

PROPOSED NEW APPROACH FOR THE SEISMIC EVALUATION TESTING OF SUSPENDED CEILING SYSTEMS

A.S.J. Gilani¹, S.M. Takhirov² and L.M. Tedesco³

ABSTRACT

In the past decade a significant number of shake table tests of suspended ceilings have been conducted in the United States. The data collected has been used to quantify the seismic performance of suspended ceilings and to identify the critical components than can adversely affect the performance of these components. In addition, analysis of data has shown the shortcomings in the current test methodology, the steps necessary to improve the testing program, and the need for the development of a stand-alone seismic qualification standard. A new comprehensive approach has been developed and is presented in the paper. The approach utilizes an extensive array instrumentation to assess performance of a system and allows possibility of product development based on identification of weak points of the system. In addition to that the approach proposes a new seismic qualification procedure to overcome shortcomings of comparative testing as it currently done in the US. Major parts of the approach are proposed for a new ASTM standard on seismic qualification testing of suspended ceiling systems. The approach has been successfully used to test a number of systems manufactured and installed per code requirements and is practiced in the field.

¹Senior Associate, Miyamoto International, West Sacramento, CA, 95691

² NEES Site Manager, University of California Berkeley, Richmond, CA 94804

³ Senior Manager, Ceiling Systems, USG Corporation, Chicago, IL 60661

Seismic Proposed New Approach for the Seismic Evaluation Testing of Suspended Ceilings Systems

A.S.J. Gilani¹, S.M. Takhirov² and L.M. Tedesco³

ABSTRACT

In the past decade a significant number of shake table tests of suspended ceilings have been conducted in the United States. The data collected has been used to quantify the seismic performance of suspended ceilings and to identify the critical components than can adversely affect the performance of these components. In addition, analysis of data has shown the shortcomings in the current test methodology, the steps necessary to improve the testing program, and the need for the development of a stand-alone seismic qualification standard. A new comprehensive approach has been developed and is presented in the paper. The approach utilizes an extensive array instrumentation to assess performance of a system and allows possibility of product development based on identification procedure to overcome shortcomings of comparative testing as it currently done in the US. Major parts of the approach are proposed for a new ASTM standard on seismic qualification testing of suspended ceiling systems. The approach has been successfully used to test a number of systems manufactured and installed per code requirements and is practiced in the field.

Introduction

Directly hung suspended ceilings are a main feature of modern buildings. In office or commercial applications, typical ceiling areas are 10×10 m. In warehouses or other buildings, larger ceilings are used; see Figure 1. A grid system, panels, and various attachments such as light fixtures, air diffusers, and sprinklers constitute the components of typical suspended ceilings. Most installations consist of lay-in panels; first the grid is assembled, then the panels are placed. Suspended ceilings are nonstructural components, whose seismic performance depends on the adequate design, anchorage, and on the proper installation.

Components of Suspended ceilings

Suspended ceilings consist of a grid, hanger wires, and the perimeter and lateral restraints; see Figure 2. Lay-in panels and other components (e.g. light fixtures, air diffusers, and sprinklers) contribute additional seismic mass to the ceiling grid. The grid consists of light-gauge hot-dip galvanized main runners spanning in one direction and cross runners framing to these runners. Vertical wires are used to suspend the ceiling from the main structures. Mechanical connections are used to splice main runner beams. The connection between the main and cross runners is typically a staked mechanical tab connector installed on the cross runner by the manufacturer.

¹Senior Associate, Miyamoto International, West Sacramento, CA, 95691

² NEES Site Manager, University of California Berkeley, Richmond, CA 94804

³ Senior Manager, Ceiling Systems, USG Corporation, Chicago, IL 60661









Past Seismic Performance

Past earthquakes have demonstrated the susceptibility of suspended ceilings to failure during seismic events. Staring from 1971 San Fernando Earthquake, damage to these components has been surveyed and documented. The failure of these components can be a life safety hazard and result in financial losses and business interruptions. Examples of damage to suspended ceilings are the complete collapse of the system at the Santiago Airport during the 2010 Chile Earthquake; see Figure 3 (from University at Buffalo) and observed damage to a commercial building during the 2011 Christchurch (New Zealand) Earthquake; see Figure 4.



Figure 3. Santiago, Chile (2010) (From University at Buffalo)



United States Building Code Provisions

To address the seismic vulnerability of suspended ceilings, design codes have incorporated specific design and installation criteria for suspended ceilings. For example, the building code

[1] requires that the grid connections have a minimum capacity of 800 N, hanger wires be used at 1.2 m maximum spacing and tied with a minimum of three turns and have a minimum capacity of 450 N. In addition, installation requirements for the attachment of the ceiling system to adjacent building walls are specified.

Because these systems are difficult to analyze numerically, earthquake simulation testing has been used to assess the seismic performance of suspended ceilings. Testing and evaluation of data [6] have shown that the code-prescribed installation had an acceptable performance. However, the analysis of test data also showed that the current experimental and evaluation methodology require revisions.

Proposed evaluation methodology

In the past, suspended ceiling specimens were evaluated using only a comparative method. However, this approach has limitations (for example lack of definition for acceptable performance states and qualification levels) and thus cannot be universally applied. The proposed evaluation methodology intents to address these shortcomings and has three key components: static testing, earthquake simulator testing with enhanced instrumentation, and use of performance levels.

Static Test Procedure

ICC-ES AC368 [7] provides specific requirements for evaluation of ceiling grid intersections. However, currently neither this document nor any other standards specify acceptance criteria for the main runners in compression. To address this issue, a static test procedure has been developed. Tests are conducted to assess the strength and stiffness of the main runners. In addition, sufficient number of sensors (strain gages) is recommended to correlate the data with applied loading. This in-turn will be used to calibrate the results obtained from shake table tests described in the next section.

The proposed test assembly is indented to represent a portion of ceiling installation. As such, main runners, cross tees, panels, and hanger wires are used and the ceiling system is installed using procedures used in the field. This contrasts with conducting direct compression tests on a selected length (for example 1.2 m) portion of a main runner.

To capture the response of the main runners accurately, it was important to simulate field installation boundary conditions. This included the support condition of main runners and the ceiling system. The U.S. code [1] requires that two adjacent edges of a ceiling be connected to the perimeter members and two other sides are unrestrained. For the static tests, the main runners were attached on the reaction side and free to slide on the loading side. On the sides perpendicular to the main runner longitudinal axis, the cross tees were not attached to the wall angles. This conservative approach allows for symmetry in the tests. To ensure that only the center main runner is loaded, the adjacent main runners are cut approximately 25 mm short. The panels on the loading side are cut short to allow for loading to be applied to the main runners only. To provide fixity and prevent local buckling of the main tee at the loading and reaction points of the main runner, clamping was provided at the two ends.

The 4.9x4.9 m test frame used for shake table testing of suspended ceiling systems can be modified for static tests. The modification is needed to allow application of horizontal load using a loading platform. In this setup a suspended ceiling system was pushed from a loading frame through the opening. The loading frame is a stiff independent unit with a platform plate, installed on the side of the test frame. The test specimens are loaded along the longitudinal axis of the main runners using a ram supported on the loading platform plate using two lines of linear bearings. The linear bearings serve two purposes: the loading platform is restrained to move only along the longitudinal axis of main runners and it restrains all rotations at the loading point which can lead to local buckling. The friction in the linear bearing system was nominally small (approximately 90 N). A photograph of the test setup depicting the modified frame, loading platform, and installed ceiling specimen is shown in Figure 5 and Figure 6 shows the schematics of the test setup and a sample test specimen.

The proposed minimum instrumentation for the static tests consisted of a load cell, displacement transducers, and strain gages. The load cell and displacement transducer on the loading side were used to estimate the capacity and stiffness of the main runners. The strain gage on the main runner was used to correlate the applied load to the measured stress (load) in the member to ensure that loading was transferred to the main runner. The strain gages on the hanger were used to monitor the incipient buckling.



Figure 5. Static test frame and loading frame



Earthquake Simulator Test Procedure

In the U.S., earthquake simulator tests of suspended ceiling systems have been conducted using a 4.9x4.9 m test frame ([3] and [9]); see Figure 7. The frame is intended to mimic a portion of ceiling installed in the field. Previous tests have used instrumentation primarily based on the ICC-ES AC156 [8] test protocol. However, for the tests used as part of the proposed evaluation methodology, significantly more channels of data were used. One key addition was the

requirement for the use of strain gages placed on key components (see Figure 8) to allow for experimental measurement of strain (force) in components of the test specimens. Such data were in-turn used to assess the performance of systems and provide comparison with the design values prescribed in the building codes.





Figure 8. Strain gage, main runner

Based on the performance levels of ASCE/SEI 41-06 [2] and damage states of FEMA HAZUS [4] quantitative performance states of I through V are proposed in this paper and listed in Table 1. The application of these values is restricted to typical commercial buildings and for acoustic in-lay panels. When an enhanced performance is desires, such as for ceilings installed in structures with higher risk factors, or for ceilings with heavy metal the failure of a single panel might constitute unacceptable performance and thus not considered herein.

Table 1.	Definition of perform	nance states used in	this paper

	Performance state						
Damaged item	Ι	II	III	IV	V		
Panels dislodged	No limit	No limit	No limit	No limit	No limit		
Panels fell	None	<5%	5-20%	20-50%	>50%		
Grid failure of buckling	None	None	None	1 or 2	>2		
Connection failure	None	None	1 or 2	3 to 5	>5		
Perimeter failure	None	None	1 or 2	3 to 5	>5		
System failure	None	None	<20%	20-50%	>50%		

For the purpose of evaluation of specimens, the pass level is set as class I or II: no structural damage, but allowing for dislodging of panels and falling of up to 5% of panels. The 5% limit is selected as representative of what is typically allowed in design and accounts for uncertainties in design and installation, for example, panels not cut to size or hanger wires not being uniformly taut.

Case study: application to grid main runners

Overview

The current edition of the building code in the U.S. [1] requires that heavy-duty main runners be used in the grid assemble in regions of high seismicity. In addition, the code also describes alternate means and methods, and allows for the use of shake table testing in lieu of analytical investigation. The grid rating is a measure of applied uniform loading to a 1.2-m simply supported member that causes a deflection of L/360 (3.5 mm). To meet the heavy- or intermediate-duty rating, this load should be greater than 0.8 and 0.5 kN/m2, respectively. The procedure developed by the authors and described earlier was applied to a case study focused on the use of intermediate duty main runners in high seismic regions. The two specific systems used in testing and evaluation are referred to as the 11C (heavy-duty) and 11A (intermediate-duty) systems in this paper.

Main Runner Compression Tests

Static testing of the main runners 11C and 11A were conducted using the protocol developed by the authors and described earlier. To ensure repeatability in results, three samples for each of the two specimens were tested. All systems experienced global out-of-plane buckling as their failure mode; see Figure 9 and Figure 10.





Figure 10. Global buckling, 11A

Figure 11 and Figure 12 present the force-displacement plots for specimens 11C and 11A, respectively (three samples per plot). The plots are shown up to the point of incipient buckling. The data for the three test samples are shown as solid line, and the dashed lines correspond to the idealized linear approximation to the plots used to compute the axial stiffness of the test specimens.



Figure 11. Force-deflection relation, 11C

Figure 12. Force-deflection relation, 11A

Table 2 summarizes the experimental data. For each set of three tests, the data closely track and produce similar axial strength and stiffness with coefficient of variation (COV) of 11% or less. The reduction in axial strength and stiffness is approximately 11% and 2% between 11C and 11A. It is further noted that the main runners for both systems have significantly larger axial capacity that the spices.

Table 2.	Experimental	results	from	static 1	tests
----------	--------------	---------	------	----------	-------

Property	Compres	sion capacit	ty, kN	Axial stiffness, kN/m			
	Average	Std Dev.	COV	Average	Std Dev.	COV	
11C	5.30	0.33	6%	332	15	4%	
11A	4.70	0.33	7%	326	35	11%	

Earthquake simulator tests

Table 3 summarizes the findings for the specimen 11A and 11C. For 11C, at test with S_s of 2.00 g, two panels fell, followed by four more panels falling at test with S_s of 2.25 g. At test with S_s of 2.50 g, large number of panels fell, followed by partial collapse of the grid. For 11A, at tests with S_s of 3.00 g, large number of panels fell, followed by extensive collapse of the grid. For both specimens, dislocation of the cross tee-to main runner connections precipitated the system failure.

Table 3.	Global	performance	of S	pecimen	11A	and 11C

	11C					11A		
S _s , g	1.75	2.00	2.25	2.50	2.75	3.00	1.75 through 2.75	3.00
Panels dislodged				Y				Y
Panels fell		2	4	Y				Y
Grid buckling								
Connection failure				Y				Y
Perimeter failure								
System failure				Partial				Extensive
Performance level	Ι	II	III	IV			Ι	V

Figure 13 and Figure 14 present the required response spectra (RRS) for horizontal and

vertical directions, and the test response spectra (TRS) for X-, Y-, and Z- directions computed from experimentally measured earthquake simulator internal accelerometers for specimens 11C and 11A, respectively. The data is shown for a test with S_s spectral acceleration of 2.00g, the last test for which both systems met performance level of I or II. The resonance search data indicated that the systems had horizontal (X- and Y-) frequencies of approximately 18 Hz and vertical (Z-) frequency of 8.5 Hz. For both specimens, the TRS enveloped the RRS in all three directions past the filtering cutoff frequency which was significantly lower that the systems' resonant frequencies.





The response of Specimen 11A was further evaluated using the building code provisions. Such evaluation was not necessary for Specimen 11C because 11C used main runners that met the building code requirements and thus can be used in regions of high seismicity. For Specimen 11A, the test with spectral acceleration of 2.75 g, the last test prior to failure was used for further evaluation.

Figure 15 presents the motion of the grid relative to the test frame for the displacement transducers that monitor the grid response at the floating sides. Also shown in the figure is the dashed line representing the code prescribed clearance of 19 mm on the floating sides. Since the grid motion is significantly below this threshold, no impact of the 11A system at the floating sides is expected.

Figure 15 presents the forces measured in the main runners instrumented for the tests. The measured forces were computed as the product of the main tee area, steel Young modulus, and the strains recorded from strain gage data. Also shown in the figure are the dashed lines representing the tensile and compressive capacities of the main tee. The tensile capacity is computed using the yield strength of main tee obtained from laboratory tests. The compression capacity accounts for buckling and is based on the data measured as described in Table 2. Since the measured main runner forces are well below the capacity, yielding, or buckling of the main runner is not expected.

Specimen 11A was evaluated by the procedure developed in the paper and described

earlier. The specimen underwent testing with spectral accelerations including the test equal to 2.75g. The TRS enveloped RRS beyond the filtering limit which was significantly lower than all resonant frequencies of the system, and the measured data were below the code prescribed values and the capacity of the main runner. Thus, 11A was qualified by experimentation to S_s of 2.75 g. Specimen 11A was qualified to a level higher than that of Specimen 11C. Because 11C is qualified for use according to the U.S. building code provisions, 11A is therefore qualified for use in place of 11C.





Conclusions

A new experimental procedure has been developed and proposed to assist in evaluation of suspended ceilings and alternate installation. This procedure includes both static and dynamic testing of representative systems installed to simulate field conditions. Extensive array of instrumentation, including strain gages to monitor the load in members, form an integral part of the new procedure. In addition, performance states have been developed to assist with and quantify response. As a case study, this procedure was applied to evaluation of systems of intermediate-duty main runners as a substitute to building code mandated heavy-duty members.

- The proposed evaluation procedure provides a rigorous approach than can be implemented for a wide range of alternate installation;
- The development of the performance states forms a critical component of the seismic qualification document proposed for future development;
- The measurement of the force in the system components such as the main runners and hanger wires provide data that is used to determine the margin of safety against component capacity as a function of input seismic intensity;
- Experimental data showed that the substitution of intermediate- for heavy-duty main runners did not adversely affect the seismic response of the system.

Acknowledgements

The financial support of USG to this project is kindly appreciated. Significant contributions of

Ms. Yelena Straight and Mr. Jose Estrada of USG and Mr. Bob Glasgow of Miyamoto International to the success of this project are acknowledged. The efforts of the staff at the PEER Center, and in particular, Mr. Wes Neighbor (laboratory manager) in instrumentation, data acquisition, and conducting of the tests are recognized.

References

- [1] American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) (2010), ASCE/SEI 7-10: Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures, ASCE, Reston, VA.
- [2] American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) (2006), ASCE/SEI 41-06: Seismic Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings, ASCE, Reston, VA.
- [3] Badillo-Almaraz, H., Whittaker, A.S. and Reinhorn, A.M., (2007), Seismic Fragility of Suspended Ceiling Systems Earthquake Spectra, 23 (1), pages 21-40.
- [4] Federal Emergency Management Agency (2010), *Multi-hazard loss estimation methodology earthquake model*, HAZUS-MH MR1 technical manual, Washington, DC.
- [5] Gilani, A.S.J., et al (2008) *Earthquake Simulator Testing and Evaluation of Suspended Ceilings: Standard and Alternate Perimeter Installations*, Proceedings of American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) structural congress, Vancouver, BC.
- [6] Gilani, A.S.J., and Takhirov, S.M., (2011) Current U.S. practice of seismic qualification of suspended ceilings by means of shake table tests, Ingegneria Sismica (International Journal of Earthquake Engineering), Volume 1, pages 26-42.
- [7] ICC Evaluation Service, LLC (ICC-ES) (2007), ICC-ES AC368: Acceptance Criteria for Suspended Ceiling Framing Systems, ICC-ES, Whittier, CA.
- [8] ICC Evaluation Service, LLC (ICC-ES) (2010), ICC-ES AC156, Acceptance criteria for seismic certification by shake-table testing of non-structural components and systems, International Code Council, Whittier, CA.
- [9] Takhirov, S.M. (2009), Seismic Evaluation of Suspended Ceiling Systems. A Report to United States Gypsum Company, Report No. PEER STI/2009-02, PEER center, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA.
- [10] Takhirov, S.M. (2011a), Static Compression Load Capacity of Main Tees in Suspended Ceiling Systems: A Report to: USG, Report No. PEER – STI 2011-01, PEER center, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA.
- [11] Takhirov, S.M. (2011b), Comparative Seismic Evaluation of Suspended Ceiling Systems: Intermediate versus Heavy Duty: A Report to: USG, Report No. PEER – STI 2011-11, PEER center, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA.