



***Background
Document***

**Performance Prediction and Evaluation of
Steel Special Moment Frames for Seismic Loads**

Report No. SAC/BD-00/25

SAC Joint Venture

A partnership of

Structural Engineers Association of California (SEAOC)

Applied Technology Council (ATC)

California Universities for Research in Earthquake Engineering (CUREe)

By

Kihak Lee and Douglas A. Foutch

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Submitted for distribution to

SAC Joint Venture

650-595-1542

<http://www.sacsteel.org>

May 2000

DISCLAIMER

This document is one of a series documenting background information related to Phase II of the FEMA-funded SAC Steel Project. It is being disseminated in the public interest to increase awareness of the many factors which contribute to the seismic performance of steel moment frame structures. The information contained herein is not for design use and is not acceptable to specific building projects. This report has not been reviewed for accuracy, and the SAC Joint Venture has not verified any of the results presented. **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.



**Background
Document**

**Performance Prediction and Evaluation of
Steel Special Moment Frames for Seismic Loads**

Report No. SAC/BD-00/25

SAC Joint Venture

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

By

Kihak Lee and Douglas A. Foutch
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Submitted for distribution to
SAC Joint Venture
650-595-1542
<http://www.sacsteel.org>

May 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.

PREFACE

The primary objectives of the FEMA/SAC Phase II Steel Project are to develop guidelines for the seismic evaluation, inspection, repair, design and construction of moment-resisting steel frame buildings. A diverse collection of technical investigations is supporting this effort, including the identification of basic material properties in rolled steel sections; development of appropriate welding materials, details, and inspection procedures; specification of anticipated seismic demands imposed on connections as a result of structural response to strong ground motions; and large-scale connection testing to calibrate and verify the design procedures that are ultimately proposed. Tying these activities together is a series of detailed finite element analyses of various connection configurations to quantify the influence of material properties, geometry, and detailing on predicted behavior. In addition, a series of studies have been performed to incorporate the results of the various investigations into a performance-based seismic engineering format that can become the basis of the SAC guidelines. Cost and risk studies and investigations into the past performance of this class of structures were also performed to gather valuable information used in the development of the guidelines and other documents.

This report was carried out as part of the overall efforts of the Performance Prediction and Evaluation team of the SAC Phase II Steel Project. This team was responsible for assessing the ability of various types of analytical models and idealizations to predict seismic response of steel moment frame structures and to recommend appropriate analytical methods for use in design and evaluation. In addition, the team developed a probabilistic approach for assessing the confidence that a structure can achieve a target performance objective (i.e., not to exceed a performance level for a given seismic hazard). Working with Guideline Writers, and based on extensive nonlinear dynamic response simulations, appropriate values for demand and resistance factors were developed along with analysis method and other adjustment factors. The team evaluated the reliability of current code based methods when used in conjunction with SAC prequalified connections.

This report focuses on the performance of special moment frames. New buildings having connections with substantial ductility capacity are considered, including studies of the safety of such buildings in aftershocks following damaging design level events. The ability of structures designed based on 1997 NEHRP provisions to attain various performance objectives are assessed. The confidence that older steel moment frames can achieve these performance objectives is also evaluated. Recommendations are developed for appropriate demand, resistance and analysis method adjustment factors. This project was performed at the University of Illinois, Urbana. This work was identified as Task 5.5.4 of the SAC Phase II program.

Numerous individuals helped to develop the scope and content of this project and to review a preliminary version of this report. These individuals included members of the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) for Performance Prediction and Evaluation; the Project Management Committee, and several members of the Project Oversight Committee. The contributions of these individuals are greatly appreciated.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1-1
1.1 Background	1-1
1.2 Objectives of this Study	1-2
1.3 Organization	1-3
2. Issues on Case Study Buildings, Analysis Procedures and Ground Motions	2-1
2.1 Prototype Pre-Northridge Structures	2-1
2.2 Loading Information and Design Procedure	2-4
2.3 Design Procedure	2-5
2.4 Modeling Procedure	2-6
2.4.1 Element Model	2-6
2.4.2 Moment Connection	2-9
2.4.3 Interior Gravity Frames	2-15
2.4.3.1 P-delta Effects	2-15
2.4.3.2 Interior Columns and Simple Connections	2-15
2.4.4 Structural Damping and Strain Hardening Ratio	2-19
2.5 Ground Motions for NLTH analysis	2-19
3. Behavior of New Steel Special Moment Resisting Frame Structures.....	3-1
3.1 Background	3-1
3.2 Comparison of Seismic Code Provisions (1997 NEHRP vs. 1994 UBC)	3-3
3.3 Design of Post-Northridge Buildings	3-7
3.3.1 Design of Post-Northridge Buildings in LA	3-10
3.3.2 Design of Post-Northridge Buildings in Seattle.....	3-15
3.4 Analytical Model for Post-Northridge Buildings.....	3-17
3.5 Static Pushover Analyses for Post-Northridge Buildings	3-18
3.6 Drift Capacity for Local and Global Collapse	3-26
3.7 Drift Demand from Nonlinear Time History Analysis	3-35
3.7.1 Drift Demands from Different Frame Configurations	3-35

3.7.2	Drift Demands for Typical Post-Northridge SMRF Buildings	3-39
3.7.3	Axial Force Demand in Columns.....	3-42
3.7.4	Plastic Rotation Demand	3-47
3.7.5	Drift Demands for Type 1 (RBS) and Type 2 Connection Models	3-51
3.7.6	Drift Demands for Post-Northridge SMRF Buildings in Seattle	3-54
3.7.6.1	Seattle Buildings Located on Stiff Soil	3-54
3.7.6.2	Seattle Buildings Located on Soft Soil	3-56
3.8	Summary and Conclusions.....	3-59
4.	Behavior of Existing Steel Special Moment Resisting Frame Structures	4-1
4.1	Background	4-1
4.2	Comparison of Past UBC Seismic Provisions	4-2
4.3	Design of Pre-Northridge SMRF Buildings.....	4-10
4.3.1	1973 UBC Design	4-12
4.3.2	1985 UBC Design	4-14
4.3.3	1994 UBC Design	4-16
4.3.4	Periods of Pre-Northridge SMRF Buildings	4-17
4.4	Analytical Model of Pre-Northridge SMRF Buildings	4-19
4.5	Static Pushover Analysis for Pre-Northridge SMRF Buildings.....	4-20
4.6	Drift Capacities for Pre-Northridge Buildings	4-25
4.7	Drift Demands for Pre-Northridge Buildings.....	4-31
4.7.1	LA Pre-Northridge SMRF Buildings Designed by 1994 UBC.....	4-35
4.7.2	LA Pre-Northridge SMRF Buildings Designed by 1985 UBC.....	4-38
4.7.3	LA Pre-Northridge SMRF Buildings Designed by 1973 UBC.....	4-40
4.7.4	Seattle Pre-Northridge SMRF Buildings Located on Soft Soil.....	4-44
4.8	Column Axial Force Demand and Estimation	4-46
4.9	Summary and Conclusion	4-53

5. Performance Based Seismic Evaluation Procedure for Steel Moment

Frame Buildings5-1

5.1 Background 5-1

5.2 Performance Levels..... 5-1

5.3 Load and Resistance Factor Format for Evaluation and Design of Building Systems
at Multiple Performance Levels 5-3

5.4 Performance Objectives 5-3

5.5 Performance Evaluation Process for New Buildings 5-4

5.6 Reliability Format Evaluation Procedures 5-6

5.6.1 Determination of Median Drift Capacity and Resistance Factors..... 5-6

5.6.1.1 Determination of Drift Capacities, \hat{C} 5-7

5.6.1.2 Determination of the Resistance Factor, ϕ 5-7

5.6.2 Determination of Demand Factors, γ and γ_a 5-9

5.6.2.1 Determination of γ 5-9

5.6.2.2 Determination of γ_a 5-10

5.6.3 Determination of β_{UT} 5-11

5.6.4 Calculation of the Confidence Factor, λ_{con} 5-12

5.7 Performance Evaluation of New Buildings using Default Parameters 5-14

5.7.1 Performance Evaluation Procedure 5-14

5.7.2 Example for Performance Evaluation for LA 9-story Post-Northridge Building
using RBS Connection 5-15

5.8 Modeling of Uncertainty and Randomness in the Evaluation Process 5-18

5.8.1 Background 5-18

5.8.2 Buildings Used for the Study 5-18

5.9 Local Variation of the Slope of the Hazard Curve, k 5-19

5.10 Uncertainties in Analysis Methods 5-28

5.11 Other Uncertainties 5-31

5.12 Coupling and Double Counting of Uncertainties in Capacity and Demand 5-1

5.13 Example for Performance Evaluation of New Building using the Site-specific
Hazard Curve..... 5-35

5.14	Implication for Evaluation of Existing Buildings	5-37
5.15	Evaluating the Relative Effect of Reducing the Uncertainty in Various Design Parameters from a Safety and Reliability Point of View	5-37
6.	Performance Prediction and Evaluation for New Buildings.....	6-1
6.1	Drift Demands and Capacities for the Post-Northridge Buildings.....	6-1
6.2	Performance Prediction using Confidence Level Calculations.....	6-1
6.2.1	Example for Performance Evaluation for New buildings	6-6
6.3	Fragility Model for New Buildings.....	6-7
6.4	Summary and Conclusions.....	6-12
7.	Performance Prediction and Evaluation for Existing Buildings	7-1
7.1	Drift Demands and Capacities for the Pre-Northridge Buildings	7-1
7.2	Performance Evaluation Based on Year of Construction.....	7-1
7.3	Expected Performance of Existing Building Based on Stiffness	7-2
7.4	Performance Prediction using Confidence Level Calculation	7-6
7.4.1	Example for Performance Evaluation for pre-Northridge buildings.....	7-11
7.5	Fragility Model for Existing Buildings	7-14
7.6	Summary and Conclusion	7-19
8.	Performance Evaluation for Damaged Buildings	8-1
8.1	Introduction	8-1
8.2	Performance Levels and Objectives.....	8-2
8.3	Seismic Hazard and Design Spectrum	8-2
8.4	Material Properties and Condition Assessment	8-3
8.5	Modeling and Analysis of Damaged Buildings	8-3
8.6	Analytical Methods for Performance Prediction and Evaluation of Damaged Buildings	8-3
8.6.1	Background	8-3
8.6.2	Performance of Buildings for Multiple Earthquake Occurrences	8-4
8.6.3	The Use of Stiffness as a Measure of Performance	8-13
8.7	Performance Prediction using Confidence Level Calculations.....	8-19

8.8 Summary and Conclusions.....	8-25
9. Summary and Conclusions.....	9-1
9.1 Summary	9-1
9.2 Conclusions.....	9-4
10. References	10-1
Appendix A. Results from IDA procedures	A-1
Appendix B. Calculated Bias Factors for Post- and Pre-Northridge Buildings.....	B-1