

Master Thesis

NUMERICAL SIMULATION OF STRENGTHENED UNREINFORCED
MASONRY (URM) WALLS BY NEW RETROFITTING TECHNOLOGIES FOR
BLAST LOADING

BY

YU SU

B.E., Civil/Structural

School of Civil, Environmental and Mining Engineering
The University of Adelaide

December 2008

DECLARATION

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

Y. Su

10 December 2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express his sincere gratitude to his supervisors, Dr. C.Q. Wu and Associate Professor M. Griffith, for their invaluable guidance and supervision during the course of this study. Their good nature, patience, frankness, and technical expertise had a profound impact on the author's academic experience and personal goals. Special thanks are given to Stephen Carr, Computing Support, for helping with definitely improving the software and hardware environment.

Finally, the author extends his sincerest thanks to his family for the ongoing support, especially his father Guozhi and uncle Dachen.

PUBLICATIONS FROM THE THESIS

International Journal papers:

1. **Su, Y.**, Wu, C., Griffith, M.C. (2008). Mitigation of blast effects of aluminium foam protected masonry walls. *Transactions of Tianjin University, ISSN 1006-4982, Vol.14, 2008*. Also will be published in *the 2nd International Conference on Analysis and Design of Structures against Explosive and Impact Loads, Beijing China, 17-19, October 2008*.
2. **Su, Y.**, Wu, C., Griffith, M.C. (April, 2008 submitted). Numerical Analysis of FRP Repaired URM Wall under Out-of-Plane Loading. *Submitted to Construction and Building Materials*.
3. **Su, Y.**, Wu, C., Griffith, M.C. (August, 2008 submitted). Numerical Simulation of Mitigation of Blast Effects of Aluminium Foams on Masonry Structures. *Submitted to Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, ASCE*.
4. **Su, Y.**, Wu, C., Griffith, M.C. (2008 submitted). Mitigation of blast effects on masonry walls using retrofit technologies. *Submitted to Advances in Structural Engineering*.

International Conference papers:

1. **Su, Y.**, Wu, C., Griffith, M.C. (2008). Numerical analysis of out-of-plane loaded masonry wall using homogenization technique. *The 14th International Brick and Block Masonry Conference in Sydney, 17-20 February 2008*.
2. **Su, Y.**, Wu, C., Griffith, M.C. (2008 accepted). Numerical simulation of bond-slip models between FRP and masonry in pull tests. *The Tenth International Symposium on Structural Engineering for Young Experts, Hunan, China, 19-21, October 2008*.
3. **Su, Y.**, Wu, C., Griffith, M.C. (2009 submitted). Performance of retrofitted masonry walls under blast loads. *The 9th International Symposium on Fibre Reinforced Polymer Reinforcement for Concrete Structures, Sydney, Australia, 13-15, July 2009*.

ABSTRACT

Terrorism has become a serious threat in the world, with bomb attacks carried out both inside and outside buildings. There are already many unreinforced masonry buildings in existence, and some of them are historical buildings. However, they do not perform well under blast loading. Aiming on protecting masonry buildings, retrofitting techniques were developed. Some experimental work on studying the effect of retrofitted URM walls has been done in recent years; however, these tests usually cost a significant amount of time and funds. Because of this, numerical simulation has become a good alternative, and can be used to study the behaviour of masonry structures, and predict the outcomes of experimental tests.

This project was carried out to find efficient retrofitting technique under blast loading by developing numerical material models. It was based on experimental research of strengthening URM walls by using retrofitting technologies under out-of-plane loading at the University of Adelaide. The numerical models can be applied to study large-scaled structures under static loading, and the research work is then extended to the field of blast loading. Aiming on deriving efficient material models, homogenization technology was introduced to this research. Fifty cases of numerical analysis on masonry basic cell were conducted to derive equivalent orthotropic material properties. To study the increasing capability in strength and ductility of retrofitted URM walls, pull-tests were simulated using interface element model to investigate the bond-slip relationship of FRP plates bonded to masonry blocks. The interface element model was then used to simulate performance of retrofitted URM walls under static loads. The accuracy of the numerical results was verified by comparing with the experimental results from previous tests at the University of Adelaide by Griffith et al. (2007) on unreinforced masonry walls and by Yang (2007) on FRP retrofitted masonry walls. To study the debonding behaviours of retrofits

bonded to masonry, and find appropriate solution to protect certain masonry walls against blast loading, various retrofitting technologies were examined. The simulation covers explosive impacts of a wide range of impulses. Based on this work, pressure-impulse diagrams for different types of retrofitted URM walls were developed as a design guideline for estimating the blast effect on retrofitted masonry walls.

The outcomes of this research will contribute to the development of numerical simulation on modelling retrofitted URM walls, improving the technique for explosion-resistant of masonry buildings, and providing a type of guideline for blast-resistant design.

CONTENTS

DECLARATION	I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	II
PUBLICATIONS FROM THE THESIS	III
ABSTRACT	IV
LIST OF FIGURES	IX
LIST OF TABLES	XV
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. BACKGOURND	1
1.2. SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES	3
1.3. THESIS OUTLINE	4
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
2.1. INTRODUCTION	6
2.2. BACKGROUND OF URM STRUCTURES	6
2.3. CONVENTIONAL METHODS FOR URM STRENGTHENING	8
2.3.1. <i>Fibre Reinforced Polymers</i>	8
2.3.2. <i>Spray-on Polyurea</i>	11
2.3.3. <i>Aluminium Foam</i>	12
2.4. ESTIMATING RESPONSE OF MASONRY WALLS UNDER BLAST LOADING	12
2.4.1. <i>Estimation of Blast Loading</i>	12
2.4.2. <i>Finite Element Method</i>	16
2.4.3. <i>Design Guideline</i>	19
2.5. SUMMARY	19
3. NUMERICAL SIMULATION OF URM WALLS USING THE HOMOGENIZATION TECHNIQUE	21
3.1. INTRODUCTION	21
3.2. HOMOGENIZATION PROCESS	21

3.2.1.	<i>Homogenization Technique</i>	22
3.2.2.	<i>Material Models for Brick and Mortar</i>	23
3.2.3.	<i>Masonry Basic Cell and Convergence Tests</i>	32
3.2.4.	<i>Simulated Stress-Strain Relationships of the Masonry Basic Cell</i>	35
3.2.5.	<i>Equivalent Material Properties</i>	40
3.2.6.	<i>Development of Failure Criterion of Masonry Basic Cell</i>	40
3.3.	SMEARED CRACK MODEL.....	42
3.4.	VALIDATION OF HOMOGENIZED MODEL.....	45
3.4.1.	<i>Experiments of Masonry Walls</i>	45
3.4.2.	<i>Simulation of Masonry Walls</i>	47
3.4.3.	<i>Experimental and Numerical Validation</i>	49
3.5.	CONCLUSIONS.....	52
4.	SIMULATION OF FRP REPAIRED URM WALL UNDER OUT-OF-PLANE LOADING	53
4.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	53
4.2.	MATERIAL MODELS IN SIMULATION.....	54
4.2.1.	<i>Masonry</i>	54
4.2.2.	<i>FRP Models</i>	55
4.2.3.	<i>Bond-Slip Models</i>	56
4.3.	VALIDATION OF THE NUMERICAL MODEL USING PULL TESTS....	60
4.3.1.	<i>Pull Test Program</i>	60
4.3.2.	<i>Distinct Models</i>	62
4.3.3.	<i>Homogenized Model and Smeared Crack Model</i>	66
4.4.	APPLICATION OF THE NUMERICAL MODELS FOR FRP REPAIRED URM WALLS UNDER OUT-OF-PLANE LOADING.....	70
4.5.	CONCLUSIONS.....	77
5.	MITIGATION OF BLAST EFFECTS ON RETROFITTED URM WALLS	78
5.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	78

5.2.	MATERIAL MODELS IN THE SIMULATION	79
5.2.1.	<i>Material Model for Spray-on Polyurea</i>	79
5.2.2.	<i>Material Model for Aluminium Foam</i>	80
5.3.	SIMULATION OF RETROFITTED URM WALLS AGAINST BLAST LOADING.....	85
5.3.1.	<i>Blast Loading</i>	85
5.3.2.	<i>URM Walls</i>	88
5.3.3.	<i>NSM CFRP Retrofitted URM Walls</i>	88
5.3.4.	<i>EB CFRP or GFRP Retrofitted URM Walls</i>	90
5.3.5.	<i>Spray-on Polyurea Retrofitted URM Walls</i>	97
5.3.6.	<i>Aluminium Foam Protected URM Walls</i>	100
5.3.7.	<i>Combination of Aluminium Foam with Other Retrofits</i>	105
5.4.	PRESSURE-IMPULSE (P-I) DIAGRAM FOR RETROFITTED URM WALLS.....	107
5.5.	CONCLUSIONS.....	118
6.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	119
6.1.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	119
6.2.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	120
	NOTATIONS.....	122
	REFERENCES.....	125
	APPENDIX A: NUMERICAL MODEL OF THE MASONRY BASIC CELL	134
	APPENDIX B: NUMERICAL MODELS OF THE PULL-TESTS	141
	APPENDIX C: NUMERICAL MODELS OF THE ALUMINIUM FOAM PROTECTED URM WALLS	152

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 2.1 SAMPLES OF EB & NSM FRP PLATES	9
FIGURE 2.2 TYPICAL FREE-AIR PRESSURE TIME HISTORY	13
FIGURE 2.3 SURFACE BURST BLAST ENVIRONMENT	14
FIGURE 2.4 HOMOGENIZATION OF MASONRY MATERIAL (WU AND HA 2006).....	18
FIGURE 3.1 HOMOGENIZATION OF MASONRY MATERIAL.....	23
FIGURE 3.2 DRUCKER-PRAGER YIELD SURFACE	24
FIGURE 3.3 NOMINAL DIMENSIONS OF BRICK UNIT (MM).....	25
FIGURE 3.4 VOLUMETRIC STRAIN VERSUS PRESSURE CURVE FOR SOIL AND CRUSHABLE FOAM MODEL (LSTC 2007)	27
FIGURE 3.5 THE INPUT ELASTIC CONSTITUTIVE RELATIONSHIPS OF BRICK AND MORTAR	28
FIGURE 3.6 THEORETICAL STRESS-STRAIN RELATIONSHIP	28
FIGURE 3.7 CONFIGURATION OF THE COMPRESSION TESTS	31
FIGURE 3.8 5-LAYER-BRICK MODEL	31
FIGURE 3.9 STRESS-STRAIN CURVES OF THE SIMULATION AND TESTS	32
FIGURE 3.10 MASONRY BASIC CELL FINITE ELEMENT MODEL (3560 ELEMENTS)	33
FIGURE 3.11 TYPICAL STRESS-STRAIN RELATIONSHIPS OF THE BASIC CELL IN COMPRESSIVE-COMPRESSIVE STRESS STATES.....	37
FIGURE 3.12 TYPICAL STRESS-STRAIN RELATIONSHIPS OF THE BASIC CELL IN COMPRESSION-TENSION AND TENSION-TENSION STRESS STATES.	38
FIGURE 3.13 STRESS-STRAIN RELATION OF THE MASONRY BASIC CELL IN A SHEAR STRESS STATE	39
FIGURE 3.14 FAILURE CURVE IN XY PLANE.....	42
FIGURE 3.15 SHEAR SOFTENING MODES FOR THE MODE II.....	44
FIGURE 3.16 LOAD-DISPLACEMENT RELATIONS DURING CRACK PROPAGATION	44
FIGURE 3.17 SMEARED CRACK MODEL UNDER MODE I AND II.....	45
FIGURE 3.18 SHORT RETURN WALLS USED TO STABILIZE WALLS	46

FIGURE 3.19 AIRBAG ARRANGEMENT.....	47
FIGURE 3.20 CONFIGURATION OF URM WALL WITH OPENING	48
FIGURE 3.21 DISTINCT MODEL AND HOMOGENIZED MODEL OF THE URM WALLS WALL OPENING.....	48
FIGURE 3.22 COMPARISON OF RESULTS FROM THE SHORT WALL WITH AND WITHOUT PRE-COMPRESSION TEST AND SIMULATION	50
FIGURE 3.23 CRACK PATTERNS OF TESTS AND SIMULATIONS	51
FIGURE 3.24 CRACK PATTERNS OF SMEARED-CRACK MODEL	51
FIGURE 4.1 INTERFACE ELEMENTS MODEL AND CONTACT MODEL	57
FIGURE 4.2 BEHAVIOUR OF BOND-SLIP RELATIONSHIP (YANG 2007)	58
FIGURE 4.3 STRESS-DISPLACEMENT CURVES OF INTERFACE ELEMENT MODEL	58
FIGURE 4.4 YIELD CRITERION FOR INTERFACE MATERIAL MODEL.....	59
FIGURE 4.5 PULL-TEST SPECIMENS.....	61
FIGURE 4.6 GFRP FULLY DEBONDING FAILURE	61
FIGURE 4.7 DISTINCT NUMERICAL MODELS OF NSM AND EB PULL-TESTS.....	62
FIGURE 4.8 COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF LOCAL BOND-SLIP RELATIONSHIPS IN A PULL TEST USING INTERFACE ELEMENT MODEL	63
FIGURE 4.9 COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF LOAD-DEFLECTION CURVES IN A PULL TEST USING INTERFACE ELEMENT MODEL	63
FIGURE 4.10 COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF LOCAL BOND-SLIP RELATIONSHIPS IN A PULL TEST USING CONTACT MODEL	64
FIGURE 4.11 COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF LOAD-DEFLECTION CURVES IN A PULL TEST USING CONTACT MODEL	64
FIGURE 4.12 DEBONDING FAILURE PROGRESS OF EB GFRP MODEL	65
FIGURE 4.13 CRACK PATTERNS	66
FIGURE 4.14 HOMOGENIZED MODELS OF PULL TESTS.....	67
FIGURE 4.15 COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF LOCAL BOND-SLIP RELATIONSHIPS IN PULL TESTS	68
FIGURE 4.16 COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF LOAD-DEFLECTION CURVES IN PULL TESTS..	68
FIGURE 4.17 COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF LOCAL BOND-SLIP RELATIONSHIPS IN PULL	

TESTS	69
FIGURE 4.18 COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF LOAD-DEFLECTION CURVES IN PULL TESTS..	69
FIGURE 4.19 COMPARISON OF COMPUTING TIME WITH DIFFERENT MODELS IN PULL TESTS	70
FIGURE 4.20 CONFIGURATION OF THE DAMAGED URM WALL REPAIRED WITH TWO NSM PLATES	71
FIGURE 4.21 CONFIGURATION OF THE DAMAGED URM WALL REPAIRED WITH FIVE EB STRIPS	72
FIGURE 4.22 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP FOR THE FRP REPAIRED DAMAGED URM WALL	72
FIGURE 4.23 NUMERICAL MODELS OF THE FRP REPAIRED DAMAGED URM WALLS	73
FIGURE 4.24 LOAD-DISPLACEMENT CURVES OF THE URM WALLS UNDER THE REVERSED-CYCLIC LOADING	73
FIGURE 4.25 SIMULATION OF THE LAST PART OF LOAD-DISPLACEMENT CURVE WITH VARIOUS COEFFICIENTS OF FRICTION	74
FIGURE 4.26 SIMULATION OF NSM REPAIRED URM WALL USING THE HOMOGENIZED MODEL AND SMEAR CRACK MODEL	75
FIGURE 4.27 COMPARISON OF MAXIMUM STRAIN DISTRIBUTION ALONG TWO NSM CFRP PLATES	75
FIGURE 4.28 COMPARISON OF MAXIMUM STRAIN DISTRIBUTION ALONG TWO EB GFRP PLATES	76
FIGURE 4.29 SIMULATION OF EB REPAIRED URM WALL USING THE HOMOGENIZED MODEL AND SMEAR CRACK MODEL	77
FIGURE 5.1 SCHEMATIC STRESS- STRAIN CURVE OF ALUMINIUM FOAM (CYMAT 2003)	81
FIGURE 5.2 NUMBERING CONVENTION OF FOAM MATERIAL DIRECTIONS.....	83
FIGURE 5.3 COMPARISON OF COMPRESSIVE STRESS-STRAIN CURVES BETWEEN SIMULATION AND TEST IN DIRECTION A.....	84
FIGURE 5.4 CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPRESSIVE STRESS-TRAIN CURVES OF ALUMINIUM FOAM IN ORTHOTROPIC DIRECTIONS.....	84
FIGURE 5.5 SURFACE BURST BLAST.....	86
FIGURE 5.6 SURFACE BURST BLAST – VERTICAL SECTION.....	86

FIGURE 5.7 IDEALIZED PRESSURE-TIME VARIATION	87
FIGURE 5.8 COMPARISON OF PEAK PRESSURE P_{so}	87
FIGURE 5.9 PERFORMANCE OF URM WALL UNDER DIFFERENT BLAST LOADS	88
FIGURE 5.10 NSM CFRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS.....	89
FIGURE 5.11 DEBONDING FAILURE OF NSM CFRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS.....	90
FIGURE 5.12 EB GFRP RETROFITTED URM WALL.....	91
FIGURE 5.13 DAMAGED EB GFRP RETROFITTED URM WALL (4 PLATES ON REAR SIDE)	92
FIGURE 5.14 DAMAGED EB GFRP RETROFITTED URM WALL (8 PLATES ON REAR SIDE)	92
FIGURE 5.15 URM WALL FULLY RETROFITTED WITH EB GFRP SHEET ON REAR SURFACE	92
FIGURE 5.16 URM WALL FULLY RETROFITTED WITH EB GFRP SHEETS ON BOTH SURFACES.....	93
FIGURE 5.17 COMPARISON OF EB GFRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS	93
FIGURE 5.18 EB CFRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS (4 PLATES).....	94
FIGURE 5.19 EB CFRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS ON ENTIRE SURFACE	95
FIGURE 5.20 FULLY EB CFRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS ON BACK SURFACE	95
FIGURE 5.21 TWO SIDES FULLY EB CFRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS.....	96
FIGURE 5.22 COMPARISON OF EB CFRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS.....	96
FIGURE 5.23 COMPARISON OF EB FRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS	97
FIGURE 5.24 THICKNESS OF SPRAY-ON POLYUREA ON BLAST MITIGATION EFFECTS	98
FIGURE 5.25 SPRAY-ON POLYUREA RETROFITTED URM WALLS UNDER BLAST LOADS...	98
FIGURE 5.26 LOCAL FAILURE OF THE SPRAY-ON POLYUREA AND MASONRY (VERTICAL SECTION).....	99
FIGURE 5.27 TWO SIDES 15MM SPRAY-ON POLYUREA RETROFITTED URM WALLS.....	99
FIGURE 5.28 COMPARISON OF ENERGY ABSORPTION OF THE SPRAY-ON POLYUREA RETROFITTED WALLS	100
FIGURE 5.29 NUMERICAL MODEL OF ALUMINIUM FOAM PROTECTED URM WALL	101
FIGURE 5.30 PERFORMANCE OF ALUMINIUM FOAM PROTECTED URM WALLS UNDER	

BLAST LOADS	101
FIGURE 5.31 PERFORMANCE OF ALUMINIUM FOAM PROTECTED TWO SURFACES OF URM WALLS UNDER BLAST LOADS	102
FIGURE 5.32 COMPARISON OF ENERGY ABSORPTION OF ALUMINIUM FOAM PROTECTED URM WALLS	102
FIGURE 5.33 COMPARISON OF RETROFITTED URM WALLS	102
FIGURE 5.34 DIFFERENT DENSITIES OF ALUMINIUM FOAM ON MITIGATION OF BLAST EFFECTS ON URM WALL.....	104
FIGURE 5.35 DIFFERENT LAYER THICKNESS OF ALUMINIUM FOAM ON MITIGATION OF BLAST EFFECTS ON URM WALL.....	104
FIGURE 5.36 ALUMINIUM FOAM WITH DIFFERENT DENSITIES	104
FIGURE 5.37 ALUMINIUM FOAM SHEET WITH DIFFERENT THICKNESS	105
FIGURE 5.38 MASONRY WALL PROTECTED BY ALUMINIUM FOAM WITH DIFFERENT DENSITIES OR WITH DIFFERENT THICKNESS	105
FIGURE 5.39 COMBINATION OF ALUMINIUM FOAM WITH SPRAY-ON POLYUREA	106
FIGURE 5.40 COMBINATION OF ALUMINIUM FOAM AND STEEL PLATES	106
FIGURE 5.41 COMBINATION OF ALUMINIUM FOAM AND CFRP PLATES	107
FIGURE 5.42 COMPARISON OF EFFECTIVENESS ON ALUMINIUM FOAM PROTECTED WALL	107
FIGURE 5.43 P-I DIAGRAM FOR URM WALLS AGAINST AIRBLAST LOADS	108
FIGURE 5.44 DEFORMATION PROCESS OF ALUMINIUM FOAM PROTECTED URM WALL (VERTICAL SECTION)	109
FIGURE 5.45 DETERMINATION OF DAMAGE LEVELS BASED ON ENERGY ABSORPTION RATIO	111
FIGURE 5.46 ABSORBED ENERGY RATIO OF ALUMINIUM FOAM PROTECTED URM WALLS	112
FIGURE 5.47 ABSORBED ENERGY RATIO OF EB CFRP OR GFRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS	112
FIGURE 5.48 ABSORBED ENERGY RATIO OF SPRAY-ON POLYUREA RETROFITTED URM WALLS	112

FIGURE 5.49 P-I DIAGRAMS FOR ALUMINIUM FOAM PROTECTED URM WALLS (FRONT SIDE)	113
FIGURE 5.50 P-I DIAGRAM OF ALUMINIUM FOAM PROTECTED URM WALLS (BOTH SIDES)	113
FIGURE 5.51 P-I DIAGRAMS FOR URM WALLS AND FOAM PROTECTED URM WALLS...	114
FIGURE 5.52 P-I DIAGRAM FOR EB CFRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS.....	114
FIGURE 5.53 P-I DIAGRAM FOR EB GFRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS	115
FIGURE 5.54 P-I DIAGRAM FOR SPRAY-ON POLYUREA PROTECTED URM WALLS	115
FIGURE 5.55 INFLUENCE OF CHARGE WEIGHT ON EFFECT OF PROTECTION IN P-I DIAGRAMS OF ALUMINIUM FOAM PROTECTED URM WALLS	116
FIGURE 5.56 INFLUENCE OF CHARGE WEIGHT ON EFFECT OF PROTECTION IN P-I DIAGRAMS OF EB FRP RETROFITTED URM WALLS.....	116
FIGURE 5.57 INFLUENCE OF CHARGE WEIGHT ON EFFECT OF PROTECTION IN P-I DIAGRAMS OF SPRAY-ON POLYUREA RETROFITTED URM WALLS	117
FIGURE 5.58 P-I DIAGRAMS FOR RETROFITTED URM WALLS AT DAMAGE LEVEL II.....	117
FIGURE 5.59 P-I DIAGRAMS FOR RETROFITTED URM WALLS AT DAMAGE LEVEL I	118

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 3.1 MATERIAL PROPERTIES FOR BRICK AND MORTAR	26
TABLE 3.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE INPUTS	30
TABLE 3.3 SUMMARY OF INPUT VALUES	30
TABLE 3.4 AVERAGE STRESS AND STRAIN OF CENTRAL ELEMENTS	35
TABLE 3.5 EQUIVALENT MATERIAL PROPERTIES	40
TABLE 3.6 WALL GEOMETRY AND BOUNDARY CONDITIONS (GRIFFITH ET AL. 2007).....	46
TABLE 4.1 CARBON FRP MATERIAL PROPERTIES (YANG 2007).....	55
TABLE 4.2 GFRP MATERIAL PROPERTIES (YANG 2007)	55
TABLE 4.3 INPUTS OF INTERFACE MODEL FOR VARIOUS RETROFITS	58
TABLE 5.1 MATERIAL PROPERTIES OF SPRAY-ON POLYUREA (DAVIDSON ET AL. 2005)...	80
TABLE 5.2 MATERIAL PROPERTIES OF A356SiC040 ALUMINIUM FOAM	84
TABLE 5.3 PROPERTIES OF A356SiC030 ALUMINIUM FOAM	103
TABLE 5.4 PROPERTIES OF A356SiC020 ALUMINIUM FOAM	103
TABLE 5.5 MATERIAL PROPERTIES OF URM WALL	109
TABLE 5.6 DAMAGE LEVELS FOR ALUMINIUM FOAM PROTECTED URM WALL.....	110