MONOTONIC AND CYCLIC PERFORMANCE OF STRUCTRUALLY INSULATED PANEL SHEAR WALLS

By Jared Bernard Jamison

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTERS OF SCIENCE IN CIVIL ENGINEERING

APPROVED:

Dr. J. Daniel Dolan, Co-Chairman
Dr. W. Samuel Easterling, Co-Chairman
Dr. Maurice White

December 10, 1997 Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Shear Walls, Monotonic, Cyclic, Structural Insulated Panels

MONOTONIC AND CYCLIC PERFORMANCE OF STRUCTRUALLY INSULATED PANEL SHEAR WALLS

Jared Bernard Jamison

(ABSTRACT)

The majority of residential construction and a significant portion of light commercial and industrial construction has been, and will continue to be light-framed timber construction. In recent years, innovations have surfaced to improve upon light-framed construction. Structurally insulated panels (SIPS) are gaining popularity due to their superior energy efficiency and ease of construction. Light-framed timber construction has proven to be trustworthy in high-wind and seismic regions due to its lightweight construction and numerous redundancies. Shear walls, along with floor and roof diaphragms, resist lateral loads in a timber structure. In the past, research has focused on the static racking performance of light-framed shear walls. More recently, research has been focused on the cyclic and dynamic performance of shear walls.

To the author's knowledge, no other research is reported in the literature on the cyclic performance of SIPS shear walls. It is important to understand and quantify the monotonic and cyclic response of shear walls. In this study, twenty-three full-scale shear walls were tested under monotonic loading and sequential phased displacement cyclic loading. Four different wall configurations were examined. Monotonic and cyclic performance of the shear walls and monotonic and cyclic testing procedures are compared. Response of SIPS shear walls is also compared to the response of light-framed shear walls based on capacity, stiffness, ductility, energy dissipation, damping characteristics, and overall behavior. Results of this study will provide useful information regarding the performance of SIPS shear walls and similar systems subjected to static, cyclic, and dynamic lateral loads.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, Jerry and Betty Jamison. Thank you for always being there and for teaching me the importance of hard work and determination.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are too many people to whom I owe thanks for helping me complete this project to name here individually. I am very appreciative of everyone who assisted me in my research, as well as my graduate career.

First of all, I would like to thank Dan Dolan and Samuel Easterling for the guidance and expertise provided to me during the course of this project. I would also like to express my gratitude to the sponsors of this project, the Center for Innovative Technology and Advanced Construction Systems International. Many research projects would not be possible without the support of sponsors.

I would also like to thank everyone who assisted me in the planning and testing phase of this study. First of all, I would like to thank Brett Farmer and Dennis Huffman at the Structures and Materials Research Laboratory for their assistance in building test frames and test specimens. I would also like to thank Bob Carner for his help with the test apparatus and test instrumentation. I would also like to thank Carlisle Price and everyone else at the Brooks Forest Products Center for their help in constructing and moving test specimens.

I would like to express my gratitude to the graduate students in Civil Engineering and Wood Products for their help in all aspects of this study. They have helped me complete this project and make graduate school the most rewarding and educational experience of my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Al	bstract	, ii
De	edication	, iii
A	cknowledgements	, iv
Li	st of Tables	, ix
Li	st of Figures	, xi
1.	Introduction	. 1
	1.1 Background	. 1
	1.2 Objectives	. 2
	1.3 Design Codes	. 2
	1.4 Applications	. 2
	1.5 Thesis Organization	. 3
	1.6 Limitations of Study	. 3
2.	Literature Review	. 5
	2.1 Introduction	. 5
	2.2 Background	. 5
	2.3 Shear Wall Testing	. 6
	2.3.1 Racking Performance	. 6
	2.3.2 Cyclic Performance	. 10
	2.3.3 Dynamic Performance	. 12
	2.4 Summary	. 14
3.	Test Descriptions and Procedures	. 15
	3.1 Introduction	. 15
	3.2 Test Specimens	. 15
	3.3 Materials	. 18
	3.4 Test Apparatus	. 19
	3.5 Instrumentation	. 20
	3.6 Monotonic Tests	. 22

	3.6.1 Monotonic Testing Procedures	. 22
	3.6.2 Definition of Properties	. 22
	3.6.2.1 Load-Deflection Parameters	. 22
	3.6.2.2 Equivalent Elastic-Plastic Curve Analysis	. 23
	3.7 Cyclic Tests	. 24
	3.7.1 Cyclic Testing Procedure	. 24
	3.7.2 Definition of Properties	. 26
	3.7.2.1 Test Parameters	. 26
	3.7.2.2 Equivalent Elastic-Plastic Curve Analysis	. 27
	3.7.2.3 Cyclic Energy Analysis	. 29
	3.8 Summary	. 31
4.	Monotonic Shear Wall Test Results	. 32
	4.1 Introduction	. 32
	4.2 Results	. 32
	4.2.1 Strength and Deflection	. 35
	4.2.2 Elastic Stiffness	. 38
	4.2.3 Ductility	. 40
	4.3 Wall Behavior	. 41
	4.3.1 Uplift of Wall Ends	. 41
	4.3.2 General Wall Behavior	. 42
	4.3.3 Failure Modes	. 43
	4.4 Conclusions	. 44
	4.5 Summary	. 45
5.	Cyclic Shear Wall Test Results	. 46
	5.1 Introduction	. 46
	5.2 Results	. 46
	5.2.1 Envelope Curve Data	. 46
	5.2.1.1 Strength and Deflection	. 47
	5.2.1.2 Flactic Stiffness	51

	5.2.1.3 Ductility	. 52
	5.2.2 Cyclic Data	. 53
	5.2.2.1 Cyclic Stiffness	. 53
	5.2.2.2 Hysteretic Energy	. 58
	5.2.2.3 Potential Energy	. 61
	5.2.2.4 Equivalent Viscous Damping Ratio	. 62
	5.3 Wall Behavior	. 65
	5.3.1 Uplift of Wall Ends	. 65
	5.3.2 Failure Modes	. 66
	5.4 Conclusions	. 67
	5.5 Summary	. 68
6.	Comparisons Between Monotonic and Cyclic Tests	. 69
	6.1 Introduction	. 69
	6.2 Test Parameters	. 69
	6.2.1 Capacity and Drift	. 69
	6.2.2 Elastic Stiffness	. 71
	6.2.3 Ductility	. 72
	6.3 Wall Behavior	. 75
	6.4 Conclusions	. 75
	6.5 Summary	. 76
7.	Comparisons With Light-Frame Construction	. 77
	7.1 Introduction	. 78
	7.2 Light-Framed Construction Data	. 79
	7.3 Test Parameters	. 81
	7.3.1 Capacity	. 82
	7.3.2 Elastic Stiffness	. 85
	7.3.3 Ductility	. 88
	7.3.4 Hysteretic Energy	. 89
	7.3.5 Equivalent Viscous Damping Ratio	. 90

	7.4	Wall Behavior	92
	7.5	Overall Comparisons	92
	7.6	Conclusions	93
	7.7	Summary	94
8.	Sun	nmary and Conclusions	95
	8.1	Summary and Conclusions.	95
	8.2	Future Research	96
Re	fere	nces	98
Ap	pen	dix A	103
Ap	pen	dix B	107
Ap	pen	dix C	152
Ap	pen	dix D	158
Ap	pen	dix E	174
Vi	ta		177

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 – Description of Four Wall Configurations Tested
Table 4.1 - Monotonic Values for Load Resistance, Drift, Elastic Stiffness, and
Ductility at Maximum, Failure, and Yield
Table 4.2 – Maximum Wall End Displacements Through Failure of Walls 41
Table 4.3 – Values of Set and Set Ratio after ASTM E564 Load Removal
Table 5.1 - Initial Cycle Values for Load Resistance, Drift, Elastic Stiffness, and
Ductility at Maximum, Failure, and Yield
Table 5.2 - Stabilized Cycle Values for Load Resistance, Drift, Elastic Stiffness,
and Ductility at Maximum, Failure, and Yield
Table 5.3 - Initial Values of Load Resistance, Cyclic Stiffness, Hysteretic Energy,
Potential Energy, and Equivalent Viscous Damping Ratio at Yield and
Max
Table 5.4 - Stabilized Values of Load Resistance, Cyclic Stiffness, Hysteretic
Energy, Potential Energy, and equivalent Viscous Damping Ratio at
Yield and Max56
Table 5.5 - Maximum Wall End Displacements Through Failure of Wall
Table 6.1 – Values of Strength and Deflection at Capacity for Initial and Stabilized
Cyclic and Monotonic Load Cases
Table 6.2 – Values of Elastic Stiffness for Initial and Stabilized Cyclic and
Monotonic Load Cases
Table 6.3 – Values of Ductility Ratio for Initial and Stabilized Cyclic and
Monotonic Load Cases
Table 6.4 – Values of Drift at Yield and Failure for Initial and Stabilized Cyclic and
Monotonic Load Cases
Table 7.1 – Monotonic and Cyclic Results for Peak Load and Initial Stiffness from
There is a second with a second secon

Table 7.2 – Monotonic and Cyclic Results For Peak Load, Elastic Stiffness,	
Ductility, Hysteretic and Potential Energies, and Equivalent Viscous	
Elastic Damping Ratio From Johnson (1997)	. 79
Table 7.3 – Monotonic Results of Peak Load, Elastic Stiffness, and Ductility for	
Walls With and Without Tie-down Anchors From Heine (1997)	. 80
Table 7.4 – Cyclic Results of Peak Load, Elastic Stiffness, Ductility, Hysteretic	
Energy, and Equivalent Viscous Damping Ratio for Initial and Stabiliz	zed
Cycles from Heine (1997)	. 81
Table 7.5 – Values of Capacity per Foot of Length of Wall for SIPS Compared with	ith
Perforated, Conventional, and Engineered Construction	. 83
Table 7.6 – Values of Elastic Stiffness per Foot of Length of Wall for SIPS	
Compared with Perforated, Conventional, and Engineered	
Construction	. 86
Table 7.6 – Values of Ductility Ratio of Wall for SIPS Compared with Perforated	Ι,
Conventional, and Engineered Construction.	. 88
Table 7.7 – Values of Ductility Ratio of Wall for SIPS Compared with Perforated	١,
Conventional, and Engineered Construction.	. 90
Table 7.8 – Values of Equivalent Viscous Damping Ratio of Wall for SIPS	
Compared with Perforated, Conventional, and Engineered	
Construction.	. 91

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1 – Boundary Conditions of Four Different Wall Configurations	. 17
Figure 3.2 – Top and Bottom Plate Connection to Test Frame Detail	. 20
Figure 3.3 – Location of 6 Channels of Data Collection.	. 21
Figure 3.4 – Equivalent Elastic Plastic Curve Analysis	. 23
Figure 3.5 – Displacement History for Cyclic Loading Procedure	. 25
Figure 3.6 - Initial and Stabilized Cycles from Displacement History	. 26
Figure 3.7 – Typical Hysteretic Response and Initial and Stabilized Envelope	
Curves	. 28
Figure 3.8 - Typical Hysteresis Loop	. 29
Figure 4.1 – Load-Drift Curves for Wall A.	. 33
Figure 4.2 – Load-Drift Curves for Wall B	. 34
Figure 4.3 – Load-Drift Curves for Wall C.	. 34
Figure 4.4 – Load-Drift Curves for Wall D	. 35
Figure 4.5 – Monotonic Capacities for the Four Different Wall Configurations	. 37
Figure 4.6 – Average values of Elastic Stiffness for Four Different Wall	
Configurations	. 39
Figure 4.7 – Average Values of Ductility for the Four Different Wall	
Configurations	40
Figure 5.1 – Average Initial and Stabilized Capacities for Walls	. 50
Figure 5.2 – Average Initial and Stabilized Elastic Stiffness Values for Walls	. 52
Figure 5.3 – Average Initial and Stabilized Ductility Ratios for Walls	. 53
Figure 5.4 – Average Initial and Stabilized Cyclic Stiffness Values at Yield and	
Maximum Load Resistance for Walls.	. 57
Figure 5.5 – Average Initial Cyclic Stiffness at Average Interstory Drifts for the	
Four Wall Configurations.	. 57
Figure 5.6 – Average Stabilized Cyclic Stiffness At Average Interstory Drifts for	
the Four Wall Configurations.	. 58

Figure 5.7 – Average Initial and Stabilized Hysteretic Energy Values at Yield and	
Maximum Load Resistance for Walls	9
Figure 5.8 – Average Initial Hysteretic Energies at Average Interstory Drift for the	
Four Wall Configurations. 60)
Figure 5.9 – Average Stabilized Hysteretic Energies at Average Interstory Drift for	
the Four Wall Configurations. 60)
Figure 5.10 – Average Initial and Stabilized Potential Energy Values at Yield and	
Maximum Load Resistance for Walls. 62	2
Figure 5.11 – Average Initial and Stabilized Equivalent Viscous Damping Ratios	
at Yield and Maximum Load Resistance for Walls	4
Figure 5.12 – Average Equivalent Viscous Damping Ratio at Average Interstory	
Drifts for the Four Wall Configurations. 64	4
Figure 5.13 – Average Stabilized Equivalent Viscous Damping Ratio At Average	
Interstory Drifts for the Four Wall Configurations	5
Figure 6.1 – Comparison of Capacities for Initial and Stabilized Cyclic and	
Monotonic Testing Procedures	1
Figure 6.2 - Comparison of Ductility for Initial and Stabilized Cyclic and Monotonia	c
Testing Procedures. 73	3
Figure 7.1 – Values of Capacity Compared for the Four SIPS Walls and Perforated	
Conventional, and Engineered Construction Values	4
Figure 7.2 – Values of Elastic Stiffness Compared for the Four SIPS Walls and	
Perforated, Conventional, and Engineered Construction Values 87	7
Figure 7.3 – Values of Ductility Ratio Compared for the Four SIPS Walls and	
Perforated, Conventional, and Engineered Construction Values89	9