



**UNIVERSIDAD  
DEL AZUAY**

**FACULTAD DE CIENCIA Y TECNOLOGÍA**

**ESCUELA DE INGENIERÍA CIVIL**

*Seismic performance of special steel moment frames using detailed  
vs simple hysteretic curves*

**Trabajo previo a la obtención del grado académico de:**

**INGENIERO CIVIL**

**Autores:**

**MARÍA EMILIA CLAVIJO CALDERÓN**

**JORGE LUIS MOLINA PESÁNTEZ**

**Director:**

**PhD. PABLO DAVID QUINDE MARTÍNEZ**

**Co-Director:**

**PhD. FRANCISCO XAVIER FLORES SOLANO**

**CUENCA, ECUADOR**

**2023**

### Resumen:

Es una creencia común que modelos de estructuras que utilizan materiales bilineales sin degradación de resistencia o rigidez se comportan mejor que modelos de estructuras con materiales más detallados que incluyen degradación. Esta investigación se centra en los efectos de modelar las curvas histeréticas de vigas y columnas en pórticos especiales de acero resistente a momentos de dos formas diferentes. La estructura analizada es un pórtico especial resistente a momento de 8 pisos donde su rendimiento es obtenido mediante análisis estáticos y dinámicos. Al comparar derivas de piso y cuantificar energías en diferentes niveles de intensidad con múltiples sismos, se obtuvo que depender únicamente de la disipación de energía histerética como indicador del rendimiento sísmico es un error. La investigación incluye chequeos de comportamiento, como lo son el análisis de vibración libre, análisis modal, y análisis pushover, para validar la precisión de los modelos utilizados.

**Palabras clave:** Disipación de energía, FEMA P695, OpenSees, SSMFs, Porticos especiales de acero resistentes a momento.

### Abstract:

It is a common belief that modeling structures using bilinear materials with no strength or stiffness degradation performs better than modeling structures with more detailed materials that include degradation. This investigation focuses on the effects of modeling the hysteretic curves of beams and columns in special steel moment-resisting frames in two different ways. The analyzed structure is an 8-Story Special Steel Moment Frame where its performance is measured employing static and dynamic analyses. By comparing inter-story drifts and quantifying energies at different intensity levels with multiple ground motions, it is revealed that relying solely on hysteretic energy dissipation as an indicator of seismic performance is misguided. The investigation includes thorough checks, such as free vibration analysis, modal analysis, and pushover analysis, to validate the accuracy of the models used.

**Keywords:** Energy Dissipation, FEMA P695, OpenSees, SSMFs, Special Steel Moment Frames



Este certificado se encuentra en el repositorio digital de la Universidad del Azuay, para verificar su autenticidad escanee el código QR

Este certificado consta de: 1 página

## **Índice de contenidos**

1.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
2.	BUILDING OVERVIEW .....	1
2.1	Geometry .....	1
2.2	Design Loads .....	2
3.	NONLINEAR MODEL .....	2
3.1	Hysteresis Type .....	2
3.2	P-Delta considerations .....	3
4.	GROUND MOTIONS SCALING METHOD .....	4
5.	MODEL BEHAVIOR CHECKS .....	4
5.1	Modal Analysis .....	4
5.2	Free Vibration .....	5
5.3	Pushover checks .....	6
6.	RESULTS .....	7
6.1	Nonlinear Static Pushover Analysis .....	7
6.2	Nonlinear Time History Analysis .....	8
6.3	Energy Dissipation .....	9
6.4	Collapse Evaluation .....	11
7.	CONCLUSIONS .....	12
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	13
	REFERENCES .....	13

## **Índice de tablas**

Table 1: Summary of Modal Analysis.....	5
Table 2: Real damping of the structure and Rayleigh's theoretical damping .....	6
Table 3: CMR comparison of the NIST and the models analyzed .....	12

## **Índice de figuras**

Figure 1: Building plan view layout.....	2
Figure 2: Beam W30x108 hysteretic behavior.....	3
Figure 3: Mathematical model of the 4RSA 8-story building.....	3
Figure 4: Median spectrum of the Far-Field record set anchored to the MCE.....	4
Figure 5: Fundamental Mode of Vibration of the systems.....	5
Figure 6: Rayleigh's damping obtained by logarithmic decay of Free vibration.....	5
Figure 7: Pushover results of ductility and overstrength of the models.....	6
Figure 8: Sequence of yielding of the models.....	7
Figure 9: Pushover curves with and without P-Delta effects.....	8
Figure 10: First story drifts at the MCE intensity with P-Delta effects.....	8
Figure 11: First story drifts at higher intensities with P-Delta effects.....	9
Figure 12: First story drifts at higher intensities without P-Delta effects.....	9
Figure 13: Energy balance at the MCE intensity.....	10
Figure 14: Energy balance of A-TMZ270 at higher intensities .....	10
Figure 15: Energy balance of PEL180 at higher intensities .....	11
Figure 16: Incremental Dynamic Analyses Curves of the models.....	11
Figure 17: Fragility curve and CMR computation of the models.....	12