

## AISC Live Webinars

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

**T.R. Higgins Lecture:** SpeedCore and Steel-Concrete  
Composite Construction – The Best of Both Worlds  
March 17, 2022



**Smarter.  
Stronger.  
Steel.**

## AISC Live Webinars

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

Today's audio will be broadcast through the internet. Please be sure to turn up the volume on your speakers.

Please type any questions or comments in the Q&A window.



**Smarter.  
Stronger.  
Steel.**

## AISC Live Webinars

---

### AIA Credit

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.



## AISC Live Webinars

---

### Copyright Materials

This presentation is protected by US and International Copyright laws. Reproduction, distribution, display and use of the presentation without written permission of AISC is prohibited.

© The American Institute of Steel Construction 2022

The information presented herein is based on recognized engineering principles and is for general information only. While it is believed to be accurate, this information should not be applied to any specific application without competent professional examination and verification by a licensed professional engineer. Anyone making use of this information assumes all liability arising from such use.



# AISC Live Webinars

## Course Description

T.R. Higgins Lecture:  
SpeedCore and Steel-Concrete Composite Construction – The Best of both Worlds  
March 17, 2022

The merits of steel-concrete composite construction have been recognized and leveraged for decades, but they have never been harnessed quite so efficiently as the new SpeedCore system, which consists of composite plate shear walls and composite coupling beams. This system can be used, when needed, in lieu of traditional reinforced concrete core walls/shear walls in commercial, industrial, or nuclear construction. The primary advantages of this composite system stem from the efficient modularization and prefabrication of steel modules, and elimination of rebar cages, formwork, and falsework, resulting in an expedited construction schedule and thus overall increased project economy. In this years T.R. Higgins Lecture, Purdue Universitys Amit Varma will summarize the results of extensive research conducted over more than 12 years, culminating in the development of design specifications, provisions, and guidelines for composite walls and systems for various applications. He'll highlight experimental behavior, numerical modeling, and design of composite walls and the SpeedCore system for wind loading, seismic loading, and fire loading conditions. For wind loading, the presentation will focus on stiffness and strength. For seismic loading, the presentation will focus on the capacity design method and performance evaluation. For fire loading, the presentation will cover both the fire resistance rating (in hours) and strength at elevated temperature.



# AISC Live Webinars

## Learning Objectives

- Differentiate between steel-plate composite (SC) and SpeedCore systems.
- Summarize minimum requirements for detailing SpeedCore walls and systems.
- Relate the design provisions for SpeedCore systems to experimental behavior and numerical analyses.
- Estimate the fire behavior and resistance of SpeedCore walls.



## SpeedCore and Steel-Concrete Composite Construction –The Best of Both Worlds



Amit H. Varma  
Karl H. Kettelhut Professor  
Director, Bowen Lab for Large Scale CE Research  
Lyles School of Civil Engineering  
Purdue University



### Acknowledgments

---

- American Institute of Steel Construction
- Charles Pankow Foundation
- Steel Institute of New York
- MKA Foundation
- Supreme Group
- Geiger & Peters
- T. R. Higgins Award Jury – 2021
- **Mentors and Students (from 1994 – present)**

## Acknowledgments

- Ron Klemencic, Chairman & CEO, **MKA**
- Michel Bruneau, **Univ. at Buffalo**
- Charlie Carter, Larry Kruth, Devin Huber, **AISC**
- Anne Ellis, Mark Perniconi, **CPF**
- Soheil Shafaei, Morgan Broberg, **Purdue University**
- Ata Anvari, Mubashshir Ahmad, **Purdue University**
- Tom Bradt, Jungil Seo, **Purdue University**

## Outline

1. **Introduction to System and Use / History**
2. Section Detailing, Limits, Requirements
3. Stiffness, Strength, Deformation Capacity
4. Nonlinear Analysis & Modeling Recommendations
5. Seismic Behavior & Capacity Design
6. Seismic Performance Requirements
7. Fire Performance & Design
8. Current & Future Work

## STEEL-CONCRETE COMPOSITE CONSTRUCTION


Combines the advantages of both construction materials

- Best of both worlds
- Elegance, lightweight and strength of steel
- Mass, rigidity, and damping of concrete
- Steel formwork and falsework
- Concrete stiffness, stability, and fire resistance


## CONVENTIONAL COMPOSITE CONSTRUCTION

Composite Columns of Various Types


- Concrete filled hollow structural shapes (HSS)
- Steel shapes encased in reinforced concrete (SRC)
- Concrete-filled built-up box sections




RECTANGULAR HSS



CIRCULAR HSS



SRC




BUILT-UP BOX

## Composite Construction

Some prominent examples:

- Columbia Center | Seattle, WA → 1985
- Two Union Square | Seattle, WA → 1989
- Seattle Municipal Tower | WA → 1990
- Many innovative designs around the world



### TWO UNION SQUARE, SEATTLE

With symmetrical built-up beams, composite-filled pipe columns with 18,000 psi concrete, and visco-elastic dampened outriggers, one of the most optimized composite steel structures

*Courtesy of Magnusson Klemencic Associates*



### SEATTLE MUNICIPAL TOWER

#### GATEWAY TOWER

62-story, 140,000-m<sup>2</sup> office building with five levels of parking  
Composite columns at the corners



*Courtesy of Magnusson Klemencic Associates*

## Conventional Composite Construction


Inspired decades of research and development

- Circular and square filled composite members and frames
- Seismic behavior and design
- Design of noncompact and slender section members
- Use of high strength materials
- P-M interaction, Shear strength, Fire resistance
- AISC 360 Chapter I, App. 4, AISC 341 Seismic Chapter G

## Introducing the New SpeedCore System

### Composite Plate Shear Walls – Concrete Filled (C-PSW/CF)

- Steel plates
- Concrete infill
- Tie bars
- Shear studs
- No rebar or formwork
- SHEAR WALLS and / or ELEVATOR CORE WALLS



## A New Chapter in Composite Construction

### Rainier Square, Seattle

- Client 
- Architect 
- Structural & Civil 
- GC/GM 




*Courtesy of Magnusson Klemencic Associates*

## A New Chapter in Composite Construction

Steel Fabricator:



Steel Erector:




Rebar Fabricator:



Concrete Supplier:



## A New Chapter in Composite Construction



### Cover of ENR Magazine

Constructed in 10 months

Eight months savings as compared to  
conventional RC construction

1.4 million square feet


850-foot tall

58-story office + residential

7 levels below-grade parking

## Coupled Composite Plate Shear Walls – Core Walls

.....



*Courtesy of Magnusson Klemencic Associates*

## A New Chapter in Composite Construction

200 Park Avenue, San Jose, CA



High seismic region

937,000 rsf

19 stories

Under construction

*Courtesy of Gensler*

## A New Chapter in Composite Construction


200 Park Avenue, San Jose, CA

Webcam View – April 5, 2021

Structural Floor Plan



*Courtesy of Magnusson Klemencic Associates*



## Steel-Plate Composite (SC) Walls : Evolution

- Safety-related nuclear facilities
- Various designs AP1000<sup>®</sup>, US-APWR<sup>®</sup>, APR+<sup>®</sup>
- Extensive research, testing, and development
- AISC N690 Nuclear Specification, Appendix N9
- AISC Design Guide 32
- Section detailing, stiffness, strength, local buckling

## SC Walls and Designs in Nuclear Structures




Vogtle Unit 3 CA20 Module June 2014 © Georgia Power Company

*Accessed from: <https://vogtlegallery.georgiapower.com>*



Sub-module inside the Module Assembly Building  
May 2015 © Georgia Power Company



Workers placed all six of the third course shield building panels for Unit 3  
April 2016 © Georgia Power Company

*Accessed From: <https://vogtlegallery.georgiapower.com>*



Since the modules are so technical, and I end up making the presentation remotely due to the pandemic, I wanted to infuse some humor to keep the audience engaged, but all I could come up with were “inside” jokes!

## Outline

1. Introduction to System and Its Use / History
2. Section Detailing, Limits, Requirements
3. Stiffness, Strength, Deformation Capacity
4. Nonlinear Analysis & Modeling Recommendations
5. Seismic Behavior & Capacity Design
6. Seismic Performance Requirements
7. Fire Performance & Design
8. Current & Future Work


## Key Components

Steel plates

Tie bars

Shear studs




Concrete Infill



## Steel Plates

- Reinforcement ratio limits
  - Minimum = 1%                      Maximum = 10%
  
- Two steel plates must be connected to each other using ties  
 Ties can consist of bars, steel shapes, or built-up shapes
  
- Steel plates must be anchored to concrete infill using  
 stud anchors or ties or combination of ties and studs

## Local buckling, Plate Slenderness, Axial Compression




## Local Buckling, Plate Slenderness, Axial Compression

Wind:  $\frac{b}{t_p} \leq 1.2 \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_y}}$

Seismic:  $\frac{b}{t_p} \leq 1.05 \sqrt{\frac{E_s}{R_y F_y}}$





$$F_{cr} \geq F_y$$



$$P_{no} = A_s F_y + 0.85 f'_c A_c$$

## Tie Bar Size, Spacing, and Stability of Empty Modules


- Empty steel module flexibility governed by effective shear stiffness  $(GA)_{eff}$  associated with Vierendeel truss / frame action



$$\Delta_{total} = \frac{5 \times wL^4}{384 \times EI_{total}} + \frac{wL^2}{8 \times GA_{eff}} \quad \text{dominates}$$


## Tie Bar Size, Spacing, and Stability of Empty Modules

- Stability of empty modules during erection, construction and concrete placement → important consideration for design




## Tie Bar Size, Spacing, and Stability of Empty Modules

- Stability is governed by shear buckling, and  $P_{cr}$  is approx. equal to the same effective shear stiffness  $(GA)_{eff}$  irrespective of length and end conditions



## Tie Bar Size, Spacing, and Stability of Empty Modules

Confirmed by tests, analysis, and mechanics-based models



## Tie Bar Size, Spacing, and Stability of Empty Modules

- Minimum  $(GA)_{\text{eff}}$  of empty module for transportation, erection, and stability during construction, concrete casting
- Refined calculations can be made using theory
- Recommendations for tie bar size

$$\frac{S}{t_p} \leq 1.0 \sqrt{\frac{E_s}{2\alpha + 1}}$$

$$\alpha = 1.7 \left[ \frac{t_{sc}}{t_p} - 2 \right] \left[ \frac{t_p}{d_{tie}} \right]^4$$

- $\alpha$  is the ratio of plate flexural stiffness to tie flexural stiffness
- $\alpha$  governs the value of  $(GA)_{\text{eff}}$ , and thus the tie spacing  $S/t_p$  requirement
- Still need to meet plate slenderness req.

## Tie Bar Size, Spacing, and Stability of Empty Modules

- For example, 24 in. thick wall with ½ in. thick steel plates, and tie diameter of 1 in.
- Value of  $\alpha = 4.9$
- $S/t_p < 52$  and required tie spacing = 25 in.
- Plate slenderness requirement =  $1.2 \sqrt{E/F_y}$
- Max. slenderness = 29, required spacing < 14.5 in.
- Potential designs with tie diameter of 1 in. & spacing of 14 in.  
Or with tie spacing of 24 in. and stud spacing of 12 in.

## Recommendations for Stiffness

### In-Plane Flexural Stiffness

- Account for concrete cracking corresponding to the required strength level
- Section moment-curvature response → secant stiffness corresponding to 60% of moment capacity
- Extent of concrete cracking, if drift governs or walls are oversized

*In-plane flexure*

$$EI_{eff} = E_s I_s + 0.35 E_c I_c$$

*Axial*


$$EA_{eff} = E_s A_s + 0.45 E_c A_c$$

*In-plane shear*

$$GA_{v,eff} = G_s A_{s,wall} + G_c A_c$$

## Recommendations for Strength



### Plastic stress distribution over composite cross-section




- Steel in compression & tension  $\rightarrow f_y$
- Compression concrete  $\rightarrow 0.85f'_c$
- Equilibrium to calc. plastic neutral axis location,  $c$
- Plastic moment  $M_p$

## In-Plane Shear Strength

### Mechanics-based theory – orthotropic composite




## In-Plane Shear Strength Experimental validation



## In-Plane Shear Strength

Tests conducted in US, Japan, S.Korea, China, Europe used to confirm theory and design equations



So... while I was putting together this presentation, I wondered... why the chicken crossed the road... It seems that the chicken behind it was not “social distancing” properly

## Outline

1. Introduction to System and Its Use / History
2. Section Detailing, Limits, Requirements
3. **Stiffness, Strength, Deformation Capacity**
4. Nonlinear Analysis & Modeling Recommendations
5. Seismic Behavior & Capacity Design
6. Seismic Performance Requirements
7. Fire Performance & Design
8. Current & Future Work

# EXPERIMENTS

## Evaluation of Composite Wall Behavior

*Applicable to Seismic or Non-Seismic Behavior*

*Applicable to Coupled or Uncoupled Systems*

## Objectives

### Experimental Evaluation of Cyclic Lateral Load-Displacement

- Focus on stiffness, strength, and deformation capacity
- Parameters to be considered
  - Axial load level
  - Plate slenderness ratio
  - Tie bar size and spacing
  - Shear connectors

## Experimental Method

- Test Matrix
- Test Setup
- Loading Protocol
- Expected Results (stiffness, strength, etc.)
- Experimental Behavior – Along with Various Events
- Comparison and Assessments
- Experimental Findings

## Test Matrix

Specimens are planar C-PSW/CF


- Length = 36 in.
- Height = 108 in.
- Wall thickness = 9 in.
- Web plate and flange plate thickness = 3/16 in.

Varied parameters


- Axial load level (10 - 30%  $A_g f'_c$ )
- Plate slenderness ratio (24 – 48)
- Tie bar diameter and spacing ( $t_{sc}/2 - t_{sc}$ )
- Use of shear studs vs. ties

## Test Matrix


CW-42-55-XX-T



CW-42-14-20-TS





CW-42-14-20-T




Specimen	General			Web										Flange	
	$H, in$	$L, in$	$\frac{P}{\%A_{gfc}}$	$t_{sc}, in$	$t_p, in$	$\rho$	$s_{stud}, in$	$d_{stud}, in$	$s_{stud}/t_p$	$s_{tie}, in$	$d_{tie}, in$	$s_{tie}/t_p$	$\rho_t$	$t_{p,f}, in$	$w_f, in$
CW-42-55-10-T	108	36	10	9	3/16	4.2%	-	-	-	4.5	0.375	24.0	0.55%	3/16	11
CW-42-55-20-T	108	36	20	9	3/16	4.2%	-	-	-	4.5	0.375	24.0	0.55%	3/16	11
CW-42-55-30-T	108	36	30	9	3/16	4.2%	-	-	-	4.5	0.375	24.0	0.55%	3/16	11
CW-42-14-20-T	108	36	20	9	3/16	4.2%	-	-	-	9	0.375	48.0	0.14%	3/16	11
CW-42-14-20-TS	108	36	20	9	3/16	4.2%	4.5	0.375	24	9	0.375	48.0	0.14%	3/16	11

## Test Specimens – Tie Bar Weld Details




## Test Specimens – Base Plate Weld Details




Wall connection to the base plate



## Test Setup








## Test Specimens




Lateral Cyclic Loading



Expected Stiffness and Strength



## Lateral Load-Displacement of CW-42-55-10-T



## Photographs of Local Buckling During $2\Delta_y$ Cycles – Point B



## Photographs of Local Buckling During $3\Delta y$ Cycles – Point C



## Local Buckling & Fracture During $4\Delta y$ Cycles – Point D




## Fracture Failure During $6\Delta y$ Cycles – Point E




## Base Moment – Plastic Hinge Rotation Behavior


$$P/P_o = 10\% A_g f'_c$$




$$P/P_o = 20\% A_g f'_c$$




## Moment – Curvature Behavior of Plastic Hinge




## Moment-Curvature Behavior – Fiber Section Analysis



## Section Flexural Section Stiffness



## Rotation Capacity



## Experimental Results

AISC recommended plastic stress distribution and fiber analysis methods can conservatively estimate the flexural capacity of wall specimens.

Increasing the axial load level resulted in increasing the flexural capacity of the planar wall specimens.

The flexural stiffness of the wall specimens (in the elastic range) can be estimated reasonably using  $EI_{eff}$  equations

## Experimental Results

The plastic rotation capacity of the planar wall specimens (including those subjected to high axial loading) was in the range of 0.015 – 0.02 radians

The moment-curvature responses for the specimens calculated using fiber-based models were comparable to the envelopes of the experimentally measured experimental responses.

The peak points ( $M_{max}$ ) on the moment-curvature responses occurred after the compression strain in the steel plates exceeded 2 times the yield strain, which corresponds to concrete compressive strain of about 0.004

Q. What do you call Chewbacca when he has chocolate stuck in his hair  
A. Chocolate Chip Wookiee!

## Outline


1. Introduction to System and Its Use / History
2. Section Detailing, Limits, Requirements
3. Stiffness, Strength, Deformation Capacity
4. **Nonlinear Analysis & Modeling Recommendations**
5. Seismic Behavior & Capacity Design
6. Seismic Performance Requirements
7. Fire Performance & Design
8. Current & Future Work

## Objectives

- 3D Finite Element Models and Analysis of Planar Walls
- Effective Stress-Strain Relationships for Steel and Concrete
- 2D Finite Element Models and Analysis
- OpenSEES Fiber-Based Models and Analysis


## 3D Finite Element Models

- Individually model
  - Steel faceplates
  - Concrete infill
  - Tie bars
  - Stud anchors
  - Interactions between steel & concrete
  - Entire test setup





### 3D Finite Element Models



- Steel plasticity, local buckling, fracture
- Concrete compression plasticity, tension cracking
- Tie bar and stud anchor slip capacity & failure




### 3D Finite Element Models – Monotonic Analysis




## 3D Finite Element Models – Cyclic Analysis



## 3D Finite Element Models – Cyclic Analysis



## Effective Stress-Strain Curves



Phenomenological effective stress-strain curves:

- (a) Fundamental behavior and failure mechanisms
- (b) Conservative approach
- (c) Simplicity of their application in numerical models

## Effective Stress-Strain Curves - Steel

**Average stress:**

$$\sigma_{eff} = \frac{\sum A \sigma_{ii}}{\sum A_j}$$

Where,

$\sigma_{ii}$  = Element stress

$A_j$  = Element area

**Effective strain:**


$$\epsilon_{eff} = \frac{\Delta h}{h_p}$$

Where,


$h_p$  = Plastic hinge length

$L$  = Length of the wall


$\Delta h$  = Average of vertical displacements



## Effective Stress-Strain Curves - Concrete




(a) Side view




$A_{el}$  = Element area  
 $Y_{22}$  = Location of the axial force  
 $f_{22}$  = Axial force of each element  
 $F_{22}$  = Axial force of compression block

(b) Compression block calculations

## Proposed Effective Stress-Strain Curves




Steel




Concrete

## 2D Finite Element Model




Composite layered wall  
 (Shell, S4R)

+







Steel flange plates  
 (Truss, T3D2)

=







2D Finite Element Model

## 3D FEM Analysis vs. 2D FEM Analysis



## OpenSEES Fiber-Based Models

- Same effective stress-strain curves
- Include hysteretic relationships
- Cyclic fatigue and fracture models



## Outline


1. Introduction to System and Its Use / History
2. Section Detailing, Limits, Requirements
3. Stiffness, Strength, Deformation Capacity
4. Nonlinear Analysis & Modeling Recommendations
5. **Seismic Behavior & Capacity Design**
6. Seismic Performance Requirements
7. Fire Performance & Design
8. Current & Future Work

## Introduction

- Seismic design can be performed using ASCE 7 Standard and AISC 341 Seismic Provisions
- Performance-based design can also be conducted, but that is project specific, and not discussed here in detail
- Numerical models required for PBD are similar to those presented here

## Seismic Design Factors

- $R$  – Response modification factor is used to reduce the seismic design forces from elastic level to account for inelastic behavior and ductility of the structure
- $\Omega_o$  – Overstrength factor is used to estimate the inherent overstrength in the base shear capacity of system due to redundancies, material, etc.
- $C_d$  – Displacement amplification factor is used to calculate the inelastic story drift from the calculated elastic story drift level





## ASCE 7

- ASCE 7 provides these seismic design factors for most steel, concrete, and composite systems
- For uncoupled C-PSW/CF system (with only shear walls), ASCE 7 include values of  $R=6.5$ ,  $\Omega_o = 2.5$ , and  $C_d=5.5$
- For the coupled C-PSW/CF system (core walls, etc.) ASCE 7 did not include these values
- In ASCE 7, the largest value of R for any system is 8.

## FEMA P-695

- FEMA P-695 is a systematic process to assess the seismic collapse margin of structures designed using a consistent design method and seismic factors ( $R$ ,  $\Omega_o$ ,  $C_d$ )
- Steps include:
  - Consistent design method
  - Archetype structures in different groups
  - Nonlinear models able to model failure modes
  - Scaled suite of ground motions
  - Incremental dynamic analyses
  - Statistical evaluation of results and collapse margin

## SpeedCore Systems – Coupled & Uncoupled



## SpeedCore System - Uncoupled

- Seismic design provisions in AISC 341 Section H7 (2016) with updates in 2022
- Section H7.1 – Scope
  - Wall height-to-length ratios greater than or equal to 3
  - Flexure-critical walls
  - Walls have boundary elements or flange plates

## Uncoupled SpeedCore – FEMA P-695


- Comprehensive study was conducted to confirm the seismic design factors ( $R$ ,  $\Omega_o$ ,  $C_d$ ) already given in ASCE 7
- Archetype structures included 3, 6, 9 and 12 story structures with planar walls and flange plates.
- Also included archetype structures with C-shaped walls for 15, 18, and 22 story structures
- Nonlinear models (using OpenSEES) and incremental dynamic analyses for 22 sets of FEMA ground motions scaled

## Uncoupled SpeedCore – FEMA P-695

- Collapse was defined conservatively with maximum story drift ratio of 3% although the composite walls had not failed
- All the archetype structure passed the adjusted collapse margin ratio limits set forth in FEMA P-695 for 10% probability of failure at maximum considered earthquake, while assuming uncertainties associated with “good” designs, models, ground motions and analyses

## Coupled SpeedCore – Capacity Design


- Target R factor = 8 (highest possible in ASCE 7)
- Additional system level ductility due to coupling
- Potential to spread inelastic behavior along structure height
- Opportunity – to develop capacity design principle and get better system behavior, ductility, and thus higher R factor



## Coupled SpeedCore – Capacity Design

- Two potential sources of inelastic deformations
  1. Flexural plastic hinges at ends of coupling beams
  2. Flexural yielding at base of walls
- Preferred inelastic mechanism – form flexural plastic hinges at both ends of coupling beams and at the base of walls
- Strong wall – beam coupling beam design approach followed for sizing of composite members
- Develops extensive plastic hinging in most coupling beams before significant yielding of walls
- Coupling beams can fracture, while walls continue to provide inelastic behavior

## Coupled SpeedCore – Capacity Design



- Coupling beams form plastic hinges and distributed plasticity along structure height
- Walls sized to develop plastic hinges along entire wall height

## Coupled SpeedCore – Archetype Structure Design

- 3, 8, and 12 story – Planar coupled walls
- 18, 22 story – C-shaped coupled walls





Type 1 – Planar walls  
 Coupled and uncoupled walls



Type 2 – C-shaped walls  
 Coupled and uncoupled walls



## Coupled SpeedCore – Capacity Design

- Typical pushover behavior – OpenSEES Model






# Coupled SpeedCore – Capacity Design

## 2D Finite Element Model





# Coupled SpeedCore – Design Basis EQ



## Coupled SpeedCore – Maximum Considered EQ



Maximum Considered EQ




■ Propagation of yielding

## Coupled SpeedCore – Failure Level EQ (Scale Factor 7)


Failure Level EQ



▲ Fracture initiation



○ Total fracture



## Outline


1. Introduction to System and Its Use / History
2. Section Detailing, Limits, Requirements
3. Stiffness, Strength, Deformation Capacity
4. Nonlinear Analysis & Modeling Recommendations
5. Seismic Behavior & Capacity Design
6. **Seismic Performance Requirements**
7. Fire Performance & Design
8. Current & Future Work

## Coupled SpeedCore – FEMA P-695 Results

- Archetype structures designed and detailed according to capacity design and AISC 341-22 – Section H8
- Design provisions included in NEHRP (2020) and ASCE 7-21
- 3, 8, 12 story – planar coupled walls
- 18, 22 story – C-shaped coupled walls
- Nonlinear models developed by two independent teams
- Incremental dynamic analyses for 22 sets of FEMA P-695 ground motions scaled appropriately

## Coupled SpeedCore – FEMA P-695 Results

- Failure was conservatively assumed at 5% drift ratio although the walls don't fail
- Collapse margin ratios
- Adjusted collapse margin ratios
- Acceptance criteria for individual and group of archetype structure
- Passes for “good” designs, models ground motions, analyses
- Confirms the seismic factors  $R$ ,  $\Omega_o$ ,  $C_d$  for the system



## Seismic Design Provisions – AISC 341-22 Section H8


- System level requirements / limitations in addition to those in AISC 360-22 and Section H7 (Uncoupled)
- Wall height-to-length ratio of composite walls greater than or equal to 4, i.e., walls are flexure critical → yielding governs
- Coupling beams are also flexure critical with clear length-to-section depth ( $L/d$ )  $\geq 3.0$  and  $\leq 5.0$
- Based on archetypes included in FEMA P-695 studies, and desired ductility

## Seismic Design Provisions – AISC 341-22 Section H8


- Slenderness requirements for composite coupling beam and composite wall steel elements
- Coupling beam-to-wall connection requirements
  - Required flexure and shear strength to develop expected plastic strength of coupling beam
  - Chord rotation capacity of 0.03 rad. before strength degrades to 80% of  $M_p$

## Coupling Beam-to-Wall Connections

Required Performance



Models assumed in P-695




## Coupling Beam-to-Wall Connections

- Some tested in the past, but limited testing of flexure critical
- Additional testing ongoing currently
- Composite coupling beam consists of flange plates, web plates and concrete infill
- Different connections between these elements and wall web plates, flange plates and concrete infill
- Various connection types considered, vetted by industry, fabricators, and three final candidates selected
- Three connection types and two L/d ratios of 3 and 5


## Coupling Beam-to-Wall Connections

Connection Type 1B



- Coupling beam flange plates penetrate into walls
- Coupling beam web plates lapped and welded to walls



Connection Type 3




- Coupling beam flange plates penetrate into walls
- Wall web plates continuous with beam web plates

## Test Setup and Specimens


Specimens are 1:2 scale




## Test Setup




## Lateral Force-Displacement Behavior SP-3



## Lateral Force – Chord Rotation Behavior SP-3





## Moment – Chord Rotation Behavior for SP-3



## Photographs of Specimen During Testing

During 3 – 4  $\Delta y$  : Chord rotation of 0.035 rad.



## Findings from Seismic Performance Requirements

- Coupling beam-to-wall connections have been tested and confirmed for SpeedCore
- Three connection types have been fully tested successfully for different length-to-depth ratios


## Outline

1. Introduction to System and Its Use / History
2. Section Detailing, Limits, Requirements
3. Stiffness, Strength, Deformation Capacity
4. Nonlinear Analysis & Modeling Recommendations
5. Seismic Behavior & Capacity Design
6. Seismic Performance Requirements
7. Fire Performance & Design
8. Current & Future Work

## Fire Resistance and Design of C-PSW/CF Walls


- Focus on unprotected composite walls
- Experimental Behavior - Thermal & Structural
- Uniform and non-uniform heating
- Numerical Models, Benchmarking, Parametric Studies
- Wall axial strength equation as function of temperature
- Fire resistance rating in hours
- Steam vent hole design

## Recent Testing in China



## Observed Failure Modes

*Local Buckling*



*Weld Failure*




*Global Instability*




## Experimental Investigations


Wall thickness	9 in.
Load ratio	20 -28 %
Plate slenderness	24-48
Fire scenarios	Uniform Non-uniform
Using shear studs between tie bars	




## Structural Test Setup




## Heating Test Setup





### Photograph of Test Setup





Heaters




## Typical Experimental Results (Thermal)




## Typical Experimental Results (Structural)



## Post-Fire Photographs




## Post-Fire Photographs



## Post-Fire Photographs


Shear stud weld failure at buckled regions

No rupture of tie bars






Shear stud weld failure

## Non-Uniform (Three-Sided) Heating



## Experimental Results




### Thermal Insulation Criteria:

- Average surface temperature of unexposed surface < 139°C
- Increase at any one location < 181°C


## Experimental Findings

- Uniform heating of 9 in. thick walls
  - More than 2 hours of fire resistance
  - Local buckling between ties or ties and shear studs
  - No rupture in tie bars but some failure at stud welds
  - Vent hole spacing and diameter need to be considered
- Non-uniform heating of 9 in. thick walls
  - No failure after 140 minutes (structural or thermal)
  - Out-of-plane (global) bending


### 3D Finite Element Models and Benchmarking






### C-PSW/CF Unit Width Column




## 3D Finite Element Models and Benchmarking




## 3D Finite Element Models and Benchmarking



### 3D Finite Element Models and Benchmarking






### Computer Program for Fire Design of C-PSW/CF



The program is available for download from Purdue University Research Repository (PURR) - <https://purrr.purdue.edu/publications/3473/>

## Summary of Behavior Thermal & Structural



## Parametric Studies

- Wall slenderness ( $H/T = 5 - 20$ )
- Wall thickness (200 – 600 mm)
- Load ratio (20, 30%  $A_c f'_c$ )
- Tie bar spacing ( $S_{tie}/T = 0.5 - 1.0$ )
- Steel ratio ( $A_s/A_g = 1.33 - 5.33$  %)
- Concrete strength ( $f'_c = 40, 55$  MPa)
- Boundary condition (Pinned, Fixed)

## Results from Parametric Studies

- Wall slenderness ratio, wall thickness, load ratio and type of boundary conditions significantly affect the failure time
- Walls with slenderness higher than 10 fail due to global buckling
- The middle region of concrete infill takes longer to heat up in thicker walls, resulting in higher fire resistance
- Limiting the steel plate slenderness ratio can marginally improve the fire resistance of walls

## Results from Parametric Studies

- Non-uniform (one-sided) heating results in thermal bowing, second-order moments, and eccentric moments in the walls
- Walls with height / thickness ratios greater than 20, and subjected to one-sided heating, need fire protection on the exposed surfaces
- Typical wall height / thickness ratios are within 5 – 10
- Typical SpeedCore wall designs do not need fire protection

## Proposed Equations for Wall Strength


### Lower Bound

$$P_n(T) = \left[ 0.32 \left( \frac{P_{no}(T)}{P_e(T)} \right)^{0.3} \right] P_{no}(T)$$

$$P_e(T) = \frac{\pi^2 EI_{eff}(T)}{(L_c)^2}$$

$$P_{no}(T) = A_s F_y(T) + \sum_{i=elements} 0.85 A_{ci} f'_c(T_i)$$

$$EI_{eff}(T) = E_s(T) I_s + C_3 \sum_{i=elements} E_c(T_i) I_{ci}$$



## Fire Resistance Rating

Using results from parametric studies, and strength equation


$$R = \left[ -18.5 \left( \frac{P_u}{P_n} \right)^{\left( 0.24 - \frac{H/t_w}{230} \right)} + 15 \right] \left( \frac{1.9 t_w}{200} - 1 \right)$$


$R$  = Fire resistance rating in hours

$P_u/P_n$  = utility ratio at ambient

$H/t_w$  = wall slenderness


$t_w$  = wall thickness in mm.





## Vent Hole Design

- Calculate vapor generation rate using concrete moisture content and calculated thermal gradients
- Consider an allowable build-up pressure in the steel vessel



## Vent Hole Design

- Based on relief pressure valve design
- Input – vent hole spacing, vapor generation rate, allowable pressure
- Output – vent hole size based on effective area
- In most cases, 12 ft spacing, 1 in. diameter holes are adequate

## Outline

1. Introduction to System and Its Use / History
2. Section Detailing, Limits, Requirements
3. Stiffness, Strength, Deformation Capacity
4. Nonlinear Analysis & Modeling Recommendations
5. Seismic Behavior & Capacity Design
6. Seismic Performance Requirements
7. Fire Performance & Design
8. **Current & Future Work**


## Ongoing AISC – CPF Project

- Testing of C-PSW/CF with structural shapes (wide-flange, channel sections) as boundary elements
- Testing of different types of wall-to-foundation connections (for seismic and for wind loading)
- Testing of bolted splice connection for non-seismic applications
- Testing of SC-to-RC wall splice connections for various applications
- Testing of additional steel beam-to-composite wall connections

## Current & Future Work



### COMPOSITE FLOOR-TO-SPEEDCORE WALL SYSTEMS: PERFORMANCE-BASED FIRE RESISTANCE AND DESIGN



New research project  
Started Jan. 2021

## Upcoming Publications

- Upcoming AISC 360, AISC 341, and ASCE 7.
- Design Guide 37 for SpeedCore Systems – design for wind, seismic, and fire loading
- Co-authors: Soheil Shafaei, Morgan Broberg, Ata Anvari
  - Chapter 2 – Wind Design – Three full design examples for uncoupled and coupled systems, Mathcad sheets (download)
  - Chapter 3 – Seismic Design – Two design examples for uncoupled systems, Mathcad sheets (download)
  - Chapter 4 – Seismic Design – Two design examples for coupled systems, Mathcad sheets (download)
  - Chapter 6 – Fire Design – Design example and program

## Available Resources

The screenshot shows the YouTube channel page for Amit Varma, who has 560 subscribers. The channel features a navigation menu with options for HOME, VIDEOS, PLAYLISTS, CHANNELS, DISCUSSION, and ABOUT. Below the navigation, there is a section for 'Uploads' with a 'PLAY ALL' button. A list of six video uploads is displayed, each with a thumbnail, title, duration, and view count:

Video Title	Duration	Views	Time Ago
Structural-Fire-Resistance-Design-Speedcore-Module0...	26:29	441 views	10 months ago
Structura-Fire-Resistance-Design-Module1-...	12:54	89 views	10 months ago
Structural-Fire-Resistance-Design-Speedcore-Module2...	29:21	78 views	10 months ago
Structural-Fire-Resistance-Design-Speedcore-Module3-...	22:58	56 views	10 months ago
Structural-Fire-Resistance-Design-Speedcore-Module4...	7:57	70 views	10 months ago
Structural-Fire-Resistance-Design-Speedcore-Module5...	17:19	51 views	10 months ago

## Available Resources

The screenshot shows a research repository page with a dark header featuring a fire simulation image. The title 'Fire design of SpeedCore walls and CFT columns' is prominently displayed. Below the title, there are navigation tabs for 'About', 'Supporting Docs', and 'Versions'. The authors are listed as Amit H. Varma and Ataollah Taghipour Anvari, with their affiliations at Purdue University. A 'Download Bundle (1 MB)' button is visible. The page also includes a 'Cite this work' section with a citation for Varma and Anvari (2020) and links to BibTex and EndNote.

## Available Resources

The screenshot shows a web browser displaying the AISC website page for SpeedCore. The URL is www.aisc.org/why-steel/innovative-systems/SpeedCore/. The page features a 'QUICK OVERVIEW' section with a star icon. The text describes SpeedCore as a revolutionary concrete-filled composite steel plate shear wall (CF-CPSW) core, highlighting its faster erection time compared to traditional concrete. A list of expandable sections is provided at the bottom:

- HOW DOES IT WORK? +
- HOW IS IT DIFFERENT? +
- HOW IS IT DESIGNED? +
- HOW IS IT BUILT? +
- HOW DOES IT WORK IN FIRE? +

## Available Resources

The screenshot shows a web browser window with the URL [www.aisc.org/technical-resources/research/research-updates/](http://www.aisc.org/technical-resources/research/research-updates/). The page title is "SPEEDCORE RESEARCH DELIVERABLES UPDATE" dated April 13, 2020. The text states: "New deliverables from SpeedCore related research are now available from the AISC Research Library. These reports represent a large body of research that has recently been completed, but note there is still ongoing research for this exciting and innovative system. The projects and their associated deliverables are described below."

- R-Factors for Coupled Composite Plate Shear Walls - Concrete Filled (Coupled-CPSW/CF)**  
AMIT VARMA, MORGAN BROBERG, SOHEIL SHAFAEI, JUNGIL SEO | PURDUE UNIVERSITY  
MICHEL BRUINEAU, EMRE KIZILARSLAN | UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO  
AISC and the Charles Pankow Foundation jointly funded this research that set out to determine the R-Factor used for design in Coupled Composite Plate Shear Walls - Concrete Filled, better known as coupled SpeedCore systems. The research developed and substantiated an R-Factor of 8 for Coupled SpeedCore systems by utilizing the FEMA P-695 methodology (the study was peer-reviewed). The report goes through this process and the associated analytical studies required to complete this substantial task. Also, the report outlines prescriptive design procedures for these systems that are of great use to a designer wanting to design with these systems. A link to the Final Report for this project can be found [here](#).
- Seismic Design Coefficients for SpeedCore or Composite Plate Shear Walls - Concrete Filled (C-PSW/CF)**  
AMIT VARMA, SHUBHAM AGRAWAL, MORGAN BROBERG | PURDUE UNIVERSITY  
AISC funded the peer review component of this research that set out to determine the R-Factor used for design in Planar Composite Plate Shear Walls - Concrete Filled, or planar SpeedCore systems (no coupling beams). The research developed and substantiated an R-Factor of 6.5 for planar SpeedCore systems by utilizing the FEMA P-695 methodology (the study was peer-reviewed). The report goes through this process and the associated analytical studies required to complete this substantial task. A link to the Final Report for this project can be found [here](#).
- Performance-Based Structural Fire Engineering of Buildings with Concrete-Filled Composite Plate Shear Walls (CF-CPSW)**  
AMIT VARMA, ATAOLLAH TAGHIPOUR ANVARI, SAAHASTARANSHU BHARDWAJ, PRESHIT WAZALWA | PURDUE UNIVERSITY  
This project has recently concluded and it conducted experimental and analytical studies to evaluate the performance of concrete-filled composite plate shear walls (C-PSW/CF - also known as SpeedCore) subjected to fire loading, and to develop design guidelines and recommendations. The results from prior experimental investigations were compiled, and five additional fire tests were conducted on laboratory-scale specimens subjected to axial loading and simulated

Questions?



Discussion!

# Questions



## CEU / PDH Certificates

---

### For those participating at their own connection...

- Reporting attendance is not necessary.
- Certificates will be issued based on AISC's attendance record.
- You will be receiving certificates via email from [registration@aisc.org](mailto:registration@aisc.org).



## CEU / PDH Certificates

### For those participating at one connection with a group...

- Main registrant will report attendance via an online form. (The link will be provided in an email from [registration@aisc.org](mailto:registration@aisc.org).)
  - Username: Same as AISC website username.
  - Password: Same as AISC website password.
- Once attendance has been reported, each group member will be receiving certificates via email from [registration@aisc.org](mailto:registration@aisc.org).



Smarter.  
Stronger.  
Steel.



**AISC** | Thank you



Smarter.  
Stronger.  
Steel.