



Interface Shear Force \leq Interface Shear Resistance

Under specific construction conditions (measures), verification may not be necessary

5







GREEK CSI: STRENGHTENING THE WHOLE STRUCTURE

- Infilling Frames
- Addition of simple "infills"

(Reinforced or unreinforced concrete walls, reinforced or unreinforced masonries)

- Conversion of frames to shear walls
- Reinforced concrete walls and jackets
- Strengthening of existing masonry infills (Shotcreting reinforced layers)
- Addition of bracing. Conversion of frames
 (By steel or RC elements)

Construction of new lateral shear walls

8

GCSI:

Adding Simple Infills

- Addition of walls from: a) Unreinforced or reinforced concrete (cast in situ or prefabricated)
 b) Unreinforced or reinforced masonry
- No specific requirement to connect infill to the existing frame
- Modelling of infills by diagonal strut
- Low ductility of infill. Recommended m ≤ 1,5

WARNING

Additional shear forces are induced in the columns and beams of the frame

9

GCSI: Strengthening of existing masonry infills

• Reinforced shotcrete layers applied to both sides of the wall Minimum concrete thickness 50 mm Minimum reinforcement ratio $\rho_{vertical} = \rho_{horizontal} = 0,005$

Essential to connect both sides by bolting through the wall

No need to connect to the existing frame as it is an infill

All new construction must be suitably connected to the existing foundation

0 0





GCSI:

Frame Encasement conversion of frames to shear walls

Reinforced walls are constructed from one column to another enclosing the frame (including the beam) with jackets placed around the columns. Note, all new construction must be suitably connected to the existing foundation



GCSI: Addition of New External Walls





Schematic arrangement of connections between existing building and new wall

GCSI: Addition of a Bracing System



13

OBJECTIVES	GREEK CODE (2012) DESIGN OF INTERVENTIONS	EC 8-PART 3 (2005) CAPACITY MODELS FOR STRENGTHENING
1 Verification of the interface connection	Yes	No
2 Interventions in critical regions of linear structural members	Yes	Yes
3 Interventions to frame joints	Yes	No
4 Interventions on shear walls	Yes	No
5 Interventions on foundation elements	Yes	No
6 Frame encasement	Yes	No
7 Construction of external new shear walls	Yes	No
Amole structure u v	rame encasement onstruction of external ew shear walls	rame encasement Yes onstruction of external Yes ew shear walls

Interventions in Critical Regions of Linear Structural Members

GREEK CSI (2012)		EC 8 PART 3 (2005)	
8.2.1.1	Local repair of a damaged member region	-	-
8.2.1.2	Restoration of insufficient lap splice length of the reinforcement	A.4.3.3 A.4.4.4	Clamping of lap-splices by FRP wrapping
8.2.1.3 8.2.1.4	Interventions to strengthen the tension or compression zone against flexure with axial force	-	
8.2.1.5	Column jackets with the objective of simultaneous strengthening in the tension and compression zone	A.4.2.2	Enhancement of strength, stiffness and deformation capacity by concrete jackets
8.2.2.1 8.2.2.2	Interventions to increase the shear capacity a) inadequacy of the compression struts b) inadequacy of transverse reinforcement	A.4.3.2 A 4.4.2	Enhancement of shear strength (inadequacy of transverse reinforcement) by steel or FRP wrapping
8.2.3	Interventions to increase local ductility	A.4.2.2 A.4.4.3	Enhancement of strength, stiffness and deformation capacity by concrete jackets Confinement action by FRP wrapping
8.2.4	Interventions to increase the stiffness	A.4.2.2	Enhancement of strength, stiffness and deformation capacity by concrete jackets 15

EC 8-3

ANNEX A (informative): REINFORCED CONCRETE STRUCTURES CAPACITY MODELS FOR STRENGTHENING

- Concrete Jacketing
- Steel Jacketing
- FRP Plating and Wrapping

EC 8-3



$$\begin{aligned} & \textbf{FCR-3: Second choice} \\ & \text{Applied only the rectangular cross sections} \\ & \theta_{w} = \frac{1}{\chi_{a}} \times 0.016 \times 0.3^{v} \times r_{c}^{u_{a}v_{a}} \times \left(\frac{L_{b}}{b}\right)^{20} \times 25^{20} \frac{v_{a}}{v_{a}} \text{ where } 0.00 \times r_{a}^{0} = \frac{1}{\chi_{a}} \times 0.016 \times 0.3^{v} \times r_{c}^{u_{a}v_{a}} \times \left(\frac{L_{b}}{b}\right)^{20} \times 25^{20} \frac{v_{a}}{v_{a}} \text{ where } 0.00 \times \frac{400}{2} \frac{1}{2}(1-0.350_{a}) \\ & \theta_{w} = \frac{1}{\chi_{a}} \times 0.016 \times 0.3^{v} \times r_{c}^{u_{a}v_{a}} \times \left(\frac{L_{b}}{b}\right)^{20} \times 25^{20} \frac{v_{a}}{v_{a}} \text{ where } 0.00 \times \frac{400}{2} \frac{1}{2}(1-0.350_{a}) \\ & \theta_{w} = \frac{1}{\chi_{a}} \times 0.016 \times 0.3^{v} \times r_{c}^{u_{a}v_{a}} \times \left(\frac{L_{b}}{b}\right)^{20} \times 25^{20} \frac{v_{a}}{v_{a}} \text{ where } 0.00 \times \frac{400}{2} \frac{1}{2}(1-0.350_{a}) \\ & \theta_{w} = \frac{1}{\chi_{a}} \times 0.016 \times 0.3^{v} \times r_{w}^{u_{a}v_{a}} \times 0.00 \times \frac{400}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2}$$

23

24

 $\epsilon_{j} = 0,015 \rightarrow f_{j} = E_{j} \epsilon_{j} = 200.000 \times 0,015 = 3000 \text{MPa}$

 $\omega_{\rm w} = \frac{4}{300} \, \frac{3000}{20} = 2$









30

EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR CONCRETE JACKETING (UNIVERSITY OF PATRAS)









Load Against Displacement Envelope Curves for All Tested Specimens

(Bousias et al. 2004, Vandoros and Dritsos, 2006b, Vandoros and Dritsos, 2006c)



RECENT PROJECTS FUNDED BY EPPO

- On the specific subject of Ch. 8 of GCSI: Design of Interventions (Budget 150.000 Euro)
- 1. Investigation of the behaviour of old type RC columns strengthened by concrete jackets. (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki).
- 2. Investigation of the behaviour of RC columns after restoring insufficient reinforcement lap splice lengths. (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki).
- 3. Experimental investigation of shear strengthening of beams in their support areas, under seismic actions. (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki).
- 4. Experimental investigation of the behaviour or RC frames strengthened by infilling with new concrete walls. (Thessali University)
- 5. Experimental investigation of 4-floor RC frames strengthened by infilling with new concrete walls. (University of Patras)

Also, 5 more projects funded (Budget 150.000 Euro) on the topic of strengthening RC buildings with one or more soft storeys. $_{35}$



 $\theta_{v,GCSI}$? $\theta_{v,exp}$

Total data (42 specimens)

 $k_{\theta_{-}}$? if $\overline{\theta}_{y_{exp}} = \overline{\theta}_{y_{GCSL}}$

(β) $\theta_{y,exp}/\theta_{y,sim\pi}^{KANEPE}$:

Mean: 1.00

COV: 25.0

Median: 1.04

0.5%

 $k_{\theta v} = 1.26$

1.0%

1.5%

2.0%

(Kappos et al, EPPO report 2012)

2.0% -

1 5% -

1.0%

0.5%

0.0

GCSI: $k_{\theta y=} 1.25$

EC8-3: $k_{\theta y=} 1.05 \text{ or } 1.20$

KANEPE

0.0%

- EC8-3 and the GCSI deal with the crucial issue of the seismic risk of existing buildings and try to give guidance for assessment and retrofitting
- However, when specifically looking at the design of interventions, two crucial differences can be identified

Concept
Detail and topics covered

- From the three main parts of the Greek Code: a) verification of force transfer at interfaces, b) strengthening of elements, c) strengthening of the whole structure, only b is considered by EC8-3.
- Even when common objectives, different analytical expressions are provided leading to different outcomes.
- In the specific objective of "interventions to increase local ductility", the GCSI is found to be more conservative in comparison to EC8-3 and is drastically influenced by the normalized axial load.
- More research is needed not only in the objectives where the two Codes are contradictory but also in the areas that EC8-3 does not touch while the GCSI attempts to provide guidance, however with extremely limited experimental existing data.

34