

The Behavior of RC Beam-Column Joint with Beam Reinforced Web Opening under Cyclic Loading

Amin Saleh¹, M. Hamad², Sherif Elzeny³, S.K.Elwan⁴ and A. Deifalla⁵

¹ Professor, Ain shames University, Egypt. ² PhD, Ain shames University, Egypt.

³ Professor, Housing and building national Center, Egypt.

⁴ Associate Professor, Department of civil engineering the higher institute of engineering, Elshrouk City.

⁵ Associate Professor, Higher Institute for science and technology Alobour, Egypt, on leave from Cairo

University, Egypt.

ملخص البحث:

إن تمرير كابلات الكهرباء وأنابيب المياه وغيرها من الخدمات من خلال فتحات فى كمرات الأسقف بدلاً من تمريرها تحت هذه الكمرات يقلل ارتفاع الأدوار في المباني وبالتالي تقل تكلفة إنشائها ولأن تواجد مثل هذه الفتحات يؤثر علي الوصلة الخرسانية بين الكمره والعمود التي تعتبر من أهم أجزاء المنشأت الخرسانية لما لها من تاثير عظيم على الجساءه والإتزان الخاصه بالمنشأ خاصة فى حالة تصميم هذه المنشات على أحمال الزلازل. وحيث أن أكواد التصميم المحلية منها والدولية لا توفر الإرشادات الكافية والشروط الخاصة بهذه الحالات فقد تبين مدي الإحتياج لدراسة تأثير تواجد الفتحات علي الوصلة الخرسانية بين الكمرة والعمود تحت تأثير التحميل الترددى وتعتبر هذه الدراسة إحدى المساهمات الموجهة في هذا الإتجاه بإجراء بعض الاختبارات المعملية وكذلك باجراء دراسات التحليل الانشائي لبعض النماذ جاستخدام طريقة العناصر المحددة.

Abstract:

Most of the previous research focused on either behavior of reinforced concrete (RC) beams with openings [1] or shear behavior of RC beam-column joints [2]; however, very limited studies tackled the behavior of RC beam-column joints with nearby beam web openings. In this paper, the influence of a nearby RC beam web opening properties (i.e. reinforced opening and location) on the behavior (i.e. cracking pattern, failure mode, stiffness degradation, steel reinforcement strain, energy dissipation, load displacement envelope, strength, and ductility) of an RC beam-column joint are being investigated. In addition.

Introduction:

In modern reinforced concrete (RC) buildings, using openings at different positions of structural elements are needed, which allow the continuity of ducts and pipes for sanitation, heating, ventilation, air-conditioning, electricity, telephone and computer networks and other mechanical equipment. Passing these ducts through a transverse opening in the floor beam, instead of placing them underneath the soffit of the beam, lead to a substantial saving in cost, especially in multistory buildings.

In the design of RC moment resisting frame structures, the "strong column - weak beam" philosophy is recommended to ensure the generation of beam plastic hinging at large displacements, rather than column hinging. Experimental studies showed that RC Beam-column joints undergo large inelastic shear deformations even when with the strong column-weak beam design philosophy. The brittle joint shear failure of beam column joints will significantly reduce the overall ductility of structures and result in a dangerous failure mechanism, thus the core of the beam-column joint should have adequate shear strength to resist the high shear forces developed during earthquake attacks.

Research Significance and Previous Work

Most designer engineers permit the embedment of small pipes, provided some additional reinforcement is used around the periphery of the opening. However, when large openings are encountered, particularly in reinforced or pre-stressed concrete members, they show a general reluctance to deal with them because adequate technical information is not readily available. There is also a lack of specific guidelines in building codes of practice (ACI 2012, ECP-203), although they contain detailed treatment of openings in floor slabs. As a result, designs are frequently based on intuition, which may lead to disastrous consequences or unjustified additional costs.

Test Set-up

The specimens were tested under a rigid steel frame. The specimens considered in the experimental program represent large-scale models of exterior beam-column joints extending between the inflection points of a ductile moment resisting frame subjected to seismic action, as shown in Figure 1. The test frame consisted of four columns posttensioned to the laboratory strong floor and braced with tie rods to ensure rigidity. Figure 2a shows the elevation of the loading set-up. The reactions of loads which were applied to column and beam end were taken by a stiff steel beam supported on the main girders The column top and bottom ends were clamped by system of steel plates and rollers and anchored to two stiff steel beams using eight threaded high strength tie rods. The top steel beam lay on two concrete blocks and tied to the test frame columns while the bottom steel beam was well anchored to the laboratory strong floor using two 40 mm diameter anchors. The column axial load and the beam cyclic load were applied by two independent loading systems. Figure 2b shows the details of instrumentation and of loading arrangements. This system allowed transmitting the cyclic vertical load to the beam tip while maintaining its freedom to rotate. In order to simulate the case of seismic action, specimens were loaded by applying a constant compressive axial loads (15% of the column ultimate load sustained by concrete, about 50% of column-balanced load) on the columns while the free end of the beams was subjected to displacement-controlled reversed increasing cyclic load.

Specimen details

The experimental program included testing of three beam column joints. All specimens consist of beam had a (T-cross section) total depth of 400 mm, flange thickness of 60 mm, flange width of 350 mm, and web width of 150 mm and 1500mm clear span from the column face as shown in figs. 3(a-c). The main column had a rectangular cross section of 350 mm depth, 250 mm width, and 2000 mm clear height. Column longitudinal reinforcement is 8Ø12 and stirrups Ø8 @ 100 mm, while the beam longitudinal reinforcement are 3Ø16 and stirrups Ø8 @ 120 mm. A control RC beam column joint (JC), which reinforced by steel bars and steel stirrups without opening as shown in fig 3a. Two RC beam column joints (JS1, JS2), which have a square opening (170mm X 170mm) and reinforced with 3Ø16 (vertical and horizontal bars) around open located at clear distances from the column face 170 mm and 340 mm as shown in figs. 3b and 3c.

Test procedure

The specimens were tested under quasi-static displacement control technique. At the beginning of each test the procedure was as follows: 1) The specimen was installed in the test frame, which allowed for minor adjustments; 2) The column top and bottom

ends were clamped by system of steel plates and rollers and anchored to the two stiff steel beams; and 3) Vertical and horizontal loading systems were positioned; and 4) The data acquisition system continuously recorded readings from the load cells and the LVDTs.

Experimental Results

Cracking Patterns and Failure Modes

For all specimens, as shown in figs. 4(a-c), the crack initiation took place during the fifth cycle load at displacement equal two mm. Cracks started to appear on surface of flanged beam, and the directions of cracks were vertical. Additional wider cracks were developed with the increase of the applied load up to the failure.

For specimen (JC), as shown in fig. 4a, at eighth cycle, cracks started extended near to the joint core. At the sixteenth cycle, the displacement reached 40 mm and the ultimate load reached a value of 85 kN. While diagonal cracks were developed, near to the joint core and along depth of beam.

For specimen (JS1), as shown in fig. 4b, during the eighth cycle load at displacement equal 3mm the crack that appeared in depth of beams extended to the external lowest corner of the opening near the support. This was followed by appearing cracks at the opposite corner of the opening. As the load was increased, cracks also appeared at the other corners of the opening. More cracks appeared with increasing the load. The failure carried out at forty seventh cycle at displacement equal 24 mm due to cracks at opening of beam and ultimate load of 78.5KN

For specimen (JS2), as shown in fig. 4c, during the eighth cycle load at displacement equal 3 mm the crack, that appeared in depth of beams was at the external lowest corner of the opening near the support. This was followed by appearing cracks at the opposite corner of the opening. As the load was increased, cracks also appeared at the other corners of the opening. More cracks appeared with increasing the load. The failure carried out at forty seventh cycle at displacement equal 24 mm due to cracks at opening of beam and ultimate load of 80.6KN.

Load Deflection Response

The measured loads were plotted against the associated applied beam tip displacements at different levels of loading. Figures 5(a-c) present the experimental load-displacement hysteresis loops for all the specimens. It is clear that the behavior started elastic until certain point after these point the behavior change to plastic behavior.

For specimen (JC), as shown in figure 5a, at the first crack the applied load for the specimen at displacement 2.217 mm are 27.96 kN, the ultimate load for the specimen at displacement 30.7 mm are 85 kN and the load for the specimen at maximum recorded displacement level 41.43 mm are 91.4 KN.

For specimen (JS1), as shown in figure 5b, At the first crack the applied load for the specimen at displacement 2.393 mm are 28.94 KN, the ultimate load for the specimen at displacement 17.5 mm are 78.5 KN and the load for the specimen at maximum recorded displacement level 37.76 mm are 42.27 KN

For specimen (JS2), as shown in figure 5c, At the first crack the applied load for the specimen at displacement 2.3 mm are 33.91 KN, the ultimate load for the specimen at displacement 17.5 mm are 80.6 KN and the load for the specimen at maximum recorded displacement level 42,7 mm are 57.5 KN

The successful performance of beam-column joints under seismic action has to satisfy adequate stiffness degradation, energy dissipation, load-displacement envelope, and

ductility. The seismic response is complicated compared to static response. The differences among the performances of the joints cannot be assessed by direct comparisons of their load-displacement envelopes only. Accordingly, this section presents analyses of the test results to clarify the variations in stiffness, energy dissipation, and load-displacement envelope of the tested beam-column joints.

Stiffness Degradation

The loss of the stiffness through loading cycles is a good measure for the decay of the structural resistance to the seismic load. Stiffness loss increases at a varying rate with the increase in the peak displacement as indicated by the reductions in the slopes of the load displacement hysteresis loops. The stiffness of the specimen at a certain displacement level was taken as the average of the stiffness in both the positive and negative loading directions. The stiffness was calculated as the ratio of the peak load of the loop to the associated displacement. The degradation of the stiffness at ultimate load level was evaluated using the stiffness degradation rate *KDR* [3].

 $KDR = (Ko - K^{u}) Ko$

Where K_o and K_u are the flexural stiffness of the specimens at initial and at ultimate level, respectively. Table (3) presents the values of the stiffness degradation rates for all specimens. The stiffness degradation rates for the specimens JS1 and JS2 ranged from 76.6% to 78.33 %. We determined the stiffness at each displacement at cyclic load history for all tested the specimens as shown in fig. 6 demonstrated that the control specimen (JC) had initial stiffness values higher than all other specimens. This enhancement is attributed to the increase in the elastic modulus of concrete and the improvement of tension properties of concrete that was in turn resulted in reduction in the crack width. In addition, the stiffness degradation of all specimens with opening was lower than that without opening. The stiffness degradation of specimens (JS1 and JS2) was 11.6% and 5.3% lower than (JC), respectively.

Energy Dissipation

Under severe earthquakes, beam-column joints suffer from large inelastic deformations. The ability of dissipating the inelastic deformation energy is one of the significant factors for evaluating the performance of beam-column joints subjected to seismic action. The energy dissipated by the specimen during an individual cycle, E_i , is the area enclosed within the load-displacement hysteresis loop. Then the total energy dissipated was estimated as the sum of the areas of the loops throughout the test, which was estimated by numerical integration of the recorded load times the displacement. Figure 7 shows the dissipated energy during for all specimens. Many measures were proposed to compare the energy index" [4, 5]. In the current study, "the normalized energy index "IEN was adopted as reliable and comprehensive measure [6]. It has the advantage of including the effect of actual displacement, stiffness and energy for each cycle. As a result, this index is sensitive in assessing any variations in the seismic performance of beam-column joints.

The normalized energy index, I_{EN} , is expressed as follows: $IEN = Pu\underline{1}\Delta y i\sum m$ where E_i , is the energy dissipated during the ith cycle, Δ_y is the yield displacement of the specimen, P_u is the ultimate load, K_y is the stiffness corresponding to the yield displacement and Δ_i is the peak displacement of the ith cycle and K_i is the corresponding stiffness. The energy index is accumulated until cycle number "m" where the loop peak load dropped to 85% of its ultimate value. All specimens possessed lower energy

dissipation capacity than specimens (JC), which is because reinforcement at opening reduce the width and the propagation rate of cracks and increase the energy index values for specimens. It is clear from fig. 7 that the control specimen (JC) dissipated energy more than all other specimens (JS1 and JS2). Having an opening lowered the energy dissipation capacity of the beam column joint by up to 67%. In addition, changing the opening location from 170 mm to 340 mm has lowered the energy dissipation capacity of the beam column joint by up to 11.11%.

Load-Displacement Envelope

The measured loads were plotted against the associated applied beam tip displacements at different levels of loading. Figure 8 presents the experimental load-deflection envelope for all specimens. Having a beam opening lowered the ultimate load and corresponding displacement of beam column joint by up to 15% and 12.7%.

CONCLUSIONS

Three large-scale beam column joints were tested under cyclic loading and the following was concluded:

- Having an reinforced nearby beam web opening, lowered the energy dissipation capacity, the ultimate load and corresponding displacement of the beam column joint, and the stiffness degradation by up to 11,7%, 31%, 15%, and 12.7%, respectively.
- Changing the opening location from 170 mm to 340 mm, lowered the energy dissipation capacity, the ultimate load, corresponding displacement, and the stiffness degradation of the beam column joint by up to 6.3%, 2.7%, 13.75%, 8.66%, respectively

REFERENCES

[1] Ahmed, A., Fayyadh, M.M., Naganathan, S., ↑, Nasharuddin, K. "Reinforced concrete beams with web openings: A state of the art review." Engineering Structures 56 (2013) 2165–2174.

[2] Wang, G., Dai, J., Teng, J.G. "Shear strength model for RC beam–column joints under seismic loading." Engineering Structures 40 (2012) 350–360.

[3] Bahaa, T., "Behavior of HSC Columns under Axial Loads and Simulated Seismic Loads", Ph.D. Thesis, Structural Engineering Dept., Cairo University, July, 1997.

[4] Hwang, S.J., and Lee, H.J., "Analytical Model for Predicting Shear Strengths of Exterior Reinforced Concrete Beam-Column Joints for Seismic Resistance", ACI Structural Journal, Vol. 96, No. 5, Sep-Oct., 1999, pp. 846-857

[5] Ehsani, M. R, and Wight, J. K., "Confinement Steel Requirement for Connections in Ductile Frames", ASCE Structural Journal, Vol. 116, No. 3, Mar., 1990, pp. 751-767.

[6] ACI Committee 318, "Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete (ACI318-95) and Commentary (ACI 318R-95)", American Concrete Institute, Farmington Hills, Michigan, 1995.

Specimen	Cracki	ing level	Ultimate level		Maximum level (max. recorded displacement level)	
	P (KN)	Δ (mm)	P (KN)	Δ (mm)	P (KN)	Δ (mm)
J _c	27.96	2.217	85	30.7	67.52	41.43
JS1	28.9	2.393	78.5	17.5	42.27	37.76
JS2	33.9	2.303	80.6	16	57.53	42.73

Table (1) the major test results of the specimens.

Table (2) Stiffness degradation for all specimens

Specimen	Ko	KDR %
	kN/mm	
$\mathbf{J_c}$	16.78	84.16
JS1	14.84	76.62
JS2	16.24	78.33



Fig. 1 Test specimen prototype



Fig. 2 schematic diagram for Load setup; a) Elevation; b) Instrumentation.



Fig. 3 Details of Specimen; a) Jc, and b) JS1 and c) JS2.



Fig. 4 cracking pattern of Specimen; a) Jc and b) JS1.





Fig. 5 Load-Displacement for Specimen; a) Jc and b) JS1.



Fig. 6 Stiffness degradation for Specimen; a) Jc and b) JS1



Fig. 7 Energy Dissipation for Specimen a) Jc and b) JS1.



Fig. 8 Strength Envelope of Specimen; a) Jc and b) JS1.