

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	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 Components.....F-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

List of Figures

Figure 1-1	Conceptual boundaries defined by the Component Methodology applicability criteria of Section 2.3	1-5
Figure 2-1	Process for establishing and documenting component equivalency	2-3
Figure 2-2	Illustration of cyclic-load test data, envelope curve and maximum load, Q_M , effective yield deformation, $\Delta_{Y,eff}$, ultimate deformation, Δ_U , and initial stiffness, K_I , parameters, for a component test specimen	2-12
Figure 2-3	Illustration of a monotonic curve and determination of maximum load, Q_{MM} , and ultimate deformation, Δ_{UM} , parameters for a component test specimen	2-15
Figure 3-1	Monotonic and cyclic responses of identical steel specimens, and cyclic envelope curve fit to cyclic response..	3-2
Figure 3-2	Cyclic-load test data and cyclic envelope curve for a nailed wood light-frame shear wall specimen (data from Rosowsky et al., 2004).....	3-8
Figure 3-3	Illustration of cyclic envelope curve and key component performance parameters obtained from positive and negative loading directions based on Figure 3-2	3-8
Figure 3-4	Cyclic-load test data and cyclic envelope curve for a nailed wood shear wall specimen (data from Rosowsky et al., 2004)	3-9
Figure 3-5	Cyclic-load test data and cyclic envelope curve for a nailed wood shear wall specimen (data from Rosowsky et al., 2004)	3-9
Figure 3-6	Cyclic-load test data and cyclic envelope curve for a nailed wood shear wall specimen (data from Rosowsky et al., 2004)	3-10
Figure 3-7	Cyclic-load test data and cyclic envelope curve for a nailed wood shear wall specimen (data from Rosowsky et al., 2004)	3-10

Figure 3-8	Cyclic-load test data and cyclic envelope curve for a nailed wood shear wall specimen (data from Rosowsky et al., 2004).....	3-11
Figure 3-9	Cyclic response and cyclic envelope curve of a single HSS-section brace (data from Wakabayashi et al., 1979). In this case the initial stiffness should be determined from the negative quadrant only	3-11
Figure 3-10	Cyclic response and cyclic envelope curve of an X-brace configuration (data from Wakabayashi et al., 1979). In this case the initial stiffness should be determined from the negative quadrant only	3-12
Figure 3-11	Illustration of proposed component and connection definitions for a steel concentrically braced seismic-force-resisting system.....	3-14
Figure 3-12	Illustration of two alternative definitions for the proposed component boundary for a steel concentrically braced seismic-force-resisting system (Engelhardt, 2007).	3-15
Figure 3-13	Illustration of the proposed component boundary for a buckling-restrained brace seismic-force-resisting system (Engelhardt, 2007)	3-16
Figure 3-14	Illustration of proposed component boundaries for various wood light-frame shear walls, including (a) Simpson Strong-Tie (2009), (b) Simpson Steel Strong-Wall (Photo courtesy of Tools of the Trade Magazine, 2006), and (c) Hardy frame (Photo courtesy of SBE Builders)	3-17
Figure 3-15	Illustration of proposed component boundary for the fuse element in a steel eccentrically braced frame seismic-force-resisting system (Engelhardt, 2007)	3-18
Figure 3-16	Illustration of a proposed component boundary for a steel plate shear wall in a seismic-force-resisting system (Sabelli, 2007).....	3-19
Figure 3-17	Illustration of the difficulty in identifying an isolated component boundary in a multistory reinforced concrete shear wall seismic-force-resisting system.....	3-19
Figure 3-18	Overview of test data used in the reference component data set.....	3-20
Figure 4-1	Illustration of cyclic response of a nailed wood shear wall, data from Line et al. (2008) and Rosowsky et al. (2004).....	4-4

Figure 4-2	Illustration of cyclic response and envelope curve for a nailed wood shear wall, data from Line et al. (2008) and Rosowsky et al. (2004).....	4-4
Figure 4-3	Illustration of cyclic envelope curve and calculation of component response quantities for a nailed wood shear wall, data from Line et al. (2008) and Rosowsky et al. (2004).....	4-5
Figure A-1	Representative monotonic component behavior.	A-2
Figure A-2	Illustration of the cyclic behavior of the component model. Test data from the PEER Structural Performance Database (Berry et al., 2004) for test index numbers 8, 48, 154, and 212.....	A-3
Figure A-3	Example fitting of backbone curve to SAWS model, for the one-story high aspect ratio building No. 2	A-11
Figure A-4	Component parameters that are highly important for collapse response of three-story building	A-13
Figure A-5	Component parameters that are moderately important for collapse response of three-story building.....	A-14
Figure A-6	Component parameters that are not important the collapse response of three-story building	A-15
Figure A-7	Schematic diagram of the various mix-and-match cases considered for the building No. 10 sensitivity study. This considers possible mixing-and-matching over the height of the building.....	A-16
Figure A-8	Effects of strength on collapse capacity of building No. 10, for the mix-and-match case of only story one being replaced.....	A-17
Figure A-9	Effects of strength on collapse capacity of three-story building for the mix-and-match case of stories two and three being replaced.....	A-17
Figure A-10	Sensitivity study results for three-story building for the mix-and-match case with the bottom story walls replaced.....	A-19
Figure A-11	Sensitivity study results for three-story building, for the mix-and-match case with the upper story (stories 2-3) walls replaced	A-20
Figure A-12	Schematic diagram of the various mix-and-match cases considered in the sensitivity study. Mixing-and-	

	matching both in plan and over the height of the building are considered	A-21
Figure A-13	Sensitivity study results for mix-and-match case where walls are only replaced on the South and West sides of the building	A-22
Figure A-14	Sensitivity study results for mix-and-match case where walls are only replaced on the first story of the South and West sides of the building	A-23
Figure A-15	Sensitivity study results for mix-and-match case where walls are only replaced on the second and third stories of the South and West sides of the building.....	A-24
Figure A-16	Sensitivity study results for the 4-story building ID1003, for the case of full replacement.....	A-28
Figure B-1	Identical steel specimens tested at the University of California at San Diego under different loading histories (Figure from PEER/ATC-72-1, data from Uang et al., 2000)	B-2
Figure B-2	Comparison of cyclic envelope curves obtained for identical specimens under different loading protocols (from Gatto and Uang 2002), illustrating the effects of loading history choice on strength and deformation capacity	B-3
Figure B-3	Illustration of two cyclic-loading protocols for an example component test specimen: (a) CUREE; and (b) SPD.....	B-6
Figure B-4	Illustration of normalized cumulative deformation plot, showing (a) SAC loading protocol, (b) plot of normalized cumulative deformation vs. normalized deformation amplitude	B-11
Figure B-5	Normalized cumulative deformation plots for an example reference component protocol (CUREE) and several candidate protocols. This plot is created based on specific assumptions about the proposed and reference component and is not generally applicable	B-13
Figure B-6	Cyclic behavior of an element experiencing (a) only cyclic strength deterioration, and (b) only in-cycle strength deterioration, figures from FEMA P-440A, (FEMA, 2009).....	B-15
Figure B-7	Hypothetical cyclic-load and monotonic-load test data for reference component (top) and proposed component	

	(bottom) illustrating the importance of considering both cyclic and monotonic behavior. Identical cyclic test parameters may obscure differences in monotonic behavior due to differences in cyclic and in-cycle strength deterioration.	B-17
Figure B-8	Example time-history response of the proposed and reference component SDOF models subjected to a single ground motion scaled to $S_a(1.0s) = 1.0g$	B-18
Figure B-9	Collapse fragility curves for the proposed and reference component SDOF models subjected to 20 ground motions.....	B-18
Figure C-1	Illustration of two collapse capacity fragilities, with the same 10 th percentile collapse capacity but different variability and medians.	C-2
Figure C-2	Relationship between component deformation capacity and system-level collapse capacity, for a three-story wood light frame building (from Figure A-4 of Appendix A).	C-5
Figure C-3	Relationship between component strength and system-level collapse capacity, for a three-story wood light-frame building showing the results for: (a) full replacement; and (b) mixing-and-matching when only stories 2-3 are replaced with the stronger components	C-8
Figure D-1	Failure modes of stapled wood shear wall test specimens showing: (a) staple withdrawal for wall number 4-C; (b) staple and splitting of top plate for wall number 12-A; (c) anchor rod failure and splitting of sill plate for wall number 8-C; and (d) staple shear and blocking failure for wall number 8-B (from Talbot et al., 2009).....	D-3
Figure D-2	Illustration of several stapled wood shear wall detailing requirements, including hold-down, stud-to-sill plate connector, and backup anchor bolt. Photo from Talbot et al. (2009).....	D-11
Figure D-3	Illustration of cyclic response of stapled wood shear wall specimen 8C (Talbot et al. 2009).....	D-14
Figure E-1	Conventional (left) and buckling-restrained (right) braces under cyclic loading (from Kumar et al., 2007).....	E-2
Figure E-2	Features of a typical buckling-restrained brace (from Tsai and Hsiao, 2008)	E-3
Figure E-3	Illustration of reference component and definition of component boundary (Engelhardt, 2007)	E-4

Figure E-4	Illustration of proposed component and definition of component boundary (Photo from Star Seismic)	E-5
Figure E-5	Illustration of cyclic response of X-brace configuration tested by Clark (2009) for a two-story frame configuration.	E-8
Figure E-6	Illustration of cyclic response of single HSS-section brace from Kotulka (2007) for a 1-story, 1-bay frame.....	E-9
Figure E-7	Cyclic test data for X-brace specimen TCBF-HSS-R (Test Index 1) tested by Clark (2009) showing: (a) cyclic response and cyclic envelope curve; and (b) cyclic envelope curve and component response quantities, in terms of brace axial force and elongation. The frame height and width are 6660 mm.	E-10
Figure E-8	Plot of test data for specimen HSS-12 (Test Index 9) from Kotulka (2007) showing: (a) cyclic response and cyclic envelope curve; and (b) combination of response in the positive and negative direction for calculation of component parameters for single brace specimen, tested in a 1-bay, 1-story frame with height and width of 12 ft.	E-13
Figure E-9	Dimensions needed for computing the design stiffness for BRBs (Figure from Black et al., 2002).....	E-15
Figure E-10	Photo of steel core after fracture in buckling-restrained brace specimen (Merritt et al., 2003a).....	E-19
Figure E-11	Illustration of cyclic response of buckling-restrained brace Specimen 3 (Benzoni and Innamorato, 2007)	E-20
Figure E-12	Illustration of cyclic response, cyclic envelope curve and calculation of component response quantities of BRB Specimen 1 (Benzoni and Innamorato, 2007)	E-21
Figure F-1	Example residential building application of high-aspect ratio pre-fabricated wall components	F-2
Figure F-2	Example commercial building application of high-aspect ratio, pre-fabricated wall components	F-2
Figure F-3	Illustration of cyclic-load testing data and cyclic envelope curve (from Figure 2-2)	F-4
Figure F-4	Cyclic response and envelope curve for pre-fabricated component test specimen No.1	F-5

Figure F-5	Cyclic response and envelope curve for pre-fabricated component test specimen No.2	F-5
Figure F-6	Cyclic response and envelope curve for pre-fabricated component test specimen No.3	F-6

List of Tables

Table 2-1	Quality Rating of Test Data	2-23
Table 2-2	Quality Rating of Design Requirements	2-24
Table 2-3	Penalty Factor to Account for Uncertainty	2-26
Table 2-4	Penalty Factor to Account for Differences in Load (Strength)	2-27
Table 3-1	Sample Reference Component Data Set	3-25
Table 3-2	Sample Proposed Component Data Set	3-29
Table 4-1	Summary of Nailed Wood Shear Wall Configurations in the Reference Component Data Set	4-6
Table 4-2	Summary of Important Component Parameters for the Reference Component Data Set	4-8
Table 4-3	Summary Statistics for Reference Component Parameters	4-10
Table 4-4	Proposed Component Design Strengths for Hypothetical Combinations of Sheathing Type and Connector Spacing	4-10
Table 4-5	Proposed Component Design Stiffness for Each Panel Geometry	4-12
Table 4-6	Summary of Proposed Component Wall Configurations for Cyclic-Load Testing	4-14
Table 4-7	Summary of Proposed Component Wall Configurations for Monotonic-Load Testing	4-15
Table 4-8	Summary of Important Component Parameters from the Proposed Component Cyclic-Load Data Set	4-16
Table 4-9	Summary of Important Component Parameters from the Proposed Component Monotonic-Load Data Set	4-17
Table 4-10	Summary Statistics for Proposed Component Parameters from Cyclic-Load Test Data	4-18
Table 4-11	Penalty Factor to Account for Uncertainty (from Table 2-3)	4-20

Table 4-12	Penalty Factor to Account for Difference in Component Strengths (from Table 2-4)	4-21
Table 4-13	Evaluation of Equivalency Acceptance Criteria	4-22
Table 4-14	Summary of Acceptance Criteria Evaluation for Proposed Component Shear Walls.....	4-24
Table 5-1	Relative Importance of Component Parameters.....	5-2
Table A-1	Summary of Component Parameter Studies in Literature with Focus on Collapse Capacity	A-5
Table A-2	Summary of Component Parameter Studies in Literature with a Focus Different than Collapse Capacity.....	A-7
Table A-3	Wood Light-Frame Structural Design Properties (after FEMA P-695 Table 9-20)	A-10
Table A-4	Baseline Strength and Stiffness Component Properties for Wood Light-Frame Building Models	A-11
Table A-5	Values of Component Parameters for Wood Light-Frame Building Models.....	A-12
Table A-6	Summary of the Level of Importance of Component Parameters for Eight Wood Light-Frame Buildings	A-25
Table A-7	Reinforced Concrete Special Moment Frame Structural Design Properties	A-26
Table A-8	Values of Component Parameters for the Reinforced Concrete Moment Frame Models.....	A-27
Table A-9	Summary of the Level of Importance of Component Parameters for Six Reinforced Concrete Special Moment Frame Buildings.....	A-29
Table B-1	Key Features of Selected Loading Protocols	B-5
Table C-1	Relationship Between Component Ultimate Deformation and System-Level Collapse Capacity for Wood Light-Frame Buildings	C-6
Table C-2	Relationship Between Component Ultimate Deformation and System-Level Collapse Capacity for Reinforced Concrete Special Moment Frame Buildings	C-6
Table C-3	Relationship Between Component Strength and System-Level Collapse Capacity for Wood Light-Frame Buildings	C-9

Table C-4	Penalty Factor to Account for Uncertainty	C-11
Table C-5	Penalty Factor to Account for Differences in Strength....	C-13
Table D-1	Overview of Stapled Wood Shear Wall Configurations Tested (after Talbot et al. 2009).....	D-2
Table D-2	Summary of Nailed Wood Shear Wall Configurations in the Reference Component Data Set	D-6
Table D-3	Summary of Important Component Parameters for the Reference Component Data Set	D-7
Table D-4	Summary Statistics for the Reference Component Parameters.....	D-9
Table D-5	Summary of Important Component Parameters for Proposed Component Data Set	D-15
Table D-6	Summary Statistics for Proposed Component Parameters.....	D-16
Table D-7	Penalty Factor to Account for Uncertainty (from Table 2-3).....	D-18
Table D-8	Penalty Factor to Account for Difference in Component Strengths (from Table 2-4).....	D-18
Table D-9	Evaluation of Equivalency Acceptance Criteria for Stapled Wood Shear Walls	D-19
Table D-10	Summary of Acceptance Criteria Evaluation for Proposed Stapled Wood Shear Component	D-21
Table E-1	Summary of Conventional Brace Configurations in the Reference Component Data Set: X-Brace Tests	E-7
Table E-2	Summary of Conventional Brace Configurations in the Reference Component Data Set: Single Brace Tests	E-7
Table E-3	Summary of Important Component Parameters for the Reference Component Data Set	E-14
Table E-4	Summary Statistics for the Reference Component	E-14
Table E-5	Summary of Buckling-Restrained Brace Configurations in the Proposed Component Data Set	E-17
Table E-6	Summary of Important Component Parameters for the Proposed Component Data Set	E-22
Table E-7	Summary Statistics for the Proposed Component.....	E-23

Table E-8	Summary of Acceptance Criteria and Equivalency Evaluation	E-28
Table F-1	Summary Statistics for the Reference Component Parameters (from Table 4-3)	F-3
Table F-2	Values of Strength, Stiffness, Ductility and Deformation Capacity Parameters and Summary Statistics for the Proposed Component	F-6
Table F-3	Summary of Acceptance Criteria Evaluation for Pre-Fabricated Wall Components	F-11