PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DEL PERÚ
ESCUELA DE GRADUADOS

"Reparación de Muros de Construcciones Históricas de Tierra Mediante El Sellado
de Fisuras y Refuerzos Estructurales Adicionales"

**TESIS PARA OPTAR EL GRADO ACADÉMICO
DE MAGÍSTER EN INGENIERÍA CIVIL**

Presentada por:

Ing. Carlos Alberto Sosa Cárdenas
Ing. Edward Jonathan Soto Oblea

Asesor

Dr. Marcial Blondet Saavedra

Lima - Perú
Julio 2014

AGRADECIMIENTOS

DEDICATORIA

A Dios por darme la vida, las bendiciones y las oportunidades.

A mis padres por guiarme con amor y aconsejarme el camino a seguir.

A mi hermano y mis primos por ser una razón para seguir.

A toda mi familia por estar allí.

A todos aquellos que creyeron en mí.

Carlos

iii

DEDICATORIA

"A Dios por iluminar mi camino para lograr todas las metas a lo largo de mi vida."

"A mis queridos padres por su apoyo incondicional en todo momento."

"A mis grandes hermanos por su constante cariño y motivación a seguir adelante."

Jonathan

CONTENIDO

SEISMIC SIMULATION TESTS TO VALIDATE A DUAL TECHNIQUE FOR REPAIRING ADOBE HISTORICAL BUILDINGS DAMAGED BY EARTHQUAKE

USING MUD INJECTION AND AN EXTERNAL ROPE MESH TO REINFORCE HISTORICAL EARTHEN BUILDINGS LOCATED IN SEISMIC AREAS

RESUMEN

Se propone una técnica dual de reparación y reforzamiento para proteger las construcciones patrimoniales de adobe frente al efecto destructivo de los terremotos. La técnica consiste en la reparación de las grietas sísmicas mediante inyección de barro líquido, combinada con el reforzamiento de los muros con mallas formadas por cuerdas sintéticas (drizas). Para comprobar la efectividad de esta técnica, se efectuaron ensayos de simulación sísmica en el Laboratorio de Estructuras de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP). Se construyó un espécimen modelo de cuatro muros de adobe a escala natural que se ensayó en el simulador sísmico hasta generar grietas en los muros. Las grietas resultantes fueron reparadas mediante la inyección de barro líquido para intentar restituir la resistencia original de la estructura. Luego, los muros del modelo fueron reforzados con drizas. Después del periodo de secado, el modelo fue ensayado nuevamente en el simulador sísmico. El comportamiento del modelo ante movimientos de gran intensidad fue satisfactorio: se mantuvo la integridad estructural ante la excitación sísmica simulada, de gran severidad, y se evitó el colapso parcial de los muros.

Para entender el comportamiento de las drizas en los muros del modelo reforzado, se estudió un procedimiento de análisis de movimiento de bloque rígido sometido a fuerzas de excitación sísmica y de interacción de drizas. Finalmente, se presenta un análisis preliminar para calcular las fuerzas en las drizas. Estos resultados permitirán desarrollar un método de diseño de la malla de drizas.

Esta publicación consta de dos artículos publicados en conferencias internacionales. En ellos se compila la técnica propuesta y ensayada tal como se menciona en los párrafos superiores. El primer artículo se presentó en Turquía en setiembre de 2013 y el segundo se publicará en la ciudad de México en octubre de 2014.

TESIS PUCP

Kerpic'13 – New Generation Earthern Architecture: Learning from Heritage
International Conference
Istanbul Aydin University, Turkey, 11-14 September 2013

PONTIFICIA
UNIVERSIDAD
CATÓLICA
DEL PERÚ

Seismic Simulation Tests to Validate a Dual Technique for Repairing Adobe Historical Buildings Damaged by Earthquakes

Authors	M. Blondet, J. Vargas, C. Sosa, J. Soto
Address	Catholic University of Peru. Av. Univesitaria 1801, Lima, Perú.
E-Mail	mblondet@pucp.pe
	jhvargas@pucp.pe
	carlos.sosa@pucp.pe
	jonathan.soto@pucp.pe

ABSTRACT

For more than ten years researchers at the Catholic University of Peru (PUCP) have been studying the possibility of repairing damaged historical adobe walls through the injection of mud-based grouts in the wall cracks. Although initial test results showed that grout injections based on the original soil were effective in restoring most of the strength of adobe walls subjected to diagonal compression and lateral cyclic loads, this repair procedure was not adequate in recovering the original structural properties of a full-scale adobe structural model tested on the PUCP's shaking table under simulated seismic loads. The main conclusion was therefore that, in order to ensure structural stability during future earthquakes, mud injection must be complemented with techniques which use minimal and reversible reinforcements made of materials compatible with adobe.

This paper presents preliminary results obtained during a test program in which a previously damaged full-scale adobe model was repaired via mud injection combined with an external mesh made with nylon strings. The adobe model and the shaking sequence were identical to those used in previous tests. The behavior of the repaired model during a sequence of unidirectional earthquake motions of increasing intensity was considered to be excellent, as the external reinforcements worked to maintain structural integrity and stability, and prevented the partial collapse of wall portions that had separated during the shaking.

It is expected that these preliminary but promising results will be a firm step towards the development of adequate reinforcement systems for earthen constructions –both historical monuments and people's dwellings- located in seismic areas of the world.

Keywords: Adobe, historical, earthquake, reinforcement, repair.

1 INTRODUCTION

All over the world earthquakes continue to cause extensive damage to earthen dwellings and historical monuments. Usually, damaged earthen houses need to be rebuilt. Historical monuments, however, are precious and unique and must be repaired to reduce the damage and ensure their stability during future earthquakes. Repairing and strengthening earthen monuments is particularly challenging because the procedure requires minimal intervention to preserve as much as possible of the original fabric.

A research team at the Catholic University of Peru (PUCP) has been working in the recent past at developing technologies to repair seismically damaged adobe structures with injection of mud-based grouts (Blondet *et al.,* 2007; Dandona *et al.,* 2008). The objective of the repair procedure was to recover as much as possible of the strength and stiffness of the original structure, in order to allow it to withstand future earthquakes. Although monotonic and cyclic static tests on masonry elements performed at PUCP had shown that the mud-based grout injection repair method could be effective in restoring the original strength of damaged adobe masonry, a full-scale seismic simulation test on an adobe model repaired with this technique was not successful (Groenenberg, 2010; Blondet, Vargas and Groenenberg, 2012). It became clear, therefore, that the injection procedure should be complemented with an additional reinforcement technique.

It was decided to build a full-scale adobe model identical to the one tested previously, induce seismic damage with the PUCP's shaking table, repair the walls via grout injection, and then reinforce the repaired model walls with an external mesh made with halyard ropes. The repaired-and-reinforced model was then tested again on the shaking table to evaluate the efficacy of this dual seismic protection technique.

2 MODEL CONSTRUCTION

The full-scale adobe model, shown schematically in Figure 1, was similar to the model built and tested at the PUCP's Structures Laboratory during the previous project in order to be able to compare the results obtained (Groenenberg, 2010, Blondet, Vargas and Groenenberg, 2012). The model consisted of four adobe masonry walls (3.00 long and wide; 0.25 thick; and variable heights). Adobe blocks measured 250 mm x 250 mm x 90 mm (full size and half-size blocks were used). They were made using soil, straw and coarse sand (5:1:1 in volume). The adobe blocks were joined with mud mortar also made with soil, straw and coarse sand (3:1:1 in volume), approximately 20 mm thick. The left and right walls were identical and had a central window opening. The door was located on the front wall. The back wall had no openings and was higher than the front wall, in order to have a sloped roof.


Front wall (North)

Right wall (North)

Left wall (North)

Back wall (North)

Figure 1. Sketch of the full-scale adobe model

The model was built on a reinforced concrete square ring, which provided a rigid foundation and was used to attach the model to the shaking table and as a support during transportation from the building area to the test site.

The door and the windows had lintels made with cane rods tied up with wire. These lintels are more flexible than those made with wood pieces in order to avoid the cracks usually caused during earthquakes due to pounding. A wooden crown beam was placed on top of the model to contribute towards an integrated structural response during shaking and to transfer the weight of the roof to the walls.

3 TEST PROTOCOL AND INSTRUMENTATION

The shaking table displacement command signal used in the tests was derived from the longitudinal component registered on May 31st 1970 earthquake in Lima, Peru. Figure 2 shows the displacement pattern, normalized to a peak displacement of 1 mm. The testing program consisted of a sequence of shaking phases, in which the table displacement followed the command signal, electronically amplified to a specified peak displacement level. In general successive phases had increasing peak displacements.


Figure 2. Shaking table command displacement (normalized to 1 mm).

The instrumentation placed to measure the dynamic building response included ten accelerometers to record absolute accelerations and eight linear variable differential transducers (LVDTs) to record absolute displacements. Additionally, table motion was recorded with one LVDT and one accelerometer. The force in the servohydraulic actuator was measured with a load cell. Figure 3 shows a photo of the model before the tests and a sketch of the instruments locations.


Figure 3. Model on the shaking table and instrumentation location.

5

TESIS PUCP

Kerpic'13 – New Generation Earthern Architecture: Learning from Heritage
International Conference
Istanbul Aydin University, Turkey, 11-14 September 2013

4 DYNAMIC TESTS TO INDUCE WALL CRACKING

The undamaged model was subjected to a sequence of three phases of shaking table tests in order to induce wall cracking representative of seismic damage in adobe masonry construction. The first phase, with a peak table displacement of 30 mm ($D_0 = 30$ mm), did not cause any visible damage in the model. During the second phase, with $D_0 = 60$ mm, the model suffered extensive cracking. Large diagonal shear cracks were visible in the right and left wall, starting in the corners of the window and propagating outwards. The cracks were quite thin, so it was decided to carry out a third shaking phase in order to open the existing cracks. This shaking phase ($D_0 = 60$ mm again), was stopped after 15 seconds to avoid irreparable damage (as occurred in the previous project). Figure 4 shows the cracking patterns on the adobe walls, which are representative of extensive seismic damage on adobe wall structures.


| Damage on right wall | Cracking pattern |

Figure 4. Damage in the original adobe model after second $D_0 = 60$ mm phase

5 REPAIR & STRENGTHENING PROCEDURE

After the dynamic tests to induce seismic damage, the model was transported to the laboratory yard to be repaired and strengthened. Repair with grout injection requires that the cracks be opened to allow for full penetration of the grout. This, in some cases may contradict the conservation principle of minimum intervention. Also, in the cases of historical monuments it seems advisable to proceed step by step with the sequence of crack opening and grout injection. In this case, because of time constraints, it was decided to open all the cracks in the structure at once. All major seismic cracks (wider than 1 mm) were opened using a drill and an electric knife as shown in Figures 5 a) and b). Then all the cracks were sealed with a layer of silicon on both wall faces, leaving small openings separated approximately 50 mm from each other. The grout consisted of a mixture of one part of soil sieved through #10 mesh (2 mm opening), 50% in volume of finely cut dried grass (10 mm average length), and 35% in weight of water. This mixture was injected inside the cracks as shown in Figure 5 c), until they were fully filled.

| a) Using a drill | b) Using electric knife | c) Injecting mud-based grout |

Figure 5. Opening and injecting the seismic cracks.

TESIS PUCP

Kerpic'13 – New Generation Earthern Architecture: Learning from Heritage
International Conference
Istanbul Aydin University, Turkey, 11-14 September 2013

After all cracks were repaired with liquid mud, the model was left alone for two months to allow for an adequate drying of the sealed cracks.

It was decided to reinforce the walls of the repaired model with an external mesh made of nylon ropes known as halyard. Each rope had a nominal diameter of 1/4" and an ultimate strength of 20 kN. Figure 6 a) shows the mesh configuration. Both faces of the walls were completely covered. The vertical ropes were placed at 250 mm intervals (the length of one adobe block). They crossed the lower part of the walls at the first mortar course, and went around and were nailed to the crown beam. The horizontal ropes were also placed at 250 mm intervals (one and a half course of adobe masonry). All ropes were tensed manually by means of a turnbuckle (Figure 6 b). At each corner, the rope was placed inside a small plastic tube in order to protect the adobe wall, especially when the mesh was on a mortar joint. The meshes on both faces of the wall were joined together by 1/8" nylon strings which crossed the walls through the mortar joints at selected places (crossties). Figure 6 c) shows a detail of the reinforcement elements, and Figure 6 d) presents the repaired-and-reinforced model ready to be tested again on the shaking table.

a) Reinforcement scheme	b) Tightening a horizontal rope
c) Reinforcement detail	d) Repaired and strengthened model

Figure 6. Strengthening of the repaired model with a halyard mesh.

6 EVALUATION OF THE REPAIR & STRENGTHENING TECHNIQUE

The repaired and reinforced adobe model was tested on the shaking table following the same protocol as the virgin, undamaged model.

TESIS PUCP

Kerpic'13 – New Generation Earthern Architecture: Learning from Heritage
International Conference
Istanbul Aydin University, Turkey, 11-14 September 2013

During the first shaking phase (D_0 = 30 mm), there was no visible damage to the structure. Some diagonal cracks that had appeared in the previous test and that had been repaired with mud injection opened again during the second testing phase (D_0 = 60 mm). They are shown in blue in Figure 7 b).


a) Damage inspection   b) Cracking pattern (blue lines)

Figure7. Repaired and reinforced model after second testing phase (D_0 = 60 mm)

The third testing phase (D_0 = 90 mm) proved the necessity and effectiveness of the external mesh reinforcement. If the model had been repaired only with mud injection, it would have collapsed due to this ground shaking, which caused large displacements and more repaired cracks to open, but was maintained together by the additional mesh reinforcement.

It was then decided to subject the model to two additional intense shaking phases with 130 mm peak table displacement. These tests produced a significant amount of damage. All the repaired cracks opened and new cracks appeared in all the walls (Figure 8, left). The reinforcement mesh played a crucial role in holding the pieces of adobe wall together. It was also essential in keeping the wooden crown in place thus helping the walls to work jointly. During the second 130 mm test, the crown beam got detached due to the damage at the top of the back wall (Figure 8, right). It was noticed that the horizontal halyard ropes located in the mortar close to the base of the window started to cut the mud mortar.

Figure 8. Sketch of damage pattern and general view of the model after second (D_0 = 130 mm) test

The base shear versus global displacement curves for the model in its original, undamaged condition and after repair and strengthening are shown in Figures 9 and 10. Figure 9 shows that for low level of shaking (D0 = 30 mm) the combined mud injection repair and external nylon mesh reinforcement were quite effective in recovering the mechanical characteristics of the undamaged model: the maximum base shear was resisted without problem by the model in both cases (close to

47 kN) and almost 70% of the lateral stiffness (87 kN/mm for the original model and 60 kN/mm in the repaired and strengthened model).


a) Original Model | b) Repaired and strengthened model

Figure 9. Base shear vs. top displacement curves for first testing phase (D_0 = 30 mm)

For higher level of shaking (D0 = 60 mm) there was significant nonlinear response and the original model was severely cracked and was close to collapse. The lateral force versus displacement graphs presented in Figure 10 show that the repair and reinforcement scheme was effective in preserving a stable dynamic response, albeit with some structural damage, manifested as a reduction of lateral strength of about 33% (from 149 kN to 100 kN) and a stiffness degradation of about 45% (from 98 kN/mm to 45 kN/mm).

The seismic response for the stronger shaking imposed on the retrofitted model was excellent, from the point of view that the provided mesh reinforcement improved the structural connection between roof and walls, controlled excessive displacements and avoided partial collapses, thus preserving the integrity of the structure.


c) | d)

Figure 10. Base shear vs. top displacement curves for second testing phase (D_0 = 60 mm)

TESIS PUCP

Kerpic'13 – New Generation Earthern Architecture: Learning from Heritage
International Conference
Istanbul Aydin University, Turkey, 11-14 September 2013

7 CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The main conclusion obtained from this experimental project is that the damaged full scale adobe model tested under severe dynamic excitations was adequately protected by a retrofit technique consisting on the combination of sealing the seismic cracks via mud grout injection, and an external reinforcement made of a nylon rope mesh covering all walls. This combined technique maintained structural integrity, prevented excessive stiffness and strength degradation, and provided displacement control to the structure during the simulated intense seismic shaking. The authors are therefore confident that this dual protection system could be effectively used to protect earthen historical monuments located in seismic areas.

The halyard mesh reinforcement studied here also has great potential to be used as seismic reinforcement of low-cost earthen dwellings, since it is significantly cheaper and more widely available than the geomesh used in previous projects. Further research is required to find a cheap and simple way to tense the ropes, as the turnbuckles used in this project are relatively expensive. There is hope that the results presented here could contribute to safer housing in seismic countries where earthen construction is the main solution for most families.

8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

9 REFERENCES

[1] Blondet M., Vargas J., Morales K. and Iwaki C. 'Preliminary study on the usage of mud mortars to repair structural cracks in historical adobe buildings'. In Spanish. *Adobe USA 2007.* El Rito, New Mexico, USA, 2007.

[2] Dandona B., Vargas J., Blondet M., Cancino C., Iwaki C., and Morales K. 'Case study of early period Buddhist monastery and an experimental study on the use of mud-based grouts for repair of historic earthen walls'. *Terra 2008: 10th International Conference on the Study and Conservation of Earthen Architectural Heritage.* Bamako, Mali, 2008.

[3] Groenenberg R. 'The reparation of adobe constructions damaged by earthquake loading and development of an ATENA-GiD model to simulate shaking table tests for these structures'. *MSc. Thesis, PUCP*, Lima, Peru, 2010.

[4] Blondet M, Vargas J, and Groenenberg R. 'Evaluation of the efficacy of mud injection to repair seismic cracks on adobe structures via full-scale shaking table tests'. *15th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, 15WCEE.* Lisbon, Portugal, 2012.

USING MUD INJECTION AND AN EXTERNAL ROPE MESH TO REINFORCE HISTORICAL EARTHEN BUILDINGS LOCATED IN SEISMIC AREAS

M. Blondet[1], J. Vargas[2], C. Sosa[2] and J. Soto[2]

[1]Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP)
Avenida Universitaria 1801, Lima 32, Perú
e-mail: mblondet@pucp.pe

[2] Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP)
Avenida Universitaria 1801, Lima 32, Perú
{jhvargas, carlos.sosa, jonathan.soto}@pucp.pe

Abstract. This paper presents preliminary test results from an ongoing research project conducted at the Catholic University of Peru (PUCP), whose aim is to develop reliable techniques for the repair and retrofit of historical earthen constructions damaged by earthquakes. Initial test results showed that liquid mud injections were effective in restoring most of the strength of small adobe walls which had been previously cracked under to diagonal compression, and of full-scale adobe walls subjected to lateral cyclic loads. This repair procedure, however, was not adequate in recovering the original structural properties of a full-scale adobe model tested under simulated seismic loads on the PUCP´s shaking table. Mud injection, therefore, must be complemented with other techniques which use minimal and reversible reinforcements made of materials compatible with adobe.

A second full-scale adobe model was built, tested at the shaking table to induce seismic damage, and repaired via mud injection combined with an external mesh made of nylon ropes tightened with metal turnbuckles. The adobe model and the shaking sequence were identical to those used in the previous test. This time, the mesh reinforcement worked to maintain structural integrity and stability, and prevented the partial collapse of wall portions that had separated during the shaking. Further research is required on the use of simpler and cheaper procedures to install and tighten the nylon ropes (turnbuckles are relatively expensive), and the development of analytical tools to design the most adequate seismic reinforcement configuration. It is hoped that these promising results will be useful towards the development of adequate reinforcement systems for earthen constructions located in seismic areas of the world.

Keywords: adobe, seismic reinforcement, mud injection, external cable mesh.

1. INTRODUCTION

Earthquakes cause extensive damage to earthen dwellings and historical monuments worldwide. Damaged earthen houses usually need to be rebuilt. Monuments, however, are unique cultural heritage and they must be repaired and strengthened to ensure their stability during future earthquakes. This is a difficult task because it is required by the International Letters of Conservation (ICOMOS, 1964) to preserve as much as possible of the original fabric.

A research team at the Catholic University of Peru (PUCP) is studying a retrofitting procedure for adobe walls, devised according to the conservation principles of minimum intervention, compatible reinforcement and reversible solutions. At first, a repair procedure involving injection of liquid mud on seismic cracks was investigated (Blondet M. *et al.,* 2007). The aim was to recover as much as possible the strength and stiffness of the original structure. Although monotonic and cyclic static tests on masonry elements performed at PUCP showed that mud grout injection could be effective in restoring the original strength of damaged adobe masonry walls, a full-scale seismic simulation test on an adobe house model repaired with this technique was not successful (Groenenberg R., 2010; Blondet M. *et al.,* 2012). It became clear, therefore, that the injection procedure should be complemented with an additional reinforcement technique. For this project, a second full-scale adobe model, identical to the one tested previously, was built and tested at the PUCP's shaking table to induce seismic damage. Next, the walls were repaired via mud grout injection. The model was then reinforced with an external mesh made with nylon ropes (halyard) covering all the walls. (In sailing, a halyard is a rope that is used to hoist a sail, a flag or a yard).

The retrofitted model was tested again on the shaking table to evaluate the efficacy of this dual seismic protection technique. Its seismic performance was satisfactory because the provided reinforcement prevented partial collapse and preserved the structural integrity of the model (Blondet M. *et al.,* 2013).

This paper summarizes the experimental results obtained and outlines the current work being performed by the PUCP adobe research team to improve the proposed retrofit technique.

2. MODEL CONSTRUCTION

A full-scale adobe house model, shown in Figure 1, was built at the PUCP´s Structures Laboratory to be tested on the shaking table. It was similar to the model repaired only with mud injection, which did not have a satisfactory dynamic response during a previous project (Groenenberg R., 2010; Blondet M. *et al.,* 2012). The purpose of this test was to evaluate the efficacy of a reinforcement system complementary to the mud injection repair procedure.

The adobe masonry house consisted of four walls (3.00 m long and 0.25 m wide, with different heights). Adobe blocks measured 250 x 250 x 90 mm (full size and half-size blocks were used). They were made using soil, straw and coarse sand (5:1:1 in volume). The adobe blocks (approximately 20 mm thick) were joined with mud mortar also made with soil, straw and coarse sand (3:1:1 in volume). The left and right walls were identical and had a central window opening. The door was located on the front wall. The back wall had no openings and was higher than the front wall in order to have a sloped roof. The roof was made of a wooden framework covered with light tiles. It was attached to the four walls with a wooden crown beam. It was expected that the crown beam would contribute towards an integrated structural response during shaking and would transfer the weight of the roof to the walls. The door and the windows had lintels made with cane rods tied up with wire. These lintels are lighter and more flexible than those made with wood pieces to avoid pounding on the adobe walls during earthquakes. The model was built on a reinforced concrete square ring, which provided a rigid

foundation and was used to attach the model to the shaking table and to serve as a support during transportation from the building area to the test site (Blondet M. *et al.,* 2013).

Compression tests of adobe masonry piles yielded an average value of the tangent elastic modulus of 400 MPa. The density of the adobe blocks was 1700 kg/m^3.

Front wall

Right wall

Left wall

Back wall

Figure 1. Sketch of the full-scale adobe model. Dimensions are in meters.

3. TEST PROTOCOL AND INSTRUMENTATION

The shaking table displacement command signal used in the tests was derived from the longitudinal component registered on the May 31, 1970 earthquake in Lima, Peru. Figure 2 shows the table acceleration recorded during a simulation test corresponding to a peak command displacement D = 130 mm. The peak table acceleration A_0 was 1.53g.

Figure 2. Shaking table acceleration recorded in a test with D = 130 mm peak command displacement.

The instrumentation included accelerometers to measure absolute accelerations and linear variable differential transducers (LVDTs) to measure absolute displacements. The acceleration and the displacement of the shaking table as well as the force delivered by the

13

hydraulic actuator were also measured. The sampling rate for all instruments was 200 Hz (time interval of 0.005 s).

Model on the shaking table   Location of instrumentation

Figure 3. Full scale adobe house model and instrumentation scheme.

4.   DYNAMIC TESTS TO INDUCE SEISMIC DAMAGE

The original, undamaged model was subjected to a sequence of three phases of shaking table tests to induce wall cracking representative of seismic damage as observed in adobe masonry constructions. The first phase, with a peak command displacement D = 30 mm (peak table displacement D_{0max}= 28.90 mm and peak acceleration A_{0max}= 0.31g), did not cause any visible damage in the model. During the second phase with D = 60 mm (D_{0max} = 58.50 mm and A_{0max}= 0.64g) the model suffered extensive cracking. Large diagonal shear cracks were visible in the lateral (left and right) walls, starting in the corners of the window and propagating outwards. Since the cracks were quite thin (3 mm or less), it was decided to carry out a third shaking phase D = 60 mm (D_{0max}= 58.50 mm and A_{0max}= 0.64g) to induce further damage, with wider cracks. This last shaking phase was stopped after 15 seconds to avoid irreparable damage (as occurred in the previous project). Figure 4 shows the cracking patterns on the adobe walls, representative of seismic damage on adobe wall structures.

Right wall   Cracking scheme of right wall

Figure 4. Damage in the original adobe model after second (D = 60 mm) testing phase.

5. DYNAMIC TESTING OF RETROFITTED MODEL

5.1. Repair procedure

The damaged model was retrofitted (repaired and strengthened) in the laboratory yard. Repair with grout injection required that the cracks be opened to allow for full penetration of the grout (which may be in conflict with the conservation principle of minimum intervention). In the cases of historical monuments, it is advisable to proceed step by step with the sequence of crack opening and grout injection. In this case, because of time constraints, it was decided to open all the cracks in the adobe walls simultaneously. All cracks wider than 1 mm were opened to about 8 mm wide using a drill and an electric knife, as shown in Figures 5 a) and b). Then, all the cracks were sealed with a layer of silicon on both wall faces, leaving small openings separated approximately 100 mm from each other. Afterwards, liquid mud grout was injected on the openings. The grout consisted of a mixture of one part of soil sieved through #10 mesh (2 mm opening), 50% in volume of finely cut dried grass (10 mm average length), and 35% in weight of water. This mixture was injected inside the cracks until they were completely full with, as shown in Figure 5 c).

a) Using electric drill   b) Using electric knife   c) Injecting mud grout

Figure 5. Opening seismic cracks and injecting mud grout.

After all cracks were repaired with liquid mud, the model was left to rest for two months to allow for an adequate drying of the sealed cracks.

5.2. Strengthening procedure

After the injected grout had completely dried, all the walls of the repaired model were reinforced with an external mesh made of nylon ropes (known as halyard) with ¼" nominal diameter. Tension tests performed at the laboratory on pieces of the halyard used for the repair yielded an ultimate strength of 2 kN (nominal ultimate stress of 63 MPa) and a reference modulus of elasticity of 100 MPa. Figure 6 a) schematically shows the provided mesh configuration. The vertical ropes were placed at 250 mm intervals (the length of one adobe block) in two parts. The lower part of the rope, measuring about 1.20 m, was inserted across the wall through the first (bottom) course of mud mortar. The top part of the rope was placed over the walls, nailed to the wooden crown beam and joined to the bottom ropes on each side of the wall, using metal turnbuckles. The horizontal ropes were also placed at 250 mm intervals (two and a half courses of adobe masonry) in two parts joined by turnbuckles. All the ropes were manually tensed by means of the turnbuckles (Figure 6 b). The tensile force provided by the turnbuckles is estimated at 200 N. At each vertical corner, the ropes were placed inside a small plastic tube in order to protect the adobe walls, especially when the mesh coincided with a mortar joint. The meshes on both faces of each wall were joined together by 1/8" halyard ropes (crossties), which crossed the walls through the mortar joints at

selected places. Figure 6 c) shows a detail of the reinforcement elements, and Figure 6 d) presents the retrofitted model ready to be tested again on the shaking table.


a) Ropes reinforcement scheme

b) Tightening a horizontal rope

c) Reinforcement detail

d) Repaired and strengthened model

Figure 6. Strengthening of the repaired model with halyard mesh.

6. EVALUATION OF THE RETROFIT TECHNIQUE

The retrofitted (repaired and reinforced) adobe model was tested again on the shaking table following the same protocol as the virgin, undamaged model. During the first shaking phase (D = 30 mm; D_{0max}= 29.40 mm; A_{0max}= 0.30 g), there was no visible damage to the structure. Figure 7 b) shows the cracking pattern corresponding to the second testing phase (D = 60 mm; D_{0max}= 58.40 mm; A_{0max}= 0.71g). Previously repaired cracks are emphasized: brown lines show cracks that remained closed; blue lines show those which open due to shaking.


a) Damage inspection

b) Cracking scheme (in blue)

Figure 7. Retrofitted model after second testing phase (D = 60 mm).

16

The third testing phase (D = 90 mm; D_{0max}= 89.30 mm; A_{0max}= 1.08g) proved the effectiveness of the external mesh reinforcement. If the model had been repaired only with mud injection, it would have collapsed due to this ground shaking. The nylon rope mesh was able to maintain together the large pieces in which the walls had been broken. It was decided to subject the model to two additional intense shaking phases (D = 130 mm; $D_{0\ max}$= 128 mm; A_{0max}= 1.53g), which produced a significant amount of damage: all the repaired cracks opened and new cracks appeared in all the walls (Figure 8, left). Even though the crown beam got detached due to the damage at the top of the back wall, the reinforcement mesh and the wooden crown beam worked well together in keeping the integrity of the structure, (Figure 8, right). It was noticed that the horizontal halyard ropes, located in the mortar close to the base of the window, started to cut into the mud mortar.

Figure 8. Sketch of damage pattern and general view of the model after all shaking phases.

The base shear versus global displacement curves corresponding to the first low level shaking phases (D = 30 mm) for the model in its original and retrofitted conditions are shown in Figure 9. The retrofit procedure of mud injection plus external nylon mesh reinforcement was quite effective in recovering the mechanical characteristics of the undamaged model. In both cases, the maximum base shear sustained by the model was close to 47 kN, and the retrofitted model had almost 70% of the lateral stiffness of the original model (60 kN/mm versus 87 kN/mm).


a) Original model   b) Repaired and strengthened model

Figure 9. Base shear vs. top displacement curves for first testing phase (D = 30 mm)

For a higher level of shaking, corresponding to a command displacement D = 60 mm, there was significant nonlinear response in the original and retrofitted conditions. The original model was severely cracked and was close to collapse, but the reinforcement was successful in keeping the structural integrity. The lateral force versus displacement graphs presented in

Figure 10 show that the retrofit scheme was effective in preserving a stable dynamic response, even when the structure suffered some structural damage, manifested by a reduction in lateral strength of about 33% (from 149 kN to 100 kN) and a stiffness degradation of about 54% (from 98 kN/mm to 45 kN/mm).


a) Original model   b) Repaired and strengthened model

Figure 10. Base shear vs. top displacement curves for second testing phase (D = 60 mm)

The seismic response for the strongest shaking imposed on the retrofitted model (D = 130 mm; D_{0max}= 128 mm; A_{0max}=1.53g) was excellent because the provided mesh reinforcement maintained the structural connection between roof and walls, controlled excessive displacements and avoided partial collapses, thus preserving the integrity of the structure.

7. PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

During most strong shaking table tests performed on adobe structures at the PUCP, it was observed that the adobe walls break in large pieces, which then detach and collapse by overturning. In this project, a portion of the back wall (shown hatched in Figure 11 a) was detached from the rest of the structure during the strong shaking tests performed with the retrofitted adobe model.

A simplified structural model was generated by considering that the main structure and the detached wall portion are rigid blocks, as shown in Figure 11 b). Block A represents the main structure (assumed undamaged) and block B is the detached portion of wall. The nylon ropes prevent the overturning of block B. This situation can be represented schematically by a simple dynamic model in which the two blocks are connected by a set of N horizontal elastic ropes.

a) Damaged full scale model   b) Simplified model

Figure 11. Simplified model for adobe block interaction.

This simple model was then used to try to estimate the forces in the elastic ropes caused by the dynamic ground motions. Figure 12 shows the free body diagram of block B, including the inertia forces caused by translational and rotational accelerations. Absolute displacements of any point P with respect to an inertial reference system are denoted by x_P. Rigid block A is fixed to the ground, with absolute displacement x_O. Rigid block B, with mass m_B and mass central moment of inertia I_G, pivots around ground point O. Relative displacement (with respect to O) of any point i located on block B at height h_i is noted as u_i. A viscous damper (not shown) with damping factor ζ_B is attached at the center of mass G. (Free vibration tests performed on the adobe model between shaking phases yielded equivalent viscous damping factors between 9% and 12%). Rope i has elastic stiffness k_i and is attached to blocks A and B at a height h_i


Figure 12. Free body diagram of block B

The resulting equation of motion of the model, obtained through dynamic equilibrium, is:

$$M_e \ddot{u}_G + C_e \dot{u}_G + K_e u_G = -m_B \ddot{x}_O \qquad (1)$$

Where the equivalent coefficients for mass (M_e), stiffness (K_e) and damping (C_e) coefficients are, respectively:

$$M_e = \frac{1}{h_G^2}\left(I_G + m_B h_G^2\right) \qquad (2)$$

$$K_e = \frac{\sum k_i h_i^2}{h_G^2} \qquad (3)$$

$$C_e = 2\zeta_B \sqrt{K_e M_e} \qquad (4)$$

The natural vibration period of the system is

$$T_B = 2\pi \sqrt{M_e / K_e} \qquad (5)$$

Therefore, if the displacement response spectrum of the ground motion, $S_d(T, \zeta)$, is known, the peak seismic displacement of the center of mass G of block B is $S_d(T_B, \zeta_B)$, and the force in cable i is found to be:

$$F_i = \frac{h_i}{h_G} k_i S_d(T_B, \zeta_B) \tag{6}$$

This simple analysis procedure is currently being refined and calibrated, and it is hoped that it will serve as a basis for a design procedure for rope reinforcement system for adobe structures in seismic areas.

8. CONCLUSIONS

The main conclusion obtained from this experimental project is that the damaged full scale adobe model, tested under severe dynamic excitations, was adequately protected by a retrofit technique consisting on the combination of sealing the seismic cracks via mud grout injection and providing an external reinforcement made of a nylon rope mesh covering all the walls.

This combined retrofit technique maintained structural integrity, prevented excessive stiffness degradation and strength loss, and provided displacement control to the cracked structure during intense dynamic shaking, thus avoiding potential loss of life. The authors are therefore confident that this protection system could be effectively used to protect earthen historical monuments located in seismic areas.

Furthermore, the rope mesh reinforcement studied here has great potential to be used as seismic reinforcement for low-cost earthen dwellings. The rope used here (halyard) is relatively cheap, easy to use, and available in warehouses.

Further research is required to optimize the reinforcement system, to reduce its cost (the turnbuckles are relatively expensive), and to develop reliable analysis and design procedures.

There is hope that the results presented here could contribute to protect earthen monuments and to build safer dwellings in seismic countries where earthen construction is the main housing solution for most families.

9. REFERENCES

[1] Blondet M., Vargas J., Morales K., and Iwaki C. *Preliminary study on the usage of mud mortars to repair structural cracks in historical adobe buildings*. In Spanish. Adobe USA 2007. El Rito, New Mexico, USA, 2007.

[2] Blondet M., Vargas J., and Groenenberg R. *Evaluation of the efficacy of mud injection to repair seismic cracks on adobe structures via full-scale shaking table tests*. 15th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, 15WCEE. Lisbon, Portugal, 2012.

[3] Blondet M., Vargas J., Sosa C. A., and Soto, E. J. *Seismic simulation tests to validate a dual technique for repairing adobe historical buildings damaged by earthquakes*. New Generation Earthen Architecture: Learning from Heritage. (pp. 269-276) ESTAMBUL: Istanbul Aydin University, 2013.

[4] Groenenberg R. *The reparation of adobe constructions damaged by earthquake loading and development of an ATENA-GiD model to simulate shaking table tests for these structures*. MSc. Thesis, PUCP, Lima, Peru, 2010.

[5] ICOMOS (International Council of Monuments and Sites). *International letter related to Conservation and Restoration of Historical Monuments*. Venice, Italy, 1964.