ISSN 8755-6839



DESIGN LOAD EVALUATION FOR TSUNAMI SHELTERS BASED ON DAMAGE OBSERVATIONS AFTER INDIAN OCEAN TSUNAMI DISASTER DUE TO THE 2004 SUMATRA EARTHQUAKE

Y. Nakano

Professor, Dept. of Fundamental Engineering, Institute of Industrial Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan Email: <u>iisnak@iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp</u>

ABSTRACT

Tsunami shelters are of great importance to mitigate casualties by earthquake-induced killer waves, and the design guidelines for their practical design are recently developed by a task committee under the Japanese Cabinet Office, since great earthquakes significantly affecting coastal regions are expected to occur in the near future in Japan. Although they propose a practical design formula to calculate tsunami loads acting on shelters, it is derived primarily based on laboratory tests with scaled models but not on damage observations. It is therefore essential to examine the design loads through comparison between observed damage and structural strength. In December 2004, a huge scale Sumatra Earthquake caused extensive and catastrophic damage to 12 countries in the Indian Ocean. The author visited Sri Lanka and Thailand to survey structural damage due to tsunami, and investigated the relationship between damage to structures, lateral strengths computed based on their member properties, and observed tsunami heights. In the survey, 28 simple structures generally found in the affected coastal regions were investigated. The investigated results show that the design tsunami loads proposed in the guidelines are found rational to avoid serious damage but may not be conservative if the load amplification due to drifting debris is taken into account.

KEYWORDS: 2004 Sumatra Earthquake, tsunami shelter, design load, damage survey, inundation depth

Science of Tsunami Hazards, Vol. 29, No. 1, page 11 (2010)

1. INTRODUCTION

Mitigating damage due to tsunami as well as due to strong ground shaking is of highest priority to minimize loss of human lives and properties in areas along the coastline susceptible to tsunami hazard. Since great earthquakes such as Tokai Earthquake and Tonankai-Nankai Earthquake significantly affecting coastal regions are expected to occur in the near future in Japan, a task committee was set up under the Japanese Cabinet Office to discuss requirements and criteria to identify or design tsunami shelters and the design guidelines for tsunami shelters were proposed in 2005 (JCO 2005). The guidelines introduced an equation to compute tsunami loads expected to act on shelters constructed on coastlines, which is currently the only formula in Japan available for practically evaluating design tsunami loads for shelters. The equation was, however, developed primarily based on laboratory tests of 2-dimensional scaled model (Asakura et al. 2000) and has not yet been verified through damage observations after natural earthquake-induced tsunamis. It should also be noted that few damage investigations have been made focusing on quantitative evaluation of tsunami loads on building structures unlike that of seismic loads in the building engineering field. The author therefore made extensive damage surveys of structures that experienced the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami to investigate the relationship between their lateral resistance and observed damage, and to verify the appropriateness of the design equation. In this paper, the outline of damage surveys and investigated results on design tsunami loads is presented.

2. DAMAGE SURVEYS

2.1. Surveyed Areas

Damage surveys were made in (1) the northeast and south of Sri Lanka (Trincomalee, Galle, Matara, Hambantota etc.) on February 19 through 26, 2005 and (2) Phuket Island and Khao Lak of Thailand on March 9 through 13, 2005. Figure 1 shows the epicenter and surveyed areas. They are located about 1600 km and 500 km away from the epicenter, respectively, and have been little affected by ground shaking (Nakano 2007).



Figure 1 Epicenter and investigated areas

Science of Tsunami Hazards, Vol. 29, No. 1, page 12 (2010)

2.2. Survey Strategy

To collect as many damage data as possible for various types of structures and their structural properties, damage surveys were made at approximately 80 sites. Of the all surveyed structures, detailed surveys were made on 28 structures to record structural dimension and reinforcement arrangement to further investigate the relationship between their lateral resistance and tsunami load that acted on them since they met the following three conditions:

- (1) The lateral resistance of the surveyed structures could be simply estimated based on the structural properties obtained on site, because (i) their sectional properties (cross-sectional size, reinforcement arrangement, etc.) were measured; (ii) their damage (or collapse) mechanism was simple and the boundary between damaged and intact part of the structure was not complicated; and (iii) they were small and/or regular enough in their plan and height that their lateral strength could be calculated through simple modeling and assumptions.
- (2) The tsunami trace height was clearly found on the surveyed site through water marks left on building's walls, where it was defined as the water depth above the ground level (i.e., inundation depth) at the structure's site. In addition to that, on-site interviews were also made to enrich tsunami inundation depth data if available.
- (3) The tsunami load could be simply estimated because the surveyed structures were located in areas close to the coastlines and the direct effects by tsunami attack were the primary source of the damage.

Note that drifting debris as well as tsunami waves may have caused damaging impact on structures. Their effects were therefore considered in investigating the relationship between damage category and lateral resistance when the collision of debris was found to have obviously affected the damage to the surveyed structure.

2.3. Detailed Information Recorded on Surveyed Structures

Considering conditions for detailed surveys described earlier in 2.2, (a) building structures with simple configuration, (b) masonry (brick or concrete block) fence walls, (c) cantilever RC columns, (d) elevated water tanks supported by four columns, (e) Buddha's small mausoleums, and (f) small brick structures such as outhouses (i.e., outdoor toilets) and sheds were investigated for collecting detailed structural information. In the detailed surveys, the following data were collected at each site: (1) topographical information of the site, (2) maximum tsunami inundation depth obtained through measurement and, if necessary, supplementary on-site interviews, (3) building's use and structural type (RC, brick, concrete block, etc.), (4) damage category (no damage, cracked, or collapsed) and damage location(s), (5) structure and/or member dimension (B x D x H etc.), (6) reinforcement arrangement (diameter, spacing, cover concrete depth etc.), if it was an RC structure, and (7)general view photos and structural configurations of investigated structures.

Table 1 summarizes the investigated structures and photo 1 shows their typical damage patterns. Note that the structures categorized in (d) through (f) described above were generally found in the affected areas in Sri Lanka, and their data were collected to identify the criteria between damaged and survived structures even if they had minor or no damage. Detailed damage descriptions of surveyed structures and their structural information can be found in the related report (Nakano 2005).

Science of Tsunami Hazards, Vol. 29, No. 1, page 13 (2010)

3. EVALUATION OF LATERAL RESISTANCE OF INVESTIGATED STRUCTURES

According to the damage and failure mode observed, the flexural yielding strength My, the ultimate flexural strength at rebar fracture M_u , the overturning strength MT, and the shear strength V_u are calculated, where M_y and M_u of RC members are computed from Eqs. (3.1) through (3.3) that are usually applied to beams and columns in Japanese design practice shown as follows:

$M_{\rm y} = 0.9 \ a{ m t} \ \sigma \ { m y} \ d$	(3.1)
$M_{\rm u} = 0.9 \ a{ m t} \ \sigma \ { m u} \ d$	(3.2)
$M_{\rm y} = 0.8 \ at \ \sigma \ y \ D + 0.5 \ N \ D \ [1 - N / (B \ D \ Fc)]$	(3.3)

where M_y and M_u are the flexural yield strength and the ultimate flexural strength, respectively; σ_y and σ_u are the yield strength and the tensile strength of rebar, respectively; at is the cross-sectional area of tensile rebars; *B*, *D*, and *d* are the width, the depth, and the effective depth of a section, respectively; F_c is the compressive strength of concrete; and *N* is the axial load.

Note that most of columns investigated herein have low axial loads and their flexural resistance is evaluated from Eqs. (3.1) and (3.2) neglecting the axial load contribution to resistance while Eq. (3.3) is applied in calculating lateral resistance of a 2-story building designated by S53 in Table 1 (see also (8) in photo 1). It should also be noted that the factor 0.8 in Eq. (3.3) is modified according to the ratio of cover concrete to depth observed in the structure since the cover is thicker than the construction practice generally found in Japan. In computing the strength, the yield and tensile strength of reinforcing bars (σ_v and σ_u in Eqs. (3.1) through (3.3)) are determined from tensile tests of sample rebars (two samples from buildings in Sri Lanka and six samples from those in Thailand) that are carried out in Japan. The shear strength Vu of brick walls is defined as the product of its cross sectional area Aw in the principal direction of the structure along tsunami attack and the ultimate shear stress τ_u , where τ_u is assumed 0.4 N/mm2 considering the wall's configuration and the brick's quality generally found in the affected areas. The contribution of walls in the direction perpendicular to the tsunami attack is neglected. In calculating the lateral resistance of 2-story building S53, the load-deformation relationship is assumed to reach its peak when the brick fails. The contribution of RC columns to the overall resistance is therefore reduced to half of their ultimate strength assuming the compatibility of deformation between stiffer brick and softer RC columns, which is consistent with the assumptions found in the Japanese Standard for Seismic Evaluation of Existing RC Buildings (JBDPA 2005).

91 10	808 808		DOM:	Location	(INIII)	(N)	(m)	Code. a 7	Damage's	Remarks
300 Kan surfici Circle Mr. 703 $=$ 100 N Non-surficiency Non-surficiency 310 Kan surficiency B Outle cristion Mr. 703 $=$ 100 N Non-surficiency Non-surficiency 311 Caracterization and model action (i) B Outle cristion (iii) B Mr. 703 $=$ 2.0 1.0 Non-surficiency Non-surficiency 312 Caracterization (iii) B Outle model (iii) B Mr. 703 $=$ 2.0 1.0 Non-surficiency Non-surficiency 313 Caracterization (iii) B Outle model (iiii) B Mr. 703 $=$ 2.0 1.0 Non-surficiency Non-surficiency 313 Martaneori (iiii) B Outle model (iiii) B Mr. 703 Sinter (iiiii) Counter (iiiii) Sinter (iiiiii) Sinter (iiiii) Sinter (iiiii) Sinter (iiiiii) Sinter (iiiiii) 323 Descrite (iiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii	808 808	Column at entrance gate	RC	Trine omalee	M6:20	1	(3.0)	1.56	(×) O	Possibly damaged by drifting debris
310 Rul of current () B B Increasing (i) M	ŝ	Fence well (1)	RC+B	Thireconsise	Mr: 50.5	-	6.0	1.73	×	Just on coastine
31 Contact and a probability of the probability		Wall of outhouse (1)	в	Thinc omalee	Mg 35	1	1.3	2.38	×	B and failure of mortar between brick units considered in Mr
31 Cumue supercisetic, develope supercisetic, develope supercisetic, sector subjective supercisetic, develope supercisetic, sector subjective supercisetic, sector subjective supercisetic, sector subjective supercisetic superciset supercisetic supercisetic superci	S12	Fence columns	RC	Calls, cricket field	Mb: 6.6		3.0	1.13	×	Possibly damaged by defiting debris
316 Continue relation of a non-system Ref Oal Montange under hit by a function of (1) Montange under hit by a function of (2) C/C Other and (2) Ref O O O O And mage under hit by a function of (2) 23 Will of many relation B Odie 239 1.03 > O Dotes of (1), for (2) Dotes of (1), for (2) Dotes of (2) Dotes of (2) <td< td=""><td>\$15</td><td>Columns supporting elevated water tank (2)</td><td>RC</td><td>Gatte</td><td>M5104</td><td>1</td><td>2.4</td><td>3.03</td><td>(×)</td><td>Damaged by a drifting bus</td></td<>	\$15	Columns supporting elevated water tank (2)	RC	Gatte	M5104	1	2.4	3.03	(×)	Damaged by a drifting bus
310 Intervery volution Microsity	S16	Cantilever columns of	RC	Onlie	Mb: 26	1	2.4	1.76	0	
32 Base out (2) Rc-cds Index Mark T enservision RC-cds Index Mark T enservision RC State T enservision State T ens		automobile factory's office			Muc.33	1	24	2.04	(×) O	No damage unless hit by a bus
323Wall of entersyction()BGale3491.15 $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ <td>\$19</td> <td>Fence wall (2)</td> <td>RC+CB</td> <td>Galle</td> <td>Miz 135</td> <td>1</td> <td>235</td> <td>1.01</td> <td>×</td> <td>CB walk neglected in Mu</td>	\$19	Fence wall (2)	RC+CB	Galle	Miz 135	1	235	1.01	×	CB walk neglected in Mu
Size Wall of small shot() B Gale - 480 16 >540 \bigcirc Locand jack behald S2. East paperability of second jack behald S2. Size Mandemone f Badha() B Gale - 120 16 3.6 \bigcirc Locand jack behald S2. Size Consumer f Badha() B B Bankardea - 9.5 0.54 × Boad f abur of merather beneas behald S2. Size Consumer f Badha() B B Bankardea - 9.5 0.54 × Boad f abur of merather beneami d notice Size Consumer of page and face B B Bankardea - 9.5 0.54 4.00 D East paperability to burnati direction Size Consumer of page and face B Bankardea - 2.55 0.55 East paperability to burnati direction Size Consumer of page and face B Bankardea Consumer of page and face face Size Consumer of page and face B Bankardea Consumer of page and face for and face face Size	823	Wall of nursery school	В	Gallo	1	349	1.55	4,03	(7)	Scratch found on wall; possibly damaged by driffing debris
528Wall of earlieves(-)BOalle130163.68 \bigcirc Locand jut behind 52 / Early pependiculat to summa factoria529Oelemen supportingBBankratca-9.916 \checkmark \bigcirc Locand jut behind 52 / Early pependiculat to summa factoria531Wall of earlieves(-)BBankratca-9.99.94.0 \bigcirc Locand jut behind 52 / Early pependiculat to summa factoria531Wall of earlieves(-)BBankratca-9.92.64.0 \bigcirc Bank behind 52543Wall of earlieves(-)BMakratca-9.02.64.0 \bigcirc Bank behind 52543Wall of earlieves(-)BMakratca-9.02.64.0 \bigcirc Bank behind 52544Wall of earlieves(-)BMakratca-9.02.64.0 \bigcirc Bank behind 52545Wall of earlieves(-)BMakratca-9.02.99.0Early perpendiculative summa factoria546Wall of earlieves(-)BMakratca-0.02.90.0Early perpendiculative summa factoria548Wall of earlieves(-)BMakratca-0.02.90.0Early perpendiculative summa factoria548Wall of earlieves(-)BMakratca-0.02.90.0Early perpendiculative summa factoria548Wall of earlieves(-)BMakratca-0.02.90.0	\$24	Wall of small shot (I)	8	Galle	1	480	1.6	>5.0	0	Located just behind S 29
Sko Manual Decision of Database (b) D Calante (particle) D Located just behaled S2 Sko Manual upporting: B Hantacta - 9:3 2:95 0;4 X Bond jame of morat-benean bick mise considered in the consintered consindifered considered in the considered in the consid	\$25	Wall of outhouse (4)	B	Calle	1	130	1.6	3.68	0	Located just behind S.23 / Euroy perpendicular to trunami direction
32 Column supporting and antibacter back (a) 1 Interfactor 2 2 3 4/7 > Band antibactor to busanti decimal formanti decimal antibactor back and antibactor bactorial decimal deviation statication 1 Interfactor bactorial decimal formanti decimal antibactor bactorial decimal deviation statication 1 <td>\$26</td> <td>Mausoleum of Baddha (3)</td> <td>в</td> <td>Galle</td> <td>1</td> <td>182</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>>5.0</td> <td>0</td> <td>Located just behind S.23</td>	\$26	Mausoleum of Baddha (3)	в	Galle	1	182	1.6	>5.0	0	Located just behind S.23
83 Wall of outhouse(5) B Handwareda $=$ 83 0.95 4.07 \bigcirc Entry perpendicular to burnant direction 83 Genoma supporting B Inthouted. $=$ 305 2.6 4.02 \bigcirc Entry perpendicular to burnant direction 83 Genoma supporting B Inthouted. $=$ 305 2.6 4.02 \bigcirc Entry perpendicular to burnant direction 84 Genoma supporting B Mater $=$ 305 2.05 3.39 \bigcirc Entry perpendicular to burnant direction 84 Mail of outbrase(7) B Mater $=$ 305 2.05 3.39 \bigcirc Entry perpendicular to burnant direction 84 Mail of outbrase(7) B Mater $=$ 130 2.32 2.33 \bigcirc Mater 85 Mail of outbrase(7) B Mater $=$ 130 2.32 \bigcirc Entry perpendicular to burnant direction 85 Mater $=$ Mater $=$ </td <td>\$32</td> <td>Columns supporting elevated water tank (3)</td> <td>8</td> <td>Hambartota</td> <td>н</td> <td>5.6</td> <td>2.95</td> <td>0.54</td> <td>×</td> <td>Band failure of mortar between beick units considered in Plu</td>	\$32	Columns supporting elevated water tank (3)	8	Hambartota	н	5.6	2.95	0.54	×	Band failure of mortar between beick units considered in Plu
31Column supporting devocation unprotecting10Interfactor264.42 \bigcirc Far from condition328Columns supporting devocation state cask(r)10101022 \bigcirc 101034Malted entrone cask(r)1010103.302.30 \bigcirc 101034Wall of entrone cask1010103.302.30 \bigcirc 101034Wall of entrone cash1010103.302.30 \bigcirc 101034Wall of entrone cash1010102.302.30 \bigcirc 101034Wall of entrone cash10102.302.30010101034Mater-1162.302.310010101034Mater-1162.302.310010101035Contenter close10102.302.3100101036Mater-1162.352.310010101036Mater-1162.352.310010101036Mater-1162.352.31001010101037Mater-1162.351.400000101036Mater-<	\$33	Wall of outhouse (5)	8	Hambantota	1	83	0.95	4.07	0	Entry perpendicular to tsummi direction
383 Columns supporting derivative supporting B Innet under All of cutatives (7) B Innet under one All of cutatives (7) 51 Value cutatives (1) RC Hall of cutatives (7) RC 117 233 213 233 114 2 244 2 244	\$37	Columns supporting dovated water tank (4)	B	Hambantota	1	305	2.6	4.6	0	Far from coastline
31 Wail of cuthone (1) B Konspola 170 (3.0) 2.95 \bigcirc Embry perpendicular to brunni direction 346 Wail of cuthone (1) B Matera 263 2.05 3.39 \bigcirc Embry perpendicular to brunni direction 348 Wail of cuthone (1) B Matera - 203 2.05 3.39 \bigcirc Embry perpendicular to brunni direction 343 Wail of cuthone (1) B Matera - 203 2.05 3.39 \bigcirc Embry perpendicular to brunni direction 343 Combrero (1) B Matera - 203 2.05 3.39 \bigcirc 1.47 1.47 \square 1.47 \square 2.40 \bigcirc Approx 100m ana y from carefuse 1.4890 vollayed and 1 \square	\$38	Columns supporting elevated water tank (5)	B	Hambartota	1	\$26	(2:0)	2.92	0	
364Wall of enail shoel (a)BMatera $$ 2632.053.39 \bigcirc Enery perpendicular to burnanti direction361Wall of enablangBMatera $$ 902.052.22 \bigcirc Enery perpendicular to burnanti direction363School buildingRC+BMatera $$ 13162.832.31 \bigcirc 2.405RC building / Seimic summi direction373School buildingRC+BMatera $$ 13162.832.31 \bigcirc 2.405RC building / Seimic suparity evaluation170Wate collar valitBProception $$ 13162.832.93 \bigcirc \bigcirc 2.405Relative function170Wate collar valitBProception $$ 9000.94 \times \bigcirc Cellants, § statily collapord in F170Wate collar valitBProception $$ 14733.95 (1.40) \bigcirc \land \land 170Face columns (1)RCPaneu, Matera $$ 2.65 0.46 \times Pull-out of from ordine formic softine170Face columns (2)RCPaneu Space $$ 2.65 0.46 \times Pull-out of from ordine formic softine170Columns (1)RCPaneu $$ $$ 2.65 0.46 \times Pull-out of from ordine170Columns (2)RCPaneu $$ $$ 2.65 0.46 \times Pull-out of from ordine170Columns (2)	848	Wall of outhouse (7)	B	Kottegoda	1	170	(0.5)	2.55	0	Entry perpendicular to teunami direction
816Wall of curbuse (9)BMoters $$ 902.052.22 \bigcirc Eury perpendicular to burnani direction823School buildingRC+BMaters $$ 13162.852.31 \bigcirc 22-6007 RC building/ Sciencic cupacity conlaption824Carefiberer columns (1)RCHikkabitwa A_{07} : R $$ 13162.852.31 \bigcirc 22-6007 RC building/ Sciencic cupacity conlaption170Wale constructionBParong Basch $$ 1473 $$ 9.09 \times \bigcirc 0.618 Y conditions/ Sciencic cupacity conlaption170Wale colar Y wallBParong Basch $$ 1473 $$ 9.09 \times \bigcirc 0.618 Y conditions, Standy configure data for circle of and	848	Wall of small shot (2)	в	National	1	263	2.05	3,98	0	Entryperpendicular to tsurami direction
353School buildingRC+BMatra—1316225231 \bigcirc \bigcirc 2-story RC building/ Seimic capacity valuation357Catifiber columns (1)RCHikoduwa $Mp: R2$ $=$ (9.0)0.59 \times Of all 15 columns, 8 tailly collapsed and 7 havil101Wate callar's wallBPanag Baach $=$ (9.0)0.59 \times Of all 15 columns, 8 tailly collapsed and 7 havil102Kana Beach H&RRC+BKana Beach $=$ (9.0)0.59 \times Of all 15 columns, 8 tailly collapsed and 7 havil103Kana Beach H&RRC+BKana Beach $=$ (9.0)0.59 \times Of all 15 columns, 8 tailly collapsed and 7 havil103Fance columns (1)RCBaap Rack $=$ (9.0)0.59 \times Of all 15 columns, 9 tau constine104Fance columns (2)RCBaap Rack $=$ (9.0) 0.59 \times Of all 15 columns, 9 tailly collapsed and 7 havil104Fance columns (1)RCBap Rack $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ $=$ 104Fance columns (2)RCBan Rack $=$	S48	Wall of outhouse (9)	в	Mistara	1	8	2.05	2.22	0	Entryperpendicular to toursmit direction
Style Candidiver colume (1) RC Hikkeduwa $A\phi_{12}$: B (9.0) 0.54 × Of all 15 columms, 8 tetally collapsed and 7 heavily collapsed and 7 heavily under construction T01 Wane collar's wali B Panong Boach (9.0) 0.59 × Of all 15 colummy from construction T01 Wane collar's wali B Panong Boach (9.0) 0.59 × Of all 15 colummy from construction T02 Kamala Beach 1473 3.95 (1.00) 0.0 Approx. 60m away from constrine T03 Fance columns (2) RC Read 2.65 1.44 × Pull-out of round when constrine T03 Fance columns (2) RC Read April 7.47 2.65 1.44 × Pull-out of round when constrine T03 Columns (7) RC Read April 7.47 2.65 1.39 × Pull-out of round when constrine T03 Columns (7) RC Read 2.65 1.39 × Pull-out of round rout of round when ///////////////////////	\$53	School building	RC+B	Matera	1	1316	2.85	2.31	0	2-story RC building/ Seismic capacity evaluation performed
Image: constructionmether construction $Mac 23$ $$ (9.0) 0.9 \times \sim T01Ware cellar's valiBPaceag Bacch $ (8.0)$ 1.73 $>.5.0$ \bigcirc Appens. 100m anay from constline (act plotted in Fig. 200m boxT00Pane columns (1)RCRCReal React, Mar SN $Mc : 6.6$ $ 2.65$ 1.14 \times Pullout of from anay from constline (act plotted in Fig. 200m boxT10Columns of plot house of Navy BaseRec 6.6 $ 2.65$ 1.29 \times $Yid bling and flotture of round rebase observed / Approx. Han fig. 200m boxT11Columns of La FibraRCRec fibra, and from constline (act mar decored from the fibra and flotture of round rebase observed / Approx. Han fibra and flotture from constline (act mar decored from the fibra and flotture of round rebase observed / Approx. Han fibra and flotture of round rebase observed / Approx. Han fibra and flotture of round rebase observed / Approx. Han fibra and flottur$	\$57	Cantilever columns (1)	RC	Hikkaduwa	Mbr: 18	1	(0.6)	15.0	×	Of all 15 columns, 8 totally collapsed and 7 heavily damaged
T01Ware callar's waliBPhoney Bacch6401.75>5.40 \bigcirc Approx. 100m array from conselineT02Kamala Beach H&RRC+BKamala Beach14733.95(1.60) \bigcirc Approx. 60m array from conselineT07Fance cohumas (1)RCTape Lanux, $h\phi: 10$ 14733.95(1.60) \bigcirc Approx. 60m array from conselineT07Fance cohumas (2)RCThey Lanux, $h\phi: 13$ 2.650.49 \times Pull-out of round rebus observed / Approx. Ikm fnT08Fance cohumas (2)RCThey May Base $hx: 6.3$ 2.650.49 \times Pull-out, of round rebus observed / Approx. Ikm fnT08Fance cohumas (2)RCThey May Base $hx: 6.3$ 2.650.49 \times Pull-out, of round rebus observed / Approx. Ikm fnT08Cohumas (2)RCThey May Base $hx: 6.5$ 2.650.99 \times Pull-out, of round rebus observed / Approx. Ikm fnT09Cohumas of pior huseRCThey May $hx: 6.5$ 2.650.99 \times Pull-out, of round rebus observed / Approx. Ikm fnT19Cohumas of pior huseRCThey Lanux, $hx: 6.6$ 2.650.99 \times Pull-out, of round rebus observed / Approx. Ikm fnT19Cohumas of pior huseRCBase May Base $hx: 6.6$ 2.650.99 \times Piolon, $\mu = 1.530$ $Approx. 60m areay from conselineT19Rout$		under construction			Mu:23	1	(9.0)	0.9	×	
TC0 Kanala Beach H&R RC+B Kanala Beach 1473 3-95 (1.60) \bigcirc Approx. 60m array from consellue (not plotted in Fig. T07 Fance columns(1) RC Tap Lamu, M/r : 10 1473 2.65 0.48 \times Pull-out of round rehars of envored / Approx. Limit for the columns (2) RC They Lamu, M/r : 13 2.65 1.14 \times Pull-out of round rehars of envord / Approx. Limit for the columns (2) RC They Lamu, M/r : 6.3 2.65 1.94 \times Pull-out of round rehars of envord / Approx. Limit for the columns (2) RC They Lamu, $/Approx. Envirce of round rehars of envord / Approx. Limit for the columns (2) RC They Lamu, /Approx. Envirce of round rehars of envord / Approx. Limit for the columns of the column (2) RC They Lamu, /Approx. Envirce of round rehars of envirce of round rehars of envirce of round rehars of envord / Approx. Limit for the column (2) /Approx. Envirce of round rehars of envirce of round$	101L	Whe cellar's wall	B	Patong Beach	E	680	1.75	>5.0	0	Approx. 100m away from constine
TUTFance columns (1)RCThey Lamu, $My:$ 30 $$ 2.650.49 \times Pulliout of round refun observed / Approx. Ikm findT00Fance columns (2)RCPhaney Nap $My:$ 4.5 $$ 2.651.34 \times Pulliout, yickling, and findure of round refun observed / Approx. Ikm findT0Fance columns (2)RCPhaney Nap $My:$ 4.5 $$ 2.651.39 \times Pulliout, yickling, and findure of round refune of	201	Kemala Beach H&R	RC+B	Kemala Beach	1	1473	3.95	(1.60)	0	Appeox. 60m away from constline (not plotted in Figure 4)
T00 Frace columns (2) RC Hareg Nga $My:$ 4.5 2.65 1.14 × Putheout, yiekling, and fincture of round rebars observed / N T0 Columns of pier house RC They Lemu, $My:$ 4.7 2.65 1.39 × Putheout, yiekling, and fincture of round rebars observed / N T0 Columns of pier house RC They Lemu, $My:$ 4.7 2.65 0.39 × Yiekling, and fincture of round rebars observed / N T0 Columns of Pier house RC They Lamu, $My:$ 6.6 2.65 0.39 × Yiekling, and fincture of round rebars observed / N T1 Oration lew NoryBase) RC+Bars Mise SNp $Mx:$ 6.6 2.65 0.39 × Yiekling, and fincture of round rebars observed / N T15 Contrones of Nao Lak RC+Bars Mise SNp $Mx:$ 12.9 2.65 0.70 × 0f11 greet house, 9 collapsed or wehod a weyot T17 Cantific Ref Notes of Na N/x 5.0 0.37 × 0f11 greet house, 9 collapsed or wehod a weyot T17 Cantificer oolumns (3) </td <td>101</td> <td>Fence columns (1)</td> <td>RC</td> <td>Thap Lanu,</td> <td>Myr: 10</td> <td>1</td> <td>2.65</td> <td>0.48</td> <td>×</td> <td>Pull-out of round rebus observed/ Approx. Ikm from constine</td>	101	Fence columns (1)	RC	Thap Lanu,	Myr: 10	1	2.65	0.48	×	Pull-out of round rebus observed/ Approx. Ikm from constine
Image: Note of the first section of the first se	109	Fence columns (2)	RC	Phang Nga	My: 4.5	112	2.65	1.14	×	Pull-out, yielding, and fracture of round rebars observed
T/0 Columns of pier house RC Thap Lamin, $A\beta$: 4.7 - 2.65 0.28 × Yielding and flacture of round tehms observed / Iu T/0 funct to Nvy Bave) Rect to Nvy Bave) Rect to Nvy Bave) Main Main <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Navy Base</td> <td>Mac 6.3</td> <td>1</td> <td>2.65</td> <td>1.39</td> <td>×</td> <td>/ Approx. Ikm from coatline</td>				Navy Base	Mac 6.3	1	2.65	1.39	×	/ Approx. Ikm from coatline
interface Thrang Name Marg Name	180	Columns of pier house	RC	Thep Lenu,	Mbr: 4.7	L	2.65	0.98	×	Yielding and fiscure of round relats observed / Just on coastine
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		(next to Navy Base)		Phang Nga	Mac 6.6	1	2.65	1.05	×	
T15 RC columns of La Flora RC Bang Nang A(x:129 - 5.0 0.70 × Just on coardine T17 Cantilever columns (3) RC Phang Nga A(x:139 - 5.0 0.87 × Just on coardine T17 Cantilever columns (3) RC Phang Nga A(x:25.6 - 3.3 1.62 × Far from coardine ander construction A(x:43.9 - 3.3 2.02 × Far from coardine (extinuated at more than 1 km and another construction)	TB	Guest house of Kha o Lak Merlin Resort Hotel	RC+B	Khao Lak, Phang Nea	1	317	4.23	1.16	×Δ	Brick wall (#380am) considered in Fix Of 11 areat houses, 9 collapsed or washed away
Kilao Lak Hotel Filang Nga Aur: 19-9 - 5.0 0.87 × Just on concarrection T/T Cantilever columns (3) RC Phang Nga Apr: 25.6 - 3.3 1.62 × Just on concarrection under construction Arx: 43.9 - 3.3 2.02 × Far from constitue (estimated at more than 1 km and are constitued on the set of a set of the set of a set of the	TB	RC columns of La Flora	RC	Bang Nang	Mp: 12.9	L	5.0	0.30	×	transfer to the second s
T/T Cantilever columns (3) RC Phang Nga Apr. 28.6 - 3.3 1.62 × Far from coardine (estimated at more than 1 km ar under construction under construction Marc 43.9 - 3.3 2.02 × Far from coardine (estimated at more than 1 km ar under construction)		Khao Lak Hotel		Phang Nga	Mar: 19.9	-	5.0	0.87	×	
under constituction $Max 43.9$ — 3.3 2.00 × z a zoom consentite (eventuative constitution tanta or	LIT.	Cantilover columns (3)	RC	Phong Nga	My: 28.6	1	3.3	1.62	×	 Enfront constitute (antimeted of more than 1 from second
		under construction			Mac 43.9	1	3.3	2.02	×	COMP NEW T INCOME AN ADVANCE AN ADVANCEMENTS AND ADVANCE AND T

Science of Tsunami Hazards, Vol. 29, No. 1, page 15 (2010)

4. COMPARISON BETWEEN TSUNAMI LOAD AND OBSERVED DAMAGE

In the guidelines, the design tsunami load is defined by Eq. (4.1). In the subsequent investigations, Eq. (4.2) that is analogous to Eq. (4.1) is first defined, and the coefficient a is evaluated setting the lateral resistance of investigated structure equal to the tsunami load computed from Eq. (4.2):

$q_x(z) = \rho g (3 h - z)$	(4.1)
$p_x(z) = \rho g(a \eta_{\text{max}} - z)$	(4.2)

where $q_x(z)$ (kN/m2) is the design tsunami pressure acting on a structure at a distance z above the ground level .



(10) T09: RC fence columns of Navy Base (rebar fractured)

(11) T15: RC columns under construction

Photo 1 Typical damage to investigated structures ("S01" etc: ID Nos. in Table 1, "→": tsunami flow direction) Science of Tsunami Hazards, Vol. 29, No. 1, page 16 (2010)

defined in the guidelines (JCO 2005), ρ (t/m3) is the mass per unit volume of water (1.0 assumed herein), g (m/s2) is the gravity acceleration, h (m) is the design tsunami inundation depth, z (m) is the distance above the ground level to compute tsunami pressure p_x and q_x (0 < z < 3h for Eq. (4.1) and $0 < z < a \eta$ max for Eq. (4.2)), $p_x(z)$ (kN/m2) is the tsunami pressure acting on a structure at a distance z above the ground level where η max (m) is the observed tsunami inundation depth, a is the ratio of the water depth η ' equivalent to structure's ultimate strength to the observed tsunami inundation depth η_{max} (i.e., $a = \eta'/max$). Note that the inundation depth for h and η_{max} is defined as the water depth above the ground level at the building's location.

Figure 2 illustrates the background concept employed in Eq. (4.1). The design tsunami pressure distribution acting along the structure's height is assumed a triangular shape with the height reaching 3 times of the design tsunami inundation depth h (i.e., the pressure at the bottom is assumed 3 times of the hydrostatic pressure), which is based on the laboratory tests of 2-dimensional scaled model (Asakura et al., 2000). To examine whether or not the coefficient 3 in Eq. (4.1) is appropriate to evaluate the tsunami load, Eq. (4.2) is introduced in the manner analogous to Eq. (4.1). If the coefficient a successfully categorizes damaged and survived structures at its value of 3, one can say that Eq. (4.1) with a equal to 3 is a rational design formula to compute the tsunami load effect. In calculating the coefficient a, two typical cases of inundation depth and structure's height, which can be found in the guidelines (JCO 2005), are taken into consideration as shown in Figure 3 since they are the basic patterns of tsunami attack to existing structures in the surveyed areas.

The coefficient a can be computed assuming that the lateral resistance of an investigated structure is equal to the overall tsunami load acting on it under the pressure distribution along its height defined by Eq. (4.2). The coefficient therefore denotes the ratio of equivalent water depth η ' corresponding to the structure's lateral resistance under a triangular hydrostatic pressure profile to the observed inundation depth η_{max} . The procedure to compute the coefficient a is described in detail below.



rigure 2 Design pressure isunann distribution (Seo 2005)

Science of Tsunami Hazards, Vol. 29, No. 1, page 17 (2010)



Figure 3 Tsunami inundation depth η_{max} , building height H, and tsunami pressure distribution p_x (Nakano 2007)

1. Compute the lateral resistance of investigated structures considering their failure mode as shown earlier in Section 3.

2. Then compute shear force or bending moment acting at the failure point u (defined as the distance between the failure point and the ground surface) assuming the tsunami pressure distribution as defined in Eq. (4.2). Setting the force or moment at the height u equal to the lateral resistance obtained in step 1. above, evaluate the equivalent water depth η ' corresponding to the resistance. Note that the tsunami pressure above structures is neglected and the depth η ' is evaluated assuming the trapezoidal instead of triangular pressure distribution in computing the force or moment as shown in case 2 of Figure 3.

3. Finally compute the coefficient a, which is defined as the ratio of equivalent water depth η ' to observed tsunami inundation depth η_{max} (i.e., $a = \eta'/\eta_{max}$).

Table 1 shows the investigated tsunami inundation depth η max and the computed coefficient a. Their relationship is shown in Figure 4(a) for wall-shaped structures such as fence walls and in Figure 4(b) for column-shaped structures such as cantilever RC columns, respectively, where the structure type is determined based on the shape of member on which the tsunami attacks. When the structures with identical structural properties have different failure patterns due to the effects of drifting debris or some other reasons, two marks corresponding to different failure patterns are plotted at the same point of the figure.

Figure 4(a) shows that structures with the value of a greater than 2.5 have no major damage except for the case S23 that may have been damaged due to drifting debris, and the value of 3 for the coefficient a proposed in the guidelines can be considered rational to avoid serious damage due to tsunami attack. It should be noted, however, that the structure (S23) having the coefficient a greater than 4 suffers wall cracking, and the coefficient of 3 may not be conservative if the load amplification due to drifting debris is taken into account, and countermeasures to protect structures from damage due to drifting debris need to be taken.

Science of Tsunami Hazards, Vol. 29, No. 1, page 18 (2010)

Figure 4(b) shows that the coefficient a for column-shaped structures to discriminate between damaged and survived may lie at around 2 when the effects of drifting debris are neglected, which is slightly lower than that for wall-shaped structures. This result implies that column-shaped structures have advantage in tsunami resisting performance over wall-shaped structures on condition that both structures have enough seismic capacity to survive the ground shaking prior to the tsunami attack. It should also be noted, however, that the column-shaped structures can not be left undamaged at the coefficient a in the range of 2 to 3 as shown for the cases of S01, S15, and S16, and countermeasures against drifting debris need to be taken to protect structures as is the case of wall-shaped structures previously described



Figure 4 Computed Coefficient a vs. observed tsunami inundation depth η max (Numerals in the figure denote ID Nos. in Table 1)

5. CONCLUSIONS

To examine the design load specified in the Japanese guidelines for tsunami shelters, damage surveys are made in Sri Lanka and Thailand after the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami disaster, and the lateral strengths of structures in the affected areas, the tsunami load computed by the design formula considering tsunami inundation depth, and the observed damage are mutually compared. The major findings can be summarized as follows:

1. The value of coefficient 3 for computing design tsunami loads proposed in Eq. (4.1) of the guidelines compares well with the criteria between damaged and survived structures in the tsunami affected areas surveyed after the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami disaster, and the design tsunami load specified in the guidelines is found rational.

2. The value, however, may not be conservative if the load amplification due to drifting debris is taken into account, and other countermeasures would be needed to avoid unexpected damage due to debris.

Science of Tsunami Hazards, Vol. 29, No. 1, page 19 (2010)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was partially funded by 2004 Grant-in-Aid for Promotion of Science and Technology (Project title: Urgent Research on Damage due to Sumatra Earthquake and Indian Ocean Tsunami; Sub-theme: Vulnerability Investigations Related to Earthquake-Induced Tsunami Disasters led by Dr. K. Meguro, Prof. of Institute of Industrial Science, The University of Tokyo) and TOSTEM Foundation for Construction Materials Industry Promotion (Project title: Design Tsunami Load Evaluation and Data Archives Based on Field Surveys after Devastating Tsunami Disaster due to 2004 Sumatra Earthquake, Grant No. 05-26 (2005), Y. Nakano, Principal Investigator). The field surveys were made under extensive cooperation with Dr. G. Shoji, Assistant Professor of Tsukuba University; Mr. Ganila N. Paranavithana, Central Engineering Consultancy Bureau, Sewerage Engineering, Sri Lanka; and Mr. Perapol Begkhuntod, Thai Meteorological Department, Thailand. The author gratefully acknowledges their valuable supports to complete the research project.

REFERENCES

Asakura, R., Iwase, K., Ikeya, T. Takao, M., Kaneto, T., Fujii, N., Omori, M. (2000). An Experimental Study on Wave Force Acting on On-Shore Structures due to Overflowing Tsunamis, Proceedings of Coastal Engineering, Japan Society of Civil Engineers, 47, 911-915.

JBDPA/Japan Building Disaster Prevention Association (2005). Standard for Seismic Evaluation of Existing Reinforced Concrete Buildings, 2001; Guidelines for Seismic Retrofit of Existing Reinforced Concrete of Existing Reinforced Concrete Buildings, 2001; Technical Manual for Seismic Evaluation and Seismic Retrofit of Existing Reinforced Concrete Buildings, 2001, English Version, 1st.

JCO/Task Committee under the Japanese Cabinet Office (2005). Design Guidelines for Tsunami Shelters (in Japanese), http://www.bousai.go.jp/oshirase/h17/tsunami_siryo2.pdf Nakano, Y. (2005). Damage Report on Structures due to 2004.12.26 Sumatra Earthquake Ver. 2.2, http://sismo.iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp/Research.files/topic4.files/topic4-007.files/T4-7-1.pdf

Nakano, Y. (2007). DESIGN LOAD EVALUATION FOR TSUNAMI SHELTERS BASED ON DAMAGE OBSERVATIONS AFTER INDIAN OCEAN TSUNAMI DISASTER DUE TO THE 2004 SUMATRA EARTHQUAKE, Journal of Architecture and Building Science, Architectural Institute of Japan, 13: 25, 337-340.