

Shear Behavior of RC Column-to-Steel Beam Joints

*Ho-Jun Lee¹⁾, Hong-Gun Park²⁾, Chang-Soo Kim³⁾ and Hyeon-Jong Hwang⁴⁾

^{1), 2)} *Department of Architecture and Architectural Engineering, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-744, Korea*

³⁾ *School of Civil Engineering, Shandong Jianzhu University, Shandong 250-101, China*

⁴⁾ *College of Civil Engineering, Hunan University, Hunan 410-082, China*

¹⁾ hojun1032@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

RC column-to-steel beam (RCS) joint is one of the most popular hybrid structural systems in building constructions. Among typical joint failure modes of panel shear and concrete bearing, the shear failure mode is investigated in this study. The joint shear behavior is generally described with the shear mechanism of inner and outer panels. However, test results reveal that the joint shear strength is also affected by concrete spalling in the bearing region. In this paper, the results of cyclic load testing for large-scale RCS joints are presented, where both yielding of joint shear and beam flexure took place. Flange plastic hinges triggered premature damage in the bearing region, causing degradation of the joint shear capacity. The test results are evaluated based on existing design models and a new insight into the shear behavior of RCS joints is highlighted.

1. INTRODUCTION

The reinforced concrete column-steel beam (RCS) moment resisting frame is one of the most popular hybrid structural systems in building constructions. A number of experimental studies were undertaken to investigate the structural characteristics of RCS joints. In the very early researches (Deierlein 1988; Sheikh 1988; Kanno 1993), the experimental programs were focused on evaluating inelastic behavior of beam-column joints in terms of connection strength and deformation. To induce the connection failure, strong steel beam sections or thick flanges were used in the test specimens. In later experiments (Bugeja et al. 2000; Parra-Montesinos et al. 2003; Liang and Parra-Montesinos 2004; Cheng and Chen 2005; Alizadeh et al. 2015), research objective was to verify structural safety of RCS moment frames under high seismicity. Thus, the connections were sufficiently reinforced so that yielding was concentrated at beam plastic hinges. On the other hand, the previous studies were seldom concerned with the interaction between joint and beam failures.

The current study investigated the shear failure mode of RCS joints accompanied by beam flexural yielding. Simple and common strengthening details such as face bearing plates (FBPs), transverse beams, and headed studs were considered as test parameters. Based on cyclic load testing for large-scale interior beam-column joints, failure modes and load-carrying capacity were investigated.

2. TEST PROGRAM

Joint specimens was 2/3 scale of a prototype joint with column cross-sectional dimensions of 800×800 (mm). For steel beams, build-up section of H-600×240×12×20 (mm) was utilized. The moment capacity ratio of column to beam was 1.6 (based on actual material strengths), so that the failure of column is restrained. In real constructions, it is desirable to secure greater strength of joint than that of beams, thus inducing the beam flexural yielding. However, in the current experiment, the joint shear capacity was designed to be comparable to the beam flexural capacity to investigate the interaction effects. The joint strengths were estimated based on existing design models (ASCE 1994; AIJ 2001; Kanno and Deierlein 2002).

Fig. 1 shows test parameters of joint specimens. The main parameters were the use of transverse beams and headed studs, and FBP thickness. The FBP thickness of 16 mm satisfies the requirement of ASCE guidelines (ASCE 1994). In specimens TF6 and TF16, 6 and 16 mm-thick FBPs were used, respectively. Both specimens were also strengthened with transverse beams. In specimen SF6, headed studs and 6 mm-thick FBPs were used. On the other hand, FBPs (thickness = 16 mm) were used in F16 without either of transverse beams and headed studs.




Fig. 1 Connection details of RCS joint specimens

In the ASCE guidelines, three layers of lateral ties are required in the region of $0.4d$ (where d = beam depth) above and below the beam flanges. This regulation is to protect the highly stressed bearing region and to support the strut-and-tie action in the compression field. In the present study, U-cross ties were used instead of conventional cross-ties to effectively confine the vulnerable bearing region. The legs of U-cross ties were designed to be valid in tensile force, satisfying the B-grade lap splice. Inside the joint with transverse beams, small ties were arranged in four corners. For continuity of corner ties and simple construction, studs were welded to the beam webs. The tie spacing inside the joint was 200 mm which was the same as the column tie spacing.

The vertical length of column between loading and reaction tips was 3,060 mm while the horizontal length between reactions was 6,760 mm (see Fig. 2). The loading of 6 cycles were applied in each drift ratio of 0.375%, 0.5%, and 0.75%. After 4 cycles in 1.0% drift ratio, 2 cycles were applied in each drift ratio of 1.5%, 2.0%, 3.0%, 4.0%, 5.0%, and 6.0%.




Fig. 2 Experimental set-up

3. TEST RESULTS

3.1 Failure modes

In the specimen TF6 with transverse beams and thin FBPs, joint diagonal cracking initiated at 0.75% drift ratio. The cracking developed separately in the regions divided by transverse beams. Beam flanges yielded at 1.5% drift ratio. At 2.0% drift ratio, the crushing of cover concrete initiated due to the vertical bearing. From this point, failure of outer panel was further facilitated with the rigid body rotation of inner panel. At 3.0% drift ratio, the diagonal crack width exceeded 1.0 mm and the cracks were propagated toward the column corner. The specimen exhibited the peak loads at 4.0 drift ratio when the joint panel was severely damaged (see Fig. 3(a)). The damage modes of TF16 with ordinary FBP thickness were similar to those of TF6. This indicates that the FBP thickness did not significantly affect the overall behavior of the current specimens since the transverse beams played a governing role in load transfer mechanism.

In SF6 and F16 without transverse beams, major diagonal cracking occurred across the middle of joint panel (see Fig. 3(c) and (d)). In SF6 with headed studs welded on beam flanges, diagonal cracks were observed at 1.0% drift ratio. At 2.0% drift ratio, cover spalling due to the vertical bearing occurred, and the joint diagonal crack width exceeded 1.0 mm. The concrete spalling near the beam flanges was the most serious in SF6, which was caused by the stud extraction when the beam flange is subjected to the tensile force.

In F16 only with the conventional FBP thickness, joint diagonal cracking initiated at 1.0% drift ratio. Local crushing of the cover concrete occurred at 1.5% drift ratio which was the earliest among the specimens. At 3.0% drift ratio, joint diagonal crack width became greater than 1.0 mm. When compared with other specimens, the failure of the outer joint panel was slowly developed. Instead, rigid-body rotation of the inner panel was conspicuous. This was because shear keys that mobilize the shear mechanism of the outer panel were absent.




Fig. 3 Damage modes at 4.0% drift ratio

3.2 Load-displacement relationships

Fig. 4 shows hysteresis responses of lateral load-story drift relationship. All specimens exhibited good deformation capacity of 4% (SF6) and 6% (other specimens). The influence of FBP thickness was not noticeable (see Fig. 4(a) and (b)). Joint specimens with transverse beams or headed studs exhibited enhanced strength by increasing shear contribution of the outer panel ($V_{test} = 955, 1,040, 955, \text{ and } 906$ kN for TF6, TF16, SF6, and F16, respectively). On the other hand, in F16 without any shear keys, deformation capacity was the greatest (see Fig. 4(d)).

From the viewpoint of energy dissipation characteristics, difference between the specimens was not remarkable. All specimens showed typical hysteresis behavior of joint shear failure (AIJ 2001). The energy dissipation under cyclic loading was caused by not only yielding of joint web plate, but also that of beam flanges. The pinching of the hysteresis curves indicates the effects of concrete bearing failure and joint diagonal cracking.

Joint deformation can be divided into shear deformation and rigid-body rotation of the steel beam caused by bearing failure. By using measured shear distortion (see A in Fig. 2) and beam rotation (see B in Fig. 2), contribution of each deformation to lateral

displacement was evaluated. At 2.0% drift ratio, joint deformation contributed to 46%~50% of total displacement, and the ratio increased to 66%~75% at 4.0% drift ratio. The result indicates that most damages were concentrated in the joint.




Fig. 4 Load-displacement relationships

4. STRENGTH EVALUATION

4.1 Existing design models

When compared with predicted load of beam flexural yielding ($V_{bf} = 963$ kN), the joint specimens exhibited 94%~108% of the prediction. Only the negative strength of TF16 satisfied the prediction. The results indicate that the beam plastic capacity, including the strain hardening effect, was not fully attained. Buckling did not occur in the beam and the joint region was more severely damaged.

The joint strengths of current specimens were evaluated based on existing design models (ASCE 1994; Kanno and Deierlein 2002). In ASCE guidelines, failure modes of RCS joints are divided into shear mechanism of the panel zone (see Fig. 5) and bearing mechanism of concrete above and below the steel beam. The joint capacity is chosen to be smaller of these strengths.

In the ASCE guidelines, strengths of joint specimens were all governed by the shear mechanism with safety margin against the bearing failure of 1.32. The test strengths exhibited 113%~129% of the predicted shear capacity, indicating that the guidelines are conservative. This is partly because the guidelines neglect the effects of transverse beams and headed studs. In all specimens, the predictions are exactly the same ($V_{ASCE} = 804$ kN).

Kanno and Deierlein (2002) divided the RCS joint into the inner element and outer element, and evaluated the joint capacity by summation of the two components. Failure mode of the inner element is either shear failure or bearing failure while failure mode of the outer element is either shear failure or bond failure. Therefore, K&D can define four combinations of joint failures.

As the ASCE guidelines, Kanno and Deierlein (K&D) predicted the shear failure modes for both inner and outer panels ($V_{K\&D} = 1,177, 1,177, 1,156,$ and 986 kN for TF6, TF16, SF6, and F16, respectively). The safety margin against the bearing failure in the inner panel was 1.12. Although the predicted failure modes were the same in both design models, the predictions were greater in K&D. The joint specimens did not reach the design strengths with 81%~92% of the predictions. In the case of specimens TF16 and F16 with ordinary FBP thickness, the strength ratio was 88% and 92%, respectively.




Fig. 5 Shear mechanism of RCS joint panel

4.2 Shear strength degradation

Since the ASCE model focused on the joint shear strength of selected specimens at 1.0% joint distortion, the predictions are generally known to be fairly conservative by roughly 20% when compared with the peak strength (Parra-Montesinos and Wight 2001; Kanno 2002). The current specimens outperformed the ASCE predictions by

