

Unbonded Pretensioned Bridge Columns with Rocking Detail

Jeffrey A. Schaefer United States Air Force

Bryan Kennedy

Marc O. Eberhard

John F. Stanton

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering University of Washington

PEER 2014/08 JUNE 2014

Disclaimer

The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the study sponsor(s) or the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center.

Unbonded Pretensioned Bridge Columns with Rocking Detail

Jeffrey A. Schaefer United States Air Force

Bryan Kennedy

Marc O. Eberhard

John F. Stanton

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering University of Washington

PEER Report 2014/08 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Headquarters at the University of California, Berkeley

June 2014

ii

ABSTRACT

The columns and cap-beams of most bridges are built of cast-in-place reinforced concrete (CIP). The construction of CIP bridges often causes traffic congestion, and following an earthquake, they may be too damaged to function. To address these concerns, the authors have developed a new precast, pretensioned system. The precast feature reduces traffic delays by moving time-consuming construction activities off site. The pretensioning feature tends to reduce residual displacements after an earthquake. To minimize damage, deformations are concentrated at the columns ends, where a steel shoe confines the concrete. The use of epoxy-coated strands and the quality control available in a precasting plant will enhance durability.

The seismic performance of the system was evaluated with pseudo-static tests of two column-to-footing subassemblies. At the column base, one specimen incorporated ductile fiber-reinforced concrete (HyFRC) and a steel dowel bar that extended into the footing. The other column had neither any HYFRC nor a dowel. The first bar fracture occurred near a drift ratio of 6%, a value that can be controlled by varying the unbonded length of the reinforcement. Even after being subjected to drift ratios of over 10%, both columns had negligible damage to the concrete and residual drifts of only 0.5%.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the State of California through the Transportation System Research Program of the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER), and by the National Science Foundation Network for Earthquake Engineering Research Program (Award #1207903). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of PEER, the National Science Foundation, or any other sponsors.

The authors acknowledge the significant contributions of Rachel Schaefer and the following colleagues: Travis Thornstad, Olafur Haraldsson, and other graduate students at the University of Washington. Additional support was provided by Vince Chaijaroen, Structural Laboratory Manager at the University of Washington.

vi

ABST	[RAC]	Г	iii
ACK	NOWI	LEDGMENTS	V
TAB	LE OF	CONTENTS	vii
LIST	OF FI	IGURES	xi
LIST	OF TA	ABLES	xvii
1	INTI	RODUCTION	1
	1.1	Precasing Components to Acceleration Bridge Construction	2
	1.2	Socket Connections	3
	1.3	Unbonded Prestressing to Reduce Residual Displacements	5
	1.4	Steel Shoe Rocking Column	7
	1.5	Hybrid Fiber Reinforced Concrete	9
	1.6	Research Motivation, Objectives, and Scope	10
2	DES	IGN OF TEST SPECIMENS	13
	2.1	Geometry of Test Specimens	14
	2.2	Reinforcement	15
	2.3	Rocking Connection	18
		 2.3.1 Shoe Annular Plate	19 19 19 20 20
	2.4	Ductility through Fiber Reinforced Concrete	20
	2.5	Design of Socket Connection	22
	2.6	Design of Spread Footing	23
	2.7	Design of Cap Beam Connection	24
3	EXP	ERIMENTAL SET-UP	27
	3.1	Test Set-Up	27
	3.2	Instrumentation	29

CONTENTS

		3.2.1 Applied Loads	
		3.2.2 Strain Gauges	
		3.2.3 Curvature Rod System	
		3.2.4 Motion Capture System	
		3.2.5 Inclinometers	
		3.2.6 Strand Load Cells	
		3.2.7 Horizontal Deflection of the System	
		3.2.8 Rocking of the Footing	35
	3.3	Test Protocol	
4	OBS	ERVED DAMAGE PROGRESSION	
	4.1	Damage States Definition	
	4.2	Damage Progression	40
		4.2.1 Concrete Cracking	43
		4.2.2 Initial Yielding	44
		4.2.3 Concrete Spalling	45
		4.2.4 Damage to Longitudinal Reinforcement	48
		4.2.5 Loss of Axial-Load Capacity	51
5	MEA	ASURED RESPONSE	53
	5.1	Material Properties	53
		5.1.1 Conventional Concrete	
		5.1.2 HyFRC	55
		5.1.3 Steel Reinforcement	55
	5.2	Moment–Drift Response	56
	5.3	Effective Force Acting on Specimens	61
	5.4	Column Rotations	62
	5.5	Column Curvatures	68
	5.6	Strains in Longitudinal Reinforcement	71
		5.6.1 No. 4 Bars	71
		5.6.2 No. 6 Bars	76
	5.7	Strain in Transverse Reinforcement	80
	5.8	Strain in Prestressing Strands	82
	5.9	Strand Slip	84

6	CON	IPARISON WITH PREVIOUS TESTS	91
	6.1	Peak Strength and Strength Degradation	91
	6.2	Energy Dissipation	
	6.3	Equivalent Viscous Damping	96
	6.4	Re-centering of Columns	
		6.4.1 Re-centering Ratio	
		6.4.2 Normalized Cross-over Displacement	
7	CON	IPARISON WITH CALCULATED RESPONSE	
	7.1	Column Stiffness	
	7.2	Flexural Strength of Columns	104
	7.3	Shear Strength of Columns	
	7.4	Drift Ratio at Bar Fracture	
	7.5	Column Rotation and Vertical Displacement	
	7.6	Strand Bond Strength	110
8	SUM	IMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	113
	8.1	Summary	
	8.2	Conclusions	115
		8.2.1 Overall Conclusions	115
		8.2.2 Detailed Conclusions	115
	8.3	Recommendations	116
		8.3.1 Practice and Design Recommendations	116
		8.3.2 Recommendations for Future Research	117
REF	FEREN	CES	119
APP	PENDIX	A: MATERIALS	121
APF	PENDIX	B: SPECIMEN DRAWINGS	

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Elevation of prestressed concrete column system.	1
Figure 1.2	The process of using socket connection to accelerate construction	4
Figure 1.3	Main parts of column to cap beam socket connection	4
Figure 1.4	Theoretical cyclic load-deflection curves for both traditional reinforced concrete system (a) and unbonded prestressed concrete system (b) (adapted from Stanton et al. [1997]).	5
Figure 1.5	Effective lateral force versus lateral displacement [Cohagen et al. 2008]	6
Figure 1.6	Effective lateral force versus lateral displacement [Davis et al. 2012]	7
Figure 1.7	Plan view of steel shoe feature and dowel bar	8
Figure 1.8	Elevation view of steel shoe feature and dowel bar	8
Figure 1.9	Effective lateral force versus drift, column with HyFRC [Finnsson 2013]	9
Figure 1.10	Plan view of HyFRC section: (a) Finnsson [2013] and (b) this report	10
Figure 2.1	Reduced geometry section to accommodate actuator connection.	14
Figure 2.2	Strand and rebar pattern used in the specimens.	15
Figure 2.3	Elevation view of the specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.	16
Figure 2.4	Comparison of the unbonded regions in a column in the field and the test specimens (adapted from Davis et al. [2012]).	17
Figure 2.5	(a) Photograph and (b) schematic views of the system to detect and prevent the strands from slipping	18
Figure 2.6	Steel shoe: (a) elevation view of the shoe; and (b) bottom view of the shoe.	19
Figure 2.7	Dowel bar and cup that provide shear reinforcement across the column– footing interface in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC	20
Figure 2.8	Typical axial compression stress versus strain for HyFRC compared to conventional concrete [Ostertag et al. 2014].	21
Figure 2.9	Comparison of HyFRC regions between specimen PreT-SF-ROCK- HyFRC and PreT-SF-HyFRC [Finnsson 2013]	22
Figure 2.10	Roughened surface of the portion of the column that extends into the spread footing	23
Figure 2.11	Details of the socket connection.	23
Figure 2.12	Detailed drawing of the bottom steel of the footing.	24
Figure 2.13	Hybrid grouted socket connection [Davis et al. 2012].	25

Figure 3.1	Testing rig	27
Figure 3.2	(a) Actual and (b) schematic views for the system that transferred load from the Baldwin to the specimen while safely covering prestressing load cells and chucks.	28
Figure 3.3	Instrumentation set-up.	30
Figure 3.4	Column elevation view of three-wire strain gauge placements	31
Figure 3.5	Column cross-section view of three-wire strain gauge placements	31
Figure 3.6	(a) Photograph and (b) schematic views of the curvature rod system used on the north face	32
Figure 3.7	Optotrac sensor configuration on the test specimen, showing (a) view of north and west sensors and (b) view of south sensors.	33
Figure 3.8	Typical inclinometer attached to the column's east face	34
Figure 3.9	A string potentiometer attached to the instrumentation tower	35
Figure 3.10	The LVDT used to measure the actuator beam deflection during testing	36
Figure 3.11	Graphical representation of the target displacement history	38
Figure 4.1	Comparison of drift levels at which both columns reached the defined damage states.	42
Figure 4.2	Comparison of damage states versus drift levels occurred between the specimens in this report and those of Finnsson [2013]	42
Figure 4.3	South view of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC after cycle 9-1 (6% max drift) showing hairline cracking in the column.	43
Figure 4.4	South view of PreT-SF-ROCK after cycle 9-1 (6% max drift) showing hairline cracking in the column	44
Figure 4.5	South view of PreT-SF-ROCK after cycle 8-4 showing spalling damage above the steel shoe.	46
Figure 4.6	South view of PreT-SF-ROCK showing the fillet spalling of the footing induced by the rocking action of the steel shoe.	47
Figure 4.7	South view of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC showing the fillet spalling of the footing induced by the rocking action of the steel shoe	47
Figure 4.8	(a) Jagged portion of HyFRC that seeped through steel-wire mesh; and (b) column–footing interface after top portion of column was removed	48
Figure 4.9	Exposed north bar of PreT-SF-ROCK.	50
Figure 4.10	Fractured northwest bar of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC (fractured in footing)	50
Figure 4.11	Fractured north bar of PreT-SF-ROCK.	51
Figure 4.12	Northwest view of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC showing location of missing strand (fractured).	51

Figure 5.1	Definitions of variables for Equation (5.2).	57
Figure 5.2	Friction correction model [Brown 2008].	57
Figure 5.3	Schematic drawing of the sliding channel and its friction components	58
Figure 5.4	Uncorrected moment-drift plot for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC	58
Figure 5.5	Uncorrected moment-drift plot for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK	59
Figure 5.6	Corrected moment-drift plot for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC	59
Figure 5.7	Corrected moment-drift plot for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK	60
Figure 5.8	Effective force-displacement response for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK- HyFRC.	61
Figure 5.9	Effective force-displacement response for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK	62
Figure 5.10	Rotations of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC as measured with curvature rod system.	63
Figure 5.11	Rotations of PreT-SF-ROCK as measured with curvature rod system	64
Figure 5.12	Rotations of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC as measured from inclinometers	64
Figure 5.13	Rotations of PreT-SF-ROCK as measured from inclinometers	65
Figure 5.14	Rotations of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC as measured with the Optotrac system.	66
Figure 5.15	Rotations of PreT-SF-ROCK as measured with the Optotrac system.	66
Figure 5.16	Comparison of measured rotations for PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC	67
Figure 5.17	Comparison of measured rotations for PreT-SF-ROCK	67
Figure 5.18	Average curvatures of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, calculated from curvature rod system.	69
Figure 5.19	Average curvatures of PreT-SF-ROCK, calculated from curvature rod system.	69
Figure 5.20	Average curvatures of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, calculated from the Optotrac system.	70
Figure 5.21	Average curvatures of PreT-SF-ROCK, calculated from the Optotrac system.	70
Figure 5.22	Strain profiles for the south No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC	71
Figure 5.23	Strain profiles for the south No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK	72
Figure 5.24	Strain profiles for the north No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK	72
Figure 5.25	Strain versus drift in the south No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.	74
Figure 5.26	Strain versus drift in the north No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC	74
Figure 5.27	Strain versus drift in the south No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK.	75
Figure 5.28	Strain versus drift in the north No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK.	75

Figure 5.29	Strain profiles for the southeast No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC	76
Figure 5.30	Strain profiles for the northwest No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC	77
Figure 5.31	Strain profiles for the southeast No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK.	77
Figure 5.32	Strain profiles for the northwest No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK.	78
Figure 5.33	Strain versus drift in the southeast No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC	79
Figure 5.34	Strain versus drift in the northwest No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC	79
Figure 5.35	Strain versus drift in the southeast No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK	79
Figure 5.36	Strain versus drift in the northwest No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK.	80
Figure 5.37	Strain versus drift of transverse reinforcement in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC	81
Figure 5.38	Strain versus drift of transverse reinforcement in PreT-SF-ROCK	81
Figure 5.39	Strand strain gauge data versus drift (blue) and estimated yield strain (red) for PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.	82
Figure 5.40	Strand strain gauge data versus drift (blue) and estimated yield strain (red) for PreT-SF-ROCK.	83
Figure 5.41	Load versus drift on strand load cells for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK- HyFRC.	85
Figure 5.42	Load versus drift on strand load cells for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK	86
Figure 5.43	Definitions of variables for Equation (5.7).	87
Figure 5.44	Axial elongation in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.	88
Figure 5.45	Axial elongation in PreT-SF-ROCK	88
Figure 6.1	Moment versus drift envelopes	92
Figure 6.2	Normalized strength degradation comparisons	92
Figure 6.3	Energy dissipated per cycle.	94
Figure 6.4	Cumulative dissipated energy history	94
Figure 6.5	Normalization method for energy dissipation [Pang et al. 2008].	95
Figure 6.6	Comparison of normalized cumulative dissipated energy.	96
Figure 6.7	Equivalent viscous damping versus cycle number.	97
Figure 6.8	Equivalent viscous damping versus drift ratio	98
Figure 6.9	Forces used to calculate the re-centering ratio [Hieber et al. 2005].	99
Figure 6.10	Definition of the crossover displacement [Haraldsson et al. 2011]	100
Figure 6.11	Comparison of normalized crossover displacement.	100

Figure 7.1	Definition of variables for Equation (7.9)	108
Figure 7.2	Comparison of vertical displacement and column rotation computed from different sensors.	109
Figure 7.3	Comparison of assumed and measured bar strain concentrations.	110
Figure A.1	Column conventional concrete compressive strength history.	123
Figure A.2	E-MOD history for the column conventional concrete	124
Figure A.3	HyFRC compressive strength history.	125
Figure A.4	E-MOD history for the HyFRC.	126
Figure A.5	Footing conventional concrete compressive strength history	127
Figure A.6	Stress-strain relations for #4 reinforcement.	129
Figure A.7	Stress-strain relations for #6 reinforcement.	129
Figure A.8	Stress-strain relations for 3-gauge spiral reinforcement.	130
Figure B.1	Column elevation.	131
Figure B.2	Column cross-sectional views	132
Figure B.2	(Continued)	133
Figure B.3	Steel schedule for both specimens.	134
Figure B.4	Footing dimensions, profile view.	134
Figure B.5	Footing dimensions, transverse view.	135
Figure B.6	Footing top mat	135
Figure B.7	Footing bottom mat	136

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Instrumentation manifest for one column	29
Table 3.2	Target displacement history	
Table 4.1	Damage states used to characterize damage progression in the columns	40
Table 4.2	Summary of damage state progression for both specimens	41
Table 4.3	Comparison of drift levels at initial yield.	45
Table 4.4	Comparison of drift levels at bar fracture	49
Table 5.1	Conventional concrete compressive strengths on test days	54
Table 5.2	Conventional concrete elastic modulus on test days	54
Table 5.3	Conventional concrete tensile strength on PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test	55
Table 5.4	HyFRC material properties on PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day,	
Table 5.5	Measured properties of reinforcing steel.	56
Table 5.6	Summary of moment–drift response	61
Table 5.7	Summary of effective forces.	62
Table 7.1	Column secant stiffness at first yield	104
Table 7.2	Comparison of measured and calculated EI	104
Table 7.3	Calculated moment and observed moment strengths	105
Table 7.4	Results for shear strength calculations	106
Table 7.5	Comparison between predicted and observed drift values at bar fracture	107
Table 7.6	Stress in prestressing strands at first slip.	111
Table A.1	Design mix for one batch of HyFRC used in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK- HyFRC.	122
Table A.2	Design mix for one cubic yard of concrete used for both column and footings.	122
Table A.3	Column conventional concrete compressive strength history. Note: Day 8 is the release of prestressing strands, Day 79 is the PreT-SF-ROCK test day, Day 90 is the PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day.	123
Table A.4	Column conventional concrete E-MOD history.	124
Table A.5	Column conventional concrete tensile strength.	124

Table A.6	HyFRC compressive strength history. Note: Day 10 is the release of	
	prestressing strands, Day 92 is PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day1	25
Table A.7	HyFRC E-MOD history1	26
Table A.8	HyFRC tensile strength1	26
Table A.9	Footing conventional concrete compressive strength history. Note: Day 35	
	is PreT-SF-ROCK test day, Day 46 is PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day1	27
Table A.8	Footing conventional concrete tensile strength1	28

1 Introduction

This report describes the development and experimental testing of the column-to-footing connection for a new bridge bent system. The advantages of this system, as compared to its conventional counterpart, include:

- Accelerated bridge construction
- Improved seismic performance through re-centering
- Forestalling of column spalling and bar buckling
- Delayed bar fracture

Figure 1.1 illustrates the system schematically.



Figure 1.1 Elevation of prestressed concrete column system.

The most significant differences between this bridge bent system and a conventional, cast-in-place reinforced concrete bent system are:

- 1. The columns and beams are precast to accelerate construction (Section 1.1).
- 2. The system uses a "wet socket" connection [Haraldsson et al. 2011] between the column and the cast-in-place footing (Section 1.2).
- 3. The system combines a grouted-duct connection between the column and the precast crossbeam [Pang et al. 2008, Pang et al. 2010] and a reduced column section that extends into the cap beam [Davis et al. 2012, Davis et al. 2014] (Section 1.2).
- 4. Unbonded prestressing tendons run through the length of the column to encourage post-earthquake re-centering [Davis et al. 2012, Davis et al. 2014] (Section 1.3).
- 5. A steel shoe encases the concrete in each plastic-hinge region to concentrate earthquake-induced rotations at a single location (Section 1.4).
- 6. One version of the system includes Hybrid Fiber-Reinforced Concrete (HyFRC) in the regions of expected deformation concentration (Section 1.5).

1.1 PRECASING COMPONENTS TO ACCELERATION BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION

A precast bridge system has many advantages over one that is cast in place to the economy, the environment, and public safety. In precast bridge construction, the structural components are fabricated off site. This feature reduces the amount of time workers need to spend on site, which decreases the duration of road and lane closures. The resulting increased traffic flow due to the shortened on-site construction time will decrease commute times and gas consumption, resulting in additional savings, and will also reduce harmful emissions released into the atmosphere [Khaleghi et al. 2012]. Lastly, fabrication within a manufacturing facility leads to better quality control.

Despite the advantages of precast bridge systems, some agencies in seismically active regions have been reluctant to adopt them. States with seismic hazards, such as Washington, have used precast bridge girders for more than 50 years [Khaleghi et al. 2012], but rarely have such agencies used precast bridge columns or cap beams. The reluctance to use the latter is driven by the high-performance demands of the beam-to-column connection and by traditional contractor preference. During an earthquake, these connections experience the highest deformations and forces. Designing a connection to withstand such loading is a difficult challenge, particularly if the bridge elements are precast and inherently separate. Additionally, contractors generally are more experienced and comfortable with cast-in-place systems, causing them to hesitate before using a precast system.

To demonstrate the constuctibility of the new system, the State of Washington Department of Transportation (with the support of the Federal Highway Administration) worked with a contractor to implement non-prestressed precast bents in a bridge over Interstate 5 [Khaleghi et al. 2012]. A pretensioned version of the system would use similar connection details and so be equally constructible.

1.2 SOCKET CONNECTIONS

A bridge column-to-footing socket connection was developed at the University of Washington in collaboration with Berger/ABAM Engineers, Concrete Technology Corporation, Tri-State Construction, and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) [Haraldsson et al. 2011]. It contained no prestressing, but it was subsequently adapted for use with pretensioned columns [Davis et al. 2012, Davis et al. 2014]. In a conventional cast-in-place column, the longitudinal reinforcement at the base of the column is bent out and anchored into the cast-in-place footing. In a precast system, three alternatives are available:

- Construct the precast column with steel protruding laterally outwards at its base, and embed it in a cast-in-place footing.
- Construct the column with holes through which footing steel can pass, then cast the footing in place around the column.
- Construct the footing first, with protruding vertical starter bars that connect to the column's longitudinal reinforcement via grouted-sleeve connectors.

The first option would make transportation of the column to the job site extremely difficult, as the protruding steel would be awkward to stack and would pose a safety hazard. The second option would require very tight tolerances and would lead to a cumbersome erection process. The third option also requires small tolerances and constructability challenges. Additionally, the third option results in undesirably high strain concentrations in the footing reinforcement due to the high stiffness of the splice-sleeve connectors. While industry uses the third option often, researchers sought a better solution.

As a result, researchers developed a new connection, the wet socket connection. In this connection, the precast column is set in the excavation, the footing steel is placed, and then the footing concrete is cast. The column has straight longitudinal reinforcement, developed using anchor heads at the end of the reinforcing bars. This is a variant on the dry socket connection, in which the column is aligned and inserted into an opening in the previously cast footing. Grout is then introduced to fill the gap between the column and footing faces. This dry connection is currently used in parts of Europe, Japan, and New Zealand [Osanai et al. 1996]. The wet socket connection differs in that the footing is cast in place after the column has been placed, and its use eliminates the need to form an opening in the footing and grout it later. Additionally, the surface of the precast column is mechanically roughened where it is in contact with the cast-in-place concrete of the footing. This roughening increases the friction between the two interfaces enough that the column forces are adequately transferred into the footing.

The construction process of the wet socket column connection is straightforward (Figure 1.2). First, contractors excavate the ground. Then they place the footing rebar and erect the column. Since the column contains only straight longitudinal rebar with nothing protruding,

the column fits easily into the opening in the footing rebar. Once the column is erected, the footing concrete is cast and allowed to gain strength. After the footing gains sufficient strength, the precast cap beam is lowered onto the column and the ducts are grouted.



Figure 1.2 The process of using socket connection to accelerate construction.



Figure 1.3 Main parts of column to cap beam socket connection.

A variation of the dry socket connection is used at the top of the column (Figure 1.3). Instead of the entire column extending into the precast cap beam, which would greatly decrease the crossbeam area and strength, a reduced portion of the column is roughened and protruded upwards [Davis et al. 2012] supplemented by the extension of the longitudinal reinforcement into grouted ducts [Pang et al. 2008].

1.3 UNBONDED PRESTRESSING TO REDUCE RESIDUAL DISPLACEMENTS

Residual displacements of bridges can hinder recovery efforts in seismically active regions. It is uneconomical to design a conventional structure to remain elastic throughout the duration of a severe earthquake; however, when a structure yields, it becomes permanently deformed, typically not returning to its initial position after the loading is removed. This behavior is characteristic of conventional reinforced concrete systems (Figure 1.4a). This permanent deformation (residual displacement) is undesirable, because it can cause loss of function in the structure, particularly in bridges where a deformed surface (or joint interface) could make the road impassable. Furthermore, repairing bridges with residual displacements can be costly.

As a result, researchers have sought out methods for improving structural performance under intense cyclic loading and for reducing residual displacements [Stanton et al. 1997]. One such method is the use of unbonded prestressing tendons (e.g., Cohagen et al. [2008]). In this method, strands are stressed so that they provide a restoring force that re-centers the column after loading is removed (Figure 1.4b). For this strategy to be effective, however, the strands themselves must remain elastic throughout the loading. To achieve this, the stressed strands must be debonded so that the elongation caused by rocking can be distributed over a sufficient length to keep the stress in the strands below their yield stress.



Figure 1.4 Theoretical cyclic load-deflection curves for both traditional reinforced concrete system (a) and unbonded prestressed concrete system (b) (adapted from Stanton et al. [1997]).

The strands can be stressed either before or after casting the concrete. In pretensioned systems, the strands are stressed prior to concrete casting and transfer their load to the concrete through bond alone. Conversely, in post-tensioned systems, the strands are stressed after concrete casting and transfer their load via mechanical anchors, rendering concrete bond unnecessary.

University of Washington researchers have experimented with both methods: Cohagen et al. [2008] tested a post-tensioned system, and Davis et al. [2012] tested a pretensioned one. In Cohagen's system, the reinforced concrete column contained a single, unbonded, post-tensioned bar in its middle with a mechanical anchor at each end. The column was connected to a capbeam using the large-bar-to-duct connection prescribed in Pang et al. [2008]. Cohagen's system re-centered better than a conventional reinforced concrete system (Figure 1.5). Similarly, Davis' pretensioned system also improved the re-centering performance (Figure 1.6). In fact, Davis' system re-centered even better than Cohagen's system. Aside from the increased re-centering, pretensioning enables the stressing process to take place in a precast plant, which reduces on-site construction time. Furthermore, since pretensioned columns do not have mechanical anchors, they are viewed as more resistant to corrosion. Pretensioned bridge girders have been used since the 1950s and have shown almost no corrosion problems.



Figure 1.5 Effective lateral force versus lateral displacement [Cohagen et al. 2008].



Figure 1.6 Effective lateral force versus lateral displacement [Davis et al. 2012].

1.4 STEEL SHOE ROCKING COLUMN

Confinement can increase the compressive strength of concrete. Concrete, having a comparatively high compressive strength (compared to its tensile strength), generally fails along a shear plane, even when subjected to pure compression. When confined, concrete will not slip along this shear plane unless higher than normal compressive loads are applied. This material property is exploited in structural systems such as concrete filled tubes (CFTs), in which a steel shell confines the concrete, preventing it from failing in shear, while the concrete provides stability to the steel shell, preventing it from buckling [Fam et al. 2004; Roeder et al. 2010].

In the system developed here, the concept of confinement is used to improve upon the performance and constructability of the columns developed in Davis et al. [2012] and Finnsson [2013]. In this study, the columns have a steel shoe (consisting of a thin-walled tube welded to an annular plate) that encases the potential plastic hinge region (Figures 1.7 and 1.8). The confinement provided by the steel shoe was added to prevent the concrete at the column–footing interface from spalling.

Two sets of longitudinal bars are used. The first set, here called "through-bars," extend over the entire length of the column. They act in much the same way as bars in a conventional column, and they yield alternately in tension and compression to provide both strength and energy dissipation. They pass through holes in the annular plate and are debonded locally near the footing-column interface to reduce the strain concentration there. Additional, shorter, reinforcing bars are also welded to the shoe. They extend upwards into the column, resulting in an increased moment capacity in the region immediately above the interface, which forces the crack to occur at the interface. The confined region therefore acts rigidly, causing the column to rock rather than to deform inelastically. As a result, the total energy dissipation is concentrated in the plastic deformation of the reinforcing through-bars.

One potential problem with this design is the shear strength at the column-footing interface. To investigate whether the column needs additional resistance to sliding shear, one column in this study (the one containing HyFRC) contained a dowel bar at its center, extending 8 in. above and 3 in. below the column-footing interface (Figures 1.7 and 1.8). The dowel bar was short in length so that it would not bend and deform during loading, which would counteract the re-centering ability of the prestressing strands. To prevent deformation due to bending further, the dowel was placed inside a cup socket that inhibits translation but allows rotation. The other column, which contained the dowel bar, acquired its shear capacity from friction and longitudinal reinforcing bars alone.



Figure 1.7 Plan view of steel shoe feature and dowel bar.



Figure 1.8 Elevation view of steel shoe feature and dowel bar.

1.5 HYBRID FIBER REINFORCED CONCRETE

One potential disadvantage of pretensioned and post-tensioned systems is that the column typically experiences damage states (column spalling, bar buckling, and bar fracture) at lower drifts than is the case in non-stressed systems. In Davis' columns, the concrete in the plastic hinge region experienced spalling earlier than predicted by conventional concrete models [Berry et al. 2004].

To reduce this premature spalling, Finnsson [2013] added HyFRC to the regions in his column where the greatest moment was expected to occur: the column–footing interface and the column–cap beam interface.

HyFRC is a fiber reinforced concrete that has a higher tensile strength and more ductile compressive behavior than conventional concretes. Developed by Ostertag et al. [2014], HyFRC achieves its increased performance through the inclusion of large quantities of both steel and polymer fibers.

Finnsson's columns demonstrated that the addition of HyFRC to the plastic hinge and surrounding region did delay concrete spalling, but the column eventually suffered major damage. Furthermore, this addition did not significantly delay bar buckling or bar fracture. Figure 1.9 shows the effective lateral force versus drift of his specimen containing HyFRC.

The addition of HyFRC also complicated the construction process because the two concretes (HyFRC and conventional concrete) had to be cast separately (Figure 1.10). Since the columns were cast horizontally, a practical constraint of the pretensioning process, gravity could not provide the necessary separation. As a result, Finnsson first cast a HyFRC "shell" in a separate form and then inserted it into the outer formwork. In practice, the two-stage casting process would increase labor costs.



Figure 1.9 Effective lateral force versus drift, column with HyFRC [Finnsson 2013].

Since the steel shoe was designed to delay concrete spalling (the same function the HyFRC served in Finnsson's columns), the inclusion of the steel shoe and HyFRC was thought to be redundant. To determine whether the tube alone would provide sufficient confinement, the two columns tested here were identical except that one contained HyFRC in the plastic hinge region and the other used conventional concrete throughout.

The column in this study that included HyFRC had a different method of construction from that of Finnsson's columns (Figure 1.10). Rather than having two separate forms, researchers poured the HyFRC and conventional concrete into one single form, separating the two pours with a wire mesh dam. While this method appeared less time-consuming and allowed for greater tolerances than the method employed by Finnsson, it still added complexity and increased the time of construction.



Figure 1.10 Plan view of HyFRC section: (a) Finnsson [2013] and (b) this report.

1.6 RESEARCH MOTIVATION, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE

As discussed in the previous sections, laboratory tests have shown that the non-prestressed versions of the column–footing socket connection [Haraldsson et al. 2011] and the column– crossbeam grouted connection [Pang et al. 2008, Pang et al. 2010] provide good resistance to cyclic loading and are easy to construct. The state of Washington has used these two connections in the field, validating their constructability in practice [Khaleghi et al. 2012].

Experimental tests by Cohagen [2008] and Davis et al. [2012] demonstrated that the prestressed version of the column achieves the desired re-centering effect. However, the tests also revealed that the prestressing leads to spalling and bar buckling in the plastic hinge region that occur at lower drifts than in a comparable non-prestressed column [Davis et al. 2012]. To increase the ductility of the prestressed column, Finnsson [2013] introduced high performance materials (fiber reinforced concrete and stainless steel bars) in the plastic-hinge region. Tests on these columns yielded mixed results; the fiber reinforced concrete (HyFRC) delayed spalling and, to a lesser extent, bar buckling, while the stainless steel had minimal effect on performance. Bar fracture still occurred earlier than desired.

The two tests described in this report were conducted to:

- determine whether the inclusion of a steel shoe at the plastic-hinge region would improve column performance compared to that of the specimens created by Davis el at. [2012], PreT-SF-CONC, and Finnsson [2013], PreT-SF-HyFRC. Specifically, the steel shoe feature was designed to delay bar buckling and bar fracture while maintaining low residual displacements and ease of construction.
- 2. determine whether the use of HyFRC and a dowel would improve the performance over that of a rocking shoe specimen constructed with conventional concrete and without a dowel.
- 3. help guide the development of design procedures for this new system.

The two specimens discussed in this report had the same geometry as both preceeding specimens. Specimen PreT-SF-ROCK was identical to PreT-SF-CONC except that it included a steel shoe with additional welded reinforcement at its plastic-hinge region. Similarly, specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC was identical to PreT-SF-ROCK except for two differences: (1) PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC contained HyFRC in its plastic-hinge region whereas PreT-SF-ROCK contained only conventional concrete and (2) PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC featured a steel dowel bar that extended from its plastic-hinge region into the footing whereas PreT-SF-ROCK did not.

Chapter 2 discusses the design of the two experimental specimens, and Chapter 3 describes the experimental set-up. Chapter 4 discusses the observed damage, and Chapter 5 presents the measured data. Chapter 6 contains the data analysis. Finally, Chapter 7 summarizes the research findings and provides recommendations for practice and further research.

2 Design of Test Specimens

The research described in this report is part of a larger University of Washington program to develop bridge bent systems for seismically active regions. The primary goal of this program is to develop systems that allows for accelerated construction, lower residual displacements, reduced damage, and easy implementation into practice.

The specimens described in this chapter were developed based on the results of previous tests of column-to-footing and column-to-cap beam connections. Haraldsson et al. [2011] developed a column-to-footing connection to achieve the first goal (rapid construction). They showed that a socket connection could be constructed quickly and perform similarly to a conventional cast-in-place connection. This connection was implemented in a bridge in Washington State [Khaleghi et al. 2012].

Davis et al. [2012] developed a system to achieve the second goal (lower residual displacements) by adding unbonded pretensioned strands to the column. Although Davis' column reduced the residual displacements, the column experienced spalling, bar buckling and bar fracture at lower drifts than similar, conventional columns (e.g., Pang et al. 2008. To address this issue, Finnsson [2013] included HyFRC in his pretensioned columns in the plastic hinge region. This system also had low residual displacements. Furthermore, HyFRC, being a more ductile material than conventional concrete, delayed concrete spalling, but the system did not delay bar buckling or bar fracture. Additionally, the incorporation of HyFRC in the column posed practical constructability issues.

The system in this report was developed to address all performance issues simultaneously. Like Davis et al. [2012 and Finnsson [2013], the new system combines: (1) precast columns and cap beams; (2) unbonded pretensioned columns combined with concrete; and (3) a socket connection at the base. In addition, the new system was developed to reduce damage by incorporating a steel shoe at the top and bottom connections where the maximum moment is expected to occur. The purpose of the steel shoe is to confine the concrete sufficiently so that (rather than forming a plastic hinge) the column acts as a rigid body rocking about the shoe's base. The reinforcing bars passing through the shoe are bonded over most of the height of the column and only unbonded near the column–footing (or column–cap–beam) interface. This unbonded region is included in the design to delay bar fracture. Figure 1.1 shows this system schematically.

The seismic performance of the concept described above was investigated experimentally. This chapter discusses the detailed design of two specimens representing column-to-footing connections. Specimen PreT-SF-ROCK was constructed with conventional concrete and did not include any special measures to prevent sliding along the rocking interface while specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC included HyFRC to increase ductility and a dowel system to prevent sliding.

2.1 GEOMETRY OF TEST SPECIMENS

The specimens in this study simulated the performance of a 48-in. (4-ft) diameter column prototype. Due to the size limitations at the University of Washington's structures lab, the specimens were reduced to 41.7% scale, with a diameter of 20 in. and a cantilever height of 60 in. (measured from column–footing interface to actuator mid-height). All specimen dimensions were reduced in size to meet this scale factor as close as possible.

The columns were cast horizontally, a requirement of the prestressing operation. This requirement made it difficult to cast a column with the typical circular cross-section because the top face needed to be finished with hand tools, which are not curved. As a result, an octagonal cross-section, which consisted of flat faces, was selected instead. Unlike a square cross-section, octagonal cross-sections still allow for the use of spiral transverse reinforcement, which provides a more effective distribution of confinement stresses than are provided by rectangular ties. The rationale for selecting this geometry would also apply to the full-scale prototype.

The top portion the column had a reduced section (Figure 2.1). This geometric change was a necessity because the MTS actuator that would laterally load the column needed a flat surface to attach to the column. As a result, rather than having an octagonal cross-section, the upper two feet were rectangular. This section also had four 2-in.-diameter holes, allowing for the easy passing of threaded rods.



Figure 2.1 Reduced geometry section to accommodate actuator connection.

2.2 REINFORCEMENT

The longitudinal reinforcement consisted of conventional reinforcing steel bonded to the concrete and prestressed tendons that were unbonded over the clear height of the column. The bonded reinforcement was placed as near the outside edge of the column as possible to maximize its contribution to the column's moment capacity. In contrast, the unbonded prestressing tendons were placed near the column's center. This positioning was made to address geometric constraints at the column–cap beam connection, which are discussed in Section 2.7. Figure 2.2 shows the strand and rebar pattern used. The pattern of the strands used in the columns was the same used by Finnsson [2013] and was a result of the prestressing bed geometry.

The resources available at the University of Washington's structures lab required a specialized standoff to stress individual strands. This piece of equipment, in turn, required that the strands be spaced roughly 3 in. apart. The strand pattern used accommodates this constraint while minimizing the strand pattern area.

The deformed-bar reinforcement was intended to yield and dissipate energy, whereas the unbonded prestressing tendons were intended to remain elastic and re-center the column after loading was removed. To ensure the prestressing tendons remained elastic within the target level of deformation, they were encased in plastic sleeves in an unbonded region that extended from the column–footing connection to 48 in. up into the column. Figure 2.3, which shows an elevation view of the column, depicts this unbonded region. The unbonded region served to distribute the elongations in the tendons over a greater region, hence reducing the strain to a level below the tendon's yield strain. The re-centering force provided by the strands depends on two design parameters: (1) the strand's cross-sectional area, and (2) the strand's initial stress achieved through prestressing. The total energy dissipation capacity of the system is largely a factor of the deformed reinforcement bar's cross-sectional area.





Figure 2.2 Strand and rebar pattern used in the specimens.

The column was designed such that the prestressing strand would contribute approximately 60% of the column flexural strength, and the deformed reinforcing bar would contribute the remaining 40%. Due to this design decision, a smaller cross-sectional area of deformed bars was required in the pretensioned columns than in a conventional column with a similar flexural strength. Consequently, in the scaled test specimens, 6 No. 4 bars (corresponding to 6 No. 10 bars at full-scale) provided the necessary longitudinal reinforcement, resulting in a reinforcement ratio of only 0.36%. Additionally, each column contained 6 epoxy-coated 3/8-in.-diameter strands. This reinforcement was the same as that in columns tested by Davis et al. [2012] and Finnsson [2013].



Figure 2.3 Elevation view of the specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.
The specimens tested in this report represented only the bottom connection (Figure 2.4). This idealization is reasonable, because the columns in the field would have an inflection point at roughly mid-height. Thus, the columns in the field and in the lab would be expected to perform the same structurally. Furthermore, symmetry dictates that at the mid-height of the column the strands in the field would not undergo strand slip relative to the concrete. As a result, the strands could be bonded in the test specimen without changing the strand behavior in the field columns. However, since the strands require a finite bond length at the top of the column, the bond cutoff could not be located at the point of inflection so it was positioned 12 in. below it. This decreased unbonded length caused the strands in the test specimen to yield at lower drift ratios than they would in the corresponding field columns.

For the system to maintain its restoring force, the prestressing strands needed to be anchored fully at their ends. Otherwise, the strands would slip, which would reduce their initial strain and stress and consequently lower the potential re-centering force of the column. To reduce this risk, the strands were bonded 24 in. at the top and 24-9/16 in. at the bottom of the column (Figure 2.3).

For a strand with an effective stress of 150 ksi, ACI 318-11 requires a development length equal to 150 times the strand's diameter [ACI Committee 318 2011]. In a cap beam with a depth of 42 in. (which is common), this requirement would limit the strand diameter to a maximum of 42 in./150 or 0.28 in. But the smallest commercially available epoxy-coated strand has a diameter of 3/8 in. And even if they were available, such small strands would not be practical because the full-scale column would require roughly 30 strands to provide the desired re-centering force. This many strands would not fit into the reduced section of the column that extends into the cap beam. Therefore, to satisfy constructability requirements, the full-scale column needed a strand diameter of at least 1/2 in.



Figure 2.4 Comparison of the unbonded regions in a column in the field and the test specimens (adapted from Davis et al. [2012]).

A prototype strand diameter of 1/2-in. scales to 0.209 in. for the test specimens. As previously mentioned, 3/8 in. is the smallest epoxy-coated strand size available. Consequently, researchers used a 3/8-in. strand, realizing that an oversized strand meant that the bond stresses would be higher in the test specimens than expected in the full-scale column. These higher stresses caused the potential for bond failure to occur.

To anchor the strands during the tests, each strand was fitted with a prestressing chuck at each end. Each strand had a load cell at its top end, between the chuck and the column face (Figure 2.5). Using 7/8-in.-diameter ASTM A490 bolts and a plate with welded nuts of complimentary size screw-thread-device (STD) plate, each end of the strand was stressed to four kips by turning the bolts against the resisting chucks (Figure 2.4). During the tests, the load cell would detect any slip in the strand, while the chuck would guarantee continued anchorage. Load cells were only placed at the top of the column because the bond length was shorter at the top end. Any slip that would occur in the footing portion of the column would occur in the actuator end, and the load cell would detect it.



Figure 2.5 (a) Photograph and (b) schematic views of the system to detect and prevent the strands from slipping.

2.3 ROCKING CONNECTION

The column had a special connection ("steel shoe," Figure 2.6) at the column–footing interface to encourage rocking and to minimize damage. The rocking connection consisted of a shoe annular plate, a shoe wall, discontinuous welded bars, and through bars.



Figure 2.6 Steel shoe: (a) elevation view of the shoe; and (b) bottom view of the shoe.

2.3.1 Shoe Annular Plate

The rocking was designed to occur on the annular plate of the shoe. The steel shoe had drilled holes in a circular pattern to allow the deformed reinforcing bars to pass through it. On a similar circular pattern (rotated by 30°), No. 6 bars were welded to the interior side of the shoe's annular plate. These bars extended upwards into the column and provided extra reinforcement (both tensile and compressive) at the top of the shoe, reducing the chance of a crack plane forming at this region where the column's stiffness dramatically decreases.

2.3.2 Shoe Wall

To confine the concrete above the annular plate, a 1/4-in.-thick shoe wall extended one-half column diameter (10 in.) above the column–footing interface. This height was selected based on finite-element modeling conducted by Dr. Tieyi Zhong [Zhong 2013]. The height corresponded to the height at which the unconfined concrete above the shoe was predicted to experience a strain below 0.003 in./in. at a drift ratio of 5%.

2.3.3 Discontinuous Welded Bars

No. 6 bars were welded to the annular plate and extended 43 in. above the column–footing interface (Figure 2.2). This dimension was determined after considering the more stringent of two criteria: the location where the yield moment of the column after bar cutoff first exceeded the expected observed moment, and the location beyond the HyFRC cutoff in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC where the No. 6 bars would be fully developed. The development length criterion proved to control the cutoff point. For consistency purposes, both columns used the same cutoff length for the No. 6 bars.

2.3.4 Through Bars

No. 4 bars extended the full height of the column and through the rocking connection. To delay bar fracture, the No. 4 reinforcing bars were encased in 8-in.-long plastic sleeves, which extended 4 in. above and 4 in. below the interface. This unbonded region delayed bar fracture by distributing the bar elongation over the debonded length.

2.3.5 Dowel and Cup Socket

In specimen PreT-SF-ROCK, frictional resistance and the deformed bars alone transferred the shear forces across the column–footing interface. In specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, a 2-in.-diameter steel dowel bar was designed to contribute to the shear transfer (Figure 2.7). The dowel bar was located at the center of the column's cross-section to reduce any deformation it might experience from bending. To reduce its deformation further, the dowel bar was encased in a welded cup that allowed the bar to rotate but not slide.



Figure 2.7 Dowel bar and cup that provide shear reinforcement across the columnfooting interface in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.

2.4 DUCTILITY THROUGH FIBER REINFORCED CONCRETE

It was expected that the strain demands on the column concrete could be met by conventional concrete. Nonetheless, in case this capacity was inadequate, one specimen, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, did contain HyFRC [Ostertag et al. 2014]. In specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, the HyFRC extended 24 in. above the column–footing interface, the location where the column's yield moment (including 6 No. 4 bars and 6 No. 6 bars) first exceeded the expected observed moment during testing. The HyFRC region used in the columns of this study was similar to that used in Finnsson's columns [Finnsson 2013] with a few exceptions, as shown in Figure 2.9. First, the upper bound of the HyFRC region, 24 in. above column–footing interface, was 1 in. shorter than that of Finnsson's columns. Second, the lower bound of the HyFRC was at the

column–footing interface whereas in Finnsson's columns, HyFRC extended into the footing 4 in. The HyFRC region was shortened in this study because the region used in Finnsson's columns was deemed larger than necessary. Inclusion of HyFRC in the footing would provide little benefit because the level of confinement was so high that conventional concrete would be sufficient given the anticipated footing stresses. Since HyFRC is a more expensive, less workable mix, it was replaced with conventional concrete where possible.



Figure 2.8 Typical axial compression stress versus strain for HyFRC compared to conventional concrete [Ostertag et al. 2014].



Figure 2.9 Comparison of HyFRC regions between specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-HyFRC [Finnsson 2013].

2.5 DESIGN OF SOCKET CONNECTION

Haraldsson et al. [2011] developed the socket connection so that it is possible to precast the columns of bridge bent systems in a fabrication plant and then easily transport them to a job site, reducing the time required on site. Once on site, the column is erected and a footing cast around it. Since no reinforcing bars are exposed from the column, the only means of load transfer between the column and footing is friction. To enhance the friction at this interface, the portion of the columns that extended into the footing were roughened using a saw-tooth pattern (Figures 2.10 and 2.11).

Mechanical anchors were added to the bottom ends of the columns' longitudinal rebar. Normally, longitudinal rebar is anchored into the footing through bends, but that is not possible in this case where the rebar does not protrude out of the column. A strut-and-tie model shows that the terminator heads help transfer the diagonal strut force in the column to the vertical tension force in the rebar. This results in a Compression-Compression-Compression (CCC) node, which is stronger and would likely result in improved structural performance. Haraldsson et al. [2011] showed that this connection could be built easily and performed at least as well as a comparable conventional cast-in-place connection.



Figure 2.10 Roughened surface of the portion of the column that extends into the spread footing.



Figure 2.11 Details of the socket connection.

2.6 DESIGN OF SPREAD FOOTING

The process followed to design the spread footing in this study was the same as that followed by Finnsson [2013] with a few minor exceptions. This footing was designed according to the AASHTO Load and Resistance Factor Design Specification [AASHTO 2009a], the AASHTO Guide Specifications for LRFD Seismic Design [AASHTO 2009b], the WSDOT Bridge Design Manual [WSDOT 2008] and the Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria [Caltrans 2006]. The reinforcing layout of the bottom mat is shown in Figure 2.12; the detailed drawings of the footing are provided in Appendix B.



Figure 2.12 Detailed drawing of the bottom steel of the footing.

A void was needed underneath the footing for two reasons. First, it provided space for the chucks and prestressing strands beneath the column. Second, it permitted the column to fail in punching shear should this mode of failure be critical, although no columns using the socket connection have shown a failure of this type. The footing used in Finnsson's specimen contained a larger void area underneath the column than the footings in this reports' specimens. Researchers chose to reduce the void area to improve constructability. The void height, the main parameter, was unchanged.

Unlike previous tests, the footings in these specimens did not contain any stirrups. Past results showed that the stirrups experienced very low strains and were therefore unnecessary. They were removed to simplify construction.

2.7 DESIGN OF CAP BEAM CONNECTION

The top portion of the column used the grouted connection developed in Davis et al. [2012]. This report does not explore the structural performance of the rocking system with this connection. In his study, Davis found the top connection to perform as well as the bottom connection. Additionally, current research at the University of Washington is investigating the performance on the top rocking connection.

While this report does not investigate the performance of the cap beam connection, it is still of interest, because the cap beam connection dictates the pattern of the prestressing strands. Since the cap beam is precast, the cast-in-place socket method used in the column–footing connection is unviable. Additionally, bond forces must occur across the depth of the cap beam to

maximize the unbonded length of the prestressing strands. This consideration requires that a section of the column extend into the cap beam. If the whole column extended into the cap beam, the void would be so great that, either wider girders would be needed or the cap beam would experience excessive joint shear stress. Instead, a reduced section was used so that the opening in the cap beam could be small. To accommodate the reduced section, the prestressing strands were placed tightly in the center of the column.

To ensure adequate column moment capacity, the deformed reinforcing bars extend into the cap beam, fitting into ducts (Figure 2.13). Pang et al. [2008] showed that the confinement provided by the ducts improves the bond so that reliable anchorage is still achieved, even though the confinement does not meet the ACI development length requirements. The ducts for the deformed reinforcing bars and the reduced concrete section are grouted once the cap beam is situated.



Figure 2.13 Hybrid grouted socket connection [Davis et al. 2012].

3 Experimental Set-Up

The columns were subjected to a series of cycles of increasing lateral displacement and a constant axial load. This chapter describes the test set-up (Section 3.1), instrumentation (Section 3.2), and test protocol (Section 3.3).

3.1 TEST SET-UP

The laboratory's 2.4-million-kip capacity Baldwin test machine applied a constant vertical load while a 220-kip capacity MTS actuator applied cyclic horizontal displacements as shown in Figure 3.1. The Baldwin was self-reacting, whereas the MTS actuator was bolted to a W14×90 cross-beam, which in turn was attached to a self-reacting frame. The MTS actuator had a peak-to-peak stroke of 2 ft.



Figure 3.1 Testing rig.

Prior to testing, the specimens were placed on the concrete reaction block. Once centered, researchers poured a high-strength gypsum plaster (hydrostone) between the specimen footing and the reaction block so that the entire specimen was in contact with the block. Next, the columns were anchored using 4 1.25-in.-diameter Williams bars stressed to 100 kips each. Lastly, the columns were painted with whitewash so that cracks would be more visible during testing.

A system was needed to keep the column aligned in the correct vertical plane as it underwent cyclic loading. The system consisted of a steel encasing tube, a spherical bearing head, and a greased polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) plate and stainless steel channel (Figure 3.2). This steel encasing tube was necessary because space was required above the column for the chucks that anchored the prestressing strands and the load cells that detected potential slip. The steel tube had an inside diameter of 12 in. and wall thickness of 0.5 in. The square steel plate welded atop the tube had length of 16 in. and thickness of 7/8 in. Above the steel plate was a spherical bearing on which rested a greased PTFE pad. When the column rotated during the test, the PTFE plate slid against a stainless steel channel fixed to the head of the Baldwin and the spherical bearing adjusted for the relative rotation. The MTS actuator was fixed to the reduced section of the column using four 1-in.-diameter threaded rods (Figure 2.1). The rods were stressed to 15 kips each so that the column was firmly fixed to the actuator.



Figure 3.2 (a) Actual and (b) schematic views for the system that transferred load from the Baldwin to the specimen while safely covering prestressing load cells and chucks.

3.2 INSTRUMENTATION

Both specimens were instrumented similarly. For comparison purposes, the instrumentation was kept as similar to that in Finnsson's experiments [Finnsson 2013] as possible. Table 3.1 provides the instrumentation manifest used in each column. Figure 3.3 details the location of the exterior instruments on the column for all instruments, except for the strain gauges.

Instrument	Measured response	Quantity used
Strand load cell	Detect slip in strands	6
MTS load cell	Horizontal load	1
Baldwin load cell	Axial load	1
Linear potentiometer	Horizontal and vertical movement	13
String potentiometer	Horizontal displacements	6
Linear variable differential transformer (LVDT)	Deflection of testing rig	1
Inclinometer	Rotation	4
Three-wire strain gauge	Strain in reinforcement steel	24
Two-wire strain gauge	Strain in prestressing stands	12

Table 3.1Instrumentation manifest for one column.



Figure 3.3 Instrumentation set-up.

3.2.1 Applied Loads

Internal load cells in both the MTS actuator and Baldwin testing machine measured the respective horizontal and axial loads applied during testing.

3.2.2 Strain Gauges

Two-wire and three-wire strain gauges measured the strains in the longitudinal and transverse reinforcement as well as in the prestressing strands. Three-wire gauges were used as often as possible because they have the ability to compensate the measured readings for temperature effects. As a result, all of the longitudinal and transverse reinforcement strain gauges were three-wire. Figures 3.4 and 3.5 illustrate the placement of these three-wire strain gauges. Researchers could not use three-wire gauges on the prestressing strands because the strand diameter was not wide enough for their insertion. Therefore, the prestressing strands were instrumented with two-wire gauges.

The strain gauge pattern used was the same as that used for the specimens in Finnsson's study [Finnsson 2013] with one exception. For this research, the specimens included No. 6 bars

welded to the rocking shoe. It was of interest to discover the level of strains those bars experienced under loading. As a result, two pairs of strain gauges, one at the shoe's base and one 7 in. above the shoe's base, were placed on the northwest and southwest bars. These strain gauge locations made it possible to compare these strains with those of the No. 4 bars, which had strain gauges at the column–footing interface, 7 in. above the interface, and 7 in. below the interface. Two pairs of strain gauges were installed on the transverse reinforcement, one on the north end and one on the south, both 3 in. above the column–footing interface.

A single pair of two-wire gauges was placed on each of the six prestressing strands of each column. These strain gauges were located in the strands' unbonded region. The gauges not only measured the strain in the strands during the test but also facilitated reaching the target stress during the prestressing operation. The strain distribution across the unbonded region was assumed to be constant.



Figure 3.4 Column elevation view of three-wire strain gauge placements.



Figure 3.5 Column cross-section view of three-wire strain gauge placements.

3.2.3 Curvature Rod System

The "curvature rod" system depicted in Figure 3.6 was used to measure relative rotations between column cross-sections. As the column rotated, the linear potentiometers measured the change in distance between the threaded rods and, therefore, could be used to compute the relative rotation of each segment. If the column behaved as a rigid body, then the relative rotations would be zero.

The system consisted of a series of linear potentiometers attached to metal plates. These metal plates, in turn, were connected to a set of threaded rods that protruded from the column. The threaded rods were located on both the north and south face at 2.5 in., 9 in., 12 in., 18 in., and 24.5 in. above the column-to-footing interface. The lowest linear potentiometer measured the change in height between the footing and the lowest threaded rod.

At the column-footing interface, the column was predicted to rock as a rigid body. The lowest potentiometer, therefore, was expected to record the largest change in displacement. The next two potentiometers detected the relative column rotation due to any deformation, including cracking, between the concrete confined by the steel shoe and the unconfined concrete immediately above the shoe. Similarly, the highest two potentiometers recorded the relative column rotations at the HyFRC-conventional concrete interface.





Figure 3.6 (a) Photograph and (b) schematic views of the curvature rod system used on the north face.

3.2.4 Motion Capture System

In both tests, a motion-capture system (Optotrac) measured the three-dimensional motion of targets attached to the column. Figure 3.7 shows the light-emitting diode (LED) configuration on the column. From these measurements, column displacement, rotation, and curvature could be calculated. The system consisted of two fixed cameras that monitored a series of LED sensors placed on the column.

The arrangement of LED sensors on the column was similar to that in Finnsson's study [Finnsson 2013] with one exception. Finnsson had three rows on the west face, and one row on the north and south faces. For this experiment, researchers placed one row each on the north, west, and south column faces. Due to a limit on the amount of LEDs available, it was not possible to add two more rows on the west face. The LEDs in each row were spaced every 2 in. for the first 24 in. above the column–footing interface and 4 in. after that until a height of 34 in. was reached. The LEDs were concentrated more heavily in the lower region of the column to best capture the change in rotation, which was expected to be greatest at the column's base.



Figure 3.7 Optotrac sensor configuration on the test specimen, showing (a) view of north and west sensors and (b) view of south sensors.

3.2.5 Inclinometers

Four inclinometers were placed on the east face of the column at 4 in., 12 in., 24 in., and 34 in. above the column–footing interface. These instruments measured the column's absolute rotation directly. The placement of the inclinometers was the same as that in Finnsson's study [Finnsson 2013]. Figure 3.8 shows an inclinometer installed on the column.



Figure 3.8 Typical inclinometer attached to the column's east face.

3.2.6 Strand Load Cells

Six load cells atop each column measured any slip experienced by the prestressing strands (Figure 2.5). No load cells were placed at the bottom of the columns because the strand bond length was longer in the footing than it was at the top of the column. As a result, if the strands slipped in the footing they would also slip at the top of the column. The instruments were seated on the prestressing strands and anchored with a chuck. After release, the strands were reloaded using the method described in Section 2.2 so that each load cell measured approximately 5 kips. If a load cell registered a reduction in this measured force, then researchers could conclude that the monitored strand had slipped.

3.2.7 Horizontal Deflection of the System

During the test, six string potentiometers measured the horizontal deflection of the column while one linear potentiometer measured the horizontal translation (slip) of the footing. Figure 3.3 shows the string potentiometer set-up. The string potentiometers were clamped to an instrumentation tower and spaced at the following intervals above the column–footing interface: 2.5 in., 9 in., 12 in., 18 in., 24.5 in., and 60 in. Figure 3.9 shows a typical string potentiometer attached to the instrument tower. To ensure that the instrumentation tower did not move during the test, researchers wrench-tightened the tower to the concrete reaction block using Williams bars. Since the string potentiometers had a finite stroke, piano wire was used to extend the instrument from the tower to the threaded rods.



Figure 3.9 A string potentiometer attached to the instrumentation tower.

The single linear potentiometer was placed on the southeast side of the concrete reaction block on a metal plate. By placing the instrument in this manner, it was out of the way during the test so that researchers would have less chance of stepping on it as they mounted the column for observation. A small metal sheet was also glued to the footing to create an even surface for the instrument to bear against.

In addition, a single linear variable differential transformer (LVDT) measured the distance between the actuator beam and fixed reference tower. From this measurement, researchers could detect any deflection in the actuator beam. Its placement is shown in Figure 3.3.

An LVDT was chosen as opposed to a simple linear potentiometer because the LVDT is more capable of capturing small deflections. Since the flanges of the actuator beam were reinforced with stiffeners, the deflections in the beam were expected to be small; hence, the LVDT seemed an attractive option. Figure 3.10 illustrates the LVDT placement on the actuator beam. Ideally, the combination of the actuator displacement and beam deflection would sum to the displacement of the column measured relative to the reference tower.

3.2.8 Rocking of the Footing

Two linear potentiometers, one on the northeast end and one on the southeast end, were placed facedown at the footing base, in contact with the concrete reaction block. Thin metal sheets were placed underneath the instrument heads so that they rested against a flat surface. The combination of the two potentiometers allowed for detection of any rocking that the footing might experience.





3.3 TEST PROTOCOL

During the test, both specimens were subjected to horizontal (lateral) and vertical (axial) loading. During the test, both specimens were subjected to horizontal (lateral) and vertical (axial) loads. The axial load, 159 kips, represented the unfactored dead load of a prototype bridge at 42% scale. This load was applied first. The lateral displacement history was a modified version of the NEHRP recommendations for precast structural walls and was drift controlled [Building Seismic Safety Council 2004]. This same loading protocol was used by Finnsson [2013], Davis et al. [2012], and Haraldsson et al. [2011].

The lateral displacement history consisted of ten four-cycle sets. The lateral displacement history is shown numerically in Table 3.2 and graphically in Figure 3.11. Each set had target peak values of 1.2X, 1.44X, 1.44X, and 0.48X, where X is the maximum target drift from the previous set. Researchers manually selected the maximum target drift of the first set so that the column would remain elastic throughout the duration of the first four cycles. The last cycle in every set was purposely reduced in order to obtain the column's residual stiffness after greater loading.

During the test, the lateral load was applied in the north-south direction. In each cycle, the actuator first pulled the column to the south and then pushed the column to the north before finally returning the column to its initial position. As a result, this report refers to loading in the south as positive and loading in the north as negative. Additionally, this report refers to maximum loading in the southern direction as the peak and maximum loading in the northern direction as the valley. In each set, the column was loaded both continuously and intermittently. During the first two cycles, researchers held the lateral load at both the peaks and valleys so that they could mark cracks and document the column's damage progression. During the third and fourth cycles, the loading was applied continuously without stopping at the peaks or valleys.

Additionally, the load rate was kept as constant as possible. To achieve this, the earlier sets, having lower maximum target drifts, reached their maximum displacement in a shorter interval than the later sets. For example, the actuator reached the maximum displacement in 20 sec during Sets 1–6, 30 sec during Sets 7–9, and 60 sec during Set 10.

The day before the test, researchers conducted a test cycle to verify that all of the instruments were operating properly. In this test cycle, the axial load applied was reduced to 90 kips and the target drift was only 0.05%. The reduced loading ensured that the column suffered no damage prior to the actual test yet the instruments were engaged sufficiently enough to verify that they were working.

Set	Cycle	Drift (%)	Displacement (in.)
	1	± 0.33	± 0.20
4	2	± 0.40	± 0.24
I	3	± 0.40	± 0.24
	4	± 0.13	± 0.08
	1	± 0.48	± 0.29
2	2	± 0.58	± 0.35
2	3	± 0.58	± 0.35
	4	± 0.19	± 0.11
	1	± 0.69	± 0.41
3	2	± 0.83	± 0.50
5	3	± 0.83	± 0.50
	4	± 0.28	± 0.17
	1	± 1.00	± 0.60
1	2	± 1.19	± 0.71
4	3	± 1.19	± 0.71
	4	± 0.40	± 0.24
	1	± 1.43	± 0.86
F	2	± 1.72	± 1.03
Э	3	± 1.72	± 1.03
	4	± 0.57	± 0.34

Table 3.2Target displacement history.

Set	Cycle	Drift (%)	Displacement (in.)
	1	± 2.06	± 1.24
0	2	± 2.48	± 1.49
0	3	± 2.48	± 1.49
	4	± 0.83	± 0.50
	1	± 2.97	± 1.78
7	2	± 3.57	± 2.14
1	3	± 3.57	± 2.14
	4	± 1.19	± 0.71
	1	± 4.28	± 2.57
0	2	± 5.14	± 3.08
0	3	± 5.14	± 3.08
	4	± 1.71	± 1.03
	1	± 6.16	± 3.70
0	2	± 7.40	± 4.44
9	3	± 7.40	± 4.44
	4	± 2.47	± 1.48
	1	± 8.87	± 5.32
10	2	± 10.65	± 6.39
10	3	± 10.65	± 6.39
	4	± 3.55	± 2.13



Figure 3.11 Graphical representation of the target displacement history.

4 Observed Damage Progression

During both tests, researchers documented the columns' damage progression by taking photographs, marking crack formation and propagation, and measuring crack widths. One goal of this design was to reduce the amount of damage induced in the column. This chapter presents an analysis as to how proficiently the columns met this design goal. This chapter also contains selected images of the columns in a damaged state.

4.1 DAMAGE STATES DEFINITION

In each test, researchers monitored the columns closely to identify key damage states defined by the UW/PEER Structural Performance Database [Berry and Eberhard 2004]. Previous experiments at the University of Washington used the same damage state milestones making it easier to compare damage observations discussed in this report with those in previous studies. Table 4.1 outlines the damage states used in this study.

Damage state	Description/observation
First significant horizontal crack	Crack width ≥ 0.02 in. (0.5 mm)
First significant diagonal crack	Crack width ≥ 0.5 mm and crack extends 1/4 of column diameter
First open residual crack	Residual crack width \geq 0.01 in. (0.25 mm)
First yield of longitudinal rebar	First strain gauge that reaches yield strain
First yield of transverse reinforcement	First strain gauge that reached yield strain
First spalling in footing	Observed spalling on surface
First spalling in column	Observed flaking, minor spalling
Significant spalling in column	Spalled height ≥ 1/4 of column diameter
Fully spalled	Spalling height no longer increases with increasing deformation
Exposure of longitudinal reinforcement	First observation of column longitudinal reinforcement
Buckling of longitudinal reinforcement	First observation of buckling of longitudinal reinforcement bars
Large cracks in concrete core	Crack width ≥ 0.08 in. (2.0 mm)
Fracture of transverse reinforcement	Observation or sound
Fracture of longitudinal reinforcement	Observation or sound
Loss of axial capacity	Instability of member (column)

Table 4.1 Damage states used to characterize damage progression in the
--

4.2 DAMAGE PROGRESSION

The day prior to each test, researchers applied a small loading cycle (0.05% drift) to the instrumented column as previously described in Section 3.3. The small loading cycle allowed the researchers to confirm that all instruments were working properly. The deformation was not large enough to cause any visible cracking in the column.

In the actual test, researchers recorded the set and cycle number as well as the drift ratio at which each of the aforementioned damage states occurred. The only damage states that were not visibly apparent were first yield of longitudinal rebar and first yield of transverse reinforcement. These damage states were determined later from the strain gauge measurements in. Table 4.2 summarizes these results. Items listed as N/A indicate a damage state that was never observed. As can be seen, most of the states associated with concrete damage never occurred.

Figure 4.1 graphically compares the drift levels at which each column reached key damage states. Furthermore, Figure 4.2 graphically compares the damage progression of the columns in this report with those of Finnsson [2013], PreT-SF-HyFRC, and Davis et al [2012], PreT-SF-CONC. This comparison illustrates that the rocking columns in this report suffered

much less cracking and spalling than their predecessors. Damage states that never occurred are left blank in these plots.

Domoso stato	Pre	T-SF-RO	CK-HyFRC		PreT-SI	-ROCK
Damage state	Set	Cycle	Drift (%)	Set	Cycle	Drift (%)
First significant horizontal crack	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
First significant diagonal crack	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
First open residual crack	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
First yield of longitudinal rebar	2	2	0.41/-0.35	1	2	0.26/-0.30
First yield of transverse reinforcement	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
First spalling in footing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
First spalling in column	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	4	1.58/-1.54
Significant spalling in column	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	4	1.58/-1.54
Fully spalled	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Exposure of longitudinal reinforcement	6	2	2.25/-2.30	6	1	1.86/-1.84
Buckling of longitudinal reinforcement	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Large cracks in concrete core	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fracture of transverse reinforcement	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fracture of longitudinal reinforcement	9	1	5.96/-5.83	9	1	5.94/-5.76
Loss of axial capacity	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 4.2Summary of damage state progression for both specimens.



Figure 4.1 Comparison of drift levels at which both columns reached the defined damage states.



Figure 4.2 Comparison of damage states versus drift levels occurred between the specimens in this report and those of Finnsson [2013].

4.2.1 Concrete Cracking

Both columns experienced very little cracking, even at high drift levels. As the columns were loaded horizontally, they rocked on the bottom plate of the steel shoe as opposed to developing a plastic hinge in the concrete region above the steel shoe. Throughout the test, neither column developed cracks in the concrete that exceeded a hairline width. Researchers did not treat the separation of the footing concrete with the bottom face of the steel shoe as a conventional crack, so this separation was not considered in determining the drift ratio at which the damage states were reached. Figures 4.3 and 4.4 illustrate the limited amount of cracking observed in both PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK at a drift ratio of 6.0% drift. In these images, blue lines drawn on the column indicate the formed cracks. Both columns had little cracking. The HyFRC in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC appeared to reduce the amount of hairline cracking as compared with its solely conventional concrete column counterpart.



Figure 4.3 South view of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC after cycle 9-1 (6% max drift) showing hairline cracking in the column.



Figure 4.4 South view of PreT-SF-ROCK after cycle 9-1 (6% max drift) showing hairline cracking in the column.

4.2.2 Initial Yielding

Strain gauges on the longitudinal and transverse reinforcement allowed researchers to determine the point at which those bars first yielded. The longitudinal reinforcement in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC first yielded at -0.35% drift, whereas the longitudinal reinforcement in PreT-SF-ROCK first yielded at 0.26% drift. The drifts at initial yield observed in this report were lower than those reported by Finnsson [2013] and the same levels as those in Davis et al. [2012], which experienced initial yielding at 0.54% and -0.28% drift respectively.

As expected, initial first yield occurred at the column-footing interface where the moment was highest. The longitudinal reinforcement was unbonded 8 in. with PVC sleeves, 4 in. above and 4 in. below interface. This debonded region distributed the bar elongation over an extended length, reducing the strain for a given drift. Considering the drift level at first yield, researchers concluded that the 8 in. debonded region is essential. Table 4.3 shows the extent to which the initial yield in this report compares to that of previous experiments.

In both columns, the transverse reinforcement remained elastic throughout the duration of the test. The absence of yielding was likely attributable to the heavy confinement provided by the footing and the steel shoe. The concrete in both these regions was so heavily confined that the transverse reinforcement engaged only to a limited extent.

	Drift at Initial Yield	Percent change from PreT-SF- HyFRC [Finnsson 2013]	Percent change from PreT- SF-CONC [Davis et al. 2012]
PreT-SF- ROCK- HyFRC	-0.35%	-35%	25%
PreT-SF- ROCK	0.26%	-52%	-7.1%

 Table 4.3
 Comparison of drift levels at initial yield.

4.2.3 Concrete Spalling

The columns described in this report spalled much less than the columns in previous experiments. In fact, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC experienced no spalling in the column, whereas PreT-SF-ROCK arguably experienced only cosmetic spalling. Spalling did not occur in PreT-SF-ROCK until after a drift ratio of 5.1% (Cycle 8-4). The spalling was located on the south face immediately above the top of the steel shoe. Figure 4.5 depicts this architectural spalling in PreT-SF-ROCK.

There are two reasons why one could dismiss this spalling as architectural damage as opposed to structural damage. First, the cross-section of the column in the steel shoe region is circular whereas it is octagonal immediately above. This change in geometry causes the interface between the steel shoe and concrete above to be imperfect. The concrete above the steel shoe protrudes over the steel edge much like a cantilever. This makes it highly prone to breaking off under loading because at the cantilever edge the concrete must have zero stress whereas a short distance higher the concrete will experience compressive stress. The inverted V-shaped cracks at the top of the steel shoe shown in Figure 4.4 reflect the shear stresses that must act between these two locations. These cracks resulted in the observed spalling. They could be eliminated in the future with the use of a tapered finish, if desired. Once the cantilevered portion of concrete spalled, the spalling ceased to progress. Second, the spalling initiated at an insert of a curvature rod, an instrument that would not be present in the column in practice. The curvature rod, which was cast into the column, creates a discontinuity in the concrete, making this location more

susceptible to spalling. The higher tensile strength of HyFRC prevented this architectural spalling from occurring in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.

Minor spalling also occurred in the footing concrete immediately surrounding the steel shoe. Despite the laborers' best efforts, concrete rose roughly 1/2 in. above of the steel shoe during the footing casting. This created a fillet at the base of the shoe, which was prone to spalling when the steel shoe underwent rocking action during loading. Researchers observed this spalling in both PreT-SF-ROCK and PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC. Figures 4.6 and 4.7 depict this occurrence. In both specimens, the spalling ceased to extend once the fillet portion of concrete spalled off, leaving a flush surface. This behavior was purely cosmetic and had no effect on the columns' structural response.

As expected, no conventional spalling was observed in the footing. This observation was consistent with previous tests by Finnsson [2013], Davis et al. [2012] and Haraldsson et al. [2011], in which no footing spalling occurred either. The footings were capacity-designed, forcing all damage to occur in the columns.



Figure 4.5 South view of PreT-SF-ROCK after cycle 8-4 showing spalling damage above the steel shoe.



Figure 4.6 South view of PreT-SF-ROCK showing the fillet spalling of the footing induced by the rocking action of the steel shoe.



Figure 4.7 South view of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC showing the fillet spalling of the footing induced by the rocking action of the steel shoe.

Crushing also occurred in the concrete beneath the steel shoe as it rocked about its base. The rubble created by the rocking prevented the column from closing perfectly when it returned to its initial position. Researchers witnessed this behavior only in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC. In specimen PreT-SF-ROCK, the interface between the bottom of the shoe and the top of the footing portion of the column was very smooth. The likely cause of this difference stems from the method used to pour the HyFRC. During casting, a steel-wire mesh was placed to prevent the HyFRC from flowing into the footing portion of the column. However, the steel mesh was not perfectly rigid or impermeable. As a result, a small amount of HyFRC seeped underneath the bottom of the steel shoe, forming a jagged surface. During the test, this portion of HyFRC was crushed between the base of the steel shoe above and the conventional concrete beneath it. After both tests were complete, researchers detached the column from the footing in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC for closer observation of the column–footing interface (Figure 4.8).



Figure 4.8 (a) Jagged portion of HyFRC that seeped through steel-wire mesh; and (b) column–footing interface after top portion of column was removed.

4.2.4 Damage to Longitudinal Reinforcement

Table 4.1 (Section 4.1) defines three damage states pertaining to the longitudinal reinforcement other than yielding: exposure, buckling, and fracture. Both reinforcement exposure and fracture occurred at later cycles in the test, whereas reinforcement buckling was not observed at all. Longitudinal reinforcement exposure happened first in cycles 6-1 (PreT-SF-ROCK) and 6-2 (PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC). Due to the nature of the rocking column, the reinforcement became completely exposed without any action on behalf of the researchers, whereas in previous tests, complete exposure of the reinforcement only happened after researchers pulled away spalled portions of the column. In fact, not only did the longitudinal rebar become fully exposed but the prestressing strands were also visible, which was not the case in previous tests. Researchers originally conceived this particular damage state as a measure of how much concrete area was lost; however, in these two tests, the bars became visible through a different mechanism, rendering this damage state irrelevant.

The longitudinal reinforcement fractured at a drift ratio of approximately 6.0% (cycle 9-1) in both PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK. The fracture is depicted in

Figures 4.9–4.11. This drift level at fracture was only slightly lower than the drift level observed in Finnsson's PreT-SF-HyFRC-SS column, which fractured at 7.2% drift [Finnsson 2013]. The fact that the difference is small was not surprising, because Finnsson's PreT-SF-HyFRC-SS column contained stainless steel, which is more ductile than the conventional "black steel" used in both PreT-SF-ROCK and PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC. Finnsson's PreT-SF-HyFRC column, which also contained black steel, fractured at a drift ratio of 4.1%, indicating that the rocking behavior of the steel shoe paired with the 8-in. debonding of the longitudinal reinforcement provided added ductility to the columns in this report. Table 4.4 shows the extent to which bar fracture in this report compares to that of two previous experiments.

One unexpected occurrence was the fracture of prestressing strands in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC. During testing, specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC lost three of its prestressing strands while specimen PreT-SF-ROCK lost none. Researchers visibly observed the first fractured strand in cycle 10-1 (Figure 4.12); however, the strand may have fractured as early as cycle 9-2 when researchers heard a loud noise. The noise was likely caused by the fracture of a prestressing strand as opposed to a longitudinal rebar, because the noise appeared to come from the top of the column. Additionally, the load cell attached to the southeast strand lost all load at 7.27% drift which is roughly the drift level associated with cycle 9-2. The dowel bar placed at the column–footing interface may have caused this strand fracture as it was one of only two differing factors between specimens PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK. As the column rotated, the cup feature in the footing allowed the dowel bar to rotate while the strands resisted rotation. Furthermore, only the east facing strands fractured. It is possible that a misaligned dowel bar pressed against the east strands, causing them to kink and subsequently fracture.

Researchers did not observe any buckling in the longitudinal reinforcement in either test although the steel shoe largely concealed the longitudinal reinforcement for the majority of the test making observation of buckling difficult. However, if the longitudinal reinforcement did buckle, it would likely have failed shortly thereafter. In both tests, the longitudinal reinforcement did not fracture until approximately 6% drift. This high drift level indicates that the reinforcement roughly reached its maximum tensile capacity, supporting the observation that the reinforcement did not buckle.

	Drift at Bar Fracture	Percent increase from PreT-SF- HyFRC [Finnsson 2013]	Percent increase from PreT- SF-CONC [Davis et al. 2012]
PreT-SF- ROCK- HyFRC	5.96%	31%	33%
PreT-SF- ROCK	5.94%	30%	33%

|--|

In earlier tests [Finnsson 2013; Davis et al. 2012 Haraldsson et al. 2011], the base of the column was not confined externally by a steel shoe. As the cover spalled, the bars lost lateral support and consequently buckled. Conversely, no bars ever buckled in the footing due to the large quantity of concrete that provided significant lateral support. Thus, the steel shoe appears to offer an effective means of lateral support that consequently prevented bar buckling.



Figure 4.9 Exposed north bar of PreT-SF-ROCK.



Figure 4.10 Fractured northwest bar of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC (fractured in footing).



Figure 4.11 Fractured north bar of PreT-SF-ROCK.



Figure 4.12 Northwest view of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC showing location of missing strand (fractured).

4.2.5 Loss of Axial-Load Capacity

Neither column ever lost its axial capacity. This result was expected because, in previous tests by Finnsson [2013], Davis et al. [2012], and Haraldsson et al. [2011], the axial capacity was

retained. In fact, Haraldsson showed that the true axial capacity of the columns greatly exceeded their factored design load. After completing 40 cycles of lateral loading, Haraldsson increased the applied axial load until failure. By that time, the longitudinal bars had already buckled, the spiral had fractured, and the concrete core was partially crushed. Nonetheless, the columns did not explode until the applied axial load was three and a half times the factored design load. This result should not be surprising considering the service level axial load for a bridge column is typically in the range of $0.03f_cA_g$ to $0.10f_cA_g$.
5 Measured Response

5.1 MATERIAL PROPERTIES

Researchers constructed the columns and footings in the Structural Engineering Laboratory at the University of Washington. The casting and curing of both the columns and footings also took place in the university's structures lab. A local ready mix company (CalPortland) provided the conventional concrete, whereas researchers mixed the HyFRC themselves using the lab's facilities. Concrete cylinders were taken from each batch of concrete, using 4 in. \times 8 in. cylinders for the HyFRC and 6 in. \times 12 in. cylinders for the conventional concrete. Researchers stored the cylinders in a fog room at the University of Washington where they kept the relative humidity at 100% and the temperature at 70°F. For both specimens, researchers performed material tests on the conventional concrete and HyFRC, as well as on the longitudinal and transverse reinforcement.

5.1.1 Conventional Concrete

To build the two specimens, researchers used only two batches of conventional concrete, one for both columns and another for both footings. The cylinders of each batch were tested at 7 days, 14 days, and 28 days, as well as on both specimen test days. The cylinders were also tested on the day that the prestressing strands were released. Table 5.1 lists the compressive strengths of the concrete batches on the two specimen test days; Appendix A gives the batches' complete compressive strength histories. The measured column concrete compressive strength decreased by 3.7% as it aged from 79 days to 90 days. This decrease is likely attributable to random variations among the strengths of individual cylinders.

The moduli of elasticity were also measured for both the column and footing concrete at 28 days and on the two specimen test days. An additional column concrete test was done on the day of release. Table 5.2 lists the measured modulus of elasticity for the concrete batches on the two specimen test days; Appendix A documents the variation in modulus of elasticity over time.

	Columr	1	Footing		
Specimen	Compressive Strength (psi)	Age (days)	Compressive Strength (psi)	Age (days)	
PreT-SF- ROCK	10,273	79	9,022	35	
PreT-SF- ROCK- HyFRC	9,894	90	9,326	46	

Table 5.1Conventional concrete compressive strengths on test days.

Table 5.2 Conventional concrete elastic modulus on test day	ays.
---	------

Specimen	Elastic Modului (ksi)	Age (days)	
PreT-SF- ROCK	3,747	79	
PreT-SF- ROCK- HyFRC	3,881	90	

Split-cylinder tests were performed to measure the concretes' tensile strengths on the day specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC was tested. Researchers would have gathered more data points for this strength parameter, but the number of concrete cylinders available limited this ability. The PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day was deemed the most important date to measure this parameter because PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC contained HyFRC, and a major difference between HyFRC and conventional concrete is their difference in tensile strengths. The tensile strength was computed as:

$$f_{ct} = \frac{2P}{\pi ld} \tag{5.1}$$

where *P* is the maximum load applied in the test, *l* is the length of the specimen (12 in. for the 6 in. \times 12 in. cylinders), and *d* the diameter of the specimen (6 in. for the 6 in. \times 12 in. cylinders). Table 5.3 lists the measured tensile strengths for both the column and footing concretes on the PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day.

 Table 5.3
 Conventional concrete tensile strength on PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day.

Column			Footing		
Age (days)	Tensile Strength (psi)	Tensile Strength/f´ _c	Age (days)	Tensile Strength (psi)	Tensile Strength/f´ _c
90	673	6.8%	46	646	6.9%

5.1.2 HyFRC

The HyFRC was mixed in four, equal-sized batches. Researchers then combined and vibrated the batches together to make the mix more uniform. The same process was followed to make the HyFRC for the cylinders. Researchers conducted compressive strengths on the HyFRC cylinders at 7 days, 14 days, 28 days, release day, and the PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day. No tests were done on the PreT-SF-ROCK test day, because that specimen did not contain any HyFRC. Additionally, researchers tested the elastic modulus of the HyFRC at 28 days and on the PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day. Lastly, split-cylinder tests were done on PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day. Table 5.4 shows the HyFRC material properties at PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day; Appendix A lists the complete strength progression of the HyFRC.

 Table 5.4
 HyFRC material properties on PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day,

Specimen	Age (days)	Compressive Strength (psi)	Elastic Modulus (ksi)	Tensile Strength (psi)	Tensile Strength/f´ _c
PreT-SF- ROCK- HyFRC	92	10,203	4,496	1,452	14.2%

5.1.3 Steel Reinforcement

Both columns had four types of steel reinforcement: 3-gauge smooth wire spiral, No. 4 and No. 6 deformed reinforcing bars, and the welded steel shoe. Researchers conducted tension tests on two samples of each the No. 4 and No. 6 bar sizes. Table 5.5 lists the key properties of the reinforcing steel used in the two columns.

The 3-gauge smooth wire used was from the same batch used by Finnsson [2013]. As a result, this report repeats the tension results obtained by Finnsson. Prior to this material test, Finnsson had to straighten the wire since it was supplied in coils. This measure induced reverse plastic bending and likely caused the absence of a yield plateau in the resulting stress–strain curve. Researchers did not conduct any tests on the welded steel shoe. Researchers did not test any samples of the footing steel either because previous tests on similar footings had shown that the footing steel did not yield. Appendix A documents the full stress–strain curves.

Туре	Yield Stress	Tensile Strength	Elastic Modulus	
	f_y (ksi) f_u (ksi)		E-mod (ksi)	
#4	67.5	89.9	29,100	
#6	67.0	89.6	26,300	
3-gauge spiral	86.3	96.0	30,500	

Table 5.5Measured properties of reinforcing steel.

5.2 MOMENT–DRIFT RESPONSE

The moment at the base of the each column, including P-delta effects, was calculated using Equation (5.2)

$$M = H \cdot h_1 + P \cdot \frac{h_2}{h_1} \cdot \Delta_1 - F \cdot \Delta_2 \tag{5.2}$$

where M is the base moment, H is the lateral load applied by the MTS actuator, h_1 is the distance from the column-footing interface to the center of the MTS actuator (60 in.), P is the axial load applied by the Baldwin, h_2 is the distance from the column-footing interface to the spherical bearing (96.5 in.), Δ_1 is the measured lateral displacement of the column at elevation h_1 , F is the estimated friction force between the stainless steel sheet and the greased PTFE pad, and Δ_2 is the lateral displacement at h_2 estimated as $(h_2/h_1) \cdot \Delta_1$. Figure 5.1 graphically depicts these variables in reference to the test set-up.

Although researchers greased the PTFE pad and stainless steel sheet to minimize resistance, the two components nonetheless generated a small friction force as they slipped against each other throughout the test. The friction force (F) was calculated using the model developed by Brown [2008], illustrated in Figure 5.2.



Figure 5.1 Definitions of variables for Equation (5.2).



Figure 5.2 Friction correction model [Brown 2008].

The approximated friction had two components: one derived from the sliding in the channel and the other derived from the rotation of the spherical bearing. The effective coefficient of friction was determined using Equation (5.3):

$$\mu_{\rm eff} = \mu_{\rm flat} + \mu_{\rm curv} \frac{R}{L_{\rm total}}$$
(5.3)

In this model, μ_{flat} represents the sliding within the channel, whereas μ_{curv} represents the rotation of the spherical bearing. *R* is the radius of the spherical bearing, and L_{total} is the total height from the top of the footing to the top of the spherical bearing. The maximum friction force was calculated as $\mu_{\text{eff}} \cdot P$, where *P* is the applied axial load (159 kips). Brown [2008] determined μ_{eff} to be 1.6%, resulting in a maximum friction force of 2.54 kips or 4.2% of the maximum expected lateral load from the MTS actuator. Figure 5.3 illustrates the friction coefficients associated with the sliding channel.

Researchers used a spring stiffness, k, of 5 kips/in. when correcting the moment and effective force plots for friction. This value is different from the 60 kips/in. Brown used in his study; however, both previous tests, Finnsson [2013] and Davis et al. [2012], discovered that a spring stiffness of 60 kips/in. is too stiff and causes unlikely force–deformation relationships. Figures 5.4 and 5.5 depict the uncorrected moment–drift responses, whereas Figures 5.6 and 5.7 depict the corrected moment–drift responses of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK, respectively.



Figure 5.3 Schematic drawing of the sliding channel and its friction components.



Figure 5.4 Uncorrected moment–drift plot for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.5 Uncorrected moment–drift plot for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK.



Figure 5.6 Corrected moment–drift plot for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.7 Corrected moment–drift plot for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK.

The main differences between the uncorrected and corrected moment-drift plots are a slight reduction in maximum moment and an increase in the amount of pinching of the hysteresis loops. The overall shape of the two plots, however, is the same. Force and moment data presented in the rest of this report correspond to friction-corrected values. Table 5.6 summarizes the maximum corrected moments and the corresponding drift levels.

The moment-drift responses of the two specimens were similar to each other. The flexural strength of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC was only 4% higher than that of PreT-SF-ROCK. Additionally, both specimens continued to gain strength even after the first bar fractured at approximately 6% drift (Table 4.2). The maximum moment in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK did not occur until 6.8% drift and 8.5% drift, respectively.

Another measure of performance is strength degradation. One common definition of "failure" is the point at which moment resistance decreases to 80% of its maximum value. Similar to the specimens in Finnsson [2013], PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK maintained this level of moment resistance to drift levels beyond 10% with the exception of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC in the north direction. This observation suggests that the inclusion of HyFRC in the rocking shoe column is not needed to obtain highly ductile behavior.

	PreT-SF-RC	OCK-HyFRC	PreT-SF-ROCK	
Point of Interest	North Direction	South Direction	North Direction	South Direction
Maximum Moment (kip-in.)	-3,617	3,885	-3,619	3,731
Drift Ratio at Maximum Moment (%)	-4.55	6.78	-4.52	8.53
80% of Maximum Moment (kip-in.)	-2,931	3,150	-2,955	3,169
Drift Ratio of 80% of Maximum Moment (%)	-8.24	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 5.6Summary of moment-drift response.

5.3 EFFECTIVE FORCE ACTING ON SPECIMENS

The effective force acting on the column was calculated by dividing the base moment, M, by h_1 , the distance from the column–footing interface to the midpoint of the MTS actuator.

$$F_{\rm eff} = \frac{M}{h_1} \tag{5.4}$$

Figures 5.8 and 5.9 illustrate the effective force versus displacement plots, whereas Table 5.7 lists the maximum effective forces observed and the corresponding drift levels.



Figure 5.8 Effective force–displacement response for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.9 Effective force–displacement response for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK.

	PreT-SF-RC	-SF-ROCK-HyFRC PreT-SF-ROCI		-ROCK
Point of Interest	North Direction	South Direction	North Direction	South Direction
Maximum Effective Force (kips)	-60.3	64.7	-60.3	62.2
Drift Ratio at Maximum Effective Force (%)	-4.55	6.78	-4.52	8.53
80% of Maximum Effective Force (kips)	-48.9	52.5	-49.3	52.8
Drift Ratio of 80% of Maximum Effective Force (%)	-8.24	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 5.7Summary of effective forces.

5.4 COLUMN ROTATIONS

Researchers measured column rotations using three methods: the "curvature rod" system, inclinometers, and the Optotrac LED tracking system (Section 3.2). The relative rotation between two adjacent cross-sections was calculated using Equation (5.5):

$$\theta_{i} = \frac{\delta_{i,N} - \delta_{i,S}}{L_{i}} \tag{5.5}$$

where θ_i is the rotation at a specified column height, $\delta_{i,N}$ is the displacement measured by the north potentiometer, $\delta_{i,S}$ is the displacement measured by the south potentiometer, and L_i is the horizontal distance between the north and south potentiometers. The absolute rotation at each cross section was determined by summing the relative rotations beneath the height of interest.

Figures 5.10 and 5.11 show the absolute column rotations derived from the curvature rod measurements at the following drift levels: $\pm 0.3\%$, $\pm 0.7\%$, $\pm 1.2\%$, $\pm 2.0\%$, $\pm 3.0\%$, and $\pm 4.0\%$. These drift levels are the same that levels for which Finnsson [2013] reported rotations, which facilitates the comparison of performance.

One of the potentiometers reached the end of its stroke as the column transitioned from +4% drift to -4% drift in test PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC. As a result, this instrument provided erroneous measurements for the rotations at -4% drift. Rotations at this drift level are not plotted for this test.

Inclinometers were the second method used to measure column rotation. Figures 5.12 and 5.13 show the absolute column rotations measured with these instruments.



Figure 5.10 Rotations of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC as measured with curvature rod system.



Figure 5.11 Rotations of PreT-SF-ROCK as measured with curvature rod system.



Figure 5.12 Rotations of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC as measured from inclinometers.



Figure 5.13 Rotations of PreT-SF-ROCK as measured from inclinometers.

The detailed rotation pattern in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC seems implausible, because it indicates that the column straightened between the second and third inclinometers (located 12 in. and 24 in. above the interface). Researchers did not observe such straightening behavior. Researchers attributed this effect to the instruments' tolerances. Additionally, the top inclinometer (34 in.) did not take any measurements throughout the entire PreT-SF-ROCK test.

An Optotrac LED motion capture system was the third method used to measure column rotation. Figures 5.14 and 5.15 show the absolute column rotations measured with this system. Of the three methods, the Optotrac data was the most consistent. It also showed a slight jump in rotation at the top of the steel shoe, which was consistent with observation of hairline cracks there.

The Optotrac data, however, does show one peculiarity. In specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, the Optotrac data indicates that at drift ratios $\pm 3.0\%$ and $\pm 4.0\%$ the rotations were not symmetric. This asymmetry is inconsistent with researchers' expectations. Additionally, this asymmetry does not occur in the Optotrac data for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK. The asymmetry in Optotrac rotations for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC could be a result of column sliding. However, if this were the case, the Optotrac data should have reported rotations in the positive direction that were lower than what would be expected nominally. It did not. As a result, researchers are unsure what caused this asymmetry.

The three methods used to determine column rotation are compared at $\pm 2\%$ drift in Figures 5.16 and 5.17. These two plots show that the data from the three rotation methods are mainly consistent, especially in the PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test, for which the values fall within

5% of each other for positive drifts and 16% for negative drifts. The three methods agree less in the PreT-SF-ROCK test where the values fall within 24% of each other for positive drifts and 13% for negative drifts. Once again, the Optotrac data seems the most reliable followed by the curvature rod system. The inclinometer manufacturer (Spectron) reports an accuracy of $\pm 0.5^{\circ}$ for the instrument. This is 13% of the peak rotation, suggesting that the instrument's accuracy could inhibit its performance relative to the other two methods.



Figure 5.14 Rotations of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC as measured with the Optotrac system.



Figure 5.15 Rotations of PreT-SF-ROCK as measured with the Optotrac system.



Figure 5.16 Comparison of measured rotations for PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.17 Comparison of measured rotations for PreT-SF-ROCK.

Regardless of these small discrepancies, all of the data appears to suggest the same thing: the columns acted as nearly rigid bodies with the majority of rotation occurring at the column-footing interface. These results are consistent with the observed behavior during both tests. A smaller portion of rotation also formed at a column height of 10 in., which corresponds to the

elevation of the interface between the top of the steel shoe and the remainder of the column. This slight relative rotation was also expected since the column stiffness in the region above the steel shoe is much lower than that within the steel shoe. PreT-SF-ROCK experienced slightly more rotation gain at the 10-in. elevation than did PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC. This rotation is best illustrated in Figures 5.13 and 5.14. This result is consistent with the observations that PreT-SF-ROCK suffered more hairline cracking than did PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.

5.5 COLUMN CURVATURES

Researchers calculated column curvatures using data from the curvature rod system and the Optotrac system. The inclinometer rotation data was not converted to curvatures, because it appeared to be insufficiently accurate. Average curvatures were calculated using the previously found rotations and Equation (5.6):

$$\varphi_{i} = \frac{\delta_{i,N} - \delta_{i,S}}{L_{i}} / H_{i}$$
(5.6)

where φ_i is the average curvature over the monitored height, $\delta_{i,N}$ and $\delta_{i,S}$ are the measured displacements on the column's respective north and south faces, L_i is the horizontal distance between the north and south potentiometers, and H_i is the initial vertical distance between adjacent curvature rods.

Figures 5.18 and 5.19 show the average curvature of the two columns as measured by the curvature-rod system at the same drift levels reported for rotations: $\pm 0.3\%$, $\pm 0.7\%$, $\pm 1.2\%$, $\pm 2.0\%$, $\pm 3.0\%$, and $\pm 4.0\%$.

Figures 5.18 and 5.19 show that the majority of average curvature occurred at the base of the column, with a secondary region of curvature occurring at the top of the steel shoe. The average curvature of PreT-SF-ROCK was nearly identical to that of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC at the column's base; however, it was larger near the top of the steel shoe. This difference in measurement is consistent with the observation that PreT-SF-ROCK experienced more hairline cracking in this region than did PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.

Figures 5.20 and 5.21 document the average curvature distribution of the two columns, as derived from the Optotrac system data.

The curvatures derived from the Optotrac data are similar to those from the curvature-rod system. Again, the two plots show that the columns experienced high curvatures at the column–footing interface and little curvature elsewhere, except for immediately above the steel shoe where the column undergoes a change in stiffness. As expected, specimen PreT-SF-ROCK had a higher curvature above the steel shoe region than did PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.18 Average curvatures of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, calculated from curvature rod system.



Figure 5.19 Average curvatures of PreT-SF-ROCK, calculated from curvature rod system.



Figure 5.20 Average curvatures of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, calculated from the Optotrac system.



Figure 5.21 Average curvatures of PreT-SF-ROCK, calculated from the Optotrac system.

5.6 STRAINS IN LONGITUDINAL REINFORCEMENT

5.6.1 No. 4 Bars

Figures 5.22–5.24 show the strain profiles of the No. 4 longitudinal reinforcing bars for both tests. The strains are plotted at the three measured locations: 7 in. below the column–footing interface, at the interface, and 7 in. above the interface. In these plots, positive elevations refer to locations above the interface whereas negative elevations refer to locations below the interface. During the test, the majority of strain gauges ceased to work at large drifts. For this reason, the plots show the strain profiles at only three drift levels: $\pm 0.3\%$, $\pm 0.7\%$, and $\pm 1.2\%$. Only one strain gauge at the interface functioned during the PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test. Consequently, only one plot is shown for that test (the south bar).



Figure 5.22 Strain profiles for the south No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.23 Strain profiles for the south No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK.



Figure 5.24 Strain profiles for the north No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK.

The measured compressive and tensile strains plotted in Figures 5.22–5.24 are approximately symmetric (about the zero strain axis) at 7 in. above and 7 in. below the interface. In contrast, at the interface, the tensile strains greatly exceeded the compressive strains. One feature of both columns was the steel shoe. During the test, researchers noticed that the column rocked about the shoe's outer edges as the column was laterally loaded. This rocking behavior would cause tension in both the north and south bars at the same drift level if the column's neutral axis was located the column edge. If this were the case, then the bar opposite the direction of loading would experience high tensile strains. The above plots show such a pattern. Additionally, at low drift levels (e.g., $\pm 0.3\%$) the bars in the direction of loading show compressive strains. This behavior is consistent with the steel shoe not yet lifting off and rocking about its outer edge. In such a case, the neutral axis would not be at the outer edge. Therefore, the bar in the direction of loading should be in compression.

To understand the bars' strain behavior better, researchers created strain versus drift histories for each pair of working strain gauges located on the No. 4 longitudinal bars. Figures 5.25–5.28 show these results. Since most of the strain gauges broke at some point during the test, each plot only contains data until the respective gauge's point of breaking. Note that the plots for the strain gauge pairs above and below the interface have a different scale than the plots for the strain gauge pairs at interface. The scales are different because the strains measured at the interface were an order of magnitude higher than the strains measured above and below the interface.



Figure 5.25 Strain versus drift in the south No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.26 Strain versus drift in the north No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.







Figure 5.28 Strain versus drift in the north No. 4 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK.

The strain histories are consistent between the two specimens, and between the north and south bars. The strains are generally slightly larger when the bar is in tension as opposed to compression, which is consistent with previous results from Finnsson [2013]. This difference is also consistent with the observed vertical displacements (Section 5.10). When the bar was in tension, the crack at the base was wide. Conversely, when the bar was in compression, no visible downward movement of the steel plate at its base was apparent. Additionally, the strains measured 7 in. below the interface are comparable to those measured 7 in. above the interface.

5.6.2 No. 6 Bars

Figures 5.29–5.32 show the strain profiles of the No. 6 reinforcing bars for both column tests. The strains are plotted at the two monitored locations, 1 in. and 7 in. above the interface. In addition to the three drift levels considered in the plots for the No. 4 bar strain profiles ($\pm 0.3\%$, $\pm 0.7\%$, and $\pm 1.2\%$), the profiles for the No. 6 bars are also reported for a drift ratio of 2.0%.



Figure 5.29 Strain profiles for the southeast No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.30 Strain profiles for the northwest No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.31 Strain profiles for the southeast No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK.



Figure 5.32 Strain profiles for the northwest No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK.

Additionally, the measured tensile strains were larger at 7 in. above interface while the compressive strain appears larger at 1 in. above interface. This difference was expected. The compressive stress is more concentrated at lower elevations, hence requiring the No. 6 bars to distribute that stress to the surrounding concrete. Conversely, cracking near the top of the steel shoe would cause a loss of tensile capacity in the concrete, requiring the No. 6 bars to compensate this loss by carrying additional tensile stress. The strain profile for the northwest bar in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK appears unrealistic. At +0.3% drift the bar exhibits tensile strain, while at +0.7%, +1.2%, and 2.0% drift the bar exhibits compressive strain. In the similar directions of loading, the bar should experience the same type of stress, either compressive or tensile. This could be the result of faulty strain gauge installation.

Figures 5.33–5.36 show the strain versus drift plots for the No. 6 bars. Unlike the No. 4 bars, the No. 6 bars did not yield in either test. As a result, all working strain gauges functioned throughout the entire duration of both tests. Consequently, the plots were able to depict the bars' strain levels at extreme drift levels.



Figure 5.33 Strain versus drift in the southeast No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.34 Strain versus drift in the northwest No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.35 Strain versus drift in the southeast No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK.



Figure 5.36 Strain versus drift in the northwest No. 6 bar, PreT-SF-ROCK.

The plots in Figures 5.33–5.36 provide interesting results. First, the relatively low strain values in Figure 5.35 compared to those shown in the other three figures suggest that the strain gauge malfunctioned. If the results from Figure 5.35 are disregarded, the behavior of the No. 6 bars in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK are nearly identical. The northwest bar in PreT-SF-ROCK appears to have experienced slightly higher strains than the No. 6 bars in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, but the shapes are similar.

These four plots show that the bars' cyclic, strain–drift behavior 7 in. above the column– footing interface is symmetric, reaching strains approximately a quarter to half of the yield strain. In contrast, the bars' hysteretic behavior 1 in. above the interface is not symmetric. In the expected tensile direction, the plots' shapes resemble typical hysteretic behavior; in the expected compressive direction, however, the bars gain compressive strain until approximately 2% drift at which point they experience decreasing compressive strain and eventually tension. This measured behavior is consistent with the behavior measured for the No. 4 bars (previous section), in which the north and south bars appeared to be in tension simultaneously.

5.7 STRAIN IN TRANSVERSE REINFORCEMENT

Figures 5.37 and 5.38 illustrate the transverse reinforcement strain versus drift in both columns at a single measured location: 3 in. above the column–footing interface. The transverse reinforcement did not yield during either test. As a result, the plots include data at high drift levels.



Figure 5.37 Strain versus drift of transverse reinforcement in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.38 Strain versus drift of transverse reinforcement in PreT-SF-ROCK.

The plots in Figures 5.37 and 5.38 show that the transverse reinforcement in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK experienced similar strains as the transverse reinforcement in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC. The maximum measured strain in both specimens was only 10% of the yield strain. These results indicate that the transverse reinforcement inside the steel shoe provides little benefit.

To evaluate this conclusion, researchers converted the spiral volumetric ratio to an equivalent steel tube thickness, which resulted in an equivalent tube wall thickness of $A_{sp}/s = 0.0328$ in. This equivalent thickness is roughly one seventh that of the 0.25-in. wall thickness of the actual specimen. Therefore, researchers expected the real tube to provide the majority of the confinement, especially near the base, where the welded circular plate stiffens it.

5.8 STRAIN IN PRESTRESSING STRANDS

Strain gauges, placed in pairs in the strands' unbonded region, measured the strain history of the prestressing strands during both tests. Figures 5.39 and 5.40 show the strand strain versus drift histories. These plots also include a horizontal red line that denotes the nominal yield strain of the strand, 0.0087 in./in. This strain is based on a yield stress f_{py} =250 ksi and an elastic modulus E_p = 28,600 ksi. In specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, none of the strain gauges on the northeast strand functioned during the test. As a result, the strains for that strand are not reported.



Figure 5.39 Strand strain gauge data versus drift (blue) and estimated yield strain (red) for PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.40 Strand strain gauge data versus drift (blue) and estimated yield strain (red) for PreT-SF-ROCK.

In all cases, the strand–drift histories form a V-shape. As the drift increases in the positive or negative direction, the tension strain increases. For the strands about the east-west axis (near the center of the column), the V-shape is symmetric. This is not the case for the off-centered strands, which exhibit asymmetric behavior. In particular, the northwest and northeast strands experience higher tensile strains at positive drifts, whereas the southwest and southeast strands experience higher tensile strain at negative drifts. This behavior is consistent with the strands' locations with respect to edge of the column, about which point the column rocks.

The northwest and southwest strands in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC fractured at a drift ratio above 6% drift, whereas none fractured in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK. The fracture was not ductile as depicted by the sharp gain in strain in Figure 5.39. Additionally, the brittle failure occurred before any of the strands yielded. This observed failure is consistent with the theory that the dowel bar may have been misaligned and caused the strands to kink. Since a perfectly aligned dowel bar would be difficult to ensure in the field, future columns of this design should not include the dowel bar.

Aside from the three strands that fractured, the remaining strands in both columns all exceeded their yield strain. The strands offset to the north and south yielded much earlier (3-4% drift) than those along the east-west axis (5% drift), as expected. Additionally, the north and south strands reached strains up to 2.4 times the yield strain, whereas the east and west strands only reached strains equal to 1.6 times their nominal yield strain. These results suggest that the outer strands contributed more to the column re-centering, since they were subjected to higher strains at lower drift levels.

Lastly, as the strands cycled back and forth, the tensile strain at 0% drift steadily increased. This increase was far more pronounced for the outer (north and south) strands than it was for the center (east and west) strands. In fact, by the end of the test, the outer strands had measured strains above the yield level at 0% drift. The increase in strain at 0% drift was the result of intense cyclic yielding. While strands in previous tests experienced these zero drift changes, the changes were not nearly as dramatic as observed in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK. This difference suggests that the strands in these two specimens underwent significantly more yielding and, consequently, more strain hardening than in previous tests.

5.9 STRAND SLIP

Load cells were placed at the top of the column on each strand to detect any slip that might occur during the tests. Due to the shorter bond length at the top of the column, researchers assumed that, if the strand slipped in the footing then it would also slip at the top of the column, hence load cells were not installed on the strands beneath the column. Researchers stressed each load cell to an initial load (approximately 5 kips) prior to testing by backing out the screw thread device after the strand chucks were set. During the test, any increase in that initial load would be a sign of anchorage slip. Figures 5.41 and 5.42 show the force in each load cell throughout the test. For comparison purposes, researchers zeroed each load cell so that their initial load was zero kips. In specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, the load cell on the southeast strand did not function during the test. As a result, that load cell is omitted from the plots.



Figure 5.41 Load versus drift on strand load cells for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.42 Load versus drift on strand load cells for specimen PreT-SF-ROCK.

The plots above show that some slip occurred in 6 of the 11 strands containing functioning load cells. Three of the strands that slipped also fractured, which is consistent with the drastic loss of load these strands experienced almost instantaneously. The three slipped strands, all located on specimen PreT-SF-ROCK (Figure 5.41), began losing load at approximately 5% drift and continued to lose load for the remainder of the test. The maximum measured load loss at the load cell (5.4 kips) occurred on the southwest strand of specimen PreT-SF-ROCK. Prior to losing their entire load, the strain gauges on the three fractured strands on specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC detected an increase in strain.

Since the slip and/or fracture always occurred in the specimens at drift ratios above 5% drift, it is likely that the anchorage in the prototype would be adequate. Few bridge columns would be expected to be subjected to such a high level of deformation. In addition, the strand diameter in the full-scale column would be proportionally smaller than it was in these two test specimens. As a result, the normalized anchorage length would be large at full scale, further reducing the chance of slippage. The bond strength in relation to ACI requirements is discussed further in Section 7.6.

5.10 AXIAL ELONGATION

Researchers estimated the column's axial elongation using the Optotrac system measurements, combined with Equation (5.7):

$$\delta = L_i - L_o \tag{5.7}$$

where δ is the axial elongation at a specified column height, L_o is the initial length between two LED chord lines at their centers, and L_i is the changed length between two LED chord lines at their centers during loading. Figure 5.43 graphically depicts these variables. Figures 5.44 and 5.45 show the calculated axial elongations of both columns.



Figure 5.43 Definitions of variables for Equation (5.7).



Figure 5.44 Axial elongation in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.



Figure 5.45 Axial elongation in PreT-SF-ROCK.

The axial elongation plot of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC (Figure 5.44) shows behavior that is consistent with researchers' expectations. PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC appears to have elongated as it cycled back and forth. The majority of the elongation was concentrated at the base of the column, with a minor blip of elongation change above the steel shoe. This behavior was consistent with the concept of a small amount of rubble in the crack at the base of the column that would inhibit perfect crack closure.
The axial elongation plot of PreT-SF-ROCK (Figure 5.45) is different. While a good portion of the axial strain occurs at interface, there is also a sizeable amount of axial elongation change at 12 in. and 24 in. above the interface. Researchers are unsure what caused this discrepancy, because the same Optotrac data yielded reasonable results for both rotation and curvature. The inconsistency, however, appears at only two locations. The other data points reflect an axial elongation similar to that of specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC. As PreT-SF-ROCK cycled back and forth, the specimen appeared to elongate at its base.

6 Comparison with Previous Tests

This chapter analyzes the measured responses of specimens PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK and compares them with the responses of columns tested by Finnsson [2013] and Davis et al. [2012]. These previous tests both contained the same quantity of unbonded prestressing strands and longitudinal reinforcement, and had the same cross-sectional dimensions. The specimen constructed by Finnsson had HyFRC in the plastic hinge region above and below the column–footing interface, whereas the Davis specimen was constructed with conventional concrete throughout. Neither Finnsson nor Davis' subassemblies had a steel shoe.

6.1 PEAK STRENGTH AND STRENGTH DEGRADATION

The envelope to the cyclic moment–drift curves provides a compact measure of column resistance. Figure 6.1 shows the moment envelopes for the positive and negative peaks of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, PreT-SF-ROCK, PreT-SF-HyFRC, and PreT-SF-CONC. The moment envelopes are similar for the two rocking specimens. The measured moment for the PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC specimen was slightly larger in the positive direction but nearly identical in the negative direction up to a drift ratio of approximately -7%.

Despite having the same cross-sectional area of steel bridging the crack plane, the moment capacities of the two rocking specimens were significantly higher than those of the specimens tested by Finnsson [2013] and Davis et al. [2012]. The moment capacities of the columns in the two previous studies fell within a range of 2,533–3,083 kip-in. In comparison, the PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK's maximum moments exceeded the largest value (3,093 k-in.) by 20.6% and 17.3%, respectively. It is likely that this increased moment capacity resulted from the added confinement provided by the steel shoe, which caused the center of the compression face to shift nearer to the column's edge, creating a larger lever arm.

Figure 6.2 shows the effective force envelopes, normalized by the peak effective force for all four columns. The normalized envelopes are convenient for evaluating strength degradation. The strength of the two rocking columns degraded little. To the contrary, the two columns continued to gain strength until they reached a drift ratio of approximately 5%. At the highest drift ratios (~10%) the strength of PreT-SF-ROCK degraded less than that of PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC in both the positive and negative directions. This difference may have been the result of the fracture of strands in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC (starting at a drift ratio of 7.3%) that

did not occur in PreT-SF-ROCK. It is possible that the dowel bar placed in the center of the prestressing strand pattern in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC caused three strands to kink and then fracture. Regardless of these small differences, both rocking specimens retained over 80% of their peak strength with the exception of specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC in the negative direction, whose strength had decayed to 71% of its peak strength.



Figure 6.1 Moment versus drift envelopes.



Figure 6.2 Normalized strength degradation comparisons.

The specimens without the rocking detail (PreT-SF-HyFRC and PreT-SF-CONC) reached their peak strength at approximately $\pm 2\%$ drift while specimens PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK reached their peak strength at approximately $\pm 5\%$ drift. This difference is likely the result of the steel shoe feature. In the previous specimens, a steel shoe did not confine the columns at interface, resulting in the concrete crushing in the plastic hinge region. In PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK, the confinement of the steel shoe prevented crushing and allowed the concrete to withstand more compressive stress as the columns underwent higher drift levels.

With the exception of Davis' column, the other three columns retained the majority of their strength even at extreme drift levels. Specimen PreT-SF-CONC retained its peak strength only until approximately $\pm 4\%$ drift. Afterwards, however, PreT-SF-CONC experienced a sharp loss in strength. Specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, on the other hand, retained its strength until approximately 10% where it decreased roughly 20%, a behavior likely caused by the fracture of the prestressing strands. Specimens PreT-SF-ROCK and PreT-SF-HyFRC maintained their strength even better, to drift levels greater than 10%. In the positive direction, the strength retention was nearly identical whereas in the negative direction PreT-SF-ROCK retained slightly more strength than PreT-SF-HyFRC. These envelopes show that the rocking column provides as much ductility as the HyFRC column in Finnsson's experiment. Furthermore, these envelopes show that the absence of HyFRC in the rocking column tested here did not adversely affect ductility.

Researchers designed all of the compared columns above for use in bridge systems. In such systems, the design-level earthquakes would cause drift ratios in the range of 1–2% whereas the maximum expected earthquake might induce drift ratios of maybe 3%. In all circumstances, the four above columns would not undergo any strength loss. If the columns experienced drift higher than 4%, PreT-SF-CONC would likely significantly lose strength but the remaining three columns would not.

6.2 ENERGY DISSIPATION

Structures in earthquake-prone regions dissipate energy when they undergo cyclic, inelastic deformations. Researchers calculated the energy dissipation for both columns (which corresponds to the area enclosed by each force–displacement loading cycle). Figure 6.3 shows the energy dissipated in each cycle, while Figure 6.4 shows the cumulative energy dissipation throughout the whole test for both PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK.







Figure 6.4 Cumulative dissipated energy history.

As shown in Figure 6.3, the energy dissipation for each set of cycles followed the same pattern: the second cycle dissipated the most energy while the fourth cycle dissipated the least. This pattern is the result of the imposed deformation history, which had a displacement ratio of 1.0, 1.2, 1.2, and 0.4. The fourth cycle in each set was small in comparison to the others. Thus, it is not surprising that this cycle dissipated the least energy in each set. While the third and second cycles had the same loading ratio, the third cycle consistently dissipated less energy than did the second. This behavior is likely because the second cycle caused some damage.

The plots in Figures 6.3 and 6.4 show that the PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK specimens dissipated nearly exactly the same energy. This similarity was expected, because bar yielding is the primary contributor to this performance parameter. Therefore, the inclusion or absence of HyFRC should make little difference.

The only other difference between the two columns was the inclusion of the dowel bar in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC. The dowel bar should not contribute to the column's energy dissipation either because it was placed in such a way (using the welded cup) to allow rotation. If the dowel bar had deformed inelastically, then it would have increased the energy dissipation. Since PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC dissipated slightly less cumulative energy (7.4%) than PreT-SF-ROCK did, it appears likely that the dowel bar did not deform inelastically.

Researchers also compared the energy dissipated in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK to that of specimens PreT-SF-HyFRC and PreT-SF-CONC. Researchers normalized the energy dissipated in all of the columns using a method found in Pang et al. [2008]. In this method, the cumulative dissipated energy per cycle was divided by the area of a rectangle defined by the maximum (F_{max}) and minimum forces (F_{min}) for the entire test, and the maximum ($\Delta_{max(i)}$) and minimum displacements ($\Delta_{min(i)}$). Figure 6.5 depicts this normalization technique while Figure 6.6 compares the cumulative dissipated energy for all four specimens.



Figure 6.5 Normalization method for energy dissipation [Pang et al. 2008].



Figure 6.6 Comparison of normalized cumulative dissipated energy.

The energy dissipation characteristics of the four specimens plotted in Figure 6.6 were nearly identical until approximately Cycle 35. At that point, specimen PreT-SF-CONC began to dissipate less energy and specimen PreT-SF-ROCK began to dissipate more energy than the two HyFRC specimens. Specimens PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-HyFRC dissipated a similar amount of energy throughout the entire test. However, even as the behavior of the specimens deviated from each other at later cycles, the highest normalized energy dissipation (PreT-SF-ROCK) and the lowest normalized energy dissipation (PreT-SF-CONC) differed by a maximum of only 24.0%. The relatively close energy dissipation results make sense considering the fact that all four specimens contained prestressing. Prestressing re-centers the column, creating a pinching effect in the moment–drift response (demonstrated by Figures 5.5 and 5.6), which reduces the area enclosed by each force–displacement cycle.

6.3 EQUIVALENT VISCOUS DAMPING

Equivalent viscous damping (EVD) is a parameter closely related to energy dissipation. Researchers determined the EVD of each specimen using Equation (6.1):

$$\zeta = \frac{2}{\pi} \cdot \frac{A_{loop}}{A_{box}} \tag{6.1}$$

where A_{loop} is the area enclosed by each loading cycle and A_{box} is the area enclosed by the rectangles circumscribing each loading cycle. Figure 6.7 compares all four specimens' EVD with

respect to load cycle, and Figure 6.8 compares the specimens' EVD with respect to drift ratio. In plots for these two figures, researchers only calculated the EVD for the first cycle of each set.

The calculated EVD was similar amongst all four specimens. Specimens PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK have slightly higher EVD factors until roughly 5% drift, at which point their EVDs became nearly identical to those of specimen PreT-SF-CONC. Specimen PreT-SF-HyFRC consistently had a lower EVD than the other three specimens. These differences are very small: all of the specimens had an EVD in the range of 10–15%.



Figure 6.7 Equivalent viscous damping versus cycle number.



Figure 6.8 Equivalent viscous damping versus drift ratio.

6.4 RE-CENTERING OF COLUMNS

6.4.1 Re-centering Ratio

Hieber et al. [2005] developed a method for characterizing a system's tendency to re-center. The method calculates the ratio between the nominal restoring moments (cause by axial load and prestressing strands) and the resisting moments (provided by the longitudinal reinforcement). Figure 6.9 shows these forces in relation to the column.

Summing the moment caused by these two sets of forces about the centroid of the compression block yields the re-centering and resisting moments. The equation that calculates the resisting moment assumes that the longitudinal reinforcement (mild steel) is in tension in the unloaded condition. The strain profiles in Section 5.6.1 are consistent with this assumption.

$$M_{\rm re-centering} = (P_{\rm col} + F_{\rm pt}) \cdot \alpha D \tag{6.2}$$

$$M_{\text{resisting}} = F_s \cdot \alpha D \tag{6.3}$$

The re-centering ratio, λ_{re} , is the ratio of the two moments calculated at zero drift after peak loading. A ratio λ_{re} >1.0 implies that the column will re-center.

$$\lambda_{\rm re} = \frac{M_{\rm re-centering}}{M_{\rm resisting}} = \frac{P_{\rm col} + P_{\rm pt}}{P_s} = \frac{P_{\rm col} + A_p \cdot f_{p0}}{A_s \cdot f_y}$$
(6.4)

Specimens PreT-SF-ROCK and PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC had the same applied axial load, cross-sectional area of strand, longitudinal reinforcement, and initial strand stress. As a result, both specimens had a design re-centering ratio of 3.5 (based on nominal properties) and an actual re-centering ratio of 3.1 (based on actual properties). The two ratios differ because the longitudinal reinforcement's yield stress exceeded its nominal yield stress (Section 5.1.3).



Figure 6.9 Forces used to calculate the re-centering ratio [Hieber et al. 2005].

6.4.2 Normalized Cross-over Displacement

The normalized crossover displacement (NCOD), plotted in Figure 6.10, is a parameter that measures a column's tendency to re-center itself after cyclic loading. Haraldsson et al. [2011] defines the crossover displacement as the displacement at which the effective force returns to zero after reaching a larger displacement. To normalize this value, the range of crossover displacements was divided by the range of peak displacements. Under this definition, a NCOD value of zero corresponds to perfect re-centering while a NCOD value of one corresponds to no re-centering. Figure 6.11 compares the re-centering ratios of the four specimens. To avoid clutter, this plot only includes points from the first and second cycles of each set.

Normalized Crossover Displacement =
$$\frac{\Delta_{cross1} - \Delta_{cross2}}{\Delta_{peak1} - \Delta_{peak2}}$$
 (6.5)

The NCOD values at small drifts are likely unreliable for two reasons. First, at low drifts, none of the columns have experienced significant yielding, so the friction between the PTFE plate and stainless steel channel in the test rig has a greater influence. Second, the residual displacements are so small that even a slight variation would reflect large differences in NCOD values.



Displacement (mm)

Figure 6.10 Definition of the crossover displacement [Haraldsson et al. 2011].



Figure 6.11 Comparison of normalized crossover displacement.

Specimens PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK had nearly identical NCOD values, remaining within a range of approximately 5–8%. This suggests that added complexity of specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC would not improve re-centering performance. Specimen

PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC included a dowel bar to reduce any sliding that might have occurred in PreT-SF-ROCK; however, specimen PreT-SF-ROCK does not appear to have had larger residual displacements than PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.

Specimen PreT-SF-CONC had the highest NCOD values, increasing markedly after 3.5% drift. This gradual increase was likely a caused by the column's cyclic degradation, which was accelerated relative to the other three specimens, since it did not include HyFRC or the steel shoe rocking feature.

Specimen PreT-SF-HyFRC had slightly smaller NCOD values compared with the two "ROCK" specimens tested as part of this study. These low values suggest that the HyFRC alone provides a re-centering capability similar to that of a column with the steel shoe. Furthermore, including HyFRC in the steel shoe had little to no effect in terms of re-centering.

7 Comparison with Calculated Response

This chapter compares the measured and observed behaviors with analytical estimates. The discussion includes consideration of: column stiffness (Section 7.1), column flexural strength (Section 7.2), column shear strength (Section 7.3), bar fracture (Section 7.4), column rotation and vertical displacement (Section 7.5), and strand bond strength (Section 7.6).

7.1 COLUMN STIFFNESS

Researchers calculated the columns' secant stiffness at first yield using Equation (7.1)

Initial Secant Stiffness =
$$\frac{F_{\text{eff},y}}{\Delta_y}$$
 (7.1)

In Equation (7.1), $F_{\text{eff},y}$ is the measured lateral force at first yield, and Δ_y is the corresponding displacement at first yield. Researchers defined the yield point, as prescribed by Elwood and Eberhard [2009], as the point where the longitudinal reinforcement first yielded in tension or the concrete reached a strain of 0.002, whichever occurred first. Table 7.1 shows the initial secant stiffness of the four columns in both the north and south directions. The secant stiffness of specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC in the south direction was estimated because no strain gauges functioned on the north bar at the column-footing interface (the location of highest strain). Without such measurements, researchers could not determine an exact Δ_y , so instead they used moment–curvature analysis to estimate a yield force and then found the displacement at which that force first occurred.

The columns' modulus of rigidity was then calculated as follows:

$$EI_{\text{eff,meas}} = \frac{F_{\text{eff},y} \cdot l^3}{3 \cdot \Delta_y}$$
(7.2)

where $F_{\text{eff},y}$ is the effective force at yield, l is the cantilever length, and Δ_y is the corresponding displacement at first yield. These values were then compared to the recommendations of Elwood and Eberhard [2009], repeated in Equation (7.3):

$$\frac{EI_{\text{eff,calc}}}{EI_g} = \frac{0.45 + 2.5 \cdot \frac{P}{A_g \cdot f'_c}}{1 + 110 \cdot \frac{d_b \cdot D}{D \cdot a}}$$
(7.3)

In Equation (7.3), P is the column's axial load, A_g is the column's cross-sectional area, f'_c is the concrete compressive strength, d_b is the bar diameter, a is the cantilever length, and D is the column diameter. For the purpose of this equation, the column's axial load was taken as the vertical load applied by the Baldwin plus the initial restoring force in the prestressing strands. Using the initial force in the strands is not exact because the force in the prestressing strands increases as the column displaces; however, the column displacement at yield is so small that the change in the axial load was negligible. Table 7.2 compares the measured and calculated moduli of rigidity of the four columns. The measured stiffnesses were lower than the calculated stiffnesses, varying by 2–25%.

Specimen	North Direction Stiffness (kip/in.)	South Direction Stiffness (kip/in.)	Average Stiffness (kip/in.)
PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC	188	212*	200
PreT-SF-ROCK	220	233	227
PreT-SF-HyFRC	128	116	122
PreT-SF-CONC	180	175	178

Table 7.1 Column secant stiffness at first yield.

* Values with an asterisk used moment-curvature analysis to estimate the displacement at first yield, since strain measurements were not available.

Specimen	<i>El_{eff,meas}/El_g</i> (kip-in.²)	$EI_{\rm eff, calc}/EI_g$ (kip-in. ²)	Calculated/Measured
PreT-SF-ROCK- HyFRC	0.27	0.33	1.22
PreT-SF-ROCK	0.32	0.33	1.03
PreT-SF-HyFRC	0.30	0.34	1.13
PreT-SF-CONC	0.31	0.39	1.26

 Table 7.2
 Comparison of measured and calculated El.

7.2 FLEXURAL STRENGTH OF COLUMNS

Researchers calculated the flexural strength of the columns and compared these moments to those observed during the tests. To calculate the moments, researchers used a moment–curvature program and sectional analysis. The prestressing strands' modulus of elasticity was manually reduced by a factor of three to simulate the unbonded region. Researchers used a Kent-Park model [Kent and Park 1971] for the concrete and a tri-linear steel model for the longitudinal reinforcement. The points along the steel model were defined by the reinforcement's modulus of elasticity, yield stress, strain hardening onset strain, ultimate strain and ultimate strength.

Researchers accounted for the steel shoe feature by treating the concrete as heavily confined using a model created by Galeota et al. [1992]. The model shown in Equation (7.4) required researchers to convert the thickness of the steel shoe wall to an equivalent spiral. They did so by setting $A_s/s = t_{wall} = 0.25$ in.

$$f'_{cc} = f'_c + 3.25 \left(\frac{2 \cdot f_y}{d_c} \cdot \frac{A_s}{s}\right)$$
(7.4)

In Equation (7.4), f'_{cc} is the confined concrete compressive strength, f'_c is the nominal concrete compressive strength, f_y is the steel shoe wall tensile strength, d_c is the outer diameter of steel shoe, and A_s/s is the steel shoe wall thickness. According to this model, the properties of the steel shoe increase the concrete compressive strength through confinement by a factor of 1.48.

Using a moment-curvature program and a concrete compressive strength of $1.48 \cdot f'_c$, researchers estimated the columns' flexural strength to be 3,302 kip-in. This value underestimates the measured flexural strength of both columns. The effect of the confinement may have been larger than an increase in strength of 48%, because the base plate was not included in the analysis. To evaluate the effect of accounting for the increased confinement, researchers conducted two additional analyses and compared the results. In the first analysis, it was assumed that confinement allowed the concrete to reach four times its unconfined compressive stress. In the second, it was assumed that confinement allowed the confinement allowed the concrete to reach 40 times its unconfined compressive stress. Table 7.3 presents and compares the computed values from the two analyses.

Specimen	M _{observed} (kip-in.)	Concrete Confinement	M _{calculated} (kip-in.)	M _{calculated} / M _{observed}
PreT-SE-ROCK-		1.48× <i>f′_c</i> (Equation 7.4)	3,302	0.85
HyFRC	3,885	4×f′c	3,689	0.97
		40×f′ _c	3,905	1.03
		1.48× <i>f′_c</i> (Equation 6.13)	3,302	0.89
PreT-SF-ROCK	3,731	$4 \times f'_c$	3,689	0.99
		40×f′ _c	3,905	1.05

 Table 7.3
 Calculated moment and observed moment strengths.

In both columns, the observed flexural strength lies within the narrow range of the calculated flexural strengths where the confined concrete compressive strength was taken as $4.0 \cdot f'_c$ and $40.0 \cdot f'_c$. These results suggest that a moment–curvature program using a concrete compressive strength of $4.0 \cdot f'_c$ gives a lower bound to the column's flexural strength. This is useful for future designers because it provides a means for accurately calculating the flexural strength of the rocking column.

7.3 SHEAR STRENGTH OF COLUMNS

Researchers estimated the shear strength of the columns using Equations (7.5) through (7.7), which are repeated from ACI 318-11 [ACI Committee 318 2011].

$$V_c = 2 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{N_u}{2000 \cdot A_g}\right) \cdot \sqrt{f'_c} \cdot b_w \cdot d$$
(7.5)

$$V_s = \frac{A_v \cdot f_{yt} \cdot d}{s} \tag{7.6}$$

$$V_n = V_c + V_s \tag{7.7}$$

In the above equations, V_n is the nominal shear strength, V_c is the concrete contribution, V_s is the steel contribution, N_u is the axial load, A_g is the gross cross-sectional area, f'_c is the concrete compressive strength, b_w is the column diameter, d is the depth from the extreme compression face to the centroid of the tensile steel, A_v is the cross-sectional area of the spiral reinforcement, f_{yt} is the spiral yield strength, and s is the spiral spacing. N_u was taken as the applied axial load from the Baldwin plus the force in the prestressing strands.

Table 7.4 shows the nominal shear strengths of the two columns at onset and at the point where the strands yielded. In all cases, the shear demand-capacity ratio, V_{meas} / V_n , was less than 0.35 because the load was limited by the column's flexural strength. Thus, only about one third of the calculated shear strength capacity was needed. The result is consistent with the fact that no shear damage was observed in any of the columns.

	V _c (kips)	V _s (kips)	V _n (kips)	V _{meas} (kips)	V _{meas} /V _n
PreT-SF-ROCK- HyFRC – Initial	102.0	90.4	191.4	64.7	33.8%
PreT-SF-ROCK- HyFRC – Yield	107.4	09.4	196.8	04.7	32.9%
PreT-SF-ROCK – Initial	102.4	90.4	191.8	63.3	32.4%
PreT-SF-ROCK – Yield	107.8	09.4	197.2	02.2	31.5%

 Table 7.4
 Results for shear strength calculations.

7.4 DRIFT RATIO AT BAR FRACTURE

Researchers compared the drift ratio at which bar fracture occurred in the four specimens (PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC, PreT-SF-ROCK, PreT-SF-HyFRC, and PreT-SF-CONC) with the damage progression model proposed by Berry and Eberhard [2005]. In previous tests, researchers compared column spalling and bar buckling to damage progression models; however, since neither column spalling nor bar buckling occurred in PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC or PreT-SF-

ROCK, such comparisons were not relevant. The damage model proposed by Berry and his colleagues estimates the drift value at which bar fracture occurs, as follows:

$$\frac{\Delta_{calc,bf}}{L}[\%] = 3.5 \cdot \left(1 + 150 \cdot \rho_{eff} \cdot \frac{d_b}{D}\right) \left(1 - \frac{P}{A_g \cdot f'_c}\right) \left(1 + \frac{L}{10D}\right)$$
(7.8)

where L is the cantilever length, d_b is the bar diameter, D is the column diameter, P is the axial load, A_g is the cross-sectional area, f'_c is the concrete compressive strength, and ρ_{eff} is a ratio given as $\rho_s * f_{ys} / f'_c$. In this ratio, ρ_s is the transverse reinforcement ratio and f_{ys} is the transverse reinforcement's yield stress. The model in Equation (7.8) does not include the effects of prestressing. To accommodate this, researchers added the prestressing force to the applied axial load. Two series of comparisons were done, one with the initial force in the strands and another with the yield force. Table 7.5 shows the comparison between the predicted and observed values.

Table 7.5 shows that the Berry and Eberhard model underestimates the drift values of bar fracture for both PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK. This underestimation was expected because the longitudinal reinforcement was debonded 8 in. in both specimens, and the model does not account for the effects of debonding. Compared with PreT-SF-HyFRC and PreT-SF-CONC, the two specimens in this report have delayed bar fracture—one of the goals of this design—suggesting that debonding the longitudinal reinforcement was beneficial. The difference between the drift ratios for PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC and PreT-SF-ROCK was minimal, suggesting that HyFRC and the dowel bar do not help delay bar fracture.

Specimen	PreT-	PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC		PreT-SF-ROCK			PreT-SF- HyFRC	PreT-SF- CONC
Drift Ratio at Bar Fracture (%)	Pred.	Obs.	Obs./Pred.	Pred.	Obs.	Obs./Pred.	Obs./Pred.	Obs./Pred.
Initial Force	5.24	5.96	1.14	5.26	5.94	1.13	0.77	0.77
Yield Force	5.14	5.96	1.16	5.14	5.94	1.16	0.72	0.77

 Table 7.5
 Comparison between predicted and observed drift values at bar fracture.

7.5 COLUMN ROTATION AND VERTICAL DISPLACEMENT

The researchers sought to develop a method to relate the measured strain in the No. 4 bars to the observed column rotation. The development of an accurate methodology would be beneficial to future practice because designers could then estimate the expected reinforcing strain a column would experience given an expected rotation or drift ratio. Using measured bar strains, the total bar elongation was estimated with Equation (7.9).

$$\delta = 0.5 \left(L_u + 2 * h_B - \frac{h_B - L_u}{\varepsilon_T - \varepsilon_M} * \varepsilon_T - \frac{h_B - L_u}{\varepsilon_B - \varepsilon_M} * \varepsilon_B \right) \cdot \varepsilon_M$$
(7.9)

The variables of Equation (7.9) are illustrated in Figure 7.1 and defined as:

- δ = the bar's total elongation
- L_u = the unbonded length of the bar
- h_B = the distance from the interface to the location of the strain gauges in the bonded region
- ε_T = the strain measured from the strain gauge in the bonded region above interface
- ε_B = the strain measured from the strain gauge in the bonded region below interface
- ε_M = the strain measured from the strain gauge at interface

In Equation (7.9), researchers assumed that the strain was constant in the unbonded region and linearly varying in the bonded region.

Researchers could only compute the bar deformation for specimen PreT-SF-CONC-CON-RK since none of the strain gauges at interface functioned during the PreT-SF-CONC-FIB-RK test. Figure 7.2 compares the bar deformations with the expected deformations based on the rotations derived from the measurements of the curvature rod system at 2.5 in. above the column–footing interface, the Optotrac system at 2 in. above interface, and a theoretically rigid body. Since the *y*-intercept of the slope for the rigid body was unascertainable, it was fitted to pass through the same *y*-intercept of the expected deformations slope for the Optotrac rotations. This method allowed for an easy comparison of the slopes. All four slopes were calculated for the following drifts: $\pm 0.3\%$, $\pm 0.7\%$, and $\pm 1.2\%$.

The slopes derived from the reinforcing bar strain integration are similar to the slopes derived from the curvature rod system and Optotrac rotations. The slopes calculated all three ways are slightly smaller than the slope of the theoretically rigid body. This result is consistent with the researchers' expectations, because whereas the column behaved nearly like a rigid body, some deformation nonetheless occurred at locations other than at the interface.



Figure 7.1 Definition of variables for Equation (7.9).



Figure 7.2 Comparison of vertical displacement and column rotation computed from different sensors.

As shown in Figure 7.2, the lines or vertical displacement derived from the strain integration, while having similar slopes, are translated slightly upwards compared to those derived from the rotation mechanisms. This observation is more apparent at higher drift levels $(\pm 1.2\% \text{ and } \pm 0.7\%)$ than at lower ones $(\pm 0.3\%)$. One possible explanation for this discrepancy is that the measured strain at the interface is higher due to the method of placing the instrumentation. When researchers installed the strain gauges, the bars were prepped by grinding away some material. This reduction in material inevitably created a strain concentration at the measured location that is not found at other locations in the unbonded region. Consequently, the

real strain distribution might more closely resemble that shown in Figure 7.3. Accounting for the strain concentration would lead to a smaller predicted vertical displacement and rotation. Researchers, however, have no means of retroactively determining the extent to which this strain concentration overestimates the true strain.

While the bar strains appear to overestimate the total deformation relative to the rotation mechanisms, both methods are still reasonably close. This result suggests that designers could use anticipated drift ratios to calculate the strain demand in the reinforcing bars.



Figure 7.3 Comparison of assumed and measured bar strain concentrations.

7.6 STRAND BOND STRENGTH

Based on the drift ratio at which the load cells indicated strand slip and the strain gauge readings on the strand, researchers could compare the average bond strength between the strand and concrete with the calculated bond strength from ACI Equation 12-4 [ACI Committee 318 2011]:

$$L_d = \left(\frac{f_{se}}{3} + \frac{f_{ps} - f_{se}}{1}\right) \cdot d_b \tag{7.10}$$

where L_d is the development length, f_{se} is the effective prestressing stress, f_{ps} is the maximum stress carried by the strand, and d_b is the strand diameter.

Both columns used 3/8-in.-diameter strands. Additionally, the strands had an average effective prestressing stress of 156.9 ksi and were anchored 24 in. into the top of the column. Given these values, the ACI Equation dictates that the bond should fail when the stress in the strands exceed 168.6 ksi. In order to carry the strands' full capacity, 250 ksi, the strands would need a development length of 56.25 in. (150 db). Table 7.6 lists the stress in each strand at first slip for each of the 6 strands (out of 11) that slipped.

According to these results, the slipped strands on specimen PreT-SF-ROCK reached a stress of at least 220 ksi before any load was lost. The slipped strands on specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC had much lower stresses; however, researchers believe that this occurrence was an anomaly. After all, the majority of the strands (8 of 11) either did not slip or slipped only after

experiencing stresses greater than 220 ksi. The misaligned dowel bar is one possible reason the three strands in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC did slip under much lower stresses. These strands eventually fractured, unlike the other strands, so it is likely that the dowel bar caused the strands to kink, slip prematurely, and ultimately fracture.

The majority of the strands exhibited bond strength that was significantly higher than that given in ACI 318-11 [ACI Committee 318 2011]. That behavior is attributed to the configuration. The strands were placed near the center of the column. At the bottom of the column, a significant volume of column concrete surrounded the strands. Hoop tension capacity that inhibited splitting was therefore provided by the column concrete, the column spiral, and the surrounding footing concrete. At the top, the concrete surrounding the strands was confined by a significant amount of reinforcement and by the tensioned bolts that attached the actuator to the specimen.

	Stress in Strand (ksi)						
Specimen	Southeast Strand	Southwest Strand	East Strand	West Strand	Northeast Strand	Northwest Strand	
PreT-SF- ROCK- HyFRC	N/A	160* (2.25%)	N/A	120* (2.25%)	N/A	149* (1.48%)	
PreT-SF- ROCK	N/A	250 (5.85%)	N/A	229 (6.23%)	N/A	220 (4.87%)	

 Table 7.6
 Stress in prestressing strands at first slip.

Strands that fractured are indicated with an asterisk while strands that did not slip are indicated with N/A. The number in parenthesis is the drift ratio at which first slip occurred.

8 Summary and Conclusions

8.1 SUMMARY

This report describes the development and testing of two unbonded, pretensioned bridge column–footing subassemblies with a rocking detail. The work forms part of a larger study at the University of Washington whose goal is to develop a system that contains three advantages over the current conventional bridge bent design: (1) decreased on-site construction time, (2) improved re-centering capability, and (3) reduced damage due to cyclic lateral loading.

The first goal, decreased on-site construction time, is achieved through using a wet socket connection at the column-footing connection and a dry socket connection at the column-cap beam connection. The wet socket connection was developed and tested by Haraldsson et al. [2011] for a precast concrete column that contained no prestressing. The wet socket connection allows the column to be precast in a fabrication plant and then delivered to the site. The column is then erected in the excavation, the footing steel is placed around it, and the footing concrete is cast in place. The surface of the precast column is roughened to increase the shear transfer between the column and footing. The longitudinal reinforcing bars are anchored in the column concrete using mechanical anchors, which obviate the need to bend the bars outward into the footing and facilitate transportation. Khaleghi et al. [2012] documented the use of this connection in the field. The same connection concept was used in the tests described in this report, but here the columns were pretensioned.

Davis et al. [2012] addressed the second goal (re-centering) by including prestressing strands in addition to the mild reinforcing steel. Davis' test specimens represented the top and bottom connections in a column in which the strands were bonded at the ends of the column and unbonded over the free height between the top of the footing and the underside of the cap beam. The unbonded prestressing strands were placed near the columns' centers and caused the columns to re-center after the lateral load was released. The debonded region distributed the strain in the strands so that they remained elastic up to the design drift ratio. Each strand was also coated in epoxy to reduce the susceptibility to corrosion.

Davis' specimens had low residual displacements, as intended, but spalling, bar buckling, and bar fracture occurred at lower drift levels than had been observed in comparable non-prestressed columns (e.g., Haraldsson et al. [2011]). The earlier onset of damage was attributed

to the added axial load caused by the prestressing strands and by the short length over which the strength of the small bars were developed.

Finnsson [2013] tested two columns that were designed to delay the onset of damage through the use of ductile materials: HyFRC and stainless steel reinforcing bars. The HyFRC was placed only in the plastic hinge region, because it is more expensive than conventional concrete. Both of Finnsson's specimens contained HyFRC, but only one specimen contained stainless steel reinforcement; the other specimen used conventional "black" steel. The HyFRC delayed column spalling, but the stainless steel provided little benefit. In both cases, bar buckling and bar fracture still occurred earlier than desired.

The two columns tested for this report represent a development beyond those investigated by Finnsson [2013] and Davis et al. [2012]. They contained unbonded prestressing strands identical to those used by Davis et al. [2012] and a socket connection identical to that of Haraldsson et al. [2011], but they used a different strategy to minimize damage. In both specimens, a steel shoe confined column concrete at the column–footing interface. The shoe consisted of a short length of steel pipe with an annular plate welded to it. The intent was that the column would undergo rigid body rocking on the foundation and would be protected against damage by the confining effects of the steel shoe. Above the steel shoe, the axial stress caused by the moment and vertical load would be low enough that the unconfined concrete would not spall. To further inhibit such spalling, No. 6 bars were welded to the annular base-plate of the shoe and extended upward 2.15 column diameters (43 in.). These bars did not cross the rocking interface and so did not contribute to the flexural strength of the column.

Since the steel shoe provided such a high degree of confinement, the need for HyFRC in this region was unclear. To evaluate whether HyFRC was needed, one specimen contained purely conventional concrete (PreT-SF-CON-RK), whereas the second specimen contained a mix of conventional concrete and HyFRC (PreT-SF-FIB-RK). The region that contained HyFRC in specimen PreT-SF-FIB-RK began at the column–footing interface and extended 24 in. up into the column. A dowel and cup feature at the center of the column–footing interface of specimen PreT-SF-FIB-RK was also included to inhibit possible shear sliding at the column's base. The dowel and cup system was designed so that it provided shear resistance but no bending resistance. Specimen PreT-SF-CON-RK did not have this feature.

Another feature included in both specimens described in this report was the partial debonding of the mild reinforcement. In both specimens, the mild reinforcing was bonded to the concrete except at the column–footing interface where it was unbonded 4 in. above and 4 in. below. This unbonded region increased the length over which the elongation triggered by rocking was distributed. This elongation reduced the resulting strain, and the specimens were able to reach higher drifts before bar buckling and bar fracture occurred.

Once constructed, specimens PreT-SF-ROCK-CON and PreT-SF-ROCK-HYFRC were subjected to constant axial loading paired with cyclic transverse loading. The experimental results showed that the steel confining shoe combined with the partial debonding of mild reinforcement eliminated both column spalling and bar buckling, and delayed bar fracture. The strength of the two specimens was also higher than that of the previously tested pretensioned specimens, despite containing identical amount of prestressed reinforcement and deformed bars across the column–footing interface. This higher strength was attributed to the longer lever arm made possible by the smaller compressed area, which in turn was the result of the confining shoe.

8.2 CONCLUSIONS

8.2.1 Overall Conclusions

- 1. The two specimens tested here, both containing steel shoe features but one with and one without HyFRC, achieved their main design objectives of excellent re-centering behavior accompanied by low damage. The residual drift ratios were approximately 0.5% (i.e., 0.005) even after peak drift ratios of over 10%.
- 2. In both specimens, concrete spalling and bar buckling were eliminated by the rocking detail.
- 3. Debonding the reinforcing bars locally with a plastic tube at the rocking interface delayed bar fracture. The first bar fracture occurred near a drift ratio of 6%, as compared with 4% with the column–footing subassemblies tested by Finnsson [2013] and Davis et al. [2012, 2014].

8.2.2 Detailed Conclusions

- 1. The steel shoe effectively confined the concrete at the rocking interface. The shoe helped limit the damage and represents a great improvement over other means to limit damage, such as the use of HyFRC alone.
- 2. The flexural strengths of both rocking specimens (PreT-SF-FIB-RK and PreT-SF-CON-RK) significantly exceeded the strengths of similar specimens without the steel shoe. The increase in strength was attributed to the longer lever arm that resulted from the smaller compression region, which was in turn was caused by the higher contact stresses.
- 3. Both specimens had flexural strengths within 3% of that calculated by moment– curvature analysis in which the influence of the steel shoe was accounted for by changing the concrete strength to $4f'_c$.
- 4. The performances of both PreT-SF-FIB-RK and PreT-SF-CON-RK were nearly identical in terms of strength, re-centering, and energy dissipation. This suggests that the HyFRC and dowel bar in specimen PreT-SF-FIB-RK provided negligible benefits.
- 5. The No. 6 reinforcing bars welded to the shoe experienced compressive stresses at the base of the shoe and tensile stresses at the top. The maximum tensile and compressive stresses ranged from $0.25f_y$ to $0.50f_y$. This level of stress implies that they were

effective in distributing the concentrated force at the interface into the concrete, which might otherwise have caused local crushing at the interface, and in minimizing the width of the crack that inevitably started at the top of the shoe due to the discontinuity there.

- 6. As in previous tests, the wet socket connection performed well and suffered no visible damage throughout the tests.
- 7. In both specimens, only 50% of the strands suffered from bond slip, and they slipped only after drift ratios greater than 5%. The slip was small, thanks to the back-up anchorage system that had been implemented for that purpose. The strands were larger in diameter than the model scale demanded because smaller epoxy-coated strands could not be obtained commercially. The bond demand on them was thus unduly high; the fact that some of them slipped in the tests does not imply that they would slip in a full-scale prototype.
- 8. In specimen PreT-SF-FIB-RK, the three strands that slipped also fractured. This fracture was attributed to misalignment of the dowel and cup feature, which is believed to have come into contact with the strands and kinked them when the column was at a peak drift of 7.0%. Space limitations at the center of the column meant that the strands were very close to the cup.
- 9. The transverse reinforcement (spiral) within the steel shoe region experienced strains no greater than 10% of the yield strain, suggesting that it is not necessary for confinement within that region.

8.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.3.1 Practice and Design Recommendations

- 1. The steel shoe feature provides enough confinement that the use of HyFRC is unnecessary. In addition, using HyFRC is discouraged because the material is expensive, the casting procedure is difficult, and the uneven fracture pattern at the interface might have contributed to the slightly worse re-centering in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC.
- 2. The dowel and cup detail should not be used. It provided no noticeable improvement in performance and contributed to congestion in the column. Friction proved sufficient to prevent slip.
- 3. The mild reinforcement that is continuous across the interface should have an unbonded length there no shorter than 16 db (8 in. in these tests.).
- 4. The detailing of the concrete at the top of the tube could be changed to minimize the cosmetic damage that occurred in this area of the tube. This could be achieved by a

tapered transition from a hexadecagonal shape at the top of the steel shoe to an octagonal shape a few inches above the steel shoe.

8.3.2 Recommendations for Future Research

- 1. The presence of the steel shoe rocking feature helped minimize damage to the concrete, even at 10% drift ratio. Both specimens described in this report represented column–footing connections. It is essential to develop and investigate experimentally the behavior of a comparable rocking detail for the column–cap beam connection.
- 2. Future tests should also investigate the possibility of delaying bar fracture by further increasing the unbonded length at the interface.

REFERENCES

- AASHTO (2009a). AASHTO Guide Specifications for LRFD Seismic Bridge Design. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C.
- AASHTO (2009b). *LRFD Bridge Design Specifications* 4th ed., American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, DC.
- ACI Committee 318 (2011). Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete and Commentary, ACI 318-11, American Concrete Institute, Farming Hills, MI.
- ASTM (2009). ASTM A706 / A706M 13 Standard Specification for Low-Alloy Steel Deformed and Plain Bars for Concrete Reinforcement, American Society for Testing and Materials.
- Bekaert (2010). Dramix®, Data Sheet ZP 305. http://ncg-bg.com/assets/files/products/01_materials_for_industrial_floors/1_fibri_za_beton/Dramix ZP 305_en.pdf> Retrieved, 15 July 2012. Bekeart, Kortrijk, Belgium.
- Berry M.P., Eberhard, M.O. (2005). Practical performance model for bar buckling, ASCE, J. Struct. Eng., ASCE, 131(7): 1060–1070.
- Berry M.P., Parrish M., Eberhard, M.O. (2004). *PEER Structural Performance Database: User's Manual (Version 1.0)*, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Brown W. (2008). *Bar Buckling in Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns*, Master's Thesis, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- Building Seismic Safety Council (2004). NEHRP Recommended Provisions for Seismic Regulations for New Buildings and Other Structures, FEMA 450-1 / 2003, National Institute of Building Sciences, Washington, D.C.
- Caltrans (2006). Seismic Design Criteria Version 1.4, Sacramento, CA.
- Cohagen L.S., Pang J.B.K., Eberhard M.O., Stanton, J.F. (2008). A precast concrete bridge bent designed to recenter after an earthquake, *Washington State Department of Transportations*. *Report No. WA-RD 684.3*, Washington State Department of Transportation, Olympia, WA.
- Davis P.M., Janes T.M., Eberhard M.O, Stanton, J.F. (2012). Unbonded pre-tensioned columns for bridges in seismic regions, *PEER Report No. 2012/04*, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Davis P.M., Janes T.M., Eberhard M.O., Stanton J.F., Haraldsson, O.S. (2014). Unbonded pre-tensioned columns for accelerated bridge construction in seismic regions, ASCE, *J. Bridge Eng.*, submitted for publication.
- Elwood K., Eberhard M.O. (2009). Effective stiffness of reinforced concrete columns, American Concrete Institute, *ACI Struct. Journal*, 106(4): 476–484.
- Fam A., Qie F.S., Rizkalla S. (2004). Concrete-filled steel tubes subjected to axial compression and lateral cyclic loads, ASCE, J. Struct. Eng., 130(4): 631–640.
- Finnsson G. (2013). Unbonded pre-tensioned bridge columns with hybrid fiber-reinforced concrete shells, Master's Thesis, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- Galeota D., Giammatteo M.M, Marino R. (1992). Strength and ductility of confined high strength concrete, *Proceedings, Tenth World Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, Madrid, Spain, pp. 2609–2613.
- Haraldsson O., Janes T.M., Eberhard M.O., Stanton, J.F. (2011). Laboratory tests of column-to-footing socket connections, Highways for LIFE Technology Partnership Program. Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C.
- Hieber D., Wacker J., Eberhard M.O., Stanton, J.F. (2005). Precast concrete pier systems for rapid construction of bridges in seismic regions, *Washington State Department of Transportation Report No. WA-RD-511.1*, Washington State Department of Transportation, Olympia, WA.

- Jimenez, J. (2012). Bond Capacity of Steel Epoxy-Coated and Uncoated Pre-Stressing Strands, Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2012 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection, PEER Report No. 2012/07, Eds. Tremayne, H., and Mahin, S. Pacific Earthquake Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Kent, D.C., Park, R. (1971). Flexural Members with Confined Concrete, J. Struc. Div., ASCE 97(ST7): 1964–90.
- Khaleghi B., Schultz E., Seguirant S., Marsh L., Haraldsson O., Eberhard M.O., Stanton, J.F. (2012). Accelerated bridge construction in Washington State: From research to practice, Precast/Prestressed Concrete Institute, *PCI Journal*, 57: 34–49.
- Kuraray (2012). *Product Data Sheet*. http://www.kuraray-am.com/pvaf/fibers.php Retrieved 16 July 2012. Kuraray, Tokyo, Japan.
- Osanai Y., Watanabe F., Okamoto S. (1996). Stress transfer mechanism of socket base connections with precast concrete columns, American Concrete Institute, *ACI Struct. Journal*, 93(3): 1–11.
- Ostertag, C.P., Jen, G., Trono, W. (2014). Self-Compacting Hybrid Fiber Reinforced Concrete Composites for Bridge Columns, Cem. Concr. Compos. Submitted.
- Pang, J.B.K., Steuck, K.P., Cohagen, L.S., Eberhard, M.O., Stanton, J.F. (2008). Rapidly Constructible Large-Bar Precast Bridge-Bent Connection, *Washington State Department of Transportation Draft Report, WA-RD 684.2*, Olympia, WA, October, 184 pp.
- Pang, J.B.K., Eberhard M.O., Stanton J.F. (2010). Large-bar connection for precast bride bents in seismic regions, ASCE, J. Bridge Eng., 15(3): 231–239.
- Roeder C., Lehman D., Bishop E. (2010). Strength and stiffness of circular concrete-filled tubes, ASCE, J. Struct. Eng., 136(12): 1545–1553.
- Stanton, J., Stone, W.C., Cheok, G.S. (1997). Hybrid reinforced precast frame for seismic regions, *PCI Journal*, 42(2):20–32.
- WSDOT (2008). Bridge Design Manual (BDM), Publication No. M23-50, Washington State Department of Transportation, Bridge and Structures Office, Olympia, WA.
- Zhong, T. (2013). Personal Communication.

Appendix A: Materials

This appendix includes detailed information about the structural materials used in this study: concrete (including conventional concrete and HyFRC) and longitudinal reinforcing steel.

A.1 CONCRETE

Two concretes were used in the test specimens: conventional concrete and HyFRC. Specimen PreT-SF-ROCK contained only conventional concrete whereas specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC contained both conventional concrete and HyFRC. HyFRC is referred to as a hybrid concrete because it contains two types of fibers: steel, which increases the concrete's tensile strength, and polymer, which increases the concrete's ductility by minimizing crack opening. The steel fibers used in the mix were Dramix ZP 305, which have a length of 1.18 in., diameter of 0.02 in., tensile strength of 195 ksi, and Young's modulus of 30,500 ksi [Bekaert 2010]. A hook at each end improves the steel fibers' interlock with the rest of the concrete. The polymer fibers used in the mix were Kuralon RECS 15×8mm, which have a length of 0.31 in., tensile strength of 190 ksi, and Young's modulus of 5,800 ksi [Kuraray 2012]. The HyFRC was mixed at the University of Washington's structures lab in four equal batches. The mix proportions per batch are given in Table A.1. CalPortland, a local Seattle ready mix company, provided the conventional concrete.

The same mix design, outlined in Table A.2, was used for both the columns and footings, although batched on separate days; Finnsson used the same mix design for his specimens [Finnsson 2013]. The conventional concrete had two design goals: workability and early strength gain. The workability requirement stemmed from the horizontal casting of the column; gravity alone could not ensure that every space was filled.

The steel shoe feature compounded this problem because it limited visibility to verify whether the concrete did in fact fill every void within the shoe. It was important, however, to ensure that concrete did fill the steel shoe in its entirety for it to function properly. To achieve consolidation, the concrete had a 9-in. slump on arrival and a small hole was also drilled at the top of the shoe. When concrete paste flowed out of this hole during casting, researchers felt confident that the concrete completely filled the shoe. The early strength criterion was derived from the prestressing operation and schedule. To obtain the proper bond, the concrete needed to acquire a compressive strength of 5,000 psi before releasing the prestressed tendons without risking any slip. Due to the strict schedule, researchers wanted to release the strands as quickly as this requirement would allow. At the time of release, the concrete compressive strength exceeded 7,000 psi, well above the 5,000 psi criterion. The following subsection describes the strength gains of all concretes in more detail.

Material	Design Quantity
Fine Aggregate	104.3 lb
Pea Gravel	41.0 lb
Cement Type I/II	38.6 lb
Fly Ash	12.7 lb
ZP305 Steel Fiber	9.9 lb
RECS15	114.5 g
Water	16.9 lb
Viscosity-Modifying Admixture	0.4 oz
Superplasticizer	92.1 mL

Table A.1Design mix for one batch of HyFRC used in specimen PreT-SF-ROCK-
HyFRC.

Table A.2Design mix for one cubic yard of concrete used for both column and
footings.

Material	Design Quantity
Fine Aggregate	1240 lb
Pea Gravel	1940 lb
Cement Type I/II	752 lb
Water	240 lb
RECS15	30.0 oz
Water	30.0 oz

A.1.1 Concrete Strength

This study contained three different concrete casts: column conventional concrete, column HyFRC, and footing conventional concrete. The strength history is provided, in tabular and graphical form, for all three of these casts in Tables A.3–A.5 and Figures A.1–A.8.

A.1.1.1 Column Conventional Concrete

Table A.3Column conventional concrete compressive strength history. Note: Day 8
is the release of prestressing strands, Day 79 is the PreT-SF-ROCK test
day, Day 90 is the PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day.

Day	Strength (psi)			
7	7,677			
8	7,288			
14	7,506			
28	8,388			
79	10,273			
90	9,894			



Figure A.1 Column conventional concrete compressive strength history.



 Table A.4
 Column conventional concrete E-MOD history.

Strength (ksi)

Day

Figure A.2 E-MOD history for the column conventional concrete.

 Table A.5
 Column conventional concrete tensile strength.

Day	Strength (psi)	Strength/ f_c	
90	673	6.8%	
A.1.1.2 Column HyFRC

Table A.6HyFRC compressive strength history. Note: Day 10 is the release of
prestressing strands, Day 92 is PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day.

Day	Strength (psi)
7	6,400
10	7,150
14	7,915
28	8,685
92	10,203



Figure A.3 HyFF

HyFRC compressive strength history.

Strength (ksi) Day 3,535 4,491 4,496 \mathbf{O} Strength [ksi] 5000 5000 5000 0 L 0 Days from concrete casting

Table A.7HyFRC E-MOD history.

Figure A.4 E-MOD history for the HyFRC.

Table A.8HyFRC tensile strength.

Day	Strength [psi]	Strength/f ['] c
92	1,452	14.2%

A.1.1.3 Footing Conventional Concrete

Table A.9Footing conventional concrete compressive strength history. Note: Day
35 is PreT-SF-ROCK test day, Day 46 is PreT-SF-ROCK-HyFRC test day.

Day	Strength (psi)
7	6,225
14	6,822
28	8,890
35	9,022
46	9,326



Figure A.5 Footing conventional concrete compressive strength history.

Day	Strength [psi]	Strength/f [°] c
92	1,452	14.2%

Table A.8Footing conventional concrete tensile strength.

A.2 STEEL

In both columns, all the longitudinal, mild reinforcement bars satisfied ASTM A706 Gr. 60 [ASTM 2009]. The footing, however, did contain some A615 steel, an unavoidable circumstance, because No. 3 bars were needed but unavailable in A706. Although A615 is less ductile that A706, its use was deemed acceptable since the No. 3 bars were expected to remain elastic. Furthermore, the No. 3 bars were located at the top of the footing where they would experience minimal compression and could share the load with the surrounding concrete. The prestressing strand in this study was the same used in Finnsson [2013] and Davis et al. [2012]. The strand was 3/8-in. diameter and coated in epoxy to improve its resistance to corrosion. Jimenez [2012] showed that the low-slip bond strength of epoxy-coated strands is nearly identical to that of black (i.e., uncoated) strands.

Spiral made from No. 3 gauge smooth steel wire provided the columns' transverse reinforcement. The spiral had a cross-sectional area of 0.041 in.², a pitch of 1.25 in., and an outer diameter of 18-5/16 in. The cover in the test specimens was 13/16 in., corresponding to a typical 2-in. cover at full scale. Due to the steel shoe, the spiral was discontinuous at the column–footing interface. The spiral terminations on either side of this location adhered to ACI requirements, [ACI 2008] consisting of three closely spaced turns followed by a bend that extended into the columns' core. The same method was used for the spiral terminations at the top and bottom of the columns. Spiral reinforcement also confined the prestressing strands at the top of the column where they were bonded. The spiral used in this reinforcement had the same specifications as that used for the longitudinal reinforcement except that its spun diameter was 8 in.

A36 steel was used for all components of the steel shoe and dowel cup, whereas higher strength steel, Gr. 80, was used for the dowel bar to minimize its required size.

A.2.1 Reinforcing Steel

The stress–strain relations plots for the steel reinforcement used in both specimens are shown in Figures A.6–A.8.







Figure A.7 Stress–strain relations for #6 reinforcement.



Figure A.8 Stress–strain relations for 3-gauge spiral reinforcement.

Appendix B: Specimen Drawings

This appendix contains detailed drawing and a steel schedule for the two test specimens.





Column elevation.



Figure B.2 Column cross-sectional views.



Figure B.2 (Continued)

						Dimensions		
Quantity	Bar Size	Shape	A	В	С	Special Notes		
14	#6	Straight	43"	-	-			Longitudinal Short Bars
14	#5	Straight	73.5"	-	-			Footing Bars
18	#5	Straight	65.5"	-	-			Footing Bars
8	#4	Straight	931/4"	-	-	Lenton Terminator Heads on One side		Longitudinal Long Bars
2	#4	Straight	931/4"	-	-			
4	#4	Straight	721/2"	-	-	Lenton Terminator Heads on One side		Longitudinal Long Bars
4	#4	Straight	55"	-	-			Footing Bars
8	#4	Straight	37"	-	-			Longitudinal Bars (Top of Column)
14	#3	Straight	73.5"	-	-			Footing Bars
18	#3	Straight	65.5"	-	-			Footing Bars
4	#3	Straight	55"	-	-			Footing Bars
8	#3	Rectangle	-	8 5/8"	11"	135° hook stimups		Actuator Blockout Stirrups
8	#3	Rectangle	-	163/4"	9"	135° hook stimups		Actuator Blockout Stirrups

Shapes:

	с		
В			

Rectangle *Dimensions are Outside Diameter

Straight

Quantity	Shape	Length	
1	HSS20.000x0.500	8.00"	A36
1	HSS3.500x0.250	3.00"	A36
1	Bar A	11.00"	80 ksi yield
1	Annular Plate A	-	A36
1	Annular Plate B	-	A36
1	Annular Plate C	-	A36



Steel schedule for both specimens.







Figure B.5 Footing dimensions, transverse view.



Figure B.6 Footing top mat.



Figure B.7 Footing bottom mat.

PEER REPORTS

PEER reports are available as a free PDF download from http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports_complete.html. Printed hard copies of PEER reports can be ordered directly from our printer by following the instructions at http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports_complete.html. For other related questions about the PEER Report Series, contact the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, 325 Davis Hall mail code 1792, Berkeley, CA 94720. Tel.: (510) 642-3437; Fax: (510) 665-1655; Email: peer_editor@berkeley.edu

- PEER 2014/08 Unbonded Pretensioned Bridge Columns with Rocking Detail. Jeffrey A. Schaefer, Bryan Kennedy, Marc O. Eberhard, John F. Stanton. June 2014.
- PEER 2014/07 Northridge 20 Symposium Summary Report: Impacts, Outcomes, and Next Steps. May 2014.
- **PEER 2014/06** Report of the Tenth Planning Meeting of NEES/E-Defense Collaborative Research on Earthquake Engineering. December 2013.
- PEER 2014/05 Seismic Velocity Site Characterization of Thirty-One Chilean Seismometer Stations by Spectral Analysis of Surface Wave Dispersion. Robert Kayen, Brad D. Carkin, Skye Corbet, Camilo Pinilla, Allan Ng, Edward Gorbis, and Christine Truong. April 2014.
- PEER 2014/04 Effect of Vertical Acceleration on Shear Strength of Reinforced Concrete Columns. Hyerin Lee and Khalid M. Mosalam. April 2014.
- PEER 2014/03 Retest of Thirty-Year-Old Neoprene Isolation Bearings. James M. Kelly and Niel C. Van Engelen. March 2014.
- **PEER 2014/02** Theoretical Development of Hybrid Simulation Applied to Plate Structures. Ahmed A. Bakhaty, Khalid M. Mosalam, and Sanjay Govindjee. January 2014.
- PEER 2014/01 Performance-Based Seismic Assessment of Skewed Bridges. Peyman Kaviani, Farzin Zareian, and Ertugrul Taciroglu. January 2014.
- PEER 2013/26 Urban Earthquake Engineering. Proceedings of the U.S.-Iran Seismic Workshop. December 2013.
- PEER 2013/25 Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2013 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection. Heidi Tremayne (Editor), Stephen A. Mahin (Editor), Jorge Archbold Monterossa, Matt Brosman, Shelly Dean, Katherine deLaveaga, Curtis Fong, Donovan Holder, Rakeeb Khan, Elizabeth Jachens, David Lam, Daniela Martinez Lopez, Mara Minner, Geffen Oren, Julia Pavicic, Melissa Quinonez, Lorena Rodriguez, Sean Salazar, Kelli Slaven, Vivian Steyert, Jenny Taing, and Salvador Tena. December 2013.
- PEER 2013/24 NGA-West2 Ground Motion Prediction Equations for Vertical Ground Motions. September 2013.
- PEER 2013/23 Coordinated Planning and Preparedness for Fire Following Major Earthquakes. Charles Scawthorn. November 2013.
- PEER 2013/22 *GEM-PEER Task 3 Project: Selection of a Global Set of Ground Motion Prediction Equations.* Jonathan P. Stewart, John Douglas, Mohammad B. Javanbarg, Carola Di Alessandro, Yousef Bozorgnia, Norman A. Abrahamson, David M. Boore, Kenneth W. Campbell, Elise Delavaud, Mustafa Erdik and Peter J. Stafford. December 2013.
- PEER 2013/21 Seismic Design and Performance of Bridges with Columns on Rocking Foundations. Grigorios Antonellis and Marios Panagiotou. September 2013.
- **PEER 2013/20** Experimental and Analytical Studies on the Seismic Behavior of Conventional and Hybrid Braced Frames. Jiun-Wei Lai and Stephen A. Mahin. September 2013.
- PEER 2013/19 Toward Resilient Communities: A Performance-Based Engineering Framework for Design and Evaluation of the Built Environment. Michael William Mieler, Bozidar Stojadinovic, Robert J. Budnitz, Stephen A. Mahin and Mary C. Comerio. September 2013.
- **PEER 2013/18** Identification of Site Parameters that Improve Predictions of Site Amplification. Ellen M. Rathje and Sara Navidi. July 2013.
- PEER 2013/17 Response Spectrum Analysis of Concrete Gravity Dams Including Dam-Water-Foundation Interaction. Arnkjell Løkke and Anil K. Chopra. July 2013.
- PEER 2013/16 Effect of hoop reinforcement spacing on the cyclic response of large reinforced concrete special moment frame beams. Marios Panagiotou, Tea Visnjic, Grigorios Antonellis, Panagiotis Galanis, and Jack P. Moehle. June 2013.

- PEER 2013/15 A Probabilistic Framework to Include the Effects of Near-Fault Directivity in Seismic Hazard Assessment. Shrey Kumar Shahi, Jack W. Baker. October 2013.
- **PEER 2013/14** Hanging-Wall Scaling using Finite-Fault Simulations. Jennifer L. Donahue and Norman A. Abrahamson. September 2013.
- **PEER 2013/13** Semi-Empirical Nonlinear Site Amplification and its Application in NEHRP Site Factors. Jonathan P. Stewart and Emel Seyhan. November 2013.
- PEER 2013/12 Nonlinear Horizontal Site Response for the NGA-West2 Project. Ronnie Kamai, Norman A. Abramson, Walter J. Silva. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/11 Epistemic Uncertainty for NGA-West2 Models. Linda Al Atik and Robert R. Youngs. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/10 NGA-West 2 Models for Ground-Motion Directionality. Shrey K. Shahi and Jack W. Baker. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/09 Final Report of the NGA-West2 Directivity Working Group. Paul Spudich, Jeffrey R. Bayless, Jack W. Baker, Brian S.J. Chiou, Badie Rowshandel, Shrey Shahi, and Paul Somerville. May 2013.
- **PEER 2013/08** NGA-West2 Model for Estimating Average Horizontal Values of Pseudo-Absolute Spectral Accelerations Generated by Crustal Earthquakes. I. M. Idriss. May 2013.
- **PEER 2013/07** Update of the Chiou and Youngs NGA Ground Motion Model for Average Horizontal Component of Peak Ground Motion and Response Spectra. Brian Chiou and Robert Youngs. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/06 NGA-West2 Campbell-Bozorgnia Ground Motion Model for the Horizontal Components of PGA, PGV, and 5%-Damped Elastic Pseudo-Acceleration Response Spectra for Periods Ranging from 0.01 to 10 sec. Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/05 NGA-West 2 Equations for Predicting Response Spectral Accelerations for Shallow Crustal Earthquakes. David M. Boore, Jonathan P. Stewart, Emel Seyhan, Gail M. Atkinson. May 2013.
- **PEER 2013/04** Update of the AS08 Ground-Motion Prediction Equations Based on the NGA-West2 Data Set. Norman Abrahamson, Walter Silva, and Ronnie Kamai. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/03 PEER NGA-West2 Database. Timothy D. Ancheta, Robert B. Darragh, Jonathan P. Stewart, Emel Seyhan, Walter J. Silva, Brian S.J. Chiou, Katie E. Wooddell, Robert W. Graves, Albert R. Kottke, David M. Boore, Tadahiro Kishida, and Jennifer L. Donahue. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/02 Hybrid Simulation of the Seismic Response of Squat Reinforced Concrete Shear Walls. Catherine A. Whyte and Bozidar Stojadinovic. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/01 Housing Recovery in Chile: A Qualitative Mid-program Review. Mary C. Comerio. February 2013.
- PEER 2012/08 Guidelines for Estimation of Shear Wave Velocity. Bernard R. Wair, Jason T. DeJong, and Thomas Shantz. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/07 Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2012 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection. Heidi Tremayne (Editor), Stephen A. Mahin (Editor), Collin Anderson, Dustin Cook, Michael Erceg, Carlos Esparza, Jose Jimenez, Dorian Krausz, Andrew Lo, Stephanie Lopez, Nicole McCurdy, Paul Shipman, Alexander Strum, Eduardo Vega. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/06 Fragilities for Precarious Rocks at Yucca Mountain. Matthew D. Purvance, Rasool Anooshehpoor, and James N. Brune. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/05 Development of Simplified Analysis Procedure for Piles in Laterally Spreading Layered Soils. Christopher R. McGann, Pedro Arduino, and Peter Mackenzie–Helnwein. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/04 Unbonded Pre-Tensioned Columns for Bridges in Seismic Regions. Phillip M. Davis, Todd M. Janes, Marc O. Eberhard, and John F. Stanton. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/03 Experimental and Analytical Studies on Reinforced Concrete Buildings with Seismically Vulnerable Beam-Column Joints. Sangjoon Park and Khalid M. Mosalam. October 2012.
- PEER 2012/02 Seismic Performance of Reinforced Concrete Bridges Allowed to Uplift during Multi-Directional Excitation. Andres Oscar Espinoza and Stephen A. Mahin. July 2012.
- **PEER 2012/01** Spectral Damping Scaling Factors for Shallow Crustal Earthquakes in Active Tectonic Regions. Sanaz Rezaeian, Yousef Bozorgnia, I. M. Idriss, Kenneth Campbell, Norman Abrahamson, and Walter Silva. July 2012.
- **PEER 2011/10** Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2011 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection. Eds. Heidi Faison and Stephen A. Mahin. December 2011.
- PEER 2011/09 Calibration of Semi-Stochastic Procedure for Simulating High-Frequency Ground Motions. Jonathan P. Stewart, Emel Seyhan, and Robert W. Graves. December 2011.

- PEER 2011/08 Water Supply in regard to Fire Following Earthquake. Charles Scawthorn. November 2011.
- PEER 2011/07 Seismic Risk Management in Urban Areas. Proceedings of a U.S.-Iran-Turkey Seismic Workshop. September 2011.
- PEER 2011/06 The Use of Base Isolation Systems to Achieve Complex Seismic Performance Objectives. Troy A. Morgan and Stephen A. Mahin. July 2011.
- PEER 2011/05 Case Studies of the Seismic Performance of Tall Buildings Designed by Alternative Means. Task 12 Report for the Tall Buildings Initiative. Jack Moehle, Yousef Bozorgnia, Nirmal Jayaram, Pierson Jones, Mohsen Rahnama, Nilesh Shome, Zeynep Tuna, John Wallace, Tony Yang, and Farzin Zareian. July 2011.
- PEER 2011/04 Recommended Design Practice for Pile Foundations in Laterally Spreading Ground. Scott A. Ashford, Ross W. Boulanger, and Scott J. Brandenberg. June 2011.
- PEER 2011/03 New Ground Motion Selection Procedures and Selected Motions for the PEER Transportation Research Program. Jack W. Baker, Ting Lin, Shrey K. Shahi, and Nirmal Jayaram. March 2011.
- **PEER 2011/02** A Bayesian Network Methodology for Infrastructure Seismic Risk Assessment and Decision Support. Michelle T. Bensi, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Daniel Straub. March 2011.
- PEER 2011/01 Demand Fragility Surfaces for Bridges in Liquefied and Laterally Spreading Ground. Scott J. Brandenberg, Jian Zhang, Pirooz Kashighandi, Yili Huo, and Minxing Zhao. March 2011.
- **PEER 2010/05** Guidelines for Performance-Based Seismic Design of Tall Buildings. Developed by the Tall Buildings Initiative. November 2010.
- **PEER 2010/04** Application Guide for the Design of Flexible and Rigid Bus Connections between Substation Equipment Subjected to Earthquakes. Jean-Bernard Dastous and Armen Der Kiureghian. September 2010.
- **PEER 2010/03** Shear Wave Velocity as a Statistical Function of Standard Penetration Test Resistance and Vertical Effective Stress at Caltrans Bridge Sites. Scott J. Brandenberg, Naresh Bellana, and Thomas Shantz. June 2010.
- **PEER 2010/02** Stochastic Modeling and Simulation of Ground Motions for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Sanaz Rezaeian and Armen Der Kiureghian. June 2010.
- PEER 2010/01 Structural Response and Cost Characterization of Bridge Construction Using Seismic Performance Enhancement Strategies. Ady Aviram, Božidar Stojadinović, Gustavo J. Parra-Montesinos, and Kevin R. Mackie. March 2010.
- **PEER 2009/03** The Integration of Experimental and Simulation Data in the Study of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Systems Including Soil-Foundation-Structure Interaction. Matthew Dryden and Gregory L. Fenves. November 2009.
- **PEER 2009/02** Improving Earthquake Mitigation through Innovations and Applications in Seismic Science, Engineering, Communication, and Response. Proceedings of a U.S.-Iran Seismic Workshop. October 2009.
- PEER 2009/01 Evaluation of Ground Motion Selection and Modification Methods: Predicting Median Interstory Drift Response of Buildings. Curt B. Haselton, Ed. June 2009.
- PEER 2008/10 Technical Manual for Strata. Albert R. Kottke and Ellen M. Rathje. February 2009.
- PEER 2008/09 NGA Model for Average Horizontal Component of Peak Ground Motion and Response Spectra. Brian S.-J. Chiou and Robert R. Youngs. November 2008.
- **PEER 2008/08** Toward Earthquake-Resistant Design of Concentrically Braced Steel Structures. Patxi Uriz and Stephen A. Mahin. November 2008.
- **PEER 2008/07** Using OpenSees for Performance-Based Evaluation of Bridges on Liquefiable Soils. Stephen L. Kramer, Pedro Arduino, and HyungSuk Shin. November 2008.
- PEER 2008/06 Shaking Table Tests and Numerical Investigation of Self-Centering Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Hyung IL Jeong, Junichi Sakai, and Stephen A. Mahin. September 2008.
- PEER 2008/05 Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Design Evaluation Procedure for Bridge Foundations Undergoing Liquefaction-Induced Lateral Ground Displacement. Christian A. Ledezma and Jonathan D. Bray. August 2008.
- PEER 2008/04 Benchmarking of Nonlinear Geotechnical Ground Response Analysis Procedures. Jonathan P. Stewart, Annie On-Lei Kwok, Yousseff M. A. Hashash, Neven Matasovic, Robert Pyke, Zhiliang Wang, and Zhaohui Yang. August 2008.
- **PEER 2008/03** Guidelines for Nonlinear Analysis of Bridge Structures in California. Ady Aviram, Kevin R. Mackie, and Božidar Stojadinović. August 2008.
- **PEER 2008/02** Treatment of Uncertainties in Seismic-Risk Analysis of Transportation Systems. Evangelos Stergiou and Anne S. Kiremidjian. July 2008.
- PEER 2008/01 Seismic Performance Objectives for Tall Buildings. William T. Holmes, Charles Kircher, William Petak, and Nabih Youssef. August 2008.

- PEER 2007/12 An Assessment to Benchmark the Seismic Performance of a Code-Conforming Reinforced Concrete Moment-Frame Building. Curt Haselton, Christine A. Goulet, Judith Mitrani-Reiser, James L. Beck, Gregory G. Deierlein, Keith A. Porter, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Ertugrul Taciroglu. August 2008.
- **PEER 2007/11** Bar Buckling in Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Wayne A. Brown, Dawn E. Lehman, and John F. Stanton. February 2008.
- **PEER 2007/10** Computational Modeling of Progressive Collapse in Reinforced Concrete Frame Structures. Mohamed M. Talaat and Khalid M. Mosalam. May 2008.
- PEER 2007/09 Integrated Probabilistic Performance-Based Evaluation of Benchmark Reinforced Concrete Bridges. Kevin R. Mackie, John-Michael Wong, and Božidar Stojadinović. January 2008.
- PEER 2007/08 Assessing Seismic Collapse Safety of Modern Reinforced Concrete Moment-Frame Buildings. Curt B. Haselton and Gregory G. Deierlein. February 2008.
- PEER 2007/07 Performance Modeling Strategies for Modern Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Michael P. Berry and Marc O. Eberhard. April 2008.
- **PEER 2007/06** Development of Improved Procedures for Seismic Design of Buried and Partially Buried Structures. Linda Al Atik and Nicholas Sitar. June 2007.
- **PEER 2007/05** Uncertainty and Correlation in Seismic Risk Assessment of Transportation Systems. Renee G. Lee and Anne S. Kiremidjian. July 2007.
- PEER 2007/04 Numerical Models for Analysis and Performance-Based Design of Shallow Foundations Subjected to Seismic Loading. Sivapalan Gajan, Tara C. Hutchinson, Bruce L. Kutter, Prishati Raychowdhury, José A. Ugalde, and Jonathan P. Stewart. May 2008.
- PEER 2007/03 Beam-Column Element Model Calibrated for Predicting Flexural Response Leading to Global Collapse of RC Frame Buildings. Curt B. Haselton, Abbie B. Liel, Sarah Taylor Lange, and Gregory G. Deierlein. May 2008.
- **PEER 2007/02** Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA Ground Motion Relations for the Geometric Mean Horizontal Component of Peak and Spectral Ground Motion Parameters. Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. May 2007.
- PEER 2007/01 Boore-Atkinson NGA Ground Motion Relations for the Geometric Mean Horizontal Component of Peak and Spectral Ground Motion Parameters. David M. Boore and Gail M. Atkinson. May. May 2007.
- PEER 2006/12 Societal Implications of Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Peter J. May. May 2007.
- PEER 2006/11 Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis Using Advanced Ground Motion Intensity Measures, Attenuation Relationships, and Near-Fault Effects. Polsak Tothong and C. Allin Cornell. March 2007.
- PEER 2006/10 Application of the PEER PBEE Methodology to the I-880 Viaduct. Sashi Kunnath. February 2007.
- **PEER 2006/09** *Quantifying Economic Losses from Travel Forgone Following a Large Metropolitan Earthquake.* James Moore, Sungbin Cho, Yue Yue Fan, and Stuart Werner. November 2006.
- PEER 2006/08 Vector-Valued Ground Motion Intensity Measures for Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis. Jack W. Baker and C. Allin Cornell. October 2006.
- PEER 2006/07 Analytical Modeling of Reinforced Concrete Walls for Predicting Flexural and Coupled–Shear-Flexural Responses. Kutay Orakcal, Leonardo M. Massone, and John W. Wallace. October 2006.
- PEER 2006/06 Nonlinear Analysis of a Soil-Drilled Pier System under Static and Dynamic Axial Loading. Gang Wang and Nicholas Sitar. November 2006.
- PEER 2006/05 Advanced Seismic Assessment Guidelines. Paolo Bazzurro, C. Allin Cornell, Charles Menun, Maziar Motahari, and Nicolas Luco. September 2006.
- PEER 2006/04 Probabilistic Seismic Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Structural Components and Systems. Tae Hyung Lee and Khalid M. Mosalam. August 2006.
- PEER 2006/03 Performance of Lifelines Subjected to Lateral Spreading. Scott A. Ashford and Teerawut Juirnarongrit. July 2006.
- PEER 2006/02 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Highway Demonstration Project. Anne Kiremidjian, James Moore, Yue Yue Fan, Nesrin Basoz, Ozgur Yazali, and Meredith Williams. April 2006.
- PEER 2006/01 Bracing Berkeley. A Guide to Seismic Safety on the UC Berkeley Campus. Mary C. Comerio, Stephen Tobriner, and Ariane Fehrenkamp. January 2006.
- PEER 2005/16 Seismic Response and Reliability of Electrical Substation Equipment and Systems. Junho Song, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Jerome L. Sackman. April 2006.
- **PEER 2005/15** CPT-Based Probabilistic Assessment of Seismic Soil Liquefaction Initiation. R. E. S. Moss, R. B. Seed, R. E. Kayen, J. P. Stewart, and A. Der Kiureghian. April 2006.

Geoffrey Martin, Tara Hutchinson, Chad Harden, Sivapalan Gajan, and Justin Phalen. March 2006. PEER 2005/13 Stochastic Characterization and Decision Bases under Time-Dependent Aftershock Risk in Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Gee Liek Yeo and C. Allin Cornell. July 2005. PEER 2005/12 PEER Testbed Study on a Laboratory Building: Exercising Seismic Performance Assessment. Mary C. Comerio, editor. November 2005. Van Nuys Hotel Building Testbed Report: Exercising Seismic Performance Assessment. Helmut Krawinkler, PEER 2005/11 editor. October 2005. PEER 2005/10 First NEES/E-Defense Workshop on Collapse Simulation of Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. September 2005 PEER 2005/09 Test Applications of Advanced Seismic Assessment Guidelines. Joe Maffei, Karl Telleen, Danya Mohr, William Holmes, and Yuki Nakayama. August 2006. PEER 2005/08 Damage Accumulation in Lightly Confined Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. R. Tyler Ranf, Jared M. Nelson, Zach Price, Marc O. Eberhard, and John F. Stanton. April 2006. Experimental and Analytical Studies on the Seismic Response of Freestanding and Anchored Laboratory PEER 2005/07 Equipment. Dimitrios Konstantinidis and Nicos Makris. January 2005. PEER 2005/06 Global Collapse of Frame Structures under Seismic Excitations. Luis F. Ibarra and Helmut Krawinkler. September 2005. PEER 2005//05 Performance Characterization of Bench- and Shelf-Mounted Equipment. Samit Ray Chaudhuri and Tara C. Hutchinson. May 2006. PEER 2005/04 Numerical Modeling of the Nonlinear Cyclic Response of Shallow Foundations. Chad Harden, Tara Hutchinson, Geoffrey R. Martin, and Bruce L. Kutter. August 2005. PEER 2005/03 A Taxonomy of Building Components for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Keith A. Porter. September 2005. Fragility Basis for California Highway Overpass Bridge Seismic Decision Making. Kevin R. Mackie and Božidar PEER 2005/02 Stojadinović. June 2005. PEER 2005/01 Empirical Characterization of Site Conditions on Strong Ground Motion. Jonathan P. Stewart, Yoojoong Choi, and Robert W. Graves. June 2005. PEER 2004/09 Electrical Substation Equipment Interaction: Experimental Rigid Conductor Studies. Christopher Stearns and André Filiatrault. February 2005. PEER 2004/08 Seismic Qualification and Fragility Testing of Line Break 550-kV Disconnect Switches. Shakhzod M. Takhirov, Gregory L. Fenves, and Eric Fujisaki. January 2005. PEER 2004/07 Ground Motions for Earthquake Simulator Qualification of Electrical Substation Equipment. Shakhzod M. Takhirov, Gregory L. Fenves, Eric Fujisaki, and Don Clyde. January 2005. PEER 2004/06 Performance-Based Regulation and Regulatory Regimes. Peter J. May and Chris Koski. September 2004. PEER 2004/05 Performance-Based Seismic Design Concepts and Implementation: Proceedings of an International Workshop. Peter Fajfar and Helmut Krawinkler, editors. September 2004. PEER 2004/04 Seismic Performance of an Instrumented Tilt-up Wall Building. James C. Anderson and Vitelmo V. Bertero. July 2004. PEER 2004/03 Evaluation and Application of Concrete Tilt-up Assessment Methodologies. Timothy Graf and James O. Malley. October 2004. PEER 2004/02 Analytical Investigations of New Methods for Reducing Residual Displacements of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Junichi Sakai and Stephen A. Mahin. August 2004. PEER 2004/01 Seismic Performance of Masonry Buildings and Design Implications. Kerri Anne Taeko Tokoro, James C. Anderson, and Vitelmo V. Bertero. February 2004. PEER 2003/18 Performance Models for Flexural Damage in Reinforced Concrete Columns. Michael Berry and Marc Eberhard. August 2003. PEER 2003/17 Predicting Earthquake Damage in Older Reinforced Concrete Beam-Column Joints. Catherine Pagni and Laura Lowes. October 2004.

Workshop on Modeling of Nonlinear Cyclic Load-Deformation Behavior of Shallow Foundations. Bruce L. Kutter,

PEER 2005/14

PEER 2003/16 Seismic Demands for Performance-Based Design of Bridges. Kevin Mackie and Božidar Stojadinović. August 2003.

- PEER 2003/15 Seismic Demands for Nondeteriorating Frame Structures and Their Dependence on Ground Motions. Ricardo Antonio Medina and Helmut Krawinkler. May 2004.
- PEER 2003/14 Finite Element Reliability and Sensitivity Methods for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Terje Haukaas and Armen Der Kiureghian. April 2004.
- PEER 2003/13 Effects of Connection Hysteretic Degradation on the Seismic Behavior of Steel Moment-Resisting Frames. Janise E. Rodgers and Stephen A. Mahin. March 2004.
- **PEER 2003/12** Implementation Manual for the Seismic Protection of Laboratory Contents: Format and Case Studies. William T. Holmes and Mary C. Comerio. October 2003.
- PEER 2003/11 Fifth U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. February 2004.
- **PEER 2003/10** A Beam-Column Joint Model for Simulating the Earthquake Response of Reinforced Concrete Frames. Laura N. Lowes, Nilanjan Mitra, and Arash Altoontash. February 2004.
- PEER 2003/09 Sequencing Repairs after an Earthquake: An Economic Approach. Marco Casari and Simon J. Wilkie. April 2004.
- **PEER 2003/08** A Technical Framework for Probability-Based Demand and Capacity Factor Design (DCFD) Seismic Formats. Fatemeh Jalayer and C. Allin Cornell. November 2003.
- PEER 2003/07 Uncertainty Specification and Propagation for Loss Estimation Using FOSM Methods. Jack W. Baker and C. Allin Cornell. September 2003.
- PEER 2003/06 Performance of Circular Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns under Bidirectional Earthquake Loading. Mahmoud M. Hachem, Stephen A. Mahin, and Jack P. Moehle. February 2003.
- **PEER 2003/05** Response Assessment for Building-Specific Loss Estimation. Eduardo Miranda and Shahram Taghavi. September 2003.
- PEER 2003/04 Experimental Assessment of Columns with Short Lap Splices Subjected to Cyclic Loads. Murat Melek, John W. Wallace, and Joel Conte. April 2003.
- PEER 2003/03 Probabilistic Response Assessment for Building-Specific Loss Estimation. Eduardo Miranda and Hesameddin Aslani. September 2003.
- **PEER 2003/02** Software Framework for Collaborative Development of Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis Program. Jun Peng and Kincho H. Law. September 2003.
- PEER 2003/01 Shake Table Tests and Analytical Studies on the Gravity Load Collapse of Reinforced Concrete Frames. Kenneth John Elwood and Jack P. Moehle. November 2003.
- PEER 2002/24 Performance of Beam to Column Bridge Joints Subjected to a Large Velocity Pulse. Natalie Gibson, André Filiatrault, and Scott A. Ashford. April 2002.
- PEER 2002/23 Effects of Large Velocity Pulses on Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Greg L. Orozco and Scott A. Ashford. April 2002.
- PEER 2002/22 Characterization of Large Velocity Pulses for Laboratory Testing. Kenneth E. Cox and Scott A. Ashford. April 2002.
- **PEER 2002/21** Fourth U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/20 Barriers to Adoption and Implementation of PBEE Innovations. Peter J. May. August 2002.
- PEER 2002/19 Economic-Engineered Integrated Models for Earthquakes: Socioeconomic Impacts. Peter Gordon, James E. Moore II, and Harry W. Richardson. July 2002.
- PEER 2002/18 Assessment of Reinforced Concrete Building Exterior Joints with Substandard Details. Chris P. Pantelides, Jon Hansen, Justin Nadauld, and Lawrence D. Reaveley. May 2002.
- **PEER 2002/17** Structural Characterization and Seismic Response Analysis of a Highway Overcrossing Equipped with Elastomeric Bearings and Fluid Dampers: A Case Study. Nicos Makris and Jian Zhang. November 2002.
- PEER 2002/16 Estimation of Uncertainty in Geotechnical Properties for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Allen L. Jones, Steven L. Kramer, and Pedro Arduino. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/15 Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Subjected to Various Loading Patterns. Asadollah Esmaeily-Gh. and Yan Xiao. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/14 Inelastic Seismic Response of Extended Pile Shaft Supported Bridge Structures. T.C. Hutchinson, R.W. Boulanger, Y.H. Chai, and I.M. Idriss. December 2002.

- PEER 2002/13 Probabilistic Models and Fragility Estimates for Bridge Components and Systems. Paolo Gardoni, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Khalid M. Mosalam. June 2002.
- PEER 2002/12 Effects of Fault Dip and Slip Rake on Near-Source Ground Motions: Why Chi-Chi Was a Relatively Mild M7.6 Earthquake. Brad T. Aagaard, John F. Hall, and Thomas H. Heaton. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/11 Analytical and Experimental Study of Fiber-Reinforced Strip Isolators. James M. Kelly and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2002.
- **PEER 2002/10** Centrifuge Modeling of Settlement and Lateral Spreading with Comparisons to Numerical Analyses. Sivapalan Gajan and Bruce L. Kutter. January 2003.
- PEER 2002/09 Documentation and Analysis of Field Case Histories of Seismic Compression during the 1994 Northridge, California, Earthquake. Jonathan P. Stewart, Patrick M. Smith, Daniel H. Whang, and Jonathan D. Bray. October 2002.
- **PEER 2002/08** Component Testing, Stability Analysis and Characterization of Buckling-Restrained Unbonded Braces[™]. Cameron Black, Nicos Makris, and Ian Aiken. September 2002.
- PEER 2002/07 Seismic Performance of Pile-Wharf Connections. Charles W. Roeder, Robert Graff, Jennifer Soderstrom, and Jun Han Yoo. December 2001.
- **PEER 2002/06** The Use of Benefit-Cost Analysis for Evaluation of Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Decisions. Richard O. Zerbe and Anthony Falit-Baiamonte. September 2001.
- PEER 2002/05 Guidelines, Specifications, and Seismic Performance Characterization of Nonstructural Building Components and Equipment. André Filiatrault, Constantin Christopoulos, and Christopher Stearns. September 2001.
- PEER 2002/04 Consortium of Organizations for Strong-Motion Observation Systems and the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Lifelines Program: Invited Workshop on Archiving and Web Dissemination of Geotechnical Data, 4–5 October 2001. September 2002.
- **PEER 2002/03** Investigation of Sensitivity of Building Loss Estimates to Major Uncertain Variables for the Van Nuys Testbed. Keith A. Porter, James L. Beck, and Rustem V. Shaikhutdinov. August 2002.
- **PEER 2002/02** The Third U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. July 2002.
- PEER 2002/01 Nonstructural Loss Estimation: The UC Berkeley Case Study. Mary C. Comerio and John C. Stallmeyer. December 2001.
- PEER 2001/16 Statistics of SDF-System Estimate of Roof Displacement for Pushover Analysis of Buildings. Anil K. Chopra, Rakesh K. Goel, and Chatpan Chintanapakdee. December 2001.
- PEER 2001/15 Damage to Bridges during the 2001 Nisqually Earthquake. R. Tyler Ranf, Marc O. Eberhard, and Michael P. Berry. November 2001.
- **PEER 2001/14** Rocking Response of Equipment Anchored to a Base Foundation. Nicos Makris and Cameron J. Black. September 2001.
- PEER 2001/13 Modeling Soil Liquefaction Hazards for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Steven L. Kramer and Ahmed-W. Elgamal. February 2001.
- PEER 2001/12 Development of Geotechnical Capabilities in OpenSees. Boris Jeremić. September 2001.
- PEER 2001/11 Analytical and Experimental Study of Fiber-Reinforced Elastomeric Isolators. James M. Kelly and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2001.
- PEER 2001/10 Amplification Factors for Spectral Acceleration in Active Regions. Jonathan P. Stewart, Andrew H. Liu, Yoojoong Choi, and Mehmet B. Baturay. December 2001.
- **PEER 2001/09** Ground Motion Evaluation Procedures for Performance-Based Design. Jonathan P. Stewart, Shyh-Jeng Chiou, Jonathan D. Bray, Robert W. Graves, Paul G. Somerville, and Norman A. Abrahamson. September 2001.
- **PEER 2001/08** Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Beam-Column Connections for Seismic Performance. Clay J. Naito, Jack P. Moehle, and Khalid M. Mosalam. November 2001.
- **PEER 2001/07** The Rocking Spectrum and the Shortcomings of Design Guidelines. Nicos Makris and Dimitrios Konstantinidis. August 2001.
- **PEER 2001/06** Development of an Electrical Substation Equipment Performance Database for Evaluation of Equipment Fragilities. Thalia Agnanos. April 1999.
- PEER 2001/05 Stiffness Analysis of Fiber-Reinforced Elastomeric Isolators. Hsiang-Chuan Tsai and James M. Kelly. May 2001.

PEER 2001/04	Organizational and Societal Considerations for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Peter J. May. April 2001.
PEER 2001/03	A Modal Pushover Analysis Procedure to Estimate Seismic Demands for Buildings: Theory and Preliminary Evaluation. Anil K. Chopra and Rakesh K. Goel. January 2001.
PEER 2001/02	Seismic Response Analysis of Highway Overcrossings Including Soil-Structure Interaction. Jian Zhang and Nicos Makris. March 2001.
PEER 2001/01	Experimental Study of Large Seismic Steel Beam-to-Column Connections. Egor P. Popov and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. November 2000.
PEER 2000/10	The Second U.SJapan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. March 2000.
PEER 2000/09	Structural Engineering Reconnaissance of the August 17, 1999 Earthquake: Kocaeli (Izmit), Turkey. Halil Sezen, Kenneth J. Elwood, Andrew S. Whittaker, Khalid Mosalam, John J. Wallace, and John F. Stanton. December 2000.
PEER 2000/08	Behavior of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns Having Varying Aspect Ratios and Varying Lengths of Confinement. Anthony J. Calderone, Dawn E. Lehman, and Jack P. Moehle. January 2001.
PEER 2000/07	Cover-Plate and Flange-Plate Reinforced Steel Moment-Resisting Connections. Taejin Kim, Andrew S. Whittaker, Amir S. Gilani, Vitelmo V. Bertero, and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2000.
PEER 2000/06	Seismic Evaluation and Analysis of 230-kV Disconnect Switches. Amir S. J. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, Chun-Hao Chen, Henry Ho, and Eric Fujisaki. July 2000.
PEER 2000/05	Performance-Based Evaluation of Exterior Reinforced Concrete Building Joints for Seismic Excitation. Chandra Clyde, Chris P. Pantelides, and Lawrence D. Reaveley. July 2000.
PEER 2000/04	An Evaluation of Seismic Energy Demand: An Attenuation Approach. Chung-Che Chou and Chia-Ming Uang. July 1999.
PEER 2000/03	Framing Earthquake Retrofitting Decisions: The Case of Hillside Homes in Los Angeles. Detlof von Winterfeldt, Nels Roselund, and Alicia Kitsuse. March 2000.
PEER 2000/02	U.SJapan Workshop on the Effects of Near-Field Earthquake Shaking. Andrew Whittaker, ed. July 2000.
PEER 2000/01	Further Studies on Seismic Interaction in Interconnected Electrical Substation Equipment. Armen Der Kiureghian, Kee-Jeung Hong, and Jerome L. Sackman. November 1999.
PEER 1999/14	Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of 230-kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings. Amir S. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, and Eric Fujisaki. December 1999.
PEER 1999/13	Building Vulnerability Studies: Modeling and Evaluation of Tilt-up and Steel Reinforced Concrete Buildings. John W. Wallace, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Andrew S. Whittaker, editors. December 1999.
PEER 1999/12	Rehabilitation of Nonductile RC Frame Building Using Encasement Plates and Energy-Dissipating Devices. Mehrdad Sasani, Vitelmo V. Bertero, James C. Anderson. December 1999.
PEER 1999/11	Performance Evaluation Database for Concrete Bridge Components and Systems under Simulated Seismic Loads. Yael D. Hose and Frieder Seible. November 1999.
PEER 1999/10	U.SJapan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. December 1999.
PEER 1999/09	Performance Improvement of Long Period Building Structures Subjected to Severe Pulse-Type Ground Motions. James C. Anderson, Vitelmo V. Bertero, and Raul Bertero. October 1999.
PEER 1999/08	Envelopes for Seismic Response Vectors. Charles Menun and Armen Der Kiureghian. July 1999.
PEER 1999/07	Documentation of Strengths and Weaknesses of Current Computer Analysis Methods for Seismic Performance of Reinforced Concrete Members. William F. Cofer. November 1999.
PEER 1999/06	Rocking Response and Overturning of Anchored Equipment under Seismic Excitations. Nicos Makris and Jian Zhang. November 1999.
PEER 1999/05	Seismic Evaluation of 550 kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings. Amir S. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, and Eric Fujisaki. October 1999.
PEER 1999/04	Adoption and Enforcement of Earthquake Risk-Reduction Measures. Peter J. May, Raymond J. Burby, T. Jens Feeley, and Robert Wood.
PEER 1999/03	Task 3 Characterization of Site Response General Site Categories. Adrian Rodriguez-Marek, Jonathan D. Bray, and Norman Abrahamson. February 1999.

- PEER 1999/02 Capacity-Demand-Diagram Methods for Estimating Seismic Deformation of Inelastic Structures: SDF Systems. Anil K. Chopra and Rakesh Goel. April 1999.
- PEER 1999/01 Interaction in Interconnected Electrical Substation Equipment Subjected to Earthquake Ground Motions. Armen Der Kiureghian, Jerome L. Sackman, and Kee-Jeung Hong. February 1999.
- PEER 1998/08 Behavior and Failure Analysis of a Multiple-Frame Highway Bridge in the 1994 Northridge Earthquake. Gregory L. Fenves and Michael Ellery. December 1998.
- PEER 1998/07 Empirical Evaluation of Inertial Soil-Structure Interaction Effects. Jonathan P. Stewart, Raymond B. Seed, and Gregory L. Fenves. November 1998.
- PEER 1998/06 Effect of Damping Mechanisms on the Response of Seismic Isolated Structures. Nicos Makris and Shih-Po Chang. November 1998.
- **PEER 1998/05** Rocking Response and Overturning of Equipment under Horizontal Pulse-Type Motions. Nicos Makris and Yiannis Roussos. October 1998.
- PEER 1998/04 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Invitational Workshop Proceedings, May 14–15, 1998: Defining the Links between Planning, Policy Analysis, Economics and Earthquake Engineering. Mary Comerio and Peter Gordon. September 1998.
- PEER 1998/03 Repair/Upgrade Procedures for Welded Beam to Column Connections. James C. Anderson and Xiaojing Duan. May 1998.
- PEER 1998/02 Seismic Evaluation of 196 kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings. Amir S. Gilani, Juan W. Chavez, Gregory L. Fenves, and Andrew S. Whittaker. May 1998.
- PEER 1998/01 Seismic Performance of Well-Confined Concrete Bridge Columns. Dawn E. Lehman and Jack P. Moehle. December 2000.

ONLINE PEER REPORTS

The following PEER reports are available by Internet only at http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports_complete.html.

- PEER 2012/103 Performance-Based Seismic Demand Assessment of Concentrically Braced Steel Frame Buildings. Chui-Hsin Chen and Stephen A. Mahin. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/102 Procedure to Restart an Interrupted Hybrid Simulation: Addendum to PEER Report 2010/103. Vesna Terzic and Bozidar Stojadinovic. October 2012.
- PEER 2012/101 Mechanics of Fiber Reinforced Bearings. James M. Kelly and Andrea Calabrese. February 2012.
- PEER 2011/107 Nonlinear Site Response and Seismic Compression at Vertical Array Strongly Shaken by 2007 Niigata-ken Chuetsu-oki Earthquake. Eric Yee, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Kohji Tokimatsu. December 2011.
- PEER 2011/106 Self Compacting Hybrid Fiber Reinforced Concrete Composites for Bridge Columns. Pardeep Kumar, Gabriel Jen, William Trono, Marios Panagiotou, and Claudia Ostertag. September 2011.
- PEER 2011/105 Stochastic Dynamic Analysis of Bridges Subjected to Spacially Varying Ground Motions. Katerina Konakli and Armen Der Kiureghian. August 2011.
- PEER 2011/104 Design and Instrumentation of the 2010 E-Defense Four-Story Reinforced Concrete and Post-Tensioned Concrete Buildings. Takuya Nagae, Kenichi Tahara, Taizo Matsumori, Hitoshi Shiohara, Toshimi Kabeyasawa, Susumu Kono, Minehiro Nishiyama (Japanese Research Team) and John Wallace, Wassim Ghannoum, Jack Moehle, Richard Sause, Wesley Keller, Zeynep Tuna (U.S. Research Team). June 2011.
- PEER 2011/103 In-Situ Monitoring of the Force Output of Fluid Dampers: Experimental Investigation. Dimitrios Konstantinidis, James M. Kelly, and Nicos Makris. April 2011.
- PEER 2011/102 Ground-motion prediction equations 1964 2010. John Douglas. April 2011.
- PEER 2011/101 Report of the Eighth Planning Meeting of NEES/E-Defense Collaborative Research on Earthquake Engineering. Convened by the Hyogo Earthquake Engineering Research Center (NIED), NEES Consortium, Inc. February 2011.
- PEER 2010/111 Modeling and Acceptance Criteria for Seismic Design and Analysis of Tall Buildings. Task 7 Report for the Tall Buildings Initiative Published jointly by the Applied Technology Council. October 2010.
- PEER 2010/110 Seismic Performance Assessment and Probabilistic Repair Cost Analysis of Precast Concrete Cladding Systems for Multistory Buildlings. Jeffrey P. Hunt and Božidar Stojadinovic. November 2010.
- **PEER 2010/109** Report of the Seventh Joint Planning Meeting of NEES/E-Defense Collaboration on Earthquake Engineering. Held at the E-Defense, Miki, and Shin-Kobe, Japan, September 18–19, 2009. August 2010.
- PEER 2010/108 Probabilistic Tsunami Hazard in California. Hong Kie Thio, Paul Somerville, and Jascha Polet, preparers. October 2010.
- PEER 2010/107 Performance and Reliability of Exposed Column Base Plate Connections for Steel Moment-Resisting Frames. Ady Aviram, Božidar Stojadinovic, and Armen Der Kiureghian. August 2010.
- **PEER 2010/106** Verification of Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis Computer Programs. Patricia Thomas, Ivan Wong, and Norman Abrahamson. May 2010.
- PEER 2010/105 Structural Engineering Reconnaissance of the April 6, 2009, Abruzzo, Italy, Earthquake, and Lessons Learned. M. Selim Günay and Khalid M. Mosalam. April 2010.
- **PEER 2010/104** Simulating the Inelastic Seismic Behavior of Steel Braced Frames, Including the Effects of Low-Cycle Fatigue. Yuli Huang and Stephen A. Mahin. April 2010.
- PEER 2010/103 Post-Earthquake Traffic Capacity of Modern Bridges in California. Vesna Terzic and Božidar Stojadinović. March 2010.
- **PEER 2010/102** Analysis of Cumulative Absolute Velocity (CAV) and JMA Instrumental Seismic Intensity (I_{JMA}) Using the PEER– NGA Strong Motion Database. Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. February 2010.
- PEER 2010/101 Rocking Response of Bridges on Shallow Foundations. Jose A. Ugalde, Bruce L. Kutter, and Boris Jeremic. April 2010.
- PEER 2009/109 Simulation and Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Assessment of Self-Centering Post-Tensioned Concrete Bridge Systems. Won K. Lee and Sarah L. Billington. December 2009.
- PEER 2009/108 PEER Lifelines Geotechnical Virtual Data Center. J. Carl Stepp, Daniel J. Ponti, Loren L. Turner, Jennifer N. Swift, Sean Devlin, Yang Zhu, Jean Benoit, and John Bobbitt. September 2009.
- **PEER 2009/107** Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Current and Innovative In-Span Hinge Details in Reinforced Concrete Box-Girder Bridges: Part 2: Post-Test Analysis and Design Recommendations. Matias A. Hube and Khalid M. Mosalam. December 2009.

- PEER 2009/106 Shear Strength Models of Exterior Beam-Column Joints without Transverse Reinforcement. Sangjoon Park and Khalid M. Mosalam. November 2009.
- **PEER 2009/105** Reduced Uncertainty of Ground Motion Prediction Equations through Bayesian Variance Analysis. Robb Eric S. Moss. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/104 Advanced Implementation of Hybrid Simulation. Andreas H. Schellenberg, Stephen A. Mahin, Gregory L. Fenves. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/103 Performance Evaluation of Innovative Steel Braced Frames. T. Y. Yang, Jack P. Moehle, and Božidar Stojadinovic. August 2009.
- **PEER 2009/102** Reinvestigation of Liquefaction and Nonliquefaction Case Histories from the 1976 Tangshan Earthquake. Robb Eric Moss, Robert E. Kayen, Liyuan Tong, Songyu Liu, Guojun Cai, and Jiaer Wu. August 2009.
- PEER 2009/101 Report of the First Joint Planning Meeting for the Second Phase of NEES/E-Defense Collaborative Research on Earthquake Engineering. Stephen A. Mahin et al. July 2009.
- PEER 2008/104 Experimental and Analytical Study of the Seismic Performance of Retaining Structures. Linda Al Atik and Nicholas Sitar. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/103 Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Current and Innovative In-Span Hinge Details in Reinforced Concrete Box-Girder Bridges. Part 1: Experimental Findings and Pre-Test Analysis. Matias A. Hube and Khalid M. Mosalam. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/102 Modeling of Unreinforced Masonry Infill Walls Considering In-Plane and Out-of-Plane Interaction. Stephen Kadysiewski and Khalid M. Mosalam. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/101 Seismic Performance Objectives for Tall Buildings. William T. Holmes, Charles Kircher, William Petak, and Nabih Youssef. August 2008.
- PEER 2007/101 Generalized Hybrid Simulation Framework for Structural Systems Subjected to Seismic Loading. Tarek Elkhoraibi and Khalid M. Mosalam. July 2007.
- PEER 2007/100 Seismic Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Buildings Including Effects of Masonry Infill Walls. Alidad Hashemi and Khalid M. Mosalam. July 2007.

The Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER) is a multi-institutional research and education center with headquarters at the University of California, Berkeley. Investigators from over 20 universities, several consulting companies, and researchers at various state and federal government agencies contribute to research programs focused on performance-based earthquake engineering.

These research programs aim to identify and reduce the risks from major earthquakes to life safety and to the economy by including research in a wide variety of disciplines including structural and geotechnical engineering, geology/seismology, lifelines, transportation, architecture, economics, risk management, and public policy.

PEER is supported by federal, state, local, and regional agencies, together with industry partners.



PEER Core Institutions: University of California, Berkeley (Lead Institution) California Institute of Technology Oregon State University Stanford University University of California, Davis University of California, Irvine University of California, Irvine University of California, Los Angeles University of California, San Diego University of Southern California University of Washington

PEER reports can be ordered at http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports.html or by contacting

Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center University of California, Berkeley 325 Davis Hall, mail code 1792 Berkeley, CA 94720-1792 Tel: 510-642-3437 Fax: 510-642-1655 Email: peer_editor@berkeley.edu

ISSN 1547-0587X