

# Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Multi-Unit Wood-Frame Buildings With Weak First Stories

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  
Cathleen Carlisle, Project Monitor  
Daniel Shapiro, Technical Monitor  
Washington, D.C.

TASK ORDER CONTRACT MANAGEMENT  
Christopher Rojahn (Project Executive Director)  
Thomas R. McLane (Project Manager)  
Jon A. Heintz (Project Quality Control Monitor)  
William T. Holmes (Project Technical Monitor)

PROJECT REVIEW PANEL  
Chris Poland (Chair)  
Tony DeMascole  
Laurence Kornfield  
Bret Lizundia  
Joan MacQuarrie  
Andrew Merovich  
Tom Tobin

PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
David Mar (Project Technical Director)  
David Bonowitz  
Kelly Cobeen  
Dan Dolan  
Andre Filiatrault  
John Price

ANALYSIS CONSULTANTS  
Maikol Del Carpio  
Mike Korolyk

May 2012



## **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.

Cover Photo: Near-collapse of typical weak-story wood-frame buildings in the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake.

---

# 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 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.

In recent earthquake events, FEMA has observed that multi-unit wood-frame buildings with a weak first story represent a significant risk in highly seismic regions of the United States because of their high potential for collapse. This risk is magnified by the sheer numbers of these buildings that still exist and the numbers of people who occupy them. This collapse potential is due primarily to their soft or weak first-story walls, which have often been weakened by large numbers of openings such as garages or store front windows.

FEMA worked with ATC to develop these guidelines to address seismic retrofit requirements for weak-story wood-frame buildings in seismically active regions of the United States, with a particular focus on Northern and Southern California and the Pacific Northwest. The guidelines focus on multi-family, multi-story buildings with weak first stories, such as those damaged in the Marina District of San Francisco in the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, and apartment buildings with tuck-under parking, such as those damaged in Southern California in the 1994 Northridge earthquake.

These seismic retrofitting guidelines are the first to focus solely on the weak first story and to provide just enough additional strength to protect the first floor from collapse but not so much as to drive earthquake forces into the upper stories, placing them at risk of collapse. They are also the first to take into account the strength provided by existing non-structural walls. Both of

these steps will make seismic retrofitting more affordable. This methodology does presume, however, that the upper stories are basically regular and do provide enough strength to match the retrofitted first story.

FEMA is indebted to the Project Management Committee of David Mar (Project Technical Director), David Bonowitz, Kelly Cobeen, Dan Dolan, Andre Filiatrault, and John Price, for preparing this report, and to Mike Korolyk, who as the Analysis Consultant conducted the computer analyses to validate the guidelines. We also wish to thank the Project Review Panel of Chris Poland (Chair), Tony DeMascole, Laurence Kornfield, Bret Lizundia (ATC Board Representative), Joan MacQuarrie, Andrew Merovich, and Tom Tobin, who provided expert review and guidance throughout the developmental effort. Without their dedication and hard work, this project would not have been possible.

– Federal Emergency Management Agency

---

# Preface

In May 2009 the Applied Technology Council (ATC), with funding from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) under Task Order Contract HSFEHQ-08-D-0726, commenced development of simplified guidelines for the seismic retrofit of weak-story wood-frame buildings—one of several projects in a task order series to develop written guidance for FEMA on the creation, update, and maintenance of seismic evaluation and rehabilitation documents for existing buildings.

Multi-unit wood-frame buildings with a weak first story represent a significant risk in highly seismic regions of the United States, not only because of their damage and collapse potential, but also because of their size, prevalence and the high numbers of people who occupy them. In San Francisco, for example, approximately 4,400 older, pre-seismic-code, wood-frame residential buildings have been inventoried that contain five or more living units and are 3 or more stories in height (ATC, 2009a). Most of these buildings have potentially soft or weak ground floor (first story) walls, as do an expectedly high but unknown number of pre-seismic-code 3-to-5 story wood-frame commercial buildings, and similar buildings constructed after 1974 not included in the San Francisco inventory.

FEMA and ATC agreed that the retrofit guidelines development project should address seismic retrofit requirements for weak-story wood-frame buildings in seismically active regions of the United States, focusing primarily on Northern and Southern California and the Pacific Northwest. Configurations to be addressed included multi-family, multi-story buildings with weak first stories, such as those prevalent in San Francisco, and apartment buildings with tuck-under parking, such as those significantly damaged by the 1994 Northridge earthquake in Southern California. The project team was also charged with developing practical, model code provisions for seismic retrofit of weak-story wood-frame buildings that can be adopted by cities such as San Francisco and that are written to ensure that application and enforcement is uniform and enforceable.

This *Guidelines* document sets forth the framework for procedures for seismic evaluation and retrofit of weak-story wood-frame buildings. Throughout this document the term weak-story is used to describe a building's vulnerability, rather than soft-story. The reason is that while both

flexibility and strength contribute to the structure’s response, strength is the more dominant characteristic.

ATC is indebted to the ATC Project Management Committee, which consisted of David Mar (Project Technical Director), David Bonowitz, Kelly Cobeen, Dan Dolan, Andre Filiatrault, and John Price, for their efforts in researching and preparing this report; to Mike Korolyk, who served as the Analysis Consultant and conducted thousands of computer analyses to support and validate the guidelines; to Maikol Del Carpio, who assisted in the data analysis; and to the Project Review Panel, which consisted of Chris Poland (Chair), Tony DeMascole, Laurence Kornfield, Bret Lizundia (ATC Board Representative), Joan MacQuarrie, Andrew Merovich, and Tom Tobin, who provided expert review and guidance throughout the developmental effort. Thomas R. McLane served as Project Manager, William Holmes served as the Project Technical Monitor, and Peter Mork provided report production services. The affiliations of these individuals are provided in the list of Project Participants.

ATC also gratefully acknowledges the input, support, and guidance provided by Michael Mahoney (FEMA Project Officer), Cathleen Carlisle (FEMA Project Monitor), Robert Hanson (FEMA Subject Matter Expert), and Daniel Shapiro (FEMA Technical Monitor).

Jon A. Heintz  
ATC Director of Projects

Christopher Rojahn  
ATC Executive Director

---

# Table of Contents

Foreword.....	iii
Preface.....	v
List of Figures.....	xiii
List of Tables .....	xxiii
Glossary .....	xxv
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Earthquake Risks of Multi-Unit Weak-Story Wood-Frame Buildings .....	1
1.2 Weak-Story Building Characteristics .....	2
1.2.1 The Critical Deficiency: A First Story Lacking Adequate Strength or Stiffness.....	3
1.3 Engineering Codes and Standards.....	4
1.3.1 The Guidelines as an Alternative .....	5
1.4 Purpose and Intended Use of the <i>Guidelines</i> .....	6
1.4.1 Policy Options .....	7
1.4.2 Selecting Performance Objectives.....	8
1.5 Validation .....	10
1.6 The Weak-Story Tool.....	10
1.7 <i>Guidelines</i> Organization and Content .....	10
<b>2. Technical Overview.....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Statistical Basis.....	15
2.2 Modeling Actual and Surrogate Structures .....	15
2.2.1 The Surrogate Models .....	15
2.2.2 Characterizing an Existing Building .....	17
2.3 Acceptability Criteria .....	18
2.3.1 Performance Measure.....	18
2.3.2 Performance Objective.....	18
2.3.3 Relationship to Other Codes and Standards .....	19
2.4 Critical Deficiencies .....	21
2.5 Retrofit Design Philosophy .....	22
2.5.1 Cost-Effective, First-Story Retrofit.....	22
2.5.2 Bounded Design and Relative Strength.....	24
2.6 Limitations and Eligibility Requirements .....	25
2.6.1 General Eligibility Requirements.....	26
2.6.2 Upper-Story Eligibility Requirements.....	26
2.6.3 First-Story, Basement, and Foundation Eligibility Requirements.....	27
2.6.4 Floor and Roof Diaphragms Eligibility Requirements.....	28

<b>3.</b>	<b>Simplified Evaluation.....</b>	<b>33</b>
3.1	Purpose .....	33
3.1.1	Limitations.....	33
3.2	Simplified Evaluation Procedure .....	33
3.3	Building Survey .....	34
3.3.1	First-Story Survey.....	34
3.3.2	Upper-Story Survey .....	35
3.4	Building Characterization .....	35
3.4.1	Total Building Weight, $W$ .....	36
3.4.2	Shear Strengths of First-Story Walls .....	36
3.4.3	Shear Strength of First Story .....	37
3.4.4	Center of Strength ( $COS_1$ ) of First Story .....	37
3.4.5	Center of Strength ( $COS_2$ ) of Upper Stories.....	38
3.4.6	Eccentricity .....	38
3.4.7	Simplified Torsion Coefficient, $C_{Ts}$ .....	38
3.5	Simplified Evaluation of Seismic Performance.....	39
3.5.1	Site-Specific Spectral Acceleration Demand.....	39
3.5.2	Story-Height Factor, $Q_s$ .....	40
3.5.3	Simplified Spectral Acceleration Capacity, $S_{es}$ .....	40
3.5.4	Comparison of Demand Versus Capacity.....	40
<b>4.</b>	<b>Structure Characterization for Detailed Evaluation.....</b>	<b>41</b>
4.1	Introduction.....	41
4.2	Wall Materials .....	42
4.3	Detailed Building Survey .....	42
4.4	Load-Drift Curves for Common Sheathing Materials .....	43
4.5	Wall Line Load-Drift Curves.....	47
4.5.1	Load-Drift Curves for Combinations of Sheathing Materials .....	49
4.5.2	Adjustment Factor for Openings in the Wall Line .....	50
4.5.3	Adjustment Factor for Overturning .....	53
4.5.4	Drift Ratio Adjustment for First-Story Wall Line Height .....	56
4.6	Determine Strength of Each Story .....	57
4.6.1	Translational Load-Drift Curve .....	57
4.6.2	Peak Strength.....	58
4.6.3	Drift Ratio at Peak Strength.....	59
4.6.4	Center of Strength.....	60
4.6.5	Torsional Eccentricity at the First Story .....	61
4.6.6	Load-Rotation Curve .....	61
4.6.7	Torsional Strength .....	63
4.6.8	Torsional Demand .....	64
4.7	Characteristic Coefficients.....	64
4.7.1	Normalized First-Story Strength.....	64
4.7.2	Normalized Upper-Story Strength.....	65
4.7.3	Weak-Story Ratio, $A_{\psi}$ .....	66
4.7.4	Strength-Degradation Ratio, $C_D$ .....	66
4.7.5	Torsion Coefficient, $C_T$ .....	66
4.7.6	Story Height Factor, $Q_s$ .....	67
<b>5.</b>	<b>Detailed Evaluation .....</b>	<b>69</b>
5.1	Evaluation Steps .....	69
5.2	Calculate the Median Spectral Acceleration Capacity.....	71

5.3	Calculate the Spectral Acceleration Capacity .....	72
5.4	Evaluate the Existing Structure .....	74
5.4.1	Compare the Spectral Acceleration Capacity with Site-Specific Demand.....	74
5.4.2	Calculating the Probability of Exceedance.....	75
<b>6.</b>	<b>Retrofit.....</b>	<b>77</b>
6.1	Retrofit Scope.....	77
6.2	Retrofit Strength.....	79
6.2.1	Estimated Minimum Required Strength of the Retrofitted First Story.....	80
6.2.2	Estimated Maximum Acceptable Strength of the Retrofitted First Story.....	81
6.2.3	Estimated Ranges of Acceptable Retrofit Strength .....	83
6.3	Locating Retrofit Elements .....	85
6.3.1	Retrofit Element Location to Minimize Torsion .....	86
6.3.2	Retrofit Element Location to Ensure Eligibility.....	87
6.4	Confirmed Performance of the Retrofitted Structure .....	88
6.4.1	Retrofits Intended to Satisfy the Performance Objective .....	90
6.4.2	Optimized Retrofits that Do Not Satisfy the Performance Objective .....	90
6.5	Retrofit Element Selection and Design .....	91
6.5.1	Load Path Components .....	93
6.5.2	Second Floor Diaphragm.....	93
6.5.3	Wood Structural Panel Shear Walls .....	93
6.5.4	Steel Moment Frames.....	94
6.5.5	Steel Braced Frames.....	94
6.5.6	Concrete or Reinforced Masonry Shear Walls.....	95
<b>7.</b>	<b>Alternative Performance Assessment.....</b>	<b>97</b>
7.1	Purpose .....	97
7.2	Assessment Background.....	97
7.3	Interstory Drift Limits .....	97
7.4	Spectral Acceleration Capacity .....	98
7.5	Estimating the Drift Limit Probability of Exceedance .....	99
	<b>Appendix A: Guide to Weak-Story Tool.....</b>	<b>A-1</b>
A.1	Introduction .....	A-1
A.2	Obtaining the Weak-Story Tool .....	A-1
A.3	System Requirements .....	A-1
A.4	Weak-Story Tool Installation .....	A-1
A.5	Basic Controls .....	A-2
A.6	General Building Properties and Geometry .....	A-2
A.7	CAD Interface .....	A-4
A.7.1	Analytical Entities .....	A-4
A.7.2	Non-Analytical Entities.....	A-4
A.7.3	Other CAD Tools .....	A-6
A.8	Defining Sheathing Assemblies .....	A-7
A.9	Assigning Level Properties and Laying Out Walls .....	A-11
A.9.1	The Shearwall Layout Tab .....	A-12
A.9.2	Shearwall Table.....	A-15

A.10	Evaluation and Retrofit Summary .....	A-15
A.10.1	Evaluation Data Tab .....	A-15
A.10.2	Backbone Curves Tab.....	A-17
A.10.3	Performance Data Tab .....	A-17
<b>Appendix B:</b>	<b>Model Provisions for Mitigation Programs.....</b>	<b>B-1</b>
B.1	Targeted Mitigation Programs .....	B-1
B.1.1	Planning and Program Development .....	B-2
B.1.2	Screening .....	B-3
B.1.3	Evaluation.....	B-3
B.1.4	Retrofit Prioritization.....	B-4
B.1.5	Retrofit.....	B-5
B.2	Program Performance Objectives .....	B-5
B.3	Model Provisions and Commentary .....	B-7
<b>Appendix C:</b>	<b>Example Calculations.....</b>	<b>C-1</b>
C.1	Simplified Evaluation (Chapter 3).....	C-3
C.2	Structure Characterization and Evaluation (Chapters 4 and 5).....	C-7
C.3	Retrofit (Chapter 6).....	C-9
C.4	Torsion Calculations (Chapters 3 and 4) .....	C-17
<b>Appendix D:</b>	<b>Characterization of Existing Materials .....</b>	<b>D-1</b>
D.1	Introduction.....	D-1
D.2	Research Addressing Wall Bracing Materials .....	D-1
D.3	Load-Deflection Backbone.....	D-5
D.3.1	Plaster on Wood Lath .....	D-6
D.3.2	Horizontal Lumber Sheathing.....	D-8
D.3.3	Diagonal Lumber Sheathing .....	D-9
D.3.4	Stucco .....	D-11
D.3.5	Gypsum Wallboard.....	D-13
D.3.6	Plaster on Gypsum Lath.....	D-15
D.3.7	Wood Structural Panel Siding .....	D-17
D.3.8	Wood Structural Panel Sheathing .....	D-18
D.4	Recommended Descriptions of Wall Bracing Materials .....	D-29
D.5	Adjustment Factor for Combinations of Bracing Materials ..	D-30
D.6	Adjustment Factor for Openings in the Wall Line.....	D-32
D.7	Adjustment Factor for Overturning .....	D-33
D.8	Drift Adjustment for First-Story Wall-Line Height.....	D-34
D.9	Descriptions of Damage versus Drift.....	D-35
D.10	Recommended Future Research .....	D-54
<b>Appendix E:</b>	<b>Detailed Analytical Background .....</b>	<b>E-1</b>
E.1	Purpose .....	E-1
E.2	General.....	E-1
E.2.1	Overview and Limitations .....	E-1
E.2.2	Building Characterization.....	E-1
E.2.3	IDA Approach .....	E-2
E.2.4	Material Characterization .....	E-3
E.2.5	Performance Criteria.....	E-5
E.3	Modeling Details .....	E-7
E.3.1	Software.....	E-7

E.3.2	Typical Building Model .....	E-7
E.3.3	Hysteretic Damping.....	E-9
E.3.4	Viscous Damping .....	E-11
E.3.5	P-Delta.....	E-11
E.3.6	Accounting for Overturning Effects.....	E-11
E.4	Ground Acceleration Records .....	E-14
E.5	Translational Analyses .....	E-14
E.5.1	Analysis Flow.....	E-14
E.5.2	Median Performance .....	E-15
E.5.3	Interpolation for Intermediate Values of $C_D$ .....	E-18
E.5.4	Adjustment for Uncertainty.....	E-20
E.5.5	Assessment and Probability of Exceedance .....	E-26
E.5.6	Retrofit Analyses.....	E-29
E.5.7	Effect of First-Story Retrofit .....	E-31
E.5.8	Estimating the Minimum Retrofit for Achieving Desired Performance .....	E-33
E.5.9	Wood-Sheathed Walls versus Moment Frame Retrofit .....	E-34
E.5.10	First-Story Height.....	E-36
E.6	Torsional Analyses.....	E-38
E.6.1	Discussion on Torsional Behavior .....	E-38
E.6.2	Torsion Coefficient, $C_T$ .....	E-38
E.6.3	Modeling .....	E-39
E.6.4	Response-History Input.....	E-39
E.6.5	Assessing the Effect of Torsion.....	E-41
E.6.6	Simplified Torsion Coefficient, $C_{Ts}$ .....	E-42

**Appendix F: Validation of Analysis Methods..... F-1**

F.1	Purpose.....	F-1
F.2	The Building Under Consideration .....	F-1
F.3	Differences in Scope of Analysis .....	F-2
F.3.1	Number of Stories .....	F-3
F.3.2	Sheathing Assemblies .....	F-3
F.4	Differences in Analytical Methods.....	F-3
F.4.1	Software .....	F-3
F.4.2	Viscous Damping.....	F-6
F.4.3	Backbone of Increasing Retrofit.....	F-7
F.5	Comparison of Results .....	F-8
F.5.1	Existing Building.....	F-9
F.5.2	Retrofitted Building.....	F-10
F.6	The Optimal Retrofit for Relative Strength.....	F-11
F.7	Conclusions .....	F-12

**References..... G-1**

**Project Participants..... H-1**



---

# List of Figures

Figure 1-1	Photos illustrating near-collapse of typical weak-story wood-frame buildings in the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake (left) and the 1994 Northridge earthquake (right).....	1
Figure 1-2	Exploded views of three common multi-unit wood-frame residential building styles (roof system, top row; first story, bottom row). .....	3
Figure 2-1	Flow chart illustrating relationships between the <i>Guidelines</i> technical chapters .....	14
Figure 2-2	Plots of interstory drift versus shear force showing drift limits, $\Delta_L$ , used to develop fragility relationships from the surrogate models .....	17
Figure 2-3	Plan diagrams of three weak-story buildings.....	22
Figure 2-4	Schematic response of a corner building subject to torsion under loads in either direction, due to open wall lines on two sides at the first story.....	23
Figure 2-5	Schematic response of a building with a slightly weak story in the long direction and with torsion under loads in the long direction. ....	23
Figure 2-6	Plots illustrating floor displacements and drift ratios in a building with constant upper-story strength and varying first-story strength.....	25
Figure 2-7	Floor plan schematic showing limits on eccentricity between the center of strength ( $C_s$ ) of each upper story and the center of mass ( $C_m$ ) of the floor below it. ....	27
Figure 2-8	Floor plan schematic showing use of qualifying wall lines to meet diaphragm aspect ratio limits.....	29
Figure 2-9	Floor plan schematic showing locations of chords for cantilevered diaphragms that must satisfy eligibility rules.....	30
Figure 2-10	Floor plan schematic showing reentrant corner limits and use of qualifying wall lines to satisfy eligibility rules. ....	30
Figure 2-11	Floor plan schematic showing diaphragm openings that must be limited in size to satisfy eligibility requirements. ...	31

Figure 3-1	Illustration of wall lengths for an example wall line.....	37
Figure 4-1	Unit load-drift curves for sheathing materials with high-displacement capacity .....	45
Figure 4-2	Unit load-drift curves for sheathing materials with low-displacement capacity .....	45
Figure 4-3	Unit load-drift curves for all sheathing materials considered; note the large differences in both peak strength and displacement capacities. ....	46
Figure 4-4	Schematic of a typical wall assembly composed of various layers .....	49
Figure 4-5	Composite unit load-drift curve of a wall assembly comprising stucco, gypsum wallboard, and wood structural panels (structural plywood in figure), using 100% of the wood structural panel (WSP) sheathing plus 50% of the other sheathing materials.....	50
Figure 4-6	Composite unit load-drift curve of a wall assembly comprising stucco, gypsum wallboard and wood structural panels (structural plywood in figure), using 50% of the wood structural panel (WSP) sheathing plus 100% of the other sheathing materials .....	51
Figure 4-7	Controlling unit load-drift curve of a wall assembly comprising stucco, gypsum wallboard, and wood structural panels .....	51
Figure 4-8	Wall schematic showing variables in the adjustment factor for openings .....	52
Figure 4-9	Wall schematic showing variables in the calculated adjustment factor for overturning.....	55
Figure 4-10	Wall schematics and load-drift curves illustrating drift adjustment parameters for varying first-story wall line heights .....	57
Figure 4-11	Wall-plan schematic and depiction of the first-story load-drift curve as the sum of first story wall line load drift curves, y-direction .....	59
Figure 4-12	Wall-plan schematic showing location of center of strength at the first story.....	60
Figure 4-13	Wall-plan schematic and related torsional-load rotation curves illustrating how the first story load-rotation curve is computed .....	62

Figure 4-14	Wall-plan schematic depicting how the torsional demand on the first story is calculated.....	64
Figure 4-15	Load-drift curve depicting determination of strength-degradation ratio, $C_D$ .....	67
Figure 5-1	Flowchart of typical evaluation procedure .....	70
Figure 5-2	Plot showing variation in spectral acceleration capacity (spectral capacity) as a function of different existing building characteristics. ....	73
Figure 6-1	Flowchart of typical retrofit procedure .....	78
Figure 6-2	Plot of spectral acceleration capacity (spectral capacity) versus strength of retrofitted first-story, for buildings with strong upper stories .....	82
Figure 6-3	Plot of spectral acceleration capacity (spectral capacity) versus strength of retrofitted first-story, for buildings with weak upper stories. ....	84
Figure 6-4	Floor plan schematic showing use of retrofit elements to meet diaphragm aspect ratio limits. ....	88
Figure 6-5	Floor plan schematic showing use of retrofit elements to satisfy re-entrant corner limits, east-west analysis.....	89
Figure 6-6	Floor plan schematic showing use of retrofit elements to satisfy re-entrant corner limits, north-south analysis .....	89
Figure 6-7	Simplified load-drift curve for steel Special Moment Frame retrofit elements .....	94
Figure 7-1	Illustration of drift limit definitions relative to two sheathing backbone curves with $C_D = 0.0$ and $1.0$ , respectively .....	98
Figure 7-2	Curves showing the relationship between as-built median spectral acceleration capacity, $S_{\mu b}$ , and base-normalized upper-story strength for various weak-story ratios, $A_W$ , and for the <i>Onset of Damage</i> set of drift limits.....	100
Figure 7-3	Curves showing the relationship between as-built median spectral acceleration capacity, $S_{\mu b}$ , and base-normalized upper-story strength for various weak-story ratios, $A_W$ , and for the <i>Onset of Damage</i> set of drift limits.....	100
Figure 7-4	Curves showing the relationship between as-built median spectral acceleration capacity, $S_{\mu b}$ , and base-normalized upper-story strength for various weak-story ratios, $A_W$ , and for the <i>Onset of Strength Loss</i> set of drift limits. ....	101

Figure 7-5	Curves showing the relationship between as-built median spectral acceleration capacity, $S_{\mu_b}$ and base-normalized upper-story strength for various weak-story ratios, $A_W$ , and for the <i>Onset of Strength Loss</i> set of drift limits.....	101
Figure A-1	Screenshot of contents of WeakStoryTool folder containing installation files. ....	A-2
Figure A-2	Screenshot of control buttons.....	A-2
Figure A-3	Screenshot of <i>General</i> control.....	A-3
Figure A-4	Reference geometrical input for sample building .....	A-6
Figure A-5	Screen-shot of object snap menu.....	A-7
Figure A-6	Screenshot of <i>Assemblies</i> control.....	A-8
Figure A-7	Screenshot of table of sheathing assemblies in <i>Assemblies</i> control.....	A-9
Figure A-8	Screenshot of form for defining assembly specifications for assemblies comprising standard sheathing layers.....	A-10
Figure A-9	Screenshot of form for defining custom load-drift curves for retrofit assemblies .....	A-11
Figure A-10	Screenshot of the <i>Shearwall Layout</i> tab in the <i>Levels</i> control for an example building .....	A-12
Figure A-11	Screenshot of the perforation calculator form in the <i>Levels/Shearwall Layout</i> control.....	A-14
Figure A-12	Screenshot of the <i>Evaluation Data</i> tab in the <i>Summary</i> control for an example building .....	A-16
Figure A-13	Screenshot of the <i>Backbone Curves</i> tab in the <i>Summary</i> control for an example building showing first-story load-drift curve before retrofit.....	A-18
Figure A-14	Screenshot of the <i>Backbone Curves</i> tab in the <i>Summary</i> control for an example building showing first-story load-drift curve after retrofit. ....	A-19
Figure A-15	Screenshot of the <i>Performance Data</i> tab in the <i>Summary</i> control for an example building .....	A-20
Figure A-16	Illustration of evaluation flow <i>Upward from <math>S_{MS}</math></i> . ....	A-21
Figure A-17	Illustration of evaluation flow <i>Right from drift limit probability of exceedance</i> .....	A-21

Figure C-1	Street elevation of example building .....	C-1
Figure C-2	Example building first-floor plan.....	C-3
Figure C-3	Example building first-floor wall lengths and locations....	C-7
Figure C-4	Example building upper-story wall lengths and locations .....	C-7
Figure D-1	Load-drift data for plaster on wood lath .....	D-7
Figure D-2	Load-drift data for horizontal wood sheathing. ....	D-9
Figure D-3	Load-drift data for diagonal lumber sheathing .....	D-11
Figure D-4	Load-drift data for stucco.....	D-13
Figure D-5	Load-drift data for gypsum wallboard .....	D-15
Figure D-6	Load-drift data for plaster on gypsum lath.....	D-16
Figure D-7	Load-drift data for wood structural panel siding. ....	D-17
Figure D-8	Load-drift data for wood structural panel 8d@6.....	D-20
Figure D-9	Load-drift data for wood structural panel 8d@4.....	D-22
Figure D-10	Load-drift data for wood structural panel 8d@3.....	D-24
Figure D-11	Load-drift data for wood structural panel 10d@6.....	D-25
Figure D-12	Load-drift data for wood structural panel 10d@4.....	D-27
Figure D-13	Load-drift data for wood structural panel 10d@2.....	D-29
Figure D-14	Plotted load-deflection curves for combined materials..	D-32
Figure D-15	Crack maps for stucco sheathing at 0.2% drift for (top) Wall 1 and (bottom) Wall 2. ....	D-36
Figure D-16	Crack maps for stucco sheathing at 0.4% drift for (top) Wall 1 and (bottom) Wall 2. ....	D-37
Figure D-17	Crack maps for stucco sheathing at 0.7% drift for (top) Wall 1 and (bottom) Wall 2. ....	D-38
Figure D-18	Crack maps for stucco sheathing at failure for (top) Wall 1 and (bottom) Wall 2 .....	D-39
Figure D-19	Photos of characteristic cracking at 0.4% drift. ....	D-40
Figure D-20	Photos of characteristic cracking at 1.5% drift .....	D-41
Figure D-21	Photos of characteristic cracking at failure .....	D-42

Figure D-22	Crack maps for gypsum wallboard sheathing at 0.2% drift for (top) Wall 1 and (bottom) Wall 2. ....	D-43
Figure D-23	Crack maps for gypsum wallboard sheathing at 0.4% drift for (top) Wall 1 and (bottom) Wall 2. ....	D-44
Figure D-24	Crack maps for gypsum wallboard sheathing at 0.7% drift for (top) Wall 1 and (bottom) Wall 2. ....	D-45
Figure D-25	Crack maps for gypsum wallboard sheathing at failure for (top) Wall 1 and (bottom) Wall 2 .....	D-46
Figure D-26	Photos of characteristic cracking at 0.4% drift.....	D-47
Figure D-27	Photos of characteristic cracking at 0.7% drift.....	D-48
Figure D-28	Photos of characteristic cracking at 1.5% drift.....	D-49
Figure D-29	Detailed photos of characteristic wall cracking at 1.5% drift.....	D-50
Figure D-30	Photos of characteristic cracking at 1.5% drift showing wallboard fastener popping .....	D-51
Figure D-31	Photos of characteristic cracking at completion of Forest Products Lab testing. ....	D-53
Figure E-1	Illustration of solution flow for Incremental Dynamic Analysis results .....	E-3
Figure E-2	Unit load-drift curves for materials with low-displacement capacity .....	E-4
Figure E-3	Unit load-drift curves for materials with high-displacement capacity .....	E-5
Figure E-4	Load-drift curves for archetypical material forms .....	E-6
Figure E-5	Schematics illustrating simplified building model bar elements.....	E-8
Figure E-6	Screen-shot of typical four-story simplified building model in Perform 3D.....	E-9
Figure E-7	Plot showing hysteretic behavior of simplified structure models constrained by the backbone curve for the high-displacement capacity material form.....	E-10
Figure E-8	Plot showing hysteretic behavior of simplified structure models constrained by the backbone curve for the low-displacement capacity material form.....	E-10

Figure E-9	Schematic of fiber model showing how wall elements were modeled to capture overturning restraint and allow uplift.....	E-12
Figure E-10	Schematic of building displaced shapes and related pushover curves used in study to determine overturning adjustment factor, $Q_{ot}$ .....	E-13
Figure E-11	Plots of acceleration spectra for selected response-history records .....	E-14
Figure E-12	Flow chart used in translational analyses to optimize retrofit .....	E-16
Figure E-13	Curve fits for IDA results relating median spectral acceleration capacity (considering <i>Onset of Strength Loss</i> drift criteria) to base-normalized upper-story strength, $A_U$ for various weak-story ratios $A_W$ .....	E-17
Figure E-14	Curve fits for IDA results relating median spectral acceleration capacity (considering <i>Onset of Strength Loss</i> drift criteria) to base-normalized upper-story strength, $A_U$ for various weak-story ratios $A_W$ .....	E-17
Figure E-15	Curve fits for IDA results using <i>linear</i> interpolation model for $C_D$ relating median spectral acceleration capacity (considering <i>Onset of Strength Loss</i> drift criteria) to base-normalized upper-story strength, $A_U$ for various values of strength degradation ratio, $C_D$ , and torsion coefficient, $C_T = 0.0$ .....	E-18
Figure E-16	Curve fit for IDA results using cubic interpolation model for $C_D$ relating median spectral acceleration capacity (considering <i>Onset of Strength Loss</i> drift criteria) to base-normalized upper-story strength, $A_U$ , for various values of strength degradation ratio, $C_D$ , and torsion coefficient, $C_T = 0.0$ .....	E-19
Figure E-17	Plots of error data, as a function of strength degradation ratio, $C_D$ , and base-normalized upper-story strength, $A_U$ , for linear and cubic interpolation models for estimating median spectral acceleration capacity, $S_\mu$ .....	E-20
Figure E-18	Plots showing stiffness variations in high-displacement capacity materials (left) and low-displacement capacity materials (right) as a function of normalized force (acceleration response) and drift ratio.....	E-22
Figure E-19	Plots showing strength variations in high-displacement capacity materials (left) and low-displacement capacity materials (right) as a function of normalized force (acceleration response) and drift ratio.....	E-22

Figure E-20	Plots showing variations in drift at loss of strength in high-displacement capacity materials (left) and low-displacement capacity materials (right) as a function of normalized force (acceleration response) and drift ratio.....	E-22
Figure E-21	Plot showing effect of variation in stiffness, $K$ , on median spectral capacity, $S_{\mu_b}$ , for various configurations of material form and upper-story strength ratio, $A_U$ .....	E-24
Figure E-22	Plot showing effect of variation in peak strength, $F_U$ , on median spectral capacity, $S_{\mu_b}$ , for various configurations of material form and upper-story strength ratio, $A_U$ .....	E-25
Figure E-23	Plot showing effect of variation in drift at strength loss, $D_L$ , on median spectral capacity, $S_{\mu_b}$ , for various configurations of material form and upper-story strength ratio, $A_U$ .....	E-26
Figure E-24	Cumulative Distribution Function plots showing effect of increasing log-normal standard deviation, $\beta$ , as a function of spectral acceleration response.....	E-27
Figure E-25	Plots of ratio of spectral acceleration capacity, $S_c$ , at varying values of drift limit $POE$ to median spectral capacity .....	E-28
Figure E-26	Lognormal distribution for standard deviations, $\beta = 0.5$ and $0.6$ , for ratio of spectral acceleration demand to mean spectral acceleration capacity, over range of probabilities of exceedance, with linear fit (left) and the error (% difference) relative to the linear fit (right).....	E-29
Figure E-27	Retrofit backbone curves for various strength increments relative to the upper-story shear strength, $V_U$ .....	E-30
Figure E-28	Plot illustrating hysteretic behavior of moment frame retrofit elements .....	E-30
Figure E-29	Plots of spectral acceleration capacity (spectral capacity) as a function of total first-story retrofitted strength, $V_r$ , divided by upper-story strength, $V_U$ , for four levels of base-normalized upper-story strength, $A_U$ , varying initial pre-retrofit weak-story ratios, $A_W$ , original construction having high-displacement capacity ( $C_D = 1.0$ ), and <i>Onset of Strength</i> set of drift limits .....	E-31
Figure E-30	Plots of spectral acceleration capacity (spectral capacity) as a function of total first-story retrofitted strength, $V_r$ , divided by upper-story strength, $V_U$ , for four levels of base-normalized upper-story strength, $A_U$ , varying initial	

	pre-retrofit weak-story ratios, $A_W$ , original construction having low-displacement capacity ( $C_D = 0.0$ ), and <i>Onset of Strength</i> set of drift limits.....	E-32
Figure E-31	Plot of maximum strength of total retrofitted first-story, $V_{r,max}$ , divided by upper-story strength, $V_U$ , as a function of base-normalized upper-story strength, along with a plot of a linear-fit equation .....	E-33
Figure E-32	Plots comparing retrofit performance for moment frame (M.F.) versus plywood wall retrofit, as a function of earthquake shaking intensity, for base-normalized upper-story strength, $A_U = 0.4$ , and weak-story ratio, $A_W = 0.6$ .....	E-35
Figure E-33	Plots of median spectral acceleration capacity (spectral capacity) versus first-story height for four building models considered .....	E-36
Figure E-34	Plots of normalized median spectral acceleration capacity (spectral capacity) versus first-story height for four buildings considered.....	E-37
Figure E-35	Plots of normalized median spectral acceleration capacity (spectral capacity) versus first-story height for four buildings considered with linear fit .....	E-37
Figure E-36	Schematic illustration of floor plans and values of weak-story ratio, $A_W$ , used in Perform 3D models of unretrofitted buildings for various torsion coefficients, $C_T$ .....	E-40
Figure E-37	Schematic illustration of floor plans and values of weak-story ratio, $A_W$ , used in Perform 3D models of retrofitted buildings for various torsion coefficients, $C_T$ .....	E-40
Figure E-38	Plots of spectral acceleration capacity reduction versus torsion coefficient, $C_T$ , for the <i>Onset of Strength Loss</i> set of drift criteria, considering the longitudinal direction for various values of weak-story ratio, $A_W$ .....	E-41
Figure E-39	Plots of spectral acceleration capacity reduction versus $C_T$ , for the <i>Onset of Strength Loss</i> set of drift criteria, considering the transverse direction for various values of weak-story ratio, $A_W$ .....	E-42
Figure E-40	Illustration of the simplified torsional strength, $T_s$ .....	E-43
Figure F-1	CUREE Apartment Building used in ATC-71-1 Task 2 Analysis.....	F-2

Figure F-2	Hysteretic behavior of wood-framed elements in SAWS.....	F-4
Figure F-3	Hysteretic behavior of moment frame elements in SAWS.....	F-4
Figure F-4	Hysteretic behavior of elements emulating wood-frame walls in Perform-3D, where the degradation ratio, $CD = 0.0$ .....	F-5
Figure F-5	Hysteretic behavior of elements emulating wood-frame walls in Perform-3D, where the degradation ratio, $CD = 1.0$ .....	F-5
Figure F-6	Hysteretic behavior elements emulating ductile moment frames in Perform-3D.....	F-6
Figure F-7	Backbone curves for varying retrofits modeled in the <i>Task 2 Analysis</i> .....	F-7
Figure F-8	Backbone curves for varying retrofits modeled in the <i>Broad-Scope Analysis</i> .....	F-8
Figure F-9	Comparison of selected backbone curves for varying retrofits modeled .....	F-8
Figure F-10	Comparison of analysis results for the existing building ...	F-9
Figure F-11	Comparison of analysis results for the building with retrofit strength of $V_y/V_2$ of 0.2 for Task 2 and emulation of <i>Task 2</i> and $V_u/V_2$ of 0.2 for the <i>Broad-Scope Analysis</i> .....	F-10
Figure F-12	Comparison of backbone curves for <i>Task 2</i> retrofit set with ratio $V_y/V_2 = 0.2$ , and <i>Broad-Scope Analysis</i> retrofit set at $V_u/V_2 = 0.4$ .....	F-11
Figure F-13	Comparison of results for <i>Task 2</i> retrofit set with ratio $V_y/V_2 = 0.2$ , and <i>Broad-Scope</i> retrofit set at $V_u/V_2 = 0.4$ ..	F-12

---

# List of Tables

Table 1-1	Embedded and Alternative Criteria in the <i>Guidelines</i> .....	8
Table 2-1	Comparison of the <i>Guidelines</i> to 2009 IEBC Chapter A4...	20
Table 3-1	Drift Limit Probability of Exceedance ( <i>POE</i> ) Adjustment Factors for Low-Displacement Capacity Elements .....	34
Table 3-2	Strength Data for Sheathing Materials Considered.....	35
Table 4-1	Load-Drift Curve Data for Sheathing Materials [pounds/linear foot].....	44
Table 4-2	Simplified Adjustment Factor for Overturning.....	53
Table 5-1	Drift Limit Probability of Exceedance ( <i>POE</i> ) Adjustment Factors.....	73
Table 7-1	Curve-Fitting Coefficients ( $\gamma_U$ , $\alpha_U$ , and $\alpha_W$ ) for Calculating Spectral Acceleration Capacity .....	98
Table C-1	Example Building Properties .....	C-2
Table C-2	Example Building Weights.....	C-4
Table C-3	Example Building Spectral Capacity Calculated in Various Ways.....	C-6
Table D-1	Load-Drift Data for Plaster on Wood Lath .....	D-6
Table D-2	Load-Drift Data for Horizontal Wood Sheathing .....	D-8
Table D-3	Load-Drift Data for Diagonal Lumber Sheathing .....	D-10
Table D-4	Load-Drift Data for Stucco .....	D-12
Table D-5	Load-Drift Data for Gypsum Wallboard.....	D-14
Table D-6	Load-Drift Data for Plaster on Gypsum Lath .....	D-16
Table D-7	Load-Drift Data for Wood Structural Panel Siding .....	D-17
Table D-8	Load-Drift Data for Wood Structural Panel 8d@6 .....	D-19
Table D-9	Load-Drift Data for Wood Structural Panel 8d@4 .....	D-21
Table D-10	Load-Drift Data for Wood Structural Panel 8d@3 .....	D-23

Table D-11	Load-Drift Data for Wood Structural Panel 10d@6 .....	D-25
Table D-12	Load-Drift Data for Wood Structural Panel 10d@4 .....	D-26
Table D-13	Load-Drift Data for Wood Structural Panel 10d@2 .....	D-28
Table D-14	Recommended Values for Estimated Capacity and Variability .....	D-30
Table D-15	Data for Combined Materials .....	D-31
Table D-16	Descriptions of Damage States and Drifts .....	D-52
Table E-1	Drift Criteria, Interstory Drift Ratios in Percent .....	E-7
Table E-2	Computed Material Statistics: $\beta_x$ = Log-Normal Standard Deviation of Variable $x$ , and $\rho_{xy}$ = Correlation Coefficient of the Natural Logarithm of Variable $x$ and $y$ .....	E-23
Table E-3	Modified Material Statistics: $\beta_x$ = Log-Normal Standard Deviation of Variable $x$ , and $\rho_{xy}$ = Correlation Coefficient of the Natural Logarithm of Variable $x$ and $y$ .....	E-24
Table E-4	Summary of Composite Log-Normal Standard Deviation, $\beta_{total}$ (also known as $\beta$ ) .....	E-26