There's always a solution in steel.

AISC Live Webinars

Thank you for joining our live webinar today.
We will begin shortly. Please standby.

Thank you.

Need Help?
Call ReadyTalk Support: 800.843.9166

structural
STEEL

AISC Live Webinars

Today's audio will be broadcast through the internet.

Alternatively, to hear the audio through the phone, dial:

(800) 289-0462   Passcode: 213205

AISC Live Webinars

Today's live webinar will begin shortly. Please stand by.

As a reminder, all lines have been muted. Please type any questions or comments through the Chat feature on the left portion of your screen.

Today's audio will be broadcast through the internet.
Alternatively, to hear the audio through the phone, dial:

(800) 289-0462   Passcode: 213205

AISC Live Webinars

AISC is a Registered Provider with The American Institute of Architects Continuing Education Systems (AIA/CES). Credit(s) earned on completion of this program will be reported to AIA/CES for AIA members. Certificates of Completion for both AIA members and non-AIA members are available upon request.

This program is registered with AIA/CES for continuing professional education. As such, it does not include content that may be deemed or construed to be an approval or endorsement by the AIA of any material of construction or any method or manner of handling, using, distributing, or dealing in any material or product.

Questions related to specific materials, methods, and services will be addressed at the conclusion of this presentation.

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

AISC Live Webinars

Copyright Materials

Course Description

Session L3: Design of the Moment Frames

September 24, 2018

This session presents system/connection selection and reviews prequalification issues pertaining to moment frames. The lecture then addresses moment frame analysis, beam, column and connection design. The session concludes with the treatment of base-plates.

Learning Objectives

- Identify the various prequalified connections for use in moment frames.

- List the advantages and disadvantages of the reduced beam section (RBS) connection.

- Describe strong-column / weak-beam proportioning.

- Identify the steps of a moment frame base-plate design.

There's always a solution in steel.

Seismic Design in Steel: Concepts and Examples

Session L3: Design of the Moment Frames
September 24, 2018

Rafael Sabelli, SE

structural STEEL

Course objectives

- Understand the principles of seismic design of steel structures.
- Understand the application of those principles to two common systems:
  - Special Moment Frames
  - Buckling-Restrained Braced Frames.
- Understand the application of design requirements for those systems.

9

Resources

- AISC *Seismic Design Manual*
- *Ductile Design of Steel Structures*, Bruneau, Uang, and Sabelli, McGraw Hill.
- *Earthquakes and Seismic Design,* Facts for Steel Buildings #3. Ronald O. Hamburger, AISC.
- Other publications suggested in each session

10

Other resources

- AISC Solutions Center
  - 866.ASK.*AISC* (866-275-2472)
  - Solutions@AISC.org
- AISC Webinars
  - Webinars@AISC.org

11

Course outline

Part I: Concepts

R1. Introduction to effective seismic design

R2. Seismic design of moment frames

R3. Seismic design of braced frames

R4. Seismic design of buildings

12

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

3

Course outline

Part II: Application

L1. Planning the seismic design

L2. Building analysis and diaphragm design

L3. Design of the moment frames

L4. Design of the braced frames

13

There's always a solution in steel.

Session L3:
Design of the Moment Frames

structural
STEEL

Session topics

- Prequalification issues
- Frame analysis
- Connection design
- Optimization
- Beam strength design
- Column strength design
- Base-plate design
- Completion of design

15

Design overview

- Assume frame is drift governed
  - Postpone strength check until frame optimized
    - Drift
    - Minimization of connection reinforcement
  - Use software to compute drift
    - Model as discussed in Session L2
    - Member selection
      - Prequalification limits
      - Seismic compactness ("highly ductile member")
      - Strong-column/Weak-beam proportioning

16

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

Design overview

- RBS selected
  - Good illustration of design procedure
  - Relatively simple analysis
- WUF-W is a good candidate for a small building
  - Too simplified a design procedure
- No field welding for:
  - Bolted flange plate (BFP)
  - Bolted end plate (BEP)
- Connection selection considers
  - Contractor preferences & capabilities
  - Inspection & NDT requirements—shop and field

17

There's always a solution in steel.

Prequalification issues

Prequalification issues

- Limits on member sizes
- Limits on degree of beam reduction
- Analysis requirements
- Special design procedure in AISC 358
- Prescribed detailing
- Lateral bracing requirements
- Protected zone

19

RBS Prequalification limits

- Beam
  - I-shaped
  - W36 max.
  - 300 PLF max.
  - $t_f \leq 1\frac{3}{4}$"
  - Span/depth ≥ 7
  - Seismically compact (in center 2/3 of RBS)
  - Laterally braced at hinge (exception for composite deck)

- Column
  - I-shaped
  - Box
  - Boxed WF
- Connection
  - 25%-50% flange reduction
    - 15%-30% strength reduction
  - Dimensional limits

AISC 358 §5.3

20

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

Reduced Beam Section (RBS)

$0.5b_{bf} \leq a \leq 0.75b_{bf}$

$0.65d \leq b \leq 0.85d$

$0.1b_{bf} \leq c \leq 0.25b_{bf}$

$R = \dfrac{4c^2 + b^2}{8c}$

b_{ef} @⅔ b

$Z_{RBS} = Z_x - 2ct_{bf}(d - t_{bf})$

$b_{ef} = 2(R - c) + b_f - 2\sqrt{R^2 - \left(\dfrac{b}{3}\right)^2}$

AISC 358 §5.8

21

Frame analysis

There's always a solution in steel.

structural
STEEL

Frame analysis

- Frame model set-up
  - Stiffness modifications
  - Panel-zone modeling
    - End offsets
  - Second-order effects
- Member selection
  - Prequalification
  - Base condition

23

Moment-frame model

① ② ③ ④ ⑤

Roof

4th

3rd

2nd

1st

Upper column

Lower column

No end offsets or panel-zone elements

Second-order effects addressed via B_2 factor in member design

0.9E (RBS) typical (NIST Guide)

0.35 I_g typical concrete grade beams

Base plate and foundation rotational restraint may be quantified for additional stiffness

24

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

Moment-frame model

- AISC 358 suggests 10% increase in <u>overall drift</u> as a liberal estimate of RBS effect
- NIST Tech Brief on Steel SMF recommends 10% reduction in <u>beam stiffness</u> as a reasonable approximation
  - RBS does not affect column
- Many software programs can automatically include non-prismatic RBS members
 - RBS effect on drift is often 2%-5%

25

Moment-frame model

Roof — 56K
4th — 49K
3rd — 31K
2nd — 14K
1st

Loads from session L2 (do not include B_2 and correspond to $C_u T_a$)

26

Moment-frame model

M_{roof} = ½ 708K/g
M_{floor} = ½ 868K/g

Tributary mass (weight) included to permit period calculation

27

Member selection

- Takes care of some checks
  - Column & beam compactness
    - Highly ductile members per AISC 341 §E3.5
  - Prequalification limits per AISC 358 §5.3
- Anticipates some requirements
  - Strong-column/weak-beam AISC 341 §E3.4a
  - Potential need for column reinforcement
    - Continuity plates
    - Doublers

28

Member selection

- Beam
  - Maximum depth = $^{(360"-14")}/_7$ = 50"
  - W36 maximum nominal depth
  - 300 PLF maximum
  - $t_f \leq 1\frac{3}{4}$"
  - Prefer $r_y \geq 2$"
    - For bottom-flange brace spacing ≥ 8'
      - Maximum $L_b \sim 50 r_y$ for $R_y F_y$ = 55ksi
        - AISC 341 §D1.2b

AISC 358 §5.3

29

Member Selection

- Compactness
  - Use SDM Table
  - Note that RBS beam compactness is measured at the $^1/_6$ point of the cut
    - Additional sections not indicated in the table may work

$$b_{ef} = 2(R - c) + b_f - 2\sqrt{R^2 - \left(\frac{b}{3}\right)^2}$$

Table 1-3 (continued)
Sections That Satisfy Seismic Width-to-Thickness Requirements F_y = 50 ksi
W-Shapes

Assume $b_{ef} = 0.8 b_f$ for member selection; check later

30

Member Selection

- Strong-Column/ Weak-Beam (SCWB)
  - $\dfrac{\sum M_{pc}^*}{\sum M_{pb}^*} > 1$
  - Assume $\dfrac{\sum Z_c}{\sum Z_{RBS}} > 1.5$
    - 3.0 makes column reinforcement less likely
      - Not applicable to deep columns
    - RBS beam reduction
      - 30% assumed
    - SCWB checked later

AISC 341 §E3.4a

31

Beam and column numbers

1 column
1 beam

1 column
2 beams

2 columns
1 beam

2 columns
2 beams

32

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

Strong-column/Weak-beam

				W14X193	W14X176	W14X159	W14X145	W14X132	W14X120
		W27X114	343	1.48	1.33	1.20	1.08	0.97	0.88
		W27X102	305	1.66	1.50	1.34	1.22	1.10	0.99
		W27X94	278	1.82	1.64	1.47	1.34	1.20	1.09
		W27X84	244	2.08	1.87	1.68	1.52	1.37	1.24
		W24X103	280	1.81	1.63	1.46	1.33	1.19	1.08
		W24X94	254	2.00	1.80	1.61	1.46	1.32	1.19
		W24X84	224	2.26	2.04	1.83	1.66	1.49	1.35
		W24X76	200	2.54	2.29	2.05	1.86	1.67	1.51
		W24X68	177	2.87	2.58	2.32	2.10	1.89	1.71
		W24X62	153	3.31	2.99	2.68	2.43	2.18	1.98
		W24X55	134	3.78	3.41	3.06	2.77	2.49	2.26
		W21X68	160	3.17	2.86	2.56	2.32	2.09	1.89
		W21X62	144	3.52	3.17	2.85	2.58	2.32	2.10

33

Preliminary design

- Hand methods (see Naeim, assumptions added)

$$\Delta_i = C_d \frac{V_i h_i^2}{12}\left[\frac{1}{\sum \frac{EI_{c_i}}{h_i} + \sum \frac{EI_{b_i}}{L}}\right] = 0.02h_i$$

  o Assume typical $I_{c_i} = 2I_{b_i}$
    - End column $I_{c_i} = I_{b_i}$

$$I_{b_i} = \frac{V_i h_i}{12EN}\frac{C_d}{0.02}\left[\frac{h_i}{2} + L\right] \text{ for } N \text{ bays}$$

  o Reduces iterations
    - But with computers iterations are easy

34

Preliminary design

- Computer methods
  o Model with arbitrary member size
  o Increase or decrease stiffness to achieve proper drift
  o Use seismically compact members
  o Keep an eye on SC/WB

35

Iteration (computer analysis)

- Period changes with member changes
- Base shear changes with period
  o Use model to determine 1st-mode period T_1
    - Typically much larger than $C_u T_a$
    - Reduces forces greatly
- Modify scaling with each iteration
  o Each iteration permits reduction in forces until model period matches period used to derive forces
- Or use a response spectrum in analysis software

36

Iteration (computer analysis)

$C_u T_a = 0.92s$

T	C_s	V_{drift}	%V
0.90	0.083	276	102%
0.95	0.079	262	97%
1.00	0.075	248	92%
1.05	0.071	237	87%
1.10	0.068	226	83%
1.15	0.065	216	80%
1.20	0.063	207	76%
1.25	0.060	199	73%
1.30	0.058	191	71%
1.35	0.056	184	68%
1.40	0.054	177	66%
1.45	0.052	171	63%
1.50	0.050	166	61%

$T_1 = 1.53s$ (final iteration)

Constant acceleration [Eq. 12.8-2]
Transition to peak ground acceleration [not used for ELF]
Constant velocity [Eq. 12.8-3]
Seismic Response Coefficient, C_s
T_0 T_S
Period, T

37

Drift-determined period

$$S_a = C_s \left(\frac{R}{I_e}\right) g = \frac{S_{D1} g}{T/sec}$$

Adapted from Naeim's *Seismic Design Handbook*, 3.3.7

$$S_d = \frac{S_a}{\omega^2} = \frac{S_a T^2}{4\pi^2} = \frac{S_{D1} g T(sec)}{4\pi^2}$$

Constant acceleration [Eq. 12.8-2]
Transition to peak ground acceleration [not used for ELF]
Constant velocity [Eq. 12.8-3]
Seismic Response Coefficient, C_s
T_0 T_S
Period, T

$$S_d \approx \frac{2}{3}\Delta_{roof} = \frac{2}{3} 0.02h = \frac{S_{D1} g T(sec)}{4\pi^2}$$

$$T = \frac{2}{3}\frac{0.02h4\pi^2}{S_{D1} g \ (sec)} = \frac{2}{3}\frac{0.025h \ (sec)}{S_{D1} (feet)}$$

$$T = \frac{2}{3}\frac{0.025(51.5')(sec)}{0.6(feet)} = 1.4 sec$$

⅔ is an approximate correction factor
- Spectral displacement is not roof displacement
- 1st-mode mass participation <100%

38

Final iteration

W18x40 typical
W24x62 typical
W24x62 typical
W24x76 typical
24"x36" typical

W14x74, W14x132, W14x132, W14x74
W14x145, W14x193, W14x193, W14x145

Roof
4th
3rd
2nd
1st

39

RBS Modeling

- Many software packages facilitate more exact modeling of RBS stiffness
- Other methods available in journals
- Use of $I_{eff} = 0.9 I_b$ typically overestimates the reduction significantly

40

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

Final iteration

- 1st Mode period = 1.53s
- $C_{s(Drift)}$ = 0.049
- $V_{(Drift)}$ = 162K = 60% $V_{(Strength)}$

Drift ratio $\Delta = \dfrac{\delta_i}{h_i} = \dfrac{C_d \delta_{ei}}{I h_i}$

	Drift ratio
Story4	0.014
Story3	0.019
Story2	0.018
Story1	0.018

41

Final iteration

- Stiffness reduced compared to what was assumed in determining B_2
- Recalculate B_2
- Amplify displacements by final B_2

42

Second Order Effects: SMF

$$B_2 = \frac{1}{1 - \dfrac{P_{Story}\Delta}{\left[1 - 0.15\dfrac{P_{mf}}{P_{Story}}\right] V_{drift} h}}$$

$$B_2 = \frac{1}{1 - \dfrac{0.02 P_{Story}}{0.93 V_{drift}}}$$

	B_2
Roof	1.03
4th	1.04
3rd	1.05
2nd	1.06

- Drift-controlled
  - ○ Δ = 0.02h
- Use P-Δ gravity load
  - ○ P = 1.0D+0.5L
- Assume P_{mf} = ½ P_{story}
- B_2 = 1.06 (largest)
  - ○ Use ELM
  - ○ K=1

AISC 360 Appendix 8

43

Final iteration

- 1st Mode period = 1.53s
- $C_{s(Drift)}$ = 0.049
- $V_{(Drift)}$ = 162K = 60% $V_{(Strength)}$

B_2 * Drift ratio

Story4	0.0143	
Story3	0.0197	
Story2	0.0193	≤0.02 OK
Story1	0.0193	

B_2 ≤1.1 need not be considered but was for procedural consistency

44

Stability check (ASCE 7 12.8.7)

- $\theta_i = \dfrac{P_{story}\Delta I_e}{V_i h_i C_d}$

  - $\theta_{max} = \dfrac{1}{2\beta C_d} \leq 0.25$

    - $\beta = \dfrac{story\ shear\ demand}{story\ shear\ strength\ at\ first\ significant\ yield}$

    - Assume $\beta = \emptyset = 0.9$; $\theta_{max} = \dfrac{1}{2(0.9)(5.5)} = 0.10$

- $\theta_1 = \dfrac{3313K(0.0193h)(1.0)}{162K\,(h)5.5} = 0.07$ OK

  - $\dfrac{1}{1-\theta} = 1.08 \sim B_2$

ASCE 7 §12.8.7

45

Check irregularities

- Vertical soft story

  - Results from model

Level	Displacement (in.)	Shear (kips)	Stiffness (kips/in)
4th	0.637	60	95
3rd	0.860	113	132
2nd	0.840	146	174
1st	0.929	162	174

  - Story stiffness increases with story shear
 - Irregularity not present

46

Check irregularities

- Vertical weak story

  - Beam strength

    - Assume uniform RBS reduction %

Level	Beam	M_{pr} (ft-kip)	V_{Ecl} (kip)	ΣV_c (kip)
Roof	W18x40	303	22.1	638
4th	W24x62	591	44.0	633
3rd	W24x62	591	44.0	633
2nd	W24x76	772	57.5	782

  - Irregularity not present

47

What's the score?

- Member selection
  - Members meet compactness requirement
  - Members meet RBS prequalification limits
- Frame meets drift limit
- Frame meets ASCE stability requirement
- ELM with K=1 may be used
  - No DAM stiffness reductions

48

Slide 50

Connection design

	A	d	t_w	b_f	t_f	k	k_1	$b/2t_f$	h/t_w	I_x	Z_x
W24x62	18.2	23.7	0.430	7.04	0.590	1.63	$1^1/_{16}$	5.97	50.1	1550	153
W14x132	38.8	14.7	0.645	14.7	1.03	1.09	1 9/16	7.15	17.7	1530	234

Slide 51

Connection design

- Compute beam plastic-hinge moment
- Analyze beam at formation of plastic hinges
- Compute forces on connection
- Check connection limit states
  - AISC 341 (SC/WB)
  - AISC 358 (beam checks)
  - AISC 360 (WLY, WC, FLB, PZ)
- Example follows 2010 provisions

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

Slide 52

Compute beam plastic-hinge moment

- Select *a*, *b*, & *c*
  - *a* = 4" = 0.57b_{bf} $\quad 0.5b_{bf} \leq a \leq 0.75b_{bf}$
  - *b* = 16" = 0.68*d* $\quad 0.65d \leq b \leq 0.85d$
  - *c* = 1.5" = 0.21b_{bf} $\quad 0.1b_{bf} \leq c \leq 0.25b_{bf}$

$$Z_{RBS} = Z_x - 2ct_{bf}(d - t_{bf}) = 112in^3 = 73\%Z_x$$

$$M_{pr} = C_{pr}R_yF_yZ_{RBS} = (1.15)(1.1)(50ksi)(112in^3) = 7090\text{kip} * \text{in}$$

$$C_{pr} = \frac{F_y + F_u}{2F_y} \leq 1.2 \qquad C_{pr} = \frac{(50ksi) + (65ksi)}{2(50ksi)} = 1.15$$

AISC 358 §5.8

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

Beam analysis

- Geometry:
  - $s_h = a + {}^b/_2 = 12"$
  - $L_h = L - d_{col} - 2s_h = 360" - 14.7" - 2(12")$
  - $L_h = 321"$

Plastic hinge location

½ d_{col} s_h L_h ½ d_{col} s_h

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

53

Approximate RBS beam stiffness

- 10% reduction in beam stiffness may not be valid for some cases
  - Low span-to-depth ratios
    - As low as 5 permitted for IMF
  - Thick-flange/thin-web beams
    - Built up

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

54

Approximate RBS beam stiffness

- 10% reduction in beam stiffness very conservative for most cases
  - High span-to-depth ratios
    - ≥7 required for SMF
  - Typical flange/web thickness ratios
    - Rolled WF beams
- Sabelli approximate equation:

$$\frac{I_{ef}}{I} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{L_h}{(L_h + 2s_h)^2}\left[\frac{b}{1 - \left({}^{ct_f}/_I\right)(d - t_f)^2}\right]} = 0.93$$

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

55

Beam analysis

- Gravity distributed load
  - $w_u = 1.2D + 0.5L$
  - $w_u = 1.2(0.840\text{klf})D + 0.5(0.600\text{klf}) = 1.31\text{klf}$

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

56

Beam analysis

- Gravity shear
  - $V_g = \frac{1}{2} w_u L_h = \frac{1}{2}(1.31\text{klf})(321\text{in})(1\text{ft}/12\text{in})$
  - $V_g = 17.5\text{K}$
- Seismic shear
  - $V_{ecl} = 2M_{pr}/L_h = 2(7090\text{kip*in})/(321\text{in})=44.1\text{K}$
- Total shear
  - $V_{RBS1} = 17.5\text{K}+44.1\text{K}=61.6\text{K}$
 - $V_{RBS2} = 17.5\text{K}-44.1\text{K}=-26.6\text{K}$ (i.e., up)

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

57

Beam analysis

$M_{cl2} = M_{pr}+V_{RBS2}(s_h+\frac{1}{2}d_{col})$ $M_{cl2}=7610\text{kip*in}$
$M_{f2} = M_{pr}+V_{RBS2}s_h$ $M_{f2} = 7410\text{kip*in}$
Seismic moment diagram M_{pr} $M_{pr}=7090\text{kip*in}$

Total moment diagram

$\frac{1}{2} d_{col}$ L_h $\frac{1}{2} d_{col}$

$M_{pr}=7090\text{kip*in}$
$M_{f1}=7830\text{kip*in}$ $M_{f1}=M_{pr}+V_{RBS1}s_h$
$M_{cl1} = 8280\text{kip*in}$ $M_{cl1} = M_{pr}+V_{RBS1}(s_h+\frac{1}{2}d_{col})$

58

Beam analysis (interior column)

$M_{cl2} = M_{pr}+V_{RBS2}(s_h+\frac{1}{2}d_{col})$ $M_{cl2} = M_{pr}+V_{RBS2}(s_h+\frac{1}{2}d_{col})$
$M_{f2} = M_{pr}+V_{RBS2}s_h$ $M_{f2} = M_{pr}+V_{RBS2}s_h$
M_{pr} M_{pr}

M_{pr} M_{pr}
$M_{f1}=M_{pr}+V_{RBS1}s_h$ $M_{f1}=M_{pr}+V_{RBS1}s_h$
$M_{cl1} = M_{pr}+V_{RBS1}(s_h+\frac{1}{2}d_{col})$ $M_{cl1} = M_{pr}+V_{RBS1}(s_h+\frac{1}{2}d_{col})$

59

Check section at column face

- Moment
  - $\phi M_n = 1.0 Z_x R_y F_y$
  - $\phi M_n = 8415\text{kip} * \text{in} > 7830\text{kip} * \text{in}$ OK
- Shear
  - $\phi V_n = 306K$ Table 3-6
  - $\phi V_n = 306K > 61.6K$ OK

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

60

Strong-Column/Weak-Beam

AISC 341 §E3.4a

- $\dfrac{\sum M_{pc}^*}{\sum M_{pb}^*} > 1$

- $M_{pc}^* = Z_c\left(F_y - {P_u}/{A}\right) + V_c\, {d_b}/{2}$
  - $P_u\quad = 1.4D + 0.5L + 3.0E_h = 249K$
  - $V_c = \dfrac{2V_{ecl}{}^{L}/_2}{{}^1/_2 h_i + {}^1/_2 h_{i-1}} = 106K$
  - $M_{pc}^* = 11{,}500\,kip*in$
  - $\sum M_{pc}^* = 22{,}900\,kip*in$

V_c
V_{Ecl}
V_{Ecl}
V_c

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

61

Strong-Column/Weak-Beam

- $\sum M_{pb}^* = M_{cl1} + M_{cl2} = 15{,}900\,kip*in$

- $\dfrac{\sum M_{pc}^*}{\sum M_{pb}^*} = \dfrac{22{,}900\,kip*in}{15{,}900\,kip*in} = 1.44$ OK

$\dfrac{\sum Z_c}{\sum Z_{RBS}} = 2.1$ (just to gage the effectiveness of this as a predictor of SCWB ratio)

AISC 341 §E3.4a

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

62

Forces at column face

- $P_f = \dfrac{0.85 M_f}{d_b - t_{bf}} = 288K$ AISC 341-16 E3.6f

- Web Local yielding
  - $\phi R_n = \phi(5k_c + N)F_y t_{cw}$
  - $\phi R_n = 1.0(5k_c + t_{bf})F_y t_{cw} = 282K$ NG
    - Continuity plates required for 288K-282K=6K

AISC 360 §J.10

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

63

Forces at column face

- Web crippling
  - $\phi R_n = \phi 0.80 t_{cw}^2 \left[1 + 3\left(\dfrac{N}{d_c}\right)\left(\dfrac{t_{cw}}{t_{cf}}\right)^{1.5}\right]\sqrt{\dfrac{EF_{yw}t_{cf}}{t_{cw}}}$
  - $\phi R_n = 0.75 * 0.80 t_{cw}^2 \left[1 + 3\left(\dfrac{t_{bf}}{d_c}\right)\left(\dfrac{t_{cw}}{t_{cf}}\right)^{1.5}\right]\sqrt{\dfrac{EF_{yw}t_{cf}}{t_{cw}}}$
  - $\phi R_n = 402K$, OK

AISC 360 §J.10

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

64

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

Forces at column face

- Flange local bending
  - $\emptyset R_n = 0.9 * 6.25 t_{cf}{}^2 F_{yc}$ =298K OK
  - More stringent requirement in AISC 341-10 §E3.6f
    - $t_{cf} \geq 0.4 \sqrt{1.8 b_{bf} t_{bf} \left(\frac{F_{yb} R_{yb}}{F_{yc} R_{yc}}\right)}$ equivalent to
      - $6.25 t_{cf}{}^2 \geq 1.8 b_{bf} t_{bf} \left(\frac{F_{yb} R_{yb}}{F_{yc} R_{yc}}\right)$
      - $0.9 * 6.25 F_{yc} t_{cf}{}^2 \geq \frac{0.9*1.8}{R_{yc}} b_{bf} t_{bf} F_{yb} R_{yb}$
    - $R_u \sim 1.5 b_{bf} t_{bf} R_y F_{yb} = 343K$
      - Continuity plates would be required

AISC 360 §J.10

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

65

Additional AISC 341 check

- $t_{cf} \geq {}^{b_{bf}}/_6$
- $t_{cf} = 1.03 in$
- ${}^{b_{bf}}/_6 = {}^{7.04 in}/_6 = 1.17 in > 1.03 in$, NG
  - Continuity plates required

AISC 341 §E3.6f

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

66

Panel Zone

- $V_u = \frac{M_{f1}+M_{f2}}{d_b} - V_c = 643K - 106K = 537K$
- $\phi V_n = 1.0 F_y \left[0.6 t_{cw} d_c + \frac{1.8 b_{cf} t_{cf}^2}{d_b}\right]$ AISC 341 E3.6e(1)
- ϕV_n =285K+59K=344k
- Doubler required
  - 537K-344K=193K
  - $193K \frac{t_{cw}}{285k}$ =0.44", ½"doubler required

2 W24x62 beams
2 W14x132 columns

67

Optimization

There's always a solution in steel.

Optimization

- Current design works
  - Meets drift limit
  - Connection can meet all limit states
    - Requires continuity plates
    - Requires doubler
- Investigate design of equivalent stiffness
  - Heavier column
  - Lighter beam
  - Eliminate reinforcement

69

Elimination of doublers and continuity plates

For RBS: $I_{B2} \geq \dfrac{1}{0.9 \frac{N_c}{N_b} \frac{h}{L} \left(\frac{\Delta_{all}}{\Delta I_{C1}} - \frac{1}{I_{C2}} \right) + \frac{\Delta_{all}}{\Delta I_{B1}}}$

Elimination of doublers and continuity plates

- Try W14x145
  - $I_{b2} \geq 1460\text{in}^4$
  - W24x62
    - $I_b = 1550\text{in}^4$
  - Continuity plates
  - 5/16" doubler

- Try W14x159
  - $I_{b2} \geq 1420\text{in}^4$
  - W24x62
    - $I_b = 1550\text{in}^4$
  - No continuity plates
  - 3/16" doubler

- Try W14x176
  - $I_{b2} \geq 1360\text{in}^4$
  - W24x55
    - $I_b = 1350\text{in}^4$
    - Check drift!
  - No continuity plates
  - No doubler

Frame:
$N_c = N_b = 2$
$h = 12.5'$
$L = 30'$

Original design:
W24x62: $I_{b1} = 1550\text{in}^4$
W14x132: $I_{c1} = 1530\text{in}^4$
$\Delta_{all}/\Delta = 1.02$

For RBS: $I_{B2} \geq \dfrac{1}{0.9 \frac{N_c}{N_b} \frac{h}{L} \left(\frac{\Delta_{all}}{\Delta I_{C1}} - \frac{1}{I_{C2}} \right) + \frac{\Delta_{all}}{\Delta I_{B1}}}$

Optimization

- Original design
  - W24x62 beams $\frac{Z_c}{Z_{RBS}} = 2.1$
  - W14x132 columns
  - 1.9% drift
  - 4th floor
    - Continuity plates
    - Doubler plate
  - Roof (not shown)
    - Continuity plates
    - No doubler plate

- Redesign (3 bays) $\frac{Z_c}{Z_{RBS}} = 3.2$
  - W24x55 beams
  - W14x176 columns
  - 2.0% drift
  - 1230# more steel
    - +$1230
  - No continuity plates
    - 32 eliminated:
      - −$3200
  - No doubler plates
    - 2 eliminated:
      - −$600

$2570 savings

72

Beam strength design

There's always a solution in steel.

structural
STEEL

Beam design

74

Beam design

- 4th floor beam
- W24x62 (original design)
- V_u superseded by capacity design
- P_u = 6K (can be neglected)

75

Beam design

- Lateral bracing
  - Top flange continuously braced by deck
  - Brace at each RBS (just outside)

AISC 341 §E3.4b

76

Beam design

- Lateral bracing for *highly ductile members*
  - $L_b \leq 0.086 \frac{r_y E}{F_y} = 0.095 \frac{r_y E}{R_y F_y} = 50 r_y = 50(1.38") = 5.76'$
  - Brace @ 25.5'/5=5.1'
- Alternative: use W21x73
  - I=1600in^4 (compared to 1550in^4 for W24x62)
  - $50 r_y = 50(1.81") = 7.5'$
  - Brace @ 25.5'/4=6.4'
  - Redesign connection

AISC 341 §D1.2b

77

Beam design

- Lateral bracing

$\frac{1}{2} d_{col}$ a   b   L−2(a+b)− d_{col} = 25.5'   b   a

78

Beam design

- 4th floor beam
- W24x62 (original design)
- M_u = 1.4D + 0.5L+ 1.0E_h
  - M_u = 1.4D + 0.5L+ 1.0($B_2$162'K)
  - w_u = 1.4(0.840klf) +0.5(0.600klf) = 1.48klf
  - At column centerline
    - M_u = w_u (30ft)^2/12+ 1.0([1.05]162'K) = 281'K
  - At RBS: ϕM_n =0.9 $F_y Z_{RBS}$= 5040"K=420'K OK

79

Beam design

- At L_b>L_p (1st segment outside RBS)
  - $M_u \approx 281'K \frac{180" - {d_c}/{_2} - s_h}{180"} = 0.89 M_u = 250'K$
  - C_b=1.2 (see SDM Example 4.3.3 for method)
  - ϕM_n = 570'K
    - for L_b= 5.5' and C =1.0 (Table 3-10)
    - For C_b=1.2, 1.2*570'K = 684'K
  - ϕM_n = 0.9 $F_y Z_x$ = 574'K OK

80

Beam design

$$C_b = \frac{12.5 M_{max}}{2.5 M_{max} + 3M_A + 4M_B + 3M_C}$$

For straight-line moment diagram (no distributed load)

$M_1/M_2 \sim 1 - 2L_b/L_h$

AISC 360 §F.1

81

Column strength design

There's always a solution in steel.

structural
STEEL

Column design

	A	d	t_w	b_f	t_f	k_1	W	$b_f/2t_f$	h/t_w	I_x	Z_x
W14x145	42.7	14.8	0.680	15.5	1.09	1 9/16	145	7.11	16.8	1710	260

Roof

W18x40 typical

W24x62 typical

W24x62 typical

W24x76 typical

24"x36" typical

4th, 3rd, 2nd, 1st

W14x74, W14x132, W14x132, W14x74

W14x145, W14x193, W14x193, W14x145

14'-0", 12'-6", 12'-6", 12'-6"

83

Column design

- Case 1
  - Combo M-BLC-1
    - $1.4D + 0.5L + 1.0E_h$
    - By inspection compression controls
  - Axial and flexure considered
    - B_1 and B_2 apply

- Case 2
  - Combo M-OLC-1
    - $1.4D + 0.5L + 3.0E_h$
    - By inspection compression controls
  - Axial in the absence of flexure considered
    - B_2 applies

AISC 341 §D1.4a

84

Column design

- Shear
  - V_D = 3.2K
  - V_L = 1.5K
  - V_E = B_2 25.9K
    = 1.07(25.9K)
    = 27.7K
  - Shear strength OK by inspection

- Axial
  - P_D = 151.8K
  - P_L = 60.8K
  - P_E = B_2 51.6K
    = 55.2K

- Moment
  - M_D = 29.7'K
  - M_L = 13.6'K
  - M_E = B_2 200'K
    = 214'K

85

Column design (case 1)

- Combo M-BLC-1
  - $1.4D + 0.5L + 1.0E_h$
- Axial
  - P_u = 1.4(151.8K)+0.5(60.8K)+(55.2K) =298K
- Moment
  - M_u = 1.4(29.7'K)+0.5(13.6'K)+(214'K) =262'K

86

Column design (case 1)

- $B_1 = \dfrac{C_m}{1 - P_u/P_{E1}} \geq 1$
  - Assume C_m=0.6 (for triangular moment diagram)

  $C_m<0.6$ C_m=0.6 $C_m>0.6$ C_m=1.0

  - $P_{E1} = \dfrac{\pi^2 EI}{L^2} = 17{,}340K$ If C_m=0.6
    $B_1 = 1\ for\ P_u \leq 0.4 P_{E1}$
  - $B_1 = 1$

AISC 360 Appendix 8

87

Column design (case 1)

- ϕP_n = 1690K (Table 4-1)
  - $P_u / \phi P_n$ = 0.18
- ϕM_n = 975'K ($L_b<L_p$, Table 3-2)
- $\frac{1}{2} P_u / \phi P_n + M_u / \phi M_n$ = 0.36 OK

88

Column design (case 2)

- Combo M-OLC-1
  - $1.4D + 0.5L + 3.0E_h$
- No moment
- Axial
  - $P_u = 1.4(151.8K)+0.5(60.8K)+3.0(55.2K)$
    $=408K$
  - $P_u/\phi P_n = 0.24$ OK

89

Base-plate design

There's always a solution in steel.

structural
STEEL

Base-plate design

	A	d	t_w	b_f	t_f	k_1	W	$b_f/2t_f$	h/t_w	I_x	Z_x
W14x145	42.7	14.8	0.680	15.5	1.09	1 9/16	145	7.11	16.8	1710	260

91

Base-plate design

- Overstrength forces
- Additional ductility still helpful
- Consider tension case
- Follow Design Guide 1 method
  - Example 4.4.3 in SDM
  - "Base plate with large moment" method

92

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

23

Base-plate design

- Shear
  - V_D = 3.2K
  - V_L = 1.5K
  - V_E = B_2 25.9K
    = 1.07(25.9K)
    = 27.7K

- Axial
  - P_D = 151.8K
  - P_L = 60.8K
  - P_E = B_2 51.6K
    = 55.2K

- Moment
  - M_D = 12.8'K
  - M_L = 5.8'K
  - M_E = B_2 196'K
    = 209'K

93

Base-plate design

- $R_u = 0.7D + 3.0E_h$
  - combo M-OLC-2 (session L1)
- V_u =   85.3K
- P_u =   59.3K   Tension
- M_u =   635'K
  - Column expected strength:
    - $1.1R_yF_yZ_x$ = 1310'K   D2.6c(b)

94

Base-plate design

95

Base-plate design

- $f_{pmax} = \emptyset 0.85 f_c' \sqrt{\frac{A_2}{A_1}} =$
  $(0.65)0.85(4ksi)2 = 4.42ksi$
- $q_{max} = f_{pmax}B = 4.42ksi(32") = 141K/in$
- $e = {M_u}/{P_u} = {635'K}/{-59.3K} = -128"$

AISC Design Guide 1 §3.4

96

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

Base-plate design

- $Y = \left[f + \frac{N}{2}\right] \pm \sqrt{\left(f + \frac{N}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{2P_u(e+f)}{q_{max}}}$

- $Y =$
  $$\left[12" + \frac{32"}{2}\right] \pm$$
  $$\sqrt{\left(12" + \frac{32"}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{2(-59.3K)\,(-128"+12")}{141K/in}}$$

- Y = 54.2", <u>1.81"</u>

- $T = q_{max}Y + P_u$ =141K/in*1.81"+59.3K=314K

  78.6K/rod   AISC Design Guide 1 §3.4

97

Base-plate design

m = 8.97"

n = 9.80""

98

Base-plate design

- Flexure at the bearing side

- $t_p \geq 2.11 \sqrt{\dfrac{f_{pmax}Y\left[max(m,n) - Y/2\right]}{F_y}}$

- $t_p \geq 2.11 \sqrt{\dfrac{4.42ksi(1.81")\left[9.80" - 1.81"/2\right]}{50ksi}} = 2.51"$

- Use 2¾" plate

AISC Design Guide 1 §3.4

99

Base-plate design

- Flexure at the tension side
  - $x = f - d/2 + t_f/2$ = 5.15"
  - $t_p \geq 2.11 \sqrt{\dfrac{Tx}{BF_y}}$ = 2.1" Use 2¾" plate

AISC Design Guide 1 §3.4

100

Anchor-rod design

- Shear
  - V_u = 85.3K/4bolts
    = 21.4K/bolt
- Moment
  - $e = \frac{1}{2} t_{wp} + t_{bp} + t_{gr}$
    - $e = \frac{1}{2}(1"[\text{assumed}]) + 2\frac{3}{4}" + 2" = 5\frac{1}{4}"$
  - $M_u = \frac{1}{2} V_u e$
    = 56.2"K

½t_{wp}
t_{bp}
t_{gr}
e

4 bolts in tension only

4 bolts in shear & bending only

101

Anchor-rod design (tension)

- Check anchor rod
  - Loads
    - M_u = 0"K
    - T_u = 78.6K
    - V_u = 0K
  - Properties
    - d = 1½"
    - A = 1.77in^2
    - A_{net} = 1.41in^2=0.795A
      - Table 7-17
    - Z = 0.563in^3
  - Stresses
    - $F_{nt} = 0.795F_u = 59.7$ksi
    - $F_{nv} = 0.45F_u = 33.8$ksi
    - $f_v = \frac{V_u}{A} = 0ksi$
    - $f_a = \frac{T_u}{A} = 44.5ksi$
    - $f_b = \frac{M_u}{Z} = 0ksi$
    - $f_t = f_a + f_b = 44.5ksi$
    - $F'_{nt} = \left[1.3 - \frac{f_v}{\emptyset F_{nv}}\right] F_{nt} \leq F_{nt}$
    - $\emptyset F'_{nt} = (0.75)59.7ksi = 44.7ksi$
    - $f_t \leq \emptyset F'_{nt}$ OK

Note: F_{nt} =0.75 F_u accounts for effective net area approximately. This method does so explicitly.

AISC 341 §J3.7 102

Anchor-rod design (shear)

- Check anchor rod
  - Loads
    - M_u = 56.2"K
    - T_u = 0K
    - V_u = 21.4K
  - Properties
    - d = 2"
    - A = πin^2
    - A_{net} = 2.50in^2=0.795A
      - Table 7-17
    - Z = 1.33in^3
  - Stresses
    - $F_{nt} = 0.795F_u = 59.7$ksi
    - $F_{nv} = 0.45F_u = 33.8$ksi
    - $f_v = \frac{V_u}{A} = 3.4ksi$
    - $f_a = \frac{T_u}{A} = 0ksi$
    - $f_b = \frac{M_u}{Z} = 42.1ksi$
    - $f_t = f_a + f_b = 42.1ksi$
    - $F'_{nt} = \left[1.3 - \frac{f_v}{\emptyset F_{nv}}\right] F_{nt} \leq F_{nt}$
    - $\emptyset F'_{nt} = (0.75)59.7ksi = 44.7ksi$
    - $f_t \leq \emptyset F'_{nt}$ OK

AISC 341 §J3.7

103

Anchor-rod design

- Rods designed for tension only:
  - 1½" diameter
  - Utilizes calculated net section
- Rods designed for tension on one side, shear and bending on the other
  - 2" diameter
  - Rods are not a good bending element
- Rods designed for tension, shear, and bending
  - 2¼" diameter

104

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

Anchor-rod design

- Shear alternatives (no moment in rods)
  - Bearing of base plate and column
    - OK for base plates embedded in slabs
    - Concrete reinforcement to complete load path
    - $f_p = \emptyset 0.85 f_c' = (0.65)0.85(4ksi) = 2.2ksi$
    - $f_p B t_p$ = 2.2ksi*32"*3" = 211K
  - Friction
    - $C\mu$ = (141K/in*1.81")(0.4)=102K   ACI 349

105

Anchor-rod design

Shear alternatives

Rods designed for tension only can provide some inelastic rotation capacity; bond with concrete should be broken to allow elongation

106

Anchor-rod design

Table 14-2
Recommended Maximum Sizes for Anchor-Rod Holes in Base Plates

Increase for grade 55

- Use (8) 1½"Grade 55 anchor rod F1554, S1

Anchor Rod Diameter, in.	Hole Diameter, in.	Min. Washer Size, in.	Min. Washer Thickness
$1^1/_2$	$2^5/_{16}$	$3^1/_2$	$^5/_8$
$1^3/_4$	$2^3/_4$	4	$^7/_8$
2	$3^1/_4$	5	$^3/_4$
$2^1/_2$	$3^3/_4$	$5^1/_2$	$^7/_8$

Notes: 1. Circular or square washers meeting the washer size are acceptable.
2. Clearance must be considered when choosing an appropriate anchor rod hole location, noting effects such as the position of the rod in the hole with respect to the column, weld size and other interferences.
3. When base plates are less than $1^1/_4$ in. thick, punching of holes may be an economical option. In this case, $^3/_4$-in. anchor rods and $1^1/_{16}$-in.-diameter punched holes may be used with ASTM F844 (USS Standard) washers in place of fabricated plate washers.

107

Anchor-rod design

- Unpublished recommendations to prevent plate dishing:
  - Grade 36
    - Use Table 14-2
  - Grade 55
    - Use $t=0.4d_{rod}$
  - Grade 105
    - Use $t=0.69d_{rod}$

108

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

27

Base connection design

- Potential sources of base inelastic rotation
  - Column inelastic rotation
    - Significant overstrength
    - Affects column
  - Anchor-rod elongation
    - Compression increases overstrength
    - $M_c = P_u(N-2*4")/2 = 298K(2')/2 = 298'K$
  - Base plate flexure
    - Compression increases overstrength
  - Foundation rotation

109

Base connection design

- Column strength
  - $R_y F_y Z_x = 1191'K$
- Anchor rods
  - $M_y \sim \Sigma AdF_y \sim \Sigma A(N-2*4")F_y + M_c$
    - $M_y \sim 1060'K$ (1½" rods); 1340'K @ F_u
    - $M_y \sim 1660'K$ (2" rods); 2170'K @ F_u
- Base plate
  - $M_y \sim [M_{p.plate}/4"](N-2*4") + M_c$
    - $M_{p.plate} = F_y B t_p^2/4 = 3025"K$
  - $M_y \sim 1810'K$

N

4"

110

Base connection design

- M-OLC-2
  - $M_u = 0.9D + E_v + \Omega_o E_h \qquad = 652'K$
- Use 1½" anchor rods
- Design column connection to develop column strength
  - CJP flanges
  - Web
    - Use $^7/_{16}$" weld = $0.64 t_w$

111

Base connection design

$^7/_{16}$ DCW

CJP Flanges DCW

Gr. 50 Plate 2¾"x32"x32"

(8) 1½" Gr. 55 Anchor rods with ⅝"x3½"x3½" plate washers at base plate and at bottom. De-bond rods from concrete.

112

Completion of design

Completion of design

- Connection
  - Indicate DCW
  - Indicate weld tab removal
  - Indicate steel backing requirements
- Beam
  - Indicate protected zone
  - Design lateral braces
- Column
  - Design column splice

114

Completion of design

- Base plate
  - Provide load path for shear
  - Design concrete anchorage/force transfer to foundation
  - Design grade beam for ductile rotation
- Specifications
  - Specify weld toughness requirements
  - Specify Quality Assurance Plan

115

Summary

Summary

- SMF tend to be governed by drift
  - Design for drift first
  - Conservative assumptions in strength design do not generally affect design
    - $C_b = 1$
    - $C_m = 1$
    - Combine maxima in lieu of performing multiple calculations
- Selecting heavier columns initially reduces reinforcement

117

End of Session L3

Next:
Design of the Braced frames

There's always a solution in steel.

structural STEEL

Additional resources

THE SEISMIC DESIGN HANDBOOK
Second Edition
Farzad Naeim

119

Question time

There's always a solution in steel.

structural STEEL

Individual Webinar Registrants
CEU/PDH Certificates

Within 2 business days…

- You will receive an email on how to report attendance from: registration@aisc.org.
- Be on the lookout: Check your spam filter! Check your junk folder!
- Completely fill out online form. Don't forget to check the boxes next to each attendee's name!

Individual Webinar Registrants
CEU/PDH Certificates

Within 2 business days…

- New reporting site (URL will be provided in the forthcoming email).
- Username: Same as AISC website username.
- Password: Same as AISC website password.

8-Session Package Registrants
CEU/PDH Certificates

One certificate will be issued at the conclusion of all 8 sessions.

8-Session Package Registrants
CEU/PDH Certificates

Videos and Quizzes
- For Sessions R1 – R4, access has been available since July 16.
- For Sessions L1 – L4, find access within two days after the live air date. (An email will be sent from webinars@aisc.org.)
- All video recordings are available through October 22.
- All quizzes are due October 22.
- A final exam will also be given. It will be available October 5 and due October 22.
- Quiz scores are displayed in the Course Resources table.

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

8-Session Package Registrants
CEU/PDH Certificates

Attendance and PDH Certificates
- For Sessions R1 – R4, you must pass the quiz to receive credit for the session.
- For Sessions L1 – L4, you have two options to receive credit for the session.
  - Option 1: Watch the session live. Credit for live attendance will be displayed in the Course Resources table within two days of the session.
  - Option 2: Watch the recording and pass the quiz.

EEU Certificates – Certificate of Completion
- In addition to PDH certificates earned for each individual session, an EEU (Equivalent Education Unit) certificate of completion will be issued for participants who complete the full course. Participants must pass at least 7 of 8 quizzes and the final exam to earn the EEU.

Distribution of Certificates
- All certificates (PDH and EEU) will be issued after the course is completed (the week of October 22). Only the registrant will receive certificates for the course.

8-Session Package Registrants
Course Resources

Find all your handouts, quizzes and quiz scores, recording access, and attendance information all in one place!

8-Session Package Registrants
Course Resources

Go to www.aisc.org and sign in.

8-Session Package Registrants
Course Resources

Go to www.aisc.org and sign in.

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction

8-Session Package Registrants
Course Resources

8-Session Package Registrants
Course Resources

Thank You

Please give us your feedback!
Survey at conclusion of webinar.

There's always a solution in steel.

structural
STEEL

Copyright © 2018
American Institute of Steel Construction