Chapter 6 on Tsunami Loads and Effects in ASCE 7-16 Design Provisions and the use of the Energy Grade Line Analysis

> Gary Y.K. Chock, S.E. gchock@martinchock.com Tsunami Loads and Effects Subcommittee Chair May 2015

ASCE 7 Chapter 6- Tsunami Loads and Effects

- 6.1 General Requirements
- 6.2-6.3 Definitions, Symbols and Notation
- 6.4 Tsunami Risk Categories
- 6.5 Analysis of Design Inundation Depth and Velocity
- 6.6 Inundation Depth and Flow Velocity Based on Runup
- 6.7 Inundation Depth and Flow Velocity Based on Site-Specific Probabilistic Tsunami Hazard Analysis
- 6.8 Structural Design Procedures for Tsunami Effects
- 6.9 Hydrostatic Loads
- 6.10 Hydrodynamic Loads
- 6.11 Debris Impact Loads
- 6.12 Foundation Design
- 6.13 Structural Countermeasures for Tsunami Loading
- 6.14 Tsunami Vertical Evacuation Refuge Structures
- 6.15 Designated Nonstructural Systems
- 6.16 Non-Building Structures

MCT and Tsunami Design Zone

- The Maximum Considered Tsunami (MCT) has a 2% probability of being exceeded in a 50-year period, or a ~2500 year average return period.
- The Maximum Considered Tsunami is the design basis event, characterized by the inundation depths and flow velocities at the stages of in-flow and outflow most critical to the structure.

The Tsunami Design Zone is the area vulnerable to being flooded or inundated by the Maximum Considered Tsunami. The runup for this hazard probability is used to define a Tsunami Design Zone map.

Basic Lessons for Design of Buildings from Past Tsunami

- While structures of all material types can be subject to general and progressive collapse during tsunami, but it is feasible to design certain buildings to withstand tsunami events
- Mid-rise and larger buildings with robust structural systems survive.
- Seismic design has significant benefits to tsunami resistance of the lateral-force-resisting system.
- Local structural components may need local "enhanced resistance
- Foundation system should consider uplift and scour effects particularly at corners.

Target Reliabilities of the ASCE Tsunami Design Provisions

		Tsunami Risk Category II I = 1.0	Tsunami Risk Category III I = 1.25	Tsunami Risk Category IV I = 1.25	Tsunami Vertical Evacuation Refuge RC IV I = 1.25 & 1.3h _n
Average Reliabilities	Reliability index, β	2.74	2.87	3.03	3.68
	P _{f 50-year}	0.31%	0.21%	0.13%	0.05%
Component Failure, conditional given the MCT	Reliability index, β	1.44	1.65	1.92	2.43
	Probability of initiating a life- endangering failure	7.5%	5.0%	2.5%	0.75%

Tsunami Flow Characteristics

- Near constant velocity over land, top to bottom, with very rapidly rising depth; Unlike a storm surge; there is no stillwater
- Wave period ranges between 30 minutes to 45 minutes for each wave in a series; shoaling leads to nearshore amplitude typically being amplified to several times the offshore amplitude; fluid forces must be considered forcesustained actions
- Flow reversal

Two approaches to determine depth and flow velocity

- Flow parameters based on pre-calculated runup from the maps (the Energy Grade Line Analysis)
- Flow parameters based on a Site-Specific Probabilistic Hazard Analysis

Inundation Depth and Flow Velocity Analysis Procedures where Runup is mapped

Analysis	Tsunami Risk Category (TRC) Structure Classification								
Procedure using the Tsunami Design Zone Map	TRC II	TRC III	TRC IV (excluding TVERS)	TRC IV - Tsunami Vertical Evacuation Refuge Shelter (TVERS)					
Energy Grade Line Analysis	v	V	~	V					
Site-Specific Analysis	Permitted;	Permitted;	✓ Required if EGLA inundation depth ≥ 12 ft (3.7 m)*	•					

indicates a required procedure

- * MCT inundation depth including sea level rise component
- A "floor value" of either 90% or 75% of the Energy Grade Line calculated from the runup is maintained based on terrain roughness (urban - 90%, other roughnesses – 75%)

Offshore Tsunami Amplitude and Period for the Maximum Considered Tsunami at Monterey California



Predominant Probabilistic Sources for Monterey, CA

sources are primarily Alaska, East Aleutian, and Kuriles 2500 yr disaggregation – 238.000/ 36.580



9

Tsunami Design Zone - Monterey

Inundation Depth and Flow Velocity Based on Runup

- Energy Grade Line Analysis
 - Incremental analysis of hydraulic head starting from runup point
 - Calculation based on simple hydraulics using Manning's roughness coefficients

$$E_{g,i+1} = E_{g,i} - \left[\phi_i + s_i\right] \Delta X_i$$

Validated to be conservative through field data & 36,000 numerical simulations yielding 700,000 data points



Monterey, California – Example Transect



Obtain topographic elevation profile from a Digital Elevation Model (not GE!)

Use the transect data to compute the slope and distance along incremental segments

Assign Manning's n



Energy Grade Line Analysis done on a Spreadsheet Manning's Roughness, *n*, for Energy Grade Line Analysis

Description of Frictional Surface	n
Coastal water nearshore bottom friction	0.025 to 0.03
Open land / field	0.025
All other cases	0.03
Buildings of at least urban density	0.04

Transect	Profile			STEP 3	STEP 1	STEP 4	STEP 5	STEP 6		Calc	ulate		
STEP 2		STE	EP 3	Calculate	Input	Calculate	Calculate	Eq. 6.6.2-2	Solution for Er	ergy Head, Depth, V	elocity, and Inu	ndation Elevation	
Inp	ut	Calc	ulate	Ground	Manning		Froude number	Friction	10000				
				slope	Coefficient		Eq. 6.6.2-3	Slope				_	
×i	Zį	Δx	Δz	φi	n,	x/x _R	Fn	Si	E _{gi} Energy Head	h, inundation depth	u,	Check Section 6.6.1 u _{min} for hydrodynamic	Inundation Elevation h _i +z
(ft)	(ft)								(ft)	(ft)	(ft/sec)	forces	(ft)
Obtain Tra Points from Topograph Elevation 1	insect n a Nic Digital Model	Determine slope incr of the seg the direct incoming	e the ements pment in on of flow	Based on Δz/Δx	Based on Table 6.6-1	For determining Froude Number along	Based on proportion of distance along the transect to the inundation limit	$g f_n^2 / ((1.49/n)^2 h_{r_1}^{1/3})$	Hydraulic Head at point	Inundation depth at point i	Maximum overland flow velocity at point /	min. flow velocity shall	Water Elevation
		$\Delta \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{i+1}$	∆z _i = z z _{i +1}	r	input by segment	the transect	(1- x,/x _R) ^{1/2}	or (u) ² /((1.49/n) ² h ₋₁ ⁴³)	E _{g,i-1} + (φi + si) Δxi	$h_i = E_{g,i} / (1+0.5 F_n^2)$	= F _e v(gh)	10 ft/s and \leq the lessor of: 1.5 (gh _i) ^{1/2} and 50 ft/s	add the ground elevation and the inundation depth

The Energy Grade Line Analysis stepwise procedure consists of the following steps:

- 1. Obtain the Runup and Inundation Limit values from the Tsunami Design Map
- Approximate the principal topographic transect by a series of x-z grid coordinates defining a series of segmented slopes;
 - x is the distance inland from the shoreline to the point and z is the ground elevation of the point
- 3. Compute the topographic slope, φ_i , of each segment as the ratio of the increments of elevation and distance from point to point in the direction of the incoming flow.
- 4. Obtain the Manning's Coefficient, n, from Table 6.6-1 for each segment based on terrain analysis.
- 5. Compute the Froude number at each point on the transect using Equation 6.6.2-3.
- 6. Start at the point of Runup with a boundary condition of E R =0 at the point of Runup and
- 7. Select a nominally small value of inundation depth (~0.1 ft.) h_R at the point of Runup
- 8. Calculate the hydraulic friction slope , s₁, using Equation 6.6.2-2
- Compute the hydraulic energy head E i+1 from Equation 6.6.2-1 at successive points towards the shoreline
- 10. Calculate the inundation depth h int from the hydraulic energy E int
- 11. Using the definition of Froude number, determine the velocity u₁₊₁. Check against the minimum flow velocity required by Section 6.6.1.
- 12. Repeat through the transect until the h and u are calculated at the site. These are used as the maximum inundation depth , h max, and maximum velocity , u max, at the site.

30				_	30			6					Energy N	lethod	
25	Energy Method	-		_	25	-	-	-		1	25				
20	0			_	E 20	-	_		\sim		× 20				
15	Constant 1825			-	015 IS	~	~	-	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	Ground Elevation	₹ 15 ·				
10	-			_	a 10	1	San Accord			-Energy Method"	10 10				_
5 - Energy Method		\sim	1		u 5	1				· Starting Point	P 5				8
0					0		4772 47	-	1000 1300 1404	1000	0		-		
0 200 400 600 Distan	ce inland from shorel	line (ft)	0 1800	2000		0 200	Dist	ance Inla	and from Shoreline	(ft)	2000	0 200 400	500 800 Distance Inla	1000 1200 1400 nd from Shoreline	(ft) 1600 1800
0.000		Enter Tra	ansect P	Profile		Ground				Friction	Solution for	Energy Head, De	oth, Veloci	ty	Inundation
						slope	Manning		Froude number	Slope			0.0 ₁₁ 11 1	5. 0010 2000	Elevation
	Townset esists										E.	inundation	U,	u _{min} for	
Call and the second second	toward	1							F _{ii} (see note 2)		Energy	depth (see note		forces §6.6.1	
EXAMPLE	ocean starting	X,	Z,	Δx _i	Δz,	φί	ni	x/x _R		S,	Head	1)		101000 30:011	h+z
	at the Runup	(ft)	(ft)	(ft)	(ft)	2441	430.00	1			(ft)	(ft)	(ft/sec)	(ft/sec)	(ft)
100 M 100 M	Point			10000			00532	125/2020	0.000	The submer		- 20	100		1000
iput		1505.5	26.87			0.000.4	0.030	1.000	0.000	0.000000	0.0	0.10	0.0		26.87
f Runun Point	2	1400.1	24.53	16.4	1.14	0.0694	0.030	0.989	0.104	0.000273	2.35	2.32	1.3	10.0	26.87
reality rount	3	1456.2	23.11	16.4	1.42	0.0865	0.030	0.967	0.181	0.000323	3.77	3.71	2.0	10.0	26.82
	4	1439.8	21.69	16.4	1.42	0.0965	0.030	0.956	0.209	0.000369	5.20	5.09	2.7	10.0	26.78
this location	0	1423.4	21.03	16.4	0.66	0.0402	0.030	0.945	0.234	0.000416	5.87	5.71	3.2	10.0	26.74
VD-00 4.70 = MHVV	7	1390.6	20.66	16.4	-0.13	-0.0079	0.030	0.935	0.256	0.000461	6.25	5.90	3.6	10.0	26.69
	8	1374.1	21.29	16.4	-0.50	-0.0305	0.030	0.913	0.295	0.000634	5.64	5.40	3.9	10.0	26.69
	9	1357.7	21.92	16.4	-0.63	-0.0383	0.030	0.902	0.313	0.000735	5.02	4.78	3.9	10.0	26,70
	10	1341.3	22.55	16.4	-0.63	-0.0384	0.030	0.891	0.330	0.000850	4.40	4.17	3.8	10.0	26.72
	11	1324.9	22.89	16.4	-0.34	-0.0207	0.030	0.880	0.346	0.000977	4.08	3.85	3.9	10.0	25.74
	12	1308.5	22.67	16.4	0.22	0.0134	0.030	0.869	0.362	0.001095	4.32	4.05	4.1	10.0	26.72
	14	1275.6	21.55	16.4	0.87	0.0530	0.030	0.847	0.391	0.001234	5.47	5.09	5.0	10.0	26.64
	15	1259.2	20.76	16.4	0.79	0.0481	0.030	0.836	0.404	0.001249	6.29	5.81	5.5	10.0	26.57
	16	1242.8	19.76	16.4	1.00	0.0609	0.030	0.825	0.418	0.001275	7.31	6.72	6.1	10.0	26.48
	17	1226.4	18.87	16.4	0.89	0.0542	0.030	0.815	0.431	0.001291	8.22	7.52	6.7	10.0	26.39
	10 0	1209.9	18.13	16.4	0.74	0.0451	0.030	0.804	0.443	0.001317	0.96	8.18	7.2	10.0	26.31
	20 2	1177.1	16.76	16.4	0.71	0.0432	0.030	0.782	0.467	0.001392	10.39	9.37	8.1	10.0	26.13
	21 🗳	1160.7	16.06	16.4	0.70	0.0426	0.030	0.771	0.479	0.001429	11.12	9.97	8.6	10.0	26.03
	22 6	1144.2	15.56	16.4	0.50	0.0305	0.030	0.760	0.490	0.001466	11.64	10.39	9.0	10.0	25.95
	23 6	1127.8	15.27	16.4	0.29	0.0177	0.030	0.749	0.501	0.001512	11.96	10.62	9.3	10.0	25.89
	24 10	1111.4	15.11	10.4	0.16	0.009/	0.030	0.738	0.512	0.001567	12.14	10.74	9.5	10.0	25,85
	26 5	1078.6	14.93	16.4	0.14	0.0085	0.030	0.716	0.533	0.001691	12.38	10.84	9.9	10.0	25.77
xes:	27 5	1052.1	15.04	16.4	-0.11	-0.0067	0.030	0.706	0.543	0.001751	12.30	10.72	10.1	10.1	25.76
	28 🛱	1045.7	15.05	16.4	-0.01	-0.0005	0.030	0.695	0.553	0.001823	12.32	10.68	10.3	10.3	25,73
Structures located entirely	29 8	1029.3	15.09	16.4	-0.04	-0.0024	0.030	0.684	0.562	0.001890	12.31	10.63	10.4	10,4	25.72
inin inundation depths of 3	π 30 <u>9</u>	1012.9	15.01	16.4	0.08	0.0049	0.030	0.673	0.572	0.001958	12.42	10.67	10.6	10.6	25.68
inamis	32 10	980.0	15.30	16.4	-0.18	-0.0110	0.030	0.651	0.591	0.002093	12.20	10.38	10.8	10.8	25.66
	33 4	963.6	15.11	16.4	0.19	0.0116	0.030	0.640	0.600	0.002171	12.42	10.53	11.0	11.0	25.64
Scour depth is permitted to	> 34 힡	947.2	14.81	16.4	0.30	0.0183	0.030	0.629	0.609	0.002226	12.76	10.76	11.3	11.3	25.57
reduced per Section	35 2	930.8	14.49	16.4	0.32	0.0195	0.030	0.618	0.618	0.002275	13.12	11.01	11.6	11.6	25.50
2.2.0.1, where the iculated Eroude number in	36 E	914.4	14.16	16.4	0.33	0.0201	0.030	0.607	0.627	0.002322	13.48	11.27	11.9	11.9	25.43
	51 E	001.0	13.76	16.4	0.15	0.0091	0.030	0.586	0.644	0.002419	13.96	11.57	12.4	12.4	25.33
is than 0.5	38 0	001.04	and the second second		the second se					and the second sec					
is than 0.5	38 eta 39 ta	865.1	13.65	16.4	0.11	0.0067	0.030	0.575	0.652	0.002476	14.11	11.64	12.6	12.6	25.29
as than 0.5	38 eten 39 40	865.1 848.7	13.65	16.4 15.4	0.11	0.0067	0.030	0.575	0.652 0.661	0.002476 0.002534	14.11 14.13	11.64 11.60	12.6 12.8	12.6 12.8	25.29
ss than 0.5	38 39 40 41 29 41 41	865.1 848.7 832.3	13.65 13.67 13.64	16.4 16.4 16.4	0.11	0.0067	0.030 0.030 0.030	0.575 0.564 0.553	0.652 0.661 0.669	0.002476 0.002534 0.002600	14.11 14.13 14.21	11.64 11.60 11.61	12.6 12.8 12.9	12.6 12.8 12.9	25.29 25.27 25.25

EGLA results

Inundation depth (*h_i*) profile from Energy Grade Line analysis

Inundation elevation $(h_i + z_i)$ profile from Energy Grade Line analysis





Flow velocity (*u_i*) profile from Energy Grade Line analysis

Also see Robertson, I.N. (2016) Tsunami Loads and Effects: Guide to the Tsunami Design Provisions of ASCE 7-16, ASCE Publications



Energy Grade Line Analysis comparisons





Per Section 6.6.1, calculated flow velocity shall not be taken less than 10 ft/s (3.0 m/s) and need not be taken greater than the lesser of 1.5 (ghmax)1/2 and 50 ft/s (15.2 m/s)17

Tsunami Design Zone – Vicinity of Ocosta, WA

At sites with overwash, reference points of inundation depth are given

 V124.23° W124.21° W124.19° W124.17° W124.15° W124.13° W124.11° W124.0
 Flow Depth: 19.3 ft Lat: 46.86455 Lon: -124.1052
 W124.03° W12

N46.93

N46.91

"Where the maximum topographic elevation along the topographic transect between the shoreline and the inundation limit is greater than the runup elevation,"

- Energy Grade Line Analysis "shall assume a runup elevation and horizontal inundation limit having at least 100% of the maximum topographic elevation along the topographic transect."
- At sites with overwash, final reference points of inundation depth may be placed on the axis of the higher terrain of the peninsula.



"Overwashed Peninsulas - Where the maximum topographic elevation along the topographic transect between the shoreline and the inundation limit is greater than the runup elevation,"

Energy Grade Line Analysis shall assume a runup elevation and horizontal inundation limit having at least 100% of the maximum topographic elevation along the topographic transect.





Load Cases

- Based on a prototypical time history of depth and flow velocity as a function of the maximum values determined from the Energy Grade Line Analysis
- Check 3 discrete governing stages of flow
- Load Case 1 is a maximum buoyancy check during initial flow



Tsunami-Specific Design Conditions

- Minimum Fluid Density prescribed with 10% increase accounting for debris-laden seawater
- Flow Amplification the Energy Grade Line Analysis includes an internal allowance for this, but a Site-Specific Analysis needs to include this effect explicitly
- Directionality of Flow variation of flow shall be considered +-22.5 degrees off the principal transect

Minimum Closure Ratio – accounts for the "piling-on" effect of copious tsunami debris to create more obstruction to flow than just the bare structure Section 6.8.3.3 Load Combinations [Strength Design] Principal Tsunami Forces and Effects shall be combined with other specified loads in accordance with the load combinations of Eq. 6.8.3.3-1:

 $0.9D + \mathbf{F}_{TSU} + 1.0 H_{TSU}$ (Eq. 6.8.3.3-1a) $1.2D + \mathbf{F}_{TSU} + 0.5L + 0.2S + 1.0 H_{TSU}$ (Eq. 6.3.3.3-1b)

where,

 F_{TSU} =tsunami load effect for incoming and receding directions of flow

 H_{TSU} = load due to tsunami-induced lateral foundation pressures developed under submerged conditions. Where the net effect of H_{TSU} counteracts the principal load effect, the load factor for H_{TSU} shall be 0.9.

Tsunami Loads and Effects

Hydrostatic Forces (equations of the form $k_{s}\rho_{sw}gh$) • Unbalanced Lateral Forces at initial flooding **Buoyant Uplift based on displaced volume** Residual Water Surcharge Loads on Elevated Floors Hydrodynamc Forces (equations of the form $\frac{1}{2} k_{s} \rho_{sw}(hu^2)$ Drag Forces – per drag coefficient C_d based on size and element Lateral Impulsive Forces of Tsunami Bores or Broad Walls: Factor of 1.5 Hydrodynamic Pressurization by Stagnated Flow – per Benoulli Shock pressure effect of entrapped bore – (this is a special case) Waterborne Debris Impact Forces (flow speed and √mass) Poles, passenger vehicles, medium boulders always applied Shipping containers, boats if structure is in proximity to hazard zone Extraordinary impacts of ships only where in proximity to Risk Category III & IV structures Scour Effects (mostly prescriptive based on flow depth)

Tsunami Design

Overall Lateral Force Resisting System

- Drag on entire structure
- Closure coefficient based on projected area of all structural elements below flow level, but not less than 0.7
- For SDC D, if $V_{Tsu} \leq 0.75 \Omega_o E_h$, then system okay

Tsunami Design

Component Design

Exterior Columns and Shear Walls

- Hydrodynamic drag including effects of debris damming ($C_{cx} = 0.7$)
- Debris Impact including orientation factor ($C_0 = 0.65$)
- Interior Columns and Shear Walls
 - Hydrodynamic drag *without* debris damming (therefore, interior shear walls are favorable)
 - No debris impact loads

Buoyancy

- At an exterior inundation depth not exceeding the maximum inundation depth nor the lesser of one-story or the height of the top of the first story windows, evaluate uplift conditions.
- Buoyancy shall also include the effect of air trapped below floors. All windows, except those designed for large missile wind-borne debris impact or blast loading, shall be permitted to be considered openings when the inundation depth reaches the top of the windows or the expected strength of the glazing, whichever is less.
- Exception: Load Case 1 need not be applied to Open Structures nor to structures where the soil properties or foundation and structural design prevents detrimental hydrostatic pressurization on the underside of the foundation and lowest structural slab.

Hydrodynamic Loads

 Formulations for detailed calculations on the building and for loads on components

Typically of the standard form drag (h- inundation depth and u – flow velocity for each load case)

 $f_{dx} = \frac{1}{2} \rho_s C_d C_{cx} B(hu^2)$

Adjustments for perforated and angled walls
 Uplift pressure equations for wall-slab recesses



Debris Impact Loads

Waterborne Debris Loads

- Utility poles/logs
- Passenger vehicles
- Tumbling boulders and concrete masses
- Shipping containers only where near ports and harbors
- Large vessels considered for Critical Facilities and Risk Category IV only where near such ports and harbors
- Can be considered a DUCTILITY-GOVERNED ACTION: Any action on a structural component characterized by post-elastic force versus deformation curve that has 1) sufficient ductility and 2) results from an impulsive short-term force that is not sustained

Types of Floating Debris Logs and Shipping Containers



Power poles and tree trunks <u>become floating logs</u>





Shipping containers float even when fully loaded



Conditions for which Design for Debris Impact are Evaluated

Debris	Buildings and Other Structures	Threshold Inundation depth			
Poles, logs, passenger vehicles	All	3 ft (0.91 m)			
Boulders and Concrete Debris	All	6 ft (1.8 m)			
Shipping Containers	All	3 ft (0.91 m)			
Ships and/or barges	Tsunami Risk Category III Critical Facilities and Category IV	12 ft (3.6 m)			

Debris Impact Force Nominal maximum impact force

$$F_{ni} = u_{\max} \sqrt{km_d}$$

Design force based on the importance factor and an orientation factor

$$F_i = I_{TSU}C_oF_{ni}$$

Impact duration

$$t_d = \frac{2m_d u_{\max}}{F_{ni}}$$

Typical durations are about 5 milli-sec

 Dynamic force capped based on yielding or crushing strength of debris (about 140k for shipping containers, 110 kips for logs and poles)

Site Hazard Assessment for Shipping Containers and Boats or Ships

- Point source of debris
 - Shipping container yards
 - Ports with barges/ships



Figure 6.11-1

 Approximate probabilistic site assessment procedure based on proximity and amount of potential floating objects

- Determine potential debris plan area
 - Number of containers * area of a container
- Determine concentration: area of debris/land area
- 2% concentration defines debris dispersion zone 33

Foundation Design

- Under-seepage Forces
- Loss of Strength
- Erosion
- Local Scour
- Plunging Scour (i.e., overtopping a wall)
- Design solutions involve scour protection or perimeter deep foundations

Figure 6.12-1 Local Scour Depth due to Sustained Flow and Pore Pressure Softening



Figure C6.12-1. Schematic of tsunami loading condition for a foundation element



Tsunami Vertical Evacuation Refuge Structures

 Tsunami Vertical Evacuation Refuge Structures -ASCE 7 Chapter 6 is intended to supersede both FEMA P646 structural guidelines and IBC Appendix M

Figure 6.14-1. Minimum Refuge Elevation



-Site-Specific Max. Considered Tsunami inundation elevation at the structure

Follow-up activities in 2015

- ASCE will be publishing *Tsunami Loads and Effects: Guide to the Tsunami Design Provisions of ASCE 7-16*, with many worked examples for RC II buildings (by Ian Robertson) and a subsequent second volume of design examples emphasizing RC III, RC IV, and nonbuilding critical facility structures (by Seth Thomas)
 - RC II buildings at various locations
 - Port Operations Facility
 - Protective Barrier for Fuel Tank Farm
 - Hospital for an isolated coastal community
 - Facility with Chemical Storage
 - Tsunami Vertical Evacuation Refuge Structure
 - Podium structure for a light-frame superstructure

Webinars and Seminars will also be provided through ASCE

Summary

- PTHA-based design criteria The method of Probabilistic Tsunami Hazard Analysis is consistent with probabilistic seismic hazard analysis in the treatment of uncertainty.
- Maximum Considered Tsunami 2500-year MRI
- The tsunami design provisions utilize probabilistic Offshore Tsunami Amplitude maps and Tsunami Design Zone inundation maps
- Procedures for tsunami inundation mapping are based on using these probabilistic values of Offshore Tsunami Amplitude
- Hydraulic analysis or site-specific inundation analysis to determine site design flow conditions: velocity, depth for at least three critical loading stages
- Fluid loads, debris loads, foundation demands

The ASCE Tsunami Loads and Effects Subcommittee Comments to: Gary Chock, Chair <u>gchock@martinchock.com</u>

