



***Background  
Document***

**Weld Acceptance Criteria for  
Seismically-Loaded Welded Connections**

**Report No. SAC/BD-99/24**

**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

**William Mohr**

Edison Welding Institute  
1250 Arthur E. Adams Drive  
Columbus, Ohio 43221

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

**March 27, 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**

**Weld Acceptance Criteria for  
Seismically-Loaded Welded Connections**

**Report No. SAC/BD-99/24**

**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

**William Mohr**

Edison Welding Institute  
1250 Arthur E. Adams Drive  
Columbus, Ohio 43221

Submitted for distribution to

**SAC Joint Venture**

**650-595-1542**

**<http://www.sacsteel.org>**

**March 27, 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.

The primary responsibility of the Joining and Inspection team in the Phase II Steel Project is to develop better understanding of the critical parameters involved with the joining of elements within steel moment connections, and to develop recommendations for how to achieve desired performance in constructed projects. The objective of this study was to develop weld acceptance criteria for seismic loading conditions, considering fitness for use for different performance expectations. The currently acceptance criteria, given in AWS D1.1, was used as the base point for developing this criteria. Fracture mechanics principles are used to evaluate and estimate the size and shape of weld flaws that increase the risk of brittle fracture. An assessment of the importance of residual stresses is provided. A proposed acceptance criteria is proposed, with comments on various weld geometries and inspection methods. This project was performed at the Edison Welding Institute. This task was identified as Task 5.2.6 of the SAC Phase II program.

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



# Contents

	<u>Page</u>
1.0 Introduction .....	1
2.0 Acceptance Criteria .....	2
2.1 History of Accept/Reject Criteria Applied to Steel Welded Frames in Seismic Zones .....	2
2.2 Ultrasonic Acceptance Criteria Outside North America .....	4
2.2.1 United Kingdom .....	4
2.2.2 Japan .....	4
2.2.3 New Zealand .....	5
2.2.4 Comments on Survey of Acceptance Criteria .....	7
2.3 Application of Inspection Procedures to Welded Steel Moment Frames .....	8
3.0 Fracture Mechanics Prediction of Pull-Plate Test Results .....	8
3.1 Pull-Plate Geometry .....	9
3.2 Summary of Pull-Plate Testing Results .....	9
3.3 Geometry Factors for Fracture Mechanics Analysis .....	12
3.3.1 Backing Bar Geometry Factor .....	12
3.3.2 Fillet Weld Geometry Factor .....	14
3.3.3 Correction Factor for Three-Dimensional Geometries .....	14
3.4 Inputs to Fracture Mechanics .....	15
3.5 Results .....	16
3.6 Conclusions .....	19
4.0 Other Flaw Geometries of Interest for Acceptance Criteria .....	19
4.1 Embedded Elliptical Cracks .....	19
4.2 Weld Roots with Backing Bars and Sealing Fillet Welds .....	20
5.0 Fracture Mechanics Prediction of Brittle Fracture in Building Connections Using Pull-Plate Test Results .....	21
5.1 Pull-Plate Test Predictions .....	22
5.2 Allowing for Column Bending .....	22
5.3 Allowing for Panel Zone Deformation .....	24
5.4 Stress Concentration in the Center of the Weld .....	25
5.5 Application to Welds with Fillets on the Surface .....	26
5.6 Severe Service .....	26
5.7 Conclusions .....	29
6.0 Comments on Residual Stresses .....	29
6.1 General Features of the Residual Stress Distribution .....	30
6.2 Simplified Distribution .....	31
6.3 Consequences of the Simplified Distribution .....	32
6.4 Calculated Residual Stress Distributions .....	32

7.0 Statistical Analysis .....	34
7.1 Variables That Can Be Treated Statistically .....	34
7.1.1 Loading .....	34
7.1.2 Geometry .....	35
7.1.3 Strength .....	35
7.1.4 Resistance .....	36
7.2 Combination Analysis Using Toughness and Steel Strength .....	37
8.0 Limitations of Current AWS Acceptance Criteria .....	40
8.1 Comparison of Static and Cyclic Acceptance Criteria from D1.1 .....	42
8.2 Ways of Improving Weld Acceptance-Rejection Criteria for Seismic Loading .....	43
9.0 Recommendations for New Acceptance-Rejection Criteria .....	44
9.1 Acceptance-Rejection Criteria .....	44
9.2 Commentary .....	45
10. Other Geometries and Inspection Methods .....	45
10.1 Column Splices .....	45
10.2 Inspection Methods That Do Not Use Ultrasonic Waves .....	47
10.3 Another Approach to Inspection of Moment Connections .....	48
11.0 Conclusions and Recommendations .....	49
11.1 Conclusions .....	49
11.2 Recommendations for Future Inquiry .....	50
12.0 References .....	51

### Tables

Table 2.1	Acceptance-Rejection Criteria from Section K of AWS D1.1 .....	3
Table 2.2	Summary of Flaw Length Ratings from Japanese Construction Inspection Standard .....	4
Table 2.3	Summary of Amplitude Regions and Ranges from Japanese Construction Inspection Standard .....	5
Table 2.4	Acceptance Criteria Abstracted from Japanese Standard in Tables 12 to 14 .....	5
Table 2.5	Extract from AS/NZS 1554.1 Table 6.3 "Permissible Levels of Imperfections as Determined by Radiographic or Ultrasonic Examination for Welds of Category SP" .....	6
Table 3.1	Test Conditions Reported in SAC 95-08 .....	10
Table 3.2	Test Results from SAC Report 95-08 .....	11



Table 3.3	Test Conditions Reported by John Fisher at AISC 1998 .....	11
Table 3.4	Test Result for Tests Reported at AISC 1998 .....	12
Table 3.5	Prediction of Fracture Initiation for SAC Report 95-08 Specimens .....	17
Table 3.6	Prediction of Fracture Initiation for Specimens Reported at AISC 1998.....	18
Table 3.7	Predictions of Material Toughness for Specimens Using Differing Electrodes.....	18
Table 5.1.	Material Toughness Based on Electrode Grade from Pull-Plate Test Estimation .....	27
Table 5.2.	Toughness Stress Ratio for Severe Seismic Service .....	27
Table 5.3	Crack Depth for Switch from Yield to Fracture .....	28
Table 5.4	Crack Depth for Switch from Yield to Fracture (W24x76 beam to W14x132 column).....	28
Table 7.1.	Toughness to Stress Ratio for A36 Steel, Assuming Uniform Stresses .....	37
Table 7.2	Toughness to Stress Ratio of A572 Grade 50 Steel, Assuming Uniform Stresses .....	38
Table 7.3	Toughness to Stress Ratio for A36 Steel, Assuming 1.3 Stress Concentration in Joint Center.....	38
Table 7.4	Toughness to Stress Ratio for A572 Grade 50 Steel, Assuming 1.3 Stress Concentration in Joint Center.....	39
Table 7.5	Combination of Parameters for Allowing Surface Flaws 1/8 in. Deep or Smaller for Connections without Backing Bars .....	39

### Figures

Figure 2.1	Acceptance Criteria from British Constructional Steelwork Association (Part 1) <sup>(16)</sup> .....	54
Figure 2.2	Acceptance Criteria from British Constructional Steelwork Association (Part 2) <sup>(16)</sup> .....	55
Figure 3.1	Pull-Plate Specimen Design.....	56
Figure 3.2	Stress Intensity Factor Determined at the Deepest Point of the Crack for Pull-Plate Test Geometries .....	57
Figure 3.3	Stress Intensity Factor for Pull-Plate Test Geometries .....	58

Figure 4.1.	Embedded Flaw Stress Intensity Factor to Stress Ratio for Flaw 0.125 in. from Surface .....	59
Figure 4.2.	Geometry of Backing Bar with Sealing Fillet.....	60
Figure 4.3	Contour Plot of Stress Intensity Factor to Stress Ratio for Geometry With Backing Bar and 3/8 in. Leg Sealing Fillet Weld .....	61
Figure 5.1	2D Analysis Results for Pull-plate and Connection by Chi and Deierlein .....	62
Figure 5.2	Contour Plot of Stress Intensity Factor to Stress Ratio for Larger SAC Phase 1 Connection (W36 x 150 to W14 x 257) .....	63
Figure 5.3	Contour Plot of Stress Intensity Factor to Stress Ratio for a Beam to Column Connection W36 x 300 to W14 x 429.....	64
Figure 5.4	W36 x 300 Beam Connection with Fillet Weld Replacing Backing Bar on Full-Penetration Weld.....	65
Figure 8.1	Expected Size of Rejectable Flaws using AWS D1.1 Criteria.....	66
Figure 9.1	Notch Tips .....	67