

# Wood Frame and Soft-Story Buildings CEA/FEMA Seismic Retrofit Standard ATC-110

Colin Blaney S.E.



### OUTLINE

- > Overall Project Goal
- What is the Vision of CEA/FEMA
- Past Residential Damage
- > Typical Deficiencies
- Prescriptive vs. Engineered Approach
- What we have now ...Codes, Standards and Plan Sets
- Next Steps



#### **OVER-ARCHING GOAL**

National Pre-Standard and eventually Standard which will specifically address the seismic rehabilitation of one and two family residential dwellings (R3)



#### ATC -110 PROJECT TEAM

#### **Project Technical Committee**

Colin	Blaney	ZFA
John	Osteraas	Exponent
Kelly	Cobeen	WJE
Andre	Filiatrault	SUNY Buffalo
		Anderson Niswander
Tom	Anderson	Constr.
Frank	Rollo	Treadwell & Rollo
Ramin	Golesorkhi	Treadwell & Rollo

FA Structural Engineers

#### ATC-110 PROJECT TEAM

#### **Project Steering Committee**

David	Bonowitz	Consultant
Dan	Dolan	Washington State
David	Khorram	City of Long Beach
Vikki	Bourcier	Hobach-Lewin
Philip	Line	APA
Steve	Prvor	Simpson
Thor	Matteson	Consultant

FA Structural	Engineers
---------------	-----------

- National Standard to Address most Residential Construction
  - Cripple Wall Buildings
  - Slabs on Grade
  - Pole Type Foundations, Pier and Beam Systems
  - > Hillside Homes
  - House over Garages



## Focus on Prescriptive Approaches

- > Embed the Engineering
- Make Implementation Simple & Effective



# Streamline an Engineered Approach

Create Design Tools and Detail Libraries to assist Engineers.



- To Answer other important Questions
  - When does a certain vulnerability become an elevated concern?
  - When does the slope of a particular site warrant additional design or rehabilitation measures
  - Can the rehabilitation of Hillside Homes follow prescriptive Standards.
  - How do we address the variance of construction practices



- > To Address other important Goals
  - Can we develop a better idea of expected drift, the onset of damage and possible collapse for specific structures types and materials.
  - Cost to Benefit Indicators for Retrofits



#### PAST RESIDENTIAL DAMAGE

#### **1983 Coalinga Earthquake- M 6.3**<sup>1</sup>

- > Almost destroyed 309 single-family homes
- Major damage 558 single-family homes
- Minor damage 811 single-family homes
- 1. A disaster assessment by the American Red Cross





#### PAST RESIDENTIAL DAMAGE

"Preventing the Nightmare" 2003- Report by ABAG

The October 17th 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake. EQE Report October

1.

2.

1989.

#### **1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake -M 6.9**

- Older homes that were not bolted to their foundations or which lacked properly braced cripple walls accounted for over 2,800 of the 16,000 or 17.5% of <u>all</u> housing units made uninhabitable.<sup>1</sup>
- In Watsonville 10-20% of all pre-1940 residences suffered cripple wall damage. Some blocks suffered nearly 100%<sup>2</sup>





## WHAT'S DEFICIENT?

- The lack of continuous concrete or reinforced masonry footings at the perimeter,
- Cripple walls with inadequate bracing,
- Minimal or no attachment between the floor framing and the top of cripple wall or mudsill,
- The lack of appropriate anchorage between the mudsill and foundation system.

#### WHAT'S REALLY DEFICIENT?

#### Lack of redundancy below first floor





#### **MUDSILL ATTACHMENTS**



January 16-17, 2014 - University of California, Los Angeles

A Structural Engineers

#### **MUDSILL ATTACHMENTS**



January 16-17, 2014 - University of California, Los Angeles

FA Structural Engineers

#### **CRIPPLE WALL FAILURES**



### INADEQUATELY SHEATHED CRIPPLE WALLS



#### WHAT DOESN'T WORK?

- Horizontal Wood Sheathing/Shingles
- Stucco/Plaster ?
- ≻T1-11 Siding ?

## ≻Let in Bracing





#### WHAT DOES WORK?

- Plywood
- OSB (oriented strand board)
- Diagonal Wood Sheathing





#### FLOOR TO CRIPPLE WALL ATTACHMENTS



January 16-17, 2014 - University of California, Los Angeles

#### FA Structural Engineers

#### FLOOR TO CRIPPLE WALL ATTACHMENTS



Photos Courtesy By Area Retrofit



January 16-17, 2014 - University of California, Los Angeles

#### FA Structural Engineers

#### FLOOR TO MUDSILL ATTACHMENTS



January 16-17, 2014 - University of California, Los Angeles

#### **ZFA** Structural Engineers

#### WHAT DOCUMENTS DO WE HAVE

- ➢ FEMA P-50, P50.1
- ➢ IEBC A3
- Plan Set A
- City of LA DBS Anchor Bolt Plan (2009)
- Simpson Strong-Tie
- Plan Set B ?? (Standard Plan B)



#### PRESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS

 Engineering Intent "Embedded"
Developed for Specific "Most Typical Conditions"

Use in Manner Consistent with Details



#### **ENGINEERED SOLUTION**

- Required when building falls outside of Scope (Example-A301.2)
- When the existing detailing falls outside of the "Most Typical Conditions"
- ➢ 75% of Code Design Forces



#### WHAT MAKES THESE DOCUMENTS DIFFERENT?

- Developed for Homeowners, Contractors, & Engineers
- Focus on "Critical Risk"
- Recipe of "Prescriptive Requirements & Details"



#### WHAT IS "CRITICAL RISK"



#### IEBC A3 & WHERE DOES IT APPLY?

- Residential Buildings of Light Frame Construction (R-3)
- > Not More than Four Dwelling Units
- 16 or fewer Primarily Permanent Occupants
- Cripple Walls Less Than 4' in Height



#### WHERE DOES IEBC A3 APPLY?

- Homes with post & pier and URM Foundation Systems
- Engineering Assessment or Prescriptive Foundations



Jim Russell



Anderson Niswander

#### WHERE DOESN'T A3 APPLY?

- Cripple walls over 4' in Height
- Homes with Pole Foundations
- Buildings Exceeding Three Stories in Height
- Buildings With Slabs on Grade



#### WHERE DOESN'T A3 APPLY?



4' Max Height

Wall Stud Movement

# 3<sup>rd</sup> Story 2<sup>nd</sup> Story 1<sup>st</sup> Story 14" Max.

Cut-Off Height January 16-17, 2014 - University of California, Los Angeles



#### WHERE SHOULD YOU APPLY IEBC A3 WITH CAUTION?

- Sloping Sites
- Long Rectangular Homes
- > High Seismicity (CS > .192g, SDS> 1.25)
- Split Levels
- Homes with Heavy Finishes
- Unusual Configurations & HOG



#### **OTHER PRESCRIPTIVE METHODS**

- Plan Set A (Standard Plan A 2008)
- City of LA DBS Anchor Bolt Plan (2009)
- Simpson Strong-Tie
- Plan Set B ?? (Standard Plan B)



#### PLAN SET A- PAGE 1





#### PLAN SET A- PAGE 2





#### PLAN SET B



January 16-17, 2014 - University of California, Los Angeles

FA Structural Engineers

#### PROS & CONS OF IEBC A3

- > Pro's
  - > Adopted into the Code/ National Presence
  - Regularly Updated
  - Coordinated with Other Codes
  - > Broad applicability with engineered design
  - Standardized and prescriptive details



#### PROS & CONS OF IEBC A3

# Con's

- Does not easily Produce Plans and Details
- > Not easily available
- > Limited prescriptive details



#### **PROS & CONS OF PLAN SETS**

- > Pro's
  - > Developed for Home Owners and GC's
  - Consistent notes, detail, procedures
  - Formatted for Construction
  - Easy to Follow



#### **PROS & CONS OF PLAN SETS**

# Con's

- No Official Update Process
- Limited Applicable Details/ Conditions
- More Limited Applicability
- > No Direct Engineered Approach



#### **CONTRIBUTORS TO SUCCESS**

# Regulatory Agencies

- Embrace the Program
- Quality Control and Quality Assurance of Program



#### **NEXT STEPS**

- Review all Current Data
- Study & Define the Opportunities
- > Develop & Prioritize Realistic Goals
- Implement- Anticipated 5 year Program



# Thank you



#### PAST RESIDENTIAL DAMAGE

#### **1994 Northridge Earthquake- M 6.7**

- > 48,000 residential units made uninhabitable.
- Only 439 of the 48,000 or slightly less than 1% had cripple wall failures. <sup>1</sup>
- Difference due to newer homes, slab on grade construction, or homes retrofitted after 1971 San Fernando EQ.<sup>1</sup>

1. "Preventing the Nightmare" 2003- Report by ABAG



## WHAT'S REALLY DEFICIENT?

- Cripple Walls Below First Floor
- Sheathed one side
- Stucco, horizontal sheathing
- ➤Walls Above First Level
- Covered both sides
- Lathe & plaster, button board & plaster, gypsum board



# T1-11 siding failure at edges





#### **MUDSILL ATTACHMENTS**

Anchor Size & Spacing Use of Existing Anchors? Check for Sound Concrete



