

# **Theoretical and Experimental Analysis of Dissipative Beam-to-Column Joints in Moment Resisting Steel Frames**

**Massimo Latour**

**DISSERTATION.COM**



Boca Raton

*Theoretical and Experimental Analysis of Dissipative  
Beam-to-Column Joints in Moment Resisting Steel Frames*

Copyright © 2011 Massimo Latour

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from the publisher.

Dissertation.com  
Boca Raton, Florida  
USA • 2011

ISBN-10: 1-61233-763-5  
ISBN-13: 978-1-61233-763-0

## RINGRAZIAMENTI

Concludere questa tesi significa per prima cosa giungere al termine di questi tre anni sicuramente belli, anche se non sempre sereni, di esperienza di dottorato. Il rammarico con cui si lascia alle spalle quanto vissuto fin qui, per continuare la propria vita lavorativa verso nuovi obiettivi, è enorme.

Il ringraziamento più grande voglio rivolgerlo alle persone con cui mi sono ritrovato ogni giorno a condividere tutto (dal laboratorio ai pranzi frugali). Un particolare ricordo va a Riccardo e Fabio, colleghi del gruppo di ricerca, con cui ho trascorso gran parte di questo periodo e senza i quali non avrei mai conseguito questo obiettivo. Mi rende felice e per questo mi fa piacere menzionare Saverio e Francesco, compagni di stanza, ma prima di tutto amici. E' doveroso ringraziare, con grande stima e riconoscenza, il Prof. Gianvittorio Rizzano e il Prof. Vincenzo Piluso, che hanno rappresentato per me un punto di riferimento, ma anche un meraviglioso esempio di come si possa essere persone prima ancora che valenti accademici.

In questo momento non posso non pensare a mia madre e mio padre che, ormai, non sopportano più di vedermi curvo su libri di cui non riescono a comprendere nemmeno il significato del titolo. Infine Manuela, presenza costante cui devo molto di quanto sono riuscito a costruire in questi ultimi tre anni e senza la quale forse non ce l'avrei fatta ad essere qui a mettere questo punto.



Knowledge without follow-through is worse than no knowledge

**(Charles Bukowski)**



# CONTENTS

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 SCOPE OF THE STUDY	1
------------------------	---

## 2. SEISMIC BEHAVIOR OF MOMENT RESISTING FRAMES

2.1 THE STRUCTURAL TYPOLOGY	5
2.1.1 MRFS SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION	10
2.1.2 THE CONNECTION TYPOLOGIES	15
2.1.3 DUCTILITY CLASS	21
2.1.4 STIFFNESS AND STRENGTH OF JOINTS	28
2.2 FRAMES AND JOINTS CLASSIFICATION	34
2.3 THE COMPONENT METHOD	42
2.4 THE ROLE OF CONNECTIONS ON THE OVERALL STRUCTURAL BEHAVIOR	53
2.5 REFERENCES	67

### **3. CYCLIC BEHAVIOR OF BEAM-TO-COLUMN JOINTS: EXPERIMENTAL CAMPAIGN**

3.1 INTRODUCTION	73
3.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE TEST SETUP	78
3.3 DESIGN OF THE SPECIMENS	93
3.3.1 DESIGN OF SPECIMEN EEP-CYC 01	93
3.3.2 DESIGN OF SPECIMEN EEP-CYC 02	107
3.3.3 DESIGN OF SPECIMEN EEP-DB-CYC 03	112
3.3.4 DESIGN OF SPECIMEN TS-CYC 04	118
3.4 DESCRIPTION OF THE EXPERIMENTAL TESTS	121
3.4.1 DESCRIPTION OF TEST EEP-CYC 01	121
3.4.2 DESCRIPTION OF TEST EEP-CYC 02	127
3.4.3 DESCRIPTION OF TEST EEP-DB-CYC 03	136
3.4.4 DESCRIPTION OF TEST TS-CYC 04	141
3.4.5 GEOMETRICAL AND MECHANICAL PROPERTIES OF THE SPECIMENS	148
3.4.6 COMPARISON AMONG THE TESTS	153
3.6 REFERENCES	157

### **4. CYCLIC BEHAVIOR OF BEAM-TO-COLUMN JOINTS: MECHANICAL MODELING**

4.1 INTRODUCTION	163
------------------	-----



4.2 CYCLIC MODELING OF THE JOINT COMPONENTS: LITERATURE REVIEW	166
4.2.1 MODELING OF THE PANEL ZONE IN SHEAR	166
4.2.1.1 FIELDING AND HUANG MONOTONIC MODEL (1971)	169
4.2.1.2 KRAWINKLER MONOTONIC MODEL (1971)	174
4.2.1.3 WANG MONOTONIC MODEL (1985)	178
4.2.1.4 FIELDING AND WANG MODIFIED MONOTONIC MODEL (1996)	181
4.2.1.5 KIM & ENGELHARDT MONOTONIC MODEL (2002)	183
4.2.1.6 KIM & ENGELHARDT CYCLIC MODEL (2002)	190
4.2.2 MODELING OF COLUMN WEB PANELS UNDER TENSION AND COMPRESSION	201
4.2.3 MODELING OF THE T-STUB IN TENSION	212
4.3 ASSEMBLY AND ACCURACY OF THE MODEL	218
4.4 REFERENCES	239

## **5. APPLICATION OF DISSIPATIVE DEVICES TO BEAM-TO-COLUMN JOINTS**

5.1 ENERGETIC APPROACHES: MAIN FEATURES	243
5.1.1 PASSIVE ENERGY DISSIPATING SYSTEM	255
5.1.2 BASIC RESPONSE OF STRUCTURES EQUIPPED WITH HYSTERETIC DAMPERS	258

---

5.1.3 METALLIC AND FRICTION DAMPERS	267
5.1.3.1 METALLIC FLEXURAL DISSIPATING DEVICES	273
5.1.3.2 METALLIC SHEAR DISSIPATING DEVICES	278
5.1.3.3 FRICTION DISSIPATING DEVICES	280
5.2 DEVELOPMENT OF DISSIPATIVE T-STUBS	283
5.2.1 MECHANICAL MODELING	286
5.2.1.1 RECTANGULAR T-STUBS – PILUSO ET AL. MODEL (1997)	286
5.2.1.2 DISSIPATIVE T-STUBS – PROPOSED MODEL	310
5.2.2 EXPERIMENTAL BEHAVIOR UNDER CYCLIC LOADS	329
5.2.2.1 MONOTONIC TESTS - T-STUBS ON RIGID SUPPORT	336
5.2.2.2 MONOTONIC TESTS - COUPLED T-STUBS	343
5.2.2.3 CYCLIC TESTS – T-STUBS ON RIGID SUPPORT	348
5.2.2.4 CYCLIC TESTS – COUPLED T-STUBS	354
5.3 APPLICATION OF DISSIPATIVE T-STUBS TO DOUBLE SPLIT TEE JOINTS	358
5.3.1 THE ROLE OF MOMENT-SHEAR INTERACTION	366
5.3.1.1 EFFECT OF MOMENT-SHEAR INTERACTION ON THE VALUE OF THE PLASTIC MOMENT	366
5.3.1.2 OPTIMUM SHAPE OF DISSIPATIVE T-STUBS	381
5.3.2 EXPERIMENTAL TESTS ON DISSIPATIVE T-STUB JOINTS	391
5.3.2.1 DESIGN OF TESTED SPECIMENS	392
5.3.2.2 DESCRIPTION OF TEST TSJ-XS-CYC 06	399

---

5.3.2.3 DESCRIPTION OF TEST TSJ-XS-CYC 07	406
5.3.2.4 COMPARISON BETWEEN DISSIPATIVE AND CLASSICAL JOINTS	412
5.4 REFERENCES	415



## LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Fig. 2.1 – Steel Moment Resisting Frames in U.S.A.</i>	5
<i>Fig. 2.2 - Structural Typologies of CBF and EBF</i>	7
<i>Fig. 2.3 - Buildings Erected applying the “Column Tree” Technique</i>	8
<i>Fig. 2.4 – Classification of Moment Resisting Frames</i>	9
<i>Fig. 2.5 – Spatial Distribution of Space Frames</i>	10
<i>Fig. 2.6 – Spatial Distribution of Perimeter Frames</i>	11
<i>Fig. 2.7 – Spatial Distribution of Perimeter Frames with only few rigid bays</i>	12
<i>Fig. 2.8 – Spatial Distribution of Planar Frames</i>	13
<i>Fig. 2.9 – Spatial Distribution of Hybrid Systems</i>	14
<i>Fig. 2.10 – Rivets and High Strength Bolts</i>	16
<i>Fig. 2.11 - Examples of riveted structures</i>	17
<i>Fig. 2.12 – On the left: FCAW welding technique; On the right: SMAW welding technique</i>	18
<i>Fig. 2.13 – Failure of beam-to-column fillet welded connection (Kobe Earthquake)</i>	20
<i>Fig. 2.14 – Structural Joints Configuration (CEN, 2005)</i>	28
<i>Fig. 2.15 – Distinction between Connection and Panel zone</i>	30
<i>Fig. 2.16 – Pinned, Continuous and Semi-continuous joints</i>	31
<i>Fig. 2.17 – Modeling of a welded joint with the component method</i>	46
<i>Fig. 2.18 – Simplified model adopted by (Piluso et al., 1994)</i>	59
<i>Fig. 2.19 – Influence of non-dimensional stiffness on the period of vibration</i>	61
<i>Fig. 2.20 – Influence of non-dimensional stiffness on stability coefficient</i>	62
<i>Fig. 2.21 – Results of the parametric analysis (Aribert &amp; Grecea, 2000)</i>	64
<i>Fig. 2.22 – Proposal of behavioral factor for semi-continuous MRFs</i>	65
<i>Fig. 3.1 – Constraining devices used in the experimental campaign</i>	79

<i>Fig. 3.2 – MTS Hydraulic testing machine</i>	81
<i>Fig. 3.3 – Universal testing machine SCHENCK Hydropuls S56</i>	82
<i>Fig. 3.4 – Scheme and picture of an LVDT</i>	83
<i>Fig. 3.5 – Scheme and picture of an LVDT</i>	84
<i>Fig. 3.6 – Scheme and picture of an inclinometer</i>	85
<i>Fig. 3.7 – Scheme of a Strain Gauge</i>	85
<i>Fig. 3.8 – Actions in a frame due to seismic loads</i>	86
<i>Fig. 3.9 – Scheme reproduced in laboratory</i>	86
<i>Fig. 3.10 – AISC loading history for beam-to-column joints</i>	87
<i>Fig. 3.11 – Position of the instruments</i>	89
<i>Fig. 3.12 – Setup of the measurement devices</i>	90
<i>Fig. 3.13 – Experimental Setup</i>	92
<i>Fig. 3.14 – Definition of the equivalent shear acting in the panel zone</i>	94
<i>Fig. 3.15 – Rendering and Geometry of joint EEP – CYC 01</i>	99
<i>Fig. 3.16 – Simplified model considered in the design of end-plate (CEN, 2005)</i>	100
<i>Fig. 3.17 – Influence of coefficient <math>\alpha</math> on the collapse mechanism</i>	103
<i>Fig. 3.18 – Geometry and rendering of specimen EEP-CYC 02</i>	112
<i>Fig. 3.19 – Definition of RBS parameters</i>	113
<i>Fig. 3.20 – Typical scheme of beam with RBS</i>	114
<i>Fig. 3.21 – Scheme of the actions transferred by the RBS to the column</i>	117
<i>Fig. 3.22 – Rendering and Geometry of test TS-CYC 04</i>	120
<i>Fig. 3.23 – Test EEP-CYC 01</i>	121
<i>Fig. 3.24 – Measurement devices EEP-CYC 01</i>	121
<i>Fig. 3.25 – Measurement devices EEP-CYC 01</i>	122
<i>Fig. 3.26 – Failure of EEP-CYC 01 specimen due to brittle collapse of beam flange to end-plate welds</i>	123
<i>Fig. 3.27 – EEP-CYC 01 Moment-Rotation curve</i>	124

<i>Fig. 3.28 – Hysteretic response of end plate equivalent T-stubs</i>	125
<i>Fig. 3.29 – Cyclic response of column web in shear</i>	126
<i>Fig. 3.30 – Cyclic response of column web under alternate tension and compression</i>	126
<i>Fig. 3.31 – Energy dissipation of specimen EEP-CY 01</i>	127
<i>Fig. 3.32 – Test EEP-CYC 02</i>	128
<i>Fig. 3.33 – Measurement devices EEP-CYC 02</i>	129
<i>Fig. 3.34 – EEP-CYC 02 Moment-Rotation Curve</i>	130
<i>Fig. 3.35 – Component Hysteretic curves for specimen EEP-CYC 02</i>	132
<i>Fig. 3.36 – Formation of the crack in the end-plate</i>	133
<i>Fig. 3.37 – Failure of the end-plate</i>	134
<i>Fig. 3.38 – Energy dissipation of specimen EEP-CYC 02</i>	135
<i>Fig. 3.39 – Setup of test EEP-DB-CYC 03</i>	136
<i>Fig. 3.40 – Measurement instruments used to monitor the joint components</i>	137
<i>Fig. 3.41 – Strain Gauge used to monitor deformations of the Dog-Bone</i>	137
<i>Fig. 3.42 – Energy Dissipation of specimen EEP-DB-CYC 03</i>	138
<i>Fig. 3.43 – Flange and web buckling</i>	139
<i>Fig. 3.44 – Flange and web buckling</i>	140
<i>Fig. 3.45 – Test TS-CYC 04</i>	141
<i>Fig. 3.46 – Measurement devices</i>	142
<i>Fig. 3.47 – TS-CYC 04 Moment-Rotation Curve</i>	143
<i>Fig. 3.48 – Formation of the plastic hinges in correspondence of bolts and plate-web tie</i>	144
<i>Fig. 3.49 – Plasticization of the Tee elements</i>	145
<i>Fig. 3.50 – Development of the plastic hinges and failure of the Tee elements</i>	146
<i>Fig. 3.51 – Components hysteretic curves for specimen TS-CYC 04</i>	147
<i>Fig. 3.52 – Energy Dissipation of TS-CYC 04 joint</i>	148

<i>Fig. 3.53 – Experimental results of a coupon tensile test</i>	149
<i>Fig. 3.54 – Comparison between the actual and the engineering stress-strain relationship</i>	150
<i>Fig. 3.55 – Notation for the definition of the geometrical properties</i>	151
<i>Fig. 3.56 - Energy dissipation capacities of the tested joints</i>	154
<i>Fig. 3.57 – Comparison among the cyclic curves of the testes specimens</i>	155
<i>Fig. 4.1 – Mechanical model for bolted connections</i>	164
<i>Fig. 4.2 – Modeling of an internal welded joint</i>	168
<i>Fig. 4.3 – (Mulas, 2004) FEM model</i>	169
<i>Fig. 4.4 – Bilinear model of Fielding and Huang</i>	170
<i>Fig. 4.5 – Post-elastic model of Fielding and Huang (1971)</i>	172
<i>Fig. 4.6 – Translational equilibrium (Fielding model)</i>	172
<i>Fig. 4.7 – Application of Fielding &amp; Huang model</i>	173
<i>Fig. 4.8 – Tri-linear model of Krawinkler</i>	174
<i>Fig. 4.9 – Post-elastic model (Krawinkler,1971)</i>	175
<i>Fig. 4.10 – Krawinkler model in case of HEB 200 column and IPE 270 beam</i>	177
<i>Fig. 4.11 – Shear panel model (Wang, 1985)</i>	178
<i>Fig. 4.12 – Wang post-elastic model</i>	179
<i>Fig. 4.13 – Wang model</i>	180
<i>Fig. 4.14 – Comparison between Fielding and Wang models (Left) and Improved Fielding and Wang models (Right)</i>	182
<i>Fig. 4.15 – Quadri-linear model of Kim &amp; Engelhardt</i>	183
<i>Fig. 4.16 – Comparison among literature models in case of HEB 200-IPE 270 coupling</i>	188
<i>Fig. 4.17 – Comparison among literature models for FEM analysis tcf=27 mm</i>	189
<i>Fig. 4.18 – Comparison among literature models for FEM analysis tcf=36 mm</i>	190



<i>Fig. 4.19 – Comparison among literature models for FEM analysis <math>t_{cf}=45</math> mm</i>	190
<i>Fig. 4.20 – Kinematic Hardening model</i>	191
<i>Fig. 4.21 – Application of Kinematic Hardening model to Krawinkler specimen-A1</i>	192
<i>Fig. 4.22 – Cyclic steady state curve</i>	193
<i>Fig. 4.23 – Shear Panel cyclic curve</i>	194
<i>Fig. 4.24 – Dafalias-Popov model for Hysteresis Curve</i>	196
<i>Fig. 4.25 – Procedure for the translation of the bound line</i>	197
<i>Fig. 4.26 – Comparison with Krawinkler test A1</i>	199
<i>Fig. 4.27 – Comparison with Krawinkler test A2</i>	200
<i>Fig. 4.28 – Column web subjected to compression</i>	201
<i>Fig. 4.29 – Column web subjected to tension</i>	202
<i>Fig. 4.30 – Transitory phase</i>	203
<i>Fig. 4.31 – Stabilized response</i>	204
<i>Fig. 4.32 – Stabilized response after softening</i>	205
<i>Fig. 4.33 – Hardening factor</i>	206
<i>Fig. 4.34 – Softening factor</i>	207
<i>Fig. 4.35 – Relaxation factor</i>	208
<i>Fig. 4.36 – Cyclic curve at the <math>i</math>-th cycle for panels in tension and compression</i>	210
<i>Fig. 4.37 – Hysteresis curve in Cofie model</i>	211
<i>Fig. 4.38 – Theoretical-experimental comparisons</i>	212
<i>Fig. 4.39 – Piluso et al. model</i>	215
<i>Fig. 4.40 – Geometry of EEP-CYC 01 specimen</i>	220
<i>Fig. 4.41 – Geometry of EEP-CYC 02 specimen</i>	221
<i>Fig. 4.42 – Geometry of TS-CYC 04 specimen</i>	222
<i>Fig. 4.43 – Geometry of FPC/B specimen (Bernuzzi et al., 1996)</i>	223

<i>Fig. 4.44 – Geometry of J-1.3 specimen (Nogueiro et al., 2006)</i>	224
<i>Fig. 4.46 – Theoretical-Experimental comparison for specimen EEP-CYC 01</i>	226
<i>Fig. 4.47 – Theoretical-Experimental comparison for specimen J-1.3</i>	226
<i>Fig. 4.48 – Comparison of the energy dissipated for specimen EEP-CYC 01</i>	227
<i>Fig. 4.49 – Comparison of the energy dissipated for specimen J-1.3</i>	227
<i>Fig. 4.50 – Theoretical-Experimental comparison for specimen FW</i>	229
<i>Fig. 4.51 – Comparison of the energy dissipated for specimen FW</i>	230
<i>Fig. 4.52 – Theoretical-Experimental comparison for specimen EEP-CYC 02</i>	231
<i>Fig. 4.53 – Theoretical-Experimental comparison for specimen TS-CYC 04</i>	231
<i>Fig. 4.54 – Theoretical-Experimental comparison for specimen FPC/B</i>	232
<i>Fig. 4.55 – Comparison of the energy dissipated for specimen EEP-CYC 02</i>	233
<i>Fig. 4.56 – Comparison of the energy dissipated for specimen TS-CYC 04</i>	233
<i>Fig. 4.57 – Comparison of the energy dissipated for specimen FPC/B</i>	234
<i>Fig. 4.58 – Model performance - Peak Moment for Authors' Tests</i>	236
<i>Fig. 4.59 – Model performance - Unloading Stiffness for Authors' Tests</i>	237
<i>Fig. 4.60 – Model performance - Peak Moment for Literature Tests</i>	237
<i>Fig. 4.61 – Model performance - Unloading Stiffness for Literature Tests</i>	238
<i>Fig. 5.1 – Time variation of the energy dissipate by viscous damping of an elastic (top) and inelastic system (bottom)</i>	246
<i>Fig. 5.2 – Rain flow analogy</i>	247
<i>Fig. 5.3 – Seismic Control Systems</i>	250
<i>Fig. 5.4 – Control Schemes</i>	251
<i>Fig. 5.5 – Tuned Mass Damper - Tuned Sloshing Damper – Tuned Liquid Damper</i>	254
<i>Fig. 5.6 – Response of damped system subjected to harmonic forces</i>	259
<i>Fig. 5.7 – Deformation response factor for damped system (harmonic force)</i>	261
<i>Fig. 5.8 – Single-degree-of-freedom system incorporating hysteretic damper</i>	262
<i>Fig. 5.9 – Steady-state response amplitude of single-degree-of-freedom with</i>	

<i>hysteretic damper under harmonic base excitation, <math>k_d/k = 0.55</math></i>	265
<i>Fig. 5.10 – Typical response of metals subjected to monotonic and cyclic loads</i>	268
<i>Fig. 5.11 – Atomic arrangements corresponding to: a) edge dislocation; b) screw dislocation</i>	270
<i>Fig. 5.12 – Cyclic response of ADAS devices</i>	273
<i>Fig. 5.13 – Curvatures developed for different plate geometry</i>	274
<i>Fig. 5.14 – Application of ADAS device to a three stories steel MRFs</i>	275
<i>Fig. 5.15 – Geometry and Response of T-ADAS devices</i>	276
<i>Fig. 5.16 – Geometry and Response of Honeycomb devices</i>	277
<i>Fig. 5.17 – Distribution of Shear Panels in MRFs (Nakashima, 1995)</i>	278
<i>Fig. 5.18 – Shear Damper proposed by (Cahis et al., 1997)</i>	279
<i>Fig. 5.19 – Shear Damper proposed by (Tsai) (Tsai &amp; Wang, 1998)</i>	280
<i>Fig. 5.20 – T-stub Identification in case of Extended end plate Connections</i>	286
<i>Fig. 5.21 – Failure modes of bolted T-stubs</i>	287
<i>Fig. 5.22 – Adopted Notation</i>	288
<i>Fig. 5.23 – Influence of parameter <math>\beta</math> on the collapse mechanism</i>	291
<i>Fig. 5.24 – Yield lines for T-stubs with only one bolt row</i>	292
<i>Fig. 5.25 – Yield lines in case of group of bolts</i>	293
<i>Fig. 5.26 – Collapse mechanisms according to Piluso et al. model</i>	294
<i>Fig. 5.27 – Material Uni-axial behavior</i>	296
<i>Fig. 5.28 – Quadrilinear force-displacement curve</i>	299
<i>Fig. 5.29 – Definition of geometry, curvature and bending moment diagrams</i>	311
<i>Fig. 5.30 – Simplified model for stiffness prediction</i>	313
<i>Fig. 5.31 – Moment on the cantilever</i>	315
<i>Fig. 5.32 – Diagram of Curvatures in the fictitious scheme</i>	316
<i>Fig. 5.33 – Correlation between <math>\zeta</math> factor and the ratio <math>s/B</math></i>	320
<i>Fig. 5.34 – Derivation of effective width</i>	323

<i>Fig. 5.35 – Ratio between effective and maximum plate width</i>	326
<i>Fig. 5.36 – Typologies of Tested Specimens</i>	330
<i>Fig. 5.37 – Finite Element Model</i>	332
<i>Fig. 5.38 – Experimental test on hourglass T-stub on rigid Support</i>	336
<i>Fig. 5.39 – Experimental test on rectangular T-stub on rigid Support</i>	337
<i>Fig. 5.40 – TS01-M vs TS01-XS-M: monotonic tests comparison</i>	338
<i>Fig. 5.41 – TS02-M vs TS02-XS-M: monotonic tests comparison</i>	338
<i>Fig. 5.42 – Deformed shape of T-stub on rigid support and Coupled T-stubs</i>	339
<i>Fig. 5.43 – Typical failure of rectangular T-stubs on rigid support under monotonic loads</i>	340
<i>Fig. 5.44 – Typical failure of hourglass T-stubs on rigid support under monotonic loads</i>	341
<i>Fig. 5.45 – Rectangular T-stub – Model Comparison</i>	342
<i>Fig. 5.46 – Hourglass T-stub – Model Comparison</i>	342
<i>Fig. 5.47 – TSD series</i>	344
<i>Fig. 5.48 – TSD-XS series</i>	345
<i>Fig. 5.49 – TSD test result and models comparison</i>	346
<i>Fig. 5.50 – TSD-XS test results and model comparison</i>	346
<i>Fig. 5.51 – Typical failure of TSD specimens</i>	347
<i>Fig. 5.52 – Typical failure of TSD-XS specimens</i>	347
<i>Fig. 5.53 – TS01-C and TS01-XS-C test results</i>	348
<i>Fig. 5.54 – TS02-C15 and TS02-XS-C15 test results</i>	349
<i>Fig. 5.55 – Propagation of the heat along the flanges – Hourglass T-stub</i>	350
<i>Fig. 5.56 – Propagation of the heat along the flanges – Rectangular T-stub</i>	350
<i>Fig. 5.57 – Definition of the conventional collapse</i>	351
<i>Fig. 5.58 – TS and TS-XS low-cycle fatigue curves</i>	354
<i>Fig. 5.59 – TSD and TSD-XS series – Cyclic Tests</i>	356
<i>Fig. 5.60 – TSD and TSD-XS – low cycle fatigue curves</i>	356

<i>Fig. 5.61 – Comparison among low cycle fatigue curves</i>	357
<i>Fig. 5.62 – Different joint hysteretic behaviors</i>	361
<i>Fig. 5.63 (Huang &amp; Foutch, 2009) results</i>	363
<i>Fig. 5.64 – Distribution on internal stresses in the yielding condition under bending moment and shear</i>	369
<i>Fig. 5.65 – Representation of M-V Interaction Domain</i>	370
<i>Fig. 5.66 – Distribution of internal forces on an X-shaped T-stub</i>	372
<i>Fig. 5.67 – Influence of hourglass geometry on the position of the section of minimum resistance</i>	377
<i>Fig. 5.68 – Reduction of resistance due to moment-shear interaction for different values of <math>m/t</math></i>	380
<i>Fig. 5.69 – Average of the ratio between optimum shape and exponential law (Devices with same resistance and same <math>m/t</math> ratio)</i>	386
<i>Fig. 5.70 – <math>s/B</math> optimum vs <math>m/t</math></i>	387
<i>Fig. 5.71 – Optimum shape vs Exponential Shape</i>	390
<i>Fig. 5.72 – Specimen TSJ-XS-CYC-06</i>	397
<i>Fig. 5.73 – Specimen TSJ-CYC-07</i>	398
<i>Fig. 5.74 – Test TSJ-XS-CYC 06</i>	399
<i>Fig. 5.75 – Measurement devices (TSJ-XS-CYC 06)</i>	400
<i>Fig. 5.76 – TSJ-XS-CYC 06 Moment-Rotation Curve</i>	400
<i>Fig. 5.77 – Plasticization of the tee elements</i>	401
<i>Fig. 5.78 – Thermal state of the specimen during first cycles</i>	403
<i>Fig. 5.79 – Joints after failure. On the left: TS-CYC-04- On the right: TS-XS-CYC-06</i>	404
<i>Fig. 5.80 – Rotation of the plate due to the force acting on the T-stub</i>	405
<i>Fig. 5.81 – Dissipated Energy – TSJ-XS-CYC 06</i>	406
<i>Fig. 5.82 – Test TSJ-XS-CYC 07</i>	407
<i>Fig. 5.83 – Measurement devices (TSJ-XS-CYC 07)</i>	408

---

<i>Fig. 5.84 –Cyclic Response of Joint TSJ-XS-CYC 07</i>	409
<i>Fig. 5.85 –Crack Formation and propagation (TSJ-XS-CYC 07)</i>	410
<i>Fig. 5.86 – Position of the section of mimum resistance (TSJ-XS-CYC 07)</i>	411
<i>Fig. 5.87 – Energy dissipated by joint TSJ-XS-CYC 07</i>	412
<i>Fig. 5.88 – Comparison between joints TS-CYC 04 and TSJ-XS-CYC 07</i>	413
<i>Fig. 5.89 – Cyclic envelopes of all tested joints</i>	414
<i>Fig. 5.90 – Energy dissipated by joints</i>	415

## CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Scope of the study

Before seismic events of Northridge (Los Angeles, 17 January 1994) and Hyogoken-Nanbu (Kobe, 17 January 1995) MRFs were supposed to be the most reliable seismic resistant systems due to the high number of dissipative zones that are able to develop. Before these earthquakes, especially in United States, MRFs were realized, generally, by adopting fully welded connections, which, at the time, were retained to perform better compared to other joint typologies. In addition, the economic advantages deriving from the adoption of field fully welded connections, strongly influenced choices of building owners' and, as a result, led to the adoption of this joint typology in almost all pre-Northridge steel MRFs. After Northridge earthquake, even though the loss of life was limited, the unexpected amount of damages occurred in structures adopting as seismic resistant system welded Moment Resisting Frames put into question the role played by welded connections on the whole structural behavior.

Therefore, after the seismic events, two strategies were identified to improve behavior of fully welded connections. The first one is related to the improvement of the welding technique, usually strengthening the critical area subjected to fracture. The second one is based on the possibility of concentrating the energy dissipation in the beam, reducing the bending resistant area of beams by properly cutting the flanges in a zone close to

beam-to-column connection. This weakening approach is commonly called RBS. A new design approach, which has been the subject of many studies in last decades, has gained growing interest in last years. In fact, Eurocode 8 has opened the door to the idea of dissipating the seismic input energy in the connecting elements of beam-to-column joints. It has been recognized that semi-rigid partial strength connections can lead to dissipation and ductility capacity compatible with the seismic demand, provided that they are properly designed by means of an appropriate choice of the joint component where the dissipation has to occur.

In this work, the attention is focused on this last approach. The first part of the work is descriptive and deals with the historical development and, in general, with the seismic behavior of Moment Resisting Frames. In the same chapter general concepts concerning the component method, as introduced by last version of Eurocode 3, are given. Finally, the influence of the joint behaviour on main characteristics of partial strength and/or semi-rigid MRFs is evaluated by properly accounting for existing literature. Third chapter deals with an experimental analysis on the cyclic behaviour of classical partial strength beam-to-column joints. The main scope of the experimental campaign is to show how to control the dissipative behaviour of joints by properly designing the weakest joint component and by over-strengthening the other connecting elements. Therefore, a design procedure is pointed out and the comparison among the results obtained by cyclic tests is presented in terms of energy dissipation capacity. In addition, by monitoring during the experimental tests both the whole joint and the single joint components it is shown that the energy dissipated by the joint is equal to the sum of the energy dissipated by the joint components. This result assures that the first phase of the component approach, i.e. the component identification, has been properly carried out and



that interaction between components under cyclic loads is negligible. Chapter 4 represents the continuation of the work carried out in previous chapter. In fact, on the base of the obtained results, the goal is to provide a mechanical cyclic model for the prediction of the overall joint behaviour, starting from existing literature models. Hence, a state-of-the-art review is first presented and then, model employed to set up a computer program devoted to the prediction of the cyclic behaviour of steel beam-to-column joints is shown. In particular, cyclic model adopts Kim & Engelhardt model for shear panel, Cofie & Krawinkler model for Panels in Tension and Compression and Piluso et al. model for the prediction of the T-stub behavior. Finally, in chapter 5, an innovative approach to improve the seismic behavior of bolted beam-to-column joints, which are affected by strength and stiffness degradation, is presented. The development of a dissipative device representing the application of ADAS concept to T-stubs, is detailed. First, a mechanical and finite element model able to predict the whole force displacement curve of the so-called hourglass T-stubs are set up. Next, an experimental analysis aiming to compare the hysteretic behaviour and the dissipative capacities of rectangular and dissipative T-stubs is carried out. Finally, as a consequence of the study of the joint component, a further experimental analysis concerning the application of such devices to partial strength beam-to-column joints is presented and the results, in terms of moment-rotation curve and energy dissipation capacity, are discussed and compared to those obtained by the cyclic testing of classical joints.