>CHAPTER - 1</b>	<b>Introduction and Literature Review</b>	<b>1-24</b>
1.1	General	1
1.2	Failure Hazards of Secondary Systems	2
1.2.1	Life Hazards	2
1.2.2	Economic Loss	3
1.2.3	Loss of Building Function	3
1.3	Background of Base Isolation Technology	3
1.4	Base Isolation Devices	4
1.4.1	Laminated Rubber Bearings	5
1.4.2	Lead-Rubber Bearings	5
1.4.3	High Damping Rubber Bearings	5
1.4.4	Friction Pendulum Systems	6
1.4.5	Pure-Friction Systems	6
1.4.6	Resilient-Friction Base Isolators	7
1.4.7	Electric de France Systems	8
1.4.8	Roll-N-Cage System	8
1.5	Secondary Systems	9
1.6	Base-Isolated Secondary System: Numerical and Experimental Studies	10
1.7	Stochastic Study	12
1.8	Summary of Literature	13

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
1.9	Need and Relevance of the Present Study	14
1.10	Objectives	17
1.11	Organization of the Report	18
<b>CHAPTER - 2</b>	<b>Experimental Characterization of Base-Isolation Systems and Stability Analysis of Elastomeric Isolators</b>	<b>25-54</b>
2.1	General	25
2.2	Base-Isolators and their Characterization	26
2.2.1	Elastomeric Isolators	26
2.2.2	Sliding Isolators	28
2.2.3	Isolator Force-Deflection Characteristics	29
2.3	Experimental Characterization of Isolators	29
2.4	Stability of Elastomeric Isolators	30
2.5	Development and Verification of the FE Model	32
2.5.1	Graphical Illustration of Finite Elements	34
2.6	Parametric Study, Results and Discussions	35
2.6.1	Effects of Steel Shim Thickness	36
2.6.2	Effects of Number of Steel Shims	37
2.6.3	Effects of Shear Modulus of Rubber	38
2.6.4	Effects of Steel Cover Plate Thickness	38
2.6.5	Effects of Rubber Cover	38
2.7	Closure	39
<b>CHAPTER - 3</b>	<b>Seismic Behaviour of Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated Secondary Systems: Experimental and Numerical Investigations</b>	<b>55-116</b>
3.1	General	55
3.2	Seismic Analysis Methods of Secondary	57



CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	Systems	
	3.2.1 Floor Response Spectrum Method	57
	3.2.2 Modal Synthesis Method	59
3.3	Mathematical Modelling and Equations of Motion	60
	3.3.1 Equations of Motion for N-Storey Fixed-Base Primary Structure with Fixed-Base Secondary System	61
	3.3.2 Equation of Motion for N-Storey Fixed-Base Primary Structure with Base-Isolated Secondary System	62
	3.3.3 Mathematical Modelling of Base Isolation Systems	63
3.4	Description of Experiment	64
	3.4.1 Primary Structure (PS) and Secondary System (SS)	64
	3.4.2 Elastomeric Isolation System	65
	3.4.3 Earthquake Samples	66
3.5	Shake Table Experimental Study	66
3.6	Experimental Results	68
3.7	Experimental and Numerical Results	69
3.8	Closure	71
<b>CHAPTER - 4</b>	<b>Experimental Investigations for Interaction between Primary Structure and Secondary Systems</b>	<b>117-156</b>
4.1	General	117
4.2	Experimental Investigations	118
	4.2.1 Primary Structure (PS) and Secondary	118

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	System (SS) Frames	
	4.2.2 Shake-Table Tests	119
	4.2.3 Experimental Investigations for PS and SS	121
4.3	Experimental Results	122
4.4	Numerical Investigations	124
4.5	Numerical Results and Discussion	126
4.6	Closure	128
<b>CHAPTER - 5</b>	<b>Experimental and Numerical Investigations of Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated Secondary Systems in Demonstration Buildings</b>	<b>157-182</b>
5.1	General	157
5.2	Mathematical Formulations	158
5.3	Description of Numerical Model	159
5.4	Numerical Analysis	160
	5.4.1 Seismic Response of Fixed-Base with and without PS Interaction	160
	5.4.2 Seismic Response of Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated SS without PS Interaction	160
	5.4.3 Seismic Response of Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated SS with PS Interaction	161
	5.4.4 Response of Fixed-Base SS Housed in Base-Isolated PS	161
	5.4.5 Comparison of Floor Responses of Primary and Secondary System	161
5.5	Experimental Monitoring of the Demonstration Buildings at IIT Guwahati	162
5.6	LabVIEW® Graphical User Interface (GUI) Development	163

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	5.6.1 Equipment and Specifications	164
	5.6.2 Sensor Arrangement	164
	5.6.3 Algorithm	165
	5.6.4 Implementation of Algorithm to Develop GUI	166
	5.6.5 Implementation of Algorithm to Develop GUI	166
	5.7 Closure	167
<b>CHAPTER - 6</b>	<b>Numerical Study of Multiply-Supported Secondary Piping Systems in Primary Structure</b>	<b>183-216</b>
	6.1 General	183
	6.2 Modelling of Multiply Supported Secondary Systems	184
	6.2.1 Governing Equations of Motion	185
	6.3 Modelling of Isolator	186
	6.4 Solution of Equations of Motion	187
	6.5 Numerical Study and Parametric Investigations	187
	6.5.1 Earthquake Ground Motions	188
	6.6 Results and Discussions	189
	6.7 Closure	191
<b>CHAPTER - 7</b>	<b>Experimental and Numerical Investigations of Secondary Systems with Soil-Structure- Interaction</b>	<b>217-234</b>
	7.1 General	217
	7.2 Materials and Modelling	217
	7.2.1 Soil Bed Preparation	217

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	7.2.2 Sub-Structure and Super-Structure	218
7.3	Experimental Investigation	218
7.4	Free Vibration Test	219
7.5	Earthquake Excitations: Shake Table and Numerical Investigations	219
7.6	Closure	221
<b>CHAPTER - 8</b>	<b>Numerical Study of Secondary Systems in Real-Life RCC Structures</b>	<b>235-264</b>
8.1	General	235
8.2	Details and Modelling of CSB-A	236
	8.2.1 Modelling of Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated PS	236
	8.2.2 Modelling of the Fixed-Base SS	238
8.3	Parametric Study of CSB-A	238
8.4	Details and Modelling of CSB-B	240
	8.4.1 Double-Curvature Friction Pendulum System (DCFPS)	240
8.5	Modelling, Analysis and Design of CSB-B	241
	8.5.1 Superstructure Modelling, Analysis and Design	241
	8.5.2 Isolator Modelling	242
8.6	Modal Analysis	242
8.7	Study, Results and Discussions	242
	8.7.1 Storey Acceleration	243
	8.7.2 Storey Drift	244
	8.7.3 Storey Shear	244
8.8	Closure	244

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
<b>CHAPTER - 9</b>	<b>Numerical Study on Stochastic Response of Multiply-Supported Secondary Systems using Generalised Polynomial Chaos Method</b>	<b>265-318</b>
9.1	General	265
	9.1.1 Introduction to Stochastic Analysis of Structural Systems	265
	9.1.2 Forward Propagation of Uncertainty - an Introduction to Different Approaches	268
	9.1.3 Introduction to Multiply-Supported Secondary Systems (MSSS)	270
9.2	Details of the Generalised Polynomial Chaos (gPC) Method	271
	9.2.1 Details of Orthogonal Basis	272
	9.2.2 Convergence of PC Expansion	273
	9.2.3 Normal Distribution and Hermite Polynomial Expansion	274
	9.2.4 PC Expansion for Multi-Dimensional Random Variable	275
	9.2.5 Uncertainty Propagation in gPC Method	276
	9.2.6 Post-Processing of Polynomial Chaos Expansion	279
9.3	Deterministic Model of Base-Isolated SDOF and Base-Isolated Structure with Secondary System	282
	9.3.1 Details of Modelling Base-Isolated SDOF System	283

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	9.3.2 Details of Fixed-Base Primary Structure (FBPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS) and Base-Isolated Primary Structure (BIPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS)	283
	9.3.3 Governing Equations of Motion	285
	9.3.4 Solution of Equations of Motion	287
9.4	Stochastic Structural Dynamics using gPC Method	287
	9.4.1 PC Expansion of Time Independent Input Uncertainties	288
	9.4.2 PC Expansions of Time Dependant QoI	289
	9.4.3 Post-Processing of Results	290
9.5	Numerical Study	291
	9.5.1 Base-Isolated SDOF System with Random Inputs	291
	9.5.2 Deterministic Response of Fixed-Base Primary Structure (FBPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS) and Base-Isolated Primary Structure (BIPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS)	294
	9.5.3 Stochastic Response of Fixed-Base Primary Structure (FBPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS) and Base-Isolated Primary Structure (BIPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS)	294
9.6	Closure	301

<b>CHAPTER</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
<b>CHAPTER - 10</b>	<b>Summary and Conclusions</b>	<b>319-324</b>
	10.1 Summary	319
	10.2 Conclusions	321
	10.3 Future Scope of Work	324
	<b>References</b>	<b>325-342</b>
<b>APPENDIX- A</b>	<b>Validation of Numerical Models</b>	<b>343-348</b>
	A.1 Validation of Floor Supported SS	343
	A.2 Validation of Piping Type SS	344
<b>APPENDIX- B</b>	<b>Innovative Base-Isolation System for Protection of Lightweight Secondary Systems</b>	<b>349-382</b>
<b>APPENDIX- C</b>	<b>Isolator Design Calculations</b>	<b>383-422</b>
<b>APPENDIX- D</b>	<b>Seismic Performance of Floor Supported and Elevated Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated Liquid Storage Tank Type Secondary Systems.</b>	<b>423-444</b>
	<b>List of Publications</b>	<b>445-446</b>
	<b>Brief Bio-data</b>	<b>447</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 1.1 (a):	Laminated Rubber Bearing.	19
Figure 1.1 (b):	Force Deformation Behaviour of Laminated Rubber Bearing.	19
Figure 1.2 (a):	Lead Rubber Bearing.	19
Figure 1.2 (b):	Force Deformation Behaviour of Lead Rubber Bearing.	19
Figure 1.3:	High Damping Rubber Bearing with Mathematical Model and Force Deformation Behaviour (Markou <i>et al.</i> , 2017).	20
Figure 1.4 (a):	Friction Pendulum System.	20
Figure 1.4 (b):	Force Deformation Behaviour of Friction Pendulum System.	20
Figure 1.5 (a):	Pure-Friction System.	21
Figure 1.5 (b):	Force Deformation Behaviour of Pure-Friction System.	21
Figure 1.6 (a):	Resilient-Friction Base Isolators.	21
Figure 1.6 (b):	Force Deformation Behaviour of Resilient-Friction Base Isolators.	21
Figure 1.7 (a):	Electric De France Systems.	22
Figure 1.7 (b):	Force Deformation Behaviour of Electric De France Systems.	22
Figure 1.8:	Three Dimensional View of Roll-N-Cage Base Isolator.	22
Figure 1.9:	Tree Diagram of the Experimental and Numerical	23



FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
	Investigations Conducted in Present Study.	
Figure 2.1:	Elastomeric Isolators: (a) Geometry of 36 mm Isolator, (b) Manufactured 36 mm Isolator, (c) Geometry of 78 mm Isolator, (d) Manufactured 78 mm Isolator.	41
Figure 2.2:	PTFE Sliding Bearing: (a) Geometry of Top MS plate, (b) Geometry of Bottom MS Plate, (c) Geometry in Cross Section of Bearing, (d) Manufactured PTFE Sliding Bearing.	42
Figure 2.3:	Force-Deformation Behaviour of: (a) Elastomeric Isolator, and (b) PTFE Sliding Isolator.	43
Figure 2.4:	Laboratory Test Setup for Isolator Characterization.	43
Figure 2.5:	Experimental Force-Deformation Behaviour of Elastomeric Isolators (Height = 36 mm) under 0 kg, 20 kg, 40 kg and 60 kg Compressive Loading.	44
Figure 2.6:	Experimental Force-Deformation Behaviour of Elastomeric Isolators (Height = 78 mm) under 0 kg, 20 kg and 40 kg Compressive Loading.	45
Figure 2.7:	Experimental Force-Deformation Behaviour of PTFE Sliding Isolators under 0 kg, 20 kg, 40 kg and 60 kg Compressive Loading.	46
Figure 2.8:	Overlapping Area for Square Bearing.	47
Figure 2.9:	3D FE ABAQUS® Model of the Experimentally Characterized Isolator (36 mm Height).	47

<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>CAPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
Figure 2.10:	Experimental and Numerical Characterization Results under Vertical Compressive Load.	48
Figure 2.11:	Shear Force vs. Horizontal Displacement of LRB.	48
Figure 2.12:	Shear Force vs. Horizontal Displacement of LRB.	49
Figure 2.13:	Peak Shear Force vs. Shim Thickness.	49
Figure 2.14:	Vertical Load vs. Critical Displacement.	50
Figure 2.15:	Peak Shear Force vs. Number of Steel Shims.	50
Figure 2.16:	Vertical Load vs. Critical Displacement (Number of Shims).	51
Figure 2.17:	Peak Shear Force vs. Shear Modulus of Rubber.	51
Figure 2.18:	Vertical Load vs. Critical Displacement (Shear Modulus of Rubber).	52
Figure 2.19:	Peak Shear Force vs. Steel Cover Plate Thickness.	52
Figure 2.20:	Vertical Load vs. Critical Displacement (Steel Cover Plate Thickness).	53
Figure 2.21:	Peak Shear Force vs. Rubber Cover.	53
Figure 2.22:	Vertical Load vs. Critical Displacement (Rubber Cover).	54
Figure 3.1:	PS and SS: (a) Geometry of Five Storied Primary Structure, (b) Fabricated Primary Structure, (c) Geometry of Single Storied Secondary System, and (d) Fabricated Secondary System.	75

<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>CAPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
Figure 3.2:	(a) Elastomeric Base Isolator (b) Hysteresis Loop of the Elastomeric Base Isolator.	75
Figure 3.3:	(a) 36 mm Height Elastomeric Bearing Cross-Section (b) Experimental Force-Deformation Curve of the Isolator.	76
Figure 3.4:	Experimental Setup for Shake Table Test on Primary-Base-Isolated-Secondary System.	76
Figure 3.5:	Acceleration and Displacement Response Spectra: (a) First Floor of PS and (b) Fifth Floor of PS.	77
Figure 3.6:	Top Floor Acceleration and Displacement Response of the SS Housed on First Floor of PS.	77
Figure 3.7:	Top Floor Acceleration and Displacement Response of the SS Housed on Fifth (Top) Floor of PS.	78
Figure 3.8:	Peak Top Floor Acceleration and Displacement Response of the SS Housed on First Floor of PS.	78
Figure 3.9:	Peak Top Floor Acceleration and Displacement Response of the SS Housed on Fifth (Top) Floor of PS.	79
Figure 3.10:	Mathematical Models of (a) Fixed-Base Secondary System Installed in Fixed-Base Primary Structure, (b) Base-Isolated Secondary System Installed in Fixed-Base Primary Structure.	79

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 3.11:	Schematic Details of (a) Elastomeric Isolator (78 mm Height), (b) PTFE-Siding Isolator.	80
Figure 3.12:	Schematic Details of Test Structure and Instruments with Elastomeric Isolators.	80
Figure 3.13:	Schematic Details of Test Structure and Instruments with Sliding Isolator.	81
Figure 3.14:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 27.13$ kg and $m_b = 32.01$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	81
Figure 3.15:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 27.13$ kg and $m_b = 32.01$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Loma Prieta, 1989, 1989 Earthquake.	82
Figure 3.16:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 27.13$ kg and $m_b = 32.01$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	82
Figure 3.17:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 108.06$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	83
Figure 3.18:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 108.06$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	83

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 3.19:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 108.06$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	84
Figure 3.20:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 27.35$ kg and $m_b = 32.23$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	84
Figure 3.21:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 27.35$ kg and $m_b = 32.23$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake..	85
Figure 3.22:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 27.35$ kg and $m_b = 32.23$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	85
Figure 3.23:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 65.64$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	86
Figure 3.24:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 65.64$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	86
Figure 3.25:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 65.64$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	87
Figure 3.26:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 122.68$ kg and $m_b = 147.65$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	87
Figure 3.27:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 122.68$ kg and $m_b = 147.65$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	88

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 3.28:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 122.68$ kg and $m_b = 147.65$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	88
Figure 3.29:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 27.89$ kg and $m_b = 32.77$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	89
Figure 3.30:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 27.89$ kg and $m_b = 32.77$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	89
Figure 3.31:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 27.89$ kg and $m_b = 32.77$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	90
Figure 3.32:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 65.64$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	90
Figure 3.33:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 65.64$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	91
Figure 3.34:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 65.64$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	91
Figure 3.35:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 103.18$ kg and $m_b = 65.64$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	92
Figure 3.36:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 103.18$ kg and $m_b = 65.64$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	92

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 3.37:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 103.18$ kg and $m_b = 65.64$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI36) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	93
Figure 3.38:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 27.13$ kg and $m_b = 32.45$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	93
Figure 3.39:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 27.13$ kg and $m_b = 32.45$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	94
Figure 3.40:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 27.13$ kg and $m_b = 32.45$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	94
Figure 3.41:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 108.5$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	95
Figure 3.42:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 108.5$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	95
Figure 3.43:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 108.5$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	96
Figure 3.44:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 103.18$ kg and $m_b = 66.08$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	96
Figure 3.45:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 103.18$ kg and $m_b = 66.08$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	97

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 3.46:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 103.18$ kg and $m_b = 66.08$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	97
Figure 3.47:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 27.35$ kg and $m_b = 32.67$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	98
Figure 3.48:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 27.35$ kg and $m_b = 32.67$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	98
Figure 3.49:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 27.35$ kg and $m_b = 32.67$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	99
Figure 3.50:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 66.08$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	99
Figure 3.51:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 66.08$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	100
Figure 3.52:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 66.08$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	100
Figure 3.53:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 103.76$ kg and $m_b = 66.08$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	101
Figure 3.54:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 103.76$ kg and $m_b = 66.08$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	101



FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 3.55:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 103.76$ kg and $m_b = 66.08$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	102
Figure 3.56:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 27.89$ kg and $m_b = 33.21$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	102
Figure 3.57:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 27.89$ kg and $m_b = 33.21$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	103
Figure 3.58:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 27.89$ kg and $m_b = 33.21$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	103
Figure 3.59:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 66.08$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	104
Figure 3.60:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 66.08$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	104
Figure 3.61:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 66.08$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	105
Figure 3.62:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 108.5$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	105

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 3.63:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 108.5$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	106
Figure 3.64:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 108.5$ kg, with Rubber Isolator EBI78) for Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	106
Figure 3.65:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 21.13$ kg and $m_b = 38.63$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	107
Figure 3.66:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 21.13$ kg and $m_b = 38.63$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	107
Figure 3.67:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 42.97$ kg and $m_b = 95.35$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	108
Figure 3.68:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 42.97$ kg and $m_b = 95.35$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	108
Figure 3.69:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 126.18$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	109
Figure 3.70:	Response Comparison for SS Type-A ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 126.18$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	109
Figure 3.71:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 27.35$ kg and $m_b = 38.85$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	110

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 3.72:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 27.35$ kg and $m_b = 38.85$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	110
Figure 3.73:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 83.76$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	111
Figure 3.74:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 83.76$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	111
Figure 3.75:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 122.68$ kg and $m_b = 165.77$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	112
Figure 3.76:	Response Comparison for SS Type-B ( $m_t = 122.68$ kg and $m_b = 165.77$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	112
Figure 3.77:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 27.89$ kg and $m_b = 39.39$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	113
Figure 3.78:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 27.89$ kg and $m_b = 39.39$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	113
Figure 3.79:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 83.76$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	114
Figure 3.80:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 60.76$ kg and $m_b = 83.76$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	114

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 3.81:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 103.18$ kg and $m_b = 83.76$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	115
Figure 3.82:	Response Comparison for SS Type-C ( $m_t = 103.18$ kg and $m_b = 83.76$ kg, with sliding bearing PTFE-SBI) for Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	115
Figure 4.1:	PS and SS: (a) Geometry of Five Storied Primary Structure, (b) Fabricated Primary Structure, (c) Geometry of Single Storied Secondary System, and (d) Fabricated Secondary System.	136
Figure 4.2:	Original and Scaled Down Displacement Time History of Earthquakes.	137
Figure 4.3:	Comparison of: (a) Original and Scaled Down Displacement Time History, (b) Original and Shake Table Top Acceleration Time History, (c) FFT for Original and Shake Table Top Acceleration Time History, (d) Response Spectrum for Original and Shake Table Top Acceleration Time History (Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake).	138
Figure 4.4:	Comparison of: (a) Original and Scaled Down Displacement Time History, (b) Original and Shake Table Top Acceleration Time History, (c) FFT for Original and Shake Table Top Acceleration Time History, (d) Response Spectrum for Original and Shake Table Top Acceleration Time History (Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake).	139

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 4.5:	Comparison of: (a) Original and Scaled Down Displacement Time History, (b) Original and Shake Table Top Acceleration Time History, (c) FFT for Original and Shake Table Top Acceleration Time History, (d) Response Spectrum for Original and Shake Table Top Acceleration Time History (Northridge, 1994 Earthquake).	140
Figure 4.6:	Comparison of: (a) Original and Scaled Down Displacement Time History, (b) Original and Shake Table Top Acceleration Time History, (c) FFT for Original and Shake Table Top Acceleration Time History, (d) Response Spectrum for Original and Shake Table Top Acceleration Time History (Kobe, 1995 Earthquake).	141
Figure 4.7:	Experimental Setup for Shake-Table Tests on PS and SS.	142
Figure 4.8:	Comparison of Experimental and Numerical Acceleration and Displacement Time Histories Recorded at SS Top Floor Level for Different Cases of SS Fixed at First Floor of PS, (Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake).	143
Figure 4.9:	Comparison of Experimental and Numerical Acceleration and Displacement Time Histories Recorded at SS Top Floor Level for Different Cases of SS Fixed at Fifth Floor of PS, (Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake)	144
Figure 4.10:	Mode Shapes of PS with SS Type A, B and C Housed at Different Floors.	145

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 4.11:	Effect of Housing Elevation and Fundamental Period of SS on Top Floor Displacement and Acceleration of PS.	146
Figure 4.12:	Effect of Housing Elevation and Fundamental Period of SS on Top Floor Displacement and Acceleration of SS.	147
Figure 4.13:	Comparison of Inter Storey Drift with Position of SS on Different Floors of PS.	148
Figure 4.14:	Comparison of Storey Shear with Position of SS on Different Floors of PS.	149
Figure 4.15:	Comparison of Cascaded Analysis and PS-SS Interaction Analysis for Various Positions of SS (Loma Prieta, 1989).	150
Figure 4.16:	Comparison of Cascaded Analysis and PS-SS Interaction Analysis for Various Positions of SS (Northridge, 1994).	151
Figure 4.17:	Comparison of Cascaded Analysis and PS-SS Interaction Analysis for Various Positions of SS (Kobe, 1995).	152
Figure 4.18:	Variation of Top Floor Displacement and Acceleration Response of PS for Different PS-SS Mass Ratios ( $M_s/M_p$ ) with Change in Anchorage Level of SS (Loma Prieta, 1989).	153
Figure 4.19:	Variation of Top Floor Displacement and Acceleration Response of PS for Different PS-SS Mass Ratios ( $M_s/M_p$ ) with Change in Anchorage Level of SS (Northridge, 1994).	154

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 4.20:	Variation of Top Floor Displacement and Acceleration Response of PS for Different PS-SS Mass Ratios ( $M_s/M_p$ ) with Change in Anchorage Level of SS (Kobe, 1995).	155
Figure 5.1:	Mathematical Model for Base-Isolated Primary Structure (BIPS).	172
Figure 5.2:	Mathematical Model for Base-Isolated Primary Structure (BIPS) Housing Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS).	172
Figure 5.3:	Architectural Details of IIT Guwahati Demonstration Building (a) Plan of Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated RCC Building Showing Positions of Isolators, (b) Front Elevation of The RCC Building (all dimensions are in mm).	173
Figure 5.4:	Details of the Mild Steel Secondary System Housed in RCC Primary Structure (a) Plan, (b) Elevation (all dimensions are in mm).	173
Figure 5.5:	Myanmar (Burma), 2006 Earthquake Ground Motion (a) Time History and Acceleration Spectrum along Y-Direction (b) Time History and Acceleration Spectrum along X-Direction (Event Date: 6th November, 2006).	174
Figure 5.6:	Comparison of Top Floor Acceleration Response of Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS) with and without Interaction with Primary Structure (PS) under Myanmar (Burma), 2006 Earthquake Ground Motion.	175

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 5.7:	Comparison of Top Floor Acceleration Response of Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS) and Base-Isolated Secondary System (BISS) without Interaction under Myanmar (Burma), 2006 Earthquake Ground Motion.	175
Figure 5.8:	Comparison of Top Floor Acceleration Response of Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated SS Housed in Fixed-Base PS for the Earthquake Event Myanmar (Burma), 2006 (Isolator Properties: $T_b = 0.22$ sec, $\beta_{eff} = 0.1$ , and $q = 3$ mm).	176
Figure 5.9:	Comparison of Top Floor Acceleration of Fixed-Base Primary Structure and Base-Isolated Primary Structure Housing Secondary System for the Earthquake Event Myanmar (Burma), 2006.	176
Figure 5.10:	Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated Demonstration Buildings at IIT Guwahati.	177
Figure 5.11:	Test Setup for SS at IIT Guwahati (a) Fixed-Base PS Housing SS Base-Isolated with Elastomeric and Sliding Systems, (b) Base-Isolated PS Housing Fixed Base SS.	177
Figure 5.12:	(a) Fabricated Secondary Mild Steel System (SS), (b) Geometry of Single Storied Secondary System.	178
Figure 5.13:	Placement Details of Sixteen Accelerometers over the Structure.	178
Figure 5.14:	Connection Plan of Sixteen Accelerometers (4 Input Modules Utilized).	178



<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>CAPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
Figure 5.15:	Data Acquisition in LabVIEW® (Halvorsen 2016).	179
Figure 5.16:	Algorithm used to Develop the GUI of LabVIEW®.	179
Figure 5.17:	Steps Involved for DAQ GUI Development in LabVIEW®.	180
Figure 5.18:	LabVIEW® GUI Representation.	180
Figure 5.19:	Active sensors in NI MAX.	181
Figure 5.20:	Email Communication Data Fill-up Space and Execution.	181
Figure 6.1:	Mathematical Model of FBPS attached with FBSS.	209
Figure 6.2:	Mathematical Model of BIPS attached with FBSS	209
Figure 6.3:	Time Histories of Recorded Near-Fault Earthquakes with Equivalent Pulse Type Accelerations.	210
Figure 6.4:	SS Top Mass Acceleration Response Attached to 5 Storied PS.	210
Figure 6.5:	SS Top Mass Displacement Response Attached to 5 Storied PS.	211
Figure 6.6:	SS Top Mass Acceleration Response Attached to 9 Storied PS.	211
Figure 6.7:	SS Top Mass Displacement Response Attached to 9 Storied PS.	212

<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>CAPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
Figure 6.8:	SS Top Mass Acceleration Response Attached to 15 Storied PS.	212
Figure 6.9:	SS Top Mass Displacement Response Attached to 15 Storied PS.	213
Figure 6.10:	Base Shear and Top Floor Acceleration Response of 5 Storied PS.	213
Figure 6.11:	Base Shear and Top Floor Acceleration Response of 9 Storied PS.	214
Figure 6.12:	Base Shear and Top Floor Acceleration Response of 15 Storied PS.	214
Figure 6.13:	Displacement and Acceleration Response of 3-DOF SS Connected at Top Height of 5, 9, and 15 Storied PS.	215
Figure 6.14:	Displacement and Acceleration Response of 3-DOF SS Connected at Mid Height of 5, 9, and 15 Storied PS.	215
Figure 6.15:	Shear Force and Bending Moment Response of SS Connected at Top Height of 5, 9, and 15 Storied PS.	216
Figure 6.16:	Shear Force and Bending Moment Response of SS Connected at Mid Height of 5, 9, and 15 Storied PS.	216
Figure 7.1:	Fabricated Soil Container.	223
Figure 7.2:	Plot of Density of Sand vs. Depth of Sand.	223
Figure 7.3:	(a) Pile Cap with Piles (L/D Ratio = 20), (b) Five Storied Mild Steel Superstructure Frame.	224

<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>CAPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
Figure 7.4:	Experimental Setup for SSI Tests on Shake Table.	224
Figure 7.5:	Frequency Study of the SS Housed in PS and Combined PS-SS Structural System Mounted on Sand Bed.	225
Figure 7.6:	Frequency Study of the PS and Combined PS-SS Structural System Mounted on Sand Bed.	225
Figure 7.7:	Comparison of Acceleration and Displacement of SS Top Floor when Fixed at 1st, 3rd and 5th Floor considering SSI, El-Centro, 1940 Earthquake.	226
Figure 7.8:	Comparison of Acceleration and Displacement of SS Top Floor when Fixed at 1st, 3rd and 5th Floor Considering SSI, Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	226
Figure 7.9:	Comparison of Acceleration and Displacement of SS Top Floor when Fixed at 1st, 3rd and 5th Floor Considering SSI, Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	227
Figure 7.10:	Comparison of SS Peak Top Floor Acceleration and Peak Displacements for Various Elevations of SS under El-Centro, 1840; Loma Prieta, 1989 and Northridge, 1994 Earthquake Excitations Considering SSI.	228
Figure 7.11:	Comparison of SS Peak Top Floor Acceleration and Peak Displacements for Various Elevations of SS under El-Centro, 1840; Loma Prieta, 1989 and Northridge, 1994 Earthquake Excitations Considering SSI.	229
Figure 7.12:	Comparison of Acceleration and Displacement of SS Top Floor when Fixed at First Floor of PS Considering SSI, Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	230
Figure 7.13:	Comparison of Acceleration and Displacement of SS Top Floor when Fixed at Third Floor of PS Considering SSI, Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	230

<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>CAPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
Figure 7.14:	Comparison of Acceleration and Displacement of SS Top Floor when Fixed at Fifth Floor of PS Considering SSI, Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake.	231
Figure 7.15:	Comparison of Acceleration and Displacement of SS Top Floor when Fixed at First Floor of PS Considering SSI, Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	231
Figure 7.16:	Comparison of Acceleration and Displacement of SS Top Floor when Fixed at Third Floor of PS Considering SSI, Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	232
Figure 7.17:	Comparison of Acceleration and Displacement of SS Top Floor when Fixed at Fifth Floor of PS Considering SSI, Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake.	232
Figure 7.18:	Comparison of Acceleration and Displacement of SS Top Floor when Fixed at First Floor of PS Considering SSI, Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	233
Figure 7.19:	Comparison of Acceleration and Displacement of SS Top Floor when Fixed at Third Floor of PS Considering SSI, Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	233
Figure 7.20:	Comparison of Acceleration and Displacement of SS Top Floor when Fixed at Fifth Floor of PS Considering SSI, Northridge, 1994 Earthquake.	234
Figure 8.1:	Typical Floor Plan and Sectional Elevation of the Real-Life Building.	252
Figure 8.2:	Typical Framing Plan of CSB-A Showing Beam and Column Layout.	253
Figure 8.3:	Framing Elevation of CSB-A Showing Layout of Beam and Column Frame Along Grid-A8.	254
Figure 8.4:	Framing Plan of CSB-A Showing Location of Isolation Devices.	255

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 8.5:	Response Spectrum for Loma Prieta, 1989, Northridge, 1994 and Kobe, 1995 Earthquakes.	256
Figure 8.6:	SS Top Floor Acceleration and Displacement Time History, T = 0.2 sec (Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake).	257
Figure 8.7:	Top Floor Acceleration and Displacement Response of Various SS Housed at Stilt, Fourth and Terrace Floor of the PS (Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake).	257
Figure 8.8:	Floor Response Spectra of SS Housed at Stilt, Fourth and Terrace Floor of the PS (Loma Prieta, 1989 Earthquake).	258
Figure 8.9:	Typical Framing Plan with Column Layout of CSB-B.	258
Figure 8.10:	Elevation Details of the CSB-B.	259
Figure 8.11:	Details of the DCFPS.	259
Figure 8.12:	(a) Isolator Location Details in Plan, (b) Isolator Location Details in Section for CSB-B.	260
Figure 8.13:	Ideal Hysteresis Curve of DCFPS.	261
Figure 8.14:	DBE and MCE Response Spectra.	261
Figure 8.15:	Comparison of Storey Acceleration of Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated Structure.	262
Figure 8.16:	Comparison of Storey Drift of Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated Structure.	263
Figure 8.17:	Comparison of Storey Shear of Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated Structure.	263
Figure 9.1:	Forward Propagation of Uncertainty (Sudret 2007).	308
Figure 9.2:	The gPC Method Workflow (Sepahvand <i>et al.</i> 2010).	308
Figure 9.3:	Normalised Hermite Polynomials.	309

<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>CAPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
Figure 9.4:	Details of (a) Base-Isolated SDOF System, (b) Fixed-Base Primary Structure (FBPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS), and (c) Base-Isolated Primary Structure (BIPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS).	310
Figure 9.5:	(a) Schematic of Laminated Rubber Bearing (LRB) Isolation System used in Present Study for Seismic Isolation of PS, (b) Force Deformation Behaviour of LRB.	311
Figure 9.6:	Variance Approximation for Log-Normal Distribution of Amplitude of Ground Excitation with Normalised Hermite Polynomials.	312
Figure 9.7:	Selection of Collocation Points Based on Rank of Information Matrix.	312
Figure 9.8:	Displacement Time History of SDOF.	313
Figure 9.9:	Acceleration Time History of SDOF.	313
Figure 9.10:	Time History of PC Expansion Coefficients for Displacement and Acceleration of SDOF.	314
Figure 9.11:	PDF of Peak Displacement and Peak Acceleration for SDOF.	314
Figure 9.12:	Comparison of MC PDF with Increasing Number of Samples.	315
Figure 9.13:	Convergence of MC with Increasing Number of Samples.	315
Figure 9.14:	Primary Structure (PS) Deterministic Response under Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake Excitation.	316
Figure 9.15:	Secondary System (SS) Deterministic Response under Imperial Valley, 1940 Earthquake Excitation.	316

FIGURE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Figure 9.16:	Stochastic Response of QoI's for Different Order PC Expansion (Fixed-Base Primary Structure with Fixed-Base Secondary System).	317
Figure 9.17:	Stochastic Response of QoI's for Different Order PC Expansion (Base-Isolated Primary Structure with Fixed-Base Secondary System).	317
Figure 9.18:	Stochastic Response of QoI for Primary Structure.	318
Figure 9.19:	Stochastic Response of QoI for Secondary System.	318

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Table 2.1:	Description of Models Developed in ABAQUS®.	40
Table 2.2:	Summary of Material Properties of Steel and Rubber.	40
Table 3.1:	The Dynamic Characteristics of Fabricated PS and SS Models.	72
Table 3.2:	The Dynamic Characteristics of Elastomeric Base Isolators.	72
Table 3.3:	Details of the Earthquake Time Histories.	72
Table 3.4:	Details of the SS without and with Top Mass and Base Mass.	72
Table 3.5:	Effectiveness of the Designed Isolator (EBI36).	73
Table 3.6:	Test Matrix and Test Parameters.	74
Table 4.1:	Dynamic Characteristics of the Fabricated Single-Storeyed Secondary Systems (SS).	129
Table 4.2:	Original and Scaled Down Earthquake Time Histories.	130
Table 4.3:	Test Combinations of the SS.	131
Table 4.4:	Comparison of the Modal Frequencies of the Structure for Various PS and SS Combinations.	132
Table 4.5:	Comparison of Maximum Acceleration and Displacement at the SS Top Floor.	133
Table 4.6:	Comparison of Maximum Acceleration and Displacement at the PS Top Floor.	134
Table 4.7:	Comparison of Modal Frequencies of PS Housing SS at Different Floors.	135
Table 5.1:	Material Properties used for PS and SS.	168
Table 5.2:	Properties of Isolator used for PS and SS.	168
Table 5.3:	Details of Equipments.	169
Table 5.4:	Different functions of LabVIEW®.	170-171



<b>TABLE</b>	<b>CAPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
Table 6.1:	List of Recorded Near-Fault Earthquake Ground Motions.	192
Table 6.2:	List of Recorded Far-Fault Earthquake Ground Motions.	192
Table 6.3:	Acceleration Pulses Representing Near-Fault Earthquakes.	192
Table 6.4:	Details of the PS and SS Models Studied.	192
Table 6.5:	Fixed Base and Base-Isolated Modelling Parameters for Primary Structure.	193
Table 6.6:	Secondary System Modelling Parameters.	193
Table 6.7:	Linear Base-Isolator Modelling Parameters.	194
Table 6.8:	Modal Frequencies of 5, 9, 15 Storey Models without SS Attached to PS.	194
Table 6.9:	Modal Frequencies of 5, 9, 15 Storey Models with SS Attached to PS (Coupled System 1).	195
Table 6.10:	Modal Frequencies of 5, 9, 15 Storey Models with SS Attached to PS (Coupled System 2).	196
Table 6.11:	Peak Acceleration Response of Top Most Mass in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	197
Table 6.12:	Peak Acceleration Response of Top Most Mass in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	197
Table 6.13:	Peak Displacement Response of Top Most Mass in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	198
Table 6.14:	Peak Displacement Response of Top Most Mass in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	198

TABLE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Table 6.15:	Peak Acceleration Response of Middle Mass in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	199
Table 6.16:	Peak Acceleration Response of Middle Mass in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	199
Table 6.17:	Peak Displacement Response of Middle Mass in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	200
Table 6.18:	Peak Displacement Response of Middle Mass in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	200
Table 6.19:	Peak Acceleration Response of Bottom Mass in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	201
Table 6.20:	Peak Acceleration Response of Bottom Mass in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	201
Table 6.21:	Peak Displacement Response of Bottom Mass in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	202
Table 6.22:	Peak Displacement Response of Bottom Mass in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	202
Table 6.23:	Peak Storey Shear of Top Member in Secondary System, With Varying Storey Height Under Different Earthquakes.	203

<b>TABLE</b>	<b>CAPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
Table 6.24:	Peak Storey Shear of Top Member in Secondary System, With Varying Storey Height Under Different Earthquakes.	203
Table 6.25:	Peak Moment at Junction of SS with PS for the Top Mass, with Varying Storey Height Under Different Earthquakes.	204
Table 6.26:	Peak Moment at Junction of SS with PS for the Top Mass, with Varying Storey Height Under Different Earthquakes.	204
Table 6.27:	Peak Storey Shear of Bottom Member in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height Under Different Earthquakes.	205
Table 6.28:	Peak Storey Shear of Bottom Member in Secondary System, with Varying Storey Height Under Different Earthquakes.	205
Table 6.29:	Peak Moment at Junction of SS with PS for the Bottom Member, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	206
Table 6.30:	Peak Moment at Junction of SS with PS for the Bottom Member, with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	207
Table 6.31:	Peak Base Shear of the PS with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	207
Table 6.32:	Peak Base Shear of the PS with Varying Storey Height under Different Earthquakes.	208
Table 7.1:	Properties of the Super-Structure and Sub-Structure.	222
Table 7.2:	Properties of the SDOF SS.	222
Table 8.1:	Real-Life RCC Building Structure (CSB-A) Details.	246
Table 8.2:	Details of Isolators used for Seismic Isolation of the RCC Building Structure (CSB-A).	247

TABLE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Table 8.3:	Details of Floor Mounted Secondary System.	248
Table 8.4:	Peak Absolute Acceleration Response of SS Top Floor Housed in Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated PS.	249
Table 8.5:	Peak Relative Displacement Response of SS Top Floor Housed in Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated PS.	250
Table 8.6:	DCFPS Isolator Properties.	251
Table 8.7:	First Three Modes of Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated Building.	251
Table 9.1:	Total Number of Terms in PC Expansion with Dimensionality $d$ and Order of PC Expansion $p$ .	303
Table 9.2:	Some Common Uncertain Parameter Distributions and the Corresponding Optimal Polynomials [Xiu and Karniadakis (2002)].	303
Table 9.3:	Ball Algorithm - Relation between Ball Samples, Integer Sequence, and Hermite Polynomial Basis for $d = 4, p = 2$ .	303
Table 9.4:	Lumped Mass Modelling Properties of Primary Structure.	303
Table 9.5:	Lumped Mass Modelling Properties of Secondary (Piping) System.	304
Table 9.6:	Properties of Laminated Rubber Bearing (LRB).	304
Table 9.7:	Modal Frequencies of FBPS and BIPS with FBSS.	304
Table 9.8:	Details of Uncertainties in the Input Parameters for Fixed-Base and Base-Isolated Structure.	304
Table 9.9:	Stochastic Response of QoI for Base-Isolated SDOF.	305
Table 9.10:	Stochastic Response of QoI's for Different Order PC Expansion (Fixed-Base Primary Structure with Secondary System).	305

TABLE	CAPTION	PAGE NO.
Table 9.11:	Stochastic Response of QoI's for Different Order PC Expansion (Base-Isolated Primary Structure with Secondary System).	305
Table 9.12:	Stochastic Response of QoI's for Fixed-Base Primary Structure (FBPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS) and Base-Isolated Primary Structure (BIPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS).	306
Table 9.13:	Sensitivity Analysis Sobol' Indices for QoI's for Fixed-Base Primary Structure (FBPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS) and Base-Isolated Primary Structure (BIPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS).	307
Table 9.14:	Reliability Analysis Results for Fixed-Base Primary Structure (FBPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS) and Base-Isolated Primary Structure (BIPS) with Fixed-Base Secondary System (FBSS).	307

## NOTATIONS

$\ddot{x}_b(t)$	Acceleration at the isolation level
$g$	Acceleration due to gravity
$x_g$	Acceleration earthquake ground acceleration
$\{\ddot{x}_1\}$	Acceleration vector
$Q$	Characteristic strength
$\mu$	Coefficient of friction in sliding systems
$\xi^1$	Collocation points
$[C]$	Damping matrix
$[C_T]$	Damping matrix of the total system comprising of primary structure and secondary system
$\xi_s$	Damping ratio of superstructure
$D$	Design (isolation) displacement
$F^+$	Force corresponding to $\Delta^+$
$F^-$	Force corresponding to $\Delta^-$
$\Delta^+$	Maximum positive test displacement of isolator
$\Delta^-$	Maximum negative test displacement of isolator
$x_i$	Deterministic coefficients - PC expansion
$a_0, a_i, a_{ii}, a_{ij}$	Deterministic coefficients in response surface method
$\{x_1\}$	Displacement vector
$x_p(t)$	Displacement vector of the primary structure (except the linked DOF)
$x_L(t)$	Displacement vector of the primary structure linked to the secondary system
$x_s(t)$	Displacement vector of the secondary system
$\omega_{\text{eff}}$	Effective isolation frequency
$T_{\text{eff}}$	Effective isolation time-period
$c_{\text{eff}}$	Effective viscous damping constant
$\beta_{\text{eff}}$	Effective viscous damping of isolator for each cycle of loading
$k_{\text{eff}}$	Equivalent linear elastic stiffness for each cycle of loading of isolator (effective stiffness)
$m_s$	Floor mass of secondary system
$m_p$	Floor mass primary structure
$\Omega$	Frequency of the earthquake excitation
$F$	Frictional force in sliding system
$X$	Input uncertain parameters
$T_b$	Isolation (bearing) time-period
$\xi_b$	Isolation damping ratio
$\omega_b$	Isolation frequency
$q$	Isolator yield displacement
$G$	Limit state function
$[M]$	Mass matrix
$[M_T]$	Mass matrix of the total system comprising of primary structure and secondary system
$m_b$	Mass of base/ base-raft
$D_M$	Maximum displacement of bearing

$\mu_y$	Mean of $y$
$Z$	Non-dimensional hysteretic displacement component
$N$	Number of pc expansion terms
$\Psi$	Orthogonal basis
$Y$	Output uncertain parameter
$\nu$	Poisson's ratio
$k_b$	Post-yield stiffness; linear elastic spring stiffness of isolator; isolation/ bearing stiffness; stiffness of isolated shear beam
$P$	Probability measure on sample space
$\xi_i$	Random variable
$\alpha$	Ratio of post to pre-yield stiffness, isolation stiffness parameter
$\ddot{x}_b$	Relative acceleration of base mass
$F_b$	Restoring force developed in isolation systems
$\Omega$	Sample space
$G$	Shear modulus
$F$	Sigma algebra
$\Sigma$	Standard deviation
$\sigma_{\text{nor}}$	Standard deviation of the underlying normal distribution
$[K]$	Stiffness matrix
$[K_T]$	Stiffness matrix of the total system comprising of primary structure and secondary system
$K_p$	Story stiffness primary structure
$k_s$	Story stiffness secondary system
$t$	Time duration
$\delta t$	Time interval for solving equations of motion
$x_T(t)$	Total displacement vector of the coupled system
$M$	Total mass of structure
$W$	Total weight of building
$\{r\}$	Vector of influence coefficients
$\{r\}$	Vector of influence coefficients
$\{\dot{x}_1\}$	Velocity vector
$c_b$	Viscous damping of bearing; isolation damping coefficient
$\beta, \tau, A$ and $n$	Wen's dimensionless hysteresis parameters
$F_y$	Yield strength of bearing

## ABBREVIATIONS

2-D	Two-dimensional
3-D	Three-dimensional
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
BI	Base-Isolated
BIPS	Base-Isolated Primary Structure
BISS	Base-Isolated Secondary System
C3D8H	Continuum 3 Dimensional Hybrid
C3D8R	Continuum 3 Dimensional Reduced Integration
CSB-A	Case Study Building-A
CSB-B	Case Study Building-B
DBE	Design Basis Earthquake
EDF	Electric de France System
FB	Fixed-Base
FBPS	Fixed-Base Primary Structure
FBSS	Fixed-Base Secondary System
F-D	Force Deformation
FE	Finite Element
FFT	Fast Fourier Transform
FPS	Friction Pendulum System
gPC	Generalised Polynomial Chaos
IBC	International Building Code
HDRB	High Damping Rubber Bearing
IS	Indian Standard
LRB	Laminated Rubber Bearing
LVDT	Linear Variable Displacement Transformer
MC	Monte Carlo
MCE	Maximum Capable Earthquake
MDOF	Multi-Degree-of-Freedom
MSSS	Multiply Supported Secondary System
N-Z	New-Zealand System
P-F	Pure-friction System
PGA	Peak Ground Acceleration
PS	Primary Structure
PSs	Primary Structures
PTFE	Poly-tetra-flouro-ethelene
QoI	Quantities of Interest
R-FBI	Resilient-friction Base Isolator
SDOF	Single-Degree-of-Freedom
SS	Secondary System
SSs	Secondary Systems
UBC	Uniform Building Code
DCFPS	Double Curvature Friction Pendulum System
RCC	Reinforced Cement Concrete