TABLE OF CONTENTS

| LIST | OF TA | BLES | vi |
|------|--------------------------|--|--------------|
| LIST | OF FI | GURES | viii |
| ACKN | NOWL | EDGEMENTS | xiv |
| CHAF | PTER 1 | 1: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 | Introdu | uction | 1 |
| 1.2 | Literat | ture Review | 4 |
| 1.3 | Applic 1.3.1 1.3.2 | cations Ship/Offshore applications Structural Applications | 7 7 11 |
| 1.4 | Motiva | ation of Present Work | 16 |
| 1.5 | Organ | ization of Dissertation | 18 |
| CHAI | PTER 2 | 2: MODELING OF SLOSHING | 20 |
| 2.1 | Introd | uction | 20 |
| | 2.1.1 | Numerical Modeling of TLDs | 21 |
| | 2.1.2 | Mechanical Modeling of TLDs | 22 |
| 2.2 | Sloshi | ng-Slamming (S2) Damper Analogy | 24 |
| | 2.2.1 | Liquid Sloshing | 24 |
| | 2.2.2 | Liquid Slamming | 25 |
| | 2.2.3 | Proposed Sloshing-Slamming (S2) Analogy | |
| | 2.2.4 | Numerical Study | |
| | 2.2.5 | Base Snear Force | |
| 2.3 | Impac | t Characteristics model | 34 |
| 2.4 | Equiva | alent Linear Models | |
| | 2.4.1 | Harmonic Linearization | |
| | 2.4.2 | Statistical Linearization | |

| 2.5 | Concluding Remarks | 40 |
|-----|---|----------|
| CHA | APTER 3: TUNED LIQUID COLUMN DAMPERS | 41 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 41 |
| 3.2 | Modeling of Tuned Liquid Column Dampers | 43 |
| | 3.2.1 Equivalent Linearization: | 44 |
| | 3.2.2 Accuracy of Equivalent linearization | 45 |
| 3.3 | Optimum Absorber Parameters | 47 |
| | 3.3.1 White Noise excitation | 50 |
| | 3.3.2 First Order Filter (FOF) | 53 |
| | 3.3.3 Second Order Filter (SOF) | 55 |
| | 3.3.4 Example | 56 |
| 3.4 | Multiple Tuned Liquid Column Dampers (MTLCDs) | 57 |
| | 3.4.1 Effect of Number of dampers | 59 |
| | 3.4.2 Effect of damping ratio of dampers | 59 |
| | 3.4.3 Effect of Frequency range | 60 |
| 3.5 | Concluding Remarks | 63 |
| CHA | APTER 4: BEAT PHENOMENON | 65 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 65 |
| 4.2 | Behavior of SDOF system with TLCD | |
| | 4.2.1 Case 1: Undamped Combined System | 68 |
| | 4.2.2 Case 2: Linearly Damped Structure with Undamped Secondary S | System71 |
| | 4.2.3 Case 3: Damped Primary and Secondary System | 74 |
| 4.3 | Experimental Verification | 79 |
| 4.4 | Concluding Remarks | 80 |
| CHA | APTER 5: SEMI-ACTIVE SYSTEMS AND APPLICATIONS | 81 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 81 |
| 5.2 | Gain-scheduled Control | 82 |
| 5.2 | 5.2.1 Determination of Optimum Headloss Coefficient | |
| 5 2 | Ambigations | |
| 5.5 | 5.3.1 Example 1: SDOF-TLCD system under random white poise | 00 86 |
| | 5.3.2 Example 2: Application to Offshore Structure | 80 88 |
| 5 1 | Clinned Ontimal System | |
| 3.4 | 5.4.1 Control Strategies | 92 |
| | | |

| | 5.4.2 Example 3: MDOF system under random wind loading | 99 |
|-----|--|----------------|
| | 5.4.3 Example 4: MDOF system under harmonic loading | 102 |
| 5.5 | Concluding Remarks | 106 |
| | | |
| CHA | APTER 6: TLD EXPERIMENTS | 108 |
| 6.1 | Introduction | 108 |
| 6.2 | Experimental Studies | 110 |
| 6.3 | System Identification | 112 |
| | 6.3.1 Nonlinear System Identification | 113 |
| | 6.3.2 Combined Structure-damper analysis | 116 |
| 6.4 | Impact Pressure Studies | 118 |
| | 6.4.1 Single-point pressure measurement | 119 |
| | 6.4.2 Multiple-point pressure measurements | |
| | 6.4.5 Shallow water versus deep water slosning | 125 |
| 65 | Usedware in the loop Simulation | 127 |
| 0.5 | 6.5.1 Experimental study | |
| 6.6 | Concluding Remarks | 131 |
| 0.0 | Conordaning recinaries | |
| СНА | APTER 7. TI CD EXPERIMENTS | 132 |
| 7 1 | Introduction | 132 |
| 7.1 | | 124 |
| 1.2 | 7.2.1 Effect of tuning ratio | 134 |
| | 7.2.2 Effect of damping | |
| | 7.2.3 Effect of amplitude of excitation | 138 |
| | 7.2.4 Equivalent damping | 140 |
| 7.3 | Experimental Validation | 143 |
| 7.4 | Concluding Remarks | 147 |
| | | |
| CHA | APTER 8: DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION AND RELL ISSUES | ABILITY 148 |
| 8.1 | Introduction | 148 |
| 8.2 | Comparison of various DVAs | 150 |
| | 8.2.1 Implementation comparisons | 150 |
| | 8.2.2 Cost comparison | 155 |
| 8.3 | Risk-based Decision Analysis | 157 |
| | | |

| | 8.3.1 | Decision analysis framework | 159 |
|----------|--------|------------------------------|-----|
| | 8.3.2 | Reliability Analysis | 162 |
| | 8.3.3 | Cost and Utility Analysis | 165 |
| | 8.3.4 | Risk-based Decision Analysis | 166 |
| 8.4 | Design | of Dampers | 167 |
| | 8.4.1 | Design Guidelines | 167 |
| | 8.4.2 | Control Strategy | 169 |
| | 8.4.3 | Design Procedure | 170 |
| | 8.4.4 | Technology | 174 |
| 8.5 | Conclu | uding Remarks | 176 |
| | | | |
| CHAF | PTER 9 |): CONCLUSIONS | 177 |
| | | | |
| APPENDIX | | | |
| | | | |
| REFE | RENC | ES | 184 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE 2.1 | Parameters of the model |
|-----------|--|
| TABLE 3.1 | Example forcing functions |
| TABLE 3.2 | Comparison of optimal parameters for TMD and TLCD52 |
| TABLE 3.3 | Optimum parameters for white noise excitation for different mass ratios.53 |
| TABLE 3.4 | Optimum absorber parameters for FOF for different parameter v_1 |
| TABLE 3.5 | Optimum absorber parameters for FOF for various mass ratios54 |
| TABLE 3.6 | Optimum absorber parameters for SOF for different values of b_1 |
| TABLE 3.7 | Optimum absorber parameters for SOF for various mass ratios57 |
| TABLE 3.8 | Optimum absorber parameters |
| TABLE 3.9 | Optimum parameters for MTLCD configurations |
| TABLE 5.1 | Comparison of different control strategies: Example 1 |
| TABLE 5.2 | Numerical parameters used: Example 2 |
| TABLE 5.3 | Comparison of various control strategies: Example 3101 |
| TABLE 5.4 | Comparison of various control strategies: Example 4106 |
| TABLE 6.1 | Time lag and impact influence factor for different sensor locations122 |
| TABLE 7.1 | Performance of semi-active system as compared to uncontrolled and passive system |

| TABLE 8.1 | Component comparison of different DVAs | 156 |
|-----------|---|-----|
| TABLE 8.2 | Comparison of different systems for varying wind conditions | 159 |
| TABLE 8.3 | Random Variables used in Reliability analysis | 164 |
| TABLE 8.4 | Probability of Failure under different wind speeds | 164 |
| TABLE 8.5 | Costs and Normalized Utility Analysis | 165 |
| TABLE 8.6 | Utility analysis based on the decision analysis | 166 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 1.1 | (a) Frahm anti-rolling tank (b) nutation dampers in satellite applications5 |
|-------------|--|
| Figure 1.2 | (a) Bi-directional TLCD (b) V-shaped TLCD7 |
| Figure 1.3 | Types of passive/ controllable-passive tanks for ships |
| Figure 1.4 | (a) Free surface damping tanks (b) Semi-active control for structure with open bottom tanks |
| Figure 1.5 | Aqua dampers (Courtesy: MCC Aqua damper literature)11 |
| Figure 1.6 | (a) Schematic of TLDs installed in SYPH (b) Actual installation in the building (taken from Tamura et al. 1995) |
| Figure 1.7 | (a) Liquid damper with pressure adjustment concept (b) photograph of Hotel Cosima, Tokyo |
| Figure 1.8 | Millennium tower: passive and active TLCD concept14 |
| Figure 1.9 | (a) Shanghai Financial Trade Center (b) 7 South Dearborn Project15 |
| Figure 1.10 | TLDs installed in chimneys16 |
| Figure 2.1 | (a) Equivalent mechanical model of sloshing liquid in a tank (b) Impact damper model |
| Figure 2.2 | Variation of (a) jump frequency and (b) damping ratio of the TLD with the base amplitude (<i>taken from Yu et. al 1999</i>)27 |
| Figure 2.3 | Frames from the sloshing experiments video at high amplitudes: a part of water moves as a lumped mass and impacts the container wall. (<i>Video Courtesy: Dr. D.A. Reed</i>) |
| Figure 2.4 | Schematic diagram of the proposed sloshing-slamming (S ²) analogy29 |

| Figure 2.5 | Comparison of experimental results with S2 simulation results: (a), (b): experimental results; (c), (d): simulation results for $\Omega = 1.0$ and 0.9 32 |
|-------------|---|
| Figure 2.6 | (a) schematic of the jump phenomenon (b)Variation of the non- dimensionalized base shear force with the frequency ratio. (<i>experimental</i> <i>results taken from Fujino et al. 1992</i>) |
| Figure 2.7 | Non dimensional interaction force curves for different η |
| Figure 3.1 | Schematic of the Structure-TLCD system |
| Figure 3.2 | Exact (Non-linear) and Equivalent Linearization results |
| Figure 3.3 | Time histories for $\xi = 75$ 46 |
| Figure 3.4 | Variation of dynamic magnification factor with the head-loss coefficient and frequency ratio for a TLCD |
| Figure 3.5 | Comparison of optimum absorber parameters for a TLCD with varying α and a TMD |
| Figure 3.6 | Transfer function of the filters and the primary system: (a) first order filters (b) second order filters |
| Figure 3.7 | MTLCD configuration |
| Figure 3.8 | Effect of number of dampers on the frequency response of SDOF-MTLCD system |
| Figure 3.9 | Effect of damping ratio of the dampers on the frequency response of SDOF-MTLCD system |
| Figure 3.10 | Effect of frequency range on the frequency response of SDOF-MTLCD system |
| Figure 4.1 | Different coupled system (a) Vibration absorber (b) Coupled penduli system (c) Electrical system (d) Fluid coupling within two cylinders66 |
| Figure 4.2 | Uncontrolled and Controlled response of a structure combined with (a) TLD (b) TLCD |
| Figure 4.3 | Different combined systems |

| Figure 4.4 | Phase plane portraits of the undamped coupled system |
|-------------|--|
| Figure 4.5 | Time histories of primary system displacement for $\alpha=0$ and $\alpha=0.6$ 70 |
| Figure 4.6 | Variation of ω_A and ω_B and α s a function of α |
| Figure 4.7 | Time histories of response for ζ_1 =0.005 and ζ_1 =0.0573 |
| Figure 4.8 | Anatomy of the damped response signature74 |
| Figure 4.9 | Time histories of response for ξ = 0.2, 2 and 5075 |
| Figure 4.10 | Modal frequencies and modal damping ratios of combined system as a function of the damping ratio of the TLCD76 |
| Figure 4.11 | Phase-plane 3D plots (a) uncoupled system (b) case 1: undamped system (c) case 2: system with damping in primary system only (d) case 3: system with damping in both primary and secondary systems |
| Figure 4.12 | Experimental setup for combined structure-TLCD system on a shaking table |
| Figure 4.13 | Experimental free vibration response with different orifice openings ($\theta = 0$ fully open) |
| Figure 5.1 | Gain scheduling concept |
| Figure 5.2 | Flowchart of the two algorithms (a) iterative method (b) direct method84 |
| Figure 5.3 | Iterative method (a) convergence of response quantities (b) optimum headloss coefficient |
| Figure 5.4 | Variation of optimum headloss coefficient with loading intensity: white noise excitation |
| Figure 5.5 | Example 1: SDOF system under random excitation |
| Figure 5.6 | (a) Single degree of freedom idealization of the offshore structure (b) Concept of Liquid Dampers in TLPs |
| Figure 5.7 | Optimal Absorber parameters as a function of loading conditions |

| Figure 5.8 | (a) Variation of Optimal headloss coefficient with loading conditions for different wave spectra (b) Spectra of structural acceleration at $U_{10}=20$ m/s for different ξ |
|-------------|--|
| Figure 5.9 | Semi-active TLCD-Structure combined system93 |
| Figure 5.10 | Schematic of the control system98 |
| Figure 5.11 | Schematic of 5DOF building with semi-active TLCD on top story100 |
| Figure 5.12 | Wind loads acting on each lumped mass101 |
| Figure 5.13 | Displacements and Acceleration of Top Level under various control strategies |
| Figure 5.14 | Variation of performance indices with maximum headloss coefficient 104 |
| Figure 5.15 | Displacement of Top Floor under various control strategies104 |
| Figure 5.16 | Variation of headloss coefficient with time105 |
| Figure 5.17 | Variation of RMS displacements, RMS accelerations, maximum story shear and maximum inter-story displacements105 |
| Figure 6.1 | (a) Schematic of the experimental setup (b) pressure sensor locations 110 |
| Figure 6.2 | Sample time-histories of the shear force at $A_e = 0.3$ cm and 2.0 cm 113 |
| Figure 6.3 | Nonlinear Optimization Scheme114 |
| Figure 6.4 | Curvefitting the parameters of the impact characteristics model115 |
| Figure 6.5 | (a) Experimental plots of non-dimensional sloshing force as a function of excitation frequency for different amplitudes (b) Simulated curves after optimization |
| Figure 6.6 | Response of the structure for different amplitudes117 |
| Figure 6.7 | Pressure time histories for various frequency ratios ($A_e = 1.0$ cm)119 |
| Figure 6.8 | Probability distribution function of the peak impact pressures120 |

| Figure 6.9 | (a) Anatomy of a single pressure pulse (b) wavelet scalogram of the pressure signal |
|-------------|--|
| Figure 6.10 | (a) Pressure pulses at different locations on the wall (b) Wavelet coscalograms with sensor 2 as reference |
| Figure 6.11 | Typical sloshing wave with pressure pulse and wave mechanism schematic for (a) shallow water ($h/a = 0.12$) and (b) deep water ($h/a = 0.25$) case125 |
| Figure 6.12 | Variation of the peak pressure coefficient with height of the tank wall126 |
| Figure 6.13 | Hardware-in-the-loop concept for structure-liquid damper systems128 |
| Figure 6.14 | Schematic of the experimental setup for the HIL simulation129 |
| Figure 6.15 | Hardware-in-the-loop simulation for random loading case |
| Figure 7.1 | (a) Photograph of the Electro-pneumatic actuator (b) Schematic diagram of the experimental set-up |
| Figure 7.2 | (a) Transfer functions for different tuning ratios (b) Variation of H_2 norm with tuning ratio137 |
| Figure 7.3 | Transfer functions for different valve angle openings |
| Figure 7.4 | Variation of transfer functions for different amplitudes of excitation 139 |
| Figure 7.5 | (a) Optimization of H_2 norm (b) look-up table for semi-active control140 |
| Figure 7.6 | (a) Comparison of transfer functions: (a) $\theta = 40 \text{ deg}$, $\zeta_f = 9 \%$ (optimal damping) (b) $\theta = 60 \text{ deg}$, $\zeta_f = 30\%$ (non-optimal damping)141 |
| Figure 7.7 | 3-D plot of transfer function as a function of effective damping and frequency (a) experimental results (b) simulation results142 |
| Figure 7.8 | Excitation time histories, valve angle variations and the resulting accelerations for uncontrolled, passive and semi-active systems for time-history 1 |
| Figure 7.9 | Excitation time histories, valve angle variations and the resulting accelerations for uncontrolled, passive and semi-active systems for time-history 2 |

| Figure 8.1 | Implementation ideas for tuned liquid dampers (a) bridge towers (b) tall buildings |
|-------------|--|
| Figure 8.2 | TMD system installed in the Citicorp Building, New York City (taken from Wiesner, 1979) |
| Figure 8.3 | (a) Single-stage (b) multi-stage Pendulum-type TMDs (c) TMDs with laminated rubber bearings <i>(taken from Yamazaki et al. 1992)</i> 152 |
| Figure 8.4 | Equipment schematic for a building-mounted TLCD155 |
| Figure 8.5 | Variation of RMS accelerations of the top floor with increasing wind velocity |
| Figure 8.6 | Elements of Decision analysis160 |
| Figure 8.7 | Decision Tree for Building Serviceability166 |
| Figure 8.8 | Semi-active control strategy in tall buildings170 |
| Figure 8.9 | (a) Equivalent white noise concept (b) Variation of equivalent white noise with wind velocity |
| Figure 8.10 | Electro-pneumatic valve (courtesy Hayward Controls)174 |
| Figure A.1 | (a) Variation of Valve Conductance (b) Variation of headloss coefficient with the angle of valve opening |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to first thank my advisor and *guru*, Prof. Ahsan Kareem, who provided encouragement, support and friendship throughout the length of my stay at Notre Dame. The confidence he placed in me has been instrumental in my professional development. I would also like to thank my committee members, particularly Prof. Bill Spencer and Prof. Jeff Kantor, who guided me through many concepts in dynamics and control. I would also like to thank Prof. Yahya Kurama and Prof. Steven Skaar for their valuable guidance and constructive comments. I would also like to thank the staff in the Department of Civil Engineering and Geological Sciences, particularly Tammy, Molly and Chris. Our laboratory technician, Brent Bach, helped me in most stages of the experiments.

Next, I would like to thank my family, both in India and the U.S., who have constantly supported me during my years in graduate school. Thank you Amma, Daddy, Kumar, Chinni and others. I don't know what I would have done without my friends: Cass, Vicky, Adrish and all the other long lasting friendships I made at Notre Dame. Finally, many thanks to the wonderful campus of the University of Notre Dame whose lakes, Grotto and Fischer graduate apartments provided a home away from home and a wonderful place to grow and learn.