State of the Art: Seismic Behavior of Wood-Frame Residential Structures

Citation	Kirkham, W. J., Gupta, R., & Miller, T. H. (2014). State of the Art: Seismic Behavior of Wood-Frame Residential Structures. Journal of Structural Engineering, 140(4), 04013097. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861
DOI	10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861
Publisher	ASCE - American Society of Civil Engineers
Version	Accepted Manuscript
Terms of Use	http://cdss.library.oregonstate.edu/sa-termsofuse

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

State-of-the-Art: Seismic Behavior of Wood-Frame Residential Structures

William J. Kirkham[1], M.ASCE; Rakesh Gupta[2], M.ASCE; Thomas H. Miller[3], M.ASCE

Abstract

There are about 80 million single-family dwellings (SFD) in the United States, predominantly of wood-frame construction. Of these, 68% are owner occupied. A home is typically the largest single investment of a family, and is often not covered by earthquake insurance, even where it is available. Of all the houses in America, 50% were built before 1974, and 76% built before 1990. Most wood frame SFD (WFSFD) were built to prescriptive code provisions before seismic requirements were introduced. After the introduction of seismic design requirements, the importance of examining structures as an assembly of connected elements became more common. Much of the seismic design information on SFD construction is based on educated opinion or limited research. This review examines research that can be applied to WFSFD seismic analysis and the design and retrofit of existing WFSFD. The review is intended to cover most readily available papers published in major U.S. journals and at major conferences in the area of seismic modeling, testing and evaluation. We review the "state-of-the-art" of seismic experimentation and seismic evaluation, and provide our observations and recommendations for future research.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

CE Database subject headings: Shear walls; Diaphragms; Roofs; Wood Structures; Wood; Bibliographies; Seismic.

---

[1] Ph.D. Candidate, School of Civil and Construction Engineering and Dept. of Wood Science and Engineering, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331. Email: william.kirkham@oregonstate.edu

[2] Corresponding Author, Professor. Dept. of Wood Science and Engineering, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331. Email: rakesh.gupta@oregonstate.edu

[3] Associate Professor. School of Civil and Construction Engineering, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331. Email: thomas.miller@oregonstate.edu

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

INTRODUCTION

Most of the building structures in the United States and Canada are single-family, residential dwellings (Ni et al. 2010) . Like other structures, these buildings vary in size, configuration, age and condition. These factors affect their use as habitable dwellings and also their performance in natural disasters. Predecessors of the International Building Code (IBC) (International Code Council, 2011a) and the International Residential Code (IRC) (International Code Council, 2011b) have addressed seismic issues in past editions. However, according to the American Housing Survey of the US Census Bureau (2011), most single-family dwellings (SFD) were constructed before these seismic provisions were introduced during the 1970s and 1980s. More than half of the existing housing inventory was constructed before 1974. Seventy-five percent of the inventory was constructed before 1990. About 70% of the housing inventory are individual dwellings. People spend more than 1/3 of their lives in these structures, usually asleep and not prepared to react to a potential disaster. The seismic performance of wood-frame, single-family dwellings (WFSFD) is of vital importance to many of us.

The Association of Bay Area Governments commissioned a study (Perkins 1996) which indicates that reasonably expected major earthquakes of approximately magnitude 7 could result in over 150,000 uninhabitable housing units and 360,000 people made homeless as a result. The 1994 Northridge Earthquake Buildings Case Studies Project (Holmes et. al 1996) examined a two-story house with moderate damage and concluded, "hundreds of thousands of existing houses similar to this case study are located in areas that can expect…similar or greater levels of damage." During the 1994 Northridge Earthquake, a 6.7 magnitude event, 20 lives were lost in wood platform framed buildings according to

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Rainer and Karacabeyli (2000). Though the loss of life has been limited in WFSFD, Holmes et. al (1996) also concluded, "Life Safety Performance as a minimum code requirement does not meet the expectations of those investing in housing (e.g., owners and lenders)." Therefore, improvements in performance (reduction in damage), in addition to improved life-safety, were primary motivations for conducting this study.

Extensive literature reviews were conducted by Carney (1975) and Peterson (1983) on wood diaphragm testing and design and by van de Lindt (2004) on shear wall testing, modeling and reliability analysis. These collections will not be repeated here. This review will include more recent research in those areas and extend those reviews to cover whole building testing, finite element analysis of these structures, research on post-frame roof diaphragms and earthquake damage analysis and estimation methods. It is intended to cover most readily-available papers published in major U.S. journals and presented at major conferences. This review will also discuss the state-of-the-art in these areas, the general progress of research to date and offer an opinion on where additional research is needed.

This paper is limited to conventional construction materials and methods that are used within the United States and Canada. Conventional materials include sawn dimensional lumber, structural sheathing and metal plate connected wood trusses, which are assembled with nails, screws, adhesive and proprietary sheet metal connectors. Typical systems in these areas use modular construction with typical floor-to-floor heights generally of 2.4 m (8 ft.), walls made of studs 38x89 mm (nominal 2x4 in.) or 38x140 mm (nominal 2x6 in.), floors of joists 38 mm (nominal 2 in.) width, all with a spacing of 400 mm (16 in.) or 600 mm (24 in.) and a roof composed of plate-connected engineered trusses or rafters 38 mm

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

(nominal 2 in.) in width, spaced 600 mm (24 in.). There are methods of construction that are common in Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe and South America that are not frequently used in the United States and Canada. Without discussion of the relative merits of these systems, we have concentrated on these traditional methods used in the United States and Canada.

Unique systems have been and are being developed in the United States and Canada which involve special materials or component mechanics, such as visco-elastomeric damping materials in shear walls, installing plywood in the center of the shearwall plane (mid-ply walls), seismic dampers and similar non-conventional systems. Some of these systems are proposed, but not in regular use at present. Most of these systems remain experimental and are excluded from this review.

The present state of seismic research is presented in the following sections. The research is summarized in tabular form for brevity. The focus of the presentation is recent research, and the objectives in writing this paper are to:

1. Review the current state-of-the-art with respect to WFSFD design and research for conventional materials and methods of construction;

2. Locate research areas where potential for additional research or improvement exists;

3. Compare, contrast and synthesize conclusions between different areas of research;

4. Provide conclusions and recommendations for future research in the seismic behavior of

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

woodframe WFSFD.

PROGRESSION OF RESEARCH

Structural systems of various materials were developed using concepts of beams, columns, shear walls and diaphragms. Though most materials use these concepts, not all systems are truly composed of individual components. Systems such as concrete or masonry often have continuity through joints and are cast on-site instead of being assembled from pieces shipped to the construction site. Conversely, steel, wood, precast concrete and cold-formed steel are assembled from individual components fabricated in a factory and assembled at the construction site.

Although this general progression has been followed in all materials, wood construction has unique characteristics that do not affect the other construction materials. Concerns about the applicability of scaling factors to wood, a natural product with a cellular makeup, have led to efforts to test full-scale models. Though wood members can be trimmed to a scaled size, the fundamental fiber or cell size does not change, so scaling of some wood test models may not be valid (van de Lindt 2007). Wood is anisotropic due to this cellular composition, and thus it has different strength and stiffness properties in each orthogonal direction (Breyer et al. 2007). Wood horizontal diaphragms have been traditionally considered "flexible" rather than "rigid" (Breyer et al. 2007). The IBC (International Code Council, 2011a) defines a flexible horizontal diaphragm as one which has more than twice as much mid-span deflection as the supporting story drift, and also includes an assumption that non-cantilevered horizontal diaphragms with no more than 38 mm (1.5 in.) of concrete are flexible. An ASCE 7 (2010) provision indicates that ".,,wood structural panels are permitted to be idealized as flexible if any of the following conditions exist…". There is a growing list of peer-reviewed journal papers indicating that wood diaphragms often behave rigidly, rather than flexibly (Breyer et al. 2007). The authors are now seeing research that questions the assumption by which so many WFSFD have been designed (Christovasilis and Filiatrault, 2010, Philips et al. 1993, Skaggs and Martin 2004) . These distinctions lead to concerns that research into other materials and methods of construction or design may not fully apply to wood construction.

Quality control in the design and construction of WFSFD is sometimes difficult to achieve. Traditionally, WFSFD can be designed by unlicensed individuals unless the WFSFD is of significant size or complexity. If a structural engineer (SE) is involved, it is common for the SE to design only specific components (door or window headers, for example) and mark their design items on the architect's or designer's plans. This makes it hard for the construction team to know which component is engineered and which component is based on the prescriptive code. Field changes are occasionally made by the construction team without consultation with the designer. The relative ease with which wood members can be reshaped makes field changes more likely than with steel, for example. Basic elements (studs, plywood, OSB or oriented-strand-board) are assembled into walls, floors and roofs, and then stacked to assemble the structure. Thus, an SE may not be involved in the design of a specific WFSFD, and even if an SE is involved, the SE may not have designed the lateral force resisting system (LFRS) or the structure as a whole. Occasionally significant components are omitted, either by faulty design or construction. Falk and Itani (1988) and Graf and Seligson (2011) recommend increased quality control from design through final inspection, engineered design of all new WFSFD, engineering evaluation of older structures and certain mandated upgrades. A survey of architects and engineers in California indicated that significant omissions of key seismic resisting elements were

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

missing in more than 40% of the buildings surveyed (Schierle 1996).

As late as the 1970s, WFSFD were considered to be very safe in earthquakes (Li and Ellingwood 2007, Skaggs and Martin 2004). Traditional WFSFD built before the 1970s were often regular in shape, usually one story in height, with a roof structure that was continuous throughout the structure. Though these simple dwellings suffered some types of damage during earthquakes, there was little loss of life. Changes in architectural style resulted in WFSFD of more recent construction, that have multiple stories, segmented roofs at different levels, and few long runs of shear walls. These more recent dwellings suffered more damage, which became noticeable in the 1971 San Fernando earthquake (Moment Magnitude (MM) 6.6), the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake (MM 6.9), and very notably, the 1994 Northridge earthquake (MM 6.7) (Graf and Seligson 2011). Minimum requirements for seismic connections between components began in the 1980s versions of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) (Breyer et al., 2007).

Research into WFSFD began with individual elements and progressed to horizontal and vertical diaphragms and finally to assembled structures. The general progression of research is shown in Fig.1. (Delineations between types of design or analysis are approximate.)

The damage and loss of life in wood frame structures during the 1994 Northridge earthquake led to several major wood frame research projects. These “Megaprojects” are discussed individually in the following sections:

CUREE-Caltech Woodframe Project

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

The Consortium of Universities for Research in Earthquake Engineering (CUREE) worked with the California Institute of Technology (Caltech) to study earthquake hazard mitigation in woodframe structures (CUREE 2002). This project was announced in 1998 as a $12.1 million, three-year study, funded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services. This project became known as the CUREE-Caltech Wood-frame Project, and was charged with advancing the state-of-the-art in wood frame analysis and design for seismic hazards. Under this project approximately 30 reports were produced, comprised of five elements: testing and analysis; field investigation; proposed revisions to the building codes; economic analysis and education and outreach. This was a coordinated program involving many universities, researchers and research efforts. Summaries of the results of those relating to this paper appear in Tables 1, 5 and 8, where noted. Discussion of specific portions of the project will appear in the following sections: Shearwall Testing and Analysis, Wood Frame Dwelling Testing and Earthquake Damage Surveys.

The CUREE-Caltech project was among the first to dynamically test full-scale dwellings and to perform analysis of those results by different methods for comparison. Though it produced answers to many of the questions of the day, it also provided direction for further research in areas that it could not answer within the project timeframe (Cobeen 2004a&b). It further developed and standardized dynamic testing methods intended to better evaluate wood structure performance.

NEESWood Project

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013; posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

The NEESWood project (Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation - Wood) began in 2005 and was funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) with a $1.2 million grant, as a multi-year project to study how wood-frame structures respond to seismic forces. NEESWood continued the work begun by the CUREE-Caltech project by performing and analyzing a series of experiments based on the CUREE prototype buildings (van de Lindt 2006a&b). (These prototype buildings were designed to provide a basis for experimentation and analysis that all the CUREE-Caltech researchers could use.) NEESWood experiments included shake table testing of two-story townhouses and culminated with shake table testing of a 6-story wood building for a 7.5 magnitude earthquake. Papers based on these tests appear in Table 5 and are discussed under Wood Frame Dwelling Testing below. The performance of the 6-story building has indicated that large residential buildings can be successfully designed to withstand expected seismic activity in any region. Additional analyses of the test results are being performed and further papers will be appearing, so the results of this project are not yet complete. Though much larger than typical houses, the experiments with this structure help to evaluate some of the wood structural systems and elements that are also used in houses.

SHEARWALL TESTING AND ANALYSIS

Conventional shear walls are constructed of 38x89 mm (nominal 2x4 in.) or 38x140 mm (nominal 2x6 in.) studs with a structural sheathing consisting of plywood, oriented-strand board (OSB), Portland cement plaster or other approved material. Research efforts on the static and dynamic properties of conventional structural panel shearwalls are numerous. Table 1 provides a chronological list with a focus on the most recent ten years of research (for brevity). Table 1 also includes some notable previous studies that investigate brittle

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

finishes or non-wood materials. The most common non-wood materials are gypsum wallboard panels or Portland cement plaster on lath or expanded metal mesh. The reader is also referred to an excellent review of shear wall research by van de Lindt (2004).

Early studies tended to be static loading tests based on ASTM E-72 (American Society for Testing and Materials 2005) and more recently ASTM E-564 (American Society for Testing and Materials 2006). The studies that followed 1990 often used cyclic loading protocols proposed by the Structural Engineers Association of Southern California (SEAOSC) and the CUREE protocols developed for the CUREE-Caltech Woodframe Project. Table 2 describes the characteristics of seismic loading protocols known as ASTM E-546 (American Society for Testing and Materials 2006), ISO-16670 (ISO 1998), sequential phased displacement (SPD) (SEA 1996, Dinehart and Shenton Ill 1998), FCC-Forintek (Karacabeyli and Ceccotti 1991) and CUREE-CalTech/CUREE-CalTech Near Fault (Krawinkler et al. 2001). Figures 2a through 2f referenced in Table 2 show the shape of each of these loading protocols.

Cyclic testing has shown that concerns about the nonlinear performance of brittle or non-ductile materials (mainly gypsum and cement plaster) are warranted (Falk and Itani 1987, Hart et al. 2008, Seaders 2004&2009a). Various studies indicate permissible elastic drift limits for brittle materials, but limited research has been conducted to determine whether these materials can be kept within elastic limits for WFSFD design, or whether more attention to fastener or connection ductility may lead to improved methods of construction with brittle materials or in walls with openings (Merrick 1999, Uang and Gatto 2003, Rosowsky and Kim 2004a&b). Further, use of ductile framing or elastic adhesives to support brittle materials may allow more effective use of their strength without pushing these materials into the non-linear range.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

HORIZONTAL WOOD DIAPHRAGM RESEARCH

Research on residential diaphragms can be divided into two groups; floor (flat) diaphragms and roof diaphragms that usually have a slope or pitch (which may also be flat). Horizontal diaphragm studies are listed chronologically with the specific research focus in Table 3. Design practice has not typically differentiated between flat and pitched diaphragms (Breyer et al. 2007). Many excellent studies have been published on horizontal floor or roof diaphragms, however, there is very limited research on pitched roof diaphragms (Johnson and Burrows 1956, Tissel and Rose 1993) or roof diaphragms that include gypsum board ceilings (Walker and Gonano 1984, Alsmarker 1991). Significant numbers of these studies involve analytical models, rather than laboratory experiments.

Wood horizontal diaphragms have been traditionally considered “flexible” rather than “rigid” (ASCE 2010) . Studies by Phillips (1990); Phillips et al. (1993) and Tarabia & Itani (1997) indicate that the assumption of a flexible diaphragm may be unconservative.

Thirty papers were found investigating different aspects of gypsum shear wall design, but only three considering the effect or contribution of the gypsum ceiling in the horizontal diaphragm design. The IBC (2011a) Table 2306.3(3) contains 17 lines of gypsum board, gypsum lath and plaster or Portland cement plaster shear wall design values, using only staples, but no diaphragm design values for gypsum products used on a ceiling. Though shear capacities of walls having both plywood and gypsum cannot be summed, the IBC permits the designer to use twice the lesser shear capacity (usually the gypsum), which treats the shear wall as if gypsum existed on both sides.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

The restriction on combining gypsum and wood panel sheathing strengths is based on the understanding that the stiffer material will provide most of the lateral resistance. This is true with respect to wood shear walls. However, with roofs that are framed with dimension lumber or metal-plate-connected trusses (MPCT), the top and bottom truss chords (or joists and rafters) are distinct and separate components, so it is unclear if some additional capacity or efficiency may be obtained through a combination of the ceiling and roof sheathing. Table 3 shows two papers on pitched roof diaphragms (Johnson and Burrows 1956; Tissell and Rose 1993) and only one paper on MPCT (Tissell and Rose 1993). Also, the greatest pitch tested was 4:12, which is less than in many current roofs. The majority of the wood roof diaphragm research involves roof pitches of 3:12 or less, often with plywood overlaid on T&G roof decking several inches thick and trusses of 2x, 3x or 4x members bolted at joints. The roof diaphragm stiffness or strength for differing pitches of light 2x MPC truss configurations typically used today (6:12 or higher pitches) remain untested or unreported. There may be significant opportunities to improve the performance of MPCT with gypsum ceiling and structural panel diaphragms.

FINITE ELEMENT MODELING

Static testing of wood dwellings occurred primarily before 1990, with tests performed by Yokel et al. (1973), Yancy and Somes (1973), Tuomi and McCutcheon (1978) and Boughton and Reardon (1982). Dynamic testing of full-scale models of residential buildings was rare until the early 1990's, due to several problems. The expense of constructing a complete dwelling is great. There is also a limited number of shake tables capable of testing a full-sized model. As an alternative method of analysis, researchers

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

have used finite element (FE) models to test their analytical understanding of material and connection behavior, with model complexity ranging from simple static, linear-elastic models to complex 3-D nonlinear models analyzed with seismic excitation data. These analyses are listed chronologically including the specific focus in Table 4.

Yancey and Somes (1973) indicate that research is needed on torsional behavior, post-ultimate load behavior and simplified, practical analytical models. They stated that "the available studies are either too complicated and time consuming or too simplified that their accuracy is questionable."

Recent research has included structural reliability or fragility analysis combined with probabilistic seismic hazard models to determine damage risk (Li et al. 2010, Kim and Rosowsky 2005a&b, Li 2005, Li and Ellingwood 2007). These methods require thousands of model evaluations to produce reasonable results. Typical studies use a few tested structures or components and then perform the required analysis calibrated to the physical tests.

Much effort has been spent developing various models without reaching a consensus on the methods and elements to be used. For example, there is a general consensus in the mechanics of modeling concrete and steel with various connections and fixity. Commonly used software does not require that the designer implement an element from scratch. With WFSFD, there is no consensus on the methods used to model connections, shear walls or diaphragms. Many studies have been performed, independently of the others, and there are dozens of finite element model approaches for wood structures. However, it is difficult to compare the accuracy of models of structures using different elements and techniques.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Research comparing these elements may assist in determining which would be most useful to the practitioner.

WOOD FRAME DWELLING TESTING

A limited number of full-scale experiments has been performed on WFSFD, as summarized chronologically in Table 5. In static tests, loads or displacements are applied to a dwelling at specific locations to test deflections of diaphragms or shearwalls (Yokel et al. 1973, Yancy and Somes 1973, Tuomi and McCutcheon 1978 and Boughton and Reardon 1982).. Dynamic tests can be performed using computer-controlled hydraulic rams attached to the structure or by securing the structure on shake tables capable of generating earthquake level accelerations. The first full-scale shake table test was reported by Fischer et al. (2000), with most of the subsequent studies being performed on ever larger shake tables.

A small residential structure was designed and tested on a shake table at the University of California at San Diego (UCSD) as a portion of the CUREE-Woodframe Project (Fischer et al., 2000). The structure was heavily instrumented and many configurations for wall construction were examined. One objective for the project was to obtain as much data as possible on component and system deformations for potential study by other researchers.

Recent tests from the NEESWood project by Christovasilis et al. (2006); van de Lindt et al. (2006a,b); Pang et al. (2007) and Filiatrault et al. (2007), that continues some of the work of the CUREE-Woodframe project, investigated the performance of a complex townhouse on two coupled shake tables.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

The most recent project focuses on prediction, testing and evaluation of a 6-story wood-frame building tested on a shake table in Japan. A key component of the investigation was to verify the applicability of performance-based design (PBD) for wood structures. See van de Lindt et al. (2010, 2011, 2012); Pang et al. (2010), Pei and van de Lindt (2011).

Pavaere et al. (2003) performed experiments on a full-scale L shaped house using static and dynamic loading applied to the structure with a hydraulic ram. Displacements were measured at key locations and uplift forces were measured at locations where anchor bolts would typically be installed into a foundation.

In some cases, a specific structure was tested, but it was either a small, research sized building or an individual, unique dwelling. Researchers used the testing protocol that they believed most important or most practical at the time. These tests cannot be easily compared due to these issues. From these limited tests, there has not been enough consistent, comparable data to permit evaluation of the significance of building geometric factors on the behavior of the structure. Recent projects have both performed experimental research and performed analysis, so have resulted in models and techniques that are correlated. In historic cases where researchers performed well-documented testing, it was often difficult for subsequent researchers, not involved in the specific experiment series, to produce accurate models without making many assumptions. Recently, we have seen projects such as the NEESWood Project, which involve many researchers simultaneously working on different aspects of the research. This helped improve communication among the researchers and is a favorable trend that should result in more useful results.

Early research on shear walls, diaphragms and other components (straps, tie-downs, etc.)

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

was primarily interested in determining yielding behavior, rather than system deformation or deformation-based damage. Whole structure testing on shake tables is beginning to yield useful information on deformation and system effects. Full-scale testing has not, however, resulted in substantially more practical information on the design of individual WFSFD components, such as shear walls or diaphragms. Testing of WFSFD has been of limited use thus far in design in part because there are many variations in geometry and materials that have prevented development of accurate, general purpose design methods.

POST-FRAME BUILDINGS

Unique to post-frame design is the roof diaphragm shear reduction factor. No such reduction is used in WFSFD, thus a discussion of post-frame research is merited and a brief discussion is included here. Post-frame buildings use the moment connection capacities of timber connections and the flexural capacities of columns with a fixed base to provide the lateral force resisting system for these structures Gebremedhin et al. (1986). These buildings can be heavy timber resort lodges or SFD, but may also include many agricultural buildings. Typical construction of an agricultural post-frame building consists of corrugated metal siding and roofing over a timber framework.

Much of the agricultural post-frame design research consists of analytical studies rather than experimental programs (see chronological list with conclusions in Table 7). Generally, post-frame buildings have pitched roofs rather than flat, horizontal diaphragms. In Gebremedhin et al. (1986), an equation is used to calculate a reduction in the stiffness of horizontal diaphragms for pitches other than strictly horizontal. This is unique to post-frame construction and is not a part of typical design practice in WFSFD. Post-frame

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013; posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

testing programs specifically examining roof diaphragm stiffness are summarized with their principal conclusions, chronologically in Table 6. Experiments generally used heavy trusses (due to the size of the structures) with corrugated sheet metal roofs, so it's not clear that these experiments are relevant to WFSFD.

EARTHQUAKE DAMAGE SURVEYS

Surveys of damage from major earthquakes in the United States include those shown in Table 8. Table 8 shows the survey reports or papers chronologically with seismic event and conclusions. Typical surveys review either substantial amounts of data at a limited level or a few specific cases in depth. Many studies (10 out of 13 in the table) are based on structures damaged in California. State laws that protect both the owners' privacy and the copyrights of the architect and engineer also limit California building surveys. Signed releases must be obtained from all these parties to gain access to the plans. So, in many cases, these are not available. Further, when an organization is charged with conducting the study, the work is generally targeted towards the final report and its conclusions, rather than concentrating on extensive details that would be useful to subsequent researchers. For example, plans were rare in the early studies, but more frequent in later studies. Elevations showing the sizes of openings in interior and exterior walls are non-existent.

The 1971 San Fernando earthquake study contains valuable information on the state of seismic design as well as the results of field surveys of damaged buildings by Morgan and Bockemohle (1973); Pinkham (1973) and Steinbrugge and Schader (1973). These studies provide the examination and opinions of the researchers, but lack plans and details sufficient for further analysis. Many of their recommendations have been implemented in

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

the appropriate building codes.

The 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake was the largest event in California since the 1906 San Francisco earthquake. In a survey of damage, EQE Engineering (1989) noted that: " . . . [wood-frame] buildings have generally performed well in past earthquakes. . . ," except, "older (especially pre-1940s) homes, because these lack positive connections to their foundations or have raised floors supported by relatively weak cripple walls," and "some of the more irregularly shaped newer homes that lack clear load paths due to complex geometry or are built without enough wall area to resist the seismic forces." Additional serious problems included multi-story apartment buildings with garages on the first floor. The survey data did not include plans or details for the WFSFD examined.

The Applied Technology Council (ATC) (Poland and Scawthorn, 2000) produced a study of 500 buildings located within 0.3 km (1000 ft.) of the 1994 Northridge Earthquake fault. Though this study is quite detailed, plans were excluded in the distributed electronic database. Therefore, the database is not useful for analyzing the design of those structures. It can only be used on a gross scale to compare building damage by type or location, for example.

The Earthquake Engineering Research Institute (EERI) published a report detailing damage to different types of structures and facilities by Holmes and Somers (1996). It details some of the types of damage seen in various WFSFD during the 1994 Northridge Earthquake. Holmes et al. (1996) include evaluation of two WFSFD damaged in the Northridge earthquake. The first report describes damage to a two- story WFSFD constructed in 1958 and located within 0.8 km (1/2 mile) of a strong motion seismograph. Damage to this

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

structure was non-structural and the WFSFD was considered suitable for immediate occupancy. Notably, the cost of repairing the damage to the structure was actually so great that it was considered a total loss. The second WFSFD was a single-story home built in 1911 and seismically retrofitted three months before the earthquake. This WFSFD experienced minimal damage in comparison to WFSFD of similar construction in the immediate neighborhood. The report included plans and details, but no elevations or schedules that would show window and door opening sizes, therefore further analysis would depend on significant assumptions about the construction.

In a general survey, Crandell and Kochkin (2003) reviewed the history of wood frame WFSFD construction and related current design concerns to engineering practice. Engineering design uses the seismic provisions of the IBC (International Code Council, 2011a). The IRC (International Code Council, 2011b) is a prescriptive code, and is based on traditional methods of construction. Though related to engineering and construction practice, this code is not necessarily easily linked to engineering principles and calculations. The authors identified the following differences between engineering design practice and conventional prescriptive construction methods:

1. Lateral Force Resistance (Shear walls and Diaphragms), including perforated shear walls and rigid diaphragm behavior;

2. Connection Design, discussing cross-grain tension and toe-nailing;

3. System Effects, where loads are redistributed in the system, increasing its redundancy;

4. Safety Margins and Performance Objectives, addressing the absence of a commonly

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

understood level of performance for WFSFDs;

5. Design Loads: differences between engineering loads and prescriptive design standards. Subsequent work on the IRC (International Code Council, 2011b) has attempted to address these issues (Crandell 2007, Crandell and Martin 2009).

Schierle (2003) provides engineering surveys of damaged residential and commercial buildings affected by the Northridge earthquake. Floor plans and elevations including categorization of the damage were included, along with the engineer's written evaluation. Since there were no elevations included, some assumptions need to be made regarding exact heights of windows and doors if this study is used for further analysis.

Damage surveys have shown the types of damage that have been problematic in WFSFD. However, without significantly more detail in the surveys, it will be difficult to use these structures for further analysis. It's important to include more information in the future because these structures are of typical construction and have gone through major natural events, characteristics not necessarily true of WFSFD constructed for laboratory research. Further refinement in methods and data collection will await the next major U.S. event.

Authors of some damage surveys suggest that correctly following building codes and engineered plans would mitigate or reduce seismic damage. It is certainly true that omitting one or two fasteners on each diaphragm will reduce its capacity. Further, the building codes that were once booklets that contractors could easily carry have become large tomes that are difficult to interpret. Within the damage surveys shown in Table 8, most indicate a number of design problems with the structures (example: cripple wall bracing: Falk and

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Soltis 1988; EQE Engineering 1989; NAHB 1994) but also one or two quality control items on each structure (example: no anchor bolts: Falk and Soltis 1988). Part of the problem is that without the original plans for the WFSFD, it's difficult to know if a hold-down or anchor bolt is missing because it's not on the plans, or because it was omitted during construction. So, differentiating between design errors and construction defects has been difficult for these surveys. Nevertheless, the quality of WFSFD construction is generally not as good as commercial construction and more quality control would help.

Damage surveys also frequently conclude that seismic strengthening efforts are effective. Much attention is usually paid to ensuring that new construction adheres to the current code, whereas upgrading older construction is considered "elective." (Holmes et al. 1996).

DAMAGE ESTIMATION METHODS

There are a number of different damage estimation methods and strategies that have been developed by different researchers and organizations. Table 9 summarizes these methods and their specific purposes. These strategies are largely based on the accepted traditional basis for design, life-safety. Buildings constructed to the code requirements in the United States are intended, "…to minimize the hazard to life and improve occupancy capability of essential facitities after a design level event or occurance." (International Code Council, 2011a) Under these strategies, a building will most likely suffer significant damage to the structural system and need to be significantly repaired or replaced due to the economics of repair.

In recent seismic events, some wood-framed WFSFD which were judged habitable were

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

nevertheless considered total losses by the insurance companies (Holmes et al 1996). The damage was non-structural, limited to cracking of walls and finishes. The cost of repairing building finishes was too great relative to the value of the WFSFD. None of the existing damage estimation methods can accurately predict the level or cost of damage because the methods are directed towards evaluating and obtaining the life-safety standard.

Lucksiri et al. (2012) adapt the basic philosophy of rapid visual screening to the unique characteristics of WFSFD, emphasizing plan geometry, and validate the method by a comparison of 480 representative models.

Generally, damage estimation methods seem to be well developed at present. These methods were mainly developed after the Northridge earthquake. Additional opportunities for research in this area will require further comparison to concurrent experiments or await the next major event in the U.S. Since this is most likely to be in California, amendments to state laws allowing access to building plans by researchers would be very useful. Additionally, involving an analysis component by researchers whose primary focus is in wood construction would help to expose information gaps and omissions. Similar to the experiences of dynamic structural testing, it would be useful to perform detailed or FEA analysis simultaneously with damage investigation, so that useful comparisons with existing design methods can be obtained.

RESEARCH CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Knowledge needs to be created to ensure that WFSFD can be designed and built to resist seismic loads to the level expected by building owners, civil authorities and society expectations. By producing research that improves accurate modeling of different WFSFD configurations, designers will understand what components are truly required and what level of performance can be expected. For example, designers currently design roof structures based on data developed in the 1950s, when the cost of lumber was relatively low due to sale of inexpensive Federal timber in the National Forests and old growth lumber was readily available. Presently, the decision on whether these configurations are cost effective remains with the architect, engineer and the owner, not with the researcher. Consequently, cost of construction is rarely a reported factor in WFSFD research.

Improvements in the following areas are crucial to improving seismic performance of WFSFD. Research has not addressed many areas in seismic behavior of WFSFD.

<u>Innovative Methods.</u> Conventional construction methods were developed to be cost-effective and easily installed. For example, the use of short or 'pony' walls to span vertically from a short concrete foundation to the first level of a house built on sloping terrain. But these methods have been difficult to analyze and research has shown some of them to be ineffective. Thus, there is a significant need to develop new and innovative construction materials, connections, fasteners and techniques to overcome the limitations of wood, such as increasing system ductility.

<u>Brittle Finishes.</u> Present research has concluded that brittle materials are of limited value in providing seismic resistance. There has been limited research to improve seismic performance of brittle materials, such as gypsum wallboard, including the effects of openings, nor to improve ductility in the construction of shear walls designed with brittle materials. Brittle finishes may have stiffness and strength that can be exploited if ductile methods of connection can be developed. Use of elastomeric sheets, resilient channels or

ductile fasteners could be routes to achieve this. Examination of using all of the gypsum walls in an SFD may result in elastic (non-damaging) performance. There is also substantial opportunity to study the behavior of MPCT (metal-plate-connected trusses) in WFSFD lateral force resisting systems (LFRS), as wells as combinations of gypsum board ceilings with structural wood sheathing on the MPCT and on flat roofs.

Horizontal/Pitched Diaphragms. Abundant data exist on rectangular horizontal or low pitch gable roofs particularly with a heavy timber supporting framework. Different configurations (L, T and U shapes, for example) need to be tested, as do roofs of differing pitches and hip roofs. It needs to be determined whether a shear stiffness or strength reduction factor similar to post-frame design is applicable to WFSFD. OSB and structural insulated panels (SIP) roofs should also be tested to verify whether existing data are applicable to their design. Assumptions of flexible diaphragm behavior continue to persist in the building codes in spite of research indicating that the assumption is not valid for all structures; therefore additional research is needed to show that the assessment of diaphragm flexibility needs to be made in each case by the designer. If pitch results in a stiffness reduction factor, some rigid roofs could be flexible or semi-rigid or rigid at different pitches. Research should address how a stiffness reduction factor, if any, affects design of SFD horizontal diaphragms.

Finite Element Methods. Researchers have contributed much effort in finite element modeling of wood structures, but have not yet developed consensus methods and elements that should be used. PBD may result in better designs for buildings than the present code based methods. However, to date, different researchers have used different methods of analysis and design. As a result, it is difficult to compare the accuracy of models of structures using PBD, different FE elements and techniques. Research comparing these

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

methods may assist in determining which would be most useful to the practitioner. For many practitioners, PBD methods will need to be codified to result in widespread use. But at present, few of these methods have been adopted or provided in the commercially available finite element software, limiting use by design practitioners. Synthesizing the existing research and disseminating this research to the designers is the greatest challenge here.

Whole Structure Testing. Historic tests of WFSFD have been of limited use because it has been so difficult to completely quantify the structure so as to allow an independent researcher to refine their analysis methods. To date, there have not been enough consistent, comparable data to permit evaluation of the significance of building geometric factors on the behavior of the structure. Whole house testing had primarily measured damage to the WFSFD components, rather than determining whether a limiting behavior has been reached by the WFSFD as a whole. Therefore, such testing is not easily correlated with the testing of individual components. Research on shear walls, diaphragms and other components is usually based on yielding performance as a method of determining whether life-safety goals are being met. Such tests generally do not measure the amount or type of damage at various loading intervals. Substantial recent progress in testing large structures has been made. Understanding and integrating the measured results into present analysis methods remains the major challenge.

Damage Estimation Methods: Damage estimation methods seem to be well developed at present, and are mainly products after the Northridge earthquake. Additional opportunities for research in this area will require further comparison to concurrent experiments (such as application to a shake table structure before testing) or await the next significant

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

earthquake in the U.S.

Damage Surveys. More complete reports of damaged WFSFD are needed. Open access to California plans and documents on WFSFD for research would assist this effort greatly. (California is not the only state affected by earthquakes, but earthquakes are common and the laws restricting release of the original plans affect researcher's access to data that might improve design.) There is a challenge to define the required document sufficiently to permit detailed analysis while protecting the designer from the risk of losing their intellectual property within the plans. It's important to include more information in the future because these structures are of typical construction and have gone through major natural events, characteristics not necessarily true of WFSFD constructed for laboratory research. Further refinement in methods of documenting the existing structure and communicating that data to future researchers is needed so that the present or future PBD models can be applied to real structures with real damage. It would be helpful to test some structures or portions of structures using the different testing protocols developed to date, to determine which protocol(s) best simulate(s) actual seismic stresses, deflection and damage. Application of FEA to sample damaged structures before demolition, would allow more accurate modeling to be performed.

Collaboration. Research continues along paths that seem most likely to improve design and evaluation of WFSFD. The following trends seem very positive: full-scale shake table tests of large structures; comparison of tested structure performance with results from finite element design programs, both for strength and prediction of deformation of components; and multi-researcher projects where test results have been analyzed, and finite element models produced by researchers either from the same institution or operating under the same grant, thus ensuring access to sufficient structural detail to permit accurate modeling.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

There is a strong need to develop a better understanding of the effects of WDSFD components, attachment, LFRS and how loads are distributed to these elements within the structure. A consensus needs to be developed on performance objectives for WDSFD with respect to damage and repair costs, including new design techniques which balance life-safety with the effects of damage to building finish materials. Finite element analyses of seismically damaged WFSFD would lead to a better understanding of component performance and allow evaluation of seismic testing protocols.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

REFERENCES

Alsmarker, T. P. (1991). "Structural diaphragms in wood-framed buildings." Proceedings of the International Timber Engineering Conference (London), Vol. 4, 4.354–4.361.

American Society for Testing and Materials (2005). "Standard test methods of conducting strength tests of panels for building construction,." Annual Book of Standards, 4.11(ASTM E72-98).

American Society for Testing and Materials (2006). "Standard test methods of conducting strength tests of panels for building construction." Annual Book of Standards, 4.11(E564-95).

Anderson, G. and Bundy, D. (1990). "Stiffness of screw-fastened, metal-clad, timber-framed roof diaphragms with openings in the sheeting." Transactions of the ASAE, 33(1), 266 – 273.

ASCE (2003). Seismic Evaluation of Existing Buildings (ASCE/SEI 31-03). American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA.

ASCE (2006). ASCE/SEI 41 Seismic Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings. American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA.

ASCE/SEI 7-10 (2010). Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures. American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Baxter, P. (2004). "Comparison of screening, evaluation, rehabilitation and design provisions for wood-framed structures." M.S. thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.

Baxter, P., Miller, T. H., and Gupta, R. (2007). "Seismic screening, evaluation, rehabilitation, and design provisions for wood-framed structures." Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction, 12(4), 200–209.

Bender, D., Skaggs, T., and Woeste, F. (1991). "Rigid roof design for post-frame buildings." Applied Engineering in Agriculture, 7(6), 755 – 760.

Berg, G. V. (1973). The Great Alaska Earthquake of 1964, Vol. 6. National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC.

Black, G., Davidson, R. A., Pei, S. and van de Lindt, J., (2010) "Empirical loss analysis to support definition of seismic performance objectives for woodframe buildings." Structural Safety, 32(3), 209 – 219.

Blasetti, A., Hoffman, R., and Dinehart, D. (2008). "Simplified hysteretic finite-element model for wood and viscoelastic polymer connections for the dynamic analysis of shear walls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 134(1), 77 – 86.

Bohnhoff, D. (1992a). "Estimating frame stiffness and eave loads for diaphragm analysis of postframe buildings." Transactions of the ASAE, 35(3), 1043 – 1054.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Bohnhoff, D. (1992b). "Expanding diaphragm analysis for post-frame buildings." Applied Engineering in Agriculture, 8(4), 509 – 517.

Bohnhoff, D., Anderson, G., and Boor, P. (1991). "Influence of insulation on the behavior of steel-clad wood frame diaphragms." Applied Engineering in Agriculture, 7(6), 748 – 754.

Bott, J. W. (2005). "Horizontal stiffness of wood diaphragms." M.S. thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (April), Blacksburg, VA.

Boughton, G. N. and Reardon, G. F. (1982). Simulated Wind Tests on a House: Part 1-Description, James Cook Cyclone Structural Testing Station, Townsville, Australia.

Breyer, D. E., Fridley, K. J., Cobeen, K. E. and Pollock, D. G., (2007). Design of Wood Structures ASD. McGraw-Hill, 6th edition.

Carney, J. M. (1971). "Plywood folded plates-design and details." Report No. 121, American Plywood Association, Tacoma, WA.

Carney, J. M. (1975). "Bibliography on wood and plywood diaphragms." Journal of the Structural Division ASCE, 101(11), 2423 – 2436.

Carradine, D., Woeste, F., Dolan, J., and Loferski, J. (2000). "Demonstration of wind load design for timber frame structures using diaphragm action." Transactions of the ASAE,

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

43(3), 729 –734.

Carradine, D., Woeste, F., Dolan, J., and Loferski, J. (2004a). “Utilizing diaphragm action for wind load design of timber frame and structural insulated panel buildings.” Forest Products Journal, 54(5), 73 – 80.

Carradine, D. M., Dolan, J. D., and Bott, J. W. (2004b). “Effect of load and construction on cyclic stiffness of wood diaphragms.” Proceedings of the 8th World Conference on Timber Engineering.

Christovasilis, I., Filiatrault, A., and Wanitkorkul., A. (2006). “Seismic test of a full-scale two-story light-frame wood building: NEESWood benchmark test.” Report No. NW01, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO.

Christovasilis, I. P. (2011). “Numerical and experimental investigations of the seismic response of light-frame wood structures.” Ph.D. thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY.

Christovasilis, I. P. and Filiatrault, A. (2010). “A two-dimensional numerical model for the seismic collapse assessment of light-frame wood structures.” 2010 Structures Congress.

Cobeen, K., Russell, J. and Dolan, J. D. (2004a) “Recommendations for Earthquake Resistance in the Design and Construction of Woodframe Buildings, Part I - Recommendations.” CUREE, Richmond, CA.

Cobeen, K.; Russell, J. & Dolan, J. D. (2004b) “Recommendations for Earthquake

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Resistance in the Design and Construction of Woodframe Buildings, Part II -Topical Discussions." CUREE, Richmond, CA.

Collins, M., Kasal, B., Paevere, P., and Foliente, G. C. (2005). "Three-dimensional model of light frame wood buildings. I: Model description." Journal of Structural Engineering, 676–83.

Comerio, M. C. (1997). "Housing repair and reconstruction after Loma Prieta." National Information Service for Earthquake Engineering, Berkeley, CA.

Countryman, D. (1952). "Lateral tests on plywood sheathed diaphragms." Douglas Fir Plywood Association (DFPA), Tacoma, WA.

Countryman, D. and Colbenson, P. (1954). "1954 horizontal plywood diaphragm tests." Douglas Fir Plywood Association (DFPA), Tacoma, WA.

Crandall, J. H. (**2007).** "The Story Behind IRC Wall Bracing Provisions." Wood Design Focus, 17, 3-14.

Crandell, J. H. and Kochkin, V. (2003). "Common engineering issues in conventional construction." Wood Design Focus, 13(3).

Crandell, J. H. & Martin, Z. (2009) "The Story Behind the 2009 IRC Wall Bracing Provisions (Part 2: New Wind Bracing Requirements)", Wood Design Focus, 19, 3-10.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

CUREE (2002). "The CUREE-Caltech Woodframe Project Newsletter." CUREe-Caltech Woodframe Project, Division of Structural Engineering, University of California, San Diego, No. 7, San Diego, CA.

Dean, P. K. and Shenton III, H. W. (2005). "Experimental investigation of the effect of vertical load on the capacity of wood shear walls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 131(7), 1104–1113.

Dinehart, D. W. and Shenton III, H. W. (1998). "Comparison of static and dynamic response of timber shear walls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 124(6), 686–695.

Dolan, J. D., Carradine, D. M., Bott, J. W., and Easterling, W. S. (2003). "Design methodology of diaphragms." Report No. W-27, CUREE, Richmond, CA.

EQE Engineering (1989). The October 17, 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake. EQE Engineering, San Francisco, CA (October).

Falk, R., Cheung, C., and Itani, R. (1984). "Role of diaphragms in the mitigation of natural hazards in low-rise wood-framed buildings." Proceedings of the CIB-W73 International Conference on Natural Hazards Mitigation, New Delhi, India, 1–13 (October).

Falk, R., Moody, R., and Wolfe, R. (1989). "State-of-the-art structural modeling of light frame assemblies and buildings." In-grade testing of structural lumber: Proceedings 47363, Forest Products Research Society, 99–103.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Falk, R. and Soltis, L. (1988). "Seismic behavior of low-rise wood-framed buildings." The Shock and Vibration Digest, 20(12), 1–5.

Falk, R. H. and Itani, R. Y. (1987). "Dynamic characteristics of wood and gypsum diaphragms." Journal of Structural Engineering, 113, 1357–1370.

Falk, R. H. and Itani, R. Y. (1988). "Prediction of diaphragm displacement." Proceedings of the International Conference on Timber Engineering (Seattle), R. Y. Itani, ed., Vol. 1, Forest Products Research Society, Madison, Wisconsin, 766–773 (September).

Falk, R. H. and Itani, R. Y. (1989). "Finite element modeling of wood diaphragms." Journal of Structural Engineering, 115(3), 543–559.

FEMA (2002). FEMA 154 Rapid Visual Screening of Buildings for Seismic Hazards. Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2nd edition (March), Washington, DC.

Filiatrault, A., Christovasilis, I. P., and Wanitkorkul, A. (2008). "Experimental seismic investigation of a full-scale woodframe building." Proceedings of the 2008 Structures Congress.

Filiatrault, A., Christovasilis, I. P., Wanitkorkul, A., and van de Lindt, J. W. (2010). "Experimental seismic response of a full-scale light-frame wood building.." Journal of Structural Engineering, 136(3), 246 – 254.

Filiatrault, A., Wanitkorkul, A., Christovasilis, I. P., van de Lindt, J., Symans, M.,

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Rosowsky, D., and Davidson, R. (2007). “Experimental seismic performance evaluation of a full-scale woodframe building.” ASCE, <http://link.aip.org/link/?ASC/249/5/1>.

Filiatrault, A., Fischer, D., Folz, B., and Uang, C.-M. (2002). “Seismic testing of two-story woodframe house: Influence of wall finish materials.” Journal of Structural Engineering, 128(10), 1337–1345.

Fischer, D., Filiatrault, A., Folz, B., Uang, C.-M., and Seible, F. (2000). “Shake table tests of a two-story woodframe house.” Report No. SSRP-2000/15, Division of Structural Engineering, University of California, San Diego.

Foliente, G. (1994). “Hysteresis characterization and modeling of timber joints and structures.” Proceedings of the Pacific Timber Engineering Conference, Gold Coast, Australia, 26–35.

Foliente, G. C. (1995). “Hysteresis modeling of wood joints and structural systems.” J. of Structural Engineering, 121(6), 1013–1022.

Foliente, G. C., Paevere, P., Kasal, B., and Collins, M. (2000). “Whole structure testing and analysis of a light-frame wood building, Phase 1 – Test house details and preliminary results. *CSIRO,* 2000, Clayton, South VIC, Australia.

Foliente, G. C., Paevere, P., and Ma, F. (1998). “Parameter identification and seismic response analysis of timber structures.” World Conference on Timber Engineering.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Folz, B. and Filiatrault, A. (2001). "Cyclic analysis of wood shear walls." J. of Structural Engineering, 127(4), 433–441.

Gatto, K. and Uang, C.-M. (2002). Cyclic Response of Wood Frame Shearwalls; Loading Protocol and rate of loading effects. Number W-13. CUREE-Caltech Woodframe Project, Richmond, CA.

Gatto, K. and Uang, C.-M. (2003). "Effects of loading protocol on the cyclic response of woodframe shearwalls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 129(10), 1384–1393.

Gebremedhin, K. G., Bahler, E. L., and Humphreys, S. R. (1986). "Modified approach to post-frame design using diaphragm theory." Transactions of the ASAE, 29(5), 1364 – 1372.

Gebremedhin, K., Bartsch, J., and Jorgensen, M. (1992). "Predicting roof diaphragm and endwall stiffness from full scale test results of a metal-clad, post-frame building." Transactions of the ASAE, 35(3), 977 – 985.

Gebremedhin, K., Jagdale, S., and Gupta, R. (1989). "Expert system for optimizing computer aided design of post frame buildings." Applied Engineering in Agriculture, 5(3), 447 – 452.

Gebremedhin, K. G. (1988). "Computerized system for diaphragm design of metal-clad post frame buildings." Transactions of the ASAE, 31(1), 215 – 220.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Gebremedhin, K. G. and Bartsch, J. A. (1988). "Structural characteristics of foam-insulated diaphragm panels." Canadian Agricultural Engineering, 30(2), 299 – 306.

Gebremedhin, K. G. and Irish, W. W. (1984). "Experimental investigation of diaphragm behavior for farm buildings." Paper - American Society of Agricultural Engineers, St Joseph, MI.

Gebremedhin, K. G. and Price, J. (1999). "Tests of post-frame building diaphragm." Journal of Structural Engineering, 125(10), 1170–1178.

Gebremedhin, K. G. and Woeste, F. E. (1986). "Diaphragm design with knee brace slip for post-frame buildings." Transactions of the ASAE, 29(2), 538 – 542.

Goda, K., Atkinson, G. and Hong, H. (2011) "Seismic loss estimation of wood-frame houses in south-western British Columbia." Structural Safety, 33(2), 123 - 135.

Goodall, S. I. (2010). "Optimizing the performance of gypsum wall board in wood frame shear walls." M.S. thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.

Goodall, S. I. and Gupta, R. (2011). "Improving the performance of gypsum wallboard in wood frame shear walls." Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, 25(4), 287–298.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Graf, W. and Seligson, H. (2011). “Earthquake Damage to Wood-Framed Buildings in the ShakeOut Scenario.” Earthquake Spectra, *27*(2), 351-373

Hart, G. C., Hortacsu, A., Simsir, C., and Jain, A. (2008). “Performance of drywall shear walls: UC Irvine Tests.” 2008 Structures Conference, 314(41016), 135–135.

He, M., Lam, F., and Foschi, R. O. (2001). “Modeling three-dimensional timber light-frame buildings.” Journal of Structural Engineering, 127(8), 901–913.

Hoagland, R. C. and Bundy, D. S. (1983). “Strength and stiffness of screw-fastened roof panels for pole buildings.” Transactions of the ASAE, 26(2), 512 – 515.

Holmes, W. T., Ferner, H. M., Longstreth, M., and Lizundia, B. (1996). 1994 Northridge Earthquake Building Case Studies Project Proposition 122: Product 3.2. California Seismic Safety Commission, Sacramento, CA.

Holmes, W. T. and Somers, P. (1996). “Northridge earthquake of January 17, 1994 reconnaissance report.” Earthquake Spectra, 11(C).

International Code Council (2011a). International Building Code and Commentary. International Code Council,Whittier, CA.

International Code Council (2011b). International Residential Code. International Code Council, Whittier, CA.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

ISO (1998). "Timber structures -- joints made with mechanical fasteners -- quasi-static reversed-cyclic test method." ISO 16670, Standards Council of Canada, Ottawa, Canada.

Johnson, J. W. (1955). "Lateral test on a 12- by 60-foot plywood-sheathed roof diaphragm." Report No. No. T-11, Oregon Forest Products Laboratory, Corvallis, OR.

Johnson, J. W. (1971). "Lateral test of a 20- by 60-foot roof section sheathed with plywood overlaid on decking." Report No. T-29, Oregon School of Forestry, Corvallis, OR.

Johnson, J. W. and Burrows, C. H. (1956). "Lateral test on full-scale gable roofs with lumber sheating." Report No. T-19, Oregon Forest Products Laboratory.

Johnston, A. R., Dean, P. K., Shenton III, H. W. (2006). "Effects of vertical load and hold-down anchors on the cyclic response of wood framed shear walls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 132(9), 1426–1434.

Kamiya, F. (1988). "Nonlinear earthquake response analysis on sheathed wood walls by a computer actuator online system." Proceedings of the International Timber Engineering Conference.

Kang, J., Xiong, H., and Lu, X. (2009). "Cyclic tests of full-scale light-framed wood construction." 3rd International Conference on Advances in Experimental Structural Engineering. Poster.

Karacabeyli, E. and Ceccotti, A. (1996). "Test results on the lateral resistance of nailed

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

shear walls." Proceedings of the International Wood Engineering Conference, 2, 179-186.

Karacabeyli, E., Dolan, J. D., Ceccotti, A., Ni, C., Dinehart, D. W., and Shenton III, H. W. (1999b). "Comparison of static and dynamic response of timber shear walls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 125(7), 796–799.

Kasal, B., Collins, M., Foliente, G., and Paevere, P. (1999). "A hybrid deterministic and stochastic approach to inelastic modeling and analysis of light-frame buildings." 1st International RILEM Symposium on Timber Engineering, RILEM Publications S.A.R.L., 61–70 (September).

Kasal, B. and Leichti, R. J. (1992). "Nonlinear finite-element model for light-frame stud walls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 118, 3122–335.

Kasal, B., Leichti, R. J., and Itani, R. Y. (1994). "Nonlinear finite element model of complete light frame wood structures." Journal of Structural Engineering, 120, 100–119.

Kataoka, Y. and Asano, K. (1988). "The lateral behavior of frame structures stiffened by shear diaphragms." Proceedings of the International Timber Engineering Conference.

Kenji, M., Yoshimitsu, S., and Yutaka, S. (2002). "Study on structural analysis method and simplified structural design method of three-dimensional wall frame constructions with openings." Timber Construction in the New Millenium; The Proceedings of the 7th World Conference on Timber Engineering, Wan Mahmood Wan Ab. Ma jid et. al., ed., Vol. 3,

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

168–175 (August).

Kharrazi, M. H. K. (2001). "Vibration characteristics of single-family woodframe buildings." M.S. thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.

Kim, J. H. (2003). "Performance-based seismic design of light-frame shearwalls." Ph.D. thesis, Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.

Kim, J. H. and Rosowsky, D. V. (2005a). "Fragility analysis for performance-based seismic design of engineered wood shearwalls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 131(11), 1764 – 1773.

Kim, J. H. and Rosowsky, D. V. (2005b). "Incorporating nonstructural finish effects and construction quality in a performance-based framework for wood shearwall design." Structural Engineering and Mechanics, 21(1), 83 – 100.

King, A. and Deam, B. (1998). "Evaluation of the structural performance of timber framed bracing panels under earthquake attack." Proceedings of the 5th World Conference on Timber Engineering, 18–25.

Kochkin, V. G. and Crandall, J. H. (2004). "Survey of historic buildings predating the 1811-1812 new madrid earthquakes and magnitude estimation based on structural fragility." Seismological Research Letters, 75(1), 22–35.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Kohara, K. and Miyazawa, K. (1998). "Full-scale shaking table test of two story wooden dwelling houses." Proceedings of the 5th World Conference on Timber Engineering, Montreux, Switzerland, 2, 548–555.

Krawinkler, H., Parisi, F., Ibarra, L., Ayoub, A., and Medina, R. (2001). Development of a testing protocol for wood frame structures. CUREE-Caltech Woodframe Project, Richmond, CA.

Lam, F., Foschi, R. O., Prion, H. G. L., and Ventura, C. E. (2002). "Modeling the dynamic response of three-dimensional timber light-frame buildings." Timber Construction in the New Millenium; The Proceedings of the 7th World Conference on Timber Engineering, Wan Mahmood Wan Ab. Ma jid et. al., ed., 1, 55–59 (August).

Langlois, J. D., Gupta, R., and Miller, T. H. (2004). "Effects of reference displacement and damage accumulation in wood shear walls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 130, 470–479.

Lebeda, D. J., Gupta, R., Rosowsky, D. V., and Dolan, J. D. (2005). "Effect of hold-down misplacement on strength and stiffness of wood shear walls." Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction, 10, 79–87.

Leichti, R., Anderson, E., Sutt, E., and Rosowsky, D. (2006). "Sheathing nail bending yield strength-role in shear wall performances." WCTE 2006 - 9th World Conference on Timber Engineering - Portland, OR, USA - August 6-10, 2006.

Li, Y. (2005). “Fragility methodology for performance-based engineering of wood-frame residential construction.” Ph.D. thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA.

Li, Y. and Ellingwood, B. R. (2007) "Reliability of woodframe residential construction subjected to earthquakes." Structural Safety, 29(4), 294 – 307.

Li, Y., Yin, Y., Ellingwood, B. R. and Bulleit, W. M. (2010) "Uniform hazard versus uniform risk bases for performance-based earthquake engineering of light-frame wood construction." Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics, 39(11), 1199-1217.

Lucksiri, K., Miller, T. H., Gupta, R., Pei, S., and van de Lindt, J. W. (2012). “Effect of plan configuration on seismic performance of single-story wood-frame dwellings.” Natural Hazards Review, 13(1), 24–33.

Mahaney, J. A. and Kehoe, B. E. (1988). “A rational design procedure for multistory buildings with wood diaphragms.” Proceedings of the International Timber Engineering Conference.

Malesza, M., Miedzialowski, C., and Malesza, J. (2004). “Experimental and analytical deformations of the wood-framed building under lateral load.” Proceedings of the 8th World Conference on Timber Engineering, Lahti, Finland, 463–468.

Masaki, A. and Kenji, M. (2002). “Study on dynamic torsional proerties and seismic design methods of wooden houses with eccentricity in wall layout for elastic and ultimate limit states.” Timber Construction in the New Millenium; The Proceedings of the 7th World

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Conference on Timber Engineering, Wan Mahmood Wan Ab. Ma jid et. al., ed., 2, 354–361 (August).

McFadden, V. and Bundy, D. (1991). "Comparison of the cantilever and two-bay simple-beam diaphragm testing methods." Transactions of the ASAE, 34(2), 603 – 608.

McMullin, K. and Merrick, D. (2008). "Gypsum wall damage investigation," Proceedings of the ASCE Structures Congress, 314(41016), 134–134.

McMullin, K. M. and Merrick, D. S. (2002). "Seismic performance of gypsum walls – experimental test program." CUREE-Caltech Woodframe Project Rep. W-12, Consortium of Universities for Research of Earthquake Engineering, Richmond, Calif.

McMullin, K. M. and Merrick, D. S. (2007). "Seismic damage thresholds for gypsum wallboard partition walls." Journal of Architectural Engineering, 13(1), 22–29.

Merrick, D. S. (1999). "Cyclic comparison testing of light wood framed shear walls." San Jose State University, San Jose, CA.

Mi, H., Ni, C., Chui, Y. H., and Karacabeyli, E. (2004). "Lateral resistance of tall unblocked shear walls." Proceedings of the 8th World Conference on Timber Engineering, 141–146.

Mi, H., Ni, C., Chui, Y. H., and Karacabeyli, E. (2006). "Racking performance of tall unblocked shear walls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 132(1), 145–152.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Min, J. H. and Li, Z. (2012). "lateral performance of light wood diaphragms with different structural configurations under monotonic load." Advanced Materials Research, 368-373, 349–352.

Miyazawa, K. and Kohara, K. (1998). "Evaluation of seismic performance and new seismic design method of wooden dwelling house." Proceedings of the 5th World Conference on Timber Engineering.

Morgan, D. F. and Bockemohle, L. (1973). San Fernando, California Earthquake of February 9, 1971, Vol. 1. US Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Chapter History and Philosophy of California Earthquake Codes and Elements of Lateral Force Design, 23–36, Washington, DC.

Moss, P. J. and Carr, A. J. (1988). "Earthquake response of low-rise timber buildings." Proceedings of the International Timber Conference, Seattle, Washington, 848–858.

NAHB Research Center (1994) Assessment of Damage to Residential Buildings Caused by the Northridge Earthquake, The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research (July), Washington, DC.

NAHB (2001). Wood Shear Walls with Corners. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research (March), Washington, DC.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Ni, C. and Karacabeyli, E. (2004). “Deflections of nailed shearwalls and diaphragms.” Proceedings of the 8th World Conference on Timber Engineering, 259–262.

Ni, C. and Karacabeyli, E. (2007). “Performance of shear walls with diagonal or transverse lumber sheathing.” Journal of Structural Engineering, 133(12), 1832–1842.

Ni, C., Shim, K. B. and Karacabeyli, E. (2010). “Performance of braced walls under various boundary conditions.” Proceedings of World Conference on Timber Engineering.

Niu, K. and Gebremedhin, K. (1997). “Three-dimensional building stiffness model for post-frame buildings.” Transactions of the ASAE, 40(3), 795 – 801.

Ohashi, Y., Sakamoto, I., and Kimura, M. (1998). “Shaking table tests of a real scale wooden house subjected to Kobe earthquake.” Proceedings of the 5th World Conference on Timber Engineering, 556-563, Montreux, Switzerland.

Oliva, M. and Wolfe, R. W. (1988). “Contribution of gypsum wallboard to racking performance of walls.” Proceedings of the International Timber Engineering Conference, 759–765.

Oliva, M. G. (1990). “Racking behavior of wood-framed gypsum panels under dynamic load..” Report No.UCB/EERC-85/06, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, Univ. of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Osteraas, J. D., Gupta, A., Griffith, M., and McDonald, B. (2008). “Woodframe seismic

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

response analysis - benchmarking with buildings damaged during the Northridge earthquakes." Proceedings, ASCE Structures Congress, 2008.

Paevere, P. J. and Foliente, G. (2002). "Full-scale destructive testing of a single-story woodframe building." Timber Construction in the New Millenium; The Proceedings of the 7th World Conference on Timber Engineering, Wan Mahmood Wan Ab. Majid et al., ed., 4, 23–30 (August).

Paevere, P. J., Foliente, G. C., and Kasal, B. (2003). "Load-sharing and redistribution in a one-story woodframe building." Journal of Structural Engineering, 129(9), 1275–1284.

Pang, W. C., Rosowsky, D. V., Pei, S., and van de Lindt, J. W. (2007). "Evolutionary parameter hysteretic model for wood shear walls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 133(8), 1118–1129.

Pang, W., Rosowsky, D. V., Ellingwood, B. R. and Wang, Y. (2009) "Seismic Fragility Analysis and Retrofit of Conventional Residential Wood-Frame Structures in the Central United States." Journal of Structural Engineering, 135(3), 262-271.

Pang, W., Rosowsky, D. V., Pei, S., and van de Lindt, J. W. (2010). "Simplified direct displacement design of six-story woodframe building and pretest seismic performance assessment." Journal of Structural Engineering, 136(7), 813–825.

Pei, S. and van de Lindt, J. (2009). "Methodology for earthquake-induced loss estimation: An application to woodframe buildings." Structural Safety, 31(1), 31 - 42.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Pei, S. and van de Lindt, J. W. (2010). "Influence of structural properties and hazard level on seismic loss estimation for light-frame wood structures." *Engineering Structures, 32(8)*, 2183 – 2191.

Pei, S. and van de Lindt, J. W. (2011). "Seismic numerical modeling of a six-story light-frame wood building: Comparison with experiments." Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 15(6), 924–941.

Perkins, J. (1996) "Shaken awake!: estimates of uninhabitable dwelling units and peak shelter populations in future earthquakes affecting the San Francisco Bay region." Association of Bay Area Governments, Oakland, CA.

Peterson, J. (1983). "Bibliography on lumber and wood panel diaphragms." Journal of Structural Engineering, 109(12), 2838 – 2852.

Phillips, T. L. (1990). "Load sharing characteristics of three-dimensional wood diaphragms." M.S. thesis, Washington State University, Pullman, WA.

Phillips, T. L., Itani, R. Y., and McLean, D. I. (1993). "Lateral load sharing by diaphragms in wood-framed buildings." Journal of Structural Engineering, 119, 1556–1571.

Pinkham, C. W. (1973). San Fernando, California Earthquake of February 9, 1971, Vol. 1. US Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Chapter Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations, 777–783, Washington, DC.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Poland, C. D. and Scawthorn, C. (2000). ATC-38 Database on the Performance of Structures Near Strong-Motion Recordings: 1994 Northridge, California, Earthquake. Applied Technology Council, Redwood City, California.

Rainer, J. & Karacabeyli, E. (2000). "Performance of woodframe construction in earthquakes." Proceedings of the 12th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Auckland, New Zealand, 30, 1-8.

Rosowsky, D. and Kim, J. (2004a). "Incorporating nonstructural finish effects and construction quality issues into a performance-based framework for wood shearwall selection." Proceedings of the 2004 Structures Congress - Building on the Past: Securing the Future, 777 – 787.

Rosowsky, D. V. and Kim, J. H. (2004b). "Performance-based design of wood shearwalls considering performance of the overall structure." Proceedings of the 8th World Conference on Timber Engineering, 147–152.

Salenikovich, A. and Dolan, J. (2000). "The racking performance of light-frame shear walls with various tie-down restraints." 6th World Conference on Timber Engineering.

Salenikovich, A. J. and Dolan, J. D. (2003a). "The racking performance of shear walls with various aspect ratios. Part 2. Cyclic tests of fully anchored walls." Forest Products Journal, 53(11-12), 37 – 45.

Salenikovich, A. J. and Dolan, J. D. (2003b). “The racking performance of shear walls with various aspect ratios. Part I. Monotonic tests of fully anchored walls.” Forest Products Journal, 53(10), 65 – 73.

Schierle, G. G. (1996). “Quality control in seismic design and construction.” J. Performance of Constructed Facilities, 10(3), 90-95.

Schierle, G. G. (2003). “Northridge earthquake field investigations: Statistical analysis of wood-frame damage.” Report No. W-09, CUREE, Richmond, CA.

SEA (1996). “Standard method of cyclic (reversed) load test for shear resistance of framed walls for buildings.” Structural Engineers Association of Southern California, <http://www.seaosc.org/documents/StandardMethodofCyclicLoadTest.pdf>.

Seaders, P. (2004). “Performance of partially and fully anchored wood frame shear walls under monotonic, cyclic and earthquake loads.” M.S. thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.

Seaders, P., Gupta, R., and Miller, T. (2004). “Performance of code-prescribed wood shear walls.” Proceedings of the 8th World Conference on Timber Engineering, 123–128 (June).

Seaders, P., Gupta, R., and Miller, T. (2009a). “Monotonic and cyclic load testing of partially and fully anchored wood-frame shear walls.” Wood and Fiber Science, 41(2), 145–156.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Seaders, P., Miller, T.H., and Gupta, R. (2009b). "Performance of partially and fully anchored wood-frame shear walls under earthquake loads." Forest Products Journal, 59(5), 42–52.

Seible F., A. Filitrault, and C.-M. Uang, eds. (1999). Proceedings of the Invitational Workshop on Seismic Testing, Analysis and Design of Woodframe Construction. Number W-01 in CUREe Publication. CUREE-Caltech Woodframe Project, California Universities for Research in Earthquake Engineering, Richmond, CA.

Sinha, A. (2007). "Strain distribution in OSB and GWB in wood frame shear walls." M.S. thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.

Sinha, A. and Gupta, R. (2009). "Strain distribution in OSB and GWB in wood-frame shear walls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 135(6), 666–675.

Skaggs, T. D. and Martin, Z. A. , 2004, "Estimating Wood Structural Panel Diaphragm and Shear Wall Deflection." Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction, ASCE, 9, 136-141.

Steinbrugge, K. V. and Schader, E. E. (1973). San Fernando, California Earthquake of February 9, 1971, Vol. 1. US Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Chapter Earthquake Damage and Related Statistics, 691–724, Washington, DC.

Sugiyama, H., Andoh, N., Hirano, S., Unchisako, T., and Nakamura, N. (1988). "Full-scale

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

test on a Japanese type of two-story wooden frame house subjected to lateral load." International Timber Engineering Conference, 2, 55–61.

Symans, M. D., Cofer, W. F., Du, Y., and Fridley, K. J. (2004). "Seismic behavior of wood-framed structures with viscous fluid dampers." Earthquake Spectra, 20(2), 451–482.

Tarabia, A. M. and Itani, R. Y. (1997). "Seismic response of light-frame wood buildings." Journal of Structural Engineering, 123(11), 1470–1477.

Thurston, S. and King, A. (1994). "Racking resistance of LTF walls with openings." Proceedings of the Pacific Timber Engineering Conference, 1, 185–196.

Thywissen, K. and Boatwright, J. (1998). "Using safety inspection data to estimate shaking intensity for the 1994 Northridge earthquake." Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 88(5), 1243–53.

Tissell, J. R. (1967). "1966 horizontal plywood diaphragm tests." Report No. 106, American Plywood Association, Tacoma, WA.

Tissell, J. R. and Rose, J. D. (1993). "Roof diaphragms for manufactured housing." American Plywood Association, Tacoma, WA.

Tuomi, R. L. and McCutcheon, W. J. (1978). "Racking strength of light-frame nailed walls." Journal of the Structural Division ASCE, 104, 1131–1140.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Uang, C.-M. and Gatto, K. (2003). "Effects of finish materials and dynamic loading on the cyclic response of woodframe shearwalls." Journal of Structural Engineering, 129(10), 1394–1402.

US Census Bureau (2011). American Housing Survey. US Census Bureau, Washington, DC.

van de Lindt, J. W. (2004). "Evolution of wood shear wall testing, modeling, and reliability analysis: Bibliography." Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction, 9(1), 44–53.

van de Lindt, J. W. (2005). "Damage-based seismic reliability concept for woodframe structures." Journal of Structural Engineering, 131(4), 668–675.

van de Lindt, J. W. (2007). "Can woodframe structures be scaled for shake table testing?." New Horizons and Better Practice, ASCE, 1–5.

van de Lindt, J. W. (2008). "Experimental investigation of the effect of multiple earthquakes on woodframe structural integrity." Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction, 13(3), 111–117.

van de Lindt, J. W. and Gupta, R. (2006). "Damage and damage prediction for wood shearwalls subjected to simulated earthquake loads." Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, 20(2), 176–184.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

van de Lindt, J. W., Gupta, R., Pei, S., Tachibana, K., Araki, Y., Rammer, D., and Isoda, H. (2012). “Damage assessment of a full-scale six-story wood-frame building following triaxial shake table tests.” Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, 26(1), 17–25.

van de Lindt, J. W., Huart, J. N., and Rosowsky, D. V. (2004). “Wood shearwall reliability inherent in AF&PA/ASC 16.” Proceedings of the 2004 Structures Congress. Structures 2004- Building on the Past: Securing the Future, 1-7

van de Lindt, J. W. and Liu, H. (2006). “Correlation of observed damage and FEMA 356 drift limits: Results from one-story woodframe house shake table tests.” 2006 Structural Engineering and Public Safety , 1-8.

van de Lindt, J. W., Liu, H., and Pei, S. (2007). “Performance of a woodframe structure during full-scale shake-table tests: Drift, damage, and effect of partition wall.” Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, 21(1), 35–43.

van de Lindt, J. W., Pei, S., and Liu, H. (2008). “Performance-based seismic design of wood frame buildings using a probabilistic system identification concept.” Journal of Structural Engineering, 134(2), 240–247.

van de Lindt, J. W., Pei, S., Pryor, S. E., Shimizu, H., and Isoda, H. (2010). “Experimental seismic response of a full-scale six-story light-frame wood building.” Journal of Structural Engineering, 136(10), 1262–1272.

van de Lindt, J. W., Pryor, S. E. and Pei, S., (2011). “Shake table testing of a full-scale

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

seven-story steel-wood apartment building." Engineering Structures, 33(3), 757–766.

van de Lindt, J. and Rosowsky, D. (2004). "Reliability of wood shearwalls subject to wind and earthquake load." Proceedings of the 8th World Conference on Timber Engineering.

van de Lindt, J., Rosowsky, D., Filiatrault, A., Symans, M., and Davidson, R. (2006a). "Development of a performance-based seismic design philosophy for mid-rise woodframe construction: Progress on the NEESWood project." Proc. of the World Conference of Timber Engineering.

van de Lindt, J. W., Rosowsky, D. V., Filiatrault, A., Symans, M. D., and Davidson, R. A. (2006b). "The NEESWood project: Progress on the development of a performance-based seismic design philosophy for midrise woodframe construction." Proc. of 2006 World Conf. on Timber Engineering, Portland, Ore.

Walker, G. and Gonano, D. (1984). "Experimental investigation of the diaphragm action of ceilings in resisting lateral loads on houses." Proceedings of Pacific Timber Engineering Conference.

White, K. B., Miller, T. H., and Gupta, R. (2009). "Seismic performance testing of partially and fully anchored wood-frame shear walls." Wood and Fiber Science, 41(4), 396–413.

White, K. B., Miller, T. H., and Gupta, R. (2010). "Effects of dead load and multiple earthquake loadings on seismic performance of wood-frame shear walls." Forest Products J. 60(2), 150–156.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

White, K. B. D. (2005). "The performance of wood frame shear walls under earthquake loads." M.S. thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.

Williamson, T. G. and Yeh, B. (2004). "Narrow shear walls - a portal frame solution." World Conference on Timber Engineering, 1, 111–116.

Winkel, M. and Smith, I. (2010). "Structural behavior of wood light-frame wall segments subjected to in-plane and out-of-plane forces." Journal of Structural Engineering, 136(7), 826–836.

Winkel, M. H. (2006). "Behavior of light-frame walls subject to combined in-plane and out of plane loads." M.S. thesis. University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada.

Woeste, F. and Townsend, M. (1991). "Simple-beam diaphragm test considerations." Applied Engineering in Agriculture, 7(5), 613 – 616.

Xilin Lu, Wensheng Lu, C. N. and Li, H. (2006). "Shaking table test on 2-storey wood-frame construction." 4th International Conference on Earthquake Engineering.

Xu, J. (2006). "Development of a general dynamic hysteretic light-frame structure model and study on the torsional behavior of open-front light-frame structures." Ph.D. Thesis, Washington State University, Pullman, WA.

Yancey, C. W., Cheok, G. S., Sadek, F., and Mohraz, B. (1998). "A summary of the structural performance of single-family, wood-frame housing." Performer: National Inst. of Standards and Technology (BFRL), Gaithersburg, MD. Structures Div. 175p. Report: NISTIR-6224.

Yancey, C. W. and Somes, N. F. (1973). "Structural test of a wood framed housing module." Report No. NBSIR Report 73-121, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, DC.

Yasumura, M., Kamada, T., Imura, Y., Uesugi, M., and Daudeville, L. (2006). "Pseudodynamic tests and earthquake response analysis of timber structures II: two-level conventional wooden structures with plywood sheathed shear walls." Journal of Wood Science, 52, 69–74.

Yin, Y.-J. & Li, Y. (2010) "Seismic collapse risk of light-frame wood construction considering aleatoric and epistemic uncertainties." Structural Safety, 32(4), 250 - 261.

Yokel, Hsi, and Somes (1973). Full Scale Test on a Two-Story House Subjected to Lateral Load. National Bureau of Standards, Washington, DC.

Zisi, N. (2009). "The influence of brick veneer on racking behavior of light frame wood shear walls." Ph.D. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.

fig. list

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

List of Figures

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861



Figure 1: Progression of Wood-frame Dwelling Research and Methods.

Figure 2.pdf

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861



(a) Monotonic Loading

(b) ISO-16670 Loading

(c) Sequential Phased Displacement

(d) FCC-Forintek loading

(e) CUREE loading

(f) CUREE near-fault loading

Figure 2: Common shear wall testing protocols

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Table 1. Conventional wood shearwall (SW) testing and analysis

Reference	Method/Loading	Focus of Research
Oliva & Wolfe (1988); Oliva (1990)	ASTM E564. monotonic, static cycles @ 1 Hz, dynamic @ 5 Hz.	Tested 59 gypsum SW for racking resistance. 2.4 m (8 ft.) long walls confirmed codes, but longer walls, and horizontal sheets were better. Gluing increased
Thurston & King (1994)	Racking resistance	Ten SW, varying wall returns, openings & materials w/o hold-downs.
Seible et al. (1999)	Analytical study	CUREE workshop on testing, analysis & design.
Karacabeyli et al. (1999b)	Static & dynamic	Compares static & dynamic SW test results.
Merrick (1999)	cyclic, non-increasing	7 tests of plywood, OSB, gypsum wallboard SW to evaluate energy dissipation.
Salenikovich & Dolan (2000, 2003a,b)	Monotonic, cyclic @.25 Hz (ISO 1998)	Investigates the strength of anchored SW, 2.4 m (8 ft.) tall, 4:1, 2:1, 1:1, 2:3 aspect ratios.
NAHB (2001)	Static	Strength and deflection of SW w/ corners and openings.
Gatto & Uang (2002, 2003); Uang & Gatto (2003)	Dynamic & cyclic	Standard construction 2.4x2.4 m (8x8 ft.) woodframe shearwalls were tested using: monotonic, CUREE-Caltech standard (CUREE), CUREE-Caltech near-fault, sequential phased displacement (SPD), & International Standards Organization test protocols
McMullin & Merrick (2002)	Cyclic	6 shear walls of grade CD plywood, OSB & gypsum wallboard, includes tests of different types of drywall screws.
Kim (2003); Rosowsky & Kim (2004a,b); Kim & Rosowsky (2005a,b)	Reliability analysis	Develops fragility curves for various SW materials.
Langlois et al. (2004)	Static, cyclic	Applied monotonic (ASTM E564) & cyclic (CUREE) testing protocols to SW.
Ni & Karacabeyli (2004)	Analytical study	Presents equations for evaluating deflection of unblocked SW & horizontal diaphragms.
van de Lindt et al. (2004); van de Lindt & Rosowsky (2004)	Reliability analysis	Tested 12 SW designed & evaluated for reliability w/ASCE 16.
Seaders et al. (2004); Seaders et al. (2004); Seaders et al. (2009a); Seaders et al. (2009b)	Monotonic (ASTM E564), cyclic & earthquake loads	Two sets of tests of 8 partially & 2 fully anchored 2.4x2.4 m (8x8 ft.) shear walls w/ 38x89 mm (nominal 2x4 in.) Douglas-fir studs at 610 mm (24 in) o.c. 2 OSB w/8d nails & GWB.
van de Lindt (2004)	Literature review	Details 31 SW tests, modeling & reliability analysis.
Williamson & Yeh (2004)	SPD (SEAOSC, FME=3 cm)	SW w/openings ("portal frames").
Dean & Shenton III (2005)	ASTM E564 modified to exceed design allowable before the final half-cycle	Ten 2.4x2.4 m (8x8 ft.) SW w/11 mm (7/16 in.) OSB & applied vertical load.
Lebeda et al. (2005)	Static, cyclic	13 2.4x2.4 m (8x8 ft.) SW w/ misplaced hold-downs. (CUREE)
White (2005); White et al. (2009, 2010)	Earthquake records.	Tested 34 identical 2.4x2.4 m (8x8 ft.) walls of 38x89 mm (nominal 2x4 in.) kiln-dried DF. Studs were spaced at 610 mm (24 in.) o.c. Half partially anchored, half fully anchored.
Johnston et al. (2006)	Cyclic	Compares effects of vertical load & hold-down placement.
Seaders et al. (2004); White (2005); van de Lindt & Gupta (2006); White et al. (2009)	3 SAC response spectra	2.4x2.4 m (8x8 ft.) SW w/11.1 mm (7/16 in.) OSB & 12.5 mm (1/2 in.) gypsum panels.
Leichti et al. (2006)	CURRE	Tested SW with different nail strengths.
Mi et al. (2004, 2006)	Monotonic and ASTM E2126	Eight 4.9x4.9m (16x16 ft.) SW w/12.5mm (1/2 in.) plywood.
Winkel (2006); Winkel & Smith (2010)	Static	14 tests of shear walls with combined racking, uplift and bending loads.
Yasumura et al. (2006)	1940 El Centro	Two-story 3x3x6m (9x9x18 ft.) 7.5mm (5/16 in.) plywood w/openings.
McMullin & Merrick (2007)	Monotonic & CUREE-CalTech	11 tests. Discusses seismic damage thresholds for gypsum wallboard.
Ni & Karacabeyli (2007)	ISO 16670, ASTM 2126	16 SW w/ diagonal or transverse horizontal lumber sheathing and gypsum sheathing varying hold-downs, vertical load, & width of sheathing.
van de Lindt (2008)	shake table tests	24 shake table tests of SW, some w/gypsum, some w/ corner walls.
Hart et al. (2008)	Cyclic, varying by author	Discusses 195 drywall & stucco sheathing tests done by APA, Merrick, City of Los Angeles and McMullen & Pardoen for CUREE.
McMullin & Merrick (2008)	Cyclic CUREE-Caltech	17 tests w/ screws & nails w & w/o window openings.
Sinha (2007); Sinha & Gupta (2009)	Monotonically (ASTM E564)	Tested 16 standard 2.4x2.4 m (8x8 ft.) walls, 11 were sheathed with OSB on one side & GWB on the other, & 5 walls were tested without GWB. Digital image correlation was used for data acquisition & analysis which is a full-field, noncontact technique for measurement of displacements and strains.
Zisi (2009)	Monotonic & cyclic w/increasing amplitude.	Tested brick veneer on wood framed walls w/ OSB and gypsum.
Ni et al (2010)	Monotonic & cyclic (ISO 16670)	Tested 20 configurations of 1.22, 2.44 or 4.88 m long SW with 9.5 mm OSB or 12.7 mm GWB, some 4.88 m SW with a 2,44 opening, some 2.44 m walls with 1.22 or 0.61 m perpendicular bracing walls.
Goodall & Gupta (2011); Goodall (2010)	Monotonically (ASTM E564)	Tested 14 shear walls, 2 of each of 7 different designs. Six walls had 1105x610 mm window openings, eight did not. All walls were 2.4x2.4 m (8x8 ft.) & built from 38x89 mm (nominal 2x4 in.) DF studs at 610 mm o.c. Tests stopped at deflections of 4.0, 8.0, 12.0, 16.0, 20.0, 24.4, 48.8 & 73.2 mm (5/32, 5/16. 5/8, 3/4, 1, 2 in.) to record damage.

Notes: DF – Douglas-Fir; FEM – Finite Element Model; FME – First Major Event, defined as an event sufficient to bring the structure to the yield point; GWB – Gypsum Wall board; OSB – Oriented Strand Board; SAC – A joint venture of the Structural Engineers Association of California (SEAOC), the Applied Technology Council (ATC), and California Universities for Research in Earthquake Engineering (CUREE); SEAOSC – Structural Engineers Association of Southern California; SPD – Sequential Phased Displacement; SW – Shear Wall

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Table 2. Definition of shear wall testing methodologies.

Protocol Type	Standard or Common Name	Classification	Description	Figure	Reference
Static	Monotonic (ASTM E564)	Linear increasing	Ramps load to incremental limits	Fig. 2a	American Society for & testing materials (2006)
Cyclic	ISO-16670 2003	Full cycle reversing	Initial increasing sequence, then 3 cycles at each increasing displacement level	Fig. 2b	ISO (1998)
	Sequential phased displacement (SPD)		Sequential phased displacement (SPD)	Fig. 2c	SEA (1996) Dinehart & Shenton (1998)
	FCC-Forintek		Similar to SPD	Fig. 2d	Karacabeyli & Ceccotti (1996)
	CUREE		CUREE-CalTech	Fig. 2e	Krawinkler et al. (2001)
	NF		CUREE-CalTech Near Fault	Fig. 2f	Krawinkler et al. (2001)
Dynamic	Usually a set of scaled historic seismic records				

Notes: SPD – Sequential Phased Displacement; NF – Near field

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Table 3. Horizontal wood diaphragm testing and analysis

Reference	Methods	Focus of Research
Countryman (1952)	Static, Dynamic	Plywood diaphragms, mostly blocked. Tested 6 quarter-scale models, 1.5x3.0 m (5x10 ft.) & 4 full-scale models 3.7 m or 6.1x12.2 m (12 or 20x40 ft.). Dynamic load was static load increased by 1/3 & cycled 5 times.
Countryman & Colbenson (1954)	Static, Dynamic	Plywood diaphragms, about half blocked. Tested 15 full-scale models 7.3x7.3 m (24x24 ft.). Dynamic load was static load increased by 1/3 & cycled 6 times, then single cycles of increasing amplitude to failure.
Johnson (1955)	Static	Tested 3.7x18.3m (12x60 ft.) plywood diaphragm.
Johnson & Burrows (1956)	Static	Gable roofs were tested & found stronger than flat diaphragms w/ no boundary reinforcing & weaker than flat diaphragms w/ boundary reinforcing.
Tissell (1967)	Static	Tested 18 diaphragms 4.9x14.63 m (16x48 ft.).
Carney (1971)	Analytical study	Presents development of the general theory of folded plates as it applies to plywood roof diaphragms.
Johnson (1971)	-	Tested 6.1x18.3 m (20x60 ft.) roof section sheathed w/ plywood overlaid on decking.
Falk et al. (1984)	SOTA	Reviews literature on low-rise wood diaphragms. Concludes more research is needed on roofs and dynamic behavior.
Walker & Gonano (1984)	-	Tested gypsum and asbestos cement ceiling panels. Determined independent panels should be modeled for shear, solidly connected panels for flexure.
Falk & Itani (1988)	Analytical study	Compares deflection model to previous flat diaphragm tests.
Kamiya (1988)	Pseudo-dynamic tests	Simple hysteretic loop model.
Mahaney & Kehoe (1988)	Analytical study	Traditional tributary area methods & rigid diaphragm methods may be unconservative. Presents a generalized linear shear stiffness method for plywood diaphragms to distribute the shear between lateral resisting elements.
Falk et al. (1989)	SOTA	Reviews literature on low-rise wood diaphragm modeling.
Falk & Itani (1989)	Analytical study	Compares finite-element model to previous flat diaphragm tests.
Alsmarker (1991)	Static load tests of 3 flat diaphragm panels. Load parallel to ridge/eaves.	Gypsum fasteners ultimately fail at far above allowable load. Design for elastic fastener failure.
Tissell & Rose (1993)	Static load tests of 5 low pitch trussed diaphragms	Used 8 mm (5/16 in.) plywood on 50x50 mm (2x2 in.) trusses 406 mm (16 in.) o.c. Maximum slope was 2:12. No ceiling material was used in the tests. Includes some MPCT.
Foliente (1994, 1995)	Analytical study	Hysteresis model includes nonlinearity, strength and stiffness degradation, pinching & historical loading.
Tarabia & Itani (1997)	Analytical study	Nonlinear 3-D FEM. Concludes diaphragm rigidity is a significant factor in determining loads on building elements.
Yancey et al. (1998)	SOTA	NIST review of the state of residential design research.
Carradine et al. (2004b); Dolan et al. (2003)	Monotonically increasing, cyclic CUREE	Presents research on the deflection of horizontal diaphragms.
Collins et al. (2005)	Analytical study	Develops 3-D finite element model for a house.
Bott (2005)	Dynamic-elastic load test of 6 flat diaphragm panels. Load perp. to ridge/eaves.	Shear stiffness increased by: Foam adhesive/blocking 259%, blocking 135%, foam adhesive 89%; relative to unblocked diaphragm
Min & Li (2012)	Analytical study	FEM of nine flat horizontal diaphragms.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Table 4. Finite element and analytic models of wood frame dwellings.

Reference	Analysis Method	Focus of Research
Falk & Itani (1988)	Two-dimensional nonlinear FEM	Nonlinear elements model the connections between the fasteners, sheathing & framing members.
Kamiya (1988)	Simple hysteretic loop model	Pseudo-dynamic tests
Kataoka & Asano (1988)	Nonlinear stiffness model	Compared model w/ tests for a two story Japanese post & beam structure.
Mahaney & Kehoe (1988)	Linear	Traditional tributary area methods & rigid diaphragm methods may be unconservative. Presents a generalized shear stiffness method for plywood diaphragms to distribute the shear between lateral resisting elements.
Moss & Carr (1988)	-	New Zealand building code. Tested timber portal frames & excluded shear walls. Seismic response.
Kasal & Leichti (1992)	Program "ANSYS" nonlinear FEM	Wood stud wall with openings.
Foliente (1994, 1995)	Nonlinear	Hysteresis model includes nonlinearity, strength & stiffness degradation, pinching & historical loading.
Kasal et al. (1994)	Nonlinear	Model of one-story house tested by Phillips [1990]
Kasal et al. (1999)	Nonlinear	Hybrid dynamic model including hysteretic & stochastic methods.
He et al. (2001)	Program "Lightframe3D" nonlinear FEM	Presents FEM which includes individual nail connections.
Masaki & Kenji (2002); Kenji et al. (2002)	Nonlinear FEM	Dynamic model of Japanese house demonstrates 45% increase in loads due to eccentricity.
Lam et al. (2002)	Nonlinear FEM	Dynamic model of individual nail connections in the diaphragm system. Verified w/ a simple box structure.
Symans et al. (2004)	Nonlinear FEM	Modeled behavior of a house using viscous dampers.
Collins et al. (2005)	Program "ANSYS" nonlinear FEM	Modeled hysteretic behavior of a house.
Li (2005)	Program "CASHEW" nonlinear FEM	Used to develop fragility information for light frame shear walls
Winkel (2006)	Nonlinear FEM	FEM using uncoupled spring model for sheathing-framing and framing-framing nail connections is compared to test data.
Xu (2006)	Program "ABAQUS" nonlinear FEM	General hysteretic model, BWBN, was modified for nailed joints, embedded in ABAQUS & compared with the test data.
Li & Ellingwood (2007)	Programs CASHEW/OpenSees	Models of three typical shear wall types demonstrate applicability of this technique to general WFSFD structures. Concludes that this method can predict WFSFD response and assist in evaluating retrofit methods.
Blasetti et al. (2008)	Program "ANSYS" nonlinear FEM	Modeled hysteretic behavior of shear walls.
Osteraas et al. (2008)	Nonlinear FEM	Uses programs "SAWS" & "SAPWood" w/ laboratory test data (COLA, CUREE-CalTech, CUREE-EDA) compared w/ documented damage of two buildings due to the Northridge Earthquake.
Pei & van de Lindt (2009)	Program SAPWood	Model using Bayesian predictive distribution fragilities to simulate damage and repair cost. Applied to one story ranch and two-story houses, concluding the method provides reasonable results.
Pang et al. (2009)	Programs CASHEW/SAWS	Fragility analysis of 6 buildings of 2 foundation types with OSB and gypsum sheathing in Central US. Concludes that 1 story WFSFD have good life safety response but can have significant financial loss, 2 story WFSFD may need additional nailing and hold-downs.
Black et al. (2010)	Programs SAPWood/Matlab	Emperical seismic loss model applied to a 2-story, WFSFD. Concludes loss analysis can help evaluate loss, help define performance objectives and guide objective WFSFD design.
Christovasilis & Filiatrault (2010); Christovasilis (2011)	Nonlinear FEM	A 2D FEM with rigid floors including explicit connection elements.
Li et al. (2010)	Programs CASHEW/SAWS	Compares collapse probabilities of WFSFD in Western US with Central & Eastern US and concludes existing ASCE 7 seismic maps do not result in uniform risk.
Pei & van de Lindt (2010)	Programs SAPWood/Nail Pattern	Develop fragility curves based on differing possible construction quality and relating the damage to economic loss. Concludes that retrofits are of limited use in either large or small earthquakes and construction quality has major impacts.
Yin & Li (2010)	Programs CASHEW/SAWS	Examines collapse risk due to uncertainties in ground motion and in shear wall resistance in a Monte Carlo simulation to a 1 story. Concludes these uncertainties result in significant variation in outcome.
Goda et al. (2011)	Progran SAWS	Examined 1415 houses in Richmond, BC using seismic hazard model of Geological Survey of Canada. Estimates sensitivity of analysis to differing assumptions of hazard models, spatial correlation model, uncertainty in ultimate seismic capacity and spectral shape.
Pei & van de Lindt (2011)	Nonlinear FEM	FEM including hysteretic & anchorage behavior is compared to shake-table tests of a 6-story apartment building.

Note: FEM – Finite element model

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Table 5. Wood frame dwelling testing

Reference	Loading	Focus of Research
Yokel et al. (1973)	Concentrated, static & cyclic	Two story house before occupancy. Gypsum wall sheathing, trusses w/ plywood roof sheathing. Measured damping, natural frequency & drift.
Yancey & Somes (1973)	Static, cyclic	Two story HUD "Operation Breakthrough" modular unit. Gypsum wall sheathing, trusses w/ plywood roof sheathing.
Tuomi & McCutcheon (1978)	Static racking at various stages of construction	Component interaction study. One-story. Plywood wall and roof sheathing. Trusses with gypsum on bottom chord.
Boughton & Reardon (1982)	Static	1940s USAF building converted to house. Applied loads to portions of the house to determine system load distribution.
Sugiyama et al. (1988)	Static at specific locations	Tested stiffness and deformation of Japanese house under static loading.
Phillips (1990); Phillips et al. (1993)	Cyclic, ASTM E72	Single story rectangular house. Study indicates roof behaves as rigid diaphragm.
King & Deam (1998)	Dynamic testing	New Zealand code. Evaluated the post-elastic performance of wall panel, used to develop a 'dependable lateral load resistance rating.'
Kasal et al. (1999)	3-D FEM non-linear	Uses statistical properties of building components in FEM to distribute seismic forces to the lateral resisting elements. Then uses SDOF shear model to calculate displacements.
Fischer et al. (2000)	Dynamic uniaxial shake table	CUREe-Caltech two-story single-family woodframe house was tested at UC San Diego. It was 4.9x6.1 m (16x20 ft.), 38x89 mm (nominal 2x4 in.) with OSB & oriented such that shaking occurred along the short dimension of the structure. Tested at 10 different phases of construction.
"	"	Four types of shake table tests were performed for quasi-static inplane floor diaphragm tests, frequency evaluation tests, damping evaluation tests, & seismic tests, at up to five levels of increasing in amplitude.
Foliente et al. (2000); Foliente et al. (1998) Paevere & Foliente (2002) Phillips et al. (1993) Paevere et al. (2003)	Wind loading, static, dynamic and destructive	Tested single story L-shaped house containing required structural elements, with interior finishes. Concluded tributary area method was least accurate, & FEM gave most accurate results.
Kohara & Miyazawa (1998); Miyazawa & Kohara (1998)	Dynamic	Tested 2 story Japanese house.
Ohashi et al. (1998)	Dynamic	Tested 5.4x3.6x2.9m (17x12x8 ft.) tall model house.
Kharrazi (2001)	Shake table & field tests	Vibration & damping tests on shake tables & houses in the field.
Folz & Filiatrault (2001)	Cyclic SDOF FEM	CUREE Development of CASHEW model of displacement & energy dissipation in wood shearwalls.
Filiatrault et al. (2002)	Dynamic Uniaxial shake table	CUREE UCSD house. Rectangular, 2-story. Different configurations of sheathing, finish & mass distribution.
Malesza et al. (2004)	Static	Applied static load to house center w/ cables & measured floor diaphragm deflection. FEM 1.45-2.54 times measured deflections, rigid diaphragm model 1.84-4.92 times measured deflections.
van de Lindt & Liu (2006)	Uniaxial shake table	Six tests of a one story house with: (1) the exterior wood shearwalls w/ only oriented strand board (OSB) & no non-structural finishes, (2) the exterior wood shearwalls w/ OSB & drywall, and (3) the exterior wood shearwalls w/ OSB & drywall & a non-structural partition wall.
van de Lindt (2007)	Uniaxial shake table	Tested full-scale & half-scale house models. Determined that scaling was not reliable in wood frame structures.
Filiatrault et al. (2008)	Dynamic Uniaxial shake table	CUREE 2 story townhouse. Part of NEESWood project.
Xilin Lu et al. (2006)	3-D shake table	Tested 2 story wood frame structure with I joists, OSB.
van de Lindt et al. (2008, 2007); van de Lindt & Liu (2006)	Uniaxial shake table	Simple 1 story box model, 24 tests of 4 specimens with 6 ground motions.
van de Lindt et al. (2010, 2012); Pang et al. (2010); Pei & van de Lindt (2011)	Shake Table	5 tests of 6 story light framed apartment building. Examines damage, drift & performance of largest full-size structure to date. Part of NEESWood project.
Kang et al. (2009)	ISO 16670 (cyclic, increasing)	Tests of 9 full-scale 1-2 story, light framed structures.
Christovasilis (2011); Filiatrault et al. (2007, 2010, 2008)	Triaxial shake tables	Full-scale, two-story, light-frame wood townhouse building tested at MCEER on two triaxial shake tables. Part of NEESWood project.
van de Lindt et al (2011)	Shake Table	Report of testing a 6 story wood building on a 1 story steel frame. Concludes structure performed well in testing, a first story SMF is a viable option to add commercial space at ground level, and DDD produced better performance than would have been expected under current IBC requirements. Part of NEESWood project.

Notes: HUD – U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; FEM – Finite Element Model; DDD – Direct Displacement Design, a method of performance based design; MCEER – Multidisciplinary Center for Earthquake Engineering Research, University of Buffalo, NY; SDOF – Single Degree of Freedom; USAF – U.S. Air Force; SMF – Special Moment Frame, a type of steel structure

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Table 6. Post frame diaphragm testing.

Reference	Experiment	Conclusions
Hoagland & Bundy (1983)	Corrugated aluminum & steel attached w/ screws	Developed strength & stiffness values.
Gebremedhin & Irish (1984)	-	Aluminum & steel clad, timber framed, screw fastened diaphragms were tested as deep beams. Variables include direction of ribs, size of supporting grid, diaphragm width to length ratio, fastener spacing, and effect of an 'opening'.
Gebremedhin & Bartsch (1988)	Corrugated aluminum and steel panels w/urethane foam inserts	Strength and stiffness increased 3-7 times w/ foam. Failure was sudden when foam sheared.
Anderson & Bundy (1990)	Corrugated steel with openings	Plane truss analog under or over predicts stiffness by ~10%. Number and type of fasteners have significant effect.
McFadden & Bundy (1991)	Compares cantilever and two-bay diaphragm tests	Both tests gave similar values if the corners of the cantilevered test panel were reinforced.
Bohnhoff et al. (1991)	25 steel diaphragm w/rigid foam between steel and framing	Addition of insulation layer reduces stiffness & strength. Deformation of screws controlled failure mode.
Woeste & Townsend (1991)	19 cantilevered panels	Cantilevered tests need framing stiffeners & out-of-plane restraint to be consistent.
Gebremedhin et al. (1992)	Full- scale post frame building w/static loading	Endwall stiffness highly significant.
Bohnhoff (1992a)	Analytic study	Demonstrates method of calculating frame stiffness & eave loads.
Gebremedhin & Price (1999)	Full- scale post frame building tests	Data show that the roof diaphragm halves act as a unit rather than two independent parts.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Table 7. Post frame design methods.

Reference	Experiment	Conclusions
Gebremedhin & Woeste (1986)	Analytic study	Using diaphragm stiffness to redistribute loads resulted in smaller post sizes.
Gebremedhin et al. (1986)	Analytic study	Demonstrates design using diaphragm stiffness to optimize member sizes.
Gebremedhin (1988)	Analytic study	Describes the methods used in "METCLAD" design program.
Gebremedhin et al. (1989)	Analytic study	Describes Met-X-PERT program design methods.
Anderson & Bundy (1990)	Corrugated steel with openings	Plane truss analog under or over predicts stiffness by ~10%. Number & type of fasteners has significant effect.
Bender et al. (1991)	Analytic study	Shows rigid diaphragm analysis results are similar to elaborate ASAE EP484.1 flexible analysis method.
Bohnhoff (1992b)	Analytic study	Demonstrates method of calculating frame stiffness and eave loads.
Niu & Gebremedhin (1997)	Analytic study	Demonstrates method of analyzing post-frame structure in a 3-D model
Carradine et al. (2000)	Analytic study	Demonstrates application of post frame design methods to timber framed dwelling.
Carradine et al. (2004a)	Analytic study	Demonstrates application of post frame design methods to timber framed dwelling with SIP panels.

Note: SIP – Structural Insulated Panel, a sandwich panel made from OSB glued to an insulating core.

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013; posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Table 8: Previous earthquake damage surveys.

Reference	Earthquake	Dates	Plans	Conclusions
Kochkin & Crandall (2004)	New Madrid	1811-1812	No	Studied damage to historic homes. No current const. methods.
Berg (1973)	Great Alaska	1964	-	Most damage to dwellings due to earth movement or tsunami.
Morgan & Bockemohle (1973); Pinkham (1973); Steinbrugge & Schader (1973)	San Fernando	1971	-	Contains detailed surveys of damaged wood frame buildings.
Falk & Soltis (1988)	California	1980s	No	Reviews wood-frame building performance in Ca. earthquakes in 1980s.
EQE Engineering (1989)	Loma Prieta	1989	No	Damaged homes generally pre-1940s w/cripple walls, modern irregular homes, apartments with soft 1st story.
Holmes & Somers (1996)	Northridge	1994	No	Concludes, "the...earthquake should dispel the myth that wood construction is largely immune to earthquake shaking."
Holmes et al. (1996)	Northridge	1994	Yes	Includes plans and photos of 2 damaged houses with analysis.
Comerio (1997)	Loma Prieta	1989	No	Estimated that approximately 12,000 housing units were severely damaged or destroyed, and 30-35,000 incurred some minor damage.
Thywissen & Boatwright (1998)	Northridge	1994	No	Examined database of ATC-20 surveyed structures. Concluded homes were mostly resistant.
Yancey et al. (1998)	Great Alaska, San Fernando, Loma Prieta	various	No	Summarizes recent literature on damage surveys specifically related to house engineering.
Poland & Scawthorn (2000)	Northridge	1994	No	ATC-38 study of 500 buildings <1000' from fault.
NAHB Research Center, Inc. (1994)	Northridge	1994	-	Concludes most single-family dwellings had no structural damage to the roof or walls, but that approximately 50% suffered some damage to the interior or exterior finishes, 7% suffered moderate or high damage to the finishes.
Schierle (2003)	Northridge	1994	Yes	Includes plans & elevations of 4 damaged houses with analysis. (CUREE)

Journal of Structural Engineering. Submitted July 25, 2012; accepted April 30, 2013;
posted ahead of print May 2, 2013. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000861

Table 9. Current damage estimation methods.

Reference	Name of Method	Purpose
ASCE (2006)	ASCE/SEI 41-06 Prestandard & Commentary for the Seismic Rehabilitation of Buildings.	Employs linear/nonlinear, static/dynamic analyses. Objective is to avoid individual component failure.
FEMA (2002)	FEMA-154 Rapid Visual Screening of Buildings for Seismic Hazards.	Provides a method for a quick visual survey of general structures. Only 9 possible ratings for any dwelling regardless of age, material or complexity of construction. Identifies structures to receive a more detailed analysis.
ASCE (2003)	ASCE 31 Handbook for the Seismic Evaluation of Buildings. (Previously FEMA 310.)	Uses calculations based on simple methods and assumptions. Does not consider system effects of redistribution of forces. Intended to check common potential component deficiencies that might contribute to collapse.
International Code Council (2011a)	2012 International Building Code	These codes provides the basis for engineering design of new structures, prescriptive design of residential and modifications to existing structures. Sometimes these are used to evaluate seismic conformance of existing structures.
van de Lindt (2005)	Reliability Model for Drift Performance.	Damage-based seismic reliability model for light-frame wood structures subject to earthquake load.
Baxter (2004); Baxter et al. (2007)	n/a	Compares different screening, evaluation, rehabilitation and design provisions for wood-framed structures.
Lucksiri et al. (2012)	Rapid Visual Screening of Wood-Frame Dwellings with Plan Irregularity	Approach to screening for seismic hazards in wood houses with plan irregularity is developed. Plan shape, number of stories, plan area, cutoffs in area, and wall openings are investigated.