



HOCHSCHULE REGENSBURG UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES

Project number: CZ/08/LLP-LdV/TOI/134005

Seminar: Assessment of existing structures

Codes and Recommendations Dimitris Diamantidis

Regensburg University of Applied Sciences

Barcelona June 14, 2012

Ice-stadium Bad Earthquake damage, Reichenhall, January 2006

Istanbul 1999



in the second distance of



Cracks in buildings



Structural failures experience



Requirements for a code on existing structures

- •Applicability: the code should be applicable to typical assessment cases.
- **Compatibility to codes for new structures**: the code should use the same philosophy as current codes for new structures.
- **Flexibility**: the code should be flexible to include additional information gained by inspection.
- Ease of use: the code should be understandable to engineers and easy to use in practice.

Use of codes for new structures?

- Under what conditions?
- Possible relaxations/safety measures?
- Required performance level?
- Uncovered aspects (inspections etc.)?

Regulatory tools for existing structures

- What topics are covered?
- What type of buildings are dealt with?
- Under which circumstances?
- Used methodologies (prescriptive or risk based)
- Specified performance level

Example: Building Code

- 1997 UBC: 2 pages
- 2000 IBC: 14 pages
- 2003 International Existing Building Code:
 (7 pages + 214 pages A)



67 pages +214 pages Annexes

• 2012 new version 290 pages

Why reassess an existing structure?

- Deviations from original design
- Doubts about safety
- Adverse inspection results
- Change of use
- Lifetime prolongation
- Inadequate serviceability

Typical questions

- What type of inspections are necessary?
- What type of measurements shall be taken?
- What analyses shall be performed?
- What is the future risk in using the structure?



How to find the Answers

- No classical code approach
- New information becomes available
- New techniques can be implemented
- New material technologies can be used
- New decision criteria under new uncertainties

Prenormative and regulatory tools

- ISO 13822, 2003
- ICC Existing Buildings Code, 2009
- SIA 462 (Switzerland), 1994
- Danish Technical Research Council
- ASCE Seismic Evaluation, 2003
- ACI 437R -03, 2003
- JCSS Recommendations, 2001

ISO 13822

- General Framework of Assessment
- Data for assessment
- Structural Analysis
- Verification (Limit State)
- Assessment based on satisfactory past performance
- Interventions
- Report
- Judgement and Decisions

New Information (Updating)

A) Proof loading

B) Variables (concrete strength)



A) Example: Proof Loading (Survival of a load)> Updating of resistance



B) Example: Concrete strength data





JCSS Recommendations for Existing Structures

- Preface
- Part 1: General (Guidelines, Codification)
- Part 2: Reliability Updating
- Part 3: Acceptability Criteria
- Part 4: Examples and case studies
- Annex: Reliability Analysis Principles

Safety Acceptance Criteria

- European Experience (limit state verification)
- New practice in the US (performance based design)
- Optimisation based on LQI
- Judgement

Methodology

Prescriptive rules (limit state verification by use of safety factors) Performance based design (global check)



Example Performance based design earthquake



PBD criteria

- $\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{E}} \cdot \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{NP}|\mathbf{E}} < \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{A}}$
- **P**_E :propability of event
- **P_{NP|E}**: conditional probability of no performance given event
- **P**_A :acceptable probability

PBD criteria (new structure)

- $\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{E}} \cdot \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{NP}|\mathbf{E}} < \mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{A}}$
- **P**_E : 2% in 50 years
- **P**_{NP|E}: 10%
- **P**_A : 4x10⁻⁵ per year

PBD criteria (old structure)

 $p_{E} \cdot p_{NP|E} < p_{A}$ $p_{E} :4\% \text{ in 50 years}$ $p_{NP|E}:25\%$ $p_{A} :2x10^{-4} \text{ per year } (5 \text{ times larger})$

Conclusions regarding targets

- A lower safety level compared to a new structure is acceptable
- Various criteria have been proposed
- Acceptance criteria depend on cost of safety, consequences of failure, desired residual lifetime
- An increase of acceptable p_F by a factor of 2 to 10 is recommended

