# Performance of Retrofitted Singly Reinforced Concrete Walls Under Simulated Seismic Loading

Scott Minahan and Tobias Parsons Supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. G Charles Clifton







#### Acknowledgements

- Special thanks to Associate Professor Dr Charles Clifton and PhD candidate Adane Gebreyohaness
- Dr Richard Henry
- Sika New Zealand Ltd- Carbon Fibre Reinforced Polymer (CFRP) strips and epoxy
- Allied Concrete- concrete donation





### Background

- The Hope Gibbons Building
  - Built in 1928 before EQ codes were introduced in New Zealand
  - Architectural and historical significance
  - Wall elements identified as a critical structural deficiency





# Background

- Gebreyohaness tested and modelled the behaviour of representative wall elements:
  - Degradation of flexural strength at low level drift cycles
  - Poor ductility due to lack of sufficient longitudinal reinforcement
  - Insufficient confinement reinforcement causing severe damage at the toe of the specimens





# Objective

- To design, build and test two retrofit solutions that maintain the flexural strength of the wall specimens through drift cycles up to 5%
- The solutions were to be light weight and not significantly increase the flexural strength of the walls, suppressing additional demands on the building's foundations
- The solutions must be able to be implemented from the inside of the building
- The solutions must preserve the historic architectural appearance of the building



# Retrofit

- SOLUTION 1- Steel T-section and CFRP strips
  - Isolated steel T-section:
    - » Provides high ratio compression reinforcement
    - » Do not provide tension reinforcement
  - 4 CFRP strips, external tension reinforcement
    Un-bonded wall height:
    - » High strains,







#### Retrofit

- SOLUTION 2: CFRP strips
  - » 8 CFRP strips, external tension reinforcement Un-bonded wall height:
    - » Provides high ratio tension reinforcement
    - » Achieves high strains,

elongations and displacements







#### **Methodology and Testing**





**Test Setup** 







# Testing





230mm

specimens





Greater energy dissipation in the retrofitted specimens Highest degradation observed in 150mm specimens





230mm

specimens





Greater energy dissipation in the retrofitted specimens Highest degradation observed in 150mm specimens

150mm

specimens





#### Results



- All specimens maintained within 15% of peak strength to 5% drift
- Solution 1 specimens demonstrated a strength plateau
- Solution 2 specimens continued to gain strength before CFRP rupture
- CFRP rupture accompanied by sudden loss of strength





#### **RWS1 and RWS3**





# Conclusions

- Both solutions maintained within 15% of peak strengths to drifts of 5%
- Different levels of energy dissipation in solution 1 and solution 2, but both greater than un-retrofitted
- Greater protection from flexural and shear deformation was observed in Solution 1 specimens due to steel Tsections
- CFRP rupture lead a to sudden degradation in strength and point of rupture was difficult to predict.



# Significance

- Strength in it's simplicity- relatively low cost and easy to implement into the Hope Gibbons Building (one side of building)
- Does not need to change architectural appearance of the Hope Gibbons Building
- CFRP anchorage lengths were minimum recommendations yet performed well.
- Isolated steel T-section and CFRP detailing has never used in this way before.



#### Recommendations

- Further investigation:
  - How rupture occurs in un-bonded CFRP strips
  - The in-elastic response of steel T-sections
- FEM of the failure mechanism of the retrofitted walls





#### **Questions?**



