

Recommended Postearthquake Evaluation and Repair Criteria for Welded Steel Moment-Frame Buildings

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 SAC Joint Venture Partnership by
Guidelines Development Committee**

Ronald O. Hamburger, Chair

John D. Hooper
Robert Shaw
Lawrence D. Reaveley

Thomas Sabol
C. Mark Saunders
Raymond H. R. Tide

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
Leonard 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

SAC Joint Venture

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

June, 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 university earthquake research 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 consultants and 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 structures.

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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xi
1. INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 Purpose.....	1-1
1.2 Intent	1-2
1.3 Background.....	1-4
1.4 Application	1-12
1.5 Postearthquake Evaluation and Repair Process	1-12
1.6 Overview of These Recommended Criteria.....	1-14
2. INSPECTION AND CLASSIFICATION OF DAMAGE.....	2-1
2.1 Introduction.....	2-1
2.2 Damage Types	2-1
2.2.1 Girder Damage.....	2-2
2.2.2 Column Flange Damage	2-4
2.2.3 Weld Damage.....	2-6
2.2.4 Shear Tab Damage.....	2-8
2.2.5 Panel Zone Damage	2-9
2.2.6 Other Damage.....	2-10
3. PRELIMINARY POSTEARTHQUAKE ASSESSMENT	3-1
3.1 Introduction.....	3-1
3.1.1 General.....	3-1
3.1.2 Evaluator Qualifications	3-2
3.2 Screening	3-2
3.3 Preliminary Evaluation	3-4
3.3.1 General.....	3-4
3.3.2 Building Construction Characteristics	3-6
3.3.3 Preliminary Site Inspection.....	3-6
3.3.3.1 Preliminary Connection Inspections when Fireproofing is Present.....	3-9
3.3.3.2 Bare Structural Steel	3-10
3.3.4 Data Reduction and Assessment.....	3-12
3.3.4.1 Finding of Dangerous Condition	3-12
3.3.4.2 Finding of Damaged Condition	3-12
3.3.4.3 Finding of Undamaged Condition	3-13
3.3.5 Reporting and Notification	3-13
3.3.5.1 Building Departments	3-14
3.3.5.2 Private Consultants	3-14
4. LEVEL 1 DETAILED POSTEARTHQUAKE EVALUATIONS	4-1
4.1 Introduction.....	4-1
4.2 Data Collection	4-2

4.3	Evaluation Approach	4-2
4.4	Detailed Procedure.....	4-3
4.4.1	Method 1 – Inspection of All Connections.....	4-4
4.4.1.1	Detailed Connection Inspections	4-4
4.4.1.1.1	Initial Inspections.....	4-6
4.4.1.1.2	Detailed Inspections.....	4-7
4.4.1.2	Damage Characterization.....	4-7
4.4.1.3	Determine Damage Index at Each Floor for Each Direction of Response	4-10
4.4.1.4	Determine Maximum Floor Damage Index.....	4-11
4.4.1.5	Determine Recommended Recovery Strategies for the Building.....	4-11
4.4.2	Method 2 – Inspection of a Sample of Connections.....	4-12
4.4.2.1	Evaluation Step 1 – Categorize Connections by Groups.....	4-13
4.4.2.2	Step 2 – Select Samples of Connections for Inspection	4-13
4.4.2.2.1	Method A – Random Selection.....	4-14
4.4.2.2.2	Method B – Analytical Selection.....	4-17
4.4.2.3	Step 3 – Inspect the Selected Samples of Connections	4-18
4.4.2.3.1	Inspection.....	4-18
4.4.2.3.2	Damage Characterization.....	4-19
4.4.2.4	Step 4 – Inspect Connections Adjacent to Damaged Connections	4-20
4.4.2.5	Step 5 – Determine Damage Statistics for Each Group.....	4-21
4.4.2.6	Step 6 – Determine the Probability that the Connections in a Group at a Floor Level Sustained Excessive Damage	4-21
4.4.2.7	Step 7 – Determine Recommended Recovery Strategies for the Building.....	4-24
4.4.3	Additional Considerations	4-25
4.5.	Evaluation Report	4-25
5.	LEVEL 2 DETAILED POSTEARTHQUAKE EVALUATIONS	5-1
5.1	Introduction.....	5-1
5.2	Data Collection	5-2
5.3	Evaluation Approach	5-3
5.4	Field Inspection.....	5-6
5.5	Material Properties and Condition Assessment.....	5-6
5.5.1	Material Properties.....	5-7
5.6	Structural Performance Confidence Evaluation	5-12
5.7	Ground Motion Representation	5-15
5.7.1	Instrumental Recordings.....	5-15
5.7.2	Estimated Ground Motion	5-16
5.8	Analytical Procedures.....	5-17
5.8.1	Procedure Selection	5-18
5.8.2	Linear Static Procedure (LSP).....	5-18
5.8.2.1	Basis of the Procedure	5-18

5.8.2.2	Modeling and Analysis Considerations	5-21
5.8.2.2.1	Period Determination	5-21
5.8.2.3	Determination of Actions and Deformations	5-21
5.8.2.3.1	Pseudo Lateral Load	5-21
5.8.2.3.2	Vertical Distribution of Seismic Forces.....	5-23
5.8.2.3.3	Horizontal Distribution of Seismic Forces	5-23
5.8.2.3.4	Determination of Interstory Drift.....	5-23
5.8.2.3.5	Determination of Column Demands	5-24
5.8.3	Linear Dynamic Procedure (LDP).....	5-25
5.8.3.1	Basis of the Procedure	5-25
5.8.3.2	Modeling and Analysis Considerations	5-26
5.8.3.2.1	General.....	5-26
5.8.3.3	Determination of Actions and Deformations.....	5-26
5.8.3.3.1	Factored Interstory Drift Demand.....	5-26
5.8.3.3.2	Determination of Column Demands	5-26
5.8.4	Nonlinear Static Procedure (NSP)	5-26
5.8.4.1	Basis of the Procedure	5-26
5.8.4.2	Modeling and Analysis Considerations	5-27
5.8.4.2.1	General.....	5-27
5.8.4.2.2	Control Node.....	5-28
5.8.4.2.3	Lateral Load Patterns	5-28
5.8.4.2.4	Period Determination	5-28
5.8.4.2.5	Analysis of Three-Dimensional Models.....	5-28
5.8.4.2.6	Analysis of Two-Dimensional Models	5-28
5.8.4.3	Determination of Actions and Deformations	5-29
5.8.4.3.1	Target Displacement.....	5-29
5.8.4.3.2	Diaphragms	5-29
5.8.4.3.3	Factored Interstory Drift Demand.....	5-29
5.8.4.3.4	Factored Column and Column Splice Demands.....	5-29
5.8.5	Nonlinear Dynamic Procedure (NDP).....	5-29
5.8.5.1	Basis of the Procedure	5-29
5.8.5.2	Modeling and Analysis Assumptions	5-30
5.8.5.2.1	General	5-30
5.8.5.2.2	Ground Motion Characterization	5-30
5.8.5.3	Determination of Actions and Deformations.....	5-30
5.8.5.3.1	Response Quantities.....	5-30
5.8.5.3.2	Factored Interstory Drift Demand.....	5-30
5.8.5.3.3	Factored Column and Column Splice Demands.....	5-30
5.9	Mathematical Modeling.....	5-31
5.9.1	Modeling Approach	5-31
5.9.2	Model Configuration.....	5-31
5.9.3	Horizontal Torsion.....	5-32
5.9.4	Foundation Modeling.....	5-32
5.9.5	Diaphragms.....	5-33
5.9.6	$P-\Delta$ effects.....	5-33

5.9.7	Elastic Framing Properties.....	5-35
5.9.8	Nonlinear Framing Properties.....	5-35
5.9.9	Verification of Analysis Assumptions.....	5-36
5.9.10	Undamaged Connection Modeling.....	5-36
5.9.10.1	Fully Restrained Connections.....	5-36
5.9.10.1.1	Linear Modeling.....	5-36
5.9.10.1.2	Nonlinear Modeling.....	5-37
5.9.10.2	Simple Shear Tab Connections.....	5-37
5.9.10.2.1	Modeling Guidelines – Linear Analysis.....	5-38
5.9.10.2.2	Modeling Guidelines – Nonlinear Analysis.....	5-38
5.9.11	Damage Modeling.....	5-38
5.9.11.1	Fully Restrained (FR) Connection Damage.....	5-39
5.9.11.2	Column Damage.....	5-39
5.9.11.3	Beam Damage.....	5-40
5.9.11.4	Other Damage.....	5-40
5.10	Acceptance Criteria and Confidence Evaluation.....	5-40
5.10.1	Factored Demand to Capacity Ratio.....	5-41
5.10.2	Performance Limited by Interstory Drift Angle.....	5-43
5.10.2.1	Factored Interstory Drift Angle Demand.....	5-43
5.10.2.2	Factored Interstory Drift Angle Capacity.....	5-45
5.10.2.2.1	Global Interstory Drift Angle.....	5-45
5.10.2.2.2	Local Interstory Drift Angle.....	5-46
5.10.3	Performance Limited by Column Compressive Capacity.....	5-47
5.10.3.1	Column Compressive Demand.....	5-47
5.10.3.2	Column Compressive Capacity.....	5-48
5.10.4	Column Splice Capacity.....	5-48
5.10.4.1	Column Splice Tensile Demand.....	5-49
5.10.4.2	Column Splice Tensile Capacity.....	5-49
5.11	Evaluation Report.....	5-49
6.	POSTEARTHQUAKE REPAIR.....	6-1
6.1	Scope.....	6-1
6.2	Shoring and Temporary Bracing.....	6-2
6.2.1	Investigation.....	6-2
6.2.2	Special Requirements.....	6-2
6.3	Repair Details.....	6-3
6.3.1	Approach.....	6-3
6.3.2	Weld Fractures – Type W Damage.....	6-4
6.3.3	Column Fractures – Types C1 to C5 and P1 to P6.....	6-7
6.3.4	Column Splice Fractures – Type C7.....	6-11
6.3.5	Girder Flange Fractures – Types G3 to G5.....	6-11
6.3.6	Buckled Girder Flanges – Type G1.....	6-13
6.3.7	Buckled Column Flanges – Type C6.....	6-13
6.3.8	Gravity Connections.....	6-14
6.3.9	Reuse of Bolts.....	6-14

6.3.10	Welding Specifications	6-15
6.4	Preparation	6-15
6.4.1	Welding Procedure Specifications	6-15
6.4.2	Welder Training	6-16
6.4.3	Welder Qualifications	6-16
6.4.4	Joint Mock-Ups	6-16
6.4.5	Repair Sequence	6-17
6.4.6	Concurrent Work	6-17
6.5	Execution	6-17
6.5.1	General	6-17
6.5.2	Removal of Backing	6-18
6.5.3	Removal of Weld Tabs	6-19
6.5.4	Defect Removal	6-19
6.5.5	Girder Repair	6-20
6.5.6	Weld Repair (Types W2, or W3 and Defects)	6-21
6.5.7	Weld Overlays	6-21
6.5.8	Column Flange Repairs – Type C2	6-23
APPENDIX A. DETAILED PROCEDURES FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION		A-1
A.1	Scope	A-1
A.2	Performance Evaluation Approach	A-1
A.2.1	Confidence of Ability to Withstand Collapse	A-1
A.2.2	Basic Procedure	A-3
A.3	Determination of Hazard Parameters	A-6
A.4	Determination of Demand Factors	A-6
A.5	Determination of Beam-Column Connection Assembly Capacities	A-9
A.5.1	Connection Test Protocols	A-10
A.5.2	Determination of Beam-Column Assembly Capacities and Resistance Factors	A-10
A.6	Global Stability Capacity	A-11
APPENDIX B. SAMPLE PLACARDS		B-1
B.1	“Inspected” Placard	B-1
B.2	“Restricted Use” Placard	B-2
B.3	Modified “Restricted Use” Placard	B-3
B.4	“Unsafe” Placard	B-4
APPENDIX C. SAMPLE INSPECTION FORMS		C-1
REFERENCES, BIBLIOGRAPHY, AND ACRONYMS		R-1
SAC PROJECT PARTICIPANTS		S-1