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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The goal of this effort is to compare the seismic fragilities of a nuclear power plant system obtained by a traditional seismic probabilistic risk assessment (SPRA) and an advanced SPRA that utilizes Nonlinear Soil-Structure Interaction (NLSSI) analysis. Soil-structure interaction (SSI) response analysis for a traditional SPRA involves the linear analysis, which ignores geometric nonlinearities (i.e., soil and structure are glued together and the soil material undergoes tension when the structure uplifts). The NLSSI analysis will consider geometric nonlinearities.

Risk calculations should focus on providing best estimate results, and associated insights, for evaluation and decision-making. Specifically, seismic probabilistic risk assessments (SPRAs) are intended to provide best estimates of the various combinations of structure and equipment failures that can lead to a seismic-induced core damage event. However, in some instances, the current SPRA approach has large uncertainties, and potentially masks other important events.

SPRA’s are performed by convolving the seismic hazard (this is the estimate of all likely damaging earthquakes at the site of interest) with the seismic fragility (the conditional probability of failure of a structure, system, or component given the occurrence of earthquake ground motion). In this calculation, there are three main pieces to seismic risk quantification, 1) seismic hazard and nuclear power plants (NPPs) response to the hazard, fragility or capacity of structures, systems and components (SSC), and systems analysis.

Two areas where nonlinear effects may be important in SPRA calculations are, 1) calculation of in-structure response at the area of interest, and 2) calculation of seismic fragilities (current fragility calculations assume a lognormal distribution for the conditional probability of failure of components).

The focus of the research task presented herein is on implementation of NLSSI into the SPRA calculation process when calculating in-structure response at the area of interest. The specific nonlinear soil behavior included in the NLSSI calculation presented in this report is gapping and sliding. Other NLSSI effects are not included in the calculation. The results presented in this report provide preliminary and approximate comparisons of fragilities calculated using a traditional SPRA assumption that in-structure response scales linearly with increasing ground motion with fragilities calculated by removing this assumption and by considering gapping and sliding.

A comparison of the response distributions showed that the median demands calculated considering the nonlinear effects do not scale linearly unlike in traditional SPRA. A comparison between the component fragilities showed that the conditional probabilities of failure for given PGA values estimated using advanced SPRA are generally smaller than those calculated using the traditional approach.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Design Basis Earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INL</td>
<td>Idaho National Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLSSI</td>
<td>Nonlinear Soil Structure Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNSA</td>
<td>National Nuclear Security Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Nuclear Regulatory Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASSI</td>
<td>System for Analysis of Soil Structure Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCDF</td>
<td>Seismic Core Damage Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>Soil-Structure Interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

The estimate of the seismic hazard at nuclear facilities continues to evolve and generally leads to an increase in the hazard. The change in understanding of the site-specific seismic hazard curve occurs as more information is gathered on seismic sources and events, and additional research is performed to update attenuation relationships and characterize local site effects. As the seismic hazard increases, more intense input ground motions are used to numerically evaluate nuclear facility response. This results in higher soil strains, increased potential for gapping and sliding and larger in-structure responses. Therefore, as the intensity of ground motions increases, the importance of capturing nonlinear effects in numerical SSI models increases.

The goal of this effort is to compare the seismic fragilities obtained by a traditional nuclear power plant seismic probabilistic risk assessment (SPRA) and an advanced SPRA that utilizes Nonlinear Soil-Structure Interaction (NLSSI) analysis. Soil-structure interaction (SSI) analysis in traditional SPRA involves ignoring the geometric properties (soil and structure are glued together, namely, the soil undergoes tension when structure uplifts), and using linear soil properties and linear structure properties. The NLSSI analysis of this study will consider geometric nonlinearities, namely, gapping and sliding of the foundation.

The focus of the research task presented herein is on the implementation of NLSSI into the SPRA calculation process when calculating in-structure response at the area of interest. The specific nonlinear soil behavior included in the NLSSI calculation presented in this report is gapping and sliding. Other NLSSI effects are not included in the calculation. The commercial software program, LS-DYNA, is used for the NLSSI analyses.

The results presented in this report are used to approximate trends in seismic fragility behavior when using NLSSI. Only a limited number of NLSSI analyses were performed. The resulting seismic fragilities are considered to be approximate and are intended only to provide an initial comparison to seismic fragilities obtained from linear analysis. A larger sample of NLSSI analyses is currently being performed to permit a more rigorous quantification of seismic fragilities. These analyses and the resulting fragilities will be documented in a future report.

1.2 External hazard analysis

This report documents an approach or methodology for incorporating advanced seismic NLSSI tools in a risk-informed framework. This fits within the vision to advance external hazards analysis. The vision of performing advanced external hazard (in this report seismic is presented, future efforts will couple seismic and flooding) risk-informed margins management is using verified and validated tools and methods that provide best estimate nuclear facility response, with quantified uncertainties, and ensures plant safety during and after beyond design basis events.

The vision will be completed in the short, medium, and long term by accomplishing to following goals:
The long-term goal will be accomplished by incorporating structural dynamics capabilities in the MOOSE framework (since this framework has access to numerical tools that can quantify reactor core behavior). Structural dynamic numerical development is documented in Appendix A.
2. Problem Description

2.1 Representative soil site and nuclear power plant structure

This study uses a soil profile representing the basalt under the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) located at INL. The soil properties listed in Table 3-1 is considered to be uniform with depth. Excluding soil damping, these values were used in the TRA-670 SPRA.

Table 2-1: Soil properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Lognormal Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit weight</td>
<td>159 lb/ft³</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson’s ratio</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear-wave velocity</td>
<td>3720 ft/sec</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear modulus</td>
<td>68,320 kip/ft²</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damping</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selected representative NPP structure is a pressurized water reactor building. The numerical model of this structure is obtained from the SASSI2000 user manual. It consists of a pre-stressed concrete containment structure and a reinforced concrete internal structure. The numerical models of both the containment and internal structures are idealized stick models illustrated in the left panel of Figure 2-1. Median values of lumped masses and section properties of the stick models are presented in the right panel of this figure. These lumped masses include the masses of the stick elements apart from the masses of the non-structural components at each level. Therefore a zero mass density is assigned for the concrete material in the internal and containment structures. A median elastic modulus of $6.9 \times 10^5$ ksf and a median shear modulus of $2.7 \times 10^5$ ksf are assumed for the concrete material. However the concrete modulus of the internal structure is reduced by a factor of 0.5 to obtain a fundamental frequency near the peak of the UHS and therefore amplify the structural response. The CLASSI model of the representative NPP structure is identical to this SASSI2000 model.
Table 2-2: Frequencies and percentages of total mass participation of significant modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Frequency (Cyc/sec)</th>
<th>Mass participation (% of total)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UX</td>
<td>UY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>32.89</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] The lumped mass value of mass no. 3 is 4600 kips and not 46000, and mass no. 2, which is omitted in the table is equal to 4200 kips.
2.2 Seismic hazard and input ground motions

The earthquake ground motion is based on the seismic hazard for an existing NPP. Figure 3-1 shows the seismic hazard curve expressed in terms of the horizontal peak ground acceleration (PGA) and associated mean annual frequency of exceedance (MAFE). The Reference Earthquake for the traditional SPRA seismic fragility evaluation is nominally defined as the uniform hazard spectra (UHS) at a horizontal PGA of 0.4g. This PGA corresponds to a MAFE of 1.0E-04. Figure 3-2 shows these 5% damped horizontal and vertical Reference Earthquake UHS. As a simplification for this study, the shape of the UHS is considered to be invariant with MAFE. This study uses a suite of thirty sets of earthquake ground motion time histories compatible with the Reference Earthquake UHS. The horizontal time histories account for variability of the spectral acceleration in any arbitrary direction about the geomean of the two horizontal components. Figures 3-3 to 3-5 show the 5% damped response spectra for the horizontal and vertical time histories and the target mean 1.0E-04 UHS.

INL is performing a number of NLSSI analyses at multiple ground motion levels, expected to range from 3 to 5. Each ground motion intensity level is defined by a PGA, since the UHS shapes are assumed to be constant. The reference ground motion sets are scaled to generate multiple suites using the ratios of the ground motion level PGAs to the Reference Earthquake PGA.
Figure 2-3: UHS for mean annual frequency of exceedance of 1.0E-04

Figure 2-4: Response spectra for reference input ground motions at 5% damping (horizontal component H1)
Figure 2-5: Response spectra for reference input ground motions at 5% damping (horizontal component H2)

Figure 2-6: Response spectra for reference input ground motions at 5% damping (vertical component V)
2.3 Plant system considered for risk assessment

2.3.1 Equipment Components

The plant system is Emergency Cooling Pump 670-M-11 at the ATR. This pump has an electric motor that is powered by Battery 670-E-58. The motor is started by associated control logic. The system consists of the following components:

- Emergency Cooling Pump 670-M-11 (Figure 3-9)
- Battery 670-E-58 (Figure 3-10)
- Distribution Panel 670-E-23 (Figure 3-11); Circuit Breakers 670-E-23-CB1 and -CB2
- Medium Voltage Switchgear 670-E-1 (Figure 3-12 shows similar Switchgear 670-E-2 with breakers removed); Primary Pump Relay RLY-A

The actual system at ATR also includes Low Voltage Switchgear 670-E-28 and Relay 670-E-28-CR2, Medium Voltage Switchgear 670-E-2 and Primary Pump Relay RLY-A, and Flow Indicator Switch FIS-1-24. These components are excluded from the system model for this study (Section 3.4.3) for simplicity.

Concrete Block Wall 2B-G2-1 is a seismic interaction hazard to Distribution Panel 670-E-23.

The plant system components are all located on the internal structure. Battery 670-E-58 and Medium Voltage Switchgear 670-E-1 are located at Elevation 22ft. The remaining system components are located at Elevation 61ft.

Figure 2-7: Emergency cooling pump 670-M-11
2.3.2 System Logic Model

Figures 3-13 (a, b, c) show the progressive layers of single-top fault trees for the selected plant system. Figure 3-14 shows the event tree for one earthquake event or intensity level (PDS refers to Plant Damage State). Collapse of Concrete Block Wall 2B-G2-1 will damage Distribution Panel 670-E-23. A sensitivity study will be performed to understand its effect on the plant system risk. INL will calculate the SCDF with and without the block wall.
Figure 2-11: System fault trees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seismic event occurs BIN-1</th>
<th>MCS loss of auxiliary flow</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>END-STATE-NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IE-EQ-BIN-01</td>
<td>AFP-FLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2-12 – Event tree for earthquake intensity level 1
3. Traditional Seismic Probabilistic Risk Assessment

3.1 Probabilistic seismic response analysis

We performed a probabilistic seismic response analysis of the representative NPP structure using methods typically implemented in a traditional SPRA. Probability distributions for in-structure response spectra (ISRS) at the locations of components of the selected plant system were generated. The analysis consisted of the following steps:

1. Ground motion input consisted of thirty sets of acceleration time histories (Section 3.1).
2. The fixed-base Eigen solution and mass matrix were generated for the structure model with median properties using computer program SAP2000 [2] (Section 3.3).
3. Foundation impedances for the median soil profile under the structure (Section 3.2) were generated using computer program CLASSI [3].
4. Probability distributions of the structure frequency, structure damping, soil stiffness, and soil material damping were represented by scale factors with median values of 1.0 and associated lognormal standard deviations. Representative lognormal standard deviations for structure frequency and damping of 0.15 and 0.35, respectively, were used. Lognormal standard deviations for soil shear modulus and damping of 0.55 and 0.4 were used (Table 3-1).
5. Probabilistic response analysis was performed by the Latin Hypercube Sampling (LHS) approach for thirty simulations using computer program CLASSI. Stratified sampling was used to sample each of the scale factors representing the probability distributions for the variables considered (i.e., structure frequency and damping, soil stiffness and damping, earthquake acceleration time histories). Latin Hypercube experimental design was used to create the combinations of samples for the simulations.
6. Five percent damped median and 84% non-exceedance probability (NEP) ISRS were generated at the component locations. Three and a half percent damped median ISRS were also generated for use in the seismic fragility evaluations.

Table 3-1 lists the randomized property multiplier sets applied to the thirty computer models of the structure and soil. Figures 3-15 through 3-17 show the median and 84% NEP ISRS at Elevation 22ft in the X-, Y-, and Z-directions for 5% damping. Figures 3-18 through 3-20 show the median and 84% NEP ISRS at Elevation 61ft. Median and 84% NEP ISRS for 3.5% damping were also generated.

**Table 3-1: Property Randomization Multipliers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Number</th>
<th>Structure Frequency</th>
<th>Structure Damping</th>
<th>Soil Shear Modulus</th>
<th>Soil Damping</th>
<th>Soil-Foundation Coefficient of Friction*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9935</td>
<td>0.6741</td>
<td>1.0412</td>
<td>0.9213</td>
<td>0.75183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1629</td>
<td>1.5178</td>
<td>1.7367</td>
<td>0.5008</td>
<td>1.15056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0086</td>
<td>1.0574</td>
<td>1.6487</td>
<td>0.5621</td>
<td>1.01461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Number</td>
<td>Structure Frequency</td>
<td>Structure Damping</td>
<td>Soil Shear Modulus</td>
<td>Soil Damping</td>
<td>Soil-Foundation Coefficient of Friction*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0244</td>
<td>0.5591</td>
<td>0.8781</td>
<td>1.1468</td>
<td>0.94767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9621</td>
<td>1.1275</td>
<td>0.8498</td>
<td>1.2324</td>
<td>0.87831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0601</td>
<td>0.4980</td>
<td>1.4524</td>
<td>0.6324</td>
<td>0.82448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2131</td>
<td>1.3758</td>
<td>1.1158</td>
<td>0.8500</td>
<td>0.84219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0730</td>
<td>0.9197</td>
<td>0.7247</td>
<td>1.4866</td>
<td>1.03097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8753</td>
<td>0.7066</td>
<td>1.0092</td>
<td>0.9651</td>
<td>1.17557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7446</td>
<td>1.3991</td>
<td>0.9720</td>
<td>1.0116</td>
<td>1.24079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0459</td>
<td>0.7308</td>
<td>2.0275</td>
<td>0.4317</td>
<td>1.13513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.7734</td>
<td>2.2867</td>
<td>0.6451</td>
<td>1.7220</td>
<td>1.09008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.8513</td>
<td>1.0819</td>
<td>1.3094</td>
<td>0.7189</td>
<td>1.2214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.9399</td>
<td>1.2268</td>
<td>1.2243</td>
<td>0.7703</td>
<td>0.87656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9642</td>
<td>0.9893</td>
<td>0.8116</td>
<td>1.2879</td>
<td>0.92867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.1905</td>
<td>1.3174</td>
<td>0.4520</td>
<td>4.2334</td>
<td>1.46668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.9016</td>
<td>0.7988</td>
<td>1.0889</td>
<td>0.9035</td>
<td>0.80192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.1399</td>
<td>1.7135</td>
<td>1.1820</td>
<td>0.8159</td>
<td>0.72579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.8303</td>
<td>0.9575</td>
<td>0.6308</td>
<td>1.8682</td>
<td>1.35189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.8856</td>
<td>1.1062</td>
<td>0.7680</td>
<td>1.4007</td>
<td>0.78486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.9348</td>
<td>0.8889</td>
<td>0.9220</td>
<td>1.1124</td>
<td>0.91507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.9808</td>
<td>0.9059</td>
<td>1.3733</td>
<td>0.6686</td>
<td>0.99601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.3215</td>
<td>1.6053</td>
<td>0.9365</td>
<td>1.0518</td>
<td>1.73369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.0912</td>
<td>0.6113</td>
<td>0.6938</td>
<td>1.5944</td>
<td>0.5867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.0369</td>
<td>1.1834</td>
<td>3.1721</td>
<td>0.3706</td>
<td>0.68318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.2974</td>
<td>0.7767</td>
<td>0.5751</td>
<td>1.9937</td>
<td>1.31785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.9202</td>
<td>0.8611</td>
<td>1.2611</td>
<td>0.7468</td>
<td>1.04394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.1298</td>
<td>1.2376</td>
<td>0.7917</td>
<td>1.3364</td>
<td>0.96151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.8165</td>
<td>0.8198</td>
<td>1.5447</td>
<td>0.5781</td>
<td>1.06556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.1065</td>
<td>1.0263</td>
<td>0.5107</td>
<td>2.4194</td>
<td>1.41234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Used in the NLSSI simulations; not used in linear SSI analysis
Figure 3-1: Elevation 22ft, X-Direction Response Spectra, 5% Damping

Figure 3-2: Elevation 22ft, Y-Direction Response Spectra, 5% Damping
Figure 3-3: Elevation 22ft, Vertical Response Spectra, 5% Damping

Figure 3-4: Elevation 61ft, X-Direction Response Spectra, 5% Damping
Figure 3-5: Elevation 61ft, Y-Direction Response Spectra, 5% Damping

Figure 3-6: Elevation 61ft, Vertical Response Spectra, 5% Damping
### 3.2 Seismic component fragility evaluation

The system logic model shown in Section 2.3.2 relies on five components of the Emergency Cooling Pump 670-M-11 system. Seismic fragilities for these components are listed in Table 3-2. Their development is summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>$A_m$</th>
<th>$\beta_c$</th>
<th>HCLPF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pump 670-M-11</td>
<td>EL 61ft</td>
<td>3.40g</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.31g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery 670-E-59</td>
<td>EL 22ft</td>
<td>1.14g</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.59g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution Panel 670-E-23</td>
<td>EL 61ft</td>
<td>1.60g</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.40g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switchgear 670-E-1</td>
<td>EL 22ft</td>
<td>1.90g</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.64g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Wall 2B-G2-1</td>
<td>EL 61ft</td>
<td>0.60g</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.31g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.2.1 General approach

The seismic fragilities were calculated by the separation-of-variables method presented in EPRI TR-103959 (Jack R. Benjamin and Associates, Inc. and RPK Structural Mechanics Consulting, 1994) and supplemented by guidance in EPRI 1019200 (Kennedy, et al., 2009). The seismic fragility was expressed as the probability of component failure conditional on the horizontal PGA. The seismic fragility evaluation used existing documentation developed in the previous ATR deterministic seismic evaluation and SPRA, such as DOE/EH-0545 (D.O.E., 1997) Screening and Evaluation Worksheets and screening calculations, and seismic fragility calculations. Component and anchorage configurations were selectively adjusted from the actual configurations to achieve a mix of fragilities controlled by functional and anchorage failure.

Using the separation-of-variables method, the component fragilities were developed in terms of the following factors that contribute to seismic capacity:

- Component capacity: Strength, inelastic energy absorption
- Component response: Qualification method, damping, frequency, mode shape, mode combination, earthquake component combination
- Structure response: Ground motion (including earthquake response spectrum shape, horizontal earthquake peak response, and vertical component response), damping, modeling (including frequency and mode shape), mode combination, time history simulation, and foundation-structure interaction (including ground motion incoherence, vertical spatial variation of ground motion, and SSI analysis)

For this study, variability was represented by the composite lognormal standard deviation without distinction between randomness and uncertainty. Median component capacities, component responses, and associated variabilities were determined on a component-specific basis. Median component responses were determined for the median ISRS obtained by the probabilistic structure seismic response analysis for median component frequencies and
damping. Structure response variability was determined based on the differences between the median and 84% NEP ISRS for the median component frequencies and damping.

Seismic fragility evaluations of the specific components are briefly summarized as follows. Detailed calculations are included in Appendix A.

3.2.2 Emergency cooling pump 670-M-11

Seismic fragility evaluation of Pump 670-M-11 considered only anchorage failure. The pump was considered to be rugged for function. DOE/EH-0545 (D.O.E., 1997) screening of the pump anchorage was documented in Calculation No. 0602301.01-S-113 (ARES Corporation, 2008). The seismic fragility for anchorage failure was obtained by extending the screening calculation.

Pump anchorage consists of smooth L-bolts. The DOE/EH-0545 (D.O.E., 1997) screening evaluation found that anchor bolt tension capacity was limited by pullout. The median pullout capacity was obtained by empirical equations fit to test data from smooth L-bolts. The fragility evaluation determined that anchor bolt tension is controlled by concrete breakout rather than pullout. Median anchor bolt strengths for concrete breakout in tension and shear and associated variabilities were determined using empirical equations that form the basis for current American Concrete Institute anchorage design criteria.

The screening evaluation based pump seismic response on a frequency of 20 Hz. The median frequency may be higher, but the 20 Hz frequency was retained because the NLSSI ISRS at higher frequencies showed artificial numerical response. As a simplification, pump inertial loads for anchorage evaluation were based on the spectral acceleration for 5% damping rather than 3% damping. Differences between the 5% and 3.5% damped in-structure spectral accelerations at 20 Hz are minimal.

3.2.3 Battery 670-E-58

Seismic fragility evaluation of Batteries 670-E-58 and 670-E-59 for the ATR SPRA was documented in SGH Calculation No. 098122-CA-18 (SGH Inc., 2010). In this evaluation, Battery 670-E-59 was found to control over Battery 670-E-58. The existing seismic fragility evaluation of Battery 670-E-59 was consequently adapted to this study and used as a substitute for Battery 670-E-58.

The seismic fragility of the battery set was found to be controlled by failure of the diagonal brace bolts rather than functional failure. The fragility originally calculated for the ATR SPRA was adjusted to the median and 84% NEP ISRS developed for this study (Section 3.5.1).

3.2.4 Distribution panel 670-E-23

The seismic fragility of Distribution Panel 670-E-23 considered anchorage failure. Existing deterministic seismic evaluations were documented in EDF-4316 (INL, 2003) and Calculation No. 0602301.01-S-109 (ARES Corporation, 2008). Adaptation of these calculations to the seismic fragility evaluation included a number of simplifications.

- The back of 670-E-23 is bolted to the side of E-105. Anchorage for E-105 was evaluated for the combined inertia of 670-E-105 and 670-E-23. Anchors for 670-E-23 were considered to be ineffective because they lacked sufficient embedment.
Anchor bolt shear demands were based on 100-40-40 combination of orthogonal response components rather than SRSS as in EDF-4316 (INL, 2003).

Anchor bolt compression due to dead weight was included, rather than neglected as in EDF-4316 (INL, 2003).

Eccentricities due to outriggers connecting 670-E-105 to its anchorage were considered in Calculation No. 0602301.01-S-109 (ARES Corporation, 2008). These eccentricities were disregarded for simplicity.

Anchor bolts were taken to be 3/4 in. diameter Hilti Kwik-Bolt II, rather than the actual 5/8 in. Kwik-Bolts.

Calculation No. 0602301.01-S-109 (ARES Corporation, 2008) reduced the capacities of one anchor for 670-E-105 due to its proximity to an anchor for 670-E-103. The capacity reduction for bolt spacing was disregarded for simplicity.

The component horizontal frequency was estimated to be in the range of 5 to 10 Hz. The median frequency was estimated to be 7.5 Hz, and a frequency of 5 Hz was judged to have a 10% NEP. Median component damping was estimated to be 5%. Median seismic response was based on the median 5% damped in-structure spectral acceleration at the median frequency.

The median anchor bolt tension and shear strengths were based on mean values listed Table 2.6 of EPRI NP-5228-SL, Volume 1 (EPRI, 1991). Tension-shear interaction equations in EPRI TR-103959 (Jack R. Benjamin and Associates, Inc. and RPK Structural Mechanics Consulting, 1994) were implemented.

3.2.5 Medium voltage switchgear 670-E-1

Experience-based seismic evaluation of Switchgear 670-E-1 by DOE/EH-0545 (D.O.E., 1997) procedures found that it satisfied the screening caveats, but its anchorage and Primary Pump Relay RLY-A did not. As a simplification for this study, the switchgear seismic fragility was developed for functional failure, and anchorage and relay failure were excluded.

Because the switchgear effectively satisfies the EPRI NP-6041-SL (EPRI, 1991) screening criteria for a 1.2g ground spectral acceleration, the median in-structure spectral acceleration capacity was determined to be 4.8g based on EPRI 1019200 (Kennedy, et al., 2009). The switchgear frequency was estimated to be in the range of 5 to 10 Hz. Following EPRI TR-103959 (Jack R. Benjamin and Associates, Inc. and RPK Structural Mechanics Consulting, 1994), narrow spectral peaks may be clipped to obtain equivalent broadband spectral demand for comparison to broadband spectral capacity. The clipped spectral acceleration was judged to be no less than the valley of the ISRS at 6.0 Hz.

3.2.6 Concrete block wall 2B-G2-1

Collapse of Concrete Block Wall 2B-G2-1 is a seismic interaction hazard to Distribution Panel 670-E-23. This wall was evaluated as part of Wall Group 1 in Calculation No. 0602301.01-S-007 (ARES Corporation, 2008). The block wall seismic fragility was developed by extending the Conservative Deterministic Failure Margins Method in Appendix R of EPRI NP-6041-SL (EPRI, 1991) to the determination of a median collapse capacity.

4.1 Introduction

Nonlinear soil-structure interaction (SSI) analysis in this section is performed using the commercial time-domain code, LS-DYNA. LS-DYNA is a commercial finite-element program, currently developed and maintained by the Livermore Software Technology Corporation (LSTC). It is predominantly used for solving structural mechanics problems using the explicit integration algorithm, which makes it suitable for applications involving sudden loads (crash and blast simulations) and contact problems. The implicit integration algorithm is also implemented in LS-DYNA, but with limited capabilities. LS-DYNA includes a large database of material models for simulating soil and structure (especially steel and concrete), contact interfaces and seismic isolators. LS-DYNA has seen increasing usage in the civil engineering industry with applications in nonlinear site-response, and soil-structure interaction (SSI) analyses of buildings, bridges and LNG tanks (Willford et al., 2010). LS-DYNA is therefore considered a suitable choice for nonlinear SSI analysis of this study.

Nonlinear response in SSI analyses is a result of 1) nonlinear site response, which affects the foundation-level input motion to the structure, 2) hysteretic response of the soil at the vicinity of the foundation, which results in foundation flexibility and hysteretic energy dissipation at the foundation and 3) gapping and sliding of the foundation. The nonlinear SSI analyses in this report are performed considering only the geometric nonlinearities at the foundation-soil interface, which are of primary interest in this study. In-structure response spectra (ISRS) at the locations of selected components are calculated and used in the seismic fragility calculations. The seismic fragilities for each component are then compared with those calculated using the traditional SPRA process described in Section 3.

4.2 Nonlinear SSI modeling

4.2.1 The NLSSI methodology

Spears and Coleman (2014) proposed methodology to perform nonlinear soil-structure interaction analysis in the time domain. This methodology, referred to as the NLSSI methodology, is a series of steps that an analyst of reviewer can follow to perform a fully nonlinear SSI analysis in the time domain including 1) nonlinear site response, 2) nonlinear hysteretic soil behavior at the foundation vicinity, 3) geometric nonlinearities at the foundation including gapping and sliding and 4) nonlinear behavior of the structure such as concrete cracking. The NLSSI methodology is illustrated in the flowchart presented in Figure 4-1 and is used to perform the nonlinear SSI analyses in this project. As shown in the flowchart, building an NLSSI model involves 1) building the structural model, 2) building the soil domain model, 3) building the interface model and 4) specifying the input. Each of these models should be independently verified for the desired properties before assembling the NLSSI model and performing the analysis to calculate the output.

The nonlinear SSI analyses of this study are performed along the lines of the NLSSI methodology. The description of structural modeling, soil domain modeling and input specification, interface modeling, and the NLSSI model assembly are presented in Sections 4.2.1.
4.2.2, 0, 4.2.4 and 4.2.5, respectively. Verification and/or benchmarking are performed for each of the individual models as explained in the corresponding sections.

![The NLSSI methodology (Coleman et al., 2015)](image)

**4.2.2 Structural modeling**

**4.2.2.1 Modal Analysis**

The LS-DYNA model of the representative NPP structure is built using the Belytschko-Schwer resultant beam elements (beam element type 2) and assigning the cross-section properties presented in Figure 2-1. Note that assigning a zero mass density is not possible in LS-DYNA (unlike in CLASSI and SASSI) and a small value of $10^{-4}$ kip-sec$^2$/ft$^4$ (actual mass density of concrete is 0.0047 kip-sec$^2$/ft$^4$) is used instead. A fixed-base, modal analysis is performed for the representative NPP structure and the modal frequencies, mass participations and mode shapes of the first 15 modes are calculated. The modal frequencies are presented in Table 4-1 below, along with the frequencies calculated by SGH using the structural analysis code, SAP2000 (Computers and Structures Inc., 2011). The modal frequencies calculated using SAP2000 and LS-DYNA are clearly identical. The mass participations, and mode shapes (not presented here) calculated using the two programs are also almost identical.
Table 4-1: Modal frequencies of the representative NPP structure calculated using SAP2000 and LS-DYNA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Modal Frequency (Hz)</th>
<th>CLASSI/ SAP2000</th>
<th>LS-DYNA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.83</td>
<td>27.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>32.89</td>
<td>32.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2.2 Fixed-base response-history analysis

After verifying the modal frequencies, a fixed-base response-history analysis (RHA) is performed with one set of acceleration inputs (three components), and the LS-DYNA responses at key locations in the NPP structure are compared with those calculated by SGH using CLASSI. The stick model used for modal analysis is also used for the RHA. Input ground motions are applied at the base of the structure as prescribed accelerations, and a Rayleigh damping of 5% (median damping ratio of the structure) is specified in the frequency range of 5Hz to 35Hz. Rayleigh damping is modeled in LS-DYNA by specifying the mass damping coefficient using the *DAMPING_PART_MASS card, and the stiffness damping coefficient using *DAMPING_PART_STIFFNESS card. The mass and stiffness damping coefficients are calculated through a trial-and-error procedure to achieve roughly 5% damping in the frequency range specified above.

Since LS-DYNA employs an explicit integration algorithm for RHA, it requires that the analysis time step be less than a critical time step. The critical time step of a model is governed by its stiffness element (beam, solid, shell or any other element) and is equal to the duration of propagation of a wave through this element (Bathe, 1996; LSTC, 2009). In the case of beam elements, the critical time step is directly proportional to the square root of the mass density of the beam material. For this reason, a small value of mass density (e.g., $10^{-4}$ kip-sec²/ft⁴ used for modal analysis) can drastically reduce the critical time step and increase the computation time. In order to avoid large computation times in the RHA, the beam material density is increased to 0.0047 kip-sec²/ft⁴, which is equal to the actual material density of concrete. The lumped masses at the nodes are then adjusted compensate for the increased mass density of the beams, assuming that the mass of each beam is equally lumped to the two beam nodes. Sample results of the RHA performed using this approach are presented in Figure 4-2 below. The results present the 5% damped acceleration response spectra of the internal structure at an elevation of 22ft in the X direction. Figure 4-2 shows that the structural responses calculated using CLASSI and LS-DYNA are very different, in spite of the models using identical properties and having identical
modal frequencies. Further investigation into these differences revealed some issues with modeling in LS-DYNA as described below.

![Figure 4-2: Spectral acceleration in the internal structure at 22ft elevation calculated using CLASSI and a preliminary model in LS-DYNA](image)

**4.2.2.3 Practical issues faced**

Figure 4-2 shows that the response spectrum calculated from the LS-DYNA results differs from that calculated using CLASSI in two aspects: 1) the peak spectral acceleration calculated using LS-DYNA is significantly higher and 2) the frequency of this peak spectral acceleration (about 11 Hz) is considerably higher. These differences indicate that the damping in LS-DYNA is not accurately simulated, and that the natural frequencies of the RHA model do not match with those calculated in the modal analysis (1st mode frequency of the internal structure is about 8.5Hz; see Table 4-1). After a detailed investigation that included performing element level analyses in LS-DYNA, performing SASSI (Lysmer et al., 1999) analyses, and consultations with other LS-DYNA users (Robert Spears, Personal Communication, 2015) and the LS-DYNA technical support (Ushnish Basu, Personal Communication, 2015), the following errors were recovered from the preliminary LS-DYNA model and fixed:

1. Modeling Rayleigh damping: Rayleigh damping in LS-DYNA is modeled by specifying the mass damping coefficient, $\alpha$, and the stiffness damping coefficient, $\beta$, using the *DAMPING_PART_MASS and *DAMPING_PART_STIFFNESS cards, respectively. The mass damping coefficient is specified as a load curve, LCID, (LSTC, 2013) and a scale factor, SF. The ordinate of LCID denotes the time, namely, LCID stands for mass damping coefficient vs. time. Since no description of LCID was provided in the LS-DYNA manual, the ordinate of LCID was assumed to be the part number in the preliminary analysis. It was also found that the mass damping is not applied to nodal masses that are modeled using *ELEMENT_MASS, explaining the significantly larger spectral accelerations. Additionally, although unclear from the manual, it was found that the stiffness damping, $\beta$, should be
specified as a negative number, in order to accurately model Rayleigh damping. The preliminary analysis was performed using a positive number for $\beta$, which simulates a different kind of stiffness damping that is different from the Rayleigh damping coefficient.

2. Mass distribution in beam type 2 (Belytschko-Schwer resultant beam): Most finite-element structural analysis programs use a lumped-mass matrix for beam elements that distribute the mass of the beam equally to the two beam nodes. This assumption was used to update the lumped masses in the preliminary model to compensate the non-zero beam material density. However, after performing some element-level analyses, it was found that the type 2 resultant beam also lumps the rotational inertia from the beam mass on to the nodes of the beam element, causing the change in the natural frequencies. Since the expression for this lumped rotational inertia is not known, a similar model cannot be created in CLASSI, making it almost impossible to maintain equivalence between the structural models. Facing this conundrum, it was decided that a very small density be used for the beam material (which reduced the rotational inertias to almost zero), along with the lumped masses used in CLASSI/SAP2000. In order to avoid the exceptionally large computation time, which is a consequence of the small density, the time step of the analysis was artificially increased to 10 times the critical time step. Given that this increase may result in numerical instabilities, each RHA is monitored by comparing the results with those calculated from CLASSI, and by examining the energy balance in the model.

The preliminary structural model in LS-DYNA was updated to counter the issues described above. Fixed-base analyses were also performed in SASSI for further verification. Results from the updated model are presented in Figure 4-3, which also includes the CLASSI and SASSI responses. The figure shows that the CLASSI, SASSI and updated LS-DYNA models result in very similar responses, hence proving the equivalence of the structural models.

![Figure 4-3: Spectral acceleration in the internal structure at 22ft elevation calculated using CLASSI, SASSI and the updated model in LS-DYNA](image)
4.2.2.4 Results of fixed-base response-history analyses

After verifying that the CLASSI and LS-DYNA models are equivalent, a fixed-base analysis is performed with the updated LS-DYNA model with simultaneous ground motion input in the X, Y and Z directions. The results of this analysis (spectral accelerations in the internal structure at 22ft and 61ft elevations) are presented in Figure 4-4. The figure includes the results calculated using 1) CLASSI, 2) updated LS-DYNA model with the default time step (referred to as ‘LS-DYNA’ in the legend), and 3) updated LS-DYNA model with scaled time step (referred to as ‘LS-DYNA tstep’ in the legend).

Figure 4-4: 5% damped spectral accelerations of the internal structure at 22ft elevation (left) and 61ft elevation (right)

Figure 4-4 shows that the CLASSI and LS-DYNA responses are almost identical in the X and Y directions. Small differences exist between the responses in the Z direction, with LS-DYNA predicting smaller spectral accelerations at the higher frequencies. This might be due to the
differences in the damping formulations: the CLASSI model uses a frequency-independent damping formulation, while the LS-DYNA model uses Rayleigh damping. The figure also shows that the results of the LS-DYNA analysis with a (10 times) scaled time step are identical to those calculated with the default time step. Therefore the scale factor of 10 for the time step is considered suitable for fixed-base analyses with other ground motion inputs.

4.2.3 Soil domain modeling and specification of ground motion input

Soil-structure interaction in the time domain is typically performed using the direct method (Bolisetti and Whittaker, 2015; Spears and Coleman, 2014). In the direct method, the whole soil-structure system is analyzed in a single step thereby circumventing the use of superposition, which is extensively used in traditional SSI analysis methods (including SASSI and CLASSI) and is restricted to linear analyses. This enables a more realistic simulation with the use of nonlinear material models for the soil and structure, and contact models that simulate separation and sliding at the foundation-soil interface. Soil-structure interaction analysis using the direct method can be performed using most commercial finite-element codes such as ABAQUS (Dassault Systèmes, 2005), ANSYS (ANSYS Inc., 2013), LS-DYNA, or the open source finite-element code, OpenSees (Mazzoni et al., 2009). Figure 4-5 presents a sample finite-element model for SSI analysis using the direct method in LS-DYNA.

![Description of a finite-element model for soil-structure interaction analysis using the direct method](Bolisetti et al., 2015)

The finite domain in the direct method needs to satisfy the following conditions in order to simulate an infinite domain: 1) effective damping of the waves radiating away from the structure so that they do not reflect back into the soil domain from the lateral boundaries, and 2) stress equilibrium at the lateral boundaries to account for the rest of the soil domain that is not included in the finite domain model. The former is achieved by building a large soil domain with sufficient plan dimensions to dissipate the radiating waves before they reach the lateral boundaries. In this approach, the radiating waves are dissipated through hysteresis and viscous damping in the soil. The plan dimensions of the domain can be determined by a trial-and-error procedure, ensuring that the acceleration responses at the boundaries of the soil domain are equal.
to the free-field acceleration, which is calculated from a separate site-response analysis, and also by verifying that the structural response does not change with a further increase in the domain size. Stress equilibrium at the lateral boundaries can be obtained by constraining the boundary nodes at each elevation to move together in each direction. This enables the elements at the boundaries to move in pure shear, thus simulating a free-field condition (assuming that the input comprises vertically propagating shear waves), as shown in Figure 4-5.

The LS-DYNA numerical model for the SSI analysis of the representative NPP structure is presented in Figure 4-6. As illustrated in the figure, the soil domain of this model is 665ft × 665ft in plan (about 5 times the size of the basemat, which is 131ft in diameter), and 214ft deep. The dimensions of the soil domain are chosen after trying two soil domain sizes. The chosen dimensions are verified by comparing the surface response at the edge of the soil domain to the free-field response from a separate one-dimensional site-response analysis. The soil domain is built with about 192,000 solid elements that have an almost uniform size of 8ft in all directions. This element size allows the propagation of frequencies up to about 40Hz, assuming 10 elements per wavelength. The base of the soil domain is modeled as a transmitting boundary using the *BOUNDARY_NON_REFLECTING option in LS-DYNA. The ground motion input in the CLASSI analysis is applied at the free field, which is not possible in the direct method. However, given that soil domain is completely uniform, it can be assumed that the ground motion recorded at the free field is caused purely by the incident waves from the soil domain. These incident waves can be applied as an outcrop input to the LS-DYNA soil domain at any depth, in order to achieve the same free-field ground motion as CLASSI. The outcrop input is applied as a shear force history as shown in Figure 4-7. This creates an incident wave that is reflected back into the soil domain at the surface. The dampers shown in Figure 4-7 absorb the reflected wave, simulating an infinite soil domain. To verify that the input excitation in CLASSI and LS-DYNA are equivalent, the free-field response from LS-DYNA (which is the surface response of the soil at the edge of the domain far from the structure) is compared with the free-field input in the CLASSI simulations. Figure 4-8 presents the spectral accelerations of the free-field input in CLASSI and the free-field response in LS-DYNA in X, Y and Z directions. The figure clearly shows that the responses are almost similar, except that the LS-DYNA response is slightly smaller in the higher frequencies. This can be attributed to 1) finite domain effects and 2) difference in the damping formulations in the two codes.
Figure 4-6: Finite-element model for the SSI analysis of the representative NPP structure

Figure 4-7: Procedure for ground motion input in the LS-DYNA model
Several approaches of modeling the foundation-soil interface can be adopted and the approach is chosen on a case-by-case basis. Since the representative NPP structure of this study is founded on the surface, it highly susceptible to foundation uplift in comparison with real nuclear structures that are usually partially embedded. The choice of surface foundation is intentional and is expected to demonstrate an extreme case of gapping and sliding.

Preliminary NLSSI analyses were performed by modeling the foundation-soil interface in LS-DYNA using the *CONTACTAUTOMATIC_SURFACE_TO_SURFACE model. This contact model enables separation between the surfaces and simulates sliding behavior with Coulomb friction. A friction coefficient of 0.5 and a contact damping of 20% was used. The analysis was performed for one ground motion (simultaneous input in all three directions) at two intensity levels: reference PGAs of 0.4g and 0.8g. Figure 4-9 presents the basemat spectral accelerations calculated from these preliminary NLSSI analyses. The figure shows reasonable results for a reference PGA of 0.4g: the spectral accelerations calculated using linear and nonlinear analyses are almost equal, with a small reduction in peak spectral acceleration the Y direction from sliding. Predictably, a significant reduction in the spectral accelerations (at frequencies less than 10Hz) can be seen in responses to a reference PGA of 0.8g. However the spectral accelerations for frequencies above 10Hz are significantly amplified, which may be a combined result of the basemat impact on the soil due to uplift, as well as numerical noise. Given
that the amount of amplification is significant until 100Hz the results at these frequencies are likely spurious. Therefore, after several attempts in reducing the spurious response by changing the various parameters of the contact model, this approach to modeling the foundation-soil contact was ruled out for this study.

Figure 4-9: Spectral accelerations calculated using 1) CLASSI, 2) linear analysis in LS-DYNA and 3) nonlinear analyses in LS-DYNA of preliminary NLSSI analysis performed using LS-DYNA contact models for a 0.4g reference PGA (left) and 0.8g reference PGA (right)

Other approaches to simulate gapping and sliding were attempted including modeling the foundation-soil interface with very short seismic isolator elements. These elements were modeled as friction pendulum isolators using the *MAT_SEISMIC_ISOLATOR material model. A very large value was provided for the isolator surface radius, thereby making the structure sliding on an almost flat surface. Although this method provided slightly more reasonable results, penetrations were noticed at the foundation-soil interface, presumably due to insufficient vertical stiffness of the isolators. An attempt to increase the vertical stiffness resulted in an unstable analysis time step leading to discard of this approach.

The final approach involved modeling a thin layer of soil between the basemat and the soil. This layer, with the same plan dimensions as the basemat, is modeled using the *MAT_HYSTERETIC_SOIL model. This layer is illustrated in Figure 4-10. The material properties of this soil layer are chosen such that the shear strength of the layer is equal to the maximum
friction force for a given coefficient of friction and the weight of the structure. The shear strength (shear stress at failure) of the soil material is given by the equation

$$\tau_{\text{max}} = \frac{\mu W}{A}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4-1)$$

where $A$ is the maximum shear stress, $\mu$ is the coefficient of friction, $W$ is the weight of the superstructure and basemat and $A$ is the plan area of the basemat. These properties for the interface soil layer simulate a sliding behavior that is reasonably close to Coulomb friction. Simulation of gapping requires this soil layer to have almost zero strength in tension, which can be modeled directly by providing a very small value for the parameter $P_0$ in input for *MAT_HYSTERETIC_SOIL.

![Figure 4-10: Thin soil layer in at the foundation-soil interface used in the final approach to simulating gapping and sliding in the present study](image)

The input stress-strain curve provided for the interface layer for a friction coefficient of 0.7, 0.55 and 0.90, which correspond to the median, 16th percentile and 84th percentile values of the friction coefficients assumed for this study are presented in Figure 4-11 below. The figure also presents the corresponding stress-strain curves required for the layer to exactly simulate Coulomb friction. As shown in the figure, a small post-yielding stiffness is provided for the interface layer to avoid numerical instabilities. Additionally, the shear strength of the soil layer is approximately equal to the required shear strength required to simulate Coulomb friction.
Assembling the NLSSI model

After verifying that the structural models in CLASSI and LS-DYNA are equivalent, SSI analyses are performed for the representative NPP structure in LS-DYNA. The NPP structure is supported by a surface basemat that is 10ft thick and 131ft in diameter. This basemat is assumed to be rigid and is modeled with the *MAT_RIGID material model in LS-DYNA. The soil domain is assumed to be a uniform halfspace with the soil properties listed in Table 2-1. The soil is assumed to be elastic and is modeled using the *MAT_ELASTIC material model. Prior to performing a nonlinear SSI analysis that simulates gapping and sliding at the foundation, a linear model is analyzed and the results are compared with CLASSI for verification. In this linear model, the basemat is ‘tied’ to the soil surface, and no gapping or sliding is permitted. After the linear model is verified to produce the same response as CLASSI, it is modified to include contact models at the foundation-soil interface and the nonlinear analyses are performed. The procedure for SSI analysis in LS-DYNA is briefly described in the sections that follow. Results from linear analysis are presented in Section 4.3 and the results from nonlinear analyses are presented in Section 4.4.

4.3 Linear SSI analysis and benchmarking against CLASSI

A linear analysis, in which there is no separation at the foundation-soil interface, is performed in LS-DYNA to verify the SSI model by comparing the results to those calculated using CLASSI. Since CLASSI performs a linear analysis, there should be a very close match between the linear responses calculated using LS-DYNA and CLASSI. Following the procedure described in Section 4.2, a linear analysis is performed in LS-DYNA for one set (three
directions) of ground motions. In this section results of this linear analysis are presented and compared with those from CLASSI.

In the linear analysis, the foundation is attached to the elastic soil using the *CONSTRAINED_EXTRA_NODES option, which constrains the basemat and soil nodes at the basemat-soil interface to move together. The thin soil layer at the foundation-soil interface is not modeled in the linear analysis. Figure 4-12 and Figure 4-13 present the CLASSI and LS-DYNA results for the linear analysis at the center of the basemat and the internal structure, respectively. The figures show that the linear analyses in CLASSI and LS-DYNA produce almost similar results. LS-DYNA results in slightly smaller spectral accelerations mainly because of the smaller free-field accelerations. Additionally, it should be noted that the SSI analysis procedure in CLASSI does not account for kinematic interaction, unlike LS-DYNA. The kinematic interaction in LS-DYNA can also contribute to the slight reduction in spectral accelerations, especially in the higher frequencies.

Figure 4-12: 5% damped acceleration response spectra on the basemat calculated using linear SSI analyses in CLASSI and LS-DYNA
4.4 Nonlinear SSI analysis

Nonlinear analysis is performed after modifying the linear model (benchmarked in the previous section) by including the foundation-soil interface layer described in Section 4.2.4. For the study presented in this report, the nonlinear analyses are performed for three ground motions at four intensities as described in Section 4.5. Results for one of the ground motion (and using median soil and structure properties) are presented in this section. Figure 4-14 presents the spectral accelerations calculated at the basemat and Figure 4-15 presents the ISRS calculated at 22’ and 61’ elevations.
Figure 4-14: 5% damped spectral accelerations at the center of the basemat calculating using CLASSI and at four ground motion intensities in LS-DYNA (reference PGAs of 0.4g, 0.6g, 0.9g and 1.2g). The LS-DYNA results at higher intensities are scaled down to 0.4g in this figure.
Figure 4-15: 5% damped spectral accelerations in the internal structure at 22’ elevation (left) and 61’ elevation (right) calculating using CLASSI and at four ground motion intensities in LS-DYNA (reference PGAs of 0.4g, 0.6g, 0.9g and 1.2g). The LS-DYNA results at higher intensities are scaled down to 0.4g in this figure.

The following observations and conclusions can be made from the results presented in Figure 4-14 and Figure 4-15:

1. The nonlinear results at a reference PGA of 0.4g are very close to the CLASSI results, except for a small decrease in the peak spectral acceleration in the Y direction. This shows that sliding has just initiated at a reference PGA of 0.4g.

2. The nonlinear results in X and Y directions gradually deviate from the linear results with increasing reference PGA. The normalized spectral accelerations calculated using nonlinear analyses are generally decreasing with increasing reference PGA at frequencies
smaller than 10Hz. This decrease is due to the energy dissipated in sliding and results in reduced in-structure demands. The results show that this reduction can be significant for frequencies smaller than 10Hz.

3. At the higher frequencies, nonlinear effects result in an increase in the response. This is likely due to gapping, and the resulting impact of the basemat on the soil surface. This result shows that the geometric nonlinearities can result in an increase in the in-structure response at higher frequencies.

4. The results in the Z direction are almost unchanged until about 20Hz, indicating that the geometric nonlinearities do not generally affect the vertical response. At the higher frequencies, the Z direction response increases, likely due to the impact from gapping.

4.5 Seismic component capacity distributions

The component capacity distribution describes the conditional probability of failure given the in-structure spectral acceleration. The spectral acceleration capacity distributions listed in Table 4-2 were derived from the component seismic fragilities (Section 3.2). The median spectral acceleration capacity represents the 5% damped in-structure spectral acceleration in the controlling direction of motion at the median component frequency for which the net median demand on the controlling element equals its median capacity. The variability is represented by the lognormal standard deviation for component capacity.

Table 4-2: Component spectral acceleration capacity distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Frequency (Hz)</th>
<th>SA_m</th>
<th>β_c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pump 670-M-11</td>
<td>EL 61’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.46g</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery 670-E-59</td>
<td>EL 22’</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.10g</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution Panel 670-E-23</td>
<td>EL 61’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.24g</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Wall 2B-G2-1</td>
<td>EL 22’</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.73g</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switchgear 670-E-1</td>
<td>EL 61’</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>4.8g</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Component response probability distributions

We performed a deterministic seismic response analysis using three structure/soil models and a limited number of time-history sets in order to develop a preliminary estimate of the nonlinear response distribution. The deterministic response analysis followed the following procedure:

1. Ground motion input consisted of three sets of acceleration time histories. These sets were selected from the original 30time-history sets used in Section 3.1. They therefore included variability in the X and Y direction spectra about the geometric mean UHS.

2. We used three structure/soil models to represent best-estimate (BE), lower-bound LB) stiffness, and upper-bound (BE) stiffness. The BE case combined the 84% NEP structure stiffnesses, soil stiffnesses, and soil coefficient of friction. The LB case used the 16% NEP values of these parameters.
3. We computed the average ISRS for each of the BE, LB, and UB cases.
4. We defined the median response as the average of the three average ISRS plots.
5. We defined the 84% NEP response for structure and soil property uncertainty as the envelope of the three average ISRS.
6. We defined the 84%NEP response for time-history uncertainty as the envelope of the BE ISRS, compared to the average BE ISRS.

The resulting ISRS are shown in Figures 4-16 through 4-19. Comparison of the plots in these figures demonstrates that the ISRS do not scale linearly with the PGA. The nonlinear effects are frequency-dependent and therefore the spectral shapes of the ISRS are not preserved. The Pots also show the X-direction median spectral accelerations in the frequency range of 1 Hz to 4 Hz are generally higher than the Y-direction results. This discrepancy is due to the particular characteristics of the 3 time-histories that were used in this deterministic response analysis, which happened to have a directional bias towards the X-direction in this frequency range. Use of the full 30-set suite of time-histories in the full probabilistic analysis will alleviate this bias in the horizontal directional variability.

We estimated the median demands for each equipment component as the median spectral acceleration at the controlling direction and frequency (Table 4-2). Probabilistic ISRS do not typically have significant valleys between peaks as do the deterministic ISRS. The only component whose demand is controlled by a frequency where there is a nearby valley is Battery 670-E-59. Battery 670-E-59 is controlled by Elev. 22ft Y-direction spectral acceleration at 8.3 Hz. Therefore, the median demand for this battery was defined as the average spectral acceleration calculated within a range of 6.8 Hz and 10.1 Hz, which represented ±one standard deviation on the equipment frequency.

The response variabilities were estimated as follows

1. Structure response variability was calculated using the SRSS method from two components: time-history variability and structure/soil property uncertainty.
   a. Lognormal standard deviation due to time-history variability was calculated based on the ratio of the envelope BE spectral acceleration to the average BE spectral acceleration, with a minimum value of 0.10.
   b. Lognormal standard deviation due to structure/soil property uncertainty was calculated based on the ratio of the 84% spectral acceleration to the median spectral acceleration. A minimum value of 0.10 was imposed with the exception of the block wall, which has a low frequency (less than 1 Hz).

2. The other variabilities were computed using procedures and assumptions similar to the linear analysis case for each component (Section 3.2.1).

The preliminary median spectral accelerations are listed in Table 4-3. The lognormal standard deviations are listed in Table 4-4. The corresponding results from the linear CLASSI analysis at 0.4g PGA are shown for comparison. The results show an acceptable match between the linear and nonlinear response distributions at the 0.4g PGA where little nonlinearity is observed to occur in the analysis.
Table 4-3: Component median spectral acceleration preliminary demands based on deterministic response analysis, $S_{A_{m,R}}$ (g)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>0.4 g PGA (Linear)</th>
<th>0.4g PGA</th>
<th>0.6g PGA</th>
<th>0.9g PGA</th>
<th>1.2g PGA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pump 670-M-11</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery 670-E-59</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution Panel 670-E-23</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Wall 2B-G2-1</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switchgear 670-E-1</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-4: Component response preliminary lognormal standard deviations based on deterministic response analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>0.4g PGA (Linear)</th>
<th>0.4g PGA</th>
<th>0.6g PGA</th>
<th>0.9g PGA</th>
<th>1.2g PGA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pump 670-M-11</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery 670-E-59</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution Panel 670-E-23</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Wall 2B-G2-1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switchgear 670-E-1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4-16: 5% damped spectral accelerations in the internal structure at 22’ elevation (left) and 61’ elevation (right) from the deterministic response analysis at 0.4g PGA

Figure 4-17: 5% damped spectral accelerations in the internal structure at 22’ elevation (left) and 61’ elevation (right) from the deterministic response analysis at 0.6g PGA
Figure 4-18: 5% damped spectral accelerations in the internal structure at 22° elevation (left) and 61° elevation (right) from the deterministic response analysis at 0.9g PGA

Figure 4-19: 5% damped spectral accelerations in the internal structure at 22° elevation (left) and 61° elevation (right) from the deterministic response analysis at 1.2g PGA
4.7 Seismic component conditional probabilities of failure

The conditional probabilities of component failure are calculated explicitly by convolution of the component capacity distributions and the probabilistic response distributions at each PGA level. They are summarized in Table 4-5. Figure 4-20 shows the conditional probabilities of component failures given the PGA for the traditional SPRA approach in solid lines, compared to the estimated values using the advanced SPRA approach. These preliminary results suggest that the latter probabilities are generally lower than the traditional SPRA probabilities at higher intensity ground motions. The preliminary results also suggest that some of these latter probabilities may not follow a lognormal distribution. More nonlinear probabilistic response analyses and more (higher) PGA levels are required in order to further examine these observations and generalize the conclusions drawn from them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>0.4g PGA</th>
<th>0.6g PGA</th>
<th>0.9g PGA</th>
<th>1.2g PGA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pump 670-M-11</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery 670-E-59</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.0085</td>
<td>0.0878</td>
<td>0.1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution Panel 670-E-23</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
<td>0.0435</td>
<td>0.1392</td>
<td>0.2632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Wall 2B-G2-1</td>
<td>0.0644</td>
<td>0.4346</td>
<td>0.8745</td>
<td>0.9423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switchgear 670-E-1</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
<td>0.0422</td>
<td>0.0568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4-20: Component fragilities and conditional probabilities of failure calculated using the traditional and advanced PRA approaches.
5. Summary and Conclusions

This report presents the calculation of seismic fragilities in a nuclear power plant structure using two approaches:

- The traditional SPRA approach, which involves linear seismic SSI response analysis and the assumption that the component demands increase linearly with increasing ground motion intensity
- An advanced SPRA approach that considers geometric nonlinear effects at the foundation and rejects the assumption of linear increase in demand with increasing ground motion intensity.

The study in this report considered an idealized nuclear power plant structure (borrowed from the SASSI2000 user manual), a soil profile representative of the ATR site at INL and a seismic hazard representative of the Western United States. The system under consideration for risk analysis is the Emergency Cooling Pump at ATR. Five components of this system are considered: Pump 670-M-11, Battery-670-E-59, Distribution Panel 670-E-23, Block Wall 2B-G2-1 and Switchgear 670-E-1.

Linear analyses are performed by SGH using the industry-standard nonlinear SSI analysis code, CLASSI. SGH also performed the fragility calculations for the above-listed components and used the linear analysis results to calculate the seismic component fragilities.

Nonlinear SSI analyses are performed by INL using the NLSSI methodology (developed by INL) for a limited number of ground motions at four reference intensities. The nonlinear SSI analysis results clearly showed that the in-structure demands do not increase linearly with increasing intensity. The in-structure responses are lower than the corresponding linear responses for most frequencies. For some cases the in-structure responses are higher than the linear counterparts at frequencies larger than 10Hz.

SGH estimated nonlinear response distribution parameters from these preliminary NLSSI results and used these distributions to calculate preliminary estimates of the component seismic fragilities. A comparison of the response distributions showed that the median demands calculated considering the nonlinear effects do not scale linearly unlike in traditional SPRA. A comparison between the component fragilities showed that the conditional probabilities of failure for given PGA values estimated using advanced SPRA are generally smaller than those calculated using the traditional approach. The advanced SPRA calculations are currently being updated with results from a larger set of NLSSI analyses and the resulting component fragilities, and system fragilities will be presented in a future report.
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APPENDIX A

Numerical Tool Development

The team at University at Buffalo has developed the numerical capability to model dynamic saturated porous media in MOOSE. Their report is presented below.
Development of u-P-U capability in MOOSE — progress report
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1 Background

The goal of this project is to implement a three-field formulation of the dynamics of saturated porous media in the Multiphysics Object Oriented Simulation Framework (MOOSE). Dynamics of porous media are of interest in a variety of fields including mechanics of saturated and partially saturated soil, porous biological materials and petroleum reservoirs. In particular, our motivation here is to simulate and understand the dynamic response of saturated soil under earthquakes and the subsequent soil liquefaction process [1–3].

Partial differential equation (PDE) models of the dynamics of saturated porous media are based on representing the porous medium as a solid skeleton filled with fluid. Such models contain three fields — the skeleton displacement ($u$), the velocity of the fluid relative to the skeleton, or Darcy velocity ($w$), and the pressure of the fluid contained in the skeleton, or the pore pressure ($p$). Various finite element formulations are possible for these PDE models — three-field ($u$-$w$-$p$) formulations and two-field ($u$-$p$ or $u$-$w$) formulations [1]. A majority of current implementations are based on two-field formulations obtained by eliminating either the Darcy velocity $w$, resulting in a $u$-$p$ formulation [3–10], or eliminating the pressure, leading to a $u$-$w$ formulation [1,11–15]. However, here we pursue a three-field formulation motivated by the following considerations.

1. The Darcy velocity, $w$, cannot be eliminated from the formulation unless the relative acceleration of the fluid is zero (see equation (1)$^2$ below). Thus a $u$-$p$ formulation is reasonable only for scenarios in which the acceleration of the fluid relative to the solid skeleton is small. Similarly, the pore pressure, $p$, cannot be eliminated, and thus a $u$-$w$ formulation is not possible, unless the combined flexibility of the skeleton material and the fluid is non-zero (see equation (1)$^3$ below). Therefore, to realistically model phenomena such as saturated soil-foundation-structure interaction in earthquakes, liquefaction and cyclic mobility, where the relative acceleration of the fluid could be substantial, and the skeleton material and fluid are relatively incompressible, a three-field formulation is necessary. This has also been pointed out by Jeremić et al. [2,16,17].

2. Since the $u$-$p$ formulation amounts to solving for pressure and skeleton displacement as primary variable fields, post-processing in needed to compute the velocity field from the pressure gradient. The Darcy velocity obtained from a $u$-$p$ formulation is consequently of lower accuracy [18,19].

3. Both pressure and flux boundary conditions can be applied directly with a three-field formulation, but require special treatment with a two-field formulation [20].

4. Presence of the fluid velocity field in an explicit fashion in the formulation will also allow for poromechanics to be more readily coupled with transport phenomena in MOOSE.

In this report, we describe our approach to implementing a three-field formulation of the dynamics of porous media in MOOSE, indicate the current status of this effort, and outline the tasks that remain to be completed.
2 Governing equations

We begin with the set of equations developed by Biot [21] to describe dynamics of porous media. We impose the following restrictions, which are appropriate for the response of saturated soils: (i) the skeleton material (i.e., soil particles) and the fluid are incompressible; (ii) there is a single fluid phase (i.e., the soil is fully saturated); (iii) the skeleton has isotropic linear elastic behavior (nonlinear material models can be easily substituted later in MOOSE); (iv) fluid flow follow a linear isotropic form of Darcy’s law; (v) kinematics are linearized (also resulting in constant porosity); (vi) the additional apparent mass used in Biot’s equations is negligible. Then the governing equations are [22]

\[\begin{align*}
\rho \ddot{u} + \rho f \dot{w} - \nabla \cdot (\sigma - pI) &= 0 \\
\rho f \ddot{u} + \frac{\rho f}{\phi} \dot{w} + \frac{\rho f g}{K} w + \nabla p &= 0 \\
\nabla \cdot \dot{u} + \nabla \cdot w &= 0
\end{align*}\]  

These represent the momentum balance of the porous medium, the dynamic extension of Darcy’s law, and conservation of fluid mass respectively. The three fields, as described above, are the skeleton displacement, \(u\), the Darcy velocity, \(w\), and pore fluid pressure, \(p\). The Darcy velocity, more precisely, is defined as the relative rate of volume discharge per unit area of the medium, \(w = \phi (\dot{u}_f - \dot{u})\), where \(\dot{u}_f\) refers to the absolute velocity of the fluid and \(\phi\) is the porosity. \(\rho\) and \(\rho f\) are the densities of the skeleton material and the fluid, while \(\rho = (1 - \phi) \rho_s + \phi \rho f\) is the wet density of the porous medium. \(K\) is the hydraulic conductivity of the medium and \(g\) is acceleration due to gravity. The operators \(\nabla\), \(\nabla \cdot\) and \(\frac{d}{dt}\) denote gradient, divergence derivative with respect to time, and \(I\), the 3 \times 3 identity matrix.

In equation (1), \(\sigma\) is the effective stress in the skeleton. The total stress in the porous medium, \(\sigma^t = \sigma - \alpha_B p I\), where \(\alpha_B\) is the Biot-Willis coefficient [23], which is commonly taken as 1 for soil material. The constitutive equation relates the effective stress to the strain, \(\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla u + \nabla u^T)\). If the skeleton is modeled as isotropic and linear elastic, this constitutive equation is

\[\sigma = \frac{E}{1 + \nu} \left( \varepsilon + \frac{\nu}{1 - 2\nu} \text{trace}(\varepsilon) I \right)\]  

where \(E\) is modulus of elasticity and \(\nu\) is Poisson’s ration both under the drained condition. Other constitutive equations can be used or implemented easily in MOOSE without any modifications of the poromechanics implementation itself.

Introducing, in MOOSE terms, the auxiliary variables,

\[v^s = \dot{u}; \quad a^s = \ddot{u}; \quad a^f = \dot{w}\]  

the set of equations (1) becomes

\[\begin{align*}
\rho a^s + \rho f a^f - \nabla \cdot \sigma + \nabla p &= 0 \\
\rho f v^s + \frac{\rho f}{\phi} a^f + \frac{\rho f g}{K} w + \nabla p &= 0 \\
\nabla \cdot v^s + \nabla \cdot w &= 0
\end{align*}\]  

Equations (4) form a system of coupled partial differential equations with \(u\), \(w\), and \(p\) as the three unknown fields on a domain \(\Omega\). The following are appropriate boundary conditions

Skeleton boundary conditions : \(u = u_{\text{prsc}}\) on \(\Gamma_u\); \(\sigma^t \cdot \hat{n} = t_{\text{prsc}}\) on \(\Gamma_t\)

Fluid boundary conditions : \(w \cdot \hat{n} = t_{\text{qprsc}}\) on \(\Gamma_q\); \(p = p_{\text{prsc}}\) on \(\Gamma_p\)

where \(\Gamma_u\), \(\Gamma_t\), \(\Gamma_q\) and \(\Gamma_p\) are respectively the parts of the boundary, \(\Gamma\), of \(\Omega\), where skeleton displacement, traction, fluid flux and fluid pressure are prescribed. The corresponding prescribed values are \(u_{\text{prsc}}, t_{\text{prsc}}, t_{\text{qprsc}}\) and \(p_{\text{prsc}}\). \(\hat{n}\) is the outward unit normal to the boundary \(\Gamma\).

We now proceed to develop the weak form of these equations, which is the starting point for a MOOSE implementation.
3 Weak form and mapping to kernels

To build the weak-form representation of equations (4), we multiply the three component equations by the test functions $\delta u$, $dw$ and $\delta p$ respectively. After appropriate application of integration by parts (divergence theorem), we obtain the weak form

\[
\int \rho \delta u \cdot \delta u \, d\Omega + \int \rho^f a^f \cdot \delta u \, d\Omega + \int \sigma \cdot \delta \epsilon \, d\Omega - \int (\sigma \cdot \hat{n}) \delta \hat{n} \, d\Gamma + \int t_{prsc} \cdot \delta u \, d\Gamma
\]

\[
- \int p \nabla \cdot \delta u \, d\Gamma + \int p_{prsc} \hat{n} \cdot \delta w \, d\Gamma + \int \Omega \left( \rho^f a^f + \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial g}{\partial t} \right) \cdot \delta w \, d\Omega
\]

\[
- \int p \nabla \cdot \delta w \, d\Gamma + \int \Omega \nabla \cdot \nu \delta p \, d\Omega - \int \Omega \nabla \cdot w \delta p \, d\Omega
\]

Below each term in the weak form, we show how it maps to the respective kernel or boundary condition in a MOOSE implementation. We recognize that a number of terms in the weak form map to existing MOOSE kernels and boundary conditions. The $\text{StressDivergenceTensors}$, $\text{InertialForce}$ and $\text{PoroMechanicsCoupling}$ kernels and the $\text{Pressure}$ boundary condition belong to the $\text{tensor_mechanics}$ module, while the $\text{INSMass}$ kernel is from the $\text{navier_stokes}$ module. We then identify two new kernels — $\text{PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling}$ and $\text{DynamicDarcyFlow}$, and a new boundary condition — $\text{PorePressureBC}$ (shown boxed in equation (6)) that need to be implemented for a three-field dynamic poromechanics formulation. We present their implementation in section 5. We note that the kinematic boundary conditions $u = u_{prsc}$ on $\Gamma_u$ and $\hat{n} = t_{prsc}$ on $\Gamma_n$ can be imposed using the $\text{PresetBC}$ boundary condition in MOOSE.

4 Time discretization and auxiliary kernels

We discretize the formulation in time using Newmark’s method. The strong form (4) and the (6) are expressed at time $n + 1$. In Newmark’s method, the kinematics are approximated by

\[
\begin{align*}
v_{n+1} & = v^n + (1 - \gamma) \Delta t a_n^s + \gamma \Delta t a_n^{s+1} \\
u_{n+1} & = u_n + v_n^s \Delta t + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \beta \right) \Delta t^2 a_n^s + \beta \Delta t^2 a_n^{s+1} \\
w_{n+1} & = w_n + (1 - \gamma) \Delta t a_n^i + \gamma \Delta t a_n^{i+1}
\end{align*}
\]

\[n = 1 \text{ or } 2\]

We follow the clever implementation of Newmark’s method in the $\text{tensor_mechanics}$ module in MOOSE using auxiliary kernels. The following are defined in the existing auxiliary kernels $\text{NewmarkAccelAux}$ and $\text{NewmarkVelAux}$ respectively in the $\text{tensor_mechanics}$ module.

\[
a_{n+1}^s = \frac{1}{\beta \Delta t^2} \left( u_{n+1} - u_n - v_n^s \Delta t - \left( \frac{1}{2} - \beta \right) \Delta t^2 a_n^s \right)
\]

\[
v_{n+1}^s = v^n + (1 - \gamma) \Delta t a_n^s + \gamma \Delta t a_n^{s+1}
\]

\[
a_{n+1}^i = \frac{1}{\gamma \Delta t} \left( w_{n+1} - w_n - (1 - \gamma) \Delta t a_n^i \right)
\]

Following this approach, we define the following in the new auxiliary kernel $\text{NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux}$ implemented as follows.
#include "NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux.h"

template<>
InputParameters validParams<NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux>()
{
    InputParameters params = validParams<AuxKernel>();
    params.addRequiredCoupledVar("darcyvel","Darcy Velocity");
    params.addRequiredParam<Real>("gamma","gamma parameter");
    return params;
}

NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux::NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux(const InputParameters& parameters)
    : AuxKernel(parameters),
      w_old(coupledValueOld("darcyvel")),
      w(coupledValue("darcyvel")),
      gamma(getParam<Real>("gamma"))
{
}

Real NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux::computeValue()
{
    if (!isNodal())
        mooseError("NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux must run on a nodal variable");

    Real af_old = u_old[qp];
    if (_dt == 0)
        return af_old;
    return 1.0/gamma*((w[qp]-w_old[qp])/_dt - af_old*(1.0-gamma));
}

NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux.C

5 Kernel and boundary condition implementation

We implement the two kernels — PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling and PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling,
the boundary condition — PorePressureBC, and the auxiliary kernel — NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux, in a
new module called three_field_poromechanics. The new kernels, boundary condition and auxiliary kernel
are registered in ThreeFieldPoromechanics.C below.
#include "ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp.h"
#include "Moose.h"
#include "AppFactory.h"

#include "NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux.h"
#include "PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling.h"
#include "DynamicDarcyFlow.h"

template<>
InputParameters validParams<ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp>()
{
    InputParameters params = validParams<MooseApp>();

    params.set< bool >("use_legacy_uo_initialization") = false;
    params.set< bool >("use_legacy_uo_aux_computation") = false;
    return params;
}

ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp::ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp(const InputParameters &parameters) :
MooseApp(parameters)
{
    srand(processor_id());
    Moose::registerObjects(_factory);
    ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp::registerObjects(_factory);
    Moose::associateSyntax(_syntax, _action_factory);
    ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp::associateSyntax(_syntax, _action_factory);
}

ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp::~ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp()
{
}

// External entry point for dynamic application loading
extern "C" void ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp::registerApps() {
    ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp::registerApps();
}

void
ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp::registerApps()
{
    registerApp(ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp);
}

// External entry point for dynamic object registration
extern "C" void ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp::registerObjects(Factory &factory)
{
    ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp::registerObjects(factory);
}

void
ThreeFieldPoromechanicsApp::registerObjects(Factory &factory)
{
    registerAux(NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux);
    registerKernel(PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling);
The kernel **PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling** representing the term $\rho \mathbf{a} \cdot \delta \mathbf{u}$ in the weak form is implemented in **PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling.C** below.

```cpp
#include "PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling.h"
#include "SubProblem.h"

template<>
InputParameters validParams<PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling>()
{
    InputParameters params = validParams<Kernel>();
    params.set<bool>("use_displaced_mesh") = false;
    params.addRequiredCoupledVar("fluidaccel","fluid relative acceleration variable");
    params.addRequiredCoupledVar("darcyvel","Darcy velocity variable");
    params.addRequiredParam<Real>("gamma","gamma parameter");
    return params;
}

PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling::PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling(const InputParameters & parameters)
:Kernel(parameters),
  _rhof(getMaterialProperty<Real>("rhof")),
  _af_old(coupledValueOld("fluidaccel")),
  _w(coupledValue("darcyvel")),
  _w_old(coupledValueOld("darcyvel")),
  _w_var_num(coupled("darcyvel")),
  _gamma(getParam<Real>("gamma"))
{}

Real PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling::computeQpResidual()
{
    if (_dt == 0)
        return 0.0;
    return 0.0;
}
```
Real af = 1 / \gamma ((w[qp] - w_{old}[qp]) / dt - (1 - \gamma) \cdot af_{old}[qp]) ;
return \cdot test[i][qp] \cdot rhof[qp] \cdot af;
}

Real
PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling::computeQpJacobian()
{
    return 0.0;
}

Real
PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling::computeQpOffDiagJacobian(unsigned int jvar)
{
    if (dt == 0)
        return 0.0;
    if (jvar != \_w.var.num)
        return 0.0;
    return \cdot test[i][qp] \cdot rhof[qp] / (\gamma \cdot dt) \cdot phi[j][qp];
}

PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling.C

The kernel DynamicDarcyFlow representing the term \( \rho^f a^f + \frac{\rho^f}{\gamma} a^f + \frac{\rho^f}{\gamma} g \cdot \delta w \) in the weak form is implemented in DynamicDarcyFlow.C below.

```cpp
#include "DynamicDarcyFlow.h"
#include "SubProblem.h"

template<>
InputParameters validParams<DynamicDarcyFlow>()
{
    InputParameters params = validParams<Kernel>();
    params.set<bool>("use_displaced_mesh") = false;
    params.addRequiredCoupledVar("skeletondisp","skeleton displacement variable");
    params.addRequiredCoupledVar("skeletonvel","skeleton velocity variable");
    params.addRequiredCoupledVar("skeletonaccel","skeleton acceleration variable");
    params.addRequiredCoupledVar("fluidaccel","fluid relative acceleration variable");
    params.addRequiredParam<Real>("gravity","acceleration due to gravity");
    params.addRequiredParam<Real>("beta","beta parameter");
    params.addRequiredParam<Real>("gamma","gamma parameter");
    return params;
}

DynamicDarcyFlow::DynamicDarcyFlow(const InputParameters & parameters)
    : Kernel(parameters),
      \_rhof(getMaterialProperty<Real>("rhof")),
```
Real DynamicDarcyFlow::computeQpResidual()
{
    if (_dt == 0)
        return 0.0;
    Real as = 1 / _beta * (( _us_qp - _us_qp_old ) / _dt / _dt) - _vs_qp_old / _dt - _as_qp_old * (0.5 - _beta);
    Real af = 1 / _gamma * ( _u_qp - _u_qp_old ) / _dt - (1.0 - _gamma) * _af_qp_old;
    return _test[i] * _rhof_qp * (as + af / _nf_qp + _gravity / _K_qp * _u_qp);
}

Real DynamicDarcyFlow::computeQpJacobian()
{
    if (_dt == 0)
        return 0.0;
    return _test[i] * _rhof_qp * (1.0 / (_nf_qp * _gamma * _dt) + _gravity / _K_qp) * _phi[j];
}

Real DynamicDarcyFlow::computeQpOffDiagJacobian(unsigned int jvar)
{
    if (_dt == 0)
        return 0.0;
    if (jvar != _us_var_num)
        return 0.0;
    return _test[i] * _rhof_qp * (_beta * _dt * _dt) * _phi[j];
}
6 Verification example

We select as verification example a 2D-plane strain model of a block of soil with a strip load on the surface. This example has been presented in [3, 24]. It is particularly interesting because we found that numerical results presented in the literature for this problem are incorrect; perhaps due to inadequate spatial discretization, they fail to even qualitatively resemble the correct solution, misestimating basic frequency and dissipation characteristics. We computed solutions for this problem using a three-field formulation and a mixed finite element approach [25], and verified them using boundary element solutions obtained using [22], which are not influenced by the resolution of domain discretization. We therefore have confidence in using these results as reference to verify our MOOSE implementation. We also computed solutions to this problem using COMSOL based on a u-p formulation and obtained similar results, adding further confidence; however, the COMSOL solution shows instability for low values of hydraulic conductivity.

The model is shown in Figure 1. Due to symmetry, only half of the domain is represented. Displacements perpendicular to the left, right and bottom walls are constrained. A load of 15 kPa is applied instantaneously on half of the top surface. The left, right and bottom walls are impermeable, and the fluid pressure at the top surface is zero. The properties are \( E = 14.5 \times 10^{3} \) kPa, \( \nu = 0.3 \), \( \rho_{s} = 2700 \) kg/m\(^3\), \( \rho_{f} = 1000 \) kg/m\(^3\) and \( \phi = 0.42 \). Two values of hydraulic conductivity are used \( K = 10^{-1} \) m/s and \( K = 10^{-4} \) m/s. The reference solutions are shown in Figures 2 and 3.

As a first step, we consider the dynamics of the skeleton alone, without the fluid (and slightly different material properties). We model this in MOOSE using the tensor mechanics module and a 20 × 20 grid of 4-node quadrilateral Lagrange finite elements. The input file for this model is listed in the Appendix. The MOOSE solution for the displacement of the top corner point is shown in Figure 4 together with a solution from ABAQUS using an identical finite element discretization. Since the first two frequencies of the model are close to each other, a beating phenomenon is observed. We note that there is a slight discrepancy between the MOOSE and ABAQUS solutions. This requires further exploration.

The input file for the full porous medium model using the new three_field_poromechanics module is also listed in the Appendix. However, the rate of convergence of the linear solver, while executing this problem is very slow, and results in instability of the solution over time. A possible reason for this is that the jacobian for the three-field formulation is a saddle point matrix, and likely requires appropriate preconditioning. This is the main issue that needs to be resolved in the remainder of this project.

7 Remaining tasks

The following tasks remain to be completed in the project.

1. Understand and resolve the numerical convergence issue in executing the dynamic poroelasticity verification example. Verify MOOSE solution using mixed finite element solution [25], boundary element solution [22] and COMSOL solution based on u-p formulation.
Figure 2: Reference solution obtained using three-field formulation and a mixed finite element approach [25]; solution for small hydraulic conductivity, $K$, is highly mesh-dependent; fine mesh solution agreed with boundary element solution obtained using [22].

Figure 3: COMSOL solution using $u$-$p$ formulation; solution for small hydraulic conductivity, $K$, shows instability.
2. Understand and resolve the difference between the MOOSE solution and ABAQUS solution for the solid dynamics example.

3. Implement a ThreeFieldPoromechanicsAction to simplify input for three-field poromechanics problems.

4. Test the implementation using additional verification examples.

5. If the use of Lagrange finite elements for $u$ and $w$ and lower-order monomial finite elements for $p$ is found unsatisfactory, implement a mapping of the new kernels to vector finite elements such as Raviart-Thomas elements in libmesh for the $w$ field.
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Appendix — input files

Input file for tensor-mechanics dynamics example

[Mesh]
  type = GeneratedMesh
dim = 2
nx = 20
ny = 20
xmin = 0
xmax = 10
ymin = 0
ymax = 10
elem_type = QUAD4

[Variables]
  active = 'u_x u_y'

  [.u_x]
    order = FIRST
    family = LAGRANGE

  [.u_y]
    order = FIRST
    family = LAGRANGE

[AuxVariables]
  [.v_x]
    order = FIRST
    family = LAGRANGE

  [.v_y]
    order = FIRST
    family = LAGRANGE

  [.a_x]
    order = FIRST
    family = LAGRANGE

  [.a_y]
    order = FIRST
    family = LAGRANGE

[Kernels]
  active = 'stressdivx stressdivy inertia_x inertia_y'

  [.stressdivx]
type = StressDivergenceTensors
variable = u_x
component = 0
displacements = 'u_x u_y'
use_displaced_mesh = false
[.]

./stressdivy
  type = StressDivergenceTensors
  variable = u_y
  component = 1
displacements = 'u_x u_y'
  use_displaced_mesh = false
[.]

./inertia_x
  type = InertialForce
  variable = u_x
  velocity = v_x
  acceleration = a_x
  beta = 0.25
  gamma = 0.5
  use_displaced_mesh = false
[.]

./inertia_y
  type = InertialForce
  variable = u_y
  velocity = v_y
  acceleration = a_y
  beta = 0.25
  gamma = 0.5
  use_displaced_mesh = false
[.]

/AuxKernels

./accel_x
  type = NewmarkAccelAux
  variable = a_x
  displacement = u_x
  velocity = v_x
  beta = 0.25
  execute_on = timestep_end
[.]

./accel_y
  type = NewmarkAccelAux
  variable = a_y
  displacement = u_y
  velocity = v_y
  beta = 0.25
  execute_on = timestep_end
[.]

[./vel_x]
  type = NewmarkVelAux
  variable = v_x
  acceleration = a_x
  gamma = 0.5
  execute_on = timestep_end
[../]

[./vel_y]
  type = NewmarkVelAux
  variable = v_y
  acceleration = a_y
  gamma = 0.5
  execute_on = timestep_end
[../]

[/.elasticity_tensor]
  type = ComputeIsotropicElasticityTensor
  youngs_modulus = 1.0
  poissons_ratio = 0.3
  block = 0
[../]

[./strain]
  type = ComputeSmallStrain
  displacements = 'u_x u_y'
  block = 0
[../]

[./stress]
  type = ComputeLinearElasticStress
  block = 0
[../]

[./density]
  type = GenericConstantMaterial
  block = 0
  prop_names = 'density'
  prop_values = '0.1'
[../]

[Functions]
  active = 'bc_func'

[./bc_func]
  type = ParsedFunction
  value = 'if(x<5.0,0.0,10.0)'
[../]

[BCs]
[./bottom_y]  
    type = PresetBC  
    variable = u_y  
    boundary = 'bottom'  
    value = 0  
  [/]

[./top_y]  
    type = Pressure  
    variable = u_y  
    boundary = 'top'  
    component = 1 #y  
    factor = 1.0  
    function = bc_func  
    use_displaced_mesh = false  
  [/]

[./left_x]  
    type = PresetBC  
    variable = u_x  
    boundary = 'left'  
    value = 0  
  [/]

[./right_x]  
    type = PresetBC  
    variable = u_x  
    boundary = 'right'  
    value = 0  
  [/]

[Executioner]
    type = Transient  
    solve_type = 'PJFNK'  
    l_max_its = 20  
    nl_max_its = 10  
    l_tol = 1.0e-7  
    nl_rel_tol = 1.0e-12  
    start_time = 0  
    end_time = 100  
    dtmax = 0.1  
    dtmin = 0.1  
  [/TimeStepper]
    type = ConstantDT  
    dt = 0.1  
  [/]

[Outputs]
    exodus = true  
    output_on = 'timestep_end'  
  [/console]
type = Console
perf_log = true
execute_on = 'initial timestep_end failed nonlinear'

&

Input file for three-field-poromechanics example

<Mesh>
type = GeneratedMesh
dim = 2
nx = 50
ny = 50
xmin = 0
xmax = 10
ymin = 0
ymax = 10
elem_type = QUAD4

&

[Variables]
[./u_x]
  order = FIRST
  family = LAGRANGE
  [...]

[./u_y]
  order = FIRST
  family = LAGRANGE
  [...]

[./w_x]
  order = FIRST
  family = LAGRANGE
  [...]

[./w_y]
  order = FIRST
  family = LAGRANGE
  [...]

[./p]
  order = CONSTANT
  family = MONOMIAL
  [...]

&

[AuxVariables]
[./v_x]
  order = FIRST
  family = LAGRANGE
  [...]

[./v_y]
order = FIRST
family = LAGRANGE
[../]

[./a_x]
order = FIRST
family = LAGRANGE
[../]

[./a_y]
order = FIRST
family = LAGRANGE
[../]

[./af_x]
order = FIRST
family = LAGRANGE
[../]

[./af_y]
order = FIRST
family = LAGRANGE
[../]

[]

[Kernels]
[./stressdiv_x]
type = StressDivergenceTensors
variable = u_x
component = 0
displacements = 'u_x u_y'
use_displaced_mesh = false
[../]

[./stressdiv_y]
type = StressDivergenceTensors
variable = u_y
component = 1
displacements = 'u_x u_x'
use_displaced_mesh = false
[../]

[./skeletoninertia_x]
type = InertialForce
variable = u_x
velocity = v_x
acceleration = a_x
beta = 0.25
gamma = 0.5
use_displaced_mesh = false
[../]

[./skeletoninertia_y]
type = InertialForce
variable = u_y
velocity = v_y
acceleration = a_y
beta = 0.25
gamma = 0.5
use_displaced_mesh = false

[../]

./porefluidIFcoupling_x
  type = PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling
  variable = u_x
  fluidaccel = af_x
  darcyvel = w_x
  gamma = 0.5
[../]

./porefluidIFcoupling_y
  type = PoreFluidInertialForceCoupling
  variable = u_y
  fluidaccel = af_y
  darcyvel = w_y
  gamma = 0.5
[../]

./darcyflow_x
  type = DynamicDarcyFlow
  variable = w_x
  skeletondisp = u_x
  skeletonvel = v_x
  skeletonaccel = a_x
  fluidaccel = af_x
  gravity = 9.81
  beta = 0.25
  gamma = 0.5
[../]

./darcyflow_y
  type = DynamicDarcyFlow
  variable = w_y
  skeletondisp = u_y
  skeletonvel = v_y
  skeletonaccel = a_y
  fluidaccel = af_y
  gravity = 9.81
  beta = 0.25
  gamma = 0.5
[../]

./poromechskeletoncoupling_x
  type = PoroMechanicsCoupling
  variable = u_x
  porepressure = p
  component = 0
[../]
[./poromechskeltoncoupling_y]
  type = PoroMechanicsCoupling
  variable = u_y
  porepressure = p
  component = 1
[../]

[./poromechfluidcoupling_x]
  type = PoroMechanicsCoupling
  variable = w_x
  porepressure = p
  component = 0
[../]

[./poromechfluidcoupling_y]
  type = PoroMechanicsCoupling
  variable = w_y
  porepressure = p
  component = 1
[../]

[./massconservationskeleton]
  type = INSMass
  variable = p
  u = v_x
  v = v_y
  p = p
[../]

[./massconservationfluid]
  type = INSMass
  variable = p
  u = w_x
  v = w_y
  p = p
[../]

[AuxKernels]
[./accel_x]
  type = NewmarkAccelAux
  variable = a_x
  displacement = u_x
  velocity = v_x
  beta = 0.25
  execute_on = timestep_end
[../]

[./accel_y]
  type = NewmarkAccelAux
  variable = a_y
  displacement = u_y
  velocity = v_y
beta = 0.25
execute_on = timestep_end

[./vel_x]
  type = NewmarkVelAux
  variable = v_x
  acceleration = a_x
  gamma = 0.5
  execute_on = timestep_end

[./vel_y]
  type = NewmarkVelAux
  variable = v_y
  acceleration = a_y
  gamma = 0.5
  execute_on = timestep_end

[./fluidaccel_x]
  type = NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux
  variable = af_x
  darcyvel = w_x
  gamma = 0.5
  execute_on = timestep_end

[./fluidaccel_y]
  type = NewmarkPoreFluidAccelAux
  variable = af_y
  darcyvel = w_y
  gamma = 0.5
  execute_on = timestep_end

[./elasticity_tensor]
  type = ComputeIsotropicElasticityTensor
  youngs_modulus = 14.5e3
  poissons_ratio = 0.3
  block = 0

[./strain]
  type = ComputeSmallStrain
  displacements = 'u_x u_y'
  block = 0

[./stress]
  type = ComputeLinearElasticStress
  block = 0
[./density]
  type = GenericConstantMaterial
  block = 0
  prop_names = density
  prop_values = 1986

[./rhof]
  type = GenericConstantMaterial
  block = 0
  prop_names = rhof
  prop_values = 1000

[./porosity]
  type = GenericConstantMaterial
  block = 0
  prop_names = porosity
  prop_values = 0.42

[./hydconductivity]
  type = GenericConstantMaterial
  block = 0
  prop_names = hydconductivity
  prop_values = 0.1

[./biotcoeff]
  type = GenericConstantMaterial
  block = 0
  prop_names = biot_coefficient
  prop_values = 1.0

[Functions]
  active = 'bc_func'

[./bc_func]
  type = ParsedFunction
  value = 'if(x<5.0,0.0,15.0)*if(t<0.1,10*t,1.0)'

[BCs]
  [./bottom_y]
    type = PresetBC
    variable = u_y
    boundary = 'bottom'
    value = 0
[./top_y]
  type = Pressure
  variable = u_y
  boundary = 'top'
  component = 1 # y
  factor = 1.0
  function = bc_func
  use_displaced_mesh = false
[../]

[./left_x]
  type = PresetBC
  variable = u_x
  boundary = 'left'
  value = 0
[../]

[./right_x]
  type = PresetBC
  variable = u_x
  boundary = 'right'
  value = 0
[../]

[./fluidbottom_y]
  type = PresetBC
  variable = w_y
  boundary = 'bottom'
  value = 0
[../]

[./fluidleft_x]
  type = PresetBC
  variable = w_x
  boundary = 'left'
  value = 0
[../]

[./fluidright_x]
  type = PresetBC
  variable = w_x
  boundary = 'right'
  value = 0
[../]

[Preconditioning]
  active = 'smp'

[./smp]
  type = SMP
  full = true
  petsc_options_iname = '-ksp_type -pc_type -snes_atol -snes_rtol -snes_max_it -ksp_atol -ksp_rtol
petsc_options_value = 'gmres bjacobi 1e-10 1e-10 10 1e-15 1e-10'

[./fdp]
type = FDP
  full = true

[Postprocessors]
  [./cornerdisp]
    type = PointValue
    point = '10 10 0'
    variable = u_y

[Executioner]
type = Transient
  solve_type = 'PJFNK'
  l_max_its = 200
  nl_max_its = 20
  l_tol = 1.0e-12
  nl_rel_tol = 1.0e-12
  start_time = 0
  end_time = 0.5
  dtmax = 0.01
  dtmin = 0.01
  [./TimeStepper]
    type = ConstantDT
    dt = 0.01

[Outputs]
  exodus = true
  output_on = 'timestep_end'
  [./console]
    type = Console
    #perf_log = true
    execute_on = 'initial timestep_end failed nonlinear' # linear

  [./csv]
    type = CSV
    execute_on = 'initial timestep_end'
