



# Quantification of Building Seismic Performance Factors

ATC-63 Project Report - 90% Draft

FEMA P695 / April 2008



FEMA





# **Quantification of Building Seismic Performance Factors**

## **ATC-63 Project Report - 90% Draft**

Prepared by

APPLIED TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway, Suite 240  
Redwood City, California 94065  
[www.ATCouncil.org](http://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  
William T. Holmes  
John Hooper  
Allan R. Porush  
Christopher Rojahn (Project Exec. Director)

### **WORKING GROUPS**

Jason Chou  
Jianis Christovasilis  
Kelly Cobeen  
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

April 22, 2008



## **Notice**

Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Homeland Security's Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or the Applied Technology Council (ATC). 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 is to establish and document a recommended methodology for reliably quantifying building system performance and response parameters for use in seismic design. A key parameter to be addressed is the response modification coefficient ( $R$  factor), but related design parameters such as the system overstrength factor ( $\Omega_0$ ) and deflection amplification factor ( $C_d$ ) are also addressed. Collectively these factors are referred to as “Seismic Performance Factors”.

$R$  factors are used to estimate strength demands on systems that are designed using linear methods 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 largely on judgment and on qualitative comparisons with the known response capabilities of relatively few lateral-force resisting systems in use at the time. Since then, the number of systems addressed in current seismic codes and the most recent edition of the *NEHRP Recommended Provisions* has increased substantially. The potential response characteristics of these recently defined systems, and their ability to meet seismic design performance objectives, are both untested and unknown.

The recommended methodology described in this report is a refinement of an earlier preliminary version of the methodology. It is based on a review of relevant research on nonlinear response and collapse simulation, benchmarking studies of selected structural systems, feedback from an expanded group of experts and potential users, and evaluations of additional structural systems to verify the technical soundness and applicability of the approach.

ATC is indebted to the members of the ATC-63 Project Team for their efforts in the technical development of the recommended methodology, and to the leadership of Charlie Kircher, Project Technical Director. 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 Cobeen, Curt Haselton, Abbie Liel, Jianis Christovasilis, Jason Chou, Stephen Cranford, Brian Dean, Kevin Haas, Jiro Takagi, Assawin Wanitkorkul, and Farzin Zareian. The affiliations of these individuals 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 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

Preface .....	iii
List of Figures.....	xiii
List of Tables .....	xxi
<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Background and Purpose .....	1-1
1.2 Scope and Basis of the Methodology .....	1-2
1.2.1 New Building Structures.....	1-2
1.2.2 NEHRP Recommended Provisions and ASCE 7-05 .....	1-2
1.2.3 Life Safety .....	1-3
1.2.4 Structure Collapse.....	1-3
1.2.5 MCE Ground Motions .....	1-4
1.2.6 Seismic Performance Factors.....	1-5
1.2.7 Collapse Margin Ratio.....	1-8
1.2.8 Archetypes and Nonlinear Analyses.....	1-9
1.2.9 Performance Evaluation.....	1-9
1.3 Content and Organization .....	1-10
<b>2. Methodology .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
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
<b>3. Required System Information.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 General .....	3-1
3.2 Intended Applications and Performance .....	3-1
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 .....	3-4
3.3.4 Configuration Issues .....	3-5
3.3.5 Material Properties.....	3-5
3.3.6 Strength and Stiffness Requirements .....	3-6

	3.3.7	Quality Rating for design Requirements .....	3-7
3.4		Data from Experimental Investigation .....	3-10
	3.4.1	Objectives of Testing Program.....	3-10
	3.4.2	General Testing Issues .....	3-11
	3.4.3	Material Testing Program.....	3-13
	3.4.4	Component, Connection, and Assembly Testing Program.....	3-14
	3.4.5	Loading History .....	3-16
	3.4.6	System Testing Program .....	3-17
	3.4.7	Quality Rating of test Data.....	3-18
3.5		Documentation .....	3-20
<b>4.</b>	<b>Archetype Development.....</b>		<b>4-1</b>
4.1		Development of Structure System Archetypes .....	4-1
4.2		Index Archetype Configurations .....	4-2
	4.2.1	Structural Configuration Issues.....	4-2
	4.2.2	Seismic Behavioral Effects .....	4-6
	4.2.3	Components not Designated as Part of the Seismic-Force-Resisting System.....	4-8
	4.2.4	Other Controlling Load Cases.....	4-9
4.3		Performance Groups.....	4-9
	4.3.1	Identification of Performance Groups.....	4-9
4.4		Documentation .....	4-11
<b>5.</b>	<b>Nonlinear Model Development.....</b>		<b>5-1</b>
5.1		Development of Nonlinear Models for Collapse Simulation .....	5-1
5.2		Index Archetype Designs .....	5-1
	5.2.1	Performance Group Design variations .....	5-3
5.3		Index Archetype Models .....	5-4
	5.3.1	Index Archetype Model Idealization.....	5-6
5.4		Simulated Collapse Modes.....	5-8
5.5		Nonlinear Model Calibration .....	5-11
5.6		Non-Simulated Collapse Modes.....	5-13
5.7		Characterization of Modeling Uncertainties .....	5-15
5.8		Quality Rating of Index Archetype Models .....	5-15
	5.8.1	Structural Behavioral Characteristics.....	5-16
	5.8.2	Accuracy and Robustness of Models .....	5-17
5.9		Documentation .....	5-18
<b>6.</b>	<b>Nonlinear Analysis .....</b>		<b>6-1</b>
6.1		Nonlinear Analysis Procedures .....	6-1
	6.1.1	Nonlinear Analysis Software .....	6-1
6.2		Input Ground Motions.....	6-2
	6.2.1	Ground Motion Hazard .....	6-3
	6.2.2	Ground Motion Record Sets.....	6-4
	6.2.3	Ground Motion Record Scaling .....	6-5
6.3		Nonlinear Static (Pushover) Analyses.....	6-6
6.4		Nonlinear Dynamic (Response History) Analyses.....	6-8
	6.4.1	Record Scaling .....	6-11
	6.4.2	Specified Damping for Nonlinear Dynamic Analyses .....	6-11

6.4.3	Two-Dimensional versus Three-Dimensional Nonlinear Dynamic Analyses .....	6-12
6.4.4	Adjustment of Collapse Margin Ratio for Three-Dimensional Nonlinear Dynamic Analyses.....	6-12
6.4.5	Summary of Procedure for Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis .....	6-12
6.5	Documentation of Analysis Results.....	6-13
6.5.1	Documentation of Nonlinear Models.....	6-13
6.5.2	Data from Nonlinear Static Analyses .....	6-14
6.5.3	Data from Nonlinear Dynamic Analyses .....	6-14
<b>7.</b>	<b>Performance Evaluation.....</b>	<b>7-1</b>
7.1	Overview of the Performance Evaluation Process.....	7-1
7.1.1	Performance Groups .....	7-3
7.1.2	Acceptable Probability of Collapse .....	7-4
7.2	Adjusted Collapse Margin Ratio.....	7-4
7.2.1	Effect of Spectral Shape on Collapse Margin.....	7-4
7.2.2	Spectral Shape Factors.....	7-5
7.3	Total System Collapse Uncertainty .....	7-6
7.3.1	Sources of Uncertainty.....	7-6
7.3.2	Combining Uncertainties in Collapse Evaluation.....	7-7
7.3.3	Effect of Uncertainty on Collapse Margin.....	7-8
7.3.4	Total System Collapse Uncertainty .....	7-10
7.4	Acceptable Values of Adjusted Collapse Margin Ratio .....	7-12
7.5	Evaluation of the Response Modification Coefficient, $R$ .....	7-13
7.6	Evaluation of the Overstrength Factor, $\Omega_0$ .....	7-13
7.7	Evaluation of the Deflection Amplification Factor, $C_d$ ....	7-13
<b>8.</b>	<b>Documentation and Peer Review.....</b>	<b>8-1</b>
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 .....	8-3
8.2	Documentation of System Development and Results.....	8-2
8.3	Peer Review Panel .....	8-3
8.4	Submittal.....	8-4
<b>9.</b>	<b>Example Applications.....</b>	<b>9-1</b>
9.1	General .....	9-1
9.2	Example Application - Reinforced Concrete Special Moment Frame System .....	9-1
9.2.1	Introduction.....	9-1
9.2.2	Overview and Approach .....	9-2
9.2.3	Structural System Information.....	9-3

9.2.4	Identification of RC SMF Archetypes Configurations.....	9-4
9.2.5	Development of Nonlinear Structural Archetype Models.....	9-6
9.2.6	Nonlinear Structural Analyses .....	9-10
9.2.7	Evaluation of Collapse Margin and Acceptance Criteria .....	9-14
9.2.8	Iteration: Adjustment of Design Requirements to Meet Performance Goals.....	9-18
9.2.9	Summary Observations - Reinforced Concrete Special Moment Frame System.....	9-21
9.3	Example Application - Reinforced Concrete Ordinary Moment Frame System .....	9-22
9.3.1	Introduction .....	9-22
9.3.2	Overview and Approach .....	9-22
9.3.3	Structural System Information .....	9-23
9.3.4	Seismic Design Criteria.....	9-23
9.3.5	Identification of RC OMF Archetype Configurations.....	9-24
9.3.6	Nonlinear Analysis Models and Results .....	9-28
9.3.7	Evaluation of RC OMF System in SDC C.....	9-35
9.3.8	Evaluation of $\Omega_0$ using Archetype Designs .....	9-37
9.3.9	Summary Observations - Reinforced Concrete Ordinary Moment Frame System.....	9-38
9.4	Example Application - Wood Light-Frame System.....	9-38
9.4.1	Introduction .....	9-38
9.4.2	Overview and Approach .....	9-38
9.4.3	Design Requirements .....	9-39
9.4.4	Test Data .....	9-39
9.4.5	Identification of Wood Light-Frame Archetype Configurations.....	9-40
9.4.6	Development of Nonlinear Structural Archetype Models .....	9-43
9.4.7	Uncertainty due to Model Quality.....	9-45
9.4.8	Nonlinear Structural Analyses .....	9-45
9.4.9	Evaluation of Collapse Margin Ratio and Acceptance Criteria for Light-Frame Wood Archetypes without Gypsum Wallboard.....	9-48
9.4.10	Consideration of Gypsum Wallboard.....	9-52
9.4.11	Calculation of $\Omega_0$ using Set of Archetype Designs.....	9-54
9.4.12	Alternative Wood-Only Designs with Reduced R Factors .....	9-55
9.4.13	Summary Observations - Wood Light-Frame System.....	9-56
9.5	Example Applications - Summary Observations and Conclusions .....	9-56
9.5.1	Short Period Structures .....	9-56
9.5.2	Tall Moment Frame Structures .....	9-57

<b>10.</b>	<b>Supporting Studies.....</b>	<b>10-1</b>
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.....	10-3
10.2.4	Nonlinear Structural Analysis.....	10-4
10.2.5	Procedure for Incorporating Non-Simulated Failure Modes .....	10-5
10.3	Collapse Evaluation of Seismically Isolated Structures .....	10-10
10.3.1	Introduction.....	10-10
10.3.2	Isolator and Structural System Information – Quality Ratings .....	10-12
10.3.3	Definition of Properties and Methods Unique to Collapse Evaluation of Isolated Structures .....	10-14
10.3.4	Modeling Isolated Structure Archetypes .....	10-16
10.3.5	Design Properties of Isolated Structure Archetypes .....	10-21
10.3.6	Collapse Evaluation Results .....	10-27
10.3.7	Discussion - Analysis Properties and Methods Unique to Isolated Structures.....	10-35
<b>11</b>	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>11-1</b>
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.....	11-10
11.3.1	Feasibility .....	11-10
11.3.2	Approach.....	11-10
11.4	Recommendations for Further Study .....	11-11
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
<b>Appendix A:</b>	<b>Ground Motion Record Sets .....</b>	<b>A-1</b>
A.1	Introduction.....	A-1
A.2	Objectives .....	A-1
A.3	Approach.....	A-2
A.4	Spectral Shape Consideration .....	A-3
A.5	MCE and DE Demand (ASCE/SEI 7-05) .....	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-28

**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	Simplified Method to Adjust Collapse Capacity for Effects of Spectral Shape (Epsilon) .....	B-5
B.3.1	Epsilon Values for the Ground Motions in the far-Field Record Set .....	B-6
B.3.2	Target Epsilon Values .....	B-7
B.3.3	Impact of Spectral Shape on Median Collapse Capacity .....	B-11
B.4	Final Simplified Factors to Adjust Median Collapse Capacity for the Effects of Spectral Shape.....	B-12
B.5	Application to Site Specific Performance Assessment ...	B-13

**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-8
C.2.1	Establishing the Archetype Design Space.....	C-8
C.2.2	Identifying Index Archetype Configurations and Populating Performance Groups.....	C-9
C.2.3	Preparing Index Archetype Designs and Index Archetype Models .....	C-9
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	Shear Failure of Beam and Columns.....	D-5
D.3.3	Joint Panel Shear Behavior .....	D-6
D.3.4	Bond-Slip of Reinforcing Bars.....	D-6
D.3.5	Punching Shear in Slab-Column Connections ....	D-7
D.4	Local and Global Collapse Scenarios.....	D-7
D.5	Likelihood of Collapse Scenarios .....	D-7
D.6	Collapse Simulation .....	D-9

<b>Appendix E: Nonlinear Modeling of Reinforced Concrete Moment</b>	
<b>Frame Systems.....</b>	<b>E-1</b>
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 RC Beam- Column Element Model.....	E-5
E.4    Joint Modeling .....	E-15
E.4.1    Shear Panel Spring.....	E-15
E.4.2    Bond-Slip Spring Model.....	E-16
<b>Appendix F: Collapse Evaluation of Individual Buildings.....</b>	<b>F-1</b>
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
<b>Symbols .....</b>	<b>G-1</b>
<b>Glossary .....</b>	<b>H-1</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>I-1</b>
<b>Project Participants .....</b>	<b>J-1</b>



---

# List of Figures

Figure 1-1	Illustration of Seismic Performance Factors ( $R$ , $\Omega_O$ and $C_d$ ) as defined by the Commentary to the NEHRP Recommended Provisions (FEMA, 2004b).....	1-6
Figure 1-2	Illustration of Seismic Performance Factors ( $R$ , $\Omega_O$ and $C_d$ ) as defined by the Methodology .....	1-7
Figure 2-1	Key elements of the Methodology .....	2-2
Figure 2-2	Process for establishing and documenting seismic performance factors (SPFs).....	2-3
Figure 2-3	Incremental dynamic analysis response plot of spectral acceleration versus maximum interstory drift.....	2-7
Figure 2-4	Collapse fragility curve, or cumulative distribution function .....	2-8
Figure 3-1	Process for obtaining required system information .....	3-2
Figure 3-2	Characteristics of force-deformation response (a) steel beam (Uang et al. 2000), (b) plywood shear wall panel (Gatto and Uang 2002).....	3-14
Figure 4-1	Process for developing archetype index configurations and models .....	4-2
Figure 5-1	Assessment process for Index Archetype Analysis Models by nonlinear analysis .....	5-2
Figure 5-2	Example of Index Archetype Analysis Model for moment resisting frame systems .....	5-8
Figure 5-3	Parameters of an idealized component backbone curve ....	5-9
Figure 5-4	Idealized inelastic hysteretic response of structural components with cyclic strength and stiffness degradation.....	5-10
Figure 5-5	Comparison of monotonic and cyclic responses (Gatto and Uang 2002), along with skeleton curve fit to cyclic response .....	5-11
Figure 5-6	Nonlinear beam element (a) monotonic backbone hinge response curve, (b) idealized element, and	

	(c) monotonic backbone curve superimposed on cyclic hinge response .....	5-12
Figure 5-7	Component backbone curve showing a deterioration mode that might not be simulated in the analysis model..	5-14
Figure 5-8	Assessment of collapse with simulated and non-simulated modes using incremental dynamic analysis.....	5-15
Figure 6-1	Process for developing the nonlinear analysis procedures for collapse assessment.....	6-1
Figure 6-2	MCE response spectra for collapse evaluation of structure archetypes for Seismic Design Categories B through D .....	6-3
Figure 6-3	Far-Field record set (a) response spectra plots, (b) illustration of spectral intensity anchoring to maximum and minimum MCE design spectra of Seismic Design Categories B, C and D.....	6-6
Figure 6-4	Idealized nonlinear static pushover curve .....	6-7
Figure 6-5	Incremental dynamic analysis response plot of spectral acceleration versus maximum interstory drift .....	6-9
Figure 6-6	Collapse fragility curve, or cumulative distribution function .....	6-10
Figure 7-1	Process for Performance Evaluation .....	7-1
Figure 7-2	Collapse fragility curves considering (a) ground motion record-to-record uncertainty, (b) modifications for total uncertainty.....	7-8
Figure 7-3	Illustration of fragility curves and collapse margin ratios for two hypothetical seismic-force-resisting systems – same median collapse level .....	7-9
Figure 7-4	Illustration of fragility curves and collapse margin ratios for two hypothetical seismic-force-resisting systems – same $R$ factor.....	7-10
Figure 9-1	Archetype analysis model for moment frame buildings (after Haselton and Deierlein 2007, chapter 6) .....	9-4
Figure 9-2	Design documentation for a four-story space frame archetype with 30' bay spacing (building ID 1010) (after Haselton and Deierlein 2007, chapter 6) .....	9-7

Figure 9-3	Monotonic and cyclic behavior of component model used in this study (after Haselton and Deierlein 2007, chapter 4) .....	9-9
Figure 9-4	Illustration of experimental and calibrated element response (Saatciolgu and Grira, specimen BG-6) (after Haselton and Deierlein 2007, chapter 4). The solid black line shows the calibrated monotonic backbone .....	9-9
Figure 9-5	Structural modeling documentation for a four-story space frame archetype with 30' bay spacing (building ID 1010) (after Haselton and Deierlein 2007, chapter 6). .....	9-10
Figure 9-6	(a) Monotonic static pushover, and (b) peak interstory drift ratios at three deformation levels during pushover. The pushover is based on the building code specified lateral load distribution (ASCE 2005) (after Haselton and Deierlein 2007, chapter 6).....	9-11
Figure 9-7	Incremental Dynamic Analysis to collapse, showing the Maximum Considered Earthquake ground motion ( $S_{MT}$ ), median collapse capacity ( $\hat{S}_{CT}$ ), and collapse margin ratio ( $CMR$ ) for ID1010 .....	9-12
Figure 9-8	Definition of SDCs according to ASCE 7-05, as well as the seismic design criteria used in RC OMF example for evaluating SDC B.....	9-23
Figure 9-9	Archetype analysis model for RC OMFs.....	9-24
Figure 9-10	High gravity (space frame) layout .....	9-25
Figure 9-11	Low gravity (perimeter frame) layout.....	9-25
Figure 9-12	Design documentation for a 4-story RC OMF perimeter frame .....	9-27
Figure 9-13	Structural modeling documentation for a 4-story RC OMF archetype (9203) .....	9-28
Figure 9-14	Monotonic static pushover.....	9-29
Figure 9-15	Incremental dynamic analysis to collapse showing the Maximum Considered Earthquake ground motion ( $S_{MT}$ ), Median Collapse Capacity ( $\hat{S}_{CT}$ ), and Sidesway Collapse Margin Ratio ( $CMR_{SS}$ ) for design ID 9203 .....	9-31
Figure 9-16	Building Configurations Considered for the Definitions of Wood Light-Frame Archetype Buildings .....	9-41

Figure 9-17	Hysteretic Model of Shear Spring Element Included in SAWS Program (after Folz and Filiatrault 2004a, b).....	9-44
Figure 9-18	Monotonic Static Pushover Curve and Computation of $\Omega$ for Two-Story Wood Light-Frame Archetype No. 5 without Gypsum Wallboard .....	9-46
Figure 9-19	Results of Incremental Dynamic Analysis to Collapse for Two-Story Wood Light-Frame Archetype No. 5 without Gypsum Wallboard .....	9-47
Figure 9-20	Collapse Fragility Curve for Two-Story Wood Light-Frame Archetype No. 5 without Gypsum Wallboard.....	9-47
Figure 9-21	Monotonic Static Pushover Curve and Computation of $\mu_c$ for Two-Story Wood Light-Frame Archetype No. 5 without Gypsum Wallboard .....	9-49
Figure 10-1	Archetype analysis model of steel special moment frame (SMF) seismic force-resisting system.....	10-3
Figure 10-2	Modeling parameters used for beams and columns, based on calibration to experimental data by Lignos and Krawinkler (2007). Interested readers should refer to the notation and discussion in Appendix E .....	10-4
Figure 10-3	Static pushover analysis of steel frame model, illustrating computation of ductility ( $\mu_c$ ).....	10-5
Figure 10-4	Illustration of fracture behavior (Engelhardt et al., 1998) .....	10-7
Figure 10-5	Component fragility function: $P[\text{Fracture} \theta_p]$ . According to this fragility function, ductile fracture occurs on average when the plastic rotation in an RBS reaches 0.063 radians. ....	10-7
Figure 10-6	Selected simulation results for the steel SMF, for the purpose of illustrating the identification of non-simulated collapse modes. Sidesway collapse points ( $S_{CT(SC)}$ ), based on results from simulation, are shown with short bold pointers. Non-simulated (fracture-induced) collapse points ( $S_{CT(NSC)}$ ) are shown with pointers from hatched circles corresponding to maximum interstory drift at fracture ( $\theta_P = 0.063$ radians). The governing collapse point for each ground motion record is identified with an asterisk (*). ....	10-9
Figure 10-7	Comparison of steel SMF collapse fragilities for sidesway-only and combined simulated and non-simulated (sidesway and fracture-induced) collapse. (These fragilities are <u>not</u> adjusted for spectral shape). ...	10-9

Figure 10-8	Example pushover curves of an isolated structure and the same structure (superstructure) on a fixed base.....	10-15
Figure 10-9	Example illustration of system ductility used to evaluate Spectrum Shape Factor (SSF) of an isolated structure. ....	10-16
Figure 10-10	Archetype analysis model for isolated systems .....	10-18
Figure 10-11	Example nominal, upper-bound and lower-bound bilinear springs and hysteretic properties used to model the isolation system.....	10-19
Figure 10-12	Example five Individual springs and effective composite spring used to model moat wall resistance (30-inch moat wall gap). ....	10-20
Figure 10-13	Normalized design shear ( $V_s/W$ ) and strength ( $V_{max}/W$ ) of superstructures. Note. Some of the structures shown in Figure 10-13 were designed for this study, but are not discussed in this report.....	10-27
Figure 10-14	Values of Adjusted Collapse Margin Ratio ( <i>ACMR</i> ) for Code-Compliant isolated archetypes with various moat wall gap sizes and fixed-base archetypes (effectively 0-inch gap size), designed and evaluated for SDC $D_{max}$ seismic criteria. ....	10-31
Figure 10-15	Values of Adjusted Collapse Margin Ratio ( <i>ACMR</i> ) for Non-Code-Compliant isolated archetypes with various moat wall gap sizes, evaluated for SDC $D_{max}$ seismic criteria .....	10-34
Figure 10-16	Values of Adjusted Collapse Margin Ratio ( <i>ACMR</i> ) for isolated archetypes with different super-structure strengths evaluated for SDC $D_{max}$ seismic criteria .....	10-34
Figure A-1	Plots of MCE response spectral accelerations used for collapse evaluation of Seismic Design Category D, C and B structure archetypes, respectively.....	A-6
Figure A-2	Example anchoring of median spectrum of the Far-Field record set to MCE spectral acceleration at 1 second for Maximum and Minimum seismic criteria of Seismic Design Categories B, C and D ,respectively .....	A-13
Figure A-3	Plots of response spectra of the forty-four individual components of the normalized Far-Field record set, and median, one and two standard deviation response spectra of the total record set .....	A-18

Figure A-4	Plots of median and one standard deviation response spectra of the normalized Far-Field record set, and plot of the standard deviation (natural log) of response spectral acceleration .....	A-19
Figure A-5	Plot of median value of epsilon for the Far-Field record set .....	A-20
Figure A-6	Plots of response spectra of the fifty-six individual components of the normalized Near-Field record set, and median, one and two standard deviation response spectra of the total record .....	A-26
Figure A-7	Plots of median and one standard deviation response spectra of the normalized Near-Field record set, and plot of the standard deviation (natural log) of response spectral acceleration .....	A-27
Figure A-8	Plot of median value of epsilon for the Near-Field record set (and plot of median value of epsilon for the Far-Field record set for comparison) .....	A-28
Figure A-9	Plots of median response spectra of normalized Near-Field and Far-Field record sets, respectively, and the ratio of these spectra.....	A-29
Figure A-10	Plots of median response spectra of the normalized Near-Field record set, the Far-Field record set, and fault normal records of the Near-Field Pulse subset, respectively .....	A-30
Figure B-1	Comparison of an observed spectrum with spectra predicted by Boore, Joyner, and Fumal (1997); after Haselton and Baker (2006).....	B-2
Figure B-2	Relationship between collapse spectral acceleration ( $S_{CTI}$ ) and $\epsilon(T_1)$ for a single 8-story building; after Haselton et al. (2007). This includes linear regression analysis results which relate $\text{LN}[S_{CTI}(T_1)]$ to $\epsilon(T_1)$ .....	B-5
Figure B-3	Mean $\epsilon$ values for the Basic Far-Field Ground Motion Set [ $\bar{\epsilon}(T)_{\text{records}}$ ] .....	B-6
Figure B-4	Predicted $\bar{\epsilon}_0$ values from disaggregation of ground motion hazard, for the Western United States. The values are for a 1.0 second period and the 2% exceedance in 50 year motion. This figure comes directly from the United States Geological Survey Open-File Report (Harmsen et al. 2002) .....	B-8