



Quantification of Building Seismic Performance Factors: Component Equivalency Methodology

FEMA P-795 / June 2011



FEMA



Quantification of Building Seismic Performance Factors: Component Equivalency Methodology

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.

ATC MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT
Christopher Rojahn (Project Executive)
William T. Holmes (Project Technical Monitor)
Jon A. Heintz (Project Quality Control Monitor)
Ayse Hortacsu (Project Manager)

PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Charles Kircher (Project Technical Director)
Gregory Deierlein
Andre Filiatrault
James R. Harris
John Hooper
Helmut Krawinkler
Kurt Stochlia

WORKING GROUPS

Curt Haselton
Abbie Liel
Seyed Hamid Shivaee
Jackie Steiner

PROJECT REVIEW PANEL

S.K. Ghosh
Mark Gilligan
Ramon Gilsanz*
Ronald O. Hamburger
Richard E. Klingner
Philip Line
Bonnie E. Manley
Rawn Nelson
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 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 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 in all buildings and increase the expected performance of critical and higher occupancy structures.

This publication builds upon an earlier FEMA publication, FEMA P-695 *Quantification of Building Seismic Performance Factors* (FEMA, 2009b). FEMA P-695 presents a procedural methodology for reliably quantifying seismic performance factors, including the response modification coefficient, R , the system overstrength factor, Ω_o , and the deflection amplification factor, C_d , used to characterize the global seismic response of a system.

While the methodology contained in FEMA P-695 provides a means to evaluate complete seismic-force-resisting systems proposed for adoption into building codes, a component-based methodology was needed to reliably evaluate structural elements, connections, or subassemblies proposed as substitutes for equivalent components in established seismic-force-resisting systems. The Component Equivalency Methodology presented in this document fills this need by maintaining consistency with the probabilistic,

system-based collapse assessment concepts of FEMA P-695 while providing simple procedures for comparing the tested performance of different components. It is intended to be of assistance to organizations, such as the International Code Council Evaluation Service, who need to compare the seismic performance of alternate components to those contained in established seismic force resisting system.

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 publication, including the Project Management Committee consisting of Greg Deierlein, Andre Filiatrault, Jim Harris, John Hooper, Helmut Krawinkler, and Kurt Stochlia; the Project Working Groups consisting of Curt Haselton, Abbie Liel, Jackie Steiner, and Seyed Hamid Shivaee; and the Project Review Panel consisting of S.K. Ghosh, Mark Gilligan, Ramon Gilsanz, Ron Hamburger, Rich Klingner, Phil Line, Bonnie Manley, Rawn Nelson, Andrei Reinhorn, and Rafael Sabelli. Without their dedication and hard work, this project would not have been possible.

Federal Emergency Management Agency

Preface

In 2008, the Applied Technology Council (ATC) was awarded a “Seismic and Technical Guidance Development and Support” contract (HSFEHQ-08-D-0726) by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to conduct a variety of tasks, including one entitled “Quantification of Building System Performance and Response Parameters.” Designated the ATC-63-1 Project, this work was the continuation of the ATC-63 Project, funded under an earlier FEMA contract, which resulted in the publication of the FEMA P-695 report, *Quantification of Building Seismic Performance Factors* (FEMA, 2009b). This report outlined a procedural methodology for reliably quantifying seismic performance factors, including the response modification coefficient, R factor, the system overstrength factor, Ω_o , and the deflection amplification factor, C_d , used to characterize the global seismic response of a system.

While the FEMA P-695 Methodology provided a means to evaluate complete seismic-force-resisting systems proposed for adoption into building codes, a component-based methodology was still needed that could reliably evaluate structural elements, connections, or subassemblies proposed as substitutes for equivalent components in current code-approved seismic-force-resisting systems. The purpose of the ATC-63-1 Project was to develop such a methodology.

The recommended Component Equivalency Methodology described in this report balances the competing objectives of: (1) maintaining consistency with the probabilistic, analytical, system-based collapse assessment concepts of the FEMA P-695 Methodology; and (2) providing simple procedures for comparing the tested performance of different components. It was developed based on probabilistic concepts using results from collapse sensitivity studies on key performance parameters.

ATC is indebted to the leadership of Charlie Kircher, Project Technical Director, and to the members of the ATC-63-1 Project Team for their efforts in the development of the recommended methodology. The Project Management Committee, consisting of Greg Deierlein, Andre Filiatrault, Jim Harris, John Hooper, Helmut Krawinkler, and Kurt Stochlia monitored and guided the technical development efforts. The Project Working Groups, which included Curt Haselton, Abbie Liel, Seyed Hamid Shivaee, and Jackie

Steiner, deserve special recognition for their contributions in developing, investigating, and testing the methodology, and in preparing this report. The Project Review Panel, consisting of S.K. Ghosh, Mark Gilligan, Ramon Gilsanz, Ronald Hamburger, Richard Klingner, Philip Line, Bonnie Manley, Rawn Nelson, Andrei Reinhorn, and Rafael Sabelli provided technical review, advice, and consultation at key stages of the work. Ayse Hortacsu served as ATC project manager for this 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 for ATC report production services, and Ramon Gilsanz as ATC Board Contact.

Jon A. Heintz
ATC Director of Projects

Christopher Rojahn
ATC Executive Director

Table of Contents

Foreword	iii
Preface	v
List of Figures	xv
List of Tables	xxiii
1. Introduction	1-1
1.1 Background and Purpose	1-1
1.2 Objectives and Scope.....	1-3
1.3 Assumptions and Limitations	1-4
1.3.1 Equivalency Approach.....	1-4
1.3.2 Suitability of Proposed Components	1-4
1.3.3 Suitability of the Reference Seismic-Force-Resisting System.....	1-5
1.3.4 Limitations on Test Data and Design Requirements	1-6
1.4 Anticipated Use and Implementation	1-7
1.5 Technical Approach.....	1-7
1.5.1 Identification of Key Component Performance Parameters.....	1-8
1.5.2 Development of Component Testing Requirements.....	1-8
1.5.3 Development of Probabilistic Acceptance Criteria.....	1-9
1.6 Content and Organization.....	1-10
2. Component Equivalency Methodology	2-1
2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.1.1 Scope.....	2-1
2.1.2 General Approach	2-2
2.1.3 Description of Process	2-2
2.1.4 Terminology.....	2-4
2.1.5 Notation	2-6
2.1.6 Statistical Notation.....	2-7
2.2 Component Testing Requirements	2-8
2.2.1 General Requirements for Component Testing	2-9
2.2.2 Cyclic-Load Testing	2-10
2.2.3 Monotonic-Load Testing	2-13
2.3 Applicability Criteria.....	2-15
2.3.1 Required Information and Data	2-16
2.3.2 Reference Seismic-Force-Resisting-System: Collapse Performance Criteria.....	2-16
2.3.3 Quality Rating Criteria.....	2-16
2.3.4 General Criteria.....	2-16
2.4 Reference Component Test Data Requirements.....	2-17
2.4.1 Define Reference Component Design Space.....	2-17
2.4.2 Compile or Generate Reference Component Test Data... ..	2-18

2.4.3	Interpret Reference Component Test Results.....	2-18
2.4.4	Define Reference Component Performance Groups	2-18
2.4.5	Compute Summary Statistics	2-19
2.5	Proposed Component Design Requirements.....	2-19
2.5.1	Component Design Strength and Stiffness.....	2-19
2.5.2	Component Detailing Requirements	2-20
2.5.3	Component Connection Requirements.....	2-20
2.5.4	Limitations on Component Applicability and Use.....	2-20
2.5.5	Component Construction, Inspection, and Maintenance Requirements.....	2-20
2.6	Proposed Component Test Data Requirements.....	2-21
2.6.1	Define Proposed Component Design Space.....	2-21
2.6.2	Select Proposed Component Configurations for Testing	2-21
2.6.3	Perform Cyclic-Load and Monotonic-Load Tests.....	2-21
2.6.4	Interpret Proposed Component Test Results	2-21
2.6.5	Define Proposed Component Performance Groups	2-22
2.6.6	Compute Summary Statistics	2-22
2.7	Quality Rating Criteria.....	2-22
2.7.1	Quality Rating of Test Data	2-22
2.7.2	Quality Rating of Design Requirements	2-24
2.8	Component Equivalency Acceptance Criteria	2-25
2.8.1	Overall Approach to Establishing Equivalency	2-25
2.8.2	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Strength and Ultimate Deformation Capacity	2-25
2.8.3	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Effective Initial Stiffness.....	2-27
2.8.4	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Effective Ductility Capacity	2-28
2.8.5	Requirements Based on Monotonic-Load test Data: Ultimate Deformation	2-28
2.9	Documentation and Peer Review Requirements.....	2-29
2.9.1	Documentation	2-29
2.9.2	Documentation of Test Data	2-29
2.9.3	Peer Review Panel Requirements	2-30
2.9.4	Peer Review Panel Selection.....	2-30
2.9.5	Peer Review Panel Responsibilities	2-31
3.	Commentary on the Component Equivalency Methodology.....	3-1
3.1	Introduction.....	3-1
3.2	Component Testing Requirements.....	3-2
3.2.1	General Requirements for Component Testing.....	3-3
3.2.2	Cyclic-Load Testing.....	3-4
3.2.3	Monotonic-Load Testing.....	3-12
3.3	Applicability Criteria	3-12
3.3.1	Required Information and Data.....	3-12
3.3.2	Reference Seismic-Force-Resisting System: Collapse Performance Criteria	3-13
3.3.3	Quality Rating Criteria.....	3-13
3.3.4	General Criteria.....	3-13
3.4	Reference Component Test Data Requirements	3-20
3.4.1	Define Reference Component Design Space	3-21

3.4.2	Compile or Generate Reference Component Test Data...	3-22
3.4.3	Interpret Reference Component Test Results	3-22
3.4.4	Define Reference Component Performance Groups.....	3-22
3.4.5	Compute Summary Statistics.....	3-25
3.5	Proposed Component Design Requirements	3-25
3.5.1	Component Design Strength and Stiffness	3-26
3.5.2	Component Detailing Requirements.....	3-26
3.5.3	Component Connection Requirements	3-26
3.5.4	Limitations on Component Applicability and Use	3-27
3.5.5	Component Construction, Inspection, and Maintenance Requirements.....	3-27
3.6	Proposed Component Test Data Requirements	3-27
3.6.1	Define Proposed Component Design Space	3-27
3.6.2	Select Proposed Component Configurations for Testing.	3-28
3.6.3	Perform Cyclic-Load and Monotonic-Load Tests	3-28
3.6.4	Interpret Proposed Component Test Results.....	3-28
3.6.5	Define Proposed Component Performance Groups	3-28
3.6.6	Compute Summary Statistics.....	3-29
3.7	Quality Rating Criteria	3-29
3.7.1	Quality Rating of Test Data	3-29
3.7.2	Quality Rating of Design Requirements	3-31
3.8	Component Equivalency Acceptance Criteria	3-33
3.8.1	Overall Approach to Establishing Equivalency	3-33
3.8.2	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Strength and Ultimate Deformation.....	3-34
3.8.3	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Effective Initial Stiffness	3-36
3.8.4	Requirements Based on Monotonic-Load Test Data: Ductility Capacity.....	3-37
3.8.5	Requirements based on Monotonic-Load Test Data: Ultimate Deformation.....	3-37
3.9	Documentation and Peer Review Requirements	3-38
4.	Example Application.....	4-1
4.1	Introduction	4-1
4.2	Component Testing Requirements	4-1
4.3	Evaluation of Applicability Criteria	4-2
4.4	Reference Component Test Data	4-2
4.4.1	Define Reference Component Design Space.....	4-2
4.4.2	Compile or Generate Reference Component Test Data....	4-2
4.4.3	Interpret the Reference Component Test Results	4-3
4.4.4	Define Reference Component Performance Groups.....	4-9
4.4.5	Compute Summary Statistics.....	4-9
4.5	Proposed Component Design Requirements	4-10
4.5.1	Component Design Strength and Stiffness	4-10
4.5.2	Component Detailing Requirements.....	4-11
4.5.3	Component Connection Requirements	4-12
4.5.4	Limitations on Component Applicability and Use	4-13
4.5.5	Component Construction, Inspection, and Maintenance Requirements.....	4-13
4.6	Proposed Component Test Data	4-13

4.6.1	Define Proposed Component Design Space.....	4-13
4.6.2	Select Proposed Component Configurations for Testing	4-14
4.6.3	Perform Cyclic-Load and Monotonic-Load Tests	4-15
4.6.4	Interpret Proposed Component Test Results	4-16
4.6.5	Define Proposed Component Performance Groups	4-17
4.6.6	Compute Summary Statistics	4-18
4.7	Evaluate Quality Ratings	4-18
4.7.1	Quality Rating of Test Data	4-18
4.7.2	Quality Rating of Design Requirements	4-19
4.8	Evaluate Component Equivalency	4-20
4.8.1	Overview	4-20
4.8.2	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Strength and Ultimate Deformation	4-20
4.8.3	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Effective Initial Stiffness.....	4-22
4.8.4	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Effective Ductility Capacity	4-23
4.8.5	Requirements Based on Monotonic-Load Test Data: Ultimate Deformation	4-23
4.9	Summary of Example Component Equivalency Evaluation.....	4-24
5.	Conclusions and Recommendations.....	5-1
5.1	Introduction.....	5-1
5.2	Findings from Supporting Studies	5-1
5.2.1	Key Performance Parameters	5-1
5.2.2	Cyclic-Load and Monotonic-Load Test Data Requirements.....	5-4
5.2.3	Probabilistic Acceptance Criteria.....	5-5
5.3	Findings of Test Applications	5-6
5.3.1	General Findings	5-6
5.3.2	Specific Findings: Stapled-Wood Shear Wall Components.....	5-8
5.3.3	Specific Findings: Buckling Restrained Brace Components.....	5-8
5.3.4	Specific Findings: Pre-Fabricated Wall Components.....	5-9
5.3.5	Specific Findings: Nailed Wood Shear Wall Reference Component Data Set	5-9
5.4	Recommendations for Further Study	5-10
5.4.1	Compilation of Available Reference System Benchmark Data.....	5-10
5.4.2	Development of Additional Reference System Benchmark Data.....	5-10
5.4.3	Development of Standard Cyclic-Load Testing Methods.....	5-11
5.4.4	Implications for Design Requirements Related to Overstrength.....	5-11
 Appendix A: Identification of Component Parameters Important for Equivalency..... A-1		
A.1	Introduction.....	A-1
A.2	Representative Component Behavior.....	A-1

A.3	Literature Review	A-4
A.3.1	Collapse Studies	A-4
A.3.2	Non-Collapse Studies	A-6
A.4	Wood Light-Frame Building Collapse Sensitivity Studies.....	A-9
A.4.1	Building Models and Baseline Component Parameter Values.....	A-9
A.4.2	Sensitivity Study Results for Three-Story Building: Full Replacement	A-12
A.4.3	Sensitivity Study Results for Three-Story Planar Model: Mixing-and-Matching Over the Height of Building	A-15
A.4.4	Sensitivity Study Results for Three-Story Three-Dimensional Model: Mixing-and-Matching of Walls in Plan and over Height.....	A-21
A.4.5	Summary of Parameter Importance for Wood Light-Frame Buildings	A-24
A.5	Reinforced Concrete Special Moment Frame Collapse Sensitivity Study.....	A-26
A.6	Summary of Key Component Parameters	A-29

Appendix B: Development of Requirements for Cyclic-Load and Monotonic-Load TestingB-1

B.1	Introduction	B-1
B.2	Cyclic-Load Test Data Considerations.....	B-1
B.2.1	Importance of Cyclic Loading History.....	B-2
B.2.2	Overview of Commonly Used Loading Protocols	B-3
B.2.3	Selection of Acceptable Loading Histories and Protocols.....	B-5
B.2.4	Special Case: Same Loading Protocol Used to Generate Proposed and Reference Component Data	B-10
B.2.5	Illustration: Comparison of Loading Histories.....	B-10
B.2.6	Additional Considerations for Cyclic-Load Testing	B-13
B.3	Monotonic-Load Test Data Considerations.....	B-13
B.3.1	Importance of Monotonic-Load Test Data in Component Methodology.....	B-14
B.3.2	Illustration: Limitations of Using Only Cyclic-Load Test Data for Component Equivalency	B-16
B.3.3	Monotonic-Load Test Data Requirements	B-19

Appendix C: Development of Probabilistic Acceptance Criteria..... C-1

C.1	Introduction	C-1
C.2	Collapse Capacity Fragilities and the Effects of Uncertainty	C-1
C.3	Effect of Changes in Deformation Capacity on the Collapse Fragility	C-4
C.4	Effect of Changes in Strength on the Collapse Fragility	C-7
C.5	Probabilistic Acceptance Criterion Used in Component Equivalency Methodology.....	C-10
C.5.1	Overall Approach.....	C-10
C.5.2	Development of the Penalty Factor for Differences in Uncertainty.....	C-10

C.5.3	Development of the Penalty Factor for Differences in Strength.....	C-12
-------	--	------

Appendix D: Test Application: Stapled Wood Shear Wall

	Components	D-1
D.1	Introduction.....	D-1
D.2	Description of Stapled wood Shear Walls	D-1
D.3	Evaluation of Applicability Criteria.....	D-3
D.4	Reference Component Test Data	D-4
	D.4.1 Define the Reference Component Design Space.....	D-4
	D.4.2 Compile or Generate Reference Component Test Data... D-4	D-4
	D.4.3 Interpret Reference Component Test Results	D-5
	D.4.4 Define Reference Component Performance Groups	D-9
	D.4.5 Compute Summary Statistics.....	D-9
D.5	Proposed Component Design Requirements.....	D-9
	D.5.1 Component Design Strength and Stiffness	D-9
	D.5.2 Component Detailing Requirements	D-10
	D.5.3 Component Connection Requirements	D-12
	D.5.4 Limitations on Component Applicability and Use	D-12
	D.5.5 Component Construction, Inspection, and Maintenance Requirements	D-12
D.6	Proposed Component Test Data.....	D-13
	D.6.1 Define Proposed Component Design Space	D-13
	D.6.2 Select Component Configurations for Testing	D-13
	D.6.3 Perform Cyclic-Load and Monotonic-Load Tests.....	D-13
	D.6.4 Interpret Proposed Component Test Results	D-14
	D.6.5 Define Proposed Component Performance Groups and Compute Summary Statistics.....	D-15
D.7	Evaluate Quality Ratings	D-16
	D.7.1 Quality Rating of Test Data.....	D-16
	D.7.2 Quality Rating of Design Requirements.....	D-16
D.8	Evaluate Component Equivalency	D-17
	D.8.1 Overview	D-17
	D.8.2 Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Strength and Ultimate Deformation	D-17
	D.8.3 Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Effective Initial Stiffness.....	D-19
	D.8.4 Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Effective Ductility Capacity	D-20
	D.8.5 Requirements Based on Monotonic-Load Test Data: Ultimate Deformation.....	D-20
	D.8.6 Summary of Component Equivalency Evaluation	D-20
D.9	Iteration: Evaluate Component Equivalency with Modifications	D-20
D.10	Summary of Component Equivalency Evaluation of Stapled Wood Shear Walls	D-21

Appendix E: Test Application: Buckling-Restrained Brace

	Components	E-1
E.1	Introduction.....	E-1
E.2	Description of Buckling-Restrained Braces.....	E-2

E.3	Evaluation of Applicability Criteria	E-3
E.4	Reference Component Test Data	E-5
E.4.1	Define Reference Component Design Space	E-5
E.4.2	Define of Reference Component Performance Groups....	E-6
E.4.3	Compile or Generate Reference Component Test Data ...	E-6
E.4.4	Interpret Reference Component Test Results.....	E-9
E.4.5	Compute Summary Statistics	E-13
E.5	Proposed Component Design Requirements	E-14
E.5.1	Component Design Strength and Stiffness.....	E-15
E.5.2	Component Detailing Requirements	E-16
E.5.3	Component Connection Requirements.....	E-16
E.5.4	Limitations on Component Applicability and Use.....	E-16
E.5.5	Component Construction, Inspection, and Maintenance Requirements	E-16
E.6	Proposed Component Test Data	E-17
E.6.1	Define Proposed Component Design Space.....	E-19
E.6.2	Select Component Configurations for Testing.....	E-19
E.6.3	Perform Cyclic-Load and Monotonic-Load Tests.....	E-20
E.6.4	Interpret Proposed Component Test Results.....	E-21
E.6.5	Compute Summary Statistics	E-23
E.7	Evaluate Quality Ratings	E-23
E.7.1	Quality Rating of Test Data	E-23
E.7.2	Quality Rating of Design Requirements	E-24
E.8	Evaluate Component Equivalency.....	E-25
E.8.1	Overview	E-25
E.8.2	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Strength and Ultimate Deformation	E-25
E.8.3	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Effective Initial Stiffness.....	E-26
E.8.4	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Effective Ductility Capacity.....	E-26
E.8.5	Requirements Based on Monotonic-Load Test Data: Ultimate Deformation	E-27
E.8.6	Summary of Component Equivalency Evaluation	E-27
E.9	Loading Protocol Suitability.....	E-28
E.10	Summary of Component Equivalency Evaluation of Buckling-Restrained Braces	E-30
E.11	Limitations of Test Application	E-30
E.11.1	Reference Component Test Data Do Not Fully Represent the Design Space	E-30
E.11.2	The Equivalency Evaluation May Not Adequately Account for System Differences	E-30
E.11.3	Component Parameters are Approximate	E-31

Appendix F: Test Application: Pre-Fabricated Wall ComponentsF-1

F.1	Introduction	F-1
F.2	Description of Pre-Fabricated Wall Component	F-1
F.3	Evaluation of Applicability Criteria	F-2
F.4	Reference Component Test Data	F-3
F.5	Proposed Component Design Requirements	F-3
F.6	Proposed Component Test Data	F-4

F.7	Evaluate Quality Ratings	F-6
F.7.1	Quality Rating of Test Data.....	F-6
F.7.2	Quality Rating of Design Requirements.....	F-7
F.8	Evaluate Component Equivalency	F-7
F.8.1	Overview	F-7
F.8.2	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Strength and Ultimate Deformation	F-8
F.8.3	Requirements Based on Cyclic-Load Test Data: Effective Initial Stiffness.....	F-9
F.8.4	Requirements Based on Cyclic Test Data: Effective Ductility Capacity	F-9
F.8.5	Requirements Based on Monotonic Load Test Data: Ultimate Deformation.....	F-10
F.9	Summary of Component Equivalency Evaluation for Pre- Fabricated Wall Components.....	F-11
	References	G-1
	Project Participants.....	H-1