



## Test Design of the PRESSS Five-Story Precast Concrete Building

S. (Sri) Sritharan, Assistant Project Scientist  
 Akira Igarashi, Visiting Researcher  
 M. J. Nigel Priestley, Professor  
 Frieder Seible, Professor and Chair

Department of Structural Engineering  
 University of California at San Diego

### Abstract

In the final phase of the PRESSS (Precast Seismic Structural Systems) program, a large-scale five-story precast concrete building is tested under simulated seismic loading. A brief summary of various structural features incorporated in the PRESSS building and test plans are presented in this paper. Construction and test preparations of this precast building have been already completed at UCSD Charles Lee Powell Structural Laboratory. All seismic testing of the building is scheduled to be completed by the end of August 1999.

### Introduction

The PRESSS program has been on going for the past 10 years with an overall objective of developing seismic design recommendations for precast concrete systems [1,2]. In the initial two phases of this program, experimental and analytical studies of ductile connection precast elements for frame and wall structures, as distinct from strong-connection precast structures which attempt to emulate monolithic reinforced concrete construction, were conducted. In the final phase, a large-scale precast five-story building utilizing different connection details is tested under simulated seismic loads [2].

### Overview of the Test Building

Based on five-story prototype buildings with 100 x 200 sq. ft in plan (per floor), 12 ft 6 in. story height and 25 ft bay length, dimensions of the test building were established. It was first determined that, for seismic testing purposes, it would be only necessary to model 50 x 50 sq. ft plan area of the prototype buildings with 2 bays in each direction. The test building was then modeled at 60% scale of the resized prototype buildings in order to

accommodate it inside the Charles Lee Powell Structural Laboratory at the University of California at San Diego (UCSD). This resulted in the test building having 30 x 30 sq. ft in plan, 7 ft 6 in. story height and 15 ft bay length and modeling all critical connections of a real building.

In one direction of the PRESSS building, seismic resistance is provided by precast frame systems, with a precast wall system and gravity frames in the orthogonal direction (Figs. 1 and 2). Four different beam-to-column connection details, based on the past PRESSS research program [3,4], are modeled at different levels in the two parallel seismic frames. The prestressed frame shown in Fig. 3 models the hybrid and pretensioned connections while the TCY (Tension-Compression Yielding) frame in Fig. 4 models the TCY gap and TCY connections. In each frame, the connection type is identical in the first three floors and a different connection is used in the fourth and fifth floor levels.

A brief description of each of the frame connections is as follows:

- (a) Hybrid frame connection (Fig. 5) – Beam-to-column frame connection is established with unbonded post-tensioning through the center of joint and field placement of mild steel reinforcement in ducts across the joint interface closer to the top and bottom beam surfaces. The ducts are grouted to ensure adequate bond for the reinforcement prior to post-tensioning.
- (b) PreTensioned frame connection (Fig. 6) – Continuous partially bonded pretensioned beams are connected to column segments extending from the top of beam at one floor level to the bottom of beam at the level above. The moment connection between the beam and column is established by extending the column mild steel reinforcement below the beam through

sleeves located in the joint. The extended reinforcement is spliced to the column longitudinal reinforcement at the next level adjacent to the joint.




Fig. 1 Floor plan of the test building at Levels 1 to 3.




Fig. 2 Floor plan of the test building at Levels 4 and 5.

- (c) TCY gap connection (Fig. 7) – Mild steel reinforcing bars placed in grouted sleeves at the top of the beam and unbonded post-tensioning at the bottom of the beam provide the necessary moment resistance at beam ends. Beams and columns are separated by a small gap to avoid elongation of the beam due to seismic action. This gap is partially grouted at the interface over 6” at the bottom of the beam with the post-tensioning force acting at the center of grout.




Fig. 3 Elevation of Prestressed seismic frame.




Fig. 4 Elevation of TCY seismic frame.

- (d) TCY connection (Fig. 8) - Behavior of monolithic reinforced concrete connections is emulated in this connection with top and bottom mild steel reinforcement in grouted sleeves across the beam-to-column interface.

The walls in the orthogonal direction contain unbonded prestressing, with special energy dissipating devices (i.e., UFP connectors) located in a vertical construction joint between wall elements (see Fig. 9).

Two precast flooring systems are also included in the test building. The first three floors are constructed using pretopped double tees (Fig. 1) while hollow-core panels are used in the upper floors (Fig. 2).




Fig. 5 Hybrid frame connection.




Fig. 6 PreTensioned frame connection.

Combinations of two building systems and four ductile frame connections adopted in the PRESSS test building effectively provide experimental verifications of seismic behavior of five different precast prototype buildings. In addition, application of the two most popular precast flooring systems to different seismic resistant building systems is also examined.

### Design Methodology

The PRESSS building was designed using the direct-displacement based approach (DBD) [5] to sustain a maximum drift of 2% under a design level earthquake that represents the 1997 UBC Zone 4, Soil type  $S_c$  acceleration spectrum [6].




Fig. 7 TCY gap frame connection.




Fig. 8 TCY frame connection.

The UBC provisions do not include design displacement spectra that are required in the DBD approach. Hence, the 5% damped displacement response spectra included in Appendix G of the draft SEAOC Bluebook [7] were used in the PRESSS building design. As detailed later in this paper, acceleration design spectra in UBC and SEAOC Bluebook are comparable, and thus utilizing SEAOC displacement spectra in the design of the test building is satisfactory.

The reason for using the DBD approach to designing the PRESSS building was that force based design does not sufficiently account for behavior of jointed precast systems. Furthermore, the R factors given in design codes as part of the force based design are also intended for precast systems emulating monolithic concrete connections, rather than for some of the connections incorporated in the PRESSS building. As a result of applying the DBD procedure, less conservative

design base shears were obtained in both frame and wall directions of the test building when compared to those obtained from the force based design method [2]. Reduced base shear results in significant cost savings in addition to improving performance over traditional precast systems.




Fig. 9 Elevation of the jointed precast wall system.

### Seismic Test Design

Seismic testing of the PRESSS building will be independently conducted in the two orthogonal directions. In each direction, three different test schemes, namely the stiffness measurement test, pseudodynamic test and inverse triangular load test, will be used.

The stiffness measurement test is a quasi-static loading test through which the stiffness matrix of the test building is formulated. The stiffness matrix, which is updated following increased intensity of the lateral seismic loading, is useful in

- determining the appropriate integration time step when explicit schemes are used in solving the equation of motion in the pseudodynamic testing procedure,
- improving convergence of implicit integration schemes in the pseudodynamic testing procedure,

- characterizing structural behavior consistent with the direct-displacement based approach, and
- monitoring damage levels using stiffness as a damage indicator.

Significant portions of the testing in the two orthogonal directions will be performed using a pseudo-dynamic testing procedure. In this procedure, the external dynamic load is applied to the structure quasi-statically through on-line controlled hydraulic actuators. Combining numerical computation and experimental measurements, the pseudodynamic test is carried out as illustrated in Fig. 10. To ensure speedy convergence of solutions and minimize error propagation in this test procedure, algorithms developed as part of the TCCMAR masonry building test [8] will be used with some modifications. Several segments of earthquake time histories with intensities exceeding that of the design level earthquake will be used. Details of the input acceleration motions are given in the following section.

In the inverse triangular load test, the test building is subjected to a full load reversal using a set of lateral forces distributed in an inverse triangular fashion, causing the structure to deform approximately to its first mode response. The purpose of the inverse triangular load test is twofold. When designing structures either using forced-based or displacement-based method, member forces are determined by subjecting the structure to an inverse triangular load pattern. Hence, response of the building from inverse triangular load tests can be directly compared to the response assumed in the design procedure. The other benefit of the inverse triangular load test is that equivalent viscous damping of the building can be quantified. In the DBD approach, the design base shear is determined using theoretically estimated equivalent viscous damping of the structure as a whole at the design drift level. Since this equivalent damping represents hysteretic energy dissipation occurring during reverse cyclic loads, results from inverse triangular load tests can be also used to experimentally quantify this critical design parameter at different drift levels.

### Selection of Earthquake Input Motions

In the pseudodynamic test, performance of the structure is assessed for a given earthquake input motion. It was felt desirable to subject the test building to several input motions with progressively increasing intensity, thus allowing building performance to be examined at different limit states. However, it was not feasible to compile a suite of suitable acceleration time histories

recorded from past earthquakes. Therefore, it was decided that appropriate input motions for pseudodynamic testing be established by modifying recorded earthquake motions on soil type  $S_c$ .




Fig. 10 Concept of pseudodynamic testing.

The first step in establishing suitable input motions for pseudodynamic test was to choose a set of target spectra. For this purpose, four level performance based spectra as recommended by PBSE Ad-Hoc Committee of SEAOC [7] were used. Using the design spectra in the

1997 NEHRP Provisions [9] as the basis, PBSE Ad-Hoc Committee recommends acceleration spectra for earthquake hazard ranging from EQ-I to EQ-IV. These four levels represent, respectively, frequent, occasional, rare, and maximum credible earthquakes. In Fig.11, the four level earthquake hazard spectra are shown for soil type  $S_c$ , which is one of five soil types classified in the NEHRP provisions. It is noted that the EQ-III level spectrum, which represents design level earthquakes, is identical to the design spectrum included in NEHRP and 1997 UBC codes up to 4.0 s period. At periods beyond 4.0 s, these codes adopt  $1/T$  decay in the spectral values while the spectrum in Fig. 11 reduces spectral accelerations in proportion to  $1/T^2$  to maintain constant spectral displacements at longer periods. Accelerations corresponding to the EQ-IV spectrum is intended to be 50% stronger than those of EQ-III (see Fig. 11).




Fig. 11 Acceleration response spectra for earthquake hazard from EQ-I to EQ-IV [7].

The procedure adopted for obtaining suitable input motions is described here by deriving an EQ-III level input motion from the El Centro record obtained from the 1940 Imperial Valley earthquake. The duration of El Centro record is 53.7 s. Since the testing of the structure is performed in pseudo-time, only a seven-second segment of this record containing the peak acceleration cycle is used in pseudodynamic testing. The starting time of all segments, except for EQ-I motion, was decided such that the first peak of each segment is the first peak in the record exceeding 0.1g ground acceleration. For EQ-I level input motion, the same criterion was used with the first peak exceeding 0.05g. Duration of each segment was kept in the range of 4 s for lower intensity motion to 9 s for higher intensity earthquake records with long strong duration.




Fig. 12 EQ-III spectrum and 5% damped El Centro acceleration response spectra.

In Fig. 12, acceleration response spectra obtained for 53.7 s and 7 s duration of the El Centro record are compared with the EQ-III spectrum. Close agreement obtained for the two El Centro spectra confirms that strong portion of the original record is included in the 7 s segment extracted for the test simulation. This segment is then modified such that it provides an acceleration spectrum comparable to the EQ-III spectrum. In Fig. 12, it can be seen that the spectrum of the modified motion satisfactorily matches the EQIII spectrum. The necessary modification to the earthquake segment was performed using the program "SHAPE" [10], in which the changes are made iteratively by multiplying Fourier amplitudes of the original motion by spectral ratios established between target acceleration response spectrum and spectrum of the input motion. The original and modified segments of the El Centro records are shown in Fig. 13.




Fig. 13 Seven-second segment of the El Centro record.

Four other input motions simulated for possible application in the pseudodynamic test of the PRESSSS building are shown in Fig. 14. It is noted that in all modified motions, some high frequency content uncharacteristic of natural records is apparent, which elevated the peak ground acceleration (PGA) of most of the modified records by as much as 50% higher than the target PGA. Low-pass filtering of this record will eliminate the high frequency content of the records and reduce the PGA closer to the target values. However, such filtering is considered unnecessary because the response of the test building will not be sensitive to such high frequency content. Using input motions in the pseudodynamic testing, which closely match the required spectrum but with higher PGAs, will also demonstrate that structural response is not highly influenced by PGA.




Fig. 14 Four other possible input motions.

### Test Sequence

The first step in seismic testing of the PRESSSS building is to formulate the stiffness matrix in the uncracked state through a stiffness measurement test. This will be followed by a test sequence consisting of a pseudodynamic test, an inverse triangular load test, and a stiffness measurement test. This sequence is repeated

several times with intensity of the input motion for the pseudodynamic test increasing from EQ-I to EQ-IV. At each level of input motion, the inverse triangular load test is performed for one cycle with full reversal such that the resulting maximum positive and negative roof drifts do not exceed the maximum recorded drift in the preceding pseudodynamic test.

Using the above procedure, the PRESSSS building will be first tested parallel to the jointed wall system and then in the orthogonal direction to examine the behavior of seismic frames.

### Concluding Remarks

Following a brief description of the PRESSSS five-story precast test building, its test design is presented in this paper. To sufficiently characterize the behavior of the PRESSSS building, three different tests, namely stiffness measurement test, pseudodynamic test and inverse triangular load test, are considered. Significant portions of the test in the two directions are pseudodynamic, in which different level input motions with progressively increasing intensity are used. It is expected that the different levels of pseudodynamic testing together with stiffness measurement and inverse triangular tests, will sufficiently quantify the performance of the PRESSSS building at different limit states.

Construction and test setup of the PRESSSS test building have been completed in the Charles Lee Powell Structural Laboratory of the University of California at San Diego. Low amplitude shakedown testing of the building is currently underway. Wall direction of testing and the frame direction of testing are scheduled to take place in the first and last week of August, respectively.

It is intended that preliminary results from seismic testing of the PRESSSS building will be presented at the 1999 SEAOC Convention.

### Acknowledgements

Financial support for the PRESSSS research program is provided by the National Science Foundation, the Precast/Prestressed Concrete Institute, and the Precast/Prestressed Concrete Manufacturers Association of California, Inc. In addition various precasters and material suppliers directly assisted in the construction of the PRESSSS building. Their contributions are gratefully acknowledged.

### References

1. Priestley, M. J. N., "Overview of PRESSSS Research Program," *PCI Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 4, July-August 1991, pp. 50-57.
2. Nakaki, S. D., Stanton, J. F., and Sritharan, S., "An Overview of the PRESSSS Five-Story Precast Test Building," *PCI Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 2, March-April 1999, pp. 26-39.
3. Stanton, J. F., Stone, W. C., and Cheok, G.S., "A Hybrid Reinforced Precast Frame for Seismic Regions," *PCI Journal*, V. 42, No. 2, March - April 1997, pp.20-32.
4. Palmieri, L., Sagan, E., French, C., Kreger, M., "Ductile Connections for Precast Concrete Frame Systems," Paper No. SP162-13, Mete A. Sozen Symposium, ACI SP 162, American Concrete Institute, Farmington Hills, MI, 1997, pp. 313-355.
5. Priestley, M. J. N., "Displacement Based Approaches to Rational Limit States Design of New Structures," Presented at the Eleventh European Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Paris, September 1998.
6. Uniform building Code, International Conference of Building Officials, Whittier, CA, 1997.
7. PBSE Ad-Hoc Committee of Structural Engineers Association of California, APPENDIX G - Tentative Performance Based Seismic Engineering Guidelines, SEAOC Blue Book, December 1998.
8. Igarashi, A., Seible, F., Hegemier, G., and Priestley, M. J. N., The U.S.-TCCMAR Full-Scale Five-Story Masonry Research Building Test, Part III - Seismic Load Simulation, Report No. 94/03, Structural Systems Research Project, University of California, San Diego, January 1994.
9. Building Seismic Safety Council, NEHRP Recommended Provisions for Seismic Regulations for New Buildings and Other Structures, National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program, Washington, D. C., 1997.
10. Earth Mechanics, Computer Program: SHAPE, Fountain Valley, California, 1998.

