White Paper

Fire behavior of steel structures

March 2014

By M. Garlock, J. Kruppa, G-Q Li, B. Zhao

Content

A. Introduction and background information 2

B. State-of-the-art in fire-structure PBD, modeling, and experiments 3

  1. PBD practices 3
  2. Fire-structure modeling 5
  3. Fire-structure experiments 7

C. Knowledge gaps 8

  1. PBD 8
  2. Fire-structure modeling 9
  3. Small scale experiments 12

D. Topics 1 and 2: Identify and prioritize large-scale experimental needs in order of importance to PBD 12

E. Topic 3: Needed research in a timeline 14

F. Topic 4: Laboratory facilities available to address each need 14

G. Topic 5: Potential collaborators and sponsors for each need 15

H. Topic 6: Transfer of Results 15

I. Topic 7: Means to review progress and exchange information 15

J. References 16

A. Introduction and background information

The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) conducted its building and fire safety investigation of the World Trade Center (WTC) disaster of September 11, 2001, under the authority of the National Construction Safety Team (NCST) Act. The NCST's Final Report includes 30 recommendations that address (1) specific improvements to building standards, codes, and practices; (2) changes to, or the establishment of, evacuation and emergency response procedures; and, (3) research and other appropriate actions needed to help prevent future building failures. As part of NIST's plan to implement the report's recommendations regarding new methods for fire resistance design of structures, NIST intends to develop an international research and development (R&D) roadmap on the fire resistance of structures. To support the development of the roadmap, NIST plans to hold a workshop on large-scale experimental and modeling fire resistance of structures research needs. NIST has commissioned three White Papers, to be used as the basis for technical discussions at the workshop. This effort will provide input for prioritizing and coordinating international research activities and facilitate the development of advanced validated tools for the performance-based engineering fire resistant design of structures.

This report dealing with steel structures is one of these White Papers. By steel structures it is meant both pure steel structures and composite structures in which the steel is generally directly exposed to fire and the concrete contributes to the loadbearing capacity of the structure. Examples of composite structures include concrete-filled steel tube column and steel beam coupled with concrete slab.

This white paper presents the state-of-the-art of large-scale experiments, modeling, and performance-based design efforts in fire behavior of steel structures. In addition this paper discusses the seven "Topics" listed below.

- Topic 1. Research and development needs for large-scale experiments on fire resistance of structures to support performance-based engineering and structure-fire model validation;
- Topic 2. Prioritization of those needs in order of importance to performance-based engineering;
- Topic 3. Phasing the needed research in terms of a timeline;
- Topic 4. Most appropriate international laboratory facilities available to address each need;
- Topic 5. Potential collaborators and sponsors;
- Topic 6. Primary means to transfer the results from each series of tests to industry through specific national and international standards, predictive tools for use in practice, and comprehensive research reports; and
- Topic 7. Means for the coalition of international partners to review progress and exchange information on a regular basis.

This White Paper draws upon some information obtained from reports recently published, such as :

- "Structures in Fire: State of the Art, Research and Training Needs" published in 2011 by Fire Technology [1]. In this paper, the state of the art is presented for (1) modeling and predictions, (2) experiments, (3) materials. It covers all materials, not just steel, and its writing is based on the input of many researchers in this field who attended a 2007 workshop, where the participants identified top 10 research and training needs.

- "Structural Fire Resistance Experimental Research - Priority Needs of U.S. Industry" released in 2012 by NFPA Fundation [2].
- "Needs to achieve improved fire protection as regards the implementation and development of the EN Eurocodes", published in 2008 by the European Commission [3].
- "State-of-the-art and Suggestion of Research on Fire-Resistance of Structures", Report on Research Development Strategy for 2011~2020 by Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) in 2010 [4].

It also includes new research and needs in fire-structure interactions that have been identified since these reports were published.

B. State-of-the-art in fire-structure PBD, modeling, and experiments

Historically, the fire resistance of building (or other civil work) structures was assessed by performing tests on simple structural elements (beams, columns, slabs …) under standard fires (e.g. ISO 834 [5]/ASTM E 119[6]).Thereafter simple calculation methods, especially for steel structures, were able to determine the loadbearing capacity of heated structural elements, and then numerical simulations are now, more or less, abled to calculate the complete history of deformation of structures subjected to any kind of fire, which allow performance-based design

The current state of art of three mains topics: performance-based design (PBD) practices, fire-structure modeling and fire-structure experiments, is developed hereafter.

1. PBD practices

The large majority of fire design for structures is based on a “prescriptive approach”, where the code states how the building has to be constructed and, when necessary protected, under standard fire ; whereas in performance-based design (PBD) the code states how the building is to perform to meet fire safety objectives under various realistic fire conditions. In most countries, designers rely on a prescriptive approach, which is based on the results of standard fire tests on isolated structural specimens [7], or even simple calculation models, to determine the required fire protection on steel components of buildings. However, **these conventional approaches do not accurately reflect** neither a real compartment fire time-temperature relationship nor the real behavior of an entire structure subjected to non-uniform temperature distribution. Therefore, prescriptive building codes do not properly cover the real structural performance of building in real fire situation.

A performance-based design approach [8,9] allows the designer to consider real fire scenarios [10] and the effects of this fire on the structure as a whole (as opposed to individual member behavior not considering the “real” boundary conditions). With such an approach to design, it is possible to have safer and more economical choices and also to give to the designer more freedom to express the needs due to the activity within the building or the civil work. However, it requires education and judgment as related to structure-fire interactions, and it requires knowledge in structure-fire response modeling.

Considering that a performance based fire design of a steel structure is the process as reported in the CIB publication 269 [11] or in the ISO/TS 24679 [12, 13] we have to recognize that the only calculation of either the critical steel temperature or the necessary thickness of fire protection material to fulfil required fire duration under standard fire (as done by the simple calculation methods like those given within the fire parts of Structural Eurocodes [14 - 16]) **cannot be considered as a PBD design** ; it is only a way or replacing tests by simple calculation method.

Generally PBD methods are based on calculation methods, mainly analytical or numerical. But, in some cases, experimental results have to be used, either when calculation methods are not accurate enough or for providing input data for calculation ; considering, also that experimental results are necessary for the validation of the accuracy of calculation methods developed.

The **successful implementation of PBD into practice**, considering that regulation or building code allows such kind of design, is met with the following challenges in the field of structure-fire interaction (1) availability of accurate (simple and when necessary more sophisticated) predictive tools for practice, (2) educating the structural engineer and/or the fire protection engineer, (3) growing the knowledge. These challenges are described in more detail throughout the report.

All PBD approaches for structure-fire design to date are currently based on a ‘first-generation’ approach to PBD that uses deterministic values for the variables (e.g. high temperature material properties). However, there are inherent uncertainties in these variables. A **reliability performance-based approach**, which is a ‘second-generation’ PBD, uses a probability distribution for the variables with uncertainties. Such an approach “improve[s]… risk decision-making through assessment and design methods that have a strong scientific basis and that express options in terms that enable stakeholders to make informed decisions.”[17]. This is a new and growing area of research inside of structure-fire interaction [e.g., 18 – 22].

Multi-hazard design for fire is another complex, but necessary approach to PBD. Although fire is often considered as a primary hazard (its own single event), it is particularly dangerous when it is a secondary event caused by other hazards. As shown in the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center on Sept. 11, 2001, steel buildings might be able to survive a sudden impact but subsequent fires might make the buildings unable to carry the weight of the structure leading to a failure. The events of Sept. 11 made the structural engineering profession aware that more research was needed on the response of structures to fire and since then advances in the field were made; but the vast majority of this research was applied to fire as a primary event, where the initial condition of the structure was undamaged. Fire is also a secondary event, where significant structural damage exists before the fire. It could happen after impact or earthquake, but the more frequent situation should occur in the case of a blast or explosion (which is more frequently happening in chemical factories), the fire begins when the initial condition of the structure is in a damaged state: the building could be missing beams, columns, or be leaning due to permanent plastic deformations. Within this context of multi-hazard, some research has been developed for fire following blast and fire following earthquake [23 -32].

2. Fire-structure modeling

There are essentially three components to model structures in fire: the **fire model**, the **heat transfer model**, and the **structural model**. A structure-fire interaction model must consider all three components: typically, for the time being, all three are weakly coupled (one-way coupling). This means that the three components "talk" to each other in one direction only (in the direction listed above). There are not yet comprehensive tools to avoid considering the link between the 3 models in this linear way but to consider that the deformation of the structure could impact the capability of the separating element when limiting the fire propagation and have some influence on the thermal heat flux received by structural members, or the change in the fire model if a portion of a floor collapses.

Each model component can be simple or complex. For example, for a small post flash over compartment the heat transfer model can be either 1-dimensional (1-D) or 2-dimensional (2-D) respectively with even and uneven temperature through the cross-section of the element being examined, or, with a localized fire within a large compartment, it can be a 3-D model with temperature varying along the length as well as through the cross-section of the structural element. Similarly, the structural model can be 1D, 2-D or 3-D, and it can use bar elements, beam elements or more complex shell elements. The modeler needs to consider the level of details in the model and suitability on the structural performance that need to be captured. The "cost" of the analysis must also be considered: the more detailed, the more computationally expensive it is in terms of setup and run-time.

Furthermore, the modeler needs to consider that **significant uncertainty exists** in the input, including the fire load and mechanical loads, the geometry of the structure and its constitutive elements, the thermo-mechanical material properties, which need to be considered when interpreting the accuracy of the structural analysis results. A parametric or sensitivity analysis can be employed to at least partially evaluate the range of feasible predicted outcomes.

Current practices in fire-structure modelling can be divided into the following categories: (a) finite element tools (computer modeling), (b) analytical formulas, and (c) constitutive materials and uncertainties. Each of these subjects is described in detail below.

(a) Finite element tools (computer modeling)

In the past 15 years, many advances have occurred in software dedicated to structures in fire [e.g. 33, 34]. Other general purpose and commercially available software can also be used for structure-fire modeling. [e.g. 35 – 37]. These programs are quite complex to use for everyday fire applications but when used by trained practitioners they provide very accurate results. Recently, Opensees, which is an opensource code developed for seismic analysis applications, developed a thermal module [38].

Many limitations exist for modeling structures in fire in a seamless, efficient, and appropriate way. For example, the links between the fire, thermal, and structural models are not yet enough advanced. If one wants to do a 3-D computational fluid dynamics model of the fire, it is generally difficult to transfer that data to the heat transfer model in a seamless and efficient manner. However some researches were made in Europe in this respect [39] as well as in other countries [40, 41] The same difficulty exists if one wants to transfer data from a 3-D heat transfer model to a 3-D structural model (where typically the heat transfer model will use brick elements and the structural model will use commonly beam or shell elements). In addition, the complete analysis is typically one-way coupled as described previously.

(b) Analytical Formulas

As an option to computational tools, simple calculations can be performed using closed-form solutions that consider equilibrium and compatibility. These closed-form solutions can provide a reasonable approximation of the structure-fire response, and they can also be used to provide some level of validation for the more complex computational solutions. For example, the fire model can be parametric curves whose equations are straightforward even if they still are a rough estimation of the reality. The heat transfer model in steel sections with relatively thin plates can be done with a spreadsheet using a lumped mass approach that assumes that the temperature of the steel is uniform or even with a simple formula developed for predicting the temperature elevation of a pure steel component under standard fire [42]. The structural model can be a beam-element with the appropriate boundary conditions (which are assumed to be unchanged during the fire) that represent the surrounding structure.

Analytical formulae for simple elements under uniform temperature for standard fire have been developed for beams and columns and composite slabs [15, 16, 42, 43]. Both protected and unprotected steel is covered by these formulas to the extent the proper thermal properties of the protection systems are known [15, 43].

In addition, analytical formulas were developed for beams and columns with thermal gradients [15, 44 - 50] and also for composite element as concrete filled hollow steel section or I sections with concrete between the flanges [16, 51]. On the other hand, analytical calculation method was developed for structural elements located outside the building and subjected to heat coming from flames passing through windows [15, 16, 52].

Limited research is available that recommends formulas that consider the structural response of elements under fire as part of a larger structural system. For example, a proposal is made for closed-form approximations of the maximum axial force in a beam considering local buckling of the beam that will develop due to the adjacent structure [53]. More recently, several projects have been conducted in the world, which have led to different analytical formulas for predicting the load-bearing capacity of steel and concrete composite floor systems subjected to both standard fire and real compartment fire conditions and behaving under membrane actions [54 - 57].

(c) Constitutive materials

High temperature thermal and mechanical material properties of steel are available [15, 58, 59]. Most are for steels used in buildings but recently studies have been made on steels used in bridges such as A709 and A588 weathering steel [60, 61]. However some uncertainties still exist on these thermo-physical properties. It is not clear how this uncertainty/variability affects the structural response as a whole. Probabilistic approaches are able to quantify these material property uncertainties.

3. Fire-structure experiments

The discussion about fire-structure experiments is divided into the following sections: (a) standard tests on structural element, (b) structural system tests, (c) material tests, and (d) hybrid testing methods.

(a) Standard tests on structural element tests

Structural element tests are usually performed within a prescriptive regulation. Tests are conducted on individual structural elements, such as beams, columns, floors or walls, of specific dimensions to standard fire exposure in a specially designed fire test furnace. Test procedures, including fire (time-temperature) curves, are specified in standards such as ASTM E119 [6], ISO 834 [5] EN 1363 [62]…

Within this section, test on subassemblies such as girders with slabs or roof can also be considered. Often, in North America, steel columns or subassemblies are not loaded during the tests; generally, the end point (failure) criterion is based on a simple limit, such as unexposed side temperature or critical limiting temperature in structural steel.

There are many drawbacks with the structural element / subassembly tests under standard fire procedure described above, the most important being that they do not account for real fire scenarios (and no decay phase), structural interactions with adjacent framing, realistic load levels and restraint conditions. Further, some current test methods and their acceptance criteria do not give due consideration to various limit states, such as strength, stability, deflection, and rate of deflection for assembly failure.

(b) Structural system tests

There has been only a very limited number of fire experiments that considered the full structural system for evaluating global response of structures. A few tests on portal frames were conducted in the 1970's to 90's. In France, a test on a steel structure car park of 30m x 15 m, under real car fires, was performed in 2001 [63 – 65] and a test on a steel warehouse of 48 m x 32 m and 12 m height subjected to a fire with 310 tonnes of wood over a surface of 24 m x 32 m, in 2008 [66]. In China, full-scale fire tests were conducted on two-storey two-bay composite steel frames [67,68] However, the most notable and significant research in full structure fire experiments were undertaken in the last decades by the Building Research Establishment (BRE) in the U.K, which conducted a series of full-scale fire tests in the Large Building Test Facility (LBTF) at Cardington [69 - 71] The tests on multi-story steel and concrete buildings provided unique and valuable response data regarding the behaviour of both structural and non-structural elements within a real compartment subjected to real fires.

Recently a full-scale 5 story concrete building was tested at University of California San Diego on a shake table. Following the earthquake simulation, a compartment on the 3rd floor was set fire [72, 73]. While this was not a steel frame, it illustrates the kinds of multi-hazard tests that are possible. Performance assessments of both structural and non-structural systems were made. Earthquake motions damaged compartment barrier components by creating gaps at joint areas. It also damaged door frames and doors, and rendered key portions of the means of egress unusable. Important structural connections were damaged following the largest earthquake motions conducted in this test series, resulting in spalling of concrete and exposure of reinforcing steel.

(c) Material tests

In addition to fire tests on structural elements and systems, the temperature dependent properties of steel materials (both thermal and mechanical) are critically important for establishing an understanding of the fire-response of structures. The literature review indicates that the high temperature properties of steel (structural, reinforcing steel) are available. However, there is large variability in similar data obtained from different sources. This high variation in the reported high-temperature properties of steel can be attributed to lack of standardized test methods to test high-temperature properties, and no standardized equipment to measure properties.

Regarding the capability of fire protection systems to provide an adequate protection to steel or composite structures, new kind of test procedures were developed in Europe (see EN 13381- -4, -5, -6 & -8 [74 - 76]) to ensure the protective material remain cohesive and coherent to its support, despite the deflection occurring at high temperature.

Also, some tests have been done on measuring the effectiveness of SFRM (Sprayed fire-resistive material) adhesion to steel following large strains related to seismic loading [77, 78].

(d) Hybrid testing methods

Hybrid fire testing (HFT) considers the effects on a whole building, but only tests individual elements or subassemblies. Computer simulations of a full structure are made, from which an element or subassembly is tested. The computer-simulation of the full structure "talks" to the actuators that represent the forces imposed by the adjacent structure in the tests. HFT therefore simulates the fire performance of the whole building at a lower cost than full-scale testing, and with more reliable results than prescriptive testing. HFT offers the possibility of investigating various fire scenarios, using selected facilities for physical testing, and running the simulation analysis remotely at different locations anywhere in the world. This is a proven method for seismic testing and is recently being adopted for fire at NRC Canada [79 - 81].

C. Knowledge gaps

1. PBD

The knowledge gaps related to PBD are strongly tied to knowledge gaps in modeling and experiments as discussed in detail in the next two sections. The main PBD gaps are (1) the **discrepancy between a structural design** made by considering isolated structural elements to fulfill fire resistance requirements based on the standard fire versus a design of a complete structure taking into account actual fire risks, and, (2) **lack of knowledge in input data or calculation models** leading to the need to refer to large or full scale tests results.

Regarding the discrepancy (item (1)), it is of the responsibility of national authorities to accurately adjust the fire resistance requirements (expressed in terms of ISO 834/ASTM E119 duration) with the actual risks. Up to now this kind of "adjustment" was made generally by expert judgments mainly on the basis of accidental fire feedback; it is now more and more possible to make, with a "real" performance based approach (using design fire scenarios and computer code for analysis), sensitivity analysis on a large variety of buildings and activities to provide rules for more realistic requirements [82].

Performing a "real" performance based design of a structure is not possible if the **fire load during the life time** of building and related heat release rate, for different type of buildings and activities, are not available. Of course, this matter is a transversal matter whatever the material used for the structure (steel, concrete or timber)

In addition, the current regulatory structure in a lot of countries, as the United States, does not foster performance-based design approaches. Although there are some published performance-based building codes (as by ICC), there is little infrastructure or tools to use them. This would include, at a minimum, ***agreed upon performance goals and acceptable levels of risk.*** For widespread implementation of performance-based design methods, these methods must be codified into recognized national standards. These standards generally do not exist, although some are under development. Currently, ASCE's Fire Protection committee submitted a proposal to include PBD for fire in ASCE-7. While it is still under consideration, one of the main concerns by reviewers of the profession is that there is no single comprehensive source (e.g. a book or report) to guide an engineer through the process of PBD.

And finally, PBD is an engineered approach, yet there is no clearly defined **role for the structural engineer or the fire protection engineer** in the design of structures for fire. And the structural engineer is typically not educated with knowledge on fire development or fire-structure interaction, and the fire protection engineer is not educated in structural behavior. Typically the architect has responsibility for the fire safety in building design. The architect may call on a fire protection engineer but recognition for the role for the structural engineer will be necessary for widespread implementation of PBD. While this is not a knowledge gap, it is an important challenge to recognize. One way of solving it could be to train some new kind of fire protection engineer having a structural engineering background and knowledge in the fire behavior of structures or to train some smart structural engineers having a certain knowledge in fire and heat transfer.

2. Fire-structure modeling

The numerical models that are currently being used for predicting the response of structures under fire loading are complex and there is a clear need to validate the use of these models with experimental data. There is a need for having a database on component test results and on the other hand for performing full scale / real scale testing of structures under fire loading to improve the capability of these numerical models.

(a) Gaps in finite element tools (computer modeling)

The first step in structural fire response modeling is to identify the thermal loads on a structure due to fire. The thermal loads on a structure are closely coupled to the radiative and convective heating from the fires to the structure. Though some research results are already available, development of more appropriate interfaces that couple the fire dynamics to the thermal response of a structure and link the thermal models to the structural models are always a critical research need for having an efficient structural fire response modeling.

Gaps also exist due to the lack of interaction between the fire development and the structural response calculations. Within the main process commonly available, calculations are conducted in a "linear and one-way" manner (see chapter B-2). There is no systematic process to take into account the fact that, with the large deformation of the structure, there is a change in the heating condition of structural elements, due to:

- the change in the distance or position between a structural element and the fire source (mainly for pre-flashover conditions), e.g. a bending beam becoming closer to the floor where the fire is located,
- Possible damage of fire protection materials not able to have sufficient ductility to follow the large deformation of a structural element which is thermal protected,
- and possible cracks in non-loadbearing separating elements, created by large deformation of loadbearing element above, which lead to hot gases passing through and the change of heating conditions.

There is also a need to harmonize the ***definition of failure*** to be used with calculation results (mainly when calculating the deformation of the structure), which has to be different to the failure criteria used for testing, since these criteria were developed to safeguard the testing facilities and not to represent specific need within a burning building.

In the context of a multi-hazard computational platform, software needs to advance to consider seamless multi-hazard simulation and modeling various uncertainties (Monte-Carlo simulations). This needs to be done so that the simulation is efficient, numerically stable, accurate, and with robust algorithms that converges toward correct solution. But to model uncertainties data is needed to form statistics for random variables, from which probability models can be developed.

Other gaps in FE modeling include:

- For composite structures, to take into account the bonding behavior at elevated temperatures between steel and concrete as reinforcing bars, steel tube, profile steel sheet and even I or H profile concreted between flanges when the bonding resistance is considered,
- To extend the knowledge in deformation capacity of various types of connections, (e.g. moment-rotation capacity at elevated temperatures),

- Improvements of calculation capabilities for geometrical nonlinearity due to large structural deformation, for modeling rupture of connections and elements, as well as for considering the impact loading in case of collapse of upper floors.

(b) Gaps in simple calculations methods (analytical formulas)

Simple calculation methods for the following structural elements need to be developed:

- Composite columns partially exposed to fire (1, 2 or 3 faces)
- Column and beam with steel profiles encased in concrete,
- Connections within composite structure,
- Composite floors elements (composite slabs, composite beams) with fire above and with fire on both sides (under and above),
- Sub-assemblies (such as portal frame or part of it), and not only isolated structural elements.

(c) Gaps on constitutive material models

Improvement of knowledge need to be performed for the following:

- Better assessment of ductility limits for structural steel at high temperatures (given as 20% of strain in Eurocode [15,16] regardless of the temperature), especially for high strength bolts and weld,
- Physical properties at elevated temperatures for high strength steel (yield stress upper than 500 MPa),
- Better knowledge on creep effect and the way to take this phenomenon much more account for advanced analysis and to consider its influence on strain-stress relationship,
- Physical properties (stress-strain relationships, thermal properties …) of different grades of steel, during cooling phases,
- Physical properties of fire protection materials (including reactive material as intumescent paints) or system, concerning thermal conductivity, specific heat, elongation/shrinkage, all versus temperature, to be used for thermal analysis whatever the fire development,
- Quenching effect on the physical properties of structural steel and fire protection materials due to sprinkling or fire fighting,
- Data on all relevant physical characteristics, as porosity, to unable modeling mass transfer in connection with heat transfer.

(d) Traveling fires and non-structural elements under fire effects

In order to model structures under fire loading, it is essential to fully understand how fires grow and spread from one compartment to another in case of several compartments or inside one large compartment (this matter is a transversal one within the 3 White Papers). The spread of fire can be significantly affected by the presence of partitions, doors, wall, fire load distributions etc (see also "gaps in finite element tools"). Furthermore, breaking of glass windows will affect the ventilation patterns and influence the growth and spread of a fire. New research activities must be initiated in the area of modeling non-structural elements, such as partitions, doors, walls, window breakage etc.

3. Small scale experiments

While the scope of the white paper focuses on large-scale experiments, it should be noted that small-scale experiments on material properties are required to understand and model the larger-scale studies. Knowledge gaps in large-scale experiments are identified in the next section.

Standardized small scale test methods need to be developed to obtain the necessary data on materials properties of steel elements and fire protection materials, focusing mainly for the future high grades of steel, bridge steels such as A709 weathering (including both heating and cooling phases situation), and on sprayed and intumescent material for fire protection.

Accurate methods and standards need to be developed regarding test methods for assessing the capability of fire protection system (including the bonding properties of protective materials to their support), especially for that to be unable to derive the necessary thermo-physical properties from small scale tests, to be used for calculation for both pure steel structure element and composite elements.

D. Topics 1 and 2: Identify and prioritize large-scale experimental needs in order of importance to PBD

Tests, at large scale and/or full scale have to be performed to provide the necessary validation data for calculation methods and to validate the simple and advanced models. Both the experiments and the models are needed to advance PBD. The subsections below identify fire-structure interaction subjects that lack full-scale testing to validate performance and modeling. We also identify tools (hybrid fire testing and sensors) that need to be tested and validated and can potentially advance large-scale testing. The research needs are listed in order of importance (e.g., the first listing being the most important).

(a) Develop advanced tools for large-scale testing

As described previously, hybrid testing links a full structural system simulation with testing of a component of the structure in the lab. The simulation and experiment communicate with each other so that, for example, the proper boundary conditions are applied in the tests. This kind of testing has the potential to reduce costs associated with testing full systems, and although it is advanced and proven for seismic testing, only limited work has been done for fire simulations. There is a need to develop and validate (**a1**) hybrid fire testing for single events (only a fire), but it is also potentially a powerful tool (**a2**) for multi-hazard events as well (e.g. fire following and earthquake or blast).

There is a need to develop (**a3**) new sensor technology for quantifying physical behavior up to 800°C. Sensors and measurements of interest include strains, displacements, load cells, heat flux, and optical techniques. These types of information are crucial for calibrating and verifying complex analysis models.

(b) Perform large-scale steel frame tests on 3D structural systems

The largest absence of data is in large scale 3D structural system tests. These tests are important to complement the smaller scale tests that assume boundary conditions and cannot capture the response of the adjacent structure. Examples of large scale 3D structural system to be tested with with realistic fire scenarios, that are needed to validate models and advance PBD include the following: (**b1**) Multi-story steel framed structure with semi-rigid beam-to-column connections, (**b2**) Braced composite frame with beam-to-column hinge connections; with a set up different to the building tested in Cardington, (**b3**) Mixed structure with high-rise steel frames and concrete core, (**b4**) Multi-hazard of steel (and composite) structures (fire following explosion or earthquake), (**b5**) Integrated floor system structure with different types of connections with vertical elements, (**b6**) Tensioned-cable supported large span structure, (**b7**) Specimens built with high grades of steel, and with "bridge" steels, (**b8**) Integrated floor systems (steel decking slabs with both steel and composite beams) supported by steel columns, (**b9**) Steel structures with envelop elements such as steel roofing, façade.

(c) Perform large-scale tests on structural components

Large scale tests to be performed (for both standard and "real" fire conditions) on structural components for which there is a lack of knowledge are, e.g.: (**c1**) composite columns with non-uniform heating conditions over the cross-section, (**c2**) mega composite columns with steel profiles encased in concrete for super-tall buildings, (**c3**) different type of connection for composite elements, as composite beams, composite columns, (**c4**) buckling-restrained braces with concrete-filled steel tube, (**c5**) floor with fire above and with fire on both sides, (**c6**) protected steel and composite elements with, e.g., intumencent material, (**c7**) Hybrid beams (welded beam with different grades of steel for web and flanges).

(d) Deep plate girders and long span truss beams

Large open spaces in buildings often require **(d1)** deep steel plate girders or **(d2)** long span truss beams. Also, these plate girders or truss beams could be used for column transfer. Yet little or no information exists on how they respond in a fire. Deep plate girders are in particular susceptible to web shear buckling. Some studies have been done on this phenomenon at high temperature [83- 85], mostly as applied to bridges; but there is still a needs for experiments (d1) to be performed on girders deeper than 60 cm.

(e) Effect of structural response on non-structural elements

The response of non-structural elements such as active and passive fire protection systems, doors, ducts, dampers, fire stops, etc., will affect the fire spread and effectiveness of egress.

The large deformations experienced in a steel framed structure could affect the response of these non-structural systems. In addition, if the structure is designed for large seismic activity, the structural design is such that large displacements and ductility is expected. This is at odds with the design of separating and fire stop elements that cannot withstand large displacements/ductility. Full-scale testing of steel frames (**e1**) can address these issues to provide data on maximal displacement allowed and to provide knowledge for modeling such behavior of non-structural elements.

E. Topic 3: Needed research in a timeline

A timeline is presented below for the near term (less than 3 years), medium term (3 to 6 years) and long term (6 to 9 years). Before large sacle 3D structural system tests can be performed, we need to advance the tools (e.g hybrid testing and sensors) so that proper measurements can be made. This can be done in the first three years. Simultaneous to this, large-scale tests on structural components and deep plate girders can be done with the available tools. Once advanced tools are developed, large scale 3D structural system tests can be done in the medium/long term. Incorporated in these tests (as a piggy-back) can be the non-structural element tests. However, large scale experimental is not an end in itself, but is incorporated in the process described in chapter H (Topic 6).

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">less than 3 years</th><th colspan="3">3 to 6 years</th><th colspan="3">6 to 9 years</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">(a) Develop advanced tools</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td colspan="5">(b) large scale 3D structural system tests</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="7">(c) large-scale tests on structural components</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">(d) Deep plate girders and long-span truss beams</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td colspan="5">(e) Non-structural elements</td></tr>
</table>

F. Topic 4: Laboratory facilities available to address each need

(On the only assumption of the authors of the current White Paper, without any specific contact with the given labs)

- BAM, Berlin (Germany) : a1, a2, a3, c2, c3,c4,
- Braunschweig University (Germany) : b7, b8, c5, c6,c7, d1, e1
- BRE – FRS (UK) : b2, b3
- CSTB, Champs-sur-Marne (France), : b1, b6, c1, c6, d1, e1
- Efectis – Maizières-lès-Metz (France) : b1, b5, b6, b8, c2, c3, c4, c5,c6,c7, d1,e1
- Lehigh University :a1 → a3, c1 → c6, d1
- Michigan State University : a1 → a3, c1 → c6, d1
- NIST lab (NFLR) : b1, b2, b3, b4, b8, b9c1,d1, e1
- NRC, Ottawa, Canada : a1, a2, a3,b8
- TFRI, Tianjin, : b1, b2, b3, b8, c1,c4,c5

- Tongji University, China : b3, b6, c1, c2 c3, c4, c5, c6, c7
- University of California San Diego : a2

G. Topic 5: Potential collaborators and sponsors for each need

Potential collaborators are national research institutes with knowledge and interests on steel structures and fire behavior, such as: CTICM - France, and NRC Canada. In addition, Universities and their affiliated experts are potential collaborators.

Potential sponsors are national research institutes funded by the steel construction manufacturers or by national government and steel producers, such as: AISC, AISI, ArcelorMittal, China Construction (Group) Company, European Research Fund for Coal and Steel (RFCS), Tata.

H. Topic 6: Transfer of Results

To be efficient, each research project should be structured as follows:

- Bibliographical study on available knowledge on the item to be tackled and identification of existing test results dealing with the item
- If no existing test results for the item or if test results are not enough detailed, to perform some tests able to point out various using conditions. A database containing all detailed experimental results to be set up
- According to physical phenomena identified, to develop calculation method to reproduce them and provide answer to the research item
- To check, and if necessary improve, accuracy of the calculation method with results of new tests to be performed
- Then either use the calculation method to design/verify structure according to the item covered, or use the calculation method for sensibility analysis to provide simple calculation method dealing with the item
- Produce report for the use of the calculation method, giving boundary limits for validity
- Produce report for simple design method or develop standard on the same matter

I. Topic 7: Means to review progress and exchange information

To review progress, a progress update sheet as shown below can be located in a web site and updated regularly (but no less than twice a year).

Project n°	Purpose	Founded interested institutes	Founded interested laboratories	Founded interested sponsors (and amount of financial support)	Progress in the research work	Progress in the transfer of results
1						

2						

J. References

[1] Kodur, V.K., Garlock, M.E.M., Iwankiw, N. (2012). "Structures in Fire: State-of-the-Art, Research, Training Needs", Fire Technology, Vol. 48, Issue 4, pp 825-839.

[2] Kathleen H. Almand , "Structural Fire Resistance Experimental Research -Priority Needs of U.S. Industry" NFPA - Fire Protection Research Foundation, 2012

[3] J. Kruppa, G. Sedlacek et al. " "Needs to achieve improved fire protection as regards […] the EN Eurocodes", JRC/European Commission, EUR 23523 EN – 2008

[4] Li G-Q, Wu B, Jiang S-C State-of-the-art and Suggestion of Research on Fire-Resistance of Structures, Journal of Progress in Steel Building Structures, 12(5), pp13-18, 2010. (in Chinese)

[5] ISO 834-1, Fire-Resistance Tests - Elements of Building Construction - Part 1: General Requirements, Geneva – ISO -1999.

[6] American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). (2000). “Standard test methods for fire tests of building construction and materials.” E 119, ASTM, 1-21.

[7] Babrauskas V., Williamson R. B. "Historical Basis of Fire Resistance Testing" Fire Technology - Vol 14, Nb 3 / Aug 1978 (part I) and Nb 4 / Nov 1978 (part II)

[8] ISO 23932, Fire safety engineering – General principles – Geneva – ISO - 2009.

[9] J. Kruppa, D. Joyeux " Proposal For A Real Performance Based Code In Fire Resistance", Eurofire 1998

[10] ISO TS 16733, Fire safety engineering — Selection of design fire scenarios and design fires – Geneva – ISO - 2006

[11] CIB W14, Rational Fire Safety Engineering Approach to Fire Resistance of Buildings, publication 269 – 2001.

[12] ISO TS 24679, Fire safety engineering – Performance of structures in fire - 2009.

[13] J. Kruppa, "Eurocodes For Fire Safety Engineering", Conference "Code in structural Engineering" – IABSE – Dubrovnik May 3-5, 2010

[14] EN1991-1-2: Eurocode 1: Actions on structures - Part 1-2: General rules - Actions on structures exposed to fire, Brussels, CEN, 2002

[15] EN1993-1-2: Eurocode 3: Design of steel structures - Part 1-2: General rules – Structural fire design, Brussels, CEN, 2005

[16] EN1994-1-2: Eurocode 4: Design of composite steel and concrete structures – Part 1-2: General rules - Structural fire design, Brussels, CEN, 2005

[17] ATC (2004). “Engineering Design Parameters for Structural Framing Systems”, ATC-58 Project Task Report, Phase 2, Task 2.2

[18] Ellingwood, B. (2009). “Ch3, Decision Framework for Fire Risk Mitigation” in Best Practice Guidelines for S.F.R of Concrete and Steel Buildings (Draft for Public Comments), NISTIR 7563, NIST, Gaithersburg, Md.

[19] Elhami Khorasani, N., Garlock, M.E.M., Gardoni, P. (2013). “Fire Load: Survey Data, Recent Standards, and Probabilistic Models for Office Buildings”, Engineering Structures, Elsevier, in press: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2013.07.042

[20] Sanctis, G. De, Fischer, K.; Kohler, J.; Fontana, M.; Faber, M.H. (2011). “A probabilistic framework for generic fire risk assessment and risk-based decision making in buildings” Proceedings of the 11th Int. Conf. on Applications of Statistics and Probability in Civil Engineering, p 2000-2007.

[21] Shi, Kaihan, Guo, Qianru; Jeffers, Ann (2013). “Stochastic analysis of structures in fire by Monte Carlo simulation”,Journal of Structural Fire Engineering, v 4, n 1, p 37-46, March 1, 2013

[22] Thauvoye C. et al. "Method for calculating heat fluxes from a warehouse fire SFPE, 8th International Conference on Performance-Based Codes and Fire Safety Design Methods, Lund, Sweden 16-18 June 2010

[23] J.Y. Richard Liew, and Hong Chen, Explosion and Fire Analysis of Steel Frames Using Fiber Element Approach, Journal of Structural Engineering, 130(7), pp991-1000, 2004.

[24] J.Y. Richard Liew, Survivability of steel frame structures subject to blast and fire, Journal of Constructional Steel Research 64 (2008) 854–866

[25] Della Corte, G, Landolfo, R, Mazzolani, FM. (2003). “Post-earthquake fire resistance of moment resisting steel frames,” Fire Safety Journal, 38:593-612.

[26] Scawthorn, C, Eidinger, J.M., and Schiff, A.J. (2005). Fire Following Earthquake, Technical Council on Lifeline Earthquake Engineering, Monograph No. 26, Published by ASCE, January.

[27] Scawthorn, C. (2008). “The Shake Out Scenario – Fire Following Earthquake” Prepared for United States Geological Survey, Pasadena, CA and California Geological Survey, Sacramento, CA, March 3.

[28] Lee, S., Davidson, R., Ohnishi, N., and Scawthorn, C. (2008). “Fire Following Earthquake—Reviewing the State-of-the-Art of Modeling.” Earthquake Spectra: November 2008, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 933-967

[29] Mousavi, S., Bagchi, A., Kodur, V.K.R. (2008). “Review of post-earthquake fire hazard to building structures”, Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering, v 35, n 7, p 689-698, July 2008

[30] Yassin H., Iqbal, F., Bagchi, A., and Kodur, V.K.K.R. (2008). “Assessment of Post-earthquake Fire Performance of Steel-Frame Buildings”, Proceedings of the 14th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, October 12-17, 2008, Beijing, China.

[31] Neal, M., Garlock, M.E.M., Quiel, S.E., Marjanishvili, S. (2012). “Effects of Fire on a Tall Steel Building Designed to Resist Progressive Collapse”, Proceedings of the ASCE Structures Congress, ASCE, Chicago, March.

[32] Quiel, S.E. and Marjanishvili, S. (2012). “Fire Resistance of a Damaged Steel Building Frame that has been Designed to Resist Progressive Collapse,” Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 402-409

[33] Franssen J.-M. (2005). “SAFIR: A thermal/structural program for modeling structures under fire.” Engineering Journal, AISC, 42(3), pp. 143-158.

[34] http://www.vulcan-solutions.com/software.html

[35] http://www.ansys.com/

[36] Craveur J.C., Jetteur Philippe "Numerical simulation of fire resistance of ship steel decks" NAFEMS – Benchmark – July 2009

[37] ABAQUS version 6.8 Documentation, DS-Simulia, 2008

[38] Jiang J, and Usmani A. Modeling of steel frame structures in Fire using OpenSees. Journal of Computers and Structures 2013; 118: 90-99.

[39] S. Kuma, B. Zhao et al. "Integrating advanced three-dimensional modelling methodologies for predicting thermo-mechanical behaviour of steel and composite structures subjected to natural fires" European Commission - EUR 23200 EN – 2008

[40] LI G.Q. and WANG P.J., Advanced analysis and design for fire safety of steel structures, Zhejiang University Press, Hangzhou and Pringer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.

[41] Yu, Xiaojun, Jeffers, Ann E. (203). “A comparison of subcycling algorithms for bridging disparities in temporal scale between the fire and solid domains”, Fire Safety Journal, v 59, p 55-61.

[42] Joël Kruppa, Daniel Joyeux, Bin Zhao, " Scientific Background to the Harmonization of Structural Eurocodes" Heron (NL) VOLUME 50, 2005, N°. 4

[43] CECS200:2006. Code for Fire Safety of Steel Structures for Buildings. China 2006

[44] Dwaikat, M.M.S., Kodur, V.K.R., Quiel, S.E., Garlock, M.E.M., (2011). “Experimental Behavior of Steel Beam-Columns Subjected to Fire-Induced Thermal Gradients”, Journal of Constructional Steel Research, Elsevier, v67, n 1, p 30 – 38

[45] Garlock, M.E.M. and Quiel, S.E. (2007) “Mechanics of Wide-Flanged Steel Sections with Thermal Gradients Due to Fire Exposure,” International Journal of Steel Structures, Korean Society of Steel Construction, 7(3), 153-162.

[46] Garlock, M.E.M. and Quiel, S.E., (2008) “Plastic Axial Load - Moment Interaction Curves for Fire-Exposed Steel Sections with Thermal Gradients”, Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE 134(6).

[47] Quiel, S.E., Garlock, M.E.M., Paya-Zaforteza, I. (2011). “Closed-form Procedure for Predicting the Capacity and Demand of Steel Beam-Columns under Fire”, Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE, 137(9), p.967-976.

[48] Agarwal, Anil, Choe, Lisa; Varma, Amit H. (2014). “Fire design of steel columns: Effects of thermal gradients”, Journal of Constructional Steel Research, v 93, p 107-118, February.

[49] Lawson R M , Mullett D L and Rackham (1997), Design of asymmetric slimflor beam using deep composite decking, SCI Publication 175, The Steel Construction Institute, Ascot, UK,

[50] Mullett D L and Lawson R M (1999), Design of slimflor fabricated beam using deep composite decking, SCI Publication 248, The Steel Construction Institute, Ascot, UK,

[51] J. M. Aribert, Ch. Renaud and B. Zhao, " Simplified fire design for composite hollow-section columns", Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers Structures & Buildings 161 December 2008 Issue SB6, Pages 325–336

[52] S. Desanghere, "DEVELOPMENT OF A SIMPLIFIED MODEL AIMED AT PREDICTING EXTERNAL MEMBERS HEATING CONDITIONS" – Interflam 2007

[53] Selamet, S., and Garlock, M.E.M. (2012). “Predicting the maximum compressive Beam Axial Force during Fire considering Local Buckling”, Journal of Constructional Steel Research, Elsevier, V.71, p.189-201.

[54] Bailey C.G. and Moore D.B., The structural behaviour of steel frames with composite floor slabs subjected to fire: Part 1: Theory and Part 2: Design

[55] Vassart O. and Zhao B., Membrane action of composite structures in case of fire, ECCS, Technical document, N°132 2013

[56] Li G.Q., Guo X.S. and Zhou H.S. Modeling of membrane action in floor slabs subjected to fire, Structural Engineering, 29-2007

[57] ZHAO B., A new design method for calculating the fire protection of composite (steel and concrete) structures, EUROFIRE 2011 – "FSE – Trends and practical Applications" 25-27 May 2011

[58] Lie, T.T. (1992). Structural Fire Protection: Manual of Practice. ASCE Manuals and Reports of Engineering Practice. No. 78. American Society of Civil Engineers.

[59] Luecke, W.E., Banovic, S. and McColskey, J.D. (2011). “High-Temperature Tensile Constitutive Data and Models for Structural Steels in Fire”. NIST Technical Note 1714. U.S. Department of Commerce. National Institute of Standards and Technology. November.

[60] PennDOT (2011). “Effects of Fire Damage on the Structural Properties of Steel Bridge Elements”, PennDOT, April 30.

[61] Garlock, Maria (2014). “Elevated Temperature Properties of A588 Weathering Steel” CAIT-UTC-021 Final Report, Rutgers University, NJDOT, USDOT, January.

[62] " Fire resistance tests", part 1 – EN 1363-1 – CEN – March 1999

[63] Zhao B. and Fraud C., Fire resistance analysis of open car parks with composite structures under real car fire. Conference on composite construction - July 2004, South Africa.

[64] Joyeux D., Natural fires in closed car parks - Car Fire Tests CTICM report INC-96/294d – DJ/NB – August 1997

[65] Bin Zhao and Joel Kruppa, " Structural behaviour of an open car park under real fire scenarios", Fire and Materials, 2004

[66] Thauvoye C. et al. "Method for calculating heat fluxes from a warehouse fire SFPE, 8th International Conference on Performance-Based Codes and Fire Safety Design Methods, Lund, Sweden 16-18 June 2010

[67] Dong Y. L., Prasad K., Thermal and structural response of a two-story, two bay composite steel frame under fire loading. Proceedings of the Combustion Institute,2009, 32, 2543-2550

[68] Dong Y. L., Zhu E. C.,Prasad K., Thermal and structural response of two-storey two-bay composite steel frames under furnace loading. Fire Safety Journal, 2009, 4

[69] Bailey, C.G., Lennon, T., and Moore, D.B. (1999). “The behavior of full-scale

steel-framed buildings subjected to compartment fires." The Structural Engineer, Vol. 77, No. 8, pp. 15-21

[70] Lennon,T., and Moore, D. (2004).: Results and observations from full-scale fire test at BRE Cardington, 16 January 2003

[71] Gille, M., Usmani, A.S., Rotter, J.M., (2002) "A structural analysis of the Cardington British Steel corner test", Journal of Constructional Steel Research, Vol. 58, No. 4, pp. 427-442

[72] Hutchinson, T., Restrepo, J.I.; Conte, J.; Meacham, B. (2013). "Overview of the building nonstructural components and systems (BNCS) project" Proceedings of the Structures Congress 2013, p 1485-98, 2013

[73] Pantoli, E., Wang, X.; Chen, M.; Hutchinson, T.; Meacham, B.; Park, H.J. (2013). "Shake table testing of a full-scale five-story building: Performance of the major nonstructural components-Egress and façades", - Bridging Your Passion with Your Profession - Proceedings of the 2013 Structures Congress, p 1447-1459, 2013,

[74] EN 13381-4 & 8 "test method for determining the contribution to the fire resistance of structural members: by applied protection to structural elements"

[75] EN 13381-5 "test method for determining the contribution to the fire resistance of structural members: by applied protection to concrete/profiled steel sheet

[76] EN 13381-6 "test method for determining the contribution to the fire resistance of structural members: by applied protection to concrete filled hollow steel columns

[77] Braxtan, N.J.L., Pessiki, S.P. (2011). "Post-earthquake Fire Performance of Sprayed Fire Resistive Material on Steel Moment Frames". Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE, 137(9), p.946-953.

[78] Ryder, N.L., Wolin, S.D., and Milke, J. (2002). "An Investigation of the Reduction in Fire Resistance of Steel Columns Caused by Loss of Spray-Applied Fire Protection", Journal of Fire Protection Engineering, Vol 12, February, p. 31-44.

[79] Mostafaei, H. (2009) "A Hybrid Fire-Resistance Test Method for Steel Columns, NRC-CNRC Report # IRC-RR-292, November.

[80] Mostafaei, Hossein (2013). "Hybrid fire testing for assessing performance of structures in fire – Application" Fire Safety Journal, v 56, p 30-38, 2013[81] Mostafaei, Hossein (2013). "Hybrid fire testing for assessing performance of structures in fire – Methodology" Fire Safety Journal, v 58, p 170-179, 2013

[82] Henneton N., Kruppa J. and Zhao B., "Fire risk assessment for people in steel structure warehouses", EUROSTEEL, September 2011, Budapest, Hungary

[83] Payá-Zaforteza, I, Garlock, M. (2012). "A numerical investigation on the fire response of a steel girder bridge", Journal of Constructional Steel Research, Elsevier, V. 75, p.93-103. 59.

[84] Glassman, J., Garlock, M.E.M. (2013). "Shear buckling behavior of steel plate girders at elevated temperatures", Proceedings of the ASCE Structures Congress, ASCE, Pittsburgh, PA, May.

[85] Glassman, J., Garlock, M., "Web shear buckling equations for steel plate girder bridges at elevated temperatures" (2013). Submitted for publication in Journal of Constructional Steel Research, Elsevier.