

SESSION TU4C: The Steps Behind Building Resilience A 2020 NEHRP Effort: What Can You Expect on Major Changes on Seismic Provisions and US Seismic Value maps

S.K. Ghosh, President, PhD, S.K. Ghosh Associates LLC Nicolas Luco, PhD, Research Structural Engineer, U.S. Geological Survey Mai "Mike" Tong, Senior Physical Scientist, Federal Emergency Management Agency Jiqiu (JQ) Yuan, Building Seismic Safety Council, NIBS

January 8, 2019





Building Seismic Safety Council

OUTLINE



- NEHRP at FEMA and Overview BSSC work, Mai Tong (JQ Yuan)
- Relations between NEHRP Provisions and ASCE 7 and IBC, SK Ghosh
- Update on the ongoing 2020 NEHRP efforts (ASCE 7-22 and IBC 2024), SK Ghosh
- Update on the major changes on US Seismic Design value maps, Nico Luco (SK Ghosh)



- A 2020 NEHRP Effort: What Can You Expect on Major Changes on Seismic Provisions and US Seismic Value maps
 - NEHRP at FEMA and Overview BSSC work, Mai Tong (JQ Yuan)
- Relations between NEHRP Provisions and ASCE 7 and IBC, SK Ghosh
- Update on the ongoing 2020 NEHRP efforts (ASCE 7-22 and IBC 2024), SK Ghosh
- Update on the major changes on US Seismic Design value maps, Nico Luco (SK Ghosh)

The National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) at FEMA

- Translate new research results, lessons learned information and best practices into code resource, mitigation solutions, technical guidelines, risk awareness and earthquake preparedness materials
 - 2015 NEHRP Provisions (FEMA P-1050)
 - Seismic Performance Assessment of Buildings (FEMA P-58-2)
 - Safer, Stronger and Smarter, A Guide to Improve School to Natural Hazard Safety (FEMA P-1000)
 - Hazus Estimated Annualized Earthquake Losses for the United States (FEMA P-366)
- Support States and local at-risk communities in earthquake preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery
 - Earthquake State Assistance Program
 - National Earthquake Technical Assistance Program (NETAP)
 - Earthquake Recover Advisories
 - Building codes update, adoption and enforcement

Building Seismic Safety Council

The BSSC is an independent, voluntary organizational membership body representing a wide variety of building community interests.

Its fundamental purpose is to enhance public safety by providing a national forum that fosters improved seismic planning, design, construction and regulation in the building community.

To fulfill its purpose, the BSSC: (1) recommends, encourages and promotes the improvement and update of seismic safety provisions for adoption by the national standards and model building codes;

What are NEHRP Provisions?

7-16

ASCE

SII) ====



2020



NEHRP Recommended Seismic Provisions for New Buildings and Other Structures

Volume I: Part 1 Provisions, Part 2 Commentary FEMA P-1050-1/2015 Edition

😻 FEMA

FEMA supported BSSC effort



₩ EC



BSSC Process

AP/

Apr

DGS

Safety

Associations

ASHRAE

Association

and Nevada

PUC Project 17 CRSC Board Membership About

2020 NEHRP Provisions Update Committ

The NEHRP Recommended Provisions for New Buildings and Other Structures embodie criteria for the design and construction of buildings subject to earthquake hazards technologies contained in this resource document are diffused into several nation Amer m Loads that

PUC and IT SMEs mode The

PUC) a technic

CC).

expensional rolenuity and apply the most advanced seismic technology available. T by expert issue teams (ITs) that address specific aspects of seismic design method These committee and team members ensure that lessons learned from the building earthquakes, as well as new research to improve earthquake resistance, are reflect seismic requirements. The ITs develop proposals for requirements that are ballote BSSC's consensus process, and subsequently balloted by the member organization

PUC Committee Members

N

BUILDING ≥

UNOVATION 7

National Institute of BUILDING SCIENCE

CONFERENCE & EXPO

lame	Organization
avid Bonneville	Degenkolb Eng
eter Carrato	Bechtel Power
elly Cobeen	Wiss, Janney, El
.B. Crouse	AECOM
an Dolan	Washington Sta
nindya Dutta	Simpson Gump
.K. Ghosh	S.K. Ghosh Asso
ohn Gillengerten	John Gillengerte
on Hamburger	Simpson Gump
m Harris	James Harris &

Role Chair ineers Corporation Member lstner Associates Member Member Member ate University oertz & Heger Member ociates Member Member en oertz & Heger Member

Member

Associates

American Concrete Institute American Institute of Architects American Institute of Architects American Institute of Steel Construction American Iron and Steel Institute American Society of Civil Engineers Am

Portland Cement Association Portland Cement Association Precast/Prestressed Concrete Institute Rack Manufacturers Institute Steel Deck Institute Structural Engineer Association of

BSSC Member Organizations California Central California **Builiding Owners and Managers** Structural Engineers Association of Colorado Structural Engineers Association of Illinois Structural Engineers Association of Kansas & Concrete Masonry Association of California Missouri Structural Engineers Association of Northern **Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute** California **Department of Veterans Affairs** Structural Engineers Association of San Diego General Services Administration (SEAOSD) Insurance Institute for Business and Home Structural Engineers Association of Southern California International Code Council Structural Engineers Association of Southern Metal Building Manufacturers Association California National Association of Homebuilders Structural Engineers Association of Utah National Concrete Masonry Association Steel Joist Institute National Council of Structural Engineers

The Masonry Society

2020 Provisions Update Committee (PUC) – Issue Teams

- IT 1 Seismic Performance Objectives
- IT 2 Seismic Resisting Systems and Design Coefficients
- IT 3 Modal Response Spectrum Analysis
- IT 4 Shear Wall Design

•

- IT 5 Nonstructural Components
- IT 6 Nonbuilding Structures
- IT 7 Soil Foundation Interaction
- IT 8 Base Isolation and Energy Dissipation
- IT 9 Diaphragm Issues
- Project 17 Updated Basis for National Seismic Design Values Maps



Documentation for the 2014 Update of the United States National Seismic Hazard Maps

Mark D. Patasan Morgan P. Moschetti. Peter M. Powers. Charles S. Musilov, Katakan M. Halar, Arthur D. Panindi. Yushan Zong, Saran Rooming, Staghow C. Hannon, Olivor S. Boyl, Nal Field, Ru Grans, Kanzeh S. Rakralet, Nao Lano, Romell L. Waterler, Robert A. Williams, and Arria H. Olson.



Open-File Report 2014-1091

U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Geological Survey



A 2020 NEHRP Effort: What Can You Expect on Major Changes on Seismic Provisions and US Seismic Value maps

- NEHRP at FEMA and Overview BSSC work, Mai Tong (JQ Yuan)
- Relations between NEHRP Provisions and ASCE 7 and IBC, SK Ghosh
- Update on the ongoing 2020 NEHRP efforts (ASCE 7-22 and IBC 2024), SK Ghosh
- Update on the major changes on US Seismic Design value maps, Nico Luco (SK Ghosh)



Overview of BSSC work, Relations between NEHRP Provisions and ASCE 7 and IBC Update on the Ongoing PUC efforts, Major **Technical Changes Expected for 2020 NEHRP** Provisions (ASCE 7-22 and IBC 2024) S.K. Ghosh S.K. Ghosh Associates LLC Palatine, IL and Aliso Viejo, CA January 8, 2019

U.S. Codes and Standards



CONFERENCE & EXPO

2015 NEHRP *Provisions*



BUILDING



ASCE 7-16 Site Classification

BUILDING S
 INNOVATION

Site Class	\overline{v}_s	$\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ or $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{ch}$	\overline{s}_u	
A. Hard rock	> 5,000 ft/s	NA	NA	
B. Rock	2,500 to 5,000 ft/s	NA	NA	
C. Very dense soil and soft rock	1,200 to 2,500 ft/s	> 50 blows/ft	> 2,000 lb/ft ²	
D. Stiff soil	600 to 1,200 ft/s	15 to 50 blows/ft	1,000 to 2,000 lb/ft ²	
E. Soft clay soil	< 600 ft/s	< 15 blows/ft	< 1,000 lb/ft ²	
	Any profile with more than 10 ft of soil that has the following characteristics: — Plasticity index $PI > 20$, — Moisture content $\omega \ge 40\%$, — Undrained shear strength $\overline{S}_u < 500 \text{ lb} / \text{ft}^2$			
F. Soils requiring site response analysis in accordance with Section 21.1	See Section 20.3.1			

BUILDING SCIENCES

Proposed Site Classification

Site Class	Measured or Estimated, $\overline{oldsymbol{ u}_s}$	
A. Hard rock	> 5,000 ft/s	
B. Rock	3,000 to 5,000 ft/s	
BC. Soft Rock	2,100 to 3,000 ft/s	
C. Very dense sand or Hard clay	1,450 to 2,100 ft/s	
CD. Dense sand or Very stiff clay	1,000 to 1,450 ft/s	
D. Medium dense sand or Stiff clay	700 to 1,000 ft/s	
DE. Loose sand or Medium stiff clay	500 to 700 ft/s	
E. Very loose sand or Soft clay	< 500 ft/s	
F. Soils requiring site response analysis in accordance with Section 21.1	See Section 20.3.1	

ASCE 7-16 MCE_R Spectra





Proposed 2020 MCE_R Spectra





Risk-Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE_R) Spectral Response Acceleration Parameters.

No S_s , S_1 , PGA Only S_{MS} , S_{M1} , PGA_M No site coefficients - F_a , F_v

 S_{MS} = the mapped MCE_R spectral response acceleration parameter at short periods as determined in accordance with Section 11.4.3, and

 S_{M1} = the mapped MCE_R spectral response acceleration parameter at a period of 1 s as determined in accordance with Section 11.4.3.



Risk-Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE_R) Spectral Response Acceleration Parameters.

Risk-targeted maximum considered earthquake (MCE_R) spectral response acceleration parameters S_{MS} and S_{M1} shall be determined from the mapped values of these parameters provided at the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) website at https://doi.org/10.5066/F7NK3C76 for the site class determined in accordance with the site class requirements of Section 11.4.2.



Risk-Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE_R) Spectral Response Acceleration Parameters.

Where the soil properties are not known in sufficient detail to determine the site class and the default site class requirements of Section 11.4.2.1 apply, risk-targeted maximum considered earthquake (MCE_R) spectral response acceleration parameters S_{MS} and S_{M1} shall be determined from the mapped values of 0.2- and 1-s spectral response accelerations shown in Figs. 22-1, 22-3, 22-5, 22-6, 22-7, and 22-8 for S_{MS} and Figs. 22-2, 22-4, 22-5, 22-6, 22-7, and 22-8 for S_{M1}.



Proposed Consolidation of SDCs

ASCE 7-16

		Risk Category	
Values of S _{D1} Val	values of S _{M1}	l or II or III	IV
S _{D1} < 0.067	S _{M1} < 0.10	А	А
$0.067 \le S_{D1} < 0.133$	$0.10 \le S_{M1} < 0.20$	В	С
$0.133 \le S_{D1} < 0.20$	$0.20 \le S_{M1} < 0.30$	С	D
$0.20 \le S_{D1}$	$0.30 \le S_{M1}$	D	D

Proposed

Values of S _{M1}	SDC
S _{M1} < 0.15	Low
$0.15 \le S_{M1} < 0.30$	Moderate
$0.30 \leq S_{M1}$	High

Proposed Consolidated SDC Map Based on Default Site Class



LDING 🛛





Proposed 2020 NEHRP *Provisions* Definition for Default Site Class.

Where the soil properties are not known in sufficient detail to determine the site class, risktargeted maximum considered earthquake (MCE_R) spectral response accelerations shall be based on the more critical spectral response acceleration of Site Class C, Site Class CD and Site Class D subsurface conditions, unless the authority having jurisdiction determines, based on geotechnical data, that Site Class DE, E or F soils are present at the site.

Proposed Consolidatd SDC Map Based on Default Site Class

ONFERENCE & EXPO





Proposed Consolidatd SDC Map Based on Site Class C



Image was created using the current site coefficients. It will change somewhat once the MPRS is in use.





ASCE 7-16 SDC Map for RC I, II, or III Structures







BUILDING≌

CONFERENCE & EXPC





ASCE 7-16 SDC Map for RC I, II, or III Structures





Proposed SDC Map for RC IV Structures (Stabilization)





Default Site Class



Horizontal Irregularity Type 2, 3 Triggers

Type	Description	Reference Section	Seismic Design Category Application
2.	Reentrant Corner Irregularity: Reentrant corner irregularity is defined to exist where both plan projections of the structure beyond a reentrant corner are greater than 15% 20% of the plan dimension of the structure in the given direction.	12.3.3.4	D, E, and F
3.	Diaphragm Discontinuity Irregularity: Diaphragm discontinuity irregularity is defined to exist where there is a diaphragm with an abrupt discontinuity or variation in stiffness, including one that has a cutout or open area greater than $\frac{50\%}{25\%}$ of the gross enclosed diaphragm area, or a change in effective diaphragm stiffness of more than 50% from one story to the next.	12.3.3.4	D, E, and F

BUILDING B	Vertical Irregularity Type 2 Eliminated			
National Institute of Built DING SCIENCES CONFERENCE & EXPO	Туре	Description	Reference Section	Seismic Design Category Application
	Table <u>12.6-1</u>	D, E, and F		
	<u>2</u> ,	Weight (Mass) Irregularity: Weight (mass) irregularity is defined to exist where the effective mass of any story is more than 150% of the effective mass of an adjacent story. A roof that is lighter than the floor below need not be considered.	Table <u>12.6-1</u>	D, E, and F

$C_d = R$ For Deformation

Compatibility

BUILDING BINNOVATION

National Institute of BUILDING SCIENCES

CONFERENCE & EXPO



Accidental Torsion Modifications

The ATC-123 project (Improving Seismic Design of Buildings with Configuration Irregularities) found that the current design provisions are generally conservative for most building configurations, with the exception of buildings that rely heavily on lines of lateral resistance orthogonal to the design earthquake force to resist torsion.

The ATC-123 project set out to modify the current provisions in a way to provide a more uniform collapse reliability across structures with increasing degrees of torsional irregularity. A Part 1 modification to ASCE 7-16 strips out some of the unnecessary conservatism from the current code provisions, while adding requirements for building configurations not adequately addressed by the current provisions.



Ductile Coupled Reinforced Concrete Shear Walls



Composite Steel Plate Shear Walls with Coupling

DING

CONFERENCE & EXPO





Composite Steel Plate Shear Walls with Coupling



Scope of Nonstructural Provisions

13.1.1 Scope.

This chapter establishes minimum design criteria for nonstructural components that are permanently attached to structures and for their supports and attachments.

Nonstructural components shall meet the requirements of this chapter, including components that are in or supported by a structure, are outside of a structure, or are permanently attached to the mechanical or electrical systems of a structure. ...



Corrugated Steel Liquid Storage Tanks



Corrugated Steel Liquid Storage Tanks

Corrugated steel tanks once used only for bulk product storage are increasingly being used for water storage. Requirements have been added to provide an equivalent level of safety as provided by other types of tanks covered by ASCE 7. Similar provisions are added for corrugated steel tanks used for the storage of petrochemical and industrial liquids in anticipation of their use in the industrial sector.



Fiberglass Cooling Towers





Fiberglass Cooling Towers

Historically, concrete and steel cooling towers have performed well in seismic events. Wood cooling towers have also generally performed well in seismic events when relatively new. The primary cause of damage to wood cooling towers in earthquakes has been deteriorated condition prior to an earthquake . Because of deterioration to wood cooling towers, fiberglass cooling towers have been replacing wood cooling towers in recent years.

ASCE is in the process of developing a draft standard "Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) of Pultruded Fiber Reinforced Polymer (FRP) Structures," which includes seismic design parameters for fiber glass cooling towers. Including the parameters for fiberglass cooling towers from this draft standard in Table 15.4-2 will make it convenient for engineers to evaluate the seismic design of various potential structural systems for cooling towers used in many industrial applications.

Alternative Diaphragm Design Provisions for One-Story Structures with Flexible Diaphragms and Rigid Vertical Elements

BUILDING NNOVATION

CONFERENCE & EXPO



Alternative Diaphragm Design Provisions for One-Story Structures with Flexible Diaphragms and Rigid Vertical Elements

FEMA P-1026 recommendations for seismic design of the Rigid Wall

- Flexible Diaphragm building type included:

ONFERENCE & EXP

- Recognition that the diaphragms often yield and dominate the building behavior while the walls typically remain mostly in the elastic range for in-plane loading,
- Recognizing the distinct periods of both the shear wall system and the diaphragm, and using a two-stage equivalent lateral force analysis to capture this distinct behavior,
- Proposing the creation of a zone of reduced nailing away from the diaphragm perimeter, where distributed yielding can occur without jeopardizing the diaphragm connection to the vertical element.



Seismic Design of Rigid Wall-Flexible Diaphragm **Buildings: An Alternate** Procedure S FEMA



Alternative Diaphragm Design Provisions for One-Story Structures with Flexible Diaphragms and Rigid Vertical Elements

One change addresses the first and the third bullet points, while a second proposal addresses the second. Use of the alternative diaphragm design forces of Section 12.10.4 is permitted for any structure meeting the limitations of Sec. 12.10.4.1, and irrespective of whether or not the two-stage analysis procedure is used. Use of the two-stage analysis is dependent on use of the new Section 12.10.4 diaphragm design forces.





National Institute of BUILDING SCIENCES

An Authoritative Source of Innovative Solutions for the Built Environment

Building Seismic Safety Council

Thank You!!

For more information... www.skghoshassociates.com Phone: (847) 991-2700 Email: kbhaumik@skghoshassociates.com

Follow us on: 🖬 🕒 in 🛍







