



Evaluating Expected Annual Losses For NZ Code Compliant Steel Structure Buildings

Amir Orumiyehei Tim Sullivan Ken Elwood

September 4, 2018

Contents

- Objective
- Methodology
- Building Response
- Results
- Conclusion

Objectives How different is the expected annual loss for Wellington and Christchurch buildings? Are low-rise Are eccentrically structures more braced frame prone to seismic systems more or less loss than mid-rise vulnerable than buildings? moment resisting frame systems? 3

Methodology: Case Study Buildings

- Site
 - Christchurch
 - Wellington
- Building function
 - Office
- Structural system
 - Moment resisting frame
 - Eccentric braced frame
- Number of floors
 - 4-storey
 - 12-storey



Methodology: Design

Design approach:

- **Designed** according to NZ standards
- Response spectrum analysis.
- 3D model is generated in SAP 2000
- Reduced beam section connection is applied for MRF.
- Short active link • (shear Behavior) is opted for EBF.

Comparison between 12-storey EBF and MRF structure drift profiles shows that drift demand is larger for EBF than MRF for the upper half of the building.

4.5m



Methodology: Modeling And Analysis

- A 2-D model is developed in OpenSees.
- The modified Ibarra and Krawinkler model is adopted for MRF. (Lignos et al., 2011,2013)
- Panel zone flexibility is accounted for adopting Kim et al. (2001) approach.



Methodology: Ground Motion Selection

• Probabilistic seismic hazard assessment and ground motion selection

Multi Stripe Analyses:

- Nine different stripes with different return periods are chosen.
- The ground motion selected based on GCIM (Bradley 2010) is used (Yeow et al., 2018).



Wellington (T*=2.0s)

- Seismic loss estimation
 - Performed on SLAT (Bradley 2011)

$$\lambda(DV) = \iiint G \langle DV | DM \rangle d.G \langle DM | EDP \rangle.dG \langle EDP | IM \rangle.d\lambda(IM)$$

Deierlein et al. (2003)

7

Building Response

Drift/Acceleration building response



Median peak drift demands obtained from NLTH analyses for SLS and ULS intensity levels.



Median peak floor acceleration demands obtained from NLTH analyses for SLS and ULS intensity levels.

Loss Results

4-Storey MRF		4-Storey EBF		12-Storey MRF		12-Storey EBF	
WELL.	СНСН.	WELL.	СНСН.	WELL.	СНСН.	WELL.	CHCH.
0.17%	0.09%	0.15%	0.06%	0.09%	0.04%	0.14%	0.06%



9



Acknowledgments

This project was supported by QuakeCoRE, a New Zealand Tertiary Education Commission-funded Centre, and the Ministry of Business, Innovation, and Employment's National Hazards Research Platform.

References

- Deierlein GG, Krawinkler H, Cornell CA. (2003). A framework for performance-based earthquake engineering. Proceedings of the 2003 Pacific Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Christchurch, NZ.

- Bradley BA. (2011). SLAT: Seismic Loss Assessment Tool (Version 1.16). Department of Civil and Natural Resources Engineering, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, NZ.

- Yeow TZ, Orumiyehei A, Sullivan TJ, MacRae GA, Clifton GC, Elwood KJ (2018) "Seismic performance of steel friction connections considering direct-repair costs" Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, under review.

- O'Reilly, G. J., & Sullivan, T. J. (2016). Direct displacement-based seismic design of eccentrically braced steel frames. Journal of earthquake engineering, 20(2), 243-278.

- Lignos, D. G., & Krawinkler, H. (2010). Deterioration modeling of steel components in support of collapse prediction of steel moment frames under earthquake loading. Journal of Structural Engineering, 137(11), 1291-1302.