

RINTC project 2015-2017

- 1. Evaluate the failure rate (global collapse and usability-preventing damage) for codeconforming buildings in Italy.
- 2. Five structural typologies were considered: URM, RC, PRC, Steel, BI.
- 3. Design was for five sites and two EC8 soil classes (A and C).

Site	PGA (475) [g] (Soil A-type)	PGA (475) [g] (Soil C-type)
Milano	0.0495	0.0743
Napoli	0.1668	0.24338
L'Aquila	0.2607	0.3451



Sites and limit states



Masonry buildings (50+ structures)

















- 1. Two and three stories buildings.
- 2. Regular and irregular.
- 3. Design with simple building, equivalent frame (q=3.6), and non-linear static approaches.

Reinforced concrete buildings (50+ structures)





- 1. Three, six and nine stories.
- 2. Moment resisting frames and concrete-walls structures.
- 3. Designed with modal analysis (q=3.9).

Industrial precast reinforced concrete buildings (20+ structures)



Geometry	Lx [m]	Ly [m]	H [m]	Hc [m]
1	15	6	6	4.5
2	20	8	6	4.5
3	15	6	9	7.5
4	20	8	9	7.5

Steel industrial buildings (50+ structures)



	Snow	Wind	EQ	EQ
Sito	q_s [kN/m²]	q_v [kN/m²]	a _{g,SLV}	a _{g,SLD}
Milano	1.20	0.39	0.050	0.024
ĽAquila	1.31	0.61	0.261	0.104
Napoli	0.48	0.46	0.168	0.060

Geometry	Lx [m]	Ly [m]	H [m]	Hc [m]
1	20	6	6	4.5
2	20	8	6	4.5
3	30	6	9	6
4	30	8	9	6

Base-isolated buildings (20+ structures)









- 1. High-damping rubber bearings (HDRB).
- 2. HDRB and sliders (hybrid system).
- 3. Friction pendulums.



Failure criteria

Global collapse



Risk computed in the performance-based earthquake engineering framework



Hazard analysis at all sites (hazard curves stopped at IM with 100,000 years return period)

$$\lambda_{Sa(T)>sa} = \sum_{R_{min}}^{R_{max}} \sum_{M_{min}}^{M_{max}} P \left[Sa(T) > sa / m, r \right] \cdot v_{M=m,R=r}$$



Multi-stripe nonlinear dynamic analysis (recods selected according to the conditional spectrum approach)



Global collapse – soil type C results for three sites*



Usability preventing damage – soil type C results for three sites*



Part two - conclusions

- Despite the homogeneity of design seismic actions and engineering choices, the seismic structural reliability tends to decrease with the seismic hazard of the sites.
- 2. For the less hazardous sites, the failure rates are so low that only an upper bound to the actual failure rate can be provided.
- 3. On the other hand, the failure rates of buildings at the most hazardous of the sites are, in some cases, comparable to the annual rate of exceedance of the design ground motion intensity.
- 4. Modelling uncertainty and soil-structureinteraction have a relatively minor impact on the estimation of failure risk.
- 5. The global collapse failure rates of base-isolated structures are relatively high, those for usability-preventing damage are relatively low.



