

Quantification of Building Seismic Performance Factors

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.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Charles Kircher (Project Technical Director)
Michael Constantinou
Gregory Deierlein
James R. Harris
Jon A. Heintz (Project Manager)
William T. Holmes (Project Tech. Monitor)
John Hooper
Allan R. Porush
Christopher Rojahn (Project Executive)

WORKING GROUPS

Jason Chou
Giannis Christovasilis
Kelly Cobein
Stephen Cranford
Brian Dean
Andre Filiatrault
Kevin Haas
Curt Haselton

WORKING GROUPS (CONT'D)

Helmut Krawinkler
Abbie Liel
Jiro Takagi
Assawin Wanitkorkul
Farzin Zareian

PROJECT REVIEW PANEL

Maryann T. Phipps (Chair)
Amr Elnashai
S.K. Ghosh
Ramon Gilsanz*
Ronald O. Hamburger
Jack Hayes
Richard E. Klingner
Philip Line
Bonnie E. Manley
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.

Preface

In September 2004 the Applied Technology Council (ATC) was awarded a “Seismic and Multi-Hazard Technical Guidance Development and Support” contract (HSFEHQ-04-D-0641) by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to conduct a variety of tasks, including one entitled “Quantification of Building System Performance and Response Parameters” (ATC-63 Project). The purpose of this project was to establish and document a recommended methodology for reliably quantifying building system performance and response parameters for use in seismic design. These factors include the response modification coefficient (R factor), the system overstrength factor (Ω_0), and the deflection amplification factor (C_d), collectively referred to as “seismic performance factors.”

Seismic performance factors are used to estimate strength and deformation demands on systems that are designed using linear methods of analysis, but are responding in the nonlinear range. Their values are fundamentally critical in the specification of seismic loading. R factors were initially introduced in the ATC-3-06 report, *Tentative Provisions for the Development of Seismic Regulations for Buildings*, published in 1978, and subsequently replaced by the *NEHRP Recommended Provisions for Seismic Regulations for New Buildings and Other Structures*, published by FEMA. Original R factors were based on judgment or on qualitative comparisons with the known response capabilities of seismic-force-resisting systems in use at the time. Since then, the number of systems addressed in current seismic codes and standards has increased substantially, and their ability to meet intended seismic performance objectives is largely unknown.

The recommended methodology described in this report is based on a review of relevant research on nonlinear response and collapse simulation, benchmarking studies of selected structural systems, and evaluations of additional structural systems to verify the technical soundness and applicability of the approach. Technical review and comment at critical developmental stages was provided by a panel of experts, which included representatives from the steel, concrete, masonry and wood material industry groups. A workshop of invited experts and other interested stakeholders was convened to receive feedback on the recommended methodology, and input from this group was instrumental in shaping the final product.

ATC is indebted to the leadership of Charlie Kircher, Project Technical Director, and to the members of the ATC-63 Project Team for their efforts in the development of this recommended methodology. The Project Management Committee, consisting of Michael Constantinou, Greg Deierlein, Jim Harris, John Hooper, and Allan Porush monitored and guided the technical efforts of the Project Working Groups, which included Andre Filiatrault, Helmut Krawinkler, Kelly Cobein, Curt Haselton, Abbie Liel, Jiannis Christovasilis, Jason Chou, Stephen Cranford, Brian Dean, Kevin Haas, Jiro Takagi, Assawin Wanitkorkul, and Farzin Zareian. The Project Review Panel, consisting of Maryann Phipps (Chair), Amr Elnashai, S.K. Ghosh, Ramon Gilsanz, Ron Hamburger, Jack Hayes, Rich Klingner, Phil Line, Bonnie Manley, Andrei Reinhorn, and Rafael Sabelli provided technical advice and consultation over the duration of the 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 and Ayse Hortacsu 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.....	vii
Executive Summary	ix
List of Figures.....	xix
List of Tables	xxvii
1. Introduction.....	1-1
1.1 Background and Purpose.....	1-1
1.2 Scope and Basis of the Methodology	1-2
1.2.1 Applicable to New Building Structural Systems.....	1-2
1.2.2 Compatible with the NEHRP Recommended Provisions and ASCE/SEI 7	1-3
1.2.3 Consistent with the Life Safety Performance Objective	1-4
1.2.4 Based on Acceptably Low Probability of Structural Collapse	1-4
1.2.5 Earthquake Hazard based on MCE Ground Motions.....	1-5
1.2.6 Concepts Consistent with Current Seismic Performance Factor Definitions	1-5
1.2.7 Safety Expressed in Terms of Collapse Margin Ratio	1-9
1.2.8 Performance Quantified Through Nonlinear Collapse Simulation on a set of Archetype Models.....	1-9
1.2.9 Uncertainty Considered in Performance Evaluation.....	1-10
1.3 Content and Organization.....	1-10
2. Overview of Methodology.....	2-1
2.1 General Framework	2-1
2.2 Description of Process.....	2-2
2.3 Develop System Concept	2-2
2.4 Obtain Required Information	2-3
2.5 Characterize Behavior	2-4
2.6 Develop Models	2-5
2.7 Analyze Models.....	2-6
2.8 Evaluate Performance.....	2-8
2.9 Document Results.....	2-9
2.10 Peer Review.....	2-10

3.	Required System Information	3-1
3.1	General.....	3-1
3.2	Intended Applications and Performance.....	3-2
3.3	Design Requirements.....	3-3
3.3.1	Basis for design Requirements	3-3
3.3.2	Application Limits and Strength Limit States	3-4
3.3.3	Overstrength Design Criteria.....	3-5
3.3.4	Configuration Issues.....	3-5
3.3.5	Material Properties.....	3-6
3.3.6	Strength and Stiffness Requirements.....	3-6
3.3.7	Approximate Fundamental Period.....	3-8
3.4	Quality Rating for Design Requirements.....	3-8
3.4.1	Completeness and Robustness Characteristics	3-9
3.4.2	Confidence in Design Requirements	3-10
3.5	Data from Experimental Investigation.....	3-10
3.5.1	Objectives of Testing Program	3-11
3.5.2	General Testing Issues	3-12
3.5.3	Material Testing Program	3-14
3.5.4	Component, Connection, and Assembly Testing Program.....	3-15
3.5.5	Loading History.....	3-17
3.5.6	System Testing Program.....	3-18
3.6	Quality Rating of Test Data.....	3-19
3.6.1	Completeness and Robustness Characteristics	3-20
3.6.2	Confidence in Test Results	3-21
4.	Archetype Development.....	4-1
4.1	Development of Structural System Archetypes.....	4-1
4.2	Index Archetype Configurations.....	4-2
4.2.1	Structural Configuration Issues	4-4
4.2.2	Seismic Behavioral Effects.....	4-6
4.2.3	Load Path and Components not Designated as Part of the Seismic-Force-Resisting System.....	4-9
4.2.4	Overstrength Due to Non-Seismic Loading.....	4-10
4.3	Performance Groups	4-10
4.3.1	Identification of Performance Groups	4-11
5.	Nonlinear Model Development.....	5-1
5.1	Development of Nonlinear Models for Collapse Simulation.....	5-1
5.2	Index Archetype Designs.....	5-1
5.2.1	Seismic Design Methods	5-3
5.2.2	Criteria for Seismic Design Loading	5-4
5.2.3	Transition Period, T_s	5-6
5.2.4	Seismic Base Shear, V	5-7
5.2.5	Fundamental Period, T	5-8
5.2.6	Loads and Load Combinations	5-8
5.2.7	Trial Values of Seismic Performance Factors	5-9
5.2.8	Performance Group Design Variations.....	5-10
5.3	Index Archetype Models.....	5-11
5.3.1	Index Archetype Model Idealization	5-14
5.4	Simulated Collapse Modes	5-16
5.5	Non-Simulated Collapse Modes	5-20

5.6	Characterization of Modeling Uncertainties	5-22
5.7	Quality Rating of Index Archetype Models	5-23
5.7.1	Representation of Collapse Characteristics	5-24
5.7.2	Accuracy and Robustness of Models	5-25
6.	Nonlinear Analysis	6-1
6.1	Nonlinear Analysis Procedures	6-1
6.1.1	Nonlinear Analysis Software.....	6-2
6.2	Input Ground Motions.....	6-3
6.2.1	MCE Ground Motion Intensity	6-3
6.2.2	Ground Motion Record Sets.....	6-4
6.2.3	Ground Motion Record Scaling	6-6
6.3	Nonlinear Static (Pushover) Analyses.....	6-7
6.4	Nonlinear Dynamic (Response History) Analyses.....	6-9
6.4.1	Background on Assessment of Collapse Capacity	6-10
6.4.2	Calculation of Median Collapse Capacity and CMR	6-12
6.4.3	Ground Motion Record Intensity and Scaling.....	6-12
6.4.4	Energy Dissipation and Viscous Damping.....	6-13
6.4.5	Guidelines for CMR Calculation using Three- Dimensional Nonlinear Dynamic Analyses	6-13
6.4.6	Summary of Procedure for Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis.....	6-14
6.5	Documentation of Analysis Results	6-15
6.5.1	Documentation of Nonlinear Models	6-15
6.5.2	Data from Nonlinear Static Analyses	6-16
6.5.3	Data from Nonlinear Dynamic Analyses	6-16
7.	Performance Evaluation	7-1
7.1	Overview of the Performance Evaluation Process	7-1
7.1.1	Performance Group Evaluation Criteria.....	7-3
7.1.2	Acceptable Probability of Collapse	7-4
7.2	Adjusted Collapse Margin Ratio	7-5
7.2.1	Effect of Spectral Shape on Collapse Margin	7-5
7.2.2	Spectral Shape Factors	7-5
7.3	Total System Collapse Uncertainty	7-7
7.3.1	Sources of Uncertainty	7-7
7.3.2	Combining Uncertainties in Collapse Evaluation.....	7-8
7.3.3	Effect of Uncertainty on Collapse Margin	7-9
7.3.4	Total System Collapse Uncertainty	7-11
7.4	Acceptable Values of Adjusted Collapse Margin Ratio	7-13
7.5	Evaluation of the Response Modification Coefficient, R	7-15
7.6	Evaluation of the Overstrength Factor, Ω_o	7-15
7.7	Evaluation of the Deflection Amplification Factor, C_d	7-16
8.	Documentation and Peer Review	8-1
8.1	Recommended Qualifications, Expertise and Responsibilities for a System Development Team.....	8-1
8.1.1	System Sponsor	8-1

8.1.2	Testing Qualifications, Expertise and Responsibilities.....	8-1
8.1.3	Engineering and Construction Qualifications, Expertise and Responsibilities.....	8-2
8.1.4	Analytical Qualifications, Expertise and Responsibilities.....	8-2
8.2	Documentation of System Development and Results.....	8-2
8.3	Peer Review Panel	8-3
8.3.1	Peer Review Panel Selection	8-4
8.3.2	Peer Review Roles and Responsibilities.....	8-4
8.4	Submittal.....	8-5
9.	Example Applications	9-1
9.1	General.....	9-1
9.2	Example Application - Reinforced Concrete Special Moment Frame System.....	9-2
9.2.1	Introduction	9-2
9.2.2	Overview and Approach	9-2
9.2.3	Structural System Information.....	9-3
9.2.4	Identification of Reinforced Concrete Special Moment Frame Archetype Configurations	9-4
9.2.5	Nonlinear Model Development	9-10
9.2.6	Nonlinear Structural Analysis.....	9-13
9.2.7	Performance Evaluation.....	9-17
9.2.8	Iteration: Adjustment of Design Requirements to Meet Performance Goals	9-21
9.2.9	Evaluation of Ω_0 Using Final Set of Archetype Designs	9-25
9.2.10	Summary Observations.....	9-25
9.3	Example Application - Reinforced Concrete Ordinary Moment Frame System.....	9-25
9.3.1	Introduction	9-25
9.3.2	Overview and Approach	9-26
9.3.3	Structural System Information.....	9-26
9.3.4	Identification of Reinforced Concrete Ordinary Moment Frame Archetype Configurations	9-27
9.3.5	Nonlinear Model Development	9-33
9.3.6	Nonlinear Structural Analysis.....	9-34
9.3.7	Performance Evaluation for SDC B.....	9-38
9.3.8	Performance Evaluation for SDC C.....	9-40
9.3.9	Evaluation of Ω_0 Using Set of Archetype Designs	9-41
9.3.10	Summary Observations.....	9-42
9.4	Example Application - Wood Light-Frame System	9-43
9.4.1	Introduction	9-43
9.4.2	Overview and Approach	9-43
9.4.3	Structural System Information.....	9-43
9.4.4	Identification of Wood Light-Frame Archetype Configurations	9-44
9.4.5	Nonlinear Model Development	9-48
9.4.6	Nonlinear Structural Analyses.....	9-51
9.4.7	Performance Evaluation.....	9-54
9.4.8	Calculation of Ω_0 using Set of Archetype Designs	9-57

9.4.9	Summary Observations	9-57
9.5	Example Applications - Summary Observations and Conclusions	9-58
9.5.1	Short Period Structures.....	9-58
9.5.2	Tall Moment Frame Structures.....	9-58
9.5.3	Collapse Performance for Different Seismic Design Categories.....	9-59
10.	Supporting Studies	10-1
10.1	General	10-1
10.2	Assessment of Non-Simulated Failure Modes in a Steel Special Moment Frame System.....	10-1
10.2.1	Overview and Approach.....	10-1
10.2.2	Structural System Information	10-3
10.2.3	Nonlinear Analysis Model.....	10-4
10.2.4	Procedure for Collapse Performance Assessment, Incorporating Non-Simulated Failure Modes.....	10-6
10.3	Collapse Evaluation of Seismically Isolated Structures.....	10-12
10.3.1	Introduction	10-12
10.3.2	Isolator and Structural System Information	10-14
10.3.3	Modeling Isolated Structure Archetypes.....	10-16
10.3.4	Design Properties of Isolated Structure Archetypes.....	10-21
10.3.5	Nonlinear Static Analysis for Period-Based Ductility, SSFs, Record-to-Record Variability and Overstrength	10-27
10.3.6	Collapse Evaluation Results.....	10-30
10.3.7	Summary and Conclusion	10-39
11	Conclusions and Recommendations	11-1
11.1	Assumptions and Limitations	11-1
11.1.1	Far-Field Record Set Ground Motions	11-1
11.1.2	Influence of Secondary Systems on Collapse Performance.....	11-3
11.1.3	Buildings with Significant Irregularities	11-4
11.1.4	Redundancy of the Seismic-Force-Resisting System	11-5
11.2	Observations and Conclusions	11-5
11.2.1	Generic Findings	11-5
11.2.2	Specific Findings.....	11-8
11.3	Collapse Evaluation of Individual Buildings	11-9
11.3.1	Feasibility	11-10
11.3.2	Approach	11-10
11.4	Recommendations for Further Study.....	11-10
11.4.1	Studies Related to Improving and Refining the Methodology	11-11
11.4.2	Studies Related to Advancing Seismic Design Practice and Building Code Requirements (ASCE/SEI 7-05).....	11-12
Appendix A:	Ground Motion Record Sets	A-1
A.1	Introduction	A-1

A.2	Objectives	A-2
A.3	Approach	A-3
A.4	Spectral Shape Consideration	A-4
A.5	Maximum Considered Earthquake and Design Earthquake Demand (<i>ASCE/SEI 7-05</i>)	A-4
A.6	PEER NGA Database	A-7
A.7	Record Selection Criteria	A-8
A.8	Scaling Method	A-9
A.9	Far-Field Record Set	A-13
A.10	Near-Field Record Set	A-20
A.11	Comparison of Far-Field and Near-Field Record Sets	A-27
A.12	Robustness of Far-Field Record Set	A-33
A.12.1	Approach to Evaluating Robustness	A-33
A.12.2	Effects of PGA Selection Criteria Alone	A-34
A.12.3	Effects of PGV Selection Criteria Alone	A-36
A.12.4	Effects of both PGA and PGV Selection Criteria Simultaneously, as well as Selection of Two Records from Each Event	A-37
A.12.5	Summary of the Robustness of the Far-Field Set	A-38
A.13	Assessment of Record-to-Record Variability in Collapse Fragility	A-39
A.14	Summary and Conclusion	A-43

Appendix B: Adjustment of Collapse Capacity Considering Effects of Spectral Shape		B-1
B.1	Introduction	B-1
B.2	Previous Research on Simplified Methods to Account for Spectral Shape (Epsilon)	B-4
B.3	Development of a Simplified Method to Adjust Collapse Capacity for Effects of Spectral Shape (Epsilon)	B-6
B.3.1	Epsilon Values for the Ground Motions in the Far-Field Set	B-7
B.3.2	Target Epsilon Values	B-7
B.3.3	Impact of Spectral Shape (ϵ) on Median Collapse Capacity	B-11
B.4	Final Simplified Factors to Adjust Median Collapse Capacity for the Effects of Spectral Shape	B-21
B.5	Application to Site Specific Performance Assessment	B-24

Appendix C: Development of Index Archetype Configurations		C-1
C.1.	Development of Index Archetype Configurations for a Reinforced Concrete Moment Frame System	C-1
C.1.1	Establishing the Archetype Design Space	C-1
C.1.2	Identifying Index Archetype Configurations and Populating Performance Groups	C-4
C.1.3	Preparing Index Archetype Designs and Index Archetype Models	C-7
C.2	Development of Index Archetype Configurations for a Wood Light-Frame Shear Wall System	C-9
C.2.1	Establishing the Archetype Design Space	C-9
C.2.2	Identifying Index Archetype Configurations and Populating Performance Groups	C-10

C.2.3	Preparing Index Archetype Designs and Index Archetype Models	C-10
C.2.4	Other Considerations for Wood Light-Frame Shear Wall Systems	C-13
Appendix D:	Consideration of Behavioral Effects.....	D-1
D.1	Identification of Structural failure Modes	D-1
D.2	System Definition.....	D-2
D.3	Element Deterioration Modes.....	D-3
D.3.1	Flexural Hinging of Beams and Columns	D-5
D.3.2	Compressive Failure of Columns	D-5
D.3.3	Shear Failure of Beam and Columns.....	D-5
D.3.4	Joint Panel Shear Behavior.....	D-6
D.3.5	Bond-Slip of Reinforcing Bars.....	D-7
D.3.6	Punching Shear in Slab-Column Connections	D-7
D.4	Local and Global Collapse Scenarios.....	D-7
D.5	Likelihood of Collapse Scenarios.....	D-8
D.6	Collapse Simulation	D-9
Appendix E:	Nonlinear Modeling of Reinforced Concrete Moment Frame Systems.....	E-1
E.1	Purpose	E-1
E.2	Structural Modeling Overview	E-1
E.3	Beam-Column Element Model.....	E-2
E.3.1	Element and Hysteretic Model.....	E-3
E.3.2	Calibration of Parameters for the Reinforced Concrete Beam-Column Element Model	E-5
E.4	Joint Modeling.....	E-15
E.4.1	Shear Panel Spring	E-16
E.4.2	Bond-Slip Spring Model	E-16
Appendix F:	Collapse Evaluation of Individual Buildings.....	F-1
F.1	Introduction	F-1
F.2	Feasibility	F-1
F.3	Approach	F-1
F.4	Collapse Evaluation of Individual Building Systems.....	F-2
F.4.1	Step One: Develop Nonlinear Model(s).....	F-2
F.4.2	Step Two: Define Limit States and Acceptance Criteria.....	F-3
F.4.3	Step Three: Determine Total System Uncertainty and Acceptable Collapse Margin Ratio.....	F-3
F.4.4	Step Four: Perform Nonlinear Static Analysis (NSA)	F-4
F.4.5	Step Five: Select Record Set and Scale Records.....	F-4
F.4.6	Step Six: Perform Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis (NDA) and Evaluate Performance.....	F-5

Symbols G-1

Glossary H-1

References I-1

Project Participants..... J-1