



Quantification of Building Seismic Performance Factors

FEMA P695 / June 2009



FEMA



Quantification of Building Seismic Performance Factors

Prepared by

APPLIED TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL
201 Redwood Shores Parkway, Suite 240
Redwood City, California 94065
www.ATCouncil.org

Prepared for

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
Michael Mahoney, Project Officer
Robert D. Hanson, Technical Monitor
Washington, D.C.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Charles Kircher (Project Technical Director)
Michael Constantinou
Gregory Deierlein
James R. Harris
Jon A. Heintz (Project Manager)
William T. Holmes (Project Tech. Monitor)
John Hooper
Allan R. Porush
Christopher Rojahn (Project Executive)

WORKING GROUPS

Jason Chou
Giannis Christovasilis
Kelly Cobeen
Stephen Cranford
Brian Dean
Andre Filiatrault
Kevin Haas
Curt Haselton

WORKING GROUPS (CONT'D)

Helmut Krawinkler
Abbie Liel
Jiro Takagi
Assawin Wanitkorkul
Farzin Zareian

PROJECT REVIEW PANEL

Maryann T. Phipps (Chair)
Amr Elnashai
S.K. Ghosh
Ramon Gilsanz*
Ronald O. Hamburger
Jack Hayes
Richard E. Klingner
Philip Line
Bonnie E. Manley
Andrei M. Reinhorn
Rafael Sabelli

*ATC Board Representative



FEMA



Notice

Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the Applied Technology Council (ATC), the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), or the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Additionally, neither ATC, DHS, FEMA, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, expressed or implied, nor assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, product, or process included in this publication. Users of information from this publication assume all liability arising from such use.

Foreword

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has the goal of reducing the ever-increasing cost that disasters inflict on our country. Preventing losses before they happen by designing and building to withstand anticipated forces from these hazards is one of the key components of mitigation, and is the only truly effective way of reducing the cost of these disasters.

As part of its responsibilities under the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP), and in accordance with the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (PL 94-125) as amended, FEMA is charged with supporting mitigation activities necessary to improve technical quality in the field of earthquake engineering. The primary method of addressing this charge has been supporting the investigation of seismic and related multi-hazard technical issues as they are identified by FEMA, the development and publication of technical design and construction guidance products, the dissemination of these products, and support of training and related outreach efforts. These voluntary resource guidance products present criteria for the design, construction, upgrade, and function of buildings subject to earthquake ground motions in order to minimize the hazard to life for all buildings and increase the expected performance of critical and higher occupancy structures.

The linear design procedure contained in modern building codes is based on the concept of converting the complicated nonlinear dynamic behavior of a building structure under seismic loading to an equivalent linear problem. The design process starts with the selection of a basic seismic force resisting system for the structure. The code specifies a series of prescriptive requirements for structures based on each such system. These prescriptive requirements regulate configuration, size, materials of construction, detailing, and minimum required strength and stiffness. These seismic design performance requirements are controlled through the assignment of a series of system response coefficients (R , C_d , Ω_0), which represent the material properties and design detailing of the selected system. Based on the linear dynamic response characteristics of the structure and these response coefficients, design lateral forces are distributed to the building's various structural elements using linear analysis techniques and the resulting member

forces and structural deflections are calculated. Members are then proportioned to have adequate capacity to resist the calculated forces in combination with other prescribed loads to ensure that calculated displacements do not exceed maximum specified values.

As the codes have improved over the last several decades in how they address seismic design, one of the results was an expansion of code-approved seismic force resisting systems, with many individual systems classified by the type of detailing used. For each increment in detailing, response coefficients were assigned in the code, based largely on judgment and qualitative comparison with the known response capabilities of other systems. The result is that today's code includes more than 80 individual structural systems, each with individual system response coefficients somewhat arbitrarily assigned. Many of these recently defined structural systems have never been subjected to significant level of earthquake ground shaking and the potential response characteristics and ability to meet the design performance objectives is untested and unknown.

What was needed was a standard procedural methodology where the inelastic response characteristics and performance of typical structures designed to a set of structural system provisions could be quantified and the adequacy of the structural system provisions to meet the design performance objectives verified. Such a methodology would need to directly account for the potential variations in structure configuration of structures designed to a set of provisions, the variation in ground motion to which these structures may be subjected and available laboratory data on the behavioral characteristics of structural elements.

The objective of this publication was to develop a procedure to establish consistent and rational building system performance and response parameters (R , C_d , Ω_0) for the linear design methods traditionally used in current building codes. The primary application of the procedure is for the evaluation of structural systems for new construction with equivalent earthquake performance. The primary design performance objective was taken to minimize the risk of structural collapse under the seismic load of maximum considered earthquake as specified in the current *NEHRP Recommended Provisions for New Buildings and Other Structures* (FEMA 450). Although the R factor is the factor of most concern, displacements and material detailing to achieve the implied design ductilities were also included.

It is anticipated that this methodology will ultimately be used by the nation's model building codes and standards to set minimum acceptable design

criteria for standard code-approved systems, and to provide guidance in the selection of appropriate design criteria for other systems when linear design methods are applied. This publication will also provide a basis for future evaluation of the current tabulation of and limitations on code-approved structural systems for adequacy to achieve the inherent seismic performance objectives. This material could then potentially be used to modify or eliminate those systems or requirements that can not reliably meet these objectives.

FEMA wishes to express its sincere gratitude to Charlie Kircher, Project Technical Director, and to the members of the Project Team for their efforts in the development of this recommended methodology. The Project Management Committee consisted of Michael Constantinou, Greg Deierlein, Jim Harris, John Hooper, and Allan Porush. They in turn guided the Project Working Groups, which included Andre Filiatrault, Helmut Krawinkler, Kelly Cobeen, Curt Haselton, Abbie Liel, Jiannis Christovasilis, Jason Chou, Stephen Cranford, Brian Dean, Kevin Haas, Jiro Takagi, Assawin Wanitkorkul, and Farzin Zareian. The Project Review Panel consisted of Maryann Phipps (Chair), Amr Elnashai, S.K. Ghosh, Ramon Gilsanz, Ron Hamburger, Jack Hayes, Rich Klingner, Phil Line, Bonnie Manley, Andrei Reinhorn, and Rafael Sabelli, and they provided technical advice and consultation over the duration of the work. The names and affiliations of all who contributed to this report are provided in the list of Project Participants.

Without their dedication and hard work, this project would not have been possible. The American public who live, work and play in buildings in seismic areas are all in their debt.

Federal Emergency Management Agency

Preface

In September 2004 the Applied Technology Council (ATC) was awarded a “Seismic and Multi-Hazard Technical Guidance Development and Support” contract (HSFEHQ-04-D-0641) by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to conduct a variety of tasks, including one entitled “Quantification of Building System Performance and Response Parameters” (ATC-63 Project). The purpose of this project was to establish and document a recommended methodology for reliably quantifying building system performance and response parameters for use in seismic design. These factors include the response modification coefficient (R factor), the system overstrength factor (Ω_o), and the deflection amplification factor (C_d), collectively referred to as “seismic performance factors.”

Seismic performance factors are used to estimate strength and deformation demands on systems that are designed using linear methods of analysis, but are responding in the nonlinear range. Their values are fundamentally critical in the specification of seismic loading. R factors were initially introduced in the ATC-3-06 report, *Tentative Provisions for the Development of Seismic Regulations for Buildings*, published in 1978, and subsequently replaced by the *NEHRP Recommended Provisions for Seismic Regulations for New Buildings and Other Structures*, published by FEMA. Original R factors were based on judgment or on qualitative comparisons with the known response capabilities of seismic-force-resisting systems in use at the time. Since then, the number of systems addressed in current seismic codes and standards has increased substantially, and their ability to meet intended seismic performance objectives is largely unknown.

The recommended methodology described in this report is based on a review of relevant research on nonlinear response and collapse simulation, benchmarking studies of selected structural systems, and evaluations of additional structural systems to verify the technical soundness and applicability of the approach. Technical review and comment at critical developmental stages was provided by a panel of experts, which included representatives from the steel, concrete, masonry and wood material industry groups. A workshop of invited experts and other interested stakeholders was convened to receive feedback on the recommended methodology, and input from this group was instrumental in shaping the final product.

ATC is indebted to the leadership of Charlie Kircher, Project Technical Director, and to the members of the ATC-63 Project Team for their efforts in the development of this recommended methodology. The Project Management Committee, consisting of Michael Constantinou, Greg Deierlein, Jim Harris, John Hooper, and Allan Porush monitored and guided the technical efforts of the Project Working Groups, which included Andre Filiatrault, Helmut Krawinkler, Kelly Cobeen, Curt Haselton, Abbie Liel, Jiannis Christovasilis, Jason Chou, Stephen Cranford, Brian Dean, Kevin Haas, Jiro Takagi, Assawin Wanitkorkul, and Farzin Zareian. The Project Review Panel, consisting of Maryann Phipps (Chair), Amr Elnashai, S.K. Ghosh, Ramon Gilsanz, Ron Hamburger, Jack Hayes, Rich Klingner, Phil Line, Bonnie Manley, Andrei Reinhorn, and Rafael Sabelli provided technical advice and consultation over the duration of the work. The names and affiliations of all who contributed to this report are provided in the list of Project Participants.

ATC also gratefully acknowledges Michael Mahoney (FEMA Project Officer), Robert Hanson (FEMA Technical Monitor), and William Holmes (ATC Project Technical Monitor) for their input and guidance in the preparation of this report, Peter N. Mork and Ayse Hortacsu for ATC report production services, and Ramon Gilsanz as ATC Board Contact.

Jon A. Heintz
ATC Director of Projects

Christopher Rojahn
ATC Executive Director

Executive Summary

This report describes a recommended methodology for reliably quantifying building system performance and response parameters for use in seismic design. The recommended methodology (referred to herein as the Methodology) provides a rational basis for establishing global seismic performance factors (SPFs), including the response modification coefficient (R factor), the system overstrength factor (Ω_0), and deflection amplification factor (C_d), of new seismic-force-resisting systems proposed for inclusion in model building codes.

The purpose of this Methodology is to provide a rational basis for determining building seismic performance factors that, when properly implemented in the seismic design process, will result in *equivalent safety against collapse in an earthquake, comparable to the inherent safety against collapse intended by current seismic codes, for buildings with different seismic-force-resisting systems.*

As developed, the following key principles outline the scope and basis of the Methodology:

- It is applicable to new building structural systems.
- It is compatible with the *NEHRP Recommended Provisions for Seismic Regulations for New Buildings and Other Structures* (FEMA, 2004a) and *ASCE/SEI 7, Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures*, (ASCE, 2006a).
- It is consistent with a basic life safety performance objective inherent in current seismic codes and standards.
- Earthquake hazard is based on Maximum Considered Earthquake ground motions.
- Concepts are consistent with seismic performance factor definitions in current seismic codes and standards.
- Safety is expressed in terms of a collapse margin ratio.
- Performance is quantified through nonlinear collapse simulation on a set of archetype models.

- Uncertainty is explicitly considered in the collapse performance evaluation.

The Methodology is intended to apply broadly to all buildings, recognizing that this objective may not be fully achieved for certain seismic environments and building configurations. Likewise, the Methodology has incorporated certain simplifying assumptions deemed appropriate for reliable evaluation of seismic performance. Key assumptions and potential limitations of the Methodology are presented and summarized.

In the development of the Methodology, selected seismic-force-resisting systems were evaluated to illustrate the application of the Methodology and verify its methods. Results of these studies provide insight into the collapse performance of buildings and appropriate values of seismic performance factors. Observations and conclusions in terms of generic findings applicable to all systems, and specific findings for certain types of seismic-force-resisting systems are presented. These findings should be considered generally representative, but not necessarily indicative of all possible trends, given limitations in the number and types of systems evaluated.

The Methodology is recommended for use with model building codes and resource documents to set minimum acceptable design criteria for standard code-approved seismic-force-resisting systems, and to provide guidance in the selection of appropriate design criteria for other systems when linear design methods are applied. It also provides a basis for evaluation of current code-approved systems for their ability to achieve intended seismic performance objectives. It is possible that results of future work based on this Methodology could be used to modify or eliminate those systems or requirements that cannot reliably meet these objectives.

Table of Contents

Foreword.....	iii
Preface.....	vii
Executive Summary	ix
List of Figures.....	xix
List of Tables	xxvii
1. Introduction.....	1-1
1.1 Background and Purpose.....	1-1
1.2 Scope and Basis of the Methodology	1-2
1.2.1 Applicable to New Building Structural Systems.....	1-2
1.2.2 Compatible with the NEHRP Recommended Provisions and ASCE/SEI 7	1-3
1.2.3 Consistent with the Life Safety Performance Objective	1-4
1.2.4 Based on Acceptably Low Probability of Structural Collapse	1-4
1.2.5 Earthquake Hazard based on MCE Ground Motions.....	1-5
1.2.6 Concepts Consistent with Current Seismic Performance Factor Definitions	1-5
1.2.7 Safety Expressed in Terms of Collapse Margin Ratio	1-9
1.2.8 Performance Quantified Through Nonlinear Collapse Simulation on a set of Archetype Models.....	1-9
1.2.9 Uncertainty Considered in Performance Evaluation.....	1-10
1.3 Content and Organization.....	1-10
2. Overview of Methodology.....	2-1
2.1 General Framework	2-1
2.2 Description of Process.....	2-2
2.3 Develop System Concept	2-2
2.4 Obtain Required Information	2-3
2.5 Characterize Behavior	2-4
2.6 Develop Models	2-5
2.7 Analyze Models.....	2-6
2.8 Evaluate Performance.....	2-8
2.9 Document Results.....	2-9
2.10 Peer Review.....	2-10

3.	Required System Information	3-1
3.1	General.....	3-1
3.2	Intended Applications and Performance.....	3-2
3.3	Design Requirements.....	3-3
3.3.1	Basis for design Requirements	3-3
3.3.2	Application Limits and Strength Limit States	3-4
3.3.3	Overstrength Design Criteria.....	3-5
3.3.4	Configuration Issues.....	3-5
3.3.5	Material Properties.....	3-6
3.3.6	Strength and Stiffness Requirements.....	3-6
3.3.7	Approximate Fundamental Period.....	3-8
3.4	Quality Rating for Design Requirements.....	3-8
3.4.1	Completeness and Robustness Characteristics	3-9
3.4.2	Confidence in Design Requirements	3-10
3.5	Data from Experimental Investigation.....	3-10
3.5.1	Objectives of Testing Program	3-11
3.5.2	General Testing Issues	3-12
3.5.3	Material Testing Program	3-14
3.5.4	Component, Connection, and Assembly Testing Program.....	3-15
3.5.5	Loading History.....	3-17
3.5.6	System Testing Program.....	3-18
3.6	Quality Rating of Test Data.....	3-19
3.6.1	Completeness and Robustness Characteristics	3-20
3.6.2	Confidence in Test Results	3-21
4.	Archetype Development.....	4-1
4.1	Development of Structural System Archetypes.....	4-1
4.2	Index Archetype Configurations.....	4-2
4.2.1	Structural Configuration Issues	4-4
4.2.2	Seismic Behavioral Effects.....	4-6
4.2.3	Load Path and Components not Designated as Part of the Seismic-Force-Resisting System.....	4-9
4.2.4	Overstrength Due to Non-Seismic Loading.....	4-10
4.3	Performance Groups	4-10
4.3.1	Identification of Performance Groups	4-11
5.	Nonlinear Model Development.....	5-1
5.1	Development of Nonlinear Models for Collapse Simulation.....	5-1
5.2	Index Archetype Designs.....	5-1
5.2.1	Seismic Design Methods	5-3
5.2.2	Criteria for Seismic Design Loading	5-4
5.2.3	Transition Period, T_s	5-6
5.2.4	Seismic Base Shear, V	5-7
5.2.5	Fundamental Period, T	5-8
5.2.6	Loads and Load Combinations	5-8
5.2.7	Trial Values of Seismic Performance Factors	5-9
5.2.8	Performance Group Design Variations.....	5-10
5.3	Index Archetype Models.....	5-11
5.3.1	Index Archetype Model Idealization	5-14
5.4	Simulated Collapse Modes	5-16
5.5	Non-Simulated Collapse Modes	5-20

5.6	Characterization of Modeling Uncertainties	5-22
5.7	Quality Rating of Index Archetype Models	5-23
5.7.1	Representation of Collapse Characteristics	5-24
5.7.2	Accuracy and Robustness of Models	5-25
6.	Nonlinear Analysis	6-1
6.1	Nonlinear Analysis Procedures	6-1
6.1.1	Nonlinear Analysis Software.....	6-2
6.2	Input Ground Motions.....	6-3
6.2.1	MCE Ground Motion Intensity	6-3
6.2.2	Ground Motion Record Sets.....	6-4
6.2.3	Ground Motion Record Scaling	6-6
6.3	Nonlinear Static (Pushover) Analyses.....	6-7
6.4	Nonlinear Dynamic (Response History) Analyses.....	6-9
6.4.1	Background on Assessment of Collapse Capacity	6-10
6.4.2	Calculation of Median Collapse Capacity and CMR	6-12
6.4.3	Ground Motion Record Intensity and Scaling.....	6-12
6.4.4	Energy Dissipation and Viscous Damping.....	6-13
6.4.5	Guidelines for CMR Calculation using Three- Dimensional Nonlinear Dynamic Analyses	6-13
6.4.6	Summary of Procedure for Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis.....	6-14
6.5	Documentation of Analysis Results	6-15
6.5.1	Documentation of Nonlinear Models	6-15
6.5.2	Data from Nonlinear Static Analyses	6-16
6.5.3	Data from Nonlinear Dynamic Analyses	6-16
7.	Performance Evaluation.....	7-1
7.1	Overview of the Performance Evaluation Process	7-1
7.1.1	Performance Group Evaluation Criteria.....	7-3
7.1.2	Acceptable Probability of Collapse	7-4
7.2	Adjusted Collapse Margin Ratio	7-5
7.2.1	Effect of Spectral Shape on Collapse Margin	7-5
7.2.2	Spectral Shape Factors	7-5
7.3	Total System Collapse Uncertainty	7-7
7.3.1	Sources of Uncertainty	7-7
7.3.2	Combining Uncertainties in Collapse Evaluation.....	7-8
7.3.3	Effect of Uncertainty on Collapse Margin	7-9
7.3.4	Total System Collapse Uncertainty	7-11
7.4	Acceptable Values of Adjusted Collapse Margin Ratio	7-13
7.5	Evaluation of the Response Modification Coefficient, R	7-15
7.6	Evaluation of the Overstrength Factor, Ω_o	7-15
7.7	Evaluation of the Deflection Amplification Factor, C_d	7-16
8.	Documentation and Peer Review	8-1
8.1	Recommended Qualifications, Expertise and Responsibilities for a System Development Team.....	8-1
8.1.1	System Sponsor	8-1

8.1.2	Testing Qualifications, Expertise and Responsibilities.....	8-1
8.1.3	Engineering and Construction Qualifications, Expertise and Responsibilities.....	8-2
8.1.4	Analytical Qualifications, Expertise and Responsibilities.....	8-2
8.2	Documentation of System Development and Results.....	8-2
8.3	Peer Review Panel.....	8-3
8.3.1	Peer Review Panel Selection.....	8-4
8.3.2	Peer Review Roles and Responsibilities.....	8-4
8.4	Submittal.....	8-5
9.	Example Applications	9-1
9.1	General.....	9-1
9.2	Example Application - Reinforced Concrete Special Moment Frame System.....	9-2
9.2.1	Introduction.....	9-2
9.2.2	Overview and Approach.....	9-2
9.2.3	Structural System Information.....	9-3
9.2.4	Identification of Reinforced Concrete Special Moment Frame Archetype Configurations.....	9-4
9.2.5	Nonlinear Model Development.....	9-10
9.2.6	Nonlinear Structural Analysis.....	9-13
9.2.7	Performance Evaluation.....	9-17
9.2.8	Iteration: Adjustment of Design Requirements to Meet Performance Goals.....	9-21
9.2.9	Evaluation of Ω_0 Using Final Set of Archetype Designs.....	9-25
9.2.10	Summary Observations.....	9-25
9.3	Example Application - Reinforced Concrete Ordinary Moment Frame System.....	9-25
9.3.1	Introduction.....	9-25
9.3.2	Overview and Approach.....	9-26
9.3.3	Structural System Information.....	9-26
9.3.4	Identification of Reinforced Concrete Ordinary Moment Frame Archetype Configurations.....	9-27
9.3.5	Nonlinear Model Development.....	9-33
9.3.6	Nonlinear Structural Analysis.....	9-34
9.3.7	Performance Evaluation for SDC B.....	9-38
9.3.8	Performance Evaluation for SDC C.....	9-40
9.3.9	Evaluation of Ω_0 Using Set of Archetype Designs.....	9-41
9.3.10	Summary Observations.....	9-42
9.4	Example Application - Wood Light-Frame System.....	9-43
9.4.1	Introduction.....	9-43
9.4.2	Overview and Approach.....	9-43
9.4.3	Structural System Information.....	9-43
9.4.4	Identification of Wood Light-Frame Archetype Configurations.....	9-44
9.4.5	Nonlinear Model Development.....	9-48
9.4.6	Nonlinear Structural Analyses.....	9-51
9.4.7	Performance Evaluation.....	9-54
9.4.8	Calculation of Ω_0 using Set of Archetype Designs.....	9-57

9.4.9	Summary Observations	9-57
9.5	Example Applications - Summary Observations and Conclusions	9-58
9.5.1	Short Period Structures.....	9-58
9.5.2	Tall Moment Frame Structures.....	9-58
9.5.3	Collapse Performance for Different Seismic Design Categories.....	9-59
10.	Supporting Studies	10-1
10.1	General	10-1
10.2	Assessment of Non-Simulated Failure Modes in a Steel Special Moment Frame System.....	10-1
10.2.1	Overview and Approach.....	10-1
10.2.2	Structural System Information	10-3
10.2.3	Nonlinear Analysis Model.....	10-4
10.2.4	Procedure for Collapse Performance Assessment, Incorporating Non-Simulated Failure Modes.....	10-6
10.3	Collapse Evaluation of Seismically Isolated Structures.....	10-12
10.3.1	Introduction	10-12
10.3.2	Isolator and Structural System Information	10-14
10.3.3	Modeling Isolated Structure Archetypes	10-16
10.3.4	Design Properties of Isolated Structure Archetypes.....	10-21
10.3.5	Nonlinear Static Analysis for Period-Based Ductility, SSFs, Record-to-Record Variability and Overstrength	10-27
10.3.6	Collapse Evaluation Results.....	10-30
10.3.7	Summary and Conclusion	10-39
11	Conclusions and Recommendations	11-1
11.1	Assumptions and Limitations	11-1
11.1.1	Far-Field Record Set Ground Motions	11-1
11.1.2	Influence of Secondary Systems on Collapse Performance.....	11-3
11.1.3	Buildings with Significant Irregularities	11-4
11.1.4	Redundancy of the Seismic-Force-Resisting System	11-5
11.2	Observations and Conclusions	11-5
11.2.1	Generic Findings	11-5
11.2.2	Specific Findings.....	11-8
11.3	Collapse Evaluation of Individual Buildings	11-9
11.3.1	Feasibility	11-10
11.3.2	Approach	11-10
11.4	Recommendations for Further Study.....	11-10
11.4.1	Studies Related to Improving and Refining the Methodology	11-11
11.4.2	Studies Related to Advancing Seismic Design Practice and Building Code Requirements (ASCE/SEI 7-05).....	11-12
	Appendix A: Ground Motion Record Sets	A-1
A.1	Introduction	A-1

A.2	Objectives	A-2
A.3	Approach	A-3
A.4	Spectral Shape Consideration	A-4
A.5	Maximum Considered Earthquake and Design Earthquake Demand (<i>ASCE/SEI 7-05</i>)	A-4
A.6	PEER NGA Database	A-7
A.7	Record Selection Criteria.....	A-8
A.8	Scaling Method.....	A-9
A.9	Far-Field Record Set.....	A-13
A.10	Near-Field Record Set	A-20
A.11	Comparison of Far-Field and Near-Field Record Sets	A-27
A.12	Robustness of Far-Field Record Set	A-33
A.12.1	Approach to Evaluating Robustness.....	A-33
A.12.2	Effects of PGA Selection Criteria Alone.....	A-34
A.12.3	Effects of PGV Selection Criteria Alone.....	A-36
A.12.4	Effects of both PGA and PGV Selection Criteria Simultaneously, as well as Selection of Two Records from Each Event	A-37
A.12.5	Summary of the Robustness of the Far-Field Set	A-38
A.13	Assessment of Record-to-Record Variability in Collapse Fragility	A-39
A.14	Summary and Conclusion.....	A-43

Appendix B: Adjustment of Collapse Capacity Considering Effects of Spectral Shape	B-1	
B.1	Introduction	B-1
B.2	Previous Research on Simplified Methods to Account for Spectral Shape (Epsilon).....	B-4
B.3	Development of a Simplified Method to Adjust Collapse Capacity for Effects of Spectral Shape (Epsilon)	B-6
B.3.1	Epsilon Values for the Ground Motions in the Far-Field Set	B-7
B.3.2	Target Epsilon Values.....	B-7
B.3.3	Impact of Spectral Shape (ϵ) on Median Collapse Capacity	B-11
B.4	Final Simplified Factors to Adjust Median Collapse Capacity for the Effects of Spectral Shape	B-21
B.5	Application to Site Specific Performance Assessment	B-24

Appendix C: Development of Index Archetype Configurations	C-1	
C.1.	Development of Index Archetype Configurations for a Reinforced Concrete Moment Frame System	C-1
C.1.1	Establishing the Archetype Design Space	C-1
C.1.2	Identifying Index Archetype Configurations and Populating Performance Groups	C-4
C.1.3	Preparing Index Archetype Designs and Index Archetype Models.....	C-7
C.2	Development of Index Archetype Configurations for a Wood Light-Frame Shear Wall System.....	C-9
C.2.1	Establishing the Archetype Design Space	C-9
C.2.2	Identifying Index Archetype Configurations and Populating Performance Groups	C-10

C.2.3	Preparing Index Archetype Designs and Index Archetype Models	C-10
C.2.4	Other Considerations for Wood Light-Frame Shear Wall Systems.....	C-13
Appendix D: Consideration of Behavioral Effects..... D-1		
D.1	Identification of Structural failure Modes	D-1
D.2	System Definition.....	D-2
D.3	Element Deterioration Modes.....	D-3
D.3.1	Flexural Hinging of Beams and Columns	D-5
D.3.2	Compressive Failure of Columns	D-5
D.3.3	Shear Failure of Beam and Columns.....	D-5
D.3.4	Joint Panel Shear Behavior.....	D-6
D.3.5	Bond-Slip of Reinforcing Bars.....	D-7
D.3.6	Punching Shear in Slab-Column Connections	D-7
D.4	Local and Global Collapse Scenarios.....	D-7
D.5	Likelihood of Collapse Scenarios.....	D-8
D.6	Collapse Simulation	D-9
Appendix E: Nonlinear Modeling of Reinforced Concrete Moment Frame Systems.....E-1		
E.1	Purpose	E-1
E.2	Structural Modeling Overview	E-1
E.3	Beam-Column Element Model.....	E-2
E.3.1	Element and Hysteretic Model.....	E-3
E.3.2	Calibration of Parameters for the Reinforced Concrete Beam-Column Element Model	E-5
E.4	Joint Modeling.....	E-15
E.4.1	Shear Panel Spring	E-16
E.4.2	Bond-Slip Spring Model	E-16
Appendix F: Collapse Evaluation of Individual Buildings.....F-1		
F.1	Introduction	F-1
F.2	Feasibility	F-1
F.3	Approach	F-1
F.4	Collapse Evaluation of Individual Building Systems.....	F-2
F.4.1	Step One: Develop Nonlinear Model(s).....	F-2
F.4.2	Step Two: Define Limit States and Acceptance Criteria.....	F-3
F.4.3	Step Three: Determine Total System Uncertainty and Acceptable Collapse Margin Ratio.....	F-3
F.4.4	Step Four: Perform Nonlinear Static Analysis (NSA)	F-4
F.4.5	Step Five: Select Record Set and Scale Records.....	F-4
F.4.6	Step Six: Perform Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis (NDA) and Evaluate Performance.....	F-5

SymbolsG-1
GlossaryH-1
References I-1
Project Participants.....J-1