

# **SEISMIC PERFORMANCE OF REINFORCED CONCRETE FRAMES**

**Jaya Kashyap**

A thesis submitted for the degree of  
**Masters of Engineering Science**



---

**The University of Adelaide**

**Department of Civil, Environmental and Mining Engineering**

**June 2009**

## STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **PUBLICATIONS**

The following publications were written based on the work presented in this thesis.

### **Journal Papers**

Kashyap, J., Ozbakkaloglu T. and Griffith, M. (2008). “Seismic Behaviour of Reinforced Concrete Frames in Low Seismicity Regions.” In Preparation.

Kashyap, J., Griffith, M. and Ozbakkaloglu, T. (2008). “Seismic Performance of Brick Infilled Reinforced Concrete Frames.” In Preparation.

### **Conference Papers**

Kashyap, J., Ozbakkaloglu T. and Griffith, M. (2007). “Seismic Behaviour of Reinforced Concrete Frames in Australia.” 8th Pacific Conference on Earthquake Engineering, 5 - 7 December 2007, Singapore.

Kashyap, J., Griffith, M. and Ozbakkaloglu, T. (2008). “Seismic Performance of Reinforced Concrete Frames in Australia.” Australian Earthquake Engineering Conference, November 21-23, 2008, Ballarat, Victoria, Australia.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep and sincere gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Michael Griffith and Dr. Togay Ozbakkaloglu, supervisors of this project, for their valuable guidance, generous support and encouragement throughout this study. Their friendly discussions and valuable comments have been very helpful in preparation of this thesis.

The Earthquake Engineering Research Scholarship provided by the Australian Earthquake Engineering Society (AEES) is gratefully acknowledged.

Sincere thanks are extended to the computing officer, Dr. Stephen Carr and the departmental administrative staff, Ms Diane Keable, Mrs Josie Peluso, Mrs Ann Smith and Mrs Julie Ligertwood, for their help.

A special thank you is owed to Mr. Sudhir Adettiwar for his support. It was great to have support from my friends Rupali, Sanyogita and Parag for helping me to get through difficult times. I also wish to thank my colleagues for their assistance and friendship.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my family and my husband, Mahesh Neelam for their unwavering support. I wish to express my heartfelt thanks for their understanding, encouragement and patience.



## ABSTRACT

Many intra-tectonic plate regions are considered to have low to moderate seismic risk. However, devastating earthquakes can occur in these regions and result in high consequences in terms of casualties and damage. Non-ductile detailing practice employed in these structures make them prone to potential damage and failure during an earthquake. Furthermore, the use of infill walls is a divisive issue as on positive side dual wall-frame systems have beneficial effects related to strength, stiffness, and ductility. However, if not designed properly infill wall can also lead to undesirable structural failures of complete wall frame system. Although, there has been significant amount of international research in this area, it is worth noting that very little research exists for Australian frames.

This thesis presents the experimental and analytical research conducted at The University of Adelaide to gain some insight into the behaviour of typically detailed Australian reinforced concrete frames subjected to ground motions. The main objectives of this research were (1) to investigate the behaviour of non-seismically designed reinforced concrete frames under a 500-YRP earthquake; (2) to determine the different magnitudes of earthquake (YRP) that are likely to cause excessive drifts in or collapse of gravity-load-designed reinforced concrete frames and (3) to investigate the effect of infill walls on the moment-resisting frames subjected to seismic loads. The experimental program consisted of earthquake simulation tests on a 1/5 scale model of a 3-storey reinforced concrete frame and four 1/2-scale reinforced concrete brick infilled frame specimens subjected to quasi-static cyclic loading. The analytical study included static pushover and non-linear dynamic analyses of the 3-, 5- and 12-storey reinforced concrete frames.

From the overall performance of gravity-load-designed bare reinforced concrete frames considered in this study, it was concluded that the non-seismically designed frames appear to be capable of resisting a “design magnitude earthquake” (i.e., 500-YRP) in low earthquake hazard regions. However, their behaviour under more severe

earthquakes (e.g. a 2500-YRP earthquake) is questionable. Perhaps the earthquake design requirements should consider as an alternative the ‘collapse prevention’ limit state for longer return period earthquakes, of the order of 2000–2500-YRP. The experimental research on reinforced concrete infilled frame indicated that the infill wall does not adversely effect the in plane ultimate strength, stiffness, and ductility of the bare reinforced concrete frame.

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY .....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>PUBLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES .....</b>	<b>XI</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>XIII</b>
<b>NOTATIONS.....</b>	<b>XIV</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background and Research Needs .....	1
1.2 Objectives of the Research .....	3
1.3 Methodology and Scope of Work.....	4
1.4 Outline of Thesis.....	4
<b>2 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Introduction.....	5
2.2 Seismic Design .....	6
2.2.1 <i>Basic Concepts</i> .....	6
2.2.2 <i>Earthquake Ground Motions</i> .....	7
2.2.3 <i>Recommended Performance Levels</i> .....	10
2.3 Performance Measurement Considerations .....	12
2.3.1 <i>Drift</i> .....	12
2.3.2 <i>Ductility</i> .....	13
2.3.3 <i>Strength and Stiffness</i> .....	15

2.4	Structural Response Against Earthquake Loading .....	16
2.4.1	<i>Beam Failure</i> .....	18
2.4.2	<i>Column Failure</i> .....	19
2.4.3	<i>Beam-Column Joint</i> .....	20
2.4.4	<i>Infill Wall</i> .....	21
2.4.5	<i>Soft/Weak-Story Mechanism</i> .....	23
2.5	Code Provisions for Non-Ductile Frames .....	24
2.6	Methodology for Performance Evaluation .....	26
2.6.1	<i>Analytical Techniques</i> .....	26
2.6.2	<i>Experimental Methods</i> .....	27
2.6.3	<i>Computer Modelling</i> .....	28
2.7	Summary.....	28
<b>3</b>	<b>PREVIOUS STUDIES ON SEISMIC EVALUATION OF REINFORCED CONCRETE FRAMES.....</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1	Research on Reinforced Concrete Gravity Load Designed Frames .....	29
3.1.1	<i>Introduction</i> .....	29
3.1.2	<i>Previous Research</i> .....	30
3.1.2.1	Ductility and Overstrength .....	30
3.1.2.2	Collapse mechanism .....	33
3.1.2.3	Beam-Column Joint.....	34
3.1.2.4	Lateral Drift .....	37
3.2	Research on Reinforced Concrete Infilled Frame .....	39
3.2.1	<i>Introduction</i> .....	39
3.2.2	<i>Previous Studies</i> .....	40
3.2.2.1	Experimental Research .....	40
3.3	Summary.....	42
<b>4</b>	<b>PERFORMANCE OF REINFORCED CONCRETE GRAVITY LOAD DESIGNED FRAMES .....</b>	<b>44</b>
4.1	Introduction .....	44
4.2	Experimental Program.....	45
4.2.1	<i>Test Model</i> .....	45

4.2.2	<i>Methodology</i> .....	45
4.2.3	<i>Test Results and discussion</i> .....	46
4.3	Analytical Study .....	49
4.3.1	<i>Test Specimen</i> .....	49
4.3.2	<i>Methodology</i> .....	50
4.3.2.1	Static Pushover Analysis .....	51
4.3.2.2	Non-Linear Time History Analysis .....	54
I.	Description of Earthquake Data Used in Analysis .....	54
II.	Dynamic analysis Using Boston Earthquake.....	56
4.4	Implications .....	64
<b>5</b>	<b>PERFORMANCE OF REINFORCED CONCRETE INFILLED FRAMES</b> .....	<b>67</b>
5.1	Introduction.....	67
5.2	Test Specimen Design .....	68
5.3	Specimen Construction .....	70
5.4	Material Properties.....	70
5.4.1	<i>Concrete</i> .....	71
5.4.2	<i>Steel</i> .....	71
5.4.3	<i>Masonry</i> .....	71
5.5	Instrumentation .....	72
5.5.1	<i>Control Frame</i> .....	72
5.5.2	<i>Infilled Frame</i> .....	73
5.6	Experimental Procedure.....	74
5.7	Experimental Results and Discussion.....	76
5.7.1	<i>Force-Displacement Data</i> .....	76
5.7.2	<i>Failure Modes</i> .....	78
5.7.3	<i>Seismic Ductility</i> .....	80
5.8	Implications .....	81

**6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS..... 82**

6.1 Summary..... 82

6.2 Conclusions for Gravity-Load-Designed Reinforced Concrete Frames83

6.3 Conclusions for Reinforced Concrete Infilled Frames ..... 84

6.4 Recommendations for Future Work ..... 85

**REFERENCES ..... 87**

**APPENDIX A..... 99**

**APPENDIX B..... 195**

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1—Relationship between PGA and annual probability of exceedance for different seismic regions (from Paulay et al. 1992).....	2
Figure 2.1—Time history and associated acceleration response spectrum .....	9
Figure 2.2—Envelope response spectrum for design .....	9
Figure 2.3—Recommended performance objectives for buildings, SEAOC Vision 2000 (1995).....	12
Figure 2.4—Idealized structural response .....	14
Figure 2.5—Damage to reinforced concrete beam (Sezen et al. 2000; Konagai et al. 2006) .....	19
Figure 2.6—Shear failures in columns (Sezen et al. 2000) .....	20
Figure 2.7—Collapse due to failure of beam column joints (Sezen et al. 2000).....	21
Figure 2.8—Severe damage to dual wall-frame building (Sezen et al. 2000).....	22
Figure 2.9—Modes of failure of infilled frame (CEB 1996).....	23
Figure 2.10—Soft/weak story failure (Naeim et al. 2000) .....	24
Figure 3.1—Details of Bracci et al.’s (1995) model frame .....	30
Figure 3.2—Details of Lee et al.’s (2002) model frame.....	31
Figure 3.3—Specimen 1- Stehle et al. (2001) .....	35
Figure 3.4—Specimen 2- Stehle et al. (2001) .....	36
Figure 4.1—Elevation and joint detail of 1/5-scale model test structure .....	45
Figure 4.2—Experimental results .....	48
Figure 4.3 — Member details of frames .....	49
Figure 4.4—Analytical static pushover curve for 3-storey frame .....	51
Figure 4.5—The response spectra generated from 500-YRP and 2500-YRP earthquakes .....	55
Figure 4.6—Base shear vs. roof drift of 3-storey frame.....	56
Figure 4.7—Displacement profile and IDI for 3-storey frame.....	57
Figure 4.8—Base shear vs. roof drift for 5-storey RC frame .....	58
Figure 4.9 — Displacement profile and IDI for 5-storey frame.....	58
Figure 4.10—Base shear vs. roof drift for 12-storey RC frame .....	59

---

Figure 4.11—Displacement profile and IDI for 12-storey frame.....	60
Figure 4.12—The cumulative energy dissipation in each storey for the 3-storey frame .....	61
Figure 4.13—Ground storey response of the 3 storey frame .....	62
Figure 4.14—3rd storey response of the 5-storey frame .....	63
Figure 4.15—11th storey response of the 12-storey frame .....	63
Figure 5.1—Initial frame layout (dimensions in mm).....	68
Figure 5.2—Modified frame layout (dimensions in mm) .....	69
Figure 5.3—Construction of concrete frame .....	70
Figure 5.4—Abey Alligator expansion ties.....	72
Figure 5.5—Instrumentation layout for control frame .....	73
Figure 5.6—Instrumentation layout infilled frame .....	74
Figure 5.7—Test setup .....	75
Figure 5.8—Load sequence for control frame.....	75
Figure 5.9—Load sequence for infilled Frame-10mm gap .....	75
Figure 5.10—Load-deflection envelope.....	76
Figure 5.11 — Load vs. deflection graphs .....	77
Figure 5.12—Load-deflection envelopes .....	77
Figure 5.13—Failure pattern in brickwork.....	78
Figure 5.14—Horizontal planes in infill wall.....	79
Figure 5.15—Shear cracks in column .....	79
Figure 5.16—Exterior joint failure.....	80
Figure 5.17—Load-deflection plot of 3 cycle maximum displacements for test 3 ....	80

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 2.1—Proposed earthquake hazard levels (Ghobarah 2001) .....	7
Table 2.2—Probability factor, $k_p$ (AS 1170.4 2007) .....	10
Table 2.3—Performance levels (SEAOC Vision 2000 Committee, 1995) .....	13
Table 2.4—General damage descriptions by performance levels (SEAOC 1995)....	17
Table 3.1—Results of Bracci et al.’s (1995) model frame .....	31
Table 3.2—Results of Lee et al.’s (2002) model frame.....	32
Table 3.3—Interstorey drift at different behaviour levels .....	39
Table 3.4 — Behaviour modes at different inter-storey drift levels (FEMA 307 (1998)) .....	41
Table 4.1—Experimental results 1/5-scale model test structure .....	47
Table 4.2—Beam and column reinforcement details .....	50
Table 4.3—Summary of static pushover results .....	52
Table 4.4—Summary of maximum drift and base shear coefficient for frames .....	57
Table 4.5—Summary of local failures for frames .....	64
Table 5.1—Member details .....	68
Table 5.2—Material properties.....	71
Table 5.3—Data channels.....	73
Table 5.4—Test results summary .....	76

# NOTATIONS

a	Acceleration coefficient
C	Earthquake design coefficient
$C_{eu}$	Ultimate base shear coefficient
$C_{max}$	Maximum base shear coefficient
$C_s$	Ratio of maximum strength at failure
$C_w$	Code-prescribed strength
$C_y$	Actual structural yield strength
Dc	Smaller column dimension for rectangular column
Db	Diameter of the smallest bar in the column
$E_b$	Young's modulus of brick infill
$E_c$	Young's modulus of concrete
$E_s$	Young's modulus of steel
$f_c$	Concrete compressive strength
$f_{sy}$	Yield strength of steel
g	Acceleration due to gravity
$H_{total}$	Total height of the building
$h_{storey}$	Height of each of the storey of the building
I	Importance factor
$k_p$	Probability factor
L	Length
P	Annual probability of exceedance
$R_f$	Structural response modification factor
$R_u$	Ductility reduction factor
S	Site factor
$S_a$	Dynamic ground acceleration
T	thickness of infill
V	Base shear
W	Weight of building
Z	Earthquake hazard factor

---

$\Delta E$	Cumulative energy dissipated
$\Delta_y$	Displacement at yield
$\Delta_{\max}$	Maximum displacement
$\Delta_{\text{roof}}$	Roof displacement
$\Delta_{\text{storey}}$	Storey displacement (interstorey)
$\mu_s$	Structural ductility factor
$\Omega_s$	Overstrength above code
$\Omega_y$	Overstrength at first yield
$\Omega_{\text{total}}$	Total overstrength
$\theta$	Angle of infill diagonal to the horizontal
ACI	American concrete institution
ARP	Annual return period
AS	Australian standard
ATC	Applied technology Council
CEB	Comité euro-international du béton (Euro-international committee for concrete)
DE	Design earthquake
DME	Design magnitude earthquake
EPA	Effective peak acceleration
FEMA	Federal emergency management agency
GLD	Gravity load designed (frame)
IDI	Interstorey drift index
IMRF	Intermediate moment resisting frame
LVDT	Linear Voltage Displacement Transducer
MCE	Maximum considered earthquake
MRF	Moment resisting frame
NEHRP	National earthquake hazards reduction program (American)
OMRF	Ordinary moment resisting frame
PGA	Peak ground acceleration
RC	Reinforced concrete
SAA	Standards Association of Australia

SEAOC	Structural Engineers Association of California
SMRF	Special moment resisting frame
TFT	Taft earthquake
UBC	Uniform building code
URM	Unreinforced masonry
YRP	Year return period