

SEISMIC PERFORMANCE OF REINFORCED CONCRETE BUILDING USING SPECTRUM RESPONSE AND PUSHOVER ANALYSES

ANALYSES DE LA PERFORMANCE SISMIQUE D'UN BATIMENT EN BETON ARME PAR LES METHODES DU SPECTRE DE REPOSE ET PUSHOVER

YUCEF MEHANI¹, ABDERRAHMANE KIBBOUA¹, BENAZOUZ CHIKH¹

¹Centre National de Recherche Appliquée en Génie Parasismique (CGS), Alger, e-mail : ymehani@cgs-dz.org

¹Centre National de Recherche Appliquée en Génie Parasismique (CGS), Alger, e-mail : akibboua@cgs-dz.org

¹Centre National de Recherche Appliquée en Génie Parasismique (CGS), Alger, e-mail : bchikh@cgs-dz.org

Date de réception : 30/06/2016 / Date d'acceptation : 23/10/2016 / Date de publication : 30/01/2017

RÉSUMÉ

Les codes de conception sismiques classiques considèrent le facteur de comportement pour évaluer la réponse sismique des structures en proposant la méthode statique équivalente simplifiée et la méthode dynamique modale spectrale utilisant le spectre de réponse. Chacune des deux emploie un facteur de comportement global pour prendre en considération l'effet non linéaire de la réponse des éléments de la structure. De nos jours, la conception sismique basée sur la performance considère des analyses statiques non linéaires utilisant l'analyse pushover ou poussée progressive avec différents niveaux de performances. Elles permettent de déterminer la capacité portante ou de résistance des structures et de savoir si elles peuvent résister à des séismes majeurs. Le premier mode est généralement pris en compte dans ce genre d'analyse. Dans cette étude, seront comparés les déplacements absolus qui sont primordiaux pour le dimensionnement des joints sismiques, en utilisant l'analyse dynamique par spectre de réponse et l'analyse pushover selon l'Eurocode 8. Les résultats trouvés sont donnés en utilisant les Règles Parasismiques Algériennes (RPA version 2003) et le logiciel ETABS version 2013.

Mots clés : Analyse par spectre de réponse, Analyse pushover, Déplacement cible, Forces de cisaillement à la base, Courbe de capacité.

ABSTRACT

Classical seismic design codes consider behavior factor to assess seismic response of structures proposing simplified equivalent static method and dynamic spectral modal method using response spectrum. Both use a global behavior factor to take into account nonlinear effect of elements response. Nowadays, Performance Based Seismic Design (PBSD) considers nonlinear static analyses using Pushover analysis with different performance levels. They permit to determine the bearing capacity of structures and distinguish whether they will be able to withstand major earthquakes. The first mode is in general considered in such kind of analysis. This study will compare the absolute displacements which are necessary to design seismic gaps, using dynamic response spectrum analysis and pushover analysis according to Eurocode 8. The results are carried in accordance with the Algerian seismic design Code in force RPA99/ version 2003 and ETABS 2013 program.

Keywords: Response spectrum analysis, Pushover analysis, target displacement, Base shear forces, Capacity curve.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Algerian seismic code propose simplified methods to assess the response of structures under earthquakes actions, such as equivalent static method and spectrum response method which permit to evaluate first lateral forces, and then to check lateral displacements. The non linear behavior of dissipative elements is taken into account through the behavior factor R , which consider dissipative take. The 2003 Boumerdes major earthquake, magnitude 6.9 showed some shortcomings of these simplified methods. In the recent years, new methods of seismic assessment and design have been developed, particularly with respect to real non linear behavior of structural elements using non linear static analysis (pushover) with several performance levels. The basic theory considers capacity design approach. The literature proposes many procedures like ATC40, FEMA 354, FEMA 440, N2 method (Eurocode 8).

2. LINEAR AND NONLINEAR ANALYSIS

2.1- Response spectrum method

Response spectrum method is one of the useful tools of earthquake engineering for analyzing the performance of structures especially in earthquakes, since many systems behave as single degree of freedom systems. Thus, once the natural frequency of the structure evaluated, then the peak response of the building can be estimated by reading the value from the ground response spectrum for the appropriate frequency. In most building codes in seismic regions, this value forms the basis for calculating the forces that a structure must be designed to resist seismic analysis. Response spectrum method is a linear dynamic statistical analysis method which measures the contribution from each natural mode of vibration to indicate the likely maximum seismic response of an essentially elastic structure. Response spectrum analysis provides insight into dynamic behavior by measuring pseudo-spectral acceleration, velocity, or displacement as a function of structural period for a given time history and level of damping. It is practical to envelope response spectra such that a smooth curve represents the peak response for each realization of structural period Ref. [2].

The seismic force is represented by using the following response spectrum from a ground motion:

$$\frac{S_a}{g} = \begin{cases} 1.25A \left(1 + \frac{T}{T_1} \left(2.5\eta \frac{Q}{R} - 1 \right) \right) & 0 \leq T \leq T_1 \\ 2.5\eta(1.25A) \frac{Q}{R} & T_1 \leq T \leq T_2 \\ 2.5\eta(1.25A) \frac{Q}{R} \left(\frac{T_2}{T} \right)^2 & T_2 \leq T \leq 3s \\ 2.5\eta(1.25A) \frac{Q}{R} \left(\frac{T_2}{T} \right)^2 \left(\frac{3}{T} \right)^5 & T \geq 3s \end{cases}$$

Where:

S_a : inelastic response spectrum in terms of acceleration;
 g : gravity (= 9.81 m/s²);
 T : vibration period of a linear single degree of freedom system.
 T_1 : lowest characteristic period of site;
 h : damping correction factor;
 Q : quality factor;

R : behavior factor;

T_2 : highest characteristic period of site.

This approach permits to consider multiple modes of response. The response of a structure can be defined as a combination of many special mode shapes that in the vibrating string correspond to the harmonics. Computer analysis can be used to determine these modes for a structure. For each mode, a response is read from the design spectrum, based on the modal frequency and the modal mass, and they are then combined to provide an estimate of the total response of the structure. In this, we have to calculate the magnitude of forces in all directions and then see the effects on the building.

Combination methods include the following:

- Square root of the sum of the squares (SRSS);
- Complete quadratic combination (CQC). A method that is an improvement on SRSS for closely spaced modes.

2.2- Nonlinear Static Analysis

Linear static analysis assumes that the relationship between loads and the induced response is linear. For example, if you double the magnitude of loads, the response (displacements, strains, stresses, reaction forces, etc.), will also double. All real structures behave non linearly at some level of loading. In some cases, linear analysis may be adequate. In many other cases, the linear solution can produce erroneous results because the conservatism assumptions. Nonlinear analysis methods are best applied when either geometric or material nonlinearity is considered Ref. [8].

Geometric nonlinearity: This is a type of nonlinearity where the structure is still elastic, but the effects of large deflections cause the geometry of the structure to change, so that linear elastic theory breaks down. Typical problems that lie in this category are the elastic instability of structures, such as in the Euler bulking of struts and the large deflection analysis of a beam-column member. In general, it can be said that for geometrical non-linearity, an axially applied compressive force in a member decreases its bending stiffness, but an axially applied tensile force increases its bending stiffness. In addition, P-Delta effect is also included in this concept.

Material nonlinearity: In this type of nonlinearity, material undergoes plastic deformation. Material nonlinearity can be modeled as discrete hinges at a number of locations along the length of a frame (beam or column) element and a discrete hinge for a brace element as discrete material fibers distributed over the cross-section of the element, or as a series of material points throughout the element.

Static pushover analysis: is a static nonlinear procedure in which a structural system is subjected to a constant gravity loading and a monotonic lateral load which increases iteratively, through elastic and inelastic behavior until an ultimate condition is reached to indicate a range of performance level. As a function of both strength and deformation, the resultant nonlinear force-deformation (F-d) relationship defines the base shear versus roof displacement and may be proportional to the distribution of mass along the building height, mode shapes, or fundamental lateral loads mode, to define a capacity curve. The capacity curve defines in general four structural performance levels Ref. [9]:

- **Fully Operational** : No significant damages have occurred to structural and nonstructural components. Building is suitable for normal occupancy and use;

- **Operational**: no significant damage has occurred to structure, which retains nearly all of its pre-earthquake strength and stiffness. Non structural components are secure and most would function;

- **Life Safety**: significant damage to structural elements, with substantial reduction in stiffness, however, margin remains against collapse. Nonstructural elements are secured but may not function. Occupancy may be prevented until repair can be instituted;

- **Near Collapse**: substantial structural and nonstructural damage. Structural strength and stiffness substantially degraded. Little margin against collapse. Some falling debris hazards may have occurred.

The capacity curve can then be combined with a demand curve, typically in the form of an Acceleration Displacement Response Spectrum (ADRS). This combination essentially reduces the problem to an equivalent single degree of freedom system. Static pushover analysis is most suitable for systems in which the fundamental mode dominates behavior Ref. [7]. Results provide insight into the ductile capacity of the structural system, and indicate the mechanism, load level, and deflection at which failure occurs.

There are two nonlinear procedures using pushover methods:

- Capacity Spectrum Method Ref. [5];
- Displacement Coefficient Method Ref. [6].

2.3- Pushover Analysis according to EC8

Pushover analysis is performed under two lateral load patterns. A load distribution corresponding to the fundamental mode shape and a uniform distribution proportional to masses Ref. [4].

Classical steps of the Eurocode 8 approach are then:

- Cantilever model of the structure with concentrated masses with elastic behavior (uncracked cross sections);
- Determination of the fundamental period of vibration;
- Determination of the fundamental mode shape (Eigen vectors) normalized in such a way that $f_n=1$;
- Determination of the modal mass coefficient for the first natural mode;
- Determination of the lateral displacements at each level for the first natural mode.
- Determination of seismic forces at each level for the first natural mode;
- Transformation of the multi degree of freedom system to an equivalent single degree of freedom with an equivalent mass m^* determined as:

$$m^* = \sum m_j \phi_{j,1}^2 = \sum \bar{F}_j \quad (1)$$

Where:

m^* : mass of the equivalent single degree of freedom.

$\phi_{j,1}$: normalized eigen vector of the fundamental mode.

F_j : seismic forces at level j of the fundamental mode.

- Determination of the modal participation factor of the first natural mode:

$$\Gamma = \frac{m^*}{\sum m_j \phi_{j,1}^2} = \frac{\sum \bar{F}_j}{\sum \left(\frac{\bar{F}_j^2}{m_j} \right)} \quad (2)$$

The force F^* and displacement d^* of the equivalent single degree of freedom are computed as:

$$F^* = \frac{F_b}{\Gamma} \quad \text{et} \quad d^* = \frac{d_n}{\Gamma} \quad (3)$$

Where F_b and d_n are, respectively, the base shear force and the control node displacement of the multi degree of freedom system.

- Determination of the idealized elasto perfectly plastic force displacement relationship. The yield force F_y^* , which represents also the ultimate strength of the equivalent single degree of freedom system, is equal to the base shear force at the formation of the plastic mechanism. The initial stiffness of the equivalent single degree of freedom system is determined in such a way that the areas under the actual and the equivalent single degree of freedom system force displacement curves are equal. Based on this assumption, the yield displacement of the equivalent single degree of freedom system d_y^* is given by:

$$d_y^* = 2 \left(d_m^* - \frac{E_m^*}{F_y^*} \right) \quad (4)$$

Where E_m^* is the actual deformation energy up to the formation of the plastic mechanism and d_m^* is the estimated target displacement. Figure 1 shows the principle of energies idealization.




Figure 1 : Linearization of capacity curve (Linéarisation de la courbe de capacité)

- Determination of the period of the equivalent single degree of freedom system T^* as:

$$T^* = 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{m^* d_y^*}{F_y^*}} \quad (5)$$

- Determination of the target displacement for the equivalent single degree of freedom system as:

$$d_{et}^* = S_e(T^*) \left(\frac{T^*}{2\pi} \right)^2 \quad (6)$$

Where $S_e(T^*)$ is the elastic acceleration response spectrum at the period T^* . For the determination of the target displacement d_t^* for structures in the short period range and for structures in the medium and long period ranges, different expressions should be used:

a) $T^* < T_c$ (short period range)

- If $F_y^* / m^* \geq S_e(T^*)$, the response is elastic and thus:

$$d_t^* = d_{et}^* \quad (7)$$

- If $F_y^* / m^* < S_e(T^*)$, the response is non linear and:

$$d_t^* = \frac{d_{et}^*}{q_u} \left(1 + \left(q_u - 1 \right) \frac{T_c}{T^*} \right) \geq d_{et}^* \quad (8)$$

$$\text{with } q_u = \frac{S_e(T^*) m^*}{F_y^*}$$

Where d_{et}^* is the target displacement for the equivalent single degree of freedom system and q_u is the ratio between the acceleration in the structure with unlimited elastic behavior $S_e(T^*)$ and in the structure with limited strength F_y^* / m^* .

b) $T^* \geq T_c$ (medium and long period range), the response is nonlinear and:

$$d_t^* = d_{et}^* \quad \text{with} \quad d_t^* \leq 3 d_{et}^* \quad (9)$$

- The target displacement of the multi degree of freedom system is then:

$$d_t = \Gamma d_t^* \quad (10)$$

(03) transversal bays is considered in this study. The building is located in a high seismic zone (Zone III) with housing usage Ref. [1]. The details of beams and columns are shown in table1.

- The grade of concrete is $f_{c28} = 25$ MPa;
- The grade of steel is $f_c = 400$ MPa;
- The roof dead load is $GT = 6.54$ KN/m²;
- The roof live load is $QT = 1$ KN/m²;
- The current level dead load is $GE = 6.19$ KN/m²;
- The current level live load is $QE = 1.5$ KN/m².

Figure 2 shows a 3-D model of the structure using ETABS program Ref. [3].

Table 1: Dimensions of beams and columns (Dimensions des poutres et poteaux)

Story	Beam (cm ²)	Longitudinal Reinforcement	Column (cm ²)	Longitudinal Reinforcement
5	30x40	6HA16	30x30	8HA12
4	30x40	6HA16	35x35	4HA16 + 4HA14
3	30x40	6HA16	35x35	4HA16 + 4HA14




Figure 2: Structural model in 3D (Modèle structural en 3 Dimensions)

3. CASE STUDY

The building is five (05) stories with regularity in plan and elevation. The structure is reinforced concrete resisting moment frames with hollow clay bricks infill walls. Typical bay width and columns height in this study are selected as 4m and 3m respectively. A configuration of four (04) longitudinal bays, three

4. LINEAR AND NONLINEAR ANALYSIS

4.1- Linear Static Analysis

The main intrinsic characteristic of the structure in terms of natural periods and mode shapes are summarized in tables 2 and 3.

Table 2: Natural periods and modal participating mass (Périodes propres et participation de la masse vibrante de chaque mode)

Direction	T (s)	α_1 (%)
Long (XX)	0.729	80.240
Trans (YY)	0.744	79.860

Table 3: Mode shapes for the two first modes (Déformées modales des deux premiers modes)

Story	First mode shapes	
	Long (XX)	Trans (YY)
5	1.000	1.000
4	0.869	0.867
3	0.672	0.676
2	0.421	0.408
1	0.166	0.164

Table 4 shows the results of absolute displacements using the response spectrum method considering fifteen (15) for the two main longitudinal (XX) and transversal (YY) directions.

Table 4: Absolute displacements with RSM (Déplacements absolus avec la méthode du spectre de réponse RSM)

Story	$\delta_x^k(m)$	$\delta_y^k(m)$
5	0.114	0.117
4	0.099	0.102
3	0.077	0.079
2	0.047	0.048
1	0.019	0.019

4.2- Non Linear Static Analysis

The non linear static analysis using pushover method gave the capacity curves for the main longitudinal (XX) and transversal (YY) directions as shown in figures 3 and 4.




Figure 3: Capacity Curve for longitudinal direction XX (Courbe de capacité dans la direction longitudinale XX)




Figure 4: Capacity Curve for transversal direction YY (Courbe de capacité dans la direction longitudinale YY)

The modal participation factors of the first natural modes for the main transversal (XX) and transversal (YY) directions are shown in table 5.

Table 5: Modal participation factors (Facteurs de participation modale)

Direction	Long (XX)	Trans (YY)
Γ_1	1.340	1.340

The main parameters of the equivalent single degree of freedom are shown in table 6.

Table 6: Dimensions of beams and columns (Dimensions des poutres et poteaux)

	Long (XX)	Trans (YY)
d_m^*	0.110	0.108
d_y^*	0.022	0.024
T_c	0.5	0.5
T^*	0.908	0.965
$S_e(T^*)$	9.868	9.456
$d_{et}^*(m)$	0.206	0.223
$d_t(m)$	0.277	0.299

The non linear static analysis using pushover method gave the absolute displacements for the two main longitudinal (XX) and transversal (YY) directions as shown in table 7.

Table 7: Absolute displacements with NLSA (Déplacements absolus avec l'analyse statique non linéaire NLSA)

Story	$\delta_x^k(m)$	$\delta_y^k(m)$
5	0.277	0.299
4	0.240	0.260
3	0.186	0.202
2	0.116	0.122
1	0.046	0.049

The main results in terms of absolute displacements with the elastic and non elastic analysis are shown in figures 5 and 6.




Figure 5: Absolute displacement for longitudinal direction XX




Figure 6: Absolute displacement for transversal direction YY (Déplacement absolu dans la direction transversal YY)

5. DISCUSSION

- The analysis of the main results for both longitudinal (XX) and transversal (YY) directions showed that the linear static analysis gave less absolute displacements compared to the non linear static analysis even though we considered all the possible modes in the analysis;
- The non linear static analysis showed that the obtained values of absolute displacements are more than double than those obtained for the linear static analysis;
- For adjacent buildings, the dimension of the seismic joint is a critical choice. In case of a small gap, the hammering effect could be dangerous, otherwise, in case of a large gap, it's not economic.

6. CONCLUSION

The analysis of absolute displacements of a building using response spectrum methods, taking into account indirectly the non linear behavior of structural elements by introducing the behavior factor, and the non linear static analysis using pushover procedure have been performed.

The results showed a large difference between the two methods. The question remains, is the response spectrum response more conservative, or the non linear static analysis less conservative?

One can say that the type of loading in the non linear static analysis has a predominant role to determine the capacity curve.

RÉFÉRENCES BIBLIOGRAPHIQUES

- [1] BAEL, Technical rules of conception and design of constructions in reinforced concrete according to limit states. BAEL 91 revised 99, 1999.
- [2] DTR BC 48. Seismic Code for Building Design and Construction, R.P.A 99/ Version 2003, National Earthquake Engineering Research Centre (CGS), technical document, Algiers, Algeria, 2003.
- [3] ETABS version 2013, CSI Analysis Reference Manual, Computers and Structure, University of Berkeley, California, 2013.
- [4] Eurocode 8 2003, Design provisions for earthquake resistance of structures. Part 1.1-General rules - seismic actions and general requirements for structures, 2003.
- [5] M.Iqbal Shuharwardy, Performance Based Design Modeling for Pushover Analysis Use of the Pushover Curve, Computers and Structures, University of Berkeley, California, 1999.
- [6] Pierre Mouroux, Caterina Negulescu, Comparaison pratique entre les méthodes déplacement de l'ATC 40 (en amortissement) et de l'Eurocode 8 (en ductilité), 7ème Colloque National AFPS 2007 – Ecole Centrale Paris, 2007.
- [7] Shekhappa H and Dyavanal S.S: Nonlinear Static Analysis of G+6 Reinforced concrete building with infill walls and user refined hinges. International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology. Volume 02, Issue 09. December 2015.
- [8] VijayKumar G. Sawant and D.N Shinde: A study on simple pushover analysis of asymmetric building frames. International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology. Vol.4, issue 9, September 2015.
- [9] VijayKumar G. Sawant and D.N Shinde: Pushover Analysis of Asymmetric Three Dimensional building frames. International Journal of Novel Research in Civil Structural and Earth Sciences. Vol.2, issue 2, pp: (51-53), Month: May-August 2015, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com