

**Program to Reduce the Earthquake Hazards of
Steel Moment-Frame Structures**

**State of the Art Report on
Welding and Inspection**

DISCLAIMER

This document provides practicing engineers and building officials with a resource document for understanding the behavior of steel moment-frame buildings in earthquakes. It is one of the set of six State of the Art Reports containing detailed derivations and explanations of the basis for the design and evaluation recommendations prepared by the SAC Joint Venture. The recommendations and state of the art reports, developed by practicing engineers and researchers, are based on professional judgment and experience and supported by a large program of laboratory, field, and analytical research. **No warranty is offered with regard to the recommendations contained herein, by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the SAC Joint Venture, the individual joint venture partners, or the partner's directors, members or employees. These organizations and their employees do not assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any of the information, products or processes included in this publication. The reader is cautioned to review carefully the material presented herein and exercise independent judgment as to its suitability for application to specific engineering projects.** This publication has been prepared by the SAC Joint Venture with funding provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, under contract number EMW-95-C-4770.

Cover Art. The beam-column connection assembly shown on the cover depicts the standard detailing used in welded steel moment-frame construction prior to the 1994 Northridge earthquake. This connection detail was routinely specified by designers in the period 1970-1994 and was prescribed by the *Uniform Building Code* for seismic applications during the period 1985-1994. It is no longer considered to be an acceptable design for seismic applications. Following the Northridge earthquake, it was discovered that many of these beam-column connections had experienced brittle fractures at the joints between the beam flanges and column flanges.

State of the Art Report on Welding and Inspection

SAC Joint Venture

A partnership of
Structural Engineers Association of California (SEAOC)
Applied Technology Council (ATC)
California Universities for Research in Earthquake Engineering (CUREe)

Prepared for the SAC Joint Venture Partnership by
Matt Johnson
Edison Welding Institute

Project Oversight Committee

William J. Hall, Chair

Shirin Ader
John M. Barsom
Roger Ferch
Theodore V. Galambos
John Gross

James R. Harris
Richard Holguin
Nestor Iwankiw
Roy G. Johnston
Len Joseph

Duane K. Miller
John Theiss
John H. Wiggins

SAC Project Management Committee

SEAOC: William T. Holmes
ATC: Christopher Rojahn
CUREe: Robin Shepherd

Program Manager: Stephen A. Mahin
Project Director for Topical Investigations:
James O. Malley
Project Director for Product Development:
Ronald O. Hamburger

Topical Investigation Team

Pingsha Dong

George Gruber/Glenn M. Light

William Mohr

Technical Advisory Panel

John M. Barsom
John W. Fisher
J. Ernesto Indacochea

Duane K. Miller
Robert Pyle

Douglas Rees-Evans
Richard I. Seals

SAC Joint Venture

SEAOC: www.seaoc.org
ATC: www.atcouncil.org
CUREe: www.curee.org

September 2000

THE SAC JOINT VENTURE

SAC is a joint venture of the Structural Engineers Association of California (SEAOC), the Applied Technology Council (ATC), and California Universities for Research in Earthquake Engineering (CUREe), formed specifically to address both immediate and long-term needs related to solving performance problems with welded, steel moment-frame connections discovered following the 1994 Northridge earthquake. SEAOC is a professional organization composed of more than 3,000 practicing structural engineers in California. The volunteer efforts of SEAOC's members on various technical committees have been instrumental in the development of the earthquake design provisions contained in the *Uniform Building Code* and the 1997 *National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) Recommended Provisions for Seismic Regulations for New Buildings and other Structures*. ATC is a nonprofit corporation founded to develop structural engineering resources and applications to mitigate the effects of natural and other hazards on the built environment. Since its inception in the early 1970s, ATC has developed the technical basis for the current model national seismic design codes for buildings; the *de facto* national standard for postearthquake safety evaluation of buildings; nationally applicable guidelines and procedures for the identification, evaluation, and rehabilitation of seismically hazardous buildings; and other widely used procedures and data to improve structural engineering practice. CUREe is a nonprofit organization formed to promote and conduct research and educational activities related to earthquake hazard mitigation. CUREe's eight institutional members are the California Institute of Technology, Stanford University, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of California at Davis, the University of California at Irvine, the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of California at San Diego, and the University of Southern California. These laboratory, library, computer and faculty resources are among the most extensive in the United States. The SAC Joint Venture allows these three organizations to combine their extensive and unique resources, augmented by subcontractor universities and organizations from across the nation, into an integrated team of practitioners and researchers, uniquely qualified to solve problems related to the seismic performance of steel moment-frame buildings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding for Phases I and II of the SAC Steel Program to Reduce the Earthquake Hazards of Steel Moment-Frame Structures was principally provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, with ten percent of the Phase I program funded by the State of California, Office of Emergency Services. Substantial additional support, in the form of donated materials, services, and data has been provided by a number of individual consulting engineers, inspectors, researchers, fabricators, materials suppliers and industry groups. Special efforts have been made to maintain a liaison with the engineering profession, researchers, the steel industry, fabricators, code-writing organizations and model code groups, building officials, insurance and risk-management groups, and federal and state agencies active in earthquake hazard mitigation efforts. SAC wishes to acknowledge the support and participation of each of the above groups, organizations and individuals. In particular, we wish to acknowledge the contributions provided by the American Institute of Steel Construction, the Lincoln Electric Company, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Science Foundation, and the Structural Shape Producers Council. SAC also takes this opportunity to acknowledge the efforts of the project participants – the managers, investigators, writers, and editorial and production staff – whose work has contributed to the development of these documents. Finally, SAC extends special acknowledgement to Mr. Michael Mahoney, FEMA Project Officer, and Dr. Robert Hanson, FEMA Technical Advisor, for their continued support and contribution to the success of this effort.

In Memory of Egor Popov, Professor Emeritus, University of California at Berkeley

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
1. INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 Purpose	1-1
1.2 Background.....	1-2
1.3 Scope.....	1-10
2. TOUGHNESS REQUIREMENTS, PERFORMANCE, AND PREQUALIFICATION OF CONSUMABLES USED FOR MOMENT FRAME CONSTRUCTION DESIGNED FOR SEISMIC RESISTANCE.....	2-1
2.1 Introduction.....	2-1
2.1.1 Class A: No Toughness Requirements	2-2
2.1.2 Class B: Moderate Toughness Requirements.....	2-2
2.1.3 Class C: High Toughness at Low Temperatures	2-2
2.2 AWS Classification Requirements	2-4
2.3 Full-Scale Testing	2-4
2.3.1 Description of Full-Scale Tests	2-4
2.3.2 CVN Impact Toughness of Full-Scale Welds	2-6
2.3.3 CTOD Toughness and Low-Cycle Behavior of Full-Scale Tests	2-12
2.3.3.1 Comparison of Full-Scale Test Welds with Laboratory Test Welds ..	2-12
2.3.3.2 Development of Fracture Toughness Requirements.....	2-13
2.3.3.3 Derivation of Equivalent Charpy V-Notch (CVN) Impact Toughness	2-17
2.3.3.4 Validation of Methodology.....	2-20
2.3.3.5 Proposed Charpy V-Notch Requirements.....	2-21
2.3.4 Tensile Properties in the Full-Scale Tests	2-22
2.4 Variables Affecting Weld Metal Toughness	2-24
2.4.1 Effect of Cooling Rate on Weld Metal Strength	2-38
2.5 Prequalification of Electrodes.....	2-40
2.5.1 Prequalification Requirements and Method	2-40
2.5.2 Discussion	2-42
2.6 Chapter Summary	2-45
3. EFFECT OF INTERMIXING OF CONSUMABLES.....	3-1
3.1 Background.....	3-1
3.2 Measurement of Intermixing Effects	3-3
3.3 Mechanical Properties of Intermixed Welds	3-3
3.4 Summary and Conclusions	3-6
4. HEAT-AFFECTED-ZONE CONSIDERATIONS.....	4-1
4.1 Introduction.....	4-1

4.2	The Heat Affected Zone Regions	4-1
4.2.1	Single Pass Welds.....	4-1
4.2.2	Multiple-Pass HAZs	4-2
4.3	Measurement of HAZ Toughness.....	4-3
4.3.1	Charpy V-Notch (CVN)	4-4
4.3.2	Crack Tip Opening Displacement (CTOD).....	4-5
4.3.3	Weld Thermal Simulation	4-8
4.4	The Effects of Post Weld Heat Treatment (PWHT)	4-10
4.4.1	Toughness in Structural Steel Shapes	4-10
4.4.1.1	ASTM A572 Gr. 50	4-10
4.4.1.2	HAZ Toughness of QST Jumbo Columns	4-16
4.4.1.3	Effect of Scrap Quality on the Toughness of A913 Steel.....	4-18
4.5	Summary and Conclusions	4-19
5.	EFFECT OF HYDROGEN ON WELD METAL PROPERTIES AND INTEGRITY	5-1
5.1	Summary	5-1
5.2	Effects of Hydrogen in Steel.....	5-1
5.2.1	Introduction of Hydrogen into the Weld Pool.....	5-2
5.2.2	Sources of Hydrogen	5-2
5.2.3	Effects of Hydrogen on the Mechanical Properties of Steel	5-6
5.2.3.1	Effect of Hydrogen on Ductility	5-7
5.2.3.2	Fisheyes in Weld Metal Fracture Surfaces	5-8
5.2.3.3	Hydrogen Assisted Cracking	5-9
5.3	Hydrogen Management in Weld Metals Deposited Using Flux-Cored Arc Welding Consumables	5-10
5.3.1	Background.....	5-10
5.3.2	Diffusible Hydrogen in FCAW Weldments	5-11
5.3.3	Hydrogen Assisted Cracking in FCAW Weldments	5-16
5.3.4	Low Temperature PWHT	5-21
5.4	Summary and Conclusions	5-25
5.5	Recommendations.....	5-25
5.5.1	Recommendations: Present Problems	5-25
5.5.2	Recommendations: Proposed Specifications.....	5-27
5.5.3	Recommendations: Future Research	5-29
6.	EFFECT OF WIND SPEED	6-1
6.1	Introduction and Background	6-1
6.2	Experimental Approach	6-4
6.2.1	Weld Metal Soundness Study.....	6-4
6.2.2	Weld Metal Mechanical Property Study	6-5
6.3	Results and Discussion	6-8
6.4	Conclusions.....	6-15
6.5	Recommendations.....	6-15
7.	INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA	7-1

7.1	Introduction.....	7-1
7.2	Overview of Inspection Methods.....	7-1
7.2.1	Visual Inspection.....	7-1
7.2.2	Penetrant Testing (PT).....	7-2
7.2.3	Magnetic Particle Testing (MT).....	7-5
7.2.4	Ultrasonic Testing (UT).....	7-6
7.2.5	Radiographic Testing (RT).....	7-8
7.2.6	Acoustic Emission Testing.....	7-10
7.2.7	New NDE Techniques.....	7-10
7.2.7.1	Semi-Automated and Fully Automated UT.....	7-10
7.2.7.2	Phased Array UT.....	7-10
7.2.8	Types of Inspectors.....	7-11
7.2.9	Inspector Qualification Requirements.....	7-11
7.3	Discussion of Ultrasonic Inspection Approaches.....	7-11
7.3.1	Summary of SAC UT Round-Robin Testing.....	7-12
7.3.2	Demonstrated Limitations of the Current D1.1 Acceptance Criteria.....	7-14
7.3.3	Contract of AWS D1.1 Annex K and API Recommended Practice 2X.....	7-16
7.3.4	Southwest Research Institute Alternative Manual UT Procedures.....	7-18
7.3.5	Ultrasonic Inspection Summary.....	7-19
7.4	Acceptance Criteria.....	7-19
7.4.1	Alternative Acceptance Criteria.....	7-20
7.4.2	More Stringent Ultrasonic Amplitude-Based Criteria.....	7-20
7.4.3	Ultrasonic Size-Based Criteria.....	7-21
7.4.3.1	Alternative Acceptance-Rejection Criteria.....	7-21
7.4.3.2	Commentary on Alternative Criteria.....	7-22
7.4.4	Acceptance Criteria Using Other Inspection Techniques.....	7-24
	REFERENCES, FEMA REPORTS, SAC REPORTS, AND ACRONYMS.....	R-1
	SAC PHASE II PROJECT PARTICIPANTS.....	S-1