Cost-effective Seismic Isolation Retrofit of Heritage Cathedrals in Haiti

H. Kit Miyamoto[1] and Amir SJ Gilani[2]

[1] President, Miyamoto International, Inc. 1450 Halyard Drive, West Sacramento, CA 95691; email: kit@miyamotointernational.com

[2] Manager Earthquake Engineering, Miyamoto International, Inc. 1450 Halyard Drive West Sacramento, CA 95691; email: agilani@miyamotointernational.com

ABSTRACT

In the past earthquakes, heritage buildings have sustained severe damage and collapse in recent earthquakes, including in Italy (2009), Haiti (2010) and New Zealand (2011). For these buildings, the main vertical and lateral load bearing members are typically use variations of unreinforced masonry stone/rubble walls. These walls have little ductility and are susceptible to in-plane and out-of-plane failures that can result in building collapse. The situation is more pronounced in Haiti for heritage structures due to poor quality of design and workmanship. Heritage buildings were significantly damages in Haiti in past earthquakes (including the 2010 event). A proposed mitigation strategy combining seismic isolation and superstructure intervention was used to upgrade selected cathedrals in Haiti. The proposed method significantly reduces the level of seismic excitation acting on the existing walls and limits the superstructure retrofit, and thus preserves the historical features of the structures. Application of this technique to two cathedrals in Haiti is presented.

INTRODUCTION

Building description. Saint John Baptist Cathedral of was originally constructed in 1880 and is one of the oldest Cathedrals in Miragoane— a coastal town approximately 80 km west of Port-au-Prince, the capital of Haiti. Figure 1 shows a photograph of the building looking east. Saint Jacques et Saint Philippe Cathedral of Jacmel; see Figure 2 was originally constructed in 1859 and is one of the oldest Cathedrals in Jacmel— a coastal town approximately 80 km southwest of Port-au-Prince, the capital of Haiti.

The buildings were constructed using concrete floors with an unreinforced masonry and stone walls over stone masonry foundations. The roof structures were assembled with trusses that combine both wood and steel. The roofs are supported by the walls on the exterior and by uniformly placed columns along the interior. The front entrances of the cathedral have bell towers high. The tower is constructed with steel frames above the walls.

Both Cathedrals suffered minor damage, primarily minor cracking during the 2010 Haiti Earthquake. The damage to the building was minor because they were not located near the epicenter of the 2010 earthquake

Figure 1. Miragoane Cathedral   **Figure 2. Jacmel Cathedral**

SEISMIC EVALUATION AND RETROFIT

Overview. ASCE/SEI 41 (2006) served as the principal document used for retrofit evaluation. To achieve the design objectives and parameters, it was proposed to seismically isolate the building. This retrofit option was selected because it provides reliable seismic performance, while preserving the historical features of this cultural heritage building and minimizing retrofit of the superstructure. For historical or essential facilities, base isolation provides an attractive retrofit option (De Luca, et al 2000). Using this option, alterations of the superstructure is significantly reduced or eliminated.

Performance objectives. For the Cathedral, the ASCE 41 dual basic safety objectives were used. The seismic hazard coefficients for the site were obtained from the USGS (USGS 2012) are listed in Table 1.

Table 1.   Site seismicity for Cathedrals

Cathedral	Ss, g	S1, g
Miragoane	1.62	0.6
Jacmel	0.82	0.29

The geotechnical reports indicate that the cathedrals were built on limestone rock with an allowable bearing pressure of 1 MPa. The site condition was classified as soil class C and D for the two structures, respectively, using the data from the 2012 log of boring data.

Seismic isolation system. The isolation system parameters were chosen to obtain an approximate effective period of 3 to 4 sec. and equivalent supplementary damping of 30% at MCE. Given, the large shift in period, and additional damping, it is expected that only minor retrofit of the URSM walls would be required. The isolation plane is selected to occur just below the ground level of the buildings. The isolators will consist of a combination of 54 and 69 bearings for the Miragoane and Jacmel cathedrals. The geometric arrangement of the isolators has been selected to preserve the current load path in the URSM walls to avoid introducing additional concentrated loads to these vulnerable components (Figure 3). To install the isolators, the existing walls will be reinforced either side by permanent shoring beams, above and below the isolation plane. Next, a wall section will be removed and isolators installed. Finally, the remaining wall is cut in order to complete the isolation plane; see Figure 3.


Elevation   Plan (Jacmel)

Figure 3.   Typical detail of isolation plane

Structural load path intervention. The cathedrals in their existing configuration lack a well-defined load path for seismic forces. For example, the existing floors are not designed or detailed to serve as diaphragms and they do not have adequate connection to the perimeter walls to transfer lateral forces to these vertical members. In the absence of such load path, the vulnerable unreinforced walls will act as cantilevers, (unsupported at the top) and are susceptible to out-of-plane failure. For the seismic isolation system to be effective, this type of failure need to be precluded. In the United States, this type of failure is mitigated and the seismic load path is developed by addition of either wood or concrete diaphragms to the existing buildings. Since such approach was not feasible in Haiti, the strengthening was provided by a series of steel rods and beams (channels and angles) serve to connect the wall elements and provide horizontal bracing (diaphragm) and vertical bracing. The horizontal bracing prevent out of plane mechanisms and connect the internal columns to the external walls. Such approach has been used extensively in Europe and especially in Italy and Greece (Pezzullo et al 1992) for retrofit of historic buildings.

Figure 4 presents the plan and elevation view of the cathedrals showing the added steel members. Less intervention was required for the Jacmel Cathedral since it is subjected to smaller seismic demand. As shown in the figures steel members are

added: a) Horizontal tie-down steel rods are added to the building to connect the perimeter walls in both directions, b) System of steel truss works is added to provide diaphragm action in plane and vertical bracing, c) Bracing is added to reinforce the tower and to connect this segment to the rest of the cathedrals, d) Vertical tie-down rods are added to reinforce the walls at tower base and to improve its flexural capacity, and e) Steel longitudinal reinforcement is added to the tower walls.

STEEL BRACING - ELEV. +9.22

STEEL RODS - ELEV. +7.20

— RODS
■ STEEL BEAMS

Miragoane Cathedral   Jacmel Cathedral

Figure 4.   Typical structural intervention details

STRUCTURAL CAPACITY OF THE WALLS

The Cathedrals' unreinforced stone masonry (URSM) walls are the load bearing elements resisting the applied vertical and lateral load applied to the building. Figure 5 depicts exposed sections of the walls with the wall plaster removed for investigation for the two structures. The composition of the wall is that of unreinforced masonry with irregular-shaped stones or with rectangular-shaped stones and debris placed in the mortar

Irregular-shaped stones placed in the mortar   Rectangular-shaped stone and debris in mortar

Figure 5. Typical composition of exposed unreinforced masonry stone walls

The nominal strength of the URSM walls was based on the provisions of the Italian seismic code for unreinforced walls (MPW 2008). The code provides average tabulated values for different types of masonry. The tabulated average values were developed based on the material data available from the large pool of historical buildings in Italy. The URSM walls have the lowest mechanical properties of approximately 1.0 MPa for compressive strength

Strength of URSM walls.   The addition of the tie rods and steel members increase the capacity of the existing walls. This effect was accounted for in calculation of the in-plane and out-of-plane strength of these walls. Linear (code-based) and nonlinear (static pushover) analyses methods can be used to determine the in-plane strength of the walls. The equilibrium kinematic approach (see for example Varela-Rivera et al 2011) was used to determine the out-of-plane capacity of the walls.

Out-of-plane capacity of walls. The wall failure in the original configuration will be comprised of the rigid motion (rocking) of the wall about its base; see Figure 6. This kinematic condition is possible since the top of the wall is not attached to a diaphragm. The lateral load (acceleration) required to initiate failure is resisted by the vertical load acting on the wall. Once the steel members are added, the diaphragm action excludes this mode of failure. Instead, the failure mechanism will include formation of a hinge along the height of the wall (see Figure 6). A larger lateral force (acceleration) will be required to initiate this higher mode failure. In addition, the tie-down rods provide additional resistance to overturning and thus serve to increase the lateral load required to initiate out-of-plane failure of walls (Ismail and Ingham, 2012).

Figure 6. **Out-of-plane failure modes for a typical wall segment**

The key parameter for development of the out-of-plane strength is the lateral acceleration at the base of the wall and perpendicular to its plane that initiates failure. The computed capacities are further adjusted by two factors: Knowledge factor to account for uncertainties in material properties, construction details, and geometric characteristics. Behavior factor to account that the limited ductility of the walls and constraint by adjacent elements to provide restraint to the out-of-plane rotation of the wall segment under consideration. Equilibrium kinematic analyses of various walls of the two cathedral were conducted. Table 2 summarizes the findings. . As long as the isolated buildings acceleration demands are less than the governing values, out-of-plane failure will not occur.

Table 2.   Computed out-of-plane capacity (g) of Cathedral walls

Wall segment	Miragoane	Jacmel
Typ. between windows	0.39	0.19
Transept end wall	0.25	0.19
Central walls	0.44	0.26
Apse	0.82	0.21
Upper masonry above windows	0.73	0.20
Upper transept end wall	1.45	0.19
Bell tower	0.52	0.21

In-plane capacity walls. For the Miragoane Cathedral, the walls at the perimeter of the bell tower (see **Error! Reference source not found.**) are strengthened by adding eight (8) #5 (16 mm) reinforcement on each side. Holes will be drilled the height of the wall and vertical (longitudinal) reinforcement will be grouted in the holes. The reinforcement will be hooked at the base into the foundation to ensure that the reinforcing bars are developed and thus the full moment capacity of the walls can be achieved.

Cross-sectional analysis was conducted to develop the axial force-bending moment interaction diagram for the bell tower and main cathedral walls The capacity of the bell tower walls was determined using static pushover analysis using plastic hinges whose properties were obtained from interaction analysis and program 3Muri (S.T.A. Data 2012). Both flexural and shear failure modes were accounted for in the nonlinear analysis. The observation of damages on existing structures has led to the definition of masonry as a macro-element that captures the shear behavior in its central part and the buckling behavior in the outlying areas. The kinematic model used is described by eight degrees of freedom: the six components of displacement of the end nodes and the two components of the macro-element. The overturning mechanism of the panel, caused by the absence of a significant tensile strength of the material, is represented assuming elastic contact in interfaces, while the mechanism of shear failure is schematized considering a state of uniform tension in the central module. Maximum deformations (drift) acceptable for the panels are settled to define the collapse mechanism, due to the mechanisms of shear and bending.

Shown in Figure 7 and Figure 8 are the state of the cathedrals at their limit state. In the figures:

- Green denote wall segments that remain elastic
- Pink corresponds to flexural yielding
- Red designates flexural failure
- Ivory indicates shear yielding
- Light blue represents traction failure

For the cathedrals, no shear failure were developed and limit state was reached when walls reach their ductile flexural capacity. The failure states were reached at a base spectral acceleration of 0.12 and 0.16 g, respectively. The progression of the nonlinear response in is listed in Table 3.

Table 3.　　　Progression of nonlinear response in the cathedrals

| State	Miragoane	Jacmel
Flexural yielding , g	0.04	0.09
Shear yielding, g	0.05	0.09
Flexural failure, g	0.10	0.13
limit state, g	0.12	0.16

Mathematical model

Mathematical model

Pushover results
**Figure 7. Miragoane Cathedral**

Pushover results
Figure 8. Jacmel Cathedral

ANALYTICAL MODEL AND RESULTS

Overview.   Three-dimensional analytical model of the cathedrals were prepared; see Figure 9. The isolation system and new steel members are highlighted for clarity. The total inertial mass of the structure is estimated at 2,800 and 3,100 Mg, respectively.

Miragoane

Jacmel
Figure 9. Analytical model of the building

Drift ratios. Table 4 presents the computed story drift ratios above the isolation. The maximum story drift ratios are 0.42% and 0.49% ate the DE and MCE levels, respectively. The maximum computed drifts were: Miragoane 0.11% and Jacmel 0.13%

Table 4. **Computed story drift ratios, Miragoane**

Story	DE		MCE	
	X-	Y-	X-	Y-
TOWER ROOF7	0.11%	0.05%	0.12%	0.06%
TOWER FLR6	0.10%	0.06%	0.11%	0.07%
HIGH ROOF5-1	0.09%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%
HIGH ROOF5	0.30%	0.20%	0.34%	0.25%
ROOF4	0.14%	0.20%	0.17%	0.27%
ROOF3	0.16%	0.24%	0.19%	0.31%
MEZZANINE2	0.24%	0.26%	0.29%	0.30%
LOW ROOF1	0.20%	0.42%	0.25%	0.49%

For unreinforced masonry non-infill walls, ASCE 41 (ASCE 2006) limits drift ratios to 0.6% and 1% for life safety and collapse prevention, respectively. Therefore, for the retrofitted structure, at both DE and MCE levels, performance of between IO and LS are obtained

Story shear. Figure 10 and Figure 11 present the distribution of shear force (normalized with respect to the building seismic mass) along the height of the structures. The effective base shear for the two buildings are approximately 12% and 7% g, respectively at the DE intensity. The addition of the isolation system has served to significantly reduce the demand on the structure.



Figure 10. Story shear, Miragoane

Figure 11. Story shear, Jacmel

Out-of-plane accelerations. The out-of-plane accelerations at the ground slab and roof for Miragoane cathedral are listed in Table 5. The first column shows the capacity values computed from kinematic analysis. Columns 2 and 3 of the table show the computed demand at DE and MCE intensities. The computed demands at

both DE and MCE are less than the capacity. In other words, no out-of-plane failure is anticipated even at the MCE.

Table 5.   Out-of-plane accelerations at wall base, Miragoane

Level	Capacity, g	Demand, g	
		DE	MCE
Ground slab (0.6 m)	0.25	0.08	0.11
Roof 3 (9.9 m)	0.52	0.10	0.13

Response of the isolation system.   Figure 12 presents the force-deformation response of a typical isolator from a MCE analysis. Also shown in the figure are the nominal bi-linear backbone curve of the isolator obtained from the manufacturer data. It is seen that the loading and unloading response closely track the nominal response. Figure 13 presents the bi-direction MCE displacement response of a typical isolator. Also shown in the figure is the displacement limit (500 mm) as specified by the manufacturer. As seen, the isolator MCE displacements are less than the capacity.


**Figure 12. Typical isolator response**   **Figure 13. Bi-directional response**

CONCLUSIONS

The Miragoane and Jacmel Cathedrals were constructed of nonductile URSM walls and do not meet the current code requirements for seismic performance. The structures are being retrofitted with an isolation system and strengthening measures to improve their load path and the out-of-plane capacity of the walls.

- Analysis showed that the retrofit including the addition of the isolation system will significantly reduce the story drifts, accelerations, and shear.
- Steel tie-downs significantly increase the out-of-plane capacity of the walls. Truss assemblage of steel members provided a reliable load path for seismic forces. Added reinforcing steel increased the flexural capacity of the tower bell walls.
- The isolation retrofit will significantly reduce the demand (drift and

acceleration) on the URSM walls and the unreduced demand on the walls was reduced below member capacities

REFERENCES

ASCE/SEI 41-06 (2006), *Seismic Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings*, American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA.

De Luca, A. , Mele, E., , Molina, J., Verzeletti, G,, and Pintos, A.V. (2000) *The retrofit of historic buildings through seismic isolation: Results of pseudodynamic tests on a full-scale specimen*, proceedings of the 12th World Conference in Earthquake Engineering, Auckland, New Zealand

Ismail, N. and Ingham, J.M. (2012) *Cyclic Out-of-Plane Behavior of Slender Clay Brick Masonry Walls Seismically Strengthened Using Posttensioning,* Vol 138 No 10 pp 1255-1266, Journal of Structural Engineering, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Ralston, VA, United States.

Ministry of Public Works (MPW) (2008) *Instructions for the application of Italian Building Code DM,* Rome Italy

Pezzullo, D., Cavuoto, F;, De Cunzo, M;, Del Giudice, M. (1992) *Seismic retrofit of historical buildings*, proceedings of the 10th World Conference in Earthquake Engineering, Barcelona, Spain

Simões, A. Gago, A. Lopes R. and. Bento M. (2012) *Characterization of Old Masonry Walls: Flat-Jack Method* proceedings of the 15th World Conference in Earthquake Engineering, Lisbon, Portugal.

S.T.A. Data (2012). Lagomarsino, S. Penna, A, Galasco, A., and Cattari S., (2012) *3Muri; The calculation of masonry and checks local* Turin, Italy.

USGS (2012) United States geological Survey https://geohazards.usgs.gov/secure/designmaps/ww/signup.php

Varela-Rivera, JL, Navarrete-Macias, D, Fernandez-Baqueiro, L.E., and Moreno, E.I., (2011) *Out-of-plane behaviour of confined masonry wall*s, Vol 33, pp 1734-1741, Journal of Engineering Structures, Elsevier Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Netherlands.