



Benchmark Example No. 36

## Pushover Analysis: Performance Point Calculation by ATC-40 Procedure

## VERiFiCATION MANUAL

### BE36: Pushover Analysis: Performance Point Calculation by ATC-40 Procedure

VERiFiCATION MANUAL, Version 2018-7  
Software Version: SOFiSTiK 2018

Copyright © 2018 by SOFiSTiK AG, Oberschleissheim, Germany.

### SOFiSTiK AG

HQ Oberschleissheim  
Bruckmannring 38  
85764 Oberschleissheim  
Germany

T +49 (0)89 315878-0  
F +49 (0)89 315878-23

info@sofistik.com  
www.sofistik.com

Office Nuremberg  
Burgschmietstr. 40  
90419 Nuremberg  
Germany

T +49 (0)911 39901-0  
F +49(0)911 397904

This manual is protected by copyright laws. No part of it may be translated, copied or reproduced, in any form or by any means, without written permission from SOFiSTiK AG. SOFiSTiK reserves the right to modify or to release new editions of this manual.

The manual and the program have been thoroughly checked for errors. However, SOFiSTiK does not claim that either one is completely error free. Errors and omissions are corrected as soon as they are detected.

The user of the program is solely responsible for the applications. We strongly encourage the user to test the correctness of all calculations at least by random sampling.

### Front Cover

Project: New SOFiSTiK Office, Nuremberg | Contractor: WOLFF & MLLER, Stuttgart | Architecture: WABE-PLAN ARCHITEKTUR, Stuttgart |  
Structural Engineer: Boll und Partner. Beratende Ingenieure VBI, Stuttgart | MEP: GM Planen + Beraten, Griesheim | Lead Architect: Gerhard P.  
Wirth gpwirtharchitekten, Nuremberg | Visualisation: Armin Dariz, BiMOTiON GmbH

## Overview

**Element Type(s):**

**Analysis Type(s):**

**Procedure(s):**

**Topic(s):** EQKE

**Module(s):** SOFiLOAD

**Input file(s):** [pushover-pp-atc.dat](#)

## 1 Problem Description

The following example is intended to verify the ATC-40 procedure for the calculation of the performance point (illustrated schematically in Fig. 1), as implemented in SOFiSTiK. The elastic demand and capacity diagrams are assumed to be known.




Figure 1: Determination of the performance point  $PP (S_{dp}, S_{ap})$

## 2 Reference Solution

The reference solution is provided in [1], 8.3.3.3 "Performance Point Calculation by Capacity Spectrum Method - Procedure A".

Assuming that the elastic demand diagram (5% elastic response spectrum in ADRS format<sup>1</sup>) and the capacity diagram are known, it is possible to determine the performance point  $PP (S_{dp}, S_{ap})$  (Fig. 1). The procedure comprises of a series of trial calculations (trial performance points  $PP_t (S_{dp,t}, S_{ap,t})$ ), in which the equivalent *inelastic* single degree of freedom system (SDOF), represented by the capacity diagram, is transformed to an equivalent *elastic* SDOF system whose response in form of the performance point  $PP$  is then calculated from the reduced elastic response spectrum (demand diagram). The computation stops when the performance point  $PP$  is within a tolerance of a trial performance point  $PP_t$ . The ATC-40 Procedure A is a semi-analytical procedure since it involves graphical bilinear idealization of the capacity diagram. Detailed description of this step-by-step procedure can be found in [1].

## 3 Model and Results

In order to verify the analysis procedure for the determination of the performance point, a test case has been set up in such a way that it comprises of a SDOF with a unit mass and a non-linear spring element. It is obvious that for such an element the quantities governing the transformation from the original system

<sup>1</sup>ADRS = Spectral Acceleration  $S_a$  - Spectral Displacement  $S_d$  format

to the equivalent inelastic SDOF system must be equal to one, i.e.

$$\phi_{cnod} = 1 \quad ; \quad \Gamma = 1 \quad ; \quad m = 1 \quad , \quad (1)$$

where  $\phi_{cnod}$  is the eigenvector value at control node,  $\Gamma$  is the modal participation factor and  $m$  is the generalized modal mass. Writing now the equations which govern the conversion of the pushover curve to capacity diagram, we obtain [2]

$$S_d = \frac{u_{cnod}}{\phi_{cnod} \cdot \Gamma} = u_{cnod} \quad , \quad (2a)$$

$$S_a = \frac{V_b}{\Gamma^2 \cdot m} = V_b \quad , \quad (2b)$$

where  $V_b$  is the base shear and  $u_{cnod}$  is the control node displacement.

Since the original system is a SDOF system,  $V_b$  and  $u_{cnod}$  are nothing else but the force in spring  $P$  and the displacement of the unit mass  $u$ , respectively. It follows further that the force-displacement work law assigned to the spring element corresponds to the capacity diagram in ADRS format, with the force  $P$  and displacement  $u$  equal to  $S_a$  and  $S_d$ , respectively.

The capacity diagram used in the reference example is defined by four points, whose coordinates are listed in the Table 1. According to the analysis above, these points can be used to define the force-displacement work law  $P - u$  of the non-linear spring element (Fig.2).

Table 1: Model Properties [1]

Capacity Diagram		Elastic Demand
Point	$(S_d[mm], S_a[m/s^2])$	UBC 5% Elastic Response Spectrum.
A	( 48.77, 2.49)	Seismic Zone 4, ZEN = 0.40.
B	( 71.37, 3.03)	No near-fault effects.
C	( 96.01, 3.39)	Soil Profile:
D	(199.14, 3.73)	- Type $S_B$ : $C_A = 0.40, C_V = 0.40$ - Type $S_D$ : $C_A = 0.44, C_V = 0.64$




Figure 2: Force-displacement work law of the non-linear spring

The elastic demand is an UBC 5% damped elastic response spectrum, whose properties are summarized in Table 1. Two soil profile types are considered - soil profile type  $S_B$  and  $S_D$ .

The outcome of the analysis is shown in Figures 3 and 4.




Figure 3: Capacity-Demand-Diagram (Soil Profile Type  $S_B$ )




Figure 4: Capacity-Demand-Diagram (Soil Profile Type  $S_D$ )

The results of the SOFiSTiK calculation and the comparison with the reference solution are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Results

		$\xi_{eff}$	$SR_a$	$SR_v$	$S_{dy}$	$S_{ay}$	$S_{dp}$	$S_{ap}$
Soil type		[%]	[-]	[-]	[mm]	[m/s <sup>2</sup> ]	[mm]	[m/s <sup>2</sup> ]
$S_B$	SOF.	9.4	0.80	0.84	51.30	2.62	85.04	3.23
	Ref. [1]	9.2	0.80	0.85	53.34	2.65	83.36	3.24
	e  [%]	2.2	0.0	1.2	3.8	1.1	2.0	0.3
SOF.		14.6	0.65	0.73	59.86	3.06	149.34	3.57

Table 2: (continued)

		$\xi_{eff}$	$SR_a$	$SR_v$	$S_{dy}$	$S_{ay}$	$S_{dp}$	$S_{ap}$
Soil type		[%]	[–]	[–]	[mm]	[m/s <sup>2</sup> ]	[mm]	[m/s <sup>2</sup> ]
$S_D$	Ref. [1]	14.2	0.66	0.74	58.42	3.04	149.86	3.63
	e  [%]	2.8	1.5	1.4	2.5	0.7	0.3	1.7

$\xi_{eff}$  effective viscous damping of the equivalent linear SDOF system  
 $SR_a, SR_v$  spectral reduction factors in constant acceleration and constant velocity range of spectrum  
 $S_{dy}, S_{ay}$  spectral displacement and spectral acceleration at yielding point  
 $S_{dp}, S_{ap}$  spectral displacement and spectral acceleration at performance point

The results are in excellent agreement with the reference solution. Small differences can mainly be attributed to the approximate nature of the graphical procedure for the bilinear idealization of the capacity used in the reference solution, while the procedure implemented in SOFiLOAD is refrained from such approximation and computes the hysteretic energy directly from the area underneath the capacity curve and the coordinates of the performance point [2]. Apart from that, the performance point displacement tolerance used in SOFiLOAD is lower than the one used in the reference solution (1% compared to 5%).

## 4 Conclusion

Excellent agreement between the reference and the results computed by SOFiSTiK verifies that the procedure for the calculation of the performance point according to ATC-40 is adequately implemented.

## 5 Literature

- [1] ATC-40. *Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Concrete Buildings*. Applied Technology Council. Redwood City, CA, 1996.
- [2] *SOFiLOAD Manual: Loads and Load Functions*. Version 2018-0. SOFiSTiK AG. Oberschleißheim, Germany, 2017.