

OCONEE NUCLEAR STATION

DYNAMIC TESTING

UNREINFORCED CONCRETE MASONRY WALLS  
ARCHING ACTION VALIDATION

MASONRY WALL CONFIRMATORY TEST PROGRAM

CORRELATION WITH ARCHING THEORY  
AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Prepared For:

DUKE POWER COMPANY  
Charlotte, North Carolina

Prepared By:

COMPUTECH ENGINEERING SERVICES, INC.  
Berkeley, California

Report No. R561-70-07  
December 1985

8603240286 860310  
PDR ADOCK 05000269  
Q PDR

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	(iii)
LIST OF FIGURES . . . . .	(iv)
SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
SECTION 2 CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	3
SECTION 3 SUMMARY OF TEST RESULTS . . . . .	5
SECTION 4 DUKE POWER COMPANY'S ARCHING THEORY . . . . .	7
4.1 Arching Theory Prediction . . . . .	7
4.1.1 Theoretical Basis . . . . .	7
4.1.2 Data Used for Evaluation . . . . .	10
4.1.3 Predicted Load-Deflection Response . . . . .	11
SECTION 5 CORRELATION OF QUASI-STATIC RESULTS AND ARCHING THEORY .	17
5.1 Quasi-Static Tests . . . . .	17
5.1.1 Quasi-Static Tests - Wall No. 1 . . . . .	17
5.1.2 Quasi-Static Tests - Wall No. 2 . . . . .	18
5.1.3 Quasi-Static Tests - Wall No. 3 . . . . .	18
5.1.4 Quasi-Static Tests - Wall No. 4 . . . . .	18
5.2 Comparison of Predicted and Measured Quasi-Static Response . . . . .	31
5.2.1 Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection . . . . .	31
5.2.2 Push Force vs. Midspan Deflection . . . . .	31
SECTION 6 CORRELATION OF DYNAMIC TESTS TO ARCHING THEORY . . . . .	41
6.1 Dynamic Test Results . . . . .	41
6.2 Arching Theory Prediction . . . . .	41
6.3 Comparison of Arching Theory and Dynamic Results . . . . .	42
SECTION 7 ARCHING ACTION METHODOLOGY AND DYNAMIC TEST RESULTS . .	54
7.1 Seismic Loads for Wall Evaluation . . . . .	54
7.2 Seismic Loads From Tests . . . . .	55
7.3 Comparison of Measured Loads vs Loads For Evaluation . . . . .	56
7.4 Summary . . . . .	58

**SECTION 8 VALIDATION OF THE ARCHING ACTION METHODOLOGY . . . . . 61**

    8.1 Quasi-Static Test Comparison . . . . . 61

    8.2 Seismic Test Comparison . . . . . 62

    8.3 Summary . . . . . 62

**SECTION 9 ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS OF SAFETY . . . . . 63**

**SECTION 10 REFERENCES . . . . . 67**

**APPENDIX A . . . . . A-1**

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page No.
Table 4.1	Calculated Response: Major results Based on Measured Modulus of Elasticity, from Duke Power Company's Arching Theory . . . . . 13
Table 5.1	Quasi-Static Tests used in Correlation. . . . . 20
Table 5.2	MEASURED RESPONSE : Major Results from Quasi-Static Tests. . . . . 21
Table 6.1	Summary of Maximum Responses from Dynamic Tests on Cracked Walls . . . . . 44
Table 6.2	Comparison of Measured and Predicted Response . . . . . 45
Table 7.1	Peak Spectral Acceleration from Test Motions. . . . . 59
Table 7.2	Comparison of Moments Predicted by the Arching Action Methodology and Moments Evaluated from Measured Inertial Loads. Both evaluations are based on the test results . . . . . 60
Table 9.1	Evaluation of Factor of Safety on Oconee Spectra . . . . . 65

## LIST OF FIGURES

		Page No.
Figure 4.1	Calculated Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection. Walls No. 1, 2, 3 and 4. . . . .	14
Figure 4.2	Calculated Push Force vs. Midspan Deflection. Walls No. 1, 2, 3 and 4. . . . .	15
Figure 4.3	Calculated Moment vs. Midspan Deflection. Walls No. 1, 2, 3 and 4. . . . .	16
Figure 5.1	Test set-up for Quasi-Static tests. . . . .	22
Figure 5.2	Measured Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 1. . . . .	23
Figure 5.3	Measured Push Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 1. . . . .	24
Figure 5.4	Measured Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 2. . . . .	25
Figure 5.5	Measured Push Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 2. . . . .	26
Figure 5.6	Measured Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 3. . . . .	27
Figure 5.7	Measured Push Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 3. . . . .	28
Figure 5.8	Measured Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 4. . . . .	29
Figure 5.9	Measured Push Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 4. . . . .	30
Figure 5.10	Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 1. Calculated and Measured (adjusted). . . . .	33
Figure 5.11	Push Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 1. Calculated and Measured (adjusted). . . . .	34
Figure 5.12	Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 2. Calculated and Measured (adjusted). . . . .	35
Figure 5.13	Push Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 2. Calculated and Measured (adjusted). . . . .	36

	Page No.
Figure 5.14 Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 3. Calculated and Measured (adjusted). . . . .	37
Figure 5.15 Push Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 3. Calculated and Measured (adjusted). . . . .	38
Figure 5.16 Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 4. Calculated and Measured (adjusted). . . . .	39
Figure 5.17 Push Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 4. Calculated and Measured (adjusted). . . . .	40
Figure 6.1 Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 1. Calculated and Measured during Dynamic Tests. . . . .	46
Figure 6.2 Moment vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 1. Calculated and Evaluated from Dynamic Test Results. . . . .	47
Figure 6.3 Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 2. Calculated and Measured during Dynamic Tests. . . . .	48
Figure 6.4 Moment vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 2. Calculated and Evaluated from Dynamic Test Results. . . . .	49
Figure 6.5 Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 3. Calculated and Measured during Dynamic Tests. . . . .	50
Figure 6.6 Moment vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 3. Calculated and Evaluated from Dynamic Test Results. . . . .	51
Figure 6.7 Thrust Force vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 4. Calculated and Measured during Dynamic Tests. . . . .	52
Figure 6.8 Moment vs. Midspan Deflection - Wall No. 4. Calculated and Evaluated from Dynamic Test Results. . . . .	53

## SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

Unreinforced masonry walls have traditionally been designed to behave elastically to prevent cracking for out-of-plane loading. However, it has been shown analytically and experimentally that unreinforced masonry walls do have reserve strength and resistance to out-of-plane loading after the formation of first cracks. For walls with stiff boundaries this reserve strength has generally been attributed to arching action.

Prior to the initiation of this test program arching action theory had been experimentally verified for blast loadings on masonry walls. Two approaches for blast loading have been developed, one by McDowell, McKee and Sevin [1,2] and one by Gabrielson, et. al. [3,4,5]. Neither approach had been validated for its applicability to seismic loads.

The objective of this confirmatory test program was to demonstrate the validity of the arching action analysis methodology developed and used by Duke Power Company for the structural analysis of the masonry walls at the Oconee Nuclear Station. The total test program consisted of a pilot wall (Wall No. 0) and four additional test specimens labeled Walls No. 1, 2, 3 and 4. Two of the walls had openings (Walls No. 3 and 4) and two of the walls had attachments (Walls No. 2 and 4).

The test walls were constructed in as similar a manner as possible to the walls at the plant. The 14'-8" height of the test specimens was equal to or exceeded the height of 89% of the walls at the plant that were qualified by the arching action methodology.

Parameters that were included in the program are:

- (1) The effect of openings.
- (2) The effect of attachments.
- (3) Different input motions at the top and bottom of the wall.
- (4) The effect of two different types of time histories that envelop the SSE floor spectra. These SSE floor spectra were obtained by enveloping the floor response spectra at all elevations containing masonry walls qualified by arching in both the North-South and East-West Directions. This was done for the respective response spectra at both the top and the base of the Oconee walls.
- (5) The level of the input motion on all test specimens was gradually increased to evaluate the overall factor of safety of the walls and of the analytical methodology.

In general all the walls were tested in two stages: uncracked and cracked. Between the uncracked and cracked test sequences the walls were intentionally cracked by applying a load at midheight of the walls such that cracks at the top, center and base bedjoints were clearly visible. Each stage of testing included low level dynamic tests (pull back - free vibration) and high level dynamic tests. The high level tests used earthquake time history input signals up to intensity levels of approximately three times the envelope SSE for the Oconee Nuclear Station.

In addition to the wall tests, material tests were performed in order to determine the material properties of the wall specimens.

Two reports providing a detailed description of the test procedures and test results of the wall specimens have been issued. The first of these [6] details the results for Walls No. 0, 1 and 2 (walls without an opening) whereas the second [7] details the results for Walls 3 and 4 (walls with an opening). Both reports attempt to quantify the factor of safety for the Oconee walls as evaluated from the various response parameters obtained from the testing of the walls.

This report summarizes the test results and major findings, correlates the quasi-static test results with Duke Power Company's arching theory and applies the theory in the arching action analysis methodology to the results from seismic testing. The report also comments on the adequacy of the methodology to evaluate the Oconee masonry walls.

The reference to the SSE in this report and [6,7] is used to be consistent with current terminology. In the Oconee FSAR the terminology is for a design base earthquake and a maximum hypothetical earthquake. The use of SSE is synonymous with maximum hypothetical earthquake.



## SECTION 10 REFERENCES

- [1] McDowell, E., McKee, K. and Sevin, E.. "Arching Action Theory of Masonry Walls". Journal of the Structural Division, Proceedings of ASCE. ST2. Paper 915, March 1956.
- [2] McKee, K. and Sevin, E.. "Design of Masonry Walls for Blast Loading". ASCE Transactions. Paper No. 2988, Volume 124, 1959.
- [3] Gabrielsen, B. and Kaplan, K.. "Arching in Masonry Walls Subjected to Out-of-Plane Forces". pp 283-313. Earthquake Resistant Masonry Construction : National Workshop, National Bureau of Standards, NBS Building Science Series 106, September, 1977.
- [4] Gabrielsen, B. and Wilton, C., "Shock Tunnel Tests of Arched Wall Panels". Report No. 7030-19, URS Research Company, San Mateo, CA, February 1974.
- [5] Gabrielsen, B., Wilton, C. and Kaplan, K., "Response of Arching Walls and Debris from Interior Walls Caused by Blast Loading". Report No. 7030-23, URS Research Company, San Mateo, CA, February 1975.
- [6] Computech Engineering Services, Inc., Berkeley, California. Dynamic Testing: Unreinforced Concrete Masonry Walls - Arching Action Validation. Masonry Wall Confirmatory Test Program performed for Duke Power Company, Charlotte, North Carolina. Results from Testing Walls No. 0, 1 and 2. Report No. R561-70-05 (Partially Proprietary).
- [7] Computech Engineering Services, Inc., Berkeley, California. Dynamic Testing: Unreinforced Concrete Masonry Walls - Arching Action Validation. Masonry Wall Confirmatory Test Program performed for Duke Power Company, Charlotte, North Carolina. Results from Testing Walls No. 3 and 4. Report No. R561-70-06 (Partially Proprietary).
- [8] Simitzes, G. J., An Introduction to the Elastic Stability of Structures, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1976.

Duke Power Company  
Oconee Nuclear Station

Attachment 1

Proprietary Test Reports

Test Report No. R561-70-05

Test Report No. R561-70-06

Test Report No. R561-70-07