

**Deep Deck and Cellular
Deck Diaphragm Strength
and Stiffness Evaluation**

RESEARCH REPORT RP08-9

July 2008

Committee on Specifications
for the Design of Cold-Formed
Steel Structural Members



American Iron and Steel Institute

The material contained herein has been developed by researchers based on their research findings. The material has also been reviewed by the American Iron and Steel Institute Committee on Specifications for the Design of Cold-Formed Steel Structural Members. The Committee acknowledges and is grateful for the contributions of such researchers.

The material herein is for general information only. The information in it should not be used without first securing competent advice with respect to its suitability for any given application. The publication of the information is not intended as a representation or warranty on the part of the American Iron and Steel Institute, or of any other person named herein, that the information is suitable for any general or particular use or of freedom from infringement of any patent or patents. Anyone making use of the information assumes all liability arising from such use.



VirginiaTech
Invent the Future

**VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
AND STATE UNIVERSITY**

The Charles E. Via, Jr. Department
of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Structural Engineering and Materials

DEEP DECK AND CELLULAR DECK DIAPHRAGM STRENGTH AND STIFFNESS EVALUATION

by

**Jonathan M. Bagwell
Research Assistant**

**W. Samuel Easterling
Principal Investigator**

Submitted to

**American Iron and Steel Institute
Committee on Specifications for the Design of Cold-Formed Steel Structural Members**

**1140 Connecticut Ave, Suite 705
Washington, NC 20036**

And

**The Steel Deck Institute
P.O. Box 25
Fox River Grove, IL 60021**

Report No. CEE/VPI-ST – 08/03

July 2008

Research Report

**DEEP DECK AND CELLULAR DECK DIAPHRAGM
STRENGTH
AND STIFFNESS EVALUATION**

**by
Jonathan M. Bagwell
Research Assistant**

**W. Samuel Easterling
Principal Investigator**

Submitted to

**American Iron and Steel Institute
Committee on Specifications for the Design of Cold-Formed Steel Structural
Members
1140 Connecticut Ave, Suite 705
Washington, NC 20036
and
The Steel Deck Institute
P.O. Box 25
Fox River Grove, IL 60021**

Report No. CEE/VPI-ST – 08/03

**The Charles E. Via, Jr. Department of Civil Engineering
Structures and Materials Research Laboratory
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, VA 24060**

July 2008

DEEP DECK AND CELLULAR DECK DIAPHRAGM STRENGTH AND STIFFNESS EVALUATION

Abstract

Twenty cantilever diaphragm tests were performed in the Structures and Materials Laboratory at Virginia Tech. The tests included both deep deck and cellular deck profiles with varying structural and side-lap fasteners. The tests were conducted with three different structural fasteners: screws, powder-actuated fasteners (also referred to herein as “pins”) and welds and two different side-lap fasteners: screws and button punch.

The tests were conducted and both load and deflection of the diaphragms were recorded. The current International Code Council, ICC, evaluation procedure shows that there are two different methods for measuring diaphragm deflection. The first method uses specific corner displacements and making corrections to remove any rigid body motion. The second method is by measuring the deflection of the diagonals of the diaphragm. In this study both measurements were taken to do a comparison of the results that were obtained.

Both strength and stiffness values were calculated based on the Steel Deck Institute (SDI) Diaphragm Design Manual (2004) and modifications described by Luttrell (2005). The paper by Luttrell (2005) only recommends modifications for the calculation of diaphragm stiffness. The data obtained from the tests were compared to the SDI calculations to distinguish any noticeable trends. Modifications are recommended regarding diaphragm strength and further research is suggested to create a better stiffness prediction of diaphragms.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Scope of Research	1
1.3 Research Outline	2
1.4 Definitions.....	3
CHAPTER 2 –LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Previous Research	5
2.2 SDI Diaphragm Design Manual Calculation Procedure.....	10
CHAPTER 3 – EXPERIMENTAL TESTING.....	17
3.1 Overview	17
3.2 Test Details.....	18
3.2.1 Test Designation.....	18
3.2.2 Test Frame Configuration.....	19
3.2.3 Test Specimen Configuration.....	23
3.2.4 Test Loading and Measurements.....	25
3.3 Coupon Tests.....	29
CHAPTER 4 – DIAPHRAGM STRENGTH AND STIFFNESS EVALUATION	32
4.1 Overview	32
4.2 Diaphragm Shear Strength Calculations.....	32
4.2.1 SDIDDM03 Procedure	32
4.2.2 Fastener Strength.....	33
4.2.2.1 Screws	34
4.2.2.2 Powder-Actuated Fasteners	36
4.2.2.3 Arc-spot Welds.....	38
4.2.2.4 Example Calculation	40
4.2.3 Comparison of SDIDDM03 Calculated Strength to Observed Strength.....	43
4.2.4 Recommended Modifications to Strength Determination	54
4.3 Diaphragm Shear Stiffness Calculations	57
4.3.1 SDIDDM03 Procedure.....	57

4.3.2 Example Stiffness Calculation	57
4.3.3 Observed Behavior and Stiffness	60
4.3.4 Comparison of SDIDDM03 Calculated Stiffness to Observed Stiffness.....	66
4.3.5 Comparison of White Paper Calculated Stiffness to Observed Stiffness.....	69
4.3.6 Recommended Modifications to Stiffness Evaluation	72
CHAPTER 5 – SUMMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	74
5.1 Summary	74
5.2 Conclusions	74
5.3 Recommendations	75
REFERENCES	77
APPENDIX A – DIAPHRAGM TEST RESULTS	80
APPENDIX B – REDUCED COUPON AND DIAPHRAGM DATA.....	101
APPENDIX C - DIAPHRAGM TEST FASTENER FAILURE MATRIX.....	105

List of Figures

Figure 2-1: Diaphragm Layout Schematic.....	10
Figure 3-1: Typical Test Setup.....	18
Figure 3-2: 24 ft Span Test Setup.....	20
Figure 3-3: Beam to Beam Connection.....	20
Figure 3-4: Restraint and Roller System.....	21
Figure 3-5: Corner 1 Brace.....	22
Figure 3-6: Corner 2 Brace.....	22
Figure 3-7: Corner 3 Brace.....	23
Figure 3-8: Corner 4 Brace.....	23
Figure 3-9: Typical Panel Layout.....	24
Figure 3-10: Test Program Deck Profiles.....	25
Figure 3-11: Displacement transducer Configuration.....	26
Figure 3-12: Tensile Coupon Test Setup.....	30
Figure 4-1: Element Shear Load.....	33
Figure 4-2: Corner Force Distribution.....	33
Figure 4-3: Screw Gun and Self-Drilling Screws.....	34
Figure 4-4: Hilti X-ENP-19 L15 Powder Actuated Fastener.....	36
Figure 4-5: Hilti DX 76 Pin Installation Tool.....	37
Figure 4-6: Arc-spot Weld.....	38
Figure 4-7: Side-lap Detail.....	45
Figure 4-8: Weld Crack from Diaphragm Loading.....	46
Figure 4-9: Z-Closure for 2 x N Deck.....	47
Figure 4-10: Strength Comparison, SDIDDM03 vs. Tested.....	48
Figure 4-11: Strength Comparison with Shear Limitation.....	51
Figure 4-12: Button Punch Strength Trend.....	56
Figure 4-13: Warping distortion of N-Deck.....	61
Figure 4-14: End view of Cellular Profile Test.....	61
Figure 4-15 Load vs. Displacement for Test 5.....	66
Figure 4-16: Stiffness Comparison, SDIDDM03 versus Test (Corners).....	68
Figure 4-17: Stiffness Comparison, SDIDDM03 versus Test (Diagonals).....	68
Figure 4-18: Stiffness Comparison, White Paper versus Test (Corners).....	71
Figure 4-19: Stiffness Comparison, White Paper versus Test (Diagonals).....	71

Figure A-1: Load vs. Displacement Wheeling 4.5 in 20 Ga – Screw Test	81
Figure A-2: Load vs. Displacement USD 4.5 in 20/20 Ga – Screw Test.....	82
Figure A-3: Load vs. Displacement CSI 7.5 in 18 Ga – Screw Test.....	83
Figure A-4: Load vs. Displacement USD 4.5 in 18/18 Ga – Screw Test.....	84
Figure A-5: Load vs. Displacement USD 7.5 in 18/20 Ga – Screw Test.....	85
Figure A-6: Load vs. Displacement CSI 7.5 in 16 Ga – Screw Test.....	86
Figure A-7: Load vs. Displacement Wheeling 4.5 in 20 Ga – Pin Test.....	87
Figure A-8: Load vs. Displacement Wheeling 4.5 in 16 Ga – Pin Test.....	88
Figure A-9: Load vs. Displacement CSI 7.5 in 18 Ga – Pin Test.....	89
Figure A-10: Load vs. Displacement USD 7.5 in 18/20 – Pin Test.....	90
Figure A-11: Load vs. Displacement USD 7.5 in 16/18 – Pin Test.....	91
Figure A-12: Load vs. Displacement Wheeling 4.5 in 18 Ga – Weld Test.....	92
Figure A-13: Load vs. Displacement USD 4.5 in 20/20 Ga – Weld Test.....	93
Figure A-14: Load vs. Displacement Wheeling 6 in 20/20 Ga – Weld Test.....	94
Figure A-15: Load vs. Displacement Vulcraft 3 in 16/16 Ga – Pin Test.....	95
Figure A-16: Load vs. Displacement Vulcraft 3 in 20/20 Ga – Pin Test.....	96
Figure A-17: Load vs. Displacement Wheeling 6 in 16/16 Ga – Pin Test.....	97
Figure A-18: Load vs. Displacement Vulcraft 3 in 18/18 Ga – Screw Test.....	98
Figure A-19: Load vs. Displacement Vulcraft 3 in 20/20 Ga – Screw Test.....	99
Figure A-20: Load vs. Displacement Wheeling 6 in 20/20 Ga – Screw Test.....	100
Figure B-1: Deflection at Maximum Load Comparison, Corner vs. Diagonals.....	102

List of Tables

Table 2-1: Cellular Diaphragm Test Data.....	16
Table 3-1: Test Configurations.....	19
Table 3-2: Final Loading Time of Diaphragms.....	28
Table 3-3: Coupon Test Results	31
Table 4-1: Weld Burn-off Rate Data	39
Table 4-2: Test Matrix.....	43
Table 4-3: SDIDDM03 and Test Strength Results.....	49
Table 4-4: SDIDDM03 Fastener Strength.....	50
Table 4-5: SDIDDM03 with Shear Limitation and Test Strength Results.....	52
Table 4-6: Wheeling Button Punch Data and Test Comparison.....	53
Table 4-7: Diaphragm Displacements.....	63
Table 4-8: Corner and Diagonal Stiffness Comparison.....	64
Table 4-9: SDIDDM03 Stiffness Comparison	67
Table 4-10: White Paper Stiffness Comparison	70
Table B-1: Corrected Deflection at Maximum Load.....	101
Table B-2: SDIDDM03 Strength.....	103
Table B-3: SDIDDM03 Strength with Shear Limitation.....	104
Table C-1: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #1.....	107
Table C-2: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #2.....	108
Table C-3: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #3.....	109
Table C-4: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #4.....	110
Table C-5: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #5.....	111
Table C-6: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #6.....	112
Table C-7: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #7.....	113
Table C-8: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #8.....	114
Table C-9: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #9.....	115
Table C-10: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #10.....	116
Table C-11: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #11.....	117
Table C-12: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #12.....	118
Table C-13: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #13.....	119
Table C-14: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #14.....	120
Table C-15: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #15.....	121
Table C-16: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #16.....	122

Table C-17: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #17.....	123
Table C-18: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #18.....	124
Table C-19: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #19.....	125
Table C-20: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #20.....	126

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

In the design of any structure, the determination of proper loads is essential in the design process. The two types of loads common to any structure are vertical and horizontal. Vertical loads come from the application of live loads and the presence of dead loads that are within the structure. Horizontal loads come from external forces, such as wind or earthquakes, which are applied perpendicular to the exterior of the building. Once these loads are quantified the building components must be designed to withstand the stresses that will ensue. Some of the common building components are beams, columns, connections, roof and floor sheathing, and horizontal load resisting systems. Horizontal load resisting systems can include things such as x-bracing, shear walls and diaphragms.

Horizontal load resisting systems are placed in a building at locations that are most advantageous for their purpose. This advantage comes from the floor and roof systems ability to act as a deep beam or diaphragm to transfer the loads. The typical floor and roof bracing systems in steel buildings that are used to accomplish this are x-bracing, concrete slabs, light gage cold-formed steel deck, and steel deck reinforced concrete slabs. Light gage cold-formed steel deck used as a diaphragm system is the focus of this thesis with special interest in the effect of deep deck systems.

1.2 Scope of Research

The goal of this research was to examine the performance of deep deck and cellular deck diaphragms. Most of the diaphragm research conducted from the late 1950s to date was done with decks ranging in depth from 9/16 in. to 3 in. In this study, narrow rib decks, N-decks, with a depth greater than 3 in. and cellular decks 3 in. or greater were considered. Cellular decks have similar profiles to N-decks with the addition of a flat sheet on the bottom of the profile. This flat sheet benefits the profile in several ways. It increases the flexural strength of the profile enabling it to span longer distances. It also decreases the warping distortion that occurs at the end of the sheet. Also the flat sheet helps increase the shear strength of the section in-plane by increasing the shear area. The

research program consisted of 20 diaphragm tests and sixty tensile coupon tests representing each unique component of the different deck sections. This test program utilized three types of sheet-to-structural (structural) fasteners and two types of sheet-to-sheet fasteners. Nine tests were conducted with screws used for the structural fasteners, eight tests with Hilti powder-actuated fasteners used for the structural fasteners, and three tests with welds used for the structural fasteners.

The experimental results were analyzed to determine both the strength and stiffness of the system. The experimental values were compared to those predicted by the SDIDDM03 (Luttrell 2004) including the modifications described by Luttrell (2005) that pertain to deep deck and cellular deck profiles. Once the comparisons were made recommendations were developed for modifications to the SDI design method.

1.3 Research Outline

To better understand the research topics a brief outline will be given that describes the topics that will be covered. Chapter 2 is a review of the past research that has been done in the field of cold-formed steel diaphragms. This review, however, will be about general diaphragm behavior not pertaining to deep decks. This is because the information is not available, hence, the reason for this study. The methodology behind the SDIDDM03 is also presented in Chapter 2.

In Chapter 3, the experimental test program is described in detail. A designation was established for each test to distinguish the fastener configuration being used. The test frame configuration is shown to illustrate how the diaphragm test setups were arranged. The loading and measurements taken for each test are described in detail. Also included in the test program are coupon tests. The process used for their testing is also described.

Detailed descriptions of the diaphragm strength and stiffness calculations from the SDIDDM03 are presented in Chapter 4. Along with a description of the calculation procedure, example calculations are given. A comparison of the calculated strength and stiffness with the observed test strength and stiffness are presented.

In Chapter 5 a summary of the significant findings from the test program are presented. Along with these findings any potential conclusions and recommendations regarding the SDIDDM03 design method are also presented. Suggestions for further

research are also listed.

1.4 Definitions

Panel – An individual cold-formed steel deck unit ranging in width from 12 in. to 36 in. Each panel can either be single span or multiple spans depending upon the application.

Cover Width – The width of each panel of a cold-formed steel deck.

Structural Fastener – Any fastener used to attach the cold-formed steel deck to the main support elements of a structure.

Arc-spot Welds – A type of welded fastener that is used to secure deck panels to the supporting steel structure. These welds are made by burning a hole in the deck panel and filling in the hole with weld metal in a continuous process. The typical arc-spot weld used in this project was $\frac{3}{4}$ in. visible diameter.

Powder Actuated Fasteners – A specialized mechanical fastener used to secure the deck panels to the supporting steel structure that is also referred to as a “pin” in this report. The fastener is installed by driving the fastener from a specialized tool with a powder charge into the structural steel. The powder-actuated fastener used in this project was a Hilti X-ENP-19 L15.

Side-Lap Fastener – The side-lap is the interface where two panels connect parallel to the span of the deck. This fastener can be made by: seam welds, screws, or button punch. In this project these fasteners were made with either screws or button punch.

Button Punch – A mechanical side-lap fastener made using a specialized tool to crimp the interlocking deck side-laps between the adjacent panels.

Pitch – The width of a single flute or cell in a diaphragm profile.

CHAPTER 2 –LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Previous Research

The first research work on light gage steel shear diaphragms in the United States was done by Arthur Nilson at Cornell University. From 1956 to 1960 he tested 46 full-scale diaphragms with the cantilever test method. Originally, the tests were conducted with three connected bays loaded at the third points but it was determined that an individual bay could be tested for shear strength. The middle bay in the original test configuration was eliminated because even though some moment was transferred through the system only the total deflection was changed (Nilson, 1960a.) During the testing of steel diaphragms at Cornell University the most efficient and economical ways to connect to the frame and to join the panels were established. A special type of welding was determined to be the most efficient and has since become a part of standard industry practice. For the different fastener scenarios four basic types of welds were established. These welds are arc-spot welds at panel ends, fillet welds at panel edges, seam weld used for concave-upward hook joint, and a different seam weld used for concave-downward hook joint (Nilson, 1960 b). The cantilever test method has been used for many years and has become the American Iron and Steel Institute, AISI, standard (AISI, 2002). Luttrell followed Nilson's work and derived a semi-empirical equation to determine the shear stiffness of standard corrugated diaphragms (Luttrell, 1965a). One of Luttrell's main findings was that the panel length has a strong influence on stiffness but not on the overall ultimate strength. Apparao (1966) supported many of the observations that Luttrell had reported. The observations showed that length of the diaphragm, fastener type, and connector spacing are the major influences on shear stiffness (Apparao, 1966).

Luttrell (1967) reported on many tests of steel deck diaphragms conducted at Cornell University. The main components that he studied were intermediate side-lap fasteners, panel cover width, deck thickness, panel length, material strength, and frame flexibility. Luttrell observed a moderate influence on the ultimate strength of the diaphragms from the frame flexibility. An interesting point was that no constant correlation was found between number of side-lap fasteners and the diaphragm shear strength. However, additional side-lap fasteners between purlins were found to impact

stiffness more than strength. Luttrell found that strength increased nearly linearly as deck thickness increased. Panel cover width data was not conclusive. However, it pointed to a doubled stiffness for an increase of only 50% in cover width. The panel length was found to have a small effect on the shear strength but could have a large effect on the shear stiffness. The stiffness increase is due to the percentage of corrugation length that is not warped when load is applied (Luttrell, 1967).

Ellifritt and Luttrell (1970) reported over 100 full-scale diaphragm tests. These tests were used to determine the main components that affect diaphragm performance. Once these components were identified, then proper design criteria for both ultimate strength and shear stiffness were developed. Some of the components that were evaluated were: material yield strength, thickness, panel width, extra end weld, purlin spacing, deck profile, side lap fasteners and structural fasteners. The investigation on material yield strength found that its change did not correspond to a linear variation in strength. To account for a material thickness change, a separate equation had to be developed. The equations, which are based on profile dimensions, compute the strength and stiffness of the diaphragm. These equations needed an additional equation to act as a conversion factor which accounts for the thickness change.

For the panel width component, it was noticed that an increase in strength came with wider panels. This was the same finding made by Luttrell (1967). However, this increase was not found to be as significant as the addition of extra welds (Ellifritt and Luttrell, 1970). For the extra end weld, the test results showed that the strength only needed to be modified by a coefficient. This coefficient was related to the gage, profile of the diaphragm, and the spacing of the welds. From the purlin spacing variation it was noticed that as the purlins got closer, the ultimate strength was increased. This was due to the increase in number of fasteners and the reduction of the possibility of out-of-plane buckling of the diaphragm.

Also several different profiles were examined to determine their strength. The different profiles that were evaluated were narrow rib, intermediate rib, and wide rib sections. Because narrow rib was the weakest it was normalized and the other profiles were ranked accordingly. The wide rib profile was found to be the strongest with an average strength and stiffness increased by 25 percent over the other profiles. Only a

small number of screw-connected diaphragms were tested but results showed that if welds were replaced with screws, then the stiffness would decrease slightly but the ultimate strength was not affected much (Ellifritt and Luttrell, 1970).

In 1978 a group of researchers in Canada wanted to compare a few of the existing analytical methods for predicting the shear behavior of diaphragms. The methods that were compared were the ones proposed by Bryan (1972), and Davies (1974). All of these methods were used to describe observed behavior and failures of diaphragms with fasteners other than welding. In this study, comparisons of specific tests would be used to compare the different methods to determine their validity when welds were used as the fasteners for the diaphragms. In the tests that were done, the side-laps of each sheet were attached with a button punch. The end fasteners were done with $\frac{3}{4}$ in. arc-spot welds.

In England, diaphragm design was based largely off of the work of Bryan (1972). For each type of diaphragm described in Bryan's work a simple distribution of the forces on the fasteners was used. Through a basic comparison of Bryan's calculations and the test results, it was shown that the method dramatically underestimated the strength of the welded system by approximately four times.

Next Davies method was compared with its improved internal force distribution for the fasteners. Davies method came much closer to the tested strength but was still approximately 30% lower. Davies equations were derived for a specific fastener arrangement and it was noted that care would have to be taken to modify them accordingly (Fazio et al., 1979).

Fazio et al. (1979) showed a simplified approach to the problem at hand. This approach was based on the assumption that the seam fasteners were subjected only to longitudinal forces parallel to the panel, the end fasteners are symmetrical to the panel centerline and carry both longitudinal forces and transverse forces, intermediate girt fasteners were symmetrical to the panel center line and carry forces perpendicular to the girt, and the load-slip curves for the end fasteners and the seam fasteners may be assumed to be elasto-plastic (Fazio et al., 1979). With the test that was performed, the simplified method was only approximately 8% off of the tested result. This method was then compared to many other diaphragm tests. The results of this comparison showed a close correlation to the new method except for in a few cases where the new method was

shown to be unconservative (Fazio et al., 1979).

Ameen (1990) did an analytical study of the effects of Z-member end closures being used to increase system stiffness. This study was based on the assumption that with smaller end warping the overall system stiffness could be increased. To accomplish the analysis the current SDI formulas were modified to account for the added stiffness of the Z-member end closures. From the modified formulas, both the shear strength and the stiffness were predicted and design tables were prepared. Once the preliminary analysis was done, five experimental tests were done to see if the predicted formulas would accurately predict the real behavior of the system. Each test setup was done both with and without the end Z-member end closures. Also different fastener types were used to connect the Z-member to the diaphragm. With the fasteners in every valley and a Z-member being used that had a 2 in. flange, increased the strength varying from 10% to 107%. This variation was dependent on the panel thicknesses and the type and number of stitch connectors. For a Z-member being used that had a 4 in. flange, the strength variation was from 25% to 133%. From these test results, a close agreement was found between the developed equations and the experimental tests of approximately one percent (Ameen, 1990).

In 1990 Chris Glatt did a comparative study to determine the differences between the Tri-Services Manual (TM) and the Structural Deck Institute (SDI) manual for calculating capacities of steel diaphragms. Because the study was done in Kansas it was limited to the materials typically used in the Midwest. (Glatt, 1990) The typical diaphragm was a 22 gage narrow rib deck with 36/4 framing weld pattern, and 2 seam welds per span. Because a diaphragm is a system of small parts that work together to form a larger system, each method was tested for its sensitivity to changes. In the study six different variations were made to determine the methods' response (Glatt, 1990).

The first thing that was tested was the effect of deck thickness. From the comparison it showed that the shape and slope of the curves for design shear to diaphragm span were similar. However, the TM values increased substantially more. The range of difference in the values for the two methods was 10% to 30% greater for the TM. The second study considered the type of deck. SDI strengths apply to all deck types because deck type is not a variable in the equations. The TM values increase for wide rib

decks in comparison to narrow rib decks. The TM equation 5-9 has the most significant effect on local buckling limits of the panel edge flute. SDI equation 2.2-4, Eq. 2.2 in this document, is supposed to account for the same behavior (Glatt, 1990). It was shown that the equations were increasingly sensitive as the decks got thicker.

The third effect studied was the framing weld pattern. The 22 gage deck tests showed that the TM and the SDI was practically unchanged with the TM values averaging 25% below the SDI values. However, the 18 gage deck tests showed that the SDI equations tended to stay along the same trend and the TM values were greatly affected by the change in weld pattern. The fourth parameter considered was the panel width. This was difficult to compare but a full weld pattern of 36/7 and 30/6 which is a weld pattern of 6 in. on center for both. Both methods were shown to predict strengths that were less than 5% below the 36/7 pattern for the 30/6. The next study was done on seam weld spacing. With using just one seam weld per span the methods were pretty comparable with similar graphs of design shear to diaphragm span. However, when five seam welds were used, an increase in strength of 75% was shown for SDI whereas the TM only showed a 40% increase. This showed that the SDI equations were more sensitive to the seam weld spacing (Glatt, 1990).

These studies were done not to discredit either method, but simply to do comparisons of each method's variables. One of the major disadvantages of the TM is that it was based on 80 full-scale tests done in the sixties that only used welds. Also these welds were done by highly skilled welders that made sure to get the best strength possible out of each weld. This is not a typical field practice and therefore not the best comparison for calculation purposes. The SDI equations were developed with many full-scale tests that not only used welds, but also rivets and power-driven pins. This makes the SDI equations more versatile for the typical engineering project (Glatt, 1990).

The research presented in this section led to the development of the current diaphragm strength and stiffness evaluation procedures. Many different factors were tested that affected diaphragms. However, all of this research was limited to depths of 3 in. or less and there were no cellular profiles included. Some research has been done on deep deck and cellular profiles that were available in open literature. However, many of these tests were done in the late 1950's and 1960's. Consequentially there are not many

copies of this literature available. Luttrell has compared his calculation procedures to as many of these test results as could be found. This test study was done to have more data to compare Luttrell's modified design method presented in the white paper (Luttrell, 2005).

2.2 SDI Diaphragm Design Manual Calculation Procedure

The first SDI diaphragm design manual, SDIDDM01, was published in January 1981 by Dr. Larry Luttrell from the Department of Civil Engineering at West Virginia University (Luttrell, 1981). With regards to ultimate strength of steel shear diaphragms the manual focuses on the type and quality of the fasteners used to attach the panels to each other and to the structural system. The SDIDDM01 was based on 153 full scale diaphragm tests and many strength tests done on different fasteners types to come up with the theoretical strength formulas (Luttrell, 1981).




Figure 2-1: Diaphragm Layout Schematic

The design formulas have three scenarios as the potential limiting factors for strength. The first is at the termination of the diaphragm along a panel edge. The strength represented in pounds per foot for this limits is as follows:

$$S_u = (2\alpha_1 + n_p \cdot \alpha_2 + n_e) \cdot \frac{Q_f}{L} \quad (2.1)$$

Where:

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{w} \cdot \sum_{e=1}^n x_e \quad \text{the end distribution factor per panel}$$

x_e = distance from panel centerline to any fastener in a panel along the end support member

n_p = number of purlins or joists excluding supports at panel ends

α_2 = purlin distribution factor similar to α_1

n_e = total number of edge connectors along the edge excluding those at the purlins or joists and ends

Q_f = shear strength of sheet-to-frame fastener

L = total length of the diaphragm

w = panel cover width

The second limitation is at the side-laps along the length of the panels. At this location there is a shear transfer, from the fasteners, that helps the individual panels act as a system. The strength represented in pounds per foot for this limit is as follows:

$$S_u = \left[2(\lambda_1 - 1) + n_s \cdot \alpha_s + \frac{1}{w^2} \cdot \left(2 \cdot n_p \cdot \sum_{p=1}^n x_p^2 + 4 \cdot \sum_{e=1}^n x_e^2 \right) \right] \cdot \frac{Q_f}{L} \quad (2.2)$$

Where:

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{L_s}{135} \right)^2} \quad \text{This factor is a measure of the edge flute's tendency to deflect normal to the diaphragm plane. The factor shown is for a typical panel with a nominal 1.5 in. depth.}$$

n_s = number of side-lap connectors not at purlins or joists

$$\alpha_s = \frac{Q_s}{Q_f} \quad \text{The relative fastener strength}$$

Q_s = shear strength of sheet-to-sheet fastener

w = panel cover width

x_p = distance from panel centerline to any fastener in a panel along an interior purlin support member

L_s = purlin spacing

The third limitation is at the panel ends of the diaphragm at extreme edges of the diaphragm. These are the connectors located at the corners of the diaphragm. The strength represented in pounds per foot for this limit is as follows:

$$S_u = \frac{Q_f}{C_1} = \frac{Q_f N \cdot B}{\sqrt{B^2 + N^2 \cdot L^2}} \quad (2.3)$$

Where:

N = the average number of fasteners per foot across panel ends

$$B = n_s \cdot \alpha_s + \frac{1}{w^2} \cdot \left(2 \cdot n_p \cdot \sum_{p=1}^n x_p^2 + 4 \cdot \sum_{e=1}^n x_e^2 \right)$$

$$C_1 = \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)^2 + \left[\frac{L}{n_s \cdot \alpha_s + \frac{1}{w^2} \left[2n_p \cdot \left(\sum_{p=1}^n x_p^2 \right) + 4 \cdot \sum_{e=1}^n x_e^2 \right]} \right]^2}$$

The smallest value from Eq 2.1 through 2.3 is the controlling strength of the diaphragm (Luttrell, 1981).

As far as stiffness of the system is concerned the Steel Deck Institute Diaphragm Design Manual first edition, SDIDDM01, treats the general stiffness of the system to be represented by:

$$G' = \frac{P}{\Delta} \cdot \frac{a}{L} \quad (2.4)$$

where P is taken at or below $0.4P_u$ and Δ is the corresponding shear displacement (Luttrell, 1981). P_u is the maximum load the diaphragm can resist. The deflection of the system, Δ , comes from several different places and is summed to determine the total displacement. The deflection of the system comes from: shear displacement Δ_s , warping displacement Δ_d , relative slip at panel edge Δ_c , and other miscellaneous effects. The general stiffness equation used to determine the system stiffness is:

$$G' = \frac{E \cdot t}{2 \cdot (1 + \nu) \cdot \frac{s}{d} + D_n + C} \quad (2.5)$$

Where:

s = Developed width of plate per pitch, d

D_n = panel warping constant

C = slip relaxation constant

E = modulus of elasticity

ν = Poison's ratio

t = sheet steel thickness

All of the unknowns in Eq 2.5 are essentially given once the profile is selected and the fastener pattern is determined. The only thing that is unknown for Eq 2.5 then is the slip relaxation constant, C , which is a function of the structural and side-laps fastener flexibility. The slip relaxation constant, C , for the case in this project is when the number of sheets times the width equals the system width a .

$$C = \frac{2E \cdot t \cdot L}{w} \cdot S_f \left(\frac{1}{2 \cdot \alpha_1 + n_p \cdot \alpha_2 + 2 \cdot n_s \cdot \frac{S_f}{S_s}} \right) \quad (2.6)$$

Where:

S_f = flexibility of the sheet-to-structural fastener

S_s = flexibility of the sheet-to-sheet fastener

The second SDI diaphragm design manual, SDIDDM02, was published in 1987 (Luttrell, 1987). It was also prepared by Dr. Larry Luttrell from West Virginia University, as was the first diaphragm design manual. The strength and stiffness theories for diaphragm design are the same as the previous manual with a few modifications. As far as the strength is concerned the main change came with a general equation for λ , (Luttrell, 1987).

$$\lambda = 1 - \frac{DL_v}{240\sqrt{t}} \quad (2.7)$$

Where:

D = panel depth, in.

L_v = purlin spacing, ft

As can be seen, this new equation is made to accommodate any depth of deck whereas the previous λ_1 equation was given specifically for 1.5 in decks only. This new equation provides more diversity to the engineers' using the SDIDDM02. Also in the SDIDDM02 a stability check was added that takes into consideration the overall buckling of the diaphragm plate. Two scenarios are shown, one with many spans and another with fewer spans. The SDIDDM02 equation with fewer spans, Eq. 2.4-2, is the one that would pertain to this project. With this equation let $L = 2L_v$ (Luttrell, 1987).

$$S_c = \frac{3250}{L_v^2} \cdot \sqrt[4]{I^3 \cdot t^3 \frac{d}{s}} \quad (2.8)$$

Where:

I = panel moment of inertia, in⁴/ft of width

d = corrugation pitch, in.

s = developed flute width, in.

L = design length, ft

The third SDI diaphragm design manual, SDIDDM03, was published in September 2004. All of the major analytical theory behind the strength and stiffness evaluation of diaphragms is the same. Only one small modification was made that would apply to this project. The λ equation was given a limit that its value would always be taken as greater than or equal to 0.7.

In 2005 Dr. Luttrell prepared a document as an addendum to the SDIDDM03 titled, Deeper Steel Deck and Cellular Diaphragms (Luttrell, 2005). This white paper addresses the issues related to the decks listed in the title. The adjustments made to the equations that are typically used in the SDIDDM03 were based upon tests done by Arthur Nilson (1956) on deep decks and testing done by Fenestra Company and Mahon Steel in the 1950's. The main change to the SDIDDM03 is presented in Eq 2.5 for calculating the diaphragm stiffness. The new equation for diaphragm stiffness is:

$$G' = \frac{E \cdot t}{A_A + \left(\frac{D_n}{3 \cdot D_d \left(\frac{t_b}{t} \right)^3} \right) + C} \quad (2.9)$$

Where:

$$A_A = \frac{2.6 D_{DL}}{\left(1 + D_{DL} \frac{t_b}{t} \right)} \quad (2.10)$$

D_d = depth of deck, in.

D_{DL} = cell width/d, developed width of hat per cell, in.

t_b = bottom plate thickness, in.

With the increased torsional stiffness in a cellular system due to the bottom plate a need arose to modify the denominator of the previously used equations to increase the stiffness values obtained. The A_A term accounts for the shear path that a panel has when it involves both the top hat and a flat bottom sheet. The flat sheet has a much smaller shear width than the top hat therefore it is the stiffer element in the profile. The second

term in the denominator is the warping portion. Because the section is now tubular instead of an open flute the torsional stiffness of the section is greatly increased which makes panel warping effects a much smaller portion of the stiffness.

Luttrell developed these modifications from cellular diaphragm tests that were reported in open literature. These literature sources include: Nilson (1960a), Nilson (1960b), Nilson (1969a), Nilson (1969b) and S.B. Barnes and Associates (1959). The results for these test strength and stiffness values have been compiled into Table 2-1. These test results were compared in by Luttrell (2005) with the new calculation method and seem to have a good correlation for both the strength and stiffness.

Table 2-1: Cellular Diaphragm Test Data

Test Number	Test S_u (k/ft)	Calculated S_u (k/ft)	Test G' (k/in)	Calculated G' (k/in)	Strength (Test/Calc)	Stiffness (Test/Calc)
1	2.03	2.02	83	82	1.005	1.012
2	1.46	2.02	84	82	0.723	1.024
3	3.23	3.08	230	248	1.049	0.927
4	3.22	3.08	322	248	1.045	1.298
5	2.91	2.66	189	232	1.094	0.815
6	2.67	2.47	276	220	1.081	1.255
7	2.57	2.47	247	220	1.040	1.123
8	3.19	2.88	150	241	1.108	0.622
9	2.29	2.47	205	220	0.927	0.932
10	2.13	2.47	191	219	0.862	0.872
11	2.73	2.47	218	219	1.105	0.995
12	2.08	2.44	176	220	0.852	0.800
13	2.38	2.11	167	204	1.128	0.819
14	2.03	2.02	83	82	1.005	1.012
15	2.15	2.02	118	82	1.064	1.439
16	1.77	2.02	109	82	0.876	1.329
17	1.46	2.02	84	82	0.723	1.024
18	0.97	1.07	35	39	0.907	0.897
19	1.48	1.69	64	69	0.876	0.928
20	1.23	1.42	49	58	0.866	0.845
21	0.90	1.04	25	42	0.865	0.595
22	3.42	3.73	178	214	0.917	0.832
23	3.55	3.73	163	212	0.952	0.769
24	2.30	1.95	177	127	1.179	1.394
25	2.00	2.27	160	145	0.881	1.103
26	0.71	0.70	21	22	1.016	0.955
27	7.75	7.43	430	490	1.043	0.878
28	12.95	15.96	720	600	0.811	1.200
29	2.30	2.20	187	217	1.045	0.862
				Mean	0.967	0.985
				σ	0.120	0.213

CHAPTER 3 – EXPERIMENTAL TESTING

3.1 Overview

A series of twenty cantilever diaphragm tests were conducted at the Virginia Tech Structures and Material Science Laboratory in Blacksburg, Virginia. These tests were performed to determine the validity of diaphragm strength and stiffness equations prepared by Luttrell (2005). The equations are for use with the current Steel Deck Institute (SDI) diaphragm design manual (Luttrell 2004) and were developed to enable the design of deep deck and cellular deck diaphragms. These tests were conducted in accordance with the International Code Council, ICC, Acceptance Evaluation Criteria for Steel Deck Roof and Floor Systems (ICC 2006.)

Nine of the diaphragms used screws for the structural fastener, eight of the diaphragms used Hilti X-ENP-19 L15 powder actuated fasteners for the structural fastener, and three of the diaphragms used $\frac{3}{4}$ in. visible diameter arc-spot welds for the structural fastener. One of the goals during these tests was to evaluate measurements of both the corner and the diagonal displacements to show a comparison of the two displacements. These displacements are very important in the process of evaluating the stiffness of the diaphragm system. These two procedures will be explained later in the report.

Each test setup consisted of panels, varying in widths depending on the manufacturer, from 12 in. to 24 in. spanning 24 ft and making a total test width of 24 ft. Once the diaphragm was placed on the test frame each panel was connected to the adjacent panel at the side-lap and at the end to the frame. Then the frame was loaded by a hydraulic ram placed at the free end of the cantilever test frame. Displacement transducers were placed at all of the corners to monitor the x and y displacements. Also, displacement transducers were placed at the corners to monitor the diagonal displacements of the frame. Figure 3.1 shows a typical test setup.



Figure 3-1: Typical Test Setup

3.2 Test Details

3.2.1 Test Designation

Each test was given a designation to identify the unique aspects of each test. Each term in the designation represents a different aspect of the test. An example of one of the test designations is: WH-4.5-N-20-S-S. The first term of the designation is the manufacturer of the deck. The second term represents the depth in inches of the deck. The third term is the type of deck which can either be cellular, N-Deck, or 2xN. The fourth term is the gage of the deck for that particular test. This can either be a single number as shown or can be two numbers separated by a backslash. The number before the slash represents the hat gage and the number after the slash represents the flat sheet gage. The fifth term of the designation represents the structural fastener used. This can be a screw, powder actuated fastener or weld. The sixth term of the designation represents the side-lap, also referred to as stitch, fasteners used for the test. Table 3.1 shows the full test break down with the designations for each test and the fastener configuration used.

Table 3-1: Test Configurations

Test No.	Test Designation	Structural Fastener Configuration	Stitch Fastener	Cover Width (in)
1	WH-4.5-N-20-S-S	1 screw/rib at ends, 1 screw/ft at sides	#12, 36 in. o/c	24
2	USD-4.5-C-20/20-S-S	1 screw/rib at ends, 1 screw/ft at sides	#12, 36 in. o/c	24
3	CSI-7.5-N-18-S-S	1 screw/rib at ends, 1 screw/ft at sides	#12, 36 in. o/c	12
4	USD-4.5-C-18/18-S-S	1 screw/rib at ends, 1 screw/ft at sides	#12, 36 in. o/c	24
5	USD-7.5-C-18/20-S-S	1 screw/rib at ends, 1 screw/ft at sides	#12, 36 in. o/c	24
6	CSI-7.5-N-16-S-S	1 screw/rib at ends, 1 screw/ft at sides	#12, 36 in. o/c	12
7	WH-4.5-N-20-P-S	1 pin/rib at ends, 1 pin/ft at sides	#12, 36 in. o/c	24
8	WH-4.5-N-16-P-S	1 pin/rib at ends, 1 pin/ft at sides	#12, 36 in. o/c	24
9	CSI-7.5-N-18-P-S	1 pin/rib at ends, 1 pin/ft at sides	#12, 36 in. o/c	12
10	USD-7.5-C-18/20-P-S	1 pin/rib at ends, 1 pin/ft at sides	#12, 36 in. o/c	24
11	USD-7.5-C-16/18-P-S	1 pin/rib at ends, 1 pin/ft at sides	#12, 36 in. o/c	24
12	WH-4.5-N-18-W-S	1 weld/rib at ends, 1 weld/ft at sides	#12, 12 in. o/c	24
13	USD-4.5-C-20/20-W-S	1 weld/rib at ends, 1 weld/ft at sides	#12, 12 in. o/c	24
14	WH-3-M-20/20-W-S	1 weld/rib at ends, 1 weld/ft at sides	#12, 12 in. o/c	24
15	VC-3-C-16/16-P-BP	1 pin/rib at ends, 1 pin/ft at sides	BP, 12 in. o/c	24
16	VC-3-C-20/20-P-BP	1 pin/rib at ends, 1 pin/ft at sides	BP, 12 in. o/c	24
17	WH-3-M-16/16-P-S	1 pin/rib at ends, 1 pin/ft at sides	#12, 12 in. o/c	24
18	VC-3-C-18/18-S-S	1 screw/rib at ends, 1 screw/ft at sides	#10, 12 in. o/c	24
19	VC-3-C-20/20-S-S	1 screw/rib at ends, 1 screw/ft at sides	#10, 12 in. o/c	24
20	WH-3-M-20/20-S-S	1 screw/rib at ends, 1 screw/ft at sides	#10, 12 in. o/c	24

S - Screw	WH - Wheeling	C - Cellular
P - Pin	CSI - Consolidated Systems Inc.	N - N Deck
W - Weld	VC - Vulcraft	M – 2xN Deck
BP - Button Punch	USD - United Steel Deck	

3.2.2 Test Frame Configuration

The cantilever diaphragm test frame, as illustrated in Figure 3-2 was constructed with four W12x87 perimeter beams. The perimeter beams were spaced, from center-to-center, at 24 ft by 24 ft from the opposing webs centerline of the members as shown in Figure 3-2. On top of each beam a system of channels and angles were attached to the top flange, as illustrated in Figure 3-3.




Figure 3-2: 24 ft Span Test Setup




Figure 3-3: Beam-to-Beam Connection

These channels and angles were used to help maintain the structural integrity of the test frame. The channels and angles are meant to be changed once a sufficient amount of damage has occurred to the web of the channel making it difficult to attach any further diaphragm specimens.

The perimeter members were connected with double angle connections at corners A through D as can be seen in Figure 3-3. Beam 2 in the frame was set on roller supports at each end to allow the frame to move freely on a level plane as shown in Figure 3-4. Also a roller system was used along Beam 2 to resist any uplift of the system during the loading process, as illustrated in Figure 3-4.




Figure 3-4: Restraint and Roller System

Each brace of the cantilever diaphragm system was different and had to account for the reaction forces from the applied load. As can be seen in Figure 3-5 the Corner 1 bracing was used to account for the tension force caused by the couple on the system. The main concern was keeping the flanges of the upright W-section from deforming, so several intermediate stiffeners were welded in place to eliminate the flange deformation. The system for brace 2 and brace 3, Figures 3-6 and 3-7 respectively, were very similar because these were designed to account for compressive force from the applied force and the compression portion of the couple on the system respectively. Brace 4, Figure 3-8,

was designed as the point where the hydraulic ram would apply the load onto the system. A support angle was welded onto the face of the frame to rest the compression load cell on until the loading cycle was started. Between the load cell and the frame a swivel head was placed to keep the applied load perpendicular to the load frame.




Figure 3-5: Corner 1 Brace




Figure 3-6: Corner 2 Brace




Figure 3-7: Corner 3 Brace




Figure 3-8: Corner 4 Brace

3.2.3 Test Specimen Configuration

The framing configuration for the diaphragm systems was the test setup shown in Figure 3-2. All of the diaphragm specimens spanned the full 24 ft and were composed of the appropriate number of panels to make a 24 ft wide specimen as illustrated in Figure 3-

9. Some of the specimens had a 12 in. cover width while the majority had a 24 in. cover width. The specimens that were used ranged in thickness from 0.0359 in. (20 ga) to 0.0598 in. (16 ga).




Figure 3-9: Typical Panel Layout

In this test program there were six different profiles that were produced by the four manufacturers that provided the test materials. The different profiles that were used in this test program are illustrated in Figure 3-10. Each specimen was connected with structural fasteners on each end in every valley. This resulted in either a 24/3 or 24/4 structural fastener pattern depending on the pitch of the profile. Also along the outer sides

of the specimen a structural fastener was used on 1 ft centers.




Figure 3-10: Test Program Deck Profiles

3.2.4 Test Loading and Measurements

As illustrated in Figure 3-1, load was applied to the test setup at Corner C. The load was applied with a 150 kip hydraulic ram that was attached to brace 4 and to the reaction floor as shown in Figure 3-8. The load was measured with a 200 kip load cell. The load cell was supported by an angle that was welded to the test frame until load was applied. The support angle was cut shorter than the total length of the load cell and the swivel head combined to avoid any load being transferred into the support angle.

The frame displacements were measured during each test by a minimum of nine displacement transducers. The transducer locations are shown in Figure 3-11, which are meant to match the designations used in the ICCES (2006) evaluation procedure. All of the load and displacement information was recorded for each test using a Vishay System

5000 Data Acquisition System. For the first thirteen diaphragms that were tested the System 5000 was set to record data points every three seconds. This was done to insure that no essential points of data were missed. It was found that this produced a very large amount of data and a decision was made to go to manual recordings after each small load increment. Therefore, for the remainder of tests a smaller amount of data was taken, which still exceeded the minimum amount of data required by the ICCES (2006) evaluation procedure.




Figure 3-11: Displacement Transducer Configuration

In the ICCES evaluation procedure the transverse and parallel deflections of

displacement transducers 1 through 4 were combined to arrive at a net shear and corrected deflection. This combination is used to account for any rigid body motion in the frame assembly. In Figure 3-11 the direction of the arrows represents the positive direction of the deflections measured. These directions were chosen to correspond with the ICCES evaluation procedure. The corrected deflection, Δ_n , was computed by:

$$\Delta_n = \Delta_3 - \left[\Delta_1 + \frac{a}{b}(\Delta_2 + \Delta_4) \right] \quad (3.1)$$

Where, a and b are the dimensions of the diaphragm (24 ft and 24 ft respectively) given in Figure 3-11. In the ICCES evaluation procedure, the diagonal deflections of displacement transducers 5 and 6, as a pair, as well as 10 and 11 being a separate pair, were combined to arrive at a net shear and corrected deflection. Displacement transducers 5 and 6 were used for the first part of the experimental testing where their location was fixed no matter what depth of deck was being tested. Displacement transducers 10 and 11 were added for a few tests to check the flexibility of the supports on which the displacement transducers were mounted. Displacement transducers 10 and 11 were mounted such that the wire ran just barely above the top of the deck being tested. The corrected deflection, Δ_n , for the diagonals was computed by:

$$\Delta_n = (|\Delta_1| + |\Delta_2|) \cdot \frac{\sqrt{a^2 + b^2}}{2b} \quad (3.2)$$

According to the ICCES evaluation procedure the full frame test assembly is to be loaded to approximately one quarter and one half of the estimated maximum load. Once each one of these points is reached the load is to be removed and the recovery of the diaphragm recorded after five minutes. After these initial two loadings the full frame test assembly is loaded to failure making sure to record a minimum of 10 evenly spaced data points.

The ICC (2006) evaluation procedure requires that the loading sequence up to the maximum applied load shall be done at a load rate taking no less than ten minutes. It is

not clear if the provision intends for the total test time or only that for the final loading cycle to failure is to be less than 10 minutes. During the first eleven tests of this study the load rate was such that the *total* loading time was not less than ten minutes. This made the final loading cycle in many of these tests less than ten minutes. Tests 12-20 were conducted such that the final load cycle to failure would be greater than 10 minutes. A summary of the *final* loading cycle's times are given in Table 3-2. Note that all tests had a total loading time greater than 10 minutes. No trends in the data analysis lead to the conclusion that the load rate used impacted the test results.

Table 3-2: Final Loading Time of Diaphragms

Test	Test Designation	Final Loading Time (min)
1 (1)	WH-4.5-N-20-S-S	7.5
2 (6)	USD-4.5-C-20/20-S-S	6.0
3 (4)	CSI-7.5-N-18-S-S	7.5
4 (7)	USD-4.5-C-18/18-S-S	6.0
5 (8)	USD-7.5-C-18/20-S-S	9.5
6 (5)	CSI-7.5-N-16-S-S	6.5
7 (11)	WH-4.5-N-20-P-S	7.0
8 (10)	WH-4.5-N-16-P-S	3.5
9 (13)	CSI-7.5-N-18-P-S	5.5
10 (15)	USD-7.5-C-18/20-P-S	4.5
11 (16)	USD-7.5-C-16/18-P-S	4.5
12 (18)	WH-4.5-N-18-W-S	42.0
13 (19)	USD-4.5-C-20/20-W-S	43.0
14 (20)	WH-3-M-20/20-W-S	76.5
15 (12)	VC-3-C-16/16-P-BP	29.0
16 (14)	VC-3-C-20/20-P-BP	22.0
17 (17)	WH-3-M-16/16-P-S	66.5
18 (3)	VC-3-C-18/18-S-S	56.5
19 (2)	VC-3-C-20/20-S-S	35.5
20 (9)	WH-3-M-20/20-S-S	41.0

3.3 Coupon Tests

Tensile coupon tests were conducted on each of the diaphragm specimens tested. Two coupon tests were made from each different profile and thickness tested. This means that with a cellular profile four coupon tests were performed where two came from the flute and two came from the flat sheet. The tensile coupon tests were performed according to ASTM E8 specifications (ASTM 2004). A sample of the test setup is shown in Figure 3-12. The specimens were machined to the following nominal dimensions:

Length = 10 in. Width (C) = $\frac{3}{4}$ in. Milled Width (w) = $\frac{1}{2}$ in.

Each specimen's dimensions as well as yield and ultimate strength are reported in Table 3-3. To properly measure the thickness of each sheet the protective coating, of either paint or galvanizing, had to be removed. To remove the coatings a solution of ten percent hydrochloric acid was used on a sample specimen. Once the oxidation in the solution was finished the thickness of the specimen was measured. The tension tests were conducted using a 10 kip load cell in an INSTRON Model 4468 screw operated testing machine. Tests were performed at a speed of 0.5 in/min until failure occurred.

Each coupon was instrumented with an MTS Model 632.25F-20 extensometer. This is a 50 percent extensometer that was left on each of the specimens until failure. Because the extensometer was left on the specimen until failure it was possible to develop a full stress strain curve for each coupon. Along with the extensometer changes, in percent, being monitored during each test, the cross-head displacements, in inches, were also measured.



Figure 3-12: Tensile Coupon Test Setup

Data was collected for each specimen at a rate of every 1.2 seconds during the linear portion of the test. After the linear region of the response, the data acquisition was altered to collect readings once every 5 seconds to reduce the amount of data collected. Once the specimens failed, the two halves were placed back together and the gage was measured to determine the elongation of the specimen. The pre and post test elongations were used to determine the percent elongation. A summary of the tensile coupon test results is given in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3: Coupon Test Results

Test #	Test Designation	Yield Stress		Ultimate Strength		Average % Elongation
		(ksi)		(ksi)		
		Deck	Pan	Deck	Pan	
1	WH-4.5-N-20-S-S	107.4	-	108.6	-	6
2	USD-4.5-C-20/20-S-S	46.2	48.9	56.8	58.4	40
3	CSI-7.5-N-18-S-S	49.7	-	60.8	-	39
4	USD-4.5-C-18/18-S-S	46.6	49.7	59.1	60.1	40
5	USD-7.5-C-18/20-S-S	47.2	49.2	59.0	59.3	39
6	CSI-7.5-N-16-S-S	44.5	-	59.6	-	40
7	WH-4.5-N-20-P-S	108.4	-	109.7	-	6
8	WH-4.5-N-16-P-S	91.1	-	92.3	-	8
9	CSI-7.5-N-18-P-S	50.1	-	60.9	-	38
10	USD-7.5-C-18/20-P-S	46.7	49.3	58.8	59.7	40
11	USD-7.5-C-16/18-P-S	46.2	48.8	58.7	58.9	41
12	WH-4.5-N-18-W-S	94.8	-	97.6	-	1
13	USD-4.5-C-20/20-W-S	45.4	49.8	56.3	59.5	40
14	WH-3-M-20/20-W-S	92.4	*	94.0	*	4
15	VC-3-C-16/16-P-BP	43.0	**	56.4	**	32
16	VC-3-C-20/20-P-BP	41.4	**	56.6	**	31
17	WH-3-M-16/16-P-S	85.8	*	88.6	*	7
18	VC-3-C-18/18-S-S	41.4	**	56.0	**	31
19	VC-3-C-20/20-S-S	41.5	**	56.2	**	31
20	WH-3-M-20/20-S-S	92.0	*	93.8	*	4

“-“ = not applicable

“*” = M tests constructed of 2 deck sections back to back, so properties the same

“**” = no data for perforated bottom pan, deck properties used for calculations

CHAPTER 4 – DIAPHRAGM STRENGTH AND STIFFNESS EVALUATION

4.1 Overview

This chapter shows the calculations involved for the shear strength and stiffness evaluation of the steel deck diaphragms in this project. The third edition of the Steel Deck Institute Diaphragm Design Manual (SDIDDM03) was used to calculate the predicted strength and stiffness of each diaphragm. This method was used because of its simplicity which makes it much better for hand calculations without the use of computer analysis. However, this manual is limited to thicknesses ranging from 0.014 in. to 0.064 in. and depths ranging from 9/16 in. to 3 in. because of the study parameters used to establish the manual (Luttrell, 2004). Luttrell (2005) proposed changes to the equations used in the SDIDDM03 to account for deep decks and cellular decks.

4.2 Diaphragm Shear Strength Calculations

The shear strength of a diaphragm, as opposed to the stiffness, is often the main focus in design. The diaphragm shear strength is mainly governed by the fastener configuration that is used. The deck profile can also have a significant impact on the overall strength if buckling is the limiting factor; however, this case is more infrequent. Because the typical diaphragm has relatively few fasteners at large spacings, the fastener strength tends to govern.

4.2.1 SDIDDM03 Procedure

As shown previously in Chapter 2, the diaphragm shear strength is generally broken down to three limiting conditions: edge fasteners, interior panel fasteners, and corner fasteners. The edge fasteners are limited by the strength of the structural frame fastener as it relates to the end distribution factor as shown in Eq 2.1. The interior panel fasteners are limited by the strength of both the structural and side-lap fasteners. The interior panel fastener behavior is related to the edge flute's distortional tendency. Consider an element that is subjected to a shear load, as in Figure 4-1. The corner

fastener limitations are based on fastener strength and distortion, but their forces are larger because of the combined forces on a corner fastener, as is illustrated in Figure 4-2.




Figure 4-1: Element Shear Load

The force distribution assumes that there are both vertical and horizontal forces acting on the connector as in Figure 4-2. To get the actual force in the connector the resultant of these forces is taken, which is the reason for the square root term in the corner fastener limitation Eqn. 2.3.




Figure 4-2: Corner Force Distribution

4.2.2 Fastener Strength

The strength of fasteners is essential information for the determination of diaphragm strength. For structural fasteners, the main choices are self-drilling screws, powder actuated fasteners and arc-spot welds. The side-lap fasteners typically used are self-drilling screws, button punch (crimps) and seam welds. Each fastener has its own set

of advantages and disadvantages which will be discussed in the upcoming sections. The fasteners that will be discussed in detail are the fasteners that pertain to this test program.

4.2.2.1 Screws

Self-tapping, self-drilling screws are commonly used as fasteners in diaphragms. Some of the advantages to using screws are: consistent strength, no specialized equipment required and readily available. However, screws also have disadvantages as well which include: potential over tightening and labor intensity. The screws and equipment used in this study are shown in Figure 4-3. The screws are classified as self drilling because of the drill bit located on the tip. The screws were installed with a Hilti TKT 1300 power clutch driven screw driver. Because the structural screws are driven through the deck and through a much thicker structural member it can be a labor intensive process with each structural screw taking approximately ten seconds to drive. With screws there is the risk of over tightening, which can cause a loss of strength in the fastener. If the screw is over tightened damage to the screw head can occur which can lead to premature screw failure. (Luttrell, 1981)



Figure 4-3: Screw Gun and Self-Drilling Screws

In diaphragm construction, screws can be used as both structural fasteners and side-lap fasteners. The behavior of the screws in those two applications will vary. Thus, separate equations were developed for each case.

The most common sizes of screws used in diaphragm construction are No. 12

(0.2111 in.) and No. 14 (0.2477 in.) Because these are the most common sizes, the strength equation used in the SDIDDM03 is limited to those screw diameters. The strength equation for screws is:

$$Q_f = 1.25 \cdot F_y \cdot t (1 - 0.005 F_y), \text{ kips} \quad (4.1)$$

Where:

F_y = yield stress of sheet steel, ksi

t = base sheet metal thickness, in

The flexibility equation is also limited to No. 12 and No. 14 screws. The flexibility equation is used to determine the stiffness of the diaphragm system. The flexibility equation for structural screws is:

$$S_f = \frac{1.30}{1000 \cdot \sqrt{t}}, \frac{\text{in}}{\text{kip}} \quad (4.2)$$

Where:

t = base sheet metal thickness, in.

For side-lap fasteners a different strength equation is used. Because side-lap screws tend to vary in size more than structural screws, the screw diameter is used in the equation. This makes the equation more generally applicable. The strength equation for side-lap screws is:

$$Q_s = 115 d \cdot t, \text{ kips} \quad (4.3)$$

Where:

d = major diameter of the screw, in.

t = base sheet metal thickness, in.

The flexibility of a side-lap screw is considerably greater than a structural screw, as can be seen in the following equation.

$$S_s = \frac{3.0}{1000\sqrt{t}}, \frac{\text{in}}{\text{kip}} \quad (4.4)$$

4.2.2.2 Powder-Actuated Fasteners

The powder actuated fasteners (pins) that were used for this test program were Hilti X-ENP-19 L15. These pins can be seen in Figure 4-4 and were designed to be used with support steel of ¼ in. and thicker. The use of powder actuated fasteners has many advantages for both construction and engineering. The advantages of powder actuated fasteners are consistent strength provided and easy installation.



Figure 4-4: Hilti X-ENP-19 L15 Powder Actuated Fastener

The most important advantage of powder actuated fasteners is their ease of installation. The pins and cartridges are loaded into the installation tool, which can be seen in Figure 4-5. This installation tool had a specialized baseplate that was used because of the narrow deep ribs present in the deep deck and cellular deck profiles. The time it takes for the installation of each pin can be around 2 seconds. Some of the disadvantages of the powder actuated fastener system are the specialized equipment required and the sensitivity of the pins to the base steel being used.



Figure 4-5: Hilti DX 76 Pin Installation Tool

Proper cleaning and maintenance is required. One of the other issues is the training and understanding of how the equipment works. The pins have a desired range of penetration that is required to obtain the maximum resistance. This means that the equipment has to be adjusted according to each different thickness of material the pins are being driven into. However, once the adjustment is complete for the base material the operation is to simply load the load and install the fastener.

Powder actuated fasteners can only be used as structural fasteners so they have to be used in conjunction with other side-lap fastener types to complete the diaphragm system. Unique strength and flexibility equations have been developed for the Hilti X-ENP-19 L15 fasteners. These equations are different depending on the thickness of the base sheet metal being used for the fastener. For thinner sheet metal the strength and flexibility equations are:

$$Q_f = 61.1 \cdot t \cdot (1 - 4 \cdot t), \text{ kips} \quad (4.5)$$

$$S_f = \frac{1.25}{1000 \cdot \sqrt{t}}, \frac{\text{in}}{\text{kip}} \quad (4.6)$$

Where:

t = base sheet metal thickness < 0.0280 in.

When the base sheet metal thickness is equal or higher than the above limit the equations change to:

$$Q_f = 56 \cdot t \cdot (1 - t), \text{ kips}$$

(4.7)

$$S_f = \frac{0.75}{1000\sqrt{t}}, \frac{\text{in}}{\text{kip}} \quad (4.8)$$

Where:

$$0.028 \text{ in.} \leq t \leq 0.060 \text{ in.}$$

4.2.2.3 Arc-spot Welds

For construction purposes, welding the diaphragms to the structure has advantages and disadvantages. The biggest advantage of welding the diaphragms to the structure is that the strengths are typically higher than other fastener methods. The disadvantages are the required specialized equipment, training and labor required. A great deal of knowledge and experience is required to properly weld light gage material. It is very common in the welding process to actually burn out the edges around the weld which means the steel sheet is not in contact with the weld and therefore not transferring the load properly. Another important factor in the welding is the penetration into the steel. If a weld goes through multiple layers of steel, the visible diameter to effective diameter ratio will decrease and therefore the strength of the weld will decrease. An example of a arc-spot weld that was used in this test program is illustrated in Figure 4-6.



Figure 4-6: Arc-spot Weld

The welds that were used for this test program were nominally 3/4 in. visible diameter arc-spot welds. These welds were created by a Miller Dialarc 250 AC/DC constant current arc welder. The current that was used for the welds in this test program was 120 amps. The welding rods that were used were an E6010 material that has a 1/8 in. diameter. For both single thickness and double thickness welds several burn-off rate tests were performed. These tests were done to determine the amount of time it took to make a proper weld for each scenario. The SDIDDM03 arc-spot weld quality control requires that the burn-off rate for a 5/32 in. rod of either E60XX or E70XX be between 0.15 in/sec and 0.25 in/sec. As can be seen in Table 4-1 the burn-off rate for this test program was within this range. The arc spot welds were made by a certified welder at the Structures and Materials Laboratory at Virginia Tech.

Table 4-1: Weld Burn-off Rate Data

Single Thickness (16 gage)				
Welding Rod (1/8 in. Diameter)			Time (sec)	Burn-Off Rate (in/sec)
Initial Length (in.)	Final Length (in.)	Burn-Off (in.)		
14	11.75	2.25	11.65	0.19
11.75	9	2.75	12.09	0.23
14	11.75	2.25	11.24	0.20
14	12	2	8.94	0.22
14	11.5	2.5	11.97	0.21
Double Thickness (16 gage)				
Welding Rod (1/8" Diameter)			Time (sec)	Burn-Off Rate (in/sec)
Initial Length (in.)	Final Length (in.)	Burn-Off (in.)		
14	11	3	14.97	0.20
14	10.25	3.75	17.23	0.22
14	11.125	2.875	14.41	0.20
14	10	4	18.4	0.22
14	11.375	2.625	13.2	0.2

Welding can be used for both structural fasteners and side-lap fasteners. In this program, arc-spot welds were only used as structural fasteners, i.e. to fasten the diaphragm to the frame. As with other fasteners both strength and flexibility equations are available. The equations for strength and flexibility are:

$$Q_f = 2.2t \cdot F_u \cdot (d - t), \text{ kips} \quad (4.9)$$

$$S_f = \frac{1.15}{1000\sqrt{t}}, \frac{\text{in}}{\text{kip}} \quad (4.10)$$

Where:

d = average visible diameter (limited to a minimum of ½ in.), in.

F_u = specified minimum steel strength, ksi

t = base sheet metal thickness, in.

4.2.2.4 Example Calculation

As can be seen from the previous sections the calculations required to determine the strength and stiffness of a diaphragm are not complicated. In this section the calculation procedure for a cellular system will be shown.

The diaphragm calculations shown are for test 2, USD-4.5-C-20/20-S-S. The deck for this test is 4.5 in. deep with a hat sheet thickness of 0.0359 in. and a bottom plate thickness of 0.0359 in. The structural fastener configuration consists of No. 12 screws at 12 in. on center along all perimeter sides. The side laps are fastened with No. 12 screws at 36 in. on center.

First an initial list of parameters for the problem must be established. These are:

$n = 1$	number of interior spans
$F_y = 48 \text{ ksi}$	yield stress of sheet material
$F_u = 58 \text{ ksi}$	ultimate stress of sheet material
$L = 24 \text{ ft}$	total span of diaphragm
$w = 24 \text{ in.}$	width of deck sheet
$h = 4.5 \text{ in.}$	depth of deck profile
$t_{\text{hat}} = 0.0359 \text{ in.}$	thickness of top hat
$t_{\text{plate}} = 0.0359 \text{ in.}$	thickness of bottom plate
$w_{\text{rib}} = 12 \text{ in.}$	width of a single rib (center to center)
$d = 0.211 \text{ in.}$	major diameter of screw (in this case #12)

$n_s = 7$	number of intermediate side-lap in length per panel side-lap
$n_e = 23$	number of intermediate sheet-to-sheet fasteners per panel length and between purlin at edge
$n_p = 0$	number of purlins in length excluding ends

Once the initial parameters are defined the structural fasteners strength must be determined. In this case the No. 12 screws strength must be determined. As was shown before, Eq 4.1 is used for determining structural screw strength.

$$Q_f = 1.25(48 \text{ ksi})(0.0359 \text{ in})[1 - 0.005(48 \text{ ksi})](1000 \text{ lb/kip})$$

$$Q_f = 1637 \text{ lb}$$

Then the strength of the No. 12 side-lap screws must be determined. As was shown before, Eq 4.3 is used to determine the side-lap screw strength.

$$Q_s = 115(0.211 \text{ in})(0.0359 \text{ in})(1000 \text{ lb/kip})$$

$$Q_s = 872 \text{ lb}$$

With a cellular profile there is a possibility that the profile will have two thicknesses at all of the structural fastener locations. This means that the top hat and bottom plate thicknesses should be added together and used in the strength and stiffness equations. This example has a single thickness at fastener locations as shown in Figure 3-10.

Once the fastener strengths are determined the three diaphragm strength limitations are applied. There are a few constants to be determined that are used in the diaphragm strength calculations. These constants include the ratio of side-lap to structural fasteners, α_s , along with the edge flutes' flexibility, λ , and the fastener weighting factors, α_1 and α_2 . Each of the expressions used below are given in SDIDDM03 (Luttrell 2004.) The fastener weighting factors are based on the distance from the centerline of the deck to each fastener.

$$\alpha_s = \frac{Q_s}{Q_f} = 872 \text{ lb}/1637 \text{ lb} = 0.521$$

$$\lambda = \max \left[1 - \frac{4.5 \cdot \text{in} \cdot (24 \cdot \text{ft})}{240 \cdot \sqrt{0.0359 \cdot \text{in}}}, 0.7 \right] = 0.7$$

$$x_1 = 12 \text{ in.}$$

$$x_2 = 12 \text{ in.}$$

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{w} \cdot \sum_{e=1}^n x_e$$

$$\alpha_1 = 1$$

$$\alpha_2 = 1 \quad \text{Equal because fastener configuration is the same on the ends and purlins.}$$

Once these values are obtained the first strength limitation can be applied. The edge fastener limitation from Eq 2.1 is:

$$S_{ne} = (2 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1 + 23) \cdot \frac{1637 \text{ lb}}{24 \text{ ft}}$$

$$S_{ne} = 1705 \text{ lb/ft}$$

The next limitation is the strength of the interior fastener. This limitation is broken down into two parts for simplicity. The limitation comes from Eq 2.2 which is:

$$B = 7 \cdot (0.521) + \frac{1}{(24 \text{ in})^2} \cdot \left[(2) \cdot 0 \cdot \sum_{p=1}^4 (x_p)^2 + 4 \cdot \sum_{e=1}^4 (x_e)^2 \right]$$

$$B = 5.727$$

$$S_{ni} = [2 \cdot 1 \cdot (0.7 - 1) + 5.727] \cdot \frac{1636 \text{ lb}}{24 \text{ ft}}$$

$$S_{ni} = 350 \text{ lb/ft}$$

The corner fastener strength is the final strength limitation. The equation to calculate the strength is given by SDIDDM03 Eq. 2.2-5. The first portion of the corner fastener limitation is the average number of connectors per unit width.

$$N = \frac{\text{NumberEndFasteners}}{\text{width(ft)}}$$

$$N = \frac{3 \text{ Fasteners}}{2 \text{ ft}} = 1.5$$

$$S_{nc} = \left(1637 \text{ lb} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1.5^2 \cdot 5.727^2}{24 \text{ ft}^2 \cdot 1.5^2 + 5.727^2}} \right) = 386 \frac{\text{lb}}{\text{ft}}$$

As can be seen the minimum of the three fastener limitations the strength of the diaphragm is $S_{ni} = 350 \text{ lb/ft}$. By inspection the stability check is neglected because of the low strength caused by the fastener configuration being tested.

4.2.3 Comparison of SDIDDM03 Calculated Strength to Observed Strength

Results from SDIDDM03 (Luttrell 2004) are compared to the observed strength of each diaphragm test. The SDI white paper (Luttrell 2005) only covers modifications for diaphragm stiffness evaluation and is therefore not used for strength comparisons. Discussions relative to the observed strength of each diaphragm are included, followed by presentation of the SDIDDM03 calculated strengths. Following that presentation, a discussion of areas of concern with the current equations is included. The order of the tests performed is shown in Table 4-2. As can be seen in Table 4-2 the test definition has two numbers shown per test. The first set of numbers represents the order of the tests as they were performed. The second set of numbers represents the test number from the original test program matrix developed by the SDI. In the “Gage” column there are either one or two numbers present. Two numbers are present if the profile is cellular, with the hat thickness being the first number and the bottom plate thickness being the second number.

Table 4-2: Test Matrix

Test	Manufacturer	Depth (in)	Gage	Structural Fastener	Stitch Fastener
1 (1)	Wheeling	4.5	20	#12 screws	#10, 36 in. o.c.
2 (6)	USD	4.5	20/20	#12 screws	#10, 36 in. o.c.
3 (4)	CSI	7.5	18	#12 screws	#10, 36 in. o.c.
4 (7)	USD	4.5	18/18	#12 screws	#10, 36 in. o.c.
5 (8)	USD	7.5	18/20	#12 screws	#10, 36 in. o.c.
6 (5)	CSI	7.5	16	#12 screws	#10, 36 in. o.c.
7 (11)	Wheeling	4.5	20	Hilti fasteners	#10, 36 in. o.c.
8 (10)	Wheeling	4.5	16	Hilti fasteners	#10, 36 in. o.c.
9 (13)	CSI	7.5	18	Hilti fasteners	#10, 36 in. o.c.
10 (15)	USD	7.5	18/20	Hilti fasteners	#10, 36 in. o.c.
11 (16)	USD	7.5	16/18	Hilti fasteners	#10, 36 in. o.c.
12 (18)	Wheeling	4.5	18	3/4 in. arc-spot welds	#10, 12 in. o.c.
13 (19)	USD	4.5	20/20	3/4 in. arc-spot welds	#10, 12 in. o.c.
14 (20)	Wheeling	6	20/20	3/4 in. arc-spot welds	#10, 12 in. o.c.
15 (12)	Vulcraft	3	16/16	Hilti fasteners	BP, 12 in. o.c.
16 (14)	Vulcraft	3	20/20	Hilti fasteners	BP, 12 in. o.c.
17 (17)	Wheeling	6	16/16	Hilti fasteners	#10, 12 in. o.c.
18 (3)	Vulcraft	3	18/18	#12 screws	#12, 12 in. o.c.
19 (2)	Vulcraft	3	20/20	#12 screws	#12, 12 in. o.c.
20 (9)	Wheeling	6	20/20	#12 screws	#12, 12 in. o.c.

Three different structural fasteners and two different side-lap fasteners were used in the test program. The first six tests had No. 12 screws in every rib for structural fasteners and No. 12 screws at 36 in. on center for side-lap fasteners. In these tests it was noticed that there was the same amount of structural fasteners and side-lap fasteners that would fail in either shear or bearing. Because the side-lap fasteners are so much more flexible than the structural fasteners it was also noticed that the side-laps could either fail by rolling over and pulling out of the bottom sheet, bearing or shear. In the first six tests there was a variation in the thickness of the material at the side-lap locations. It was noted that the side-lap fasteners tended to have less roll over and pull out failures and more screw shear failures as the thickness increased. This trend lends itself to the current equations used in the SDIDDM03 because they are based on the thickness of the base sheet metal and the diameter of the connector.

The side-lap configuration for the USD cellular profiles used in this test program allows for the use of two different fasteners. A button punch or a screw can be used depending on the construction preference. In this test program, screws were the first choice for the diaphragm construction. However, with many of the samples provided from other manufacturers, it was noticed that the return flat on the stiffener was short. This issue can be better seen in Figure 4-7. Because of this piece being short, it was difficult to install the screw properly. This improper screw installation can lead to a failure mode of edge tear out, which would not occur if all edge requirements could be satisfied. Refer to Tables C-1 through C-20 in Appendix C for a complete diagram of the different failures for each fastener in the diaphragm tests.

Test specimens 7 through 11 were constructed with Hilti fasteners as the structural fasteners in every rib and No. 12 screws at 36 in. on center for the side-lap fasteners. It was noticed during these tests that the side-lap fasteners were failing at a much lower load than what would be required to fail the Hilti fasteners. Once this set of pin tests was completed it was decided that an increase in the side-lap fasteners should be made. For the remainder of the test performed the side-lap fastener spacing was decreased from 36 in. on center to 12 in. on center. During the pin tests it was noticed that certain pins would pull out of the base metal material. The cause for this was not easily determined. In all likelihood, the redistribution of forces once the side-lap fasteners

failed caused the pins to be pulled out of the test frame.



Figure 4-7: Side-lap Detail

Tests specimens 12 through 14 used nominal $\frac{3}{4}$ in. visible diameter arc-spot welds as the structural fasteners in every rib and No. 12 screws at 12 in. on center for the side-lap fasteners. As was expected, the tests that used welds attained a higher strength than the pin and screw tests. This was due both to the higher strength of the arc-spot welds, relative to screws or pins, and to the increase in the number of side-lap fasteners.

As can be seen in Table C-12 through C-14 there were several locations where the deck broke away from the arc-spot welds. A crack developed tangent to the arc-spot weld and parallel with the load being applied to the test setup in several locations, as is noted in Table C-12. This behavior can be seen in Figure 4-8. These cracks only developed on the welded tests that used high strength steel (i.e. greater than 80 ksi yield stress.)

The failure locations tended to be adjacent fasteners which would show that as each fastener fails the adjacent fasteners have an increase in their force because of redistribution. As each of these diaphragms passed their maximum load the failure was progressive.



Figure 4-8: Weld Crack from Diaphragm Loading

Test specimens 15 through 17 were constructed using powder-actuated pins and tests 18 through 20 were constructed using screws as the structural fasteners. Tests 15 and 16 used a pin in every rib for the structural fastener and a button punch at 12 in. on center for the side-lap fasteners. Button punch side lap fastening was used on these tests because that is one of the recommended methods of fastening. These tests had very low strengths in comparison to the predicted values. The reason for this attributed to the button punch strength, which will be discussed later. There were no structural fastener failures and considerable slip occurred at each side-lap location, thus indicating failure of the button punch locations.

The final pin test (Test 17) used the Wheeling 2 x N profile. This test was performed with the two sections mirroring each other (2xN) along with an added z-piece that was not present on the welded specimen. This z-piece was added to strengthen the end of each flute along with the full length of each end flute. A detail of the z-piece configuration is shown in Figure 4-9. This profile had structural fasteners in every rib and No. 12 screws at 12 in. on center for the side-lap fasteners. This test exhibited relatively high strength, in part it is believed because of the use of high strength steel deck. The load developed with stiffness similar to a cellular profile however, once the diaphragm reached its maximum load all of the pins that failed did so at once. As can be seen in Table C-17, this consisted of 9 pins along the center of one end of the diaphragm.

Tests 18 and 19 used a Vulcraft cellular profile with No. 12 screws as the structural fasteners and No. 12 screws as the side-lap fasteners. A hole was predrilled in

the top sheet to facilitate the side lap screw installation. As can be seen in Tables C-18 through C-20, screw shear was the controlling limit state for tests 18 through 20. Once all of the coupons were milled and measured it was noticed that for two of the tests, test 16 and 19, the coupon thicknesses were different than the test designation. It was determined that the bundles that were used for these tests were mislabeled. These two tests were supposed to be cellular profiles with top and bottom thickness of 20 gage material. From inspection of the bundles used in each test it was determined that two thirds of each test was constructed with 20 gage material and the other third was constructed with 18 gage material. For calculation purposes the thickness used for these tests was 20 gage as this would be the controlling configuration.




Figure 4-9: Z-Closure for 2 x N Deck

Now that the general findings from the tests have been discussed, a comparison between the observed strength and the SDIDDM03 calculated strengths will be discussed.

The measured material properties were used for comparison of calculated to actual diaphragm response. For a comparison of the observed strengths with the SDIDDM03 calculated strengths refer to Figure 4-10. Upon first inspection it is clear that the SDIDDM03 is predicting strengths that are higher than most of the observed strengths from the diaphragm tests. For numerical data and the statistical data describing these results refer to Table 4-3. As can be seen in Table 4-3 the test to calculated ratio for the entire data set was less than 1.0 with a standard deviation that is approximately 0.240.




Figure 4-10: Strength Comparison, SDIDDM03 vs. Tested

A closer look at the fastener strengths resulted in a change to the calculation procedure. A breakdown of the fastener strengths calculated by the SDIDDM03 is shown in Table 4-4. Upon inspecting each value, the first one that seems surprising is the nearly 3800 lb strength for the structural fastener used in test number five. The structural connector used in that test was a #12 screw.

Table 4-3: SDIDDM03 and Test Strength Results

Test No.	Test Designation	SDI S _u (lbs/ft)	Test Su (lbs/ft)	Ratio (Test/Calc)
1 (1)	WH-4.5-N-20-S-S	164	191	1.165
2 (6)	USD-4.5-C-20/20-S-S	149	201	1.348
3 (4)	CSI-7.5-N-18-S-S	198	143	0.723
4 (7)	USD-4.5-C-18/18-S-S	196	230	1.170
5 (8)	USD-7.5-C-18/20-S-S	202	250	1.234
6 (5)	CSI-7.5-N-16-S-S	244	201	0.822
7 (11)	WH-4.5-N-20-P-S	156	206	1.315
8 (10)	WH-4.5-N-16-P-S	258	228	0.881
9 (13)	CSI-7.5-N-18-P-S	206	144	0.700
10 (15)	USD-7.5-C-18/20-P-S	214	203	0.949
11 (16)	USD-7.5-C-16/18-P-S	276	190	0.689
12 (18)	WH-4.5-N-18-W-S	554	501	0.904
13 (19)	USD-4.5-C-20/20-W-S	373	383	1.026
14 (20)	WH-3-M-20/20-W-S	738	685	0.929
15 (12)	VC-3-C-16/16-P-BP	520	208	0.400
16 (14)	VC-3-C-20/20-P-BP	233	149	0.639
17 (17)	WH-3-M-16/16-P-S	1354	1066	0.788
18 (3)	VC-3-C-18/18-S-S	527	511	0.970
19 (2)	VC-3-C-20/20-S-S	398	360	0.903
20 (9)	WH-3-M-20/20-S-S	757	741	0.979
			Mean	0.927
			σ	0.240

The screw strength equation is based upon the total thickness of the sheet material penetrated and the yield stress of the sheet material. With cellular profiles the typical thickness that the structural fastener will penetrate is a double thickness at all locations. This makes the typical bearing and tear out limit states not control as before. This was the case for all of the cellular profiles used, except the USD 4.5 in. deep cellular deck. This profile is fabricated such that a single thickness of steel exists along the panel ends. Different configurations of side laps are used by the different manufacturers, thus resulting in conditions of either two or three thicknesses of sheet that fasteners must pass through. All the calculations were done using the standard end condition, rather than the

side lap as the calculations procedure does not differentiate between different fastener strengths along diaphragm ends. The shear strength of each type of fastener was determined by obtaining test data or information from the appropriate manufacturer. It was determined that the shear strength of the No. 12 screws used was 2000 lbs and the Hilti X-ENP-19 L15 pin shear strength was 4720 lbs. When these values are included as upper limits for fastener strength, the values of Q_f and Q_s are modified as shown in Table 4-4.

Table 4-4: SDIDDM03 Fastener Strength

Test No.	Test Designation	SDIDDM03		SDIDDM03 w/ Shear Limitation	
		Q_f (lbs)	Q_s (lbs)	Q_f (lbs)	Q_s (lbs)
1 (1)	WH-4.5-N-20-S-S	2233	771	2000	771
2 (6)	USD-4.5-C-20/20-S-S	1637	771	1637	771
3 (4)	CSI-7.5-N-18-S-S	2227	1020	2000	1020
4 (7)	USD-4.5-C-18/18-S-S	2161	1018	2000	1018
5 (8)	USD-7.5-C-18/20-S-S	3798	771	2000	771
6 (5)	CSI-7.5-N-16-S-S	2565	1284	2000	1284
7 (11)	WH-4.5-N-20-P-S	1938	771	1938	771
8 (10)	WH-4.5-N-16-P-S	3149	1284	3149	1284
9 (13)	CSI-7.5-N-18-P-S	2534	1020	2534	1020
10 (15)	USD-7.5-C-18/20-P-S	4281	771	4281	771
11 (16)	USD-7.5-C-16/18-P-S	5364	1020	4720	1020
12 (18)	WH-4.5-N-18-W-S	7194	1020	6014	1020
13 (19)	USD-4.5-C-20/20-W-S	3271	771	3055	771
14 (20)	WH-3-M-20/20-W-S	5302	1743	4034	1743
15 (12)	VC-3-C-16/16-P-BP	5897	858	4720	858
16 (14)	VC-3-C-20/20-P-BP	3732	309	3732	309
17 (17)	WH-3-M-16/16-P-S	5897	2903	4720	2000
18 (3)	VC-3-C-18/18-S-S	3871	1020	2000	1020
19 (2)	VC-3-C-20/20-S-S	2925	771	2000	771
20 (9)	WH-3-M-20/20-S-S	4459	1542	2000	1542

The weld strength equation that is used in the SDIDDM03 (2004) is one of the equations that is used in AISI (2001). In this test program this weld strength equation

was found to not control. If all of the applicable weld strength equations in AISI (2001) are considered, then the calculated strength comes closer to the observed strength. Table 4-4 shows the fastener strengths where all limit states are considered.

The test-to-predicted ratios improved once the more complete evaluation of fastener strengths were included, as can be observed in Figure 4-11 and Table 4-5. The mean diaphragm test to calculated strength is 0.993 and the standard deviation is 0.272. If tests 15 and 16 are eliminated from the data set, because of the noticeably poor performance of the button punch side laps, the mean and standard deviation change to 1.044 and 0.232 respectively.




Figure 4-11: Strength Comparison with Shear Limitation

The fastener shear strength issue does not only occur in cellular profiles but also at side-lap locations where there are double thicknesses. It also occurs with high yield strength material and thick single sheet thickness. This can be shown in tests 1, 3 and 5. Test 1 was constructed using high strength material (i.e. $F_y = 107$ ksi.) Tests 3 and 5 were constructed with deck that had yield stresses of 50 ksi and 48 ksi respectively.

Table 4-5: SDIDDM03 with Shear Limitation and Test Strength Results

Test No.	Test Designation	SDI w/ Shear Su(lbs/ft)	Test Su (lbs/ft)	Ratio (Test/Calc)
1 (1)	WH-4.5-N-20-S-S	158	191	1.208
2 (6)	USD-4.5-C-20/20-S-S	149	201	1.348
3 (4)	CSI-7.5-N-18-S-S	193	143	0.744
4 (7)	USD-4.5-C-18/18-S-S	192	230	1.194
5 (8)	USD-7.5-C-18/20-S-S	158	250	1.583
6 (5)	CSI-7.5-N-16-S-S	230	201	0.873
7 (11)	WH-4.5-N-20-P-S	156	206	1.315
8 (10)	WH-4.5-N-16-P-S	258	228	0.881
9 (13)	CSI-7.5-N-18-P-S	206	144	0.700
10 (15)	USD-7.5-C-18/20-P-S	214	203	0.949
11 (16)	USD-7.5-C-16/18-P-S	260	190	0.732
12 (18)	WH-4.5-N-18-W-S	529	501	0.946
13 (19)	USD-4.5-C-20/20-W-S	369	383	1.039
14 (20)	WH-3-M-20/20-W-S	707	685	0.970
15 (12)	VC-3-C-16/16-P-BP	486	208	0.428
16 (14)	VC-3-C-20/20-P-BP	233	149	0.639
17 (17)	WH-3-M-16/16-P-S	951	1066	1.121
18 (3)	VC-3-C-18/18-S-S	473	511	1.080
19 (2)	VC-3-C-20/20-S-S	372	360	0.968
20 (9)	WH-3-M-20/20-S-S	653	741	1.134

Mean 0.993

Std Dev 0.272

Comparison omitting tests 15 and 16

Mean 1.044

Std Dev 0.232

Even with the shear limitation applied to the calculations, tests 15 and 16 still show a considerably lower strength than the SDI prediction. This brings the discussion back to the issue of the button punch strength. The current button punch equation is a function of the sheet thickness at the side-lap. As can be seen in Table 4-5, the tested

strengths for these two tests are considerably lower than the calculated strengths. Test 15 was with a 16 gage sheet material and test 16 was with a 20 gage sheet material. The difference in the calculated strength and the observed strength seems to be greater as the thickness increases. This indicates a potential correlation between increasing material thickness and decreasing button punch strength, which is the opposite trend indicated in the SDI DDMO3 strength equation. Wheeling Corrugating Co. provided a set of test data that was performed at an independent lab facility on button punch strength. The data is listed in Table 4-6.

Table 4-6: Wheeling Button Punch Data and Test Comparison

Specimen	Button punch strength, lbs				Tests, lbs	
					No. 15	No. 16
	16 Gage	18 Gage	20 Gage	22 Gage	16 Gage	20 Gage
1	112	120	265	275	94	103
2	115	70	105	185		
3	92	160	186	270		
4	122	270	352			
5	95	205				
6		230				
Average	107.2	176	227	243		

The left portion of Table 4-6 is the Wheeling test data. The right portion of Table 4-6 is the button punch strength back calculated from the SDIDDM03 calculations, assuming the Q_f term is correct, when the Q_s term is varied until the observed test strength and the calculated strengths are equal. As can be seen for the 16 gage material, the test results fall within the lower range of the Wheeling results. The 20 gage material however only seems to match with the single outlying data point provided by Wheeling. However, this does give some validity to the notion that the button punch equation currently used in SDIDDM03 does not accurately predict the button punch strength.

4.2.4 Recommended Modifications to Strength Determination

Modifications to the SDI strength determination are recommended for all types of fastener used in the test program. Each fastener type is discussed in detail with suggestions about the modification method given where needed.

A minor modification needs to be made for screw strength in the SDIDDM03. A limitation needs to be included that does not allow the fastener force to exceed the shear strength of the screw. In the AISI (2001) provisions, the different screw strength calculations are based on the physical dimensions of parameters such as the screw head and the screw major diameter. These equations are checking for failures in the sheet metal and not the screw. Section E4.3.3 in AISI (2001) uses equation 4.11 which requires the nominal shear strengths are provided by the manufacturer.

$$P_{ns} = 0.8P_{ss} \quad (4.11)$$

Where:

P_{ss} = Nominal shear strength (resistance) of screw as reported by manufacturer or determined by independent laboratory testing

This accounts for the fact that screw manufacturers may produce screws from different grades of materials and thus could have variable shear strength. A provision similar to that in AISI (2001) is needed to place a shear limitation on the screw strength in the SDIDDM03.

The pin strength equations in the SDIDDM03 are based on the sheet metal thickness alone. A shear limitation is also needed for these equations as a similar problem to the screw shear limitation exists. The problem here is more easily solved because there are many different equations for pin strength that are based on the model of pin being used. Thus the shear strength of each type of pin could easily be included in the equation as an upper bound. This would eliminate the problem of designers using erroneously high strength values which would create more accurate diaphragm designs.

The single weld strength equation in the SDIDDM03 should be replaced with the strength equations in AISI (2001.) The AISI (2001) equations that are given for weld shear are:

$$P_{na} = \frac{\pi \cdot d_e^2}{4} \cdot 0.75 F_{xx} \quad (4.12)$$

If:

$$\frac{d_a}{t} \leq 0.815 \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_u}}$$

$$P_n = 2.20 t \cdot d_a \cdot F_u \quad (4.13)$$

$$0.815 \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_u}} < \frac{d_a}{t} < 1.397 \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_u}}$$

$$P_n = 0.280 \left(1 + 5.59 \frac{\sqrt{\frac{E}{F_u}}}{\frac{d_a}{t}} \right) \cdot t \cdot d_a \cdot F_u \quad (4.14)$$

$$\frac{d_a}{t} \geq 1.397 \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_u}}$$

$$P_n = 1.40 t \cdot d_a \cdot F_u \quad (4.15)$$

Where:

P_n = Nominal shear strength (resistance) of arc spot weld

d = Visible diameter of outer surface of arc spot weld

d_e = Effective diameter of arc spot weld

d_a = Average diameter of arc spot weld at mid-thickness of t where $d_a = (d-t)$ for single sheet or multiple sheets not more than four lapped sheets over a supporting member.

d_e = Effective diameter of fused area at plane of maximum shear transfer

$$= 0.7d - 1.5t \leq 0.55d$$

t = Total combined base steel thickness (exclusive of coatings) of sheet involved in shear transfer above plane of maximum shear transfer.

F_{xx} = Tensile strength of electrode classification

F_u = Tensile strength of sheet material

The strength of an arc spot weld is taken as the minimum of either Eq 4.12 or the applicable of equations Eq 4.13 through 4.15. Equation 4.13 is the only one used in the SDIDDM03. The controlling equation for test 12 was Eq 4.12, which is the shear strength of the weld material. For tests 13 and 14, the controlling equation was Eq 4.14. Tests 12 and 14 were constructed with high strength steel deck, which is the main reason for their different controlling equations.

The button punch strength equations in the SDIDDM03 need to be re-investigated. The equation currently in the SDIDDM03 is:

$$Q_s = 240t^2 \tag{4.16}$$

This equation predicts that the button punch strength increases as a square of the sheet thickness. As can be shown, in a comparison of the Q_s values predicted in Table 4-3 for tests 15 and 16 and the values shown in Table 4-5, there is a distinct difference in the actual strength. The trend indicated in the Wheeling test data in Table 4-6 is compared with Eqn. 4-16 in Figure 4-12.




Figure 4-12: Button Punch Strength Trend

4.3 Diaphragm Shear Stiffness Calculations

The SDIDDM03 contains a set of stiffness calculations that are presented to aid in the calculation of diaphragm deflection. Luttrell (2005) addresses deep deck and cellular deck profiles that are not covered in the SDIDDM03.

4.3.1 SDIDDM03 Procedure

The stiffness calculations for a diaphragm in the SDIDDM03 are based upon several different factors. The main factors considered in the stiffness of a diaphragm system are shear, warping, and discrete fastener displacements. The general equation is of the form:

$$G' = \frac{\frac{P \cdot a}{L}}{\Delta_s + \Delta_d + \Delta_c} \quad (4.17)$$

Where:

$$P = 0.4P_u$$

a = dimension of diaphragm perpendicular to applied load, ft.

L = design length, ft.

Δ_s = displacement due to shear

Δ_d = displacement due to warping distortion

Δ_c = displacement due to discrete fasteners

This equation, with the evaluation of each displacement, evolved into Eq 2.5 as presented earlier. Modifications were necessary to account for the changes in deck profile geometry for deep deck and cellular deck systems (Luttrell 2005.) The cellular profile geometry affects the warping distortion and the shear deflections making for a more rigid system.

4.3.2 Example Stiffness Calculation

This is a continuation of the problem in Section 4.2.2.4. The calculations were first performed with the original SDI stiffness evaluation procedure. Subsequently, the stiffness calculations using the white paper presented by Luttrell were made so a comparison between the two results could be made.

Screws are used for both frame and side-lap fastening and the flexibility for each must be calculated. The flexibility for each is given by Eqs 4.2 and 4.4 in Section 4.2.2.1. These are given by:

$$S_f = \frac{1.30}{1000 \cdot \sqrt{0.0359 \text{ in}}} = 0.006861 \frac{\text{in}}{\text{k}}$$

$$S_s = \frac{3.0}{1000 \cdot \sqrt{0.0359 \text{ in}}} = 0.016 \frac{\text{in}}{\text{k}}$$

The stiffness coefficient is calculated using Eq 2.6.

$$C = \frac{2E \cdot t \cdot L}{w} \cdot S_f \left(\frac{1}{2 \cdot \alpha_1 + n_p \cdot \alpha_2 + 2 \cdot n_s \cdot \frac{S_f}{S_s}} \right) \quad (2.6)$$

$$C = \frac{2 \cdot 29500 \text{ ksi} \cdot 0.0359 \text{ in} \cdot 288 \text{ in}}{24 \text{ in}} \cdot 0.006861 \frac{\text{in}}{\text{k}} \cdot \left(\frac{2}{2 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot 7 \cdot \frac{0.006861 \frac{\text{in}}{\text{k}}}{0.016 \frac{\text{in}}{\text{k}}}} \right)$$

$$C = 21.619$$

The warping constant D1 in the SDI manual that is required for this calculation is based on the fastener configuration of one screw in every valley. The calculations to determine the warping constant are based upon the manufacturer's dimensions for the profile. The D1 value for this example is:

$$D1 = 1915 \text{ ft}$$

The warping constant is multiplied by another constant that is configuration dependent. This constant, ρ , is based upon the number of spans for the diaphragm. For single span diaphragms, as in this test program, ρ is equal to unity. Once all of these values are established the stiffness of the system can be evaluated. The stiffness, G' , is

given in SDIDDM03 and herein as Eq. 2.5:

$$G' = \frac{E \cdot t}{2 \cdot (1 + \nu) \cdot \frac{s}{d} + D_n + C} \quad (2.5)$$

$$G' = \frac{29500 \text{ ksi} (0.0359 \text{ in})}{2.6 \cdot \frac{21 \text{ in}}{12 \text{ in}} + \left(1.0 \cdot \frac{1915 \text{ ft}}{24 \text{ ft}} \right) + 21.619} = 9.995 \frac{\text{k}}{\text{in}}$$

Luttrell (2005) recommends changes to Eq 2.5. According to Luttrell, the first term in the denominator should be modified to better represent the shear path that is involved with a profile that has a bottom plate and a top flute. As this term decreases in value, the resultant stiffness increases. The second term in the denominator is also modified to account for the stiffness of the *tubular section* that is now present by the addition of the bottom plate to the cellular profile. The first term in the denominator was modified as given in Eq 2.10.

$$A_A = \frac{2.6 \cdot D_{DL}}{\left(1 + D_{DL} \cdot \frac{t_b}{t} \right)} \quad (2.10)$$

$$A_A = \frac{2.6(1.75)}{1 + (1.75) \frac{0.0359 \text{ in}}{0.0359 \text{ in}}} = 1.655$$

The second term in the denominator is modified and becomes:

$$\frac{\rho D_n}{3 \cdot h \cdot \left(\frac{t_{\text{bottom}}}{t} \right)^3} = \frac{1.0(79.792)}{3 \cdot 4.5 \left(\frac{0.0359 \text{ in}}{0.0359 \text{ in}} \right)^3} = 5.91$$

The third term in the denominator is not modified at all because the stiffness coefficient remains the same if there is a bottom sheet or not. The final equation for the stiffness of the diaphragm system is Eq 2.9.

$$G' = \frac{E \cdot t}{A_A + \left(\frac{D_n}{3 \cdot D_d \left(\frac{t_b}{t} \right)^3} \right) + C} \quad (2.9)$$

$$G' = \frac{29500 \text{ ksi} \cdot (0.0359 \text{ in})}{1.655 + 5.91 + 21.619} = 36.3 \frac{\text{k}}{\text{in}}$$

As can be seen from this result the new stiffness evaluation is more than three and a half times greater than the original SDI stiffness value.

4.3.3 Observed Behavior and Stiffness

The observed stiffness of each diaphragm is presented and discussed in this section. Of the profiles tested, seven were deep N-deck profiles, ten were cellular profiles and three were the 2 x N profiles. As will be discussed, the cellular profiles produced a much greater stiffness than the N-deck profiles. The reason for the difference is attributed to the flat sheet attached to the hat section on the cellular profiles. As can be seen in Figure 4-13, the N-deck profile under maximum load has considerable warping distortion. This distortion is a major contribution to the deflection and consequentially the flexibility of the system. As shown in Figure 4-14, the hat-section of the cellular profile at maximum load has relatively no distortion. This lack of distortion is due to the torsional rigidity of the closed section created by the flute and the bottom pan.



Figure 4-13: Warping distortion of N-Deck




Figure 4-14: End view of Cellular Profile Test

The stiffness of each diaphragm was calculated at a load equal to forty percent of the maximum load attained in the test specimen. Adjustments were made to the maximum load and the stiffness according to the ICC (2006) evaluation procedure. In the ICC (2006) evaluation procedure, the deflections of the system can be determined

based on measurement of either specific corner displacements or by measuring the diagonal displacements. Both sets of measurements were taken in this study, along with additional corner displacements so all the relevant displacement data was obtained. All of the load versus displacement plots for the diaphragms in this study are shown in Figures A-1 through A-20 in Appendix A. The maximum load and the elastic stiffness of each diaphragm are shown in these figures. The stiffness shown was calculated using the corrected corner displacements, which is more commonly used of the two approaches.

In each of the tests, the diagonal displacements were smaller than the corner net displacement due to several factors. One of the most prevalent factors is the monitoring of many different corner displacement can be difficult. Many of the corner displacements, even under high loading, are small numbers. With such a high sensitivity the corrected deflection can be easily affected. Also with measuring the corner displacements all the displacement transducers were located at the midpoint of the frames webs. Any type of distortion in the frame members could misrepresent the deflections the diaphragm is experiencing. Overall, the typical difference between the corner and diagonal deflections was approximately 0.2 in. A summary of the displacements at maximum load for each test is given in Table 4-7.

The difference of only 0.2 in. does not sound like a major issue. However, if the 0.2 in. is consistent throughout the test then the small deflections used to calculate the stiffness, as shown in the last two columns of Table 4-7, can change the observed stiffness considerably. Table 4-8 shows the comparison of corner observed stiffness to diagonal observed stiffness.

Table 4-7: Diaphragm Displacements

Test No.	Defl. At Max Load (in)	
	Corner	Diagonal
1 (1)	3.934	3.702
2 (6)	2.831	2.758
3 (4)	5.119	4.956
4 (7)	2.365	2.119
5 (8)	3.287	3.043
6 (5)	3.830	3.628
7 (11)	1.983	3.715
8 (10)	1.277	1.078
9 (13)	6.604	6.426
10 (15)	2.111	1.818
11 (16)	1.490	1.216
12 (18)	4.447	4.179
13 (19)	1.704	1.464
14 (20)	2.467	2.270
15 (12)	1.761	1.641
16 (14)	1.967	1.815
17 (17)	1.138	0.832
18 (3)	3.321	3.088
19 (2)	4.222	4.060
20 (9)	1.556	1.237

Table 4-8: Corner and Diagonal Stiffness Comparison

Test No.	Test Designation	Stiffness (kips/in)		% Increase
		Corners	Diagonals	
1 (1)	WH-4.5-N-20-S-S	4.89	4.62	-6
2 (6)	USD-4.5-C-20/20-S-S	55.10	191.11	247
3 (4)	CSI-7.5-N-18-S-S	6.72	9.53	42
4 (7)	USD-4.5-C-18/18-S-S	33.15	133.88	304
5 (8)	USD-7.5-C-18/20-S-S	53.30	167.24	214
6 (5)	CSI-7.5-N-16-S-S	7.05	7.36	4
7 (11)	WH-4.5-N-20-P-S	12.17	5.40	-56
8 (10)	WH-4.5-N-16-P-S	14.16	18.81	33
9 (13)	CSI-7.5-N-18-P-S	3.08	2.59	-16
10 (15)	USD-7.5-C-18/20-P-S	34.34	53.14	55
11 (16)	USD-7.5-C-16/18-P-S	35.88	63.80	78
12 (18)	WH-4.5-N-18-W-S	9.97	9.82	-2
13 (19)	USD-4.5-C-20/20-W-S	52.21	271.77	421
14 (20)	WH-3-M-20/20-W-S	30.09	32.13	7
15 (12)	VC-3-C-16/16-P-BP	14.88	20.47	38
16 (14)	VC-3-C-20/20-P-BP	11.47	16.91	47
17 (17)	WH-3-M-16/16-P-S	82.54	217.08	163
18 (3)	VC-3-C-18/18-S-S	96.35	397.80	313
19 (2)	VC-3-C-20/20-S-S	72.25	172.31	138
20 (9)	WH-3-M-20/20-S-S	39.78	67.02	68
			Mean	105
			Std Dev	131

In tests 7, 11 and 13 there were slight malfunctions that affected the data collected. There was a short discovered in one of the wires connecting a diagonal displacement transducer in Test 7. When calculating the deflection of the diaphragm only one of the diagonals is required. If the single diagonal is analyzed, the deflection can be calculated by modifying Eq. 3.2 as given by:

$$\Delta_n = |\Delta_1| \frac{\sqrt{a^2 + b^2}}{b} \quad (4.18)$$

Where:

a & b are defined in Eq 3.1

Δ_1 = diagonal displacement of the functioning transducer

It was also found that in test 11 and 13 one of the diagonal displacement transducer supports was loose. This caused a false stiffness because of the added flexibility in the displacement transducer support. The stiffness values for these tests were also determined using Eq. 4.18 with the diagonal displacement transducer that was functioning properly.

Because of the observed movement in Test 13, a second set of displacement transducers was added to the system for Test 14. These displacement transducers were added, at the level of the diaphragm being tested, to see if there was any flexibility in the supports that should be addressed. As can be seen in Figure A-14 the new diagonal displacement transducer data essentially overlaps the data obtained from the parallel set of transducers indicating little to no flexibility in the system.

The average increase in stiffness, based on the diagonal based measurements versus the corner measurements, is 110 percent and the standard deviation is 113 percent, as noted in Table 4-8. As noted in most of the load versus displacement plots in App A, the stiffness based on diagonal measurements is very stiff in the initial 1/3 or so of load history. Closer evaluation of the “elastic stiffness” indicates that even larger values can be determined, as can be seen in Figure 4-15. The ICC AC43 provisions imply that the elastic stiffness should be determined based on the original zero load – zero displacement point. The general behavior in Figure 4-15 can be observed in virtually all of the tests in this program. The very stiff portion of the load vs diagonal displacement curve and the difference in the load vs corner displacement behavior requires further study before conclusions can be drawn about the comparison between the stiffness based on diagonal displacement measurements and those based on corner displacement measurements.




Figure 4-15 Load vs. Displacement for Test 5

4.3.4 Comparison of SDIDDM03 Calculated Stiffness to Observed Stiffness

The measured stiffness results, based on both corner and diagonal displacement measurements, and the calculated stiffness values based on the SDIDDM03 (Luttrell 2004) are presented in Table 4-9 and Figures 4-16 and 4-17.

Table 4-9: SDIDDM03 Stiffness Comparison

Test	Stiffness (kips/in)			Ratio	Ratio
	Corners	Diagonals	SDIDDM03	(Corner/SDIDDM03)	(Diagonals/SDIDDM03)
1 (1)	4.89	4.62	9.11	0.54	0.51
2 (6)	55.1	191.11	10.00	5.51	19.11
3 (4)	6.72	9.53	9.81	0.69	0.97
4 (7)	33.15	133.88	17.10	1.94	7.83
5 (8)	53.3	167.24	8.84	6.03	18.92
6 (5)	7.05	7.36	14.31	0.49	0.51
7 (11)	12.17	5.4	9.38	1.30	0.58
8 (10)	14.16	18.81	25.08	0.57	0.75
9 (13)	3.08	2.59	10.37	0.30	0.25
10 (15)	34.34	53.14	9.10	3.77	5.84
11 (16)	35.88	63.8	14.93	2.40	4.27
12 (18)	9.97	9.82	19.06	0.52	0.52
13 (19)	52.21	271.77	11.49	4.54	23.65
14 (20)	30.09	32.13	33.46	0.90	0.96
15 (12)	14.88	20.47	43.66	0.34	0.47
16 (14)	11.47	16.91	23.19	0.50	0.73
17 (17)	82.54	217.08	80.25	1.03	2.71
18 (3)	96.35	397.8	53.59	1.80	7.42
19 (2)	72.25	172.31	33.09	2.18	5.21
20 (9)	39.78	67.02	33.72	1.18	1.99
	Mean			1.83	5.16
	Std Dev			1.77	7.11




Figure 4-16: Stiffness Comparison, SDIDDM03 versus Test (Corners)




Figure 4-17: Stiffness Comparison, SDIDDM03 versus Test (Diagonals)

In looking at the results found from the stiffness portion of this study it can be seen that the Tests 3, 6 and 9 had stiffnesses well below calculated values. Also, Tests 15 and 16, which used button punch side-laps, have had results well below those calculated. In comparing the stiffness from the corner measurements with the original SDIDDM03 (2004) stiffness, an improvement in the overall results can be seen if the previously mentioned tests are excluded. If a comparison is made between the original SDIDDM03 (2004) stiffness and the observed stiffness from diagonal measurements, Figure 4-17, it is easily seen that there is no correlation between these results. The statistics for these comparisons can be seen in Table 4-10. With these statistical results consideration must be made for tests 15 and 16 which have been conclusively seen as outlying results. When comparing the statistical results of the SDIDDM03 in comparison with the stiffness derived from the corner and diagonal displacements respectively, an unusual trend can be seen. The stiffness from the corner displacements seems to have a much better correlation than the stiffness from the diagonal displacements. This is somewhat expected because the SDIDDM03 was developed from testing based on the stiffness derived from the corner displacements. However, neither comparison yields a consistent correlation with the diagonal displacement stiffness having a more scattered result than the corner displacement stiffness.

4.3.5 Comparison of White Paper Calculated Stiffness to Observed Stiffness

The measured stiffness results, based on both corner and diagonal displacement measurements, and the calculated stiffness values based on the SDI White Paper (Luttrell 2005) are presented in Table 4-10 and Figures 4-18 and 4-19.

Table 4-10: White Paper Stiffness Comparison

Test No.	Stiffness (kips/in)			Ratio Test (Corner)/White Paper	Ratio Test (Diag)/White Paper
	Corner	Diagonals	White Paper		
1 (1)	4.89	4.62	9.11	0.54	0.51
2 (6)	55.10	191.11	36.97	1.49	5.17
3 (4)	6.72	9.53	9.81	0.69	0.97
4 (7)	33.15	133.88	46.58	0.71	2.87
5 (8)	53.30	167.24	36.43	1.46	4.59
6 (5)	7.05	7.36	14.31	0.49	0.51
7 (11)	12.17	5.40	9.38	1.30	0.58
8 (10)	14.16	18.81	25.08	0.57	0.75
9 (13)	3.08	2.59	10.37	0.30	0.25
10 (15)	34.34	53.14	40.85	0.84	1.30
11 (16)	35.88	63.80	56.52	0.64	1.13
12 (18)	9.97	9.82	19.06	0.52	0.52
13 (19)	52.21	271.77	70.29	0.74	3.87
14 (20)	30.09	32.13	97.58	0.31	0.33
15 (12)	14.88	20.47	60.58	0.25	0.34
16 (14)	11.47	16.91	43.36	0.27	0.39
17 (17)	82.54	217.08	157.95	0.52	1.37
18 (3)	96.35	397.80	120.77	0.80	3.29
19 (2)	72.25	172.31	97.02	0.75	1.78
20 (9)	39.78	67.02	99.86	0.40	0.67
			Mean	0.68	1.56
			Std Dev	0.37	1.54




Figure 4-18: Stiffness Comparison, White Paper versus Test (Corners)




Figure 4-19: Stiffness Comparison, White Paper versus Test (Diagonals)

If one compares the results of the white paper (Luttrell, 2005) with the observed stiffness based on the diagonal measurements in Table 4-10 and Figure 4-19, it is evident that there is a high variability in the results. The observed stiffness based on diagonal measurements tends to exceed the calculated values based on the white paper (Luttrell, 2005.)

The statistical results presented in Table 4-11 indicate a mean ratio of 1.56 with a standard deviation of 1.54, which indicates large variation in the test results. If the same comparison is made with the white paper and the observed stiffness from corner displacements it can be seen that there is a mean of 0.68 with a standard deviation of 0.37. This comparison also shows a large variation in the results. The current SDI stiffness calculation procedure was developed based upon the use of corner displacements. This should make the results for the corner based stiffness match better with the test results.

If the button punch stiffness equation is found to not be an accurate prediction of the true stiffness, then the statistical data for all of these comparisons will be affected. Because tests 15 and 16 had a button punch side-lap fastener, each test was seen to be a statistical outlier. The mean for each comparison however includes the data.

4.3.6 Recommended Modifications to Stiffness Evaluation

The shear stiffness of the diaphragm configurations tested in this study were calculated using the SDIDDM03 (Luttrell, 2004) and the SDI white paper (Luttrell, 2005). As can be seen from the comparison results there is a correlation between the white paper results and the tested results from diagonal observed stiffness. The original SDIDDM03 comparison with the tested results from the corner observed stiffness seems to have close to the same correlation as the diagonal observed stiffness with the white paper. The deflection numbers being used to determine the diaphragm stiffness, based on the corner displacements, are small numbers. This causes the stiffness measurements to be very sensitive and consequentially difficult to ascertain their true value. Measuring the diagonal displacements of a diaphragm is much easier and is not nearly as sensitive as

measuring the corner displacements. More testing needs to be done to find a correct correlation between tested stiffness and predicted stiffness.

CHAPTER 5 – SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

The purpose of this study was to compare the tested strength and stiffness of deep deck and cellular deck profiles to the SDIDDM03 and to modifications of the SDIDDM03 as proposed by Luttrell (2005). A total of 20 diaphragms were constructed and loaded to failure in this test program. Seven of the tests were performed on N-deck profiles, ten tests were performed on cellular profiles and three tests were performed on 2 x N deck profiles. The fastener types (powder-actuated fasteners, screws and welds) and configurations were varied between the tests.

Measurements of both the corner and the diagonal displacements of the diaphragm were taken. These measurements were used with the two evaluation procedures to determine the diaphragm stiffness that are given in ICC-ES AC 43. The corner and diagonal displacement based stiffnesses were compared with the SDIDDM03 (Luttrell, 2004) and the white paper (Luttrell, 2005.) In general, the stiffness values based on the diagonal measurements showed higher values than the stiffness values calculated based on the traditional corner measurements.

5.2 Conclusions

The experimental results indicate that the SDIDDM03 (Luttrell, 2004) calculation procedure produces lower strength results than indicated by the tests. With the current fastener strength equations, the typical controlling limit state was bearing. This is indicated by the focus on the sheet material properties as opposed to the connector properties in the calculations. The calculated results in certain cases were affected by including a shear limitation to the fastener strength equations. The shear strength of individual fasteners (pins or screws) was obtained from the manufacturer of the particular fasteners. Omitting tests 15 and 16, as discussed in chapter 4, resulted in a mean test to calculated strength of 1.045 with a standard deviation of 0.231 for the remaining 18 tests.

The comparisons of the stiffness calculations with the test results showed wide variations. The increase in test stiffness values using the diagonal measurements versus

the corner displacement measurements was 105% but with a standard deviation of 131. Likewise, the comparison with the two calculations methods, SDIDDM03 and the modifications to the SDIDDM03, showed significant variation. The mean ratio of corner based stiffnesses to SDIDDM03 was 1.826 with a std dev of 1.769, while the ratio of the diagonal displacement based stiffnesses to SDIDDM03 was 5.159 with a std dev of 7.114. The mean ratio of corner based stiffnesses to the modified SDIDDM03 (Luttrell 2005) was 0.678 with a std dev of 0.366, while the ratio of the diagonal displacement based stiffnesses to the modified SDIDDM03 was 1.559 with a std dev of 1.535.

5.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations pertain to strength calculations:

1. The SDIDDM03 should incorporate the screw strength provisions given in the AISI NAS. This will lead to more consistent treatment and capture all the appropriate limit states.
2. The shear strength of powder-actuated fasteners should be included as a limit state. This is of particular concern as the total sheet thickness reaches a value that will result in the fastener shearing versus a deck bearing or pullout limit state.
3. The SDIDDM03 should be revised to incorporate the weld strength provisions given in the AISI NAS. This will lead to more consistent treatment and capture all the appropriate limit states. At present, the SDIDDM03 only includes one of the expressions from AISI. This is of particular concern as the total sheet thickness reaches a value that will result in limit states other than that given in the SDIDDM03 controlling.
4. The button punch strength expression given in SDIDDM03 needs to be limited to applications in which the nominal sheet thickness of the deck seams being clinched is 0.035 in. or less. Test results, both the diaphragms and an independent study conducted by Wheeling Corrugating Co., indicate that there is a sharp

divergence once the deck thickness exceeds 0.035 in. The test strengths decrease while the calculated strength increases as a square of the thickness.

5. The diagonal displacement based test stiffness values are larger than the corner displacement stiffness values. The industry, both design and testing, should move to incorporate these values so as to more fully utilize the actual diaphragm stiffness.

6. There is no clear conclusion that can be drawn regarding the stiffness calculation procedures. However, the following comments are offered. The traditional corner displacement based stiffness values compare more favorably with the SDIDDM03 procedure. The diagonal displacement based stiffness values compare more favorably with the modified SDIDDM03 approach (Luttrell, 2005.) Additional study is required prior to drawing firm conclusions regarding the methods.

REFERENCES

- Ameen, A. (1990) “Cold-Formed Steel Diaphragms with End Closures,” Department of Civil Engineering, West Virginia University
- AISI (1967), Design of Light Gage Steel Diaphragms, Washington, DC.
- AISI (2002), “Cantilever Test Method for Cold-Formed Steel Diaphragms,” TS-7-02, Washington, DC.
- AISI (2001), “North American Specification for the Design of Cold-Formed Steel Structural Members,” Washington, DC.
- ASTM (2004), “ASTM E8-04: Standard Test Method for Tension Testing of Metallic Materials”, Annual Book of ASTM Standards, 03.01, 62-85.
- Apparao, T. V. S. R. (1966) “Tests on Light Gage Steel Diaphragms”, Report No. 328, Department of Structural Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY
- Bryan, E. R. (1972) “The Stressed Skin Design of Steel Buildings.” Crosby Lockwood Staples, London, England, 159.
- Davies, J.M. (1974) “The Design of Shear Diaphragms of Corrugated Steel Sheeting.” Department of Civil Engineering, University of Salford, Salford, England, Report No. 74/50.
- Ellifritt, D.S. and Luttrell L.D. (1970), “Strength and Stiffness of Steel Deck Subjected to In-plane Loading,” Report No. 2011, Department of Civil Engineering, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV

- Fazio, P. Ha K. and Chockalingam, S. (1979) Strength of cold-formed steel shear diaphragms, Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering. 6(1), 5-17.
- Glatt, C. (1990) “A Comparison of Steel Deck Diaphragm Design Methods: Tri-Services Manual vs. Steel Deck Institute Manual,” Report, Civil Engineering Department, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.
- ICC Evaluation Service (2006) “Acceptance Criteria for Steel Deck Roof and Floor Systems,” AC43, Whittier, California.
- Luttrell, L.D.,(1965a) “Structural Performance of Light Gage Steel Diaphragms”, Report No. 319, Department of Structural Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.
- Luttrell, L.D.,(1965b) Light Gage Steel Shear Diaphragms, Civil Engineering Department Publication, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV.
- Luttrell, L.D., (1967) “Strength and Behavior of Light Gage Steel Shear Diaphragms”, Report No. 67-1, Department of Structural Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.
- Luttrell, L.D., (1981) “Steel Deck Institute Diaphragm Design Manual”, First Edition, Steel Deck Institute.
- Luttrell, L.D., (1987) “Steel Deck Institute Diaphragm Design Manual”, Second Edition, DDM02, Steel Deck Institute.
- Luttrell, L.D., (2004) “Steel Deck Institute Diaphragm Design Manual”, Third Edition, DDM03, Steel Deck Institute.
- Luttrell, L.D.,(2005) “Deeper Steel Deck and Cellular Diaphragms”, Steel Deck Institute white paper.

Nilson, A.H., (1956), Deflection of Light Gage Steel Floor Systems Under Action of Horizontal Loads, Thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.

Nilson, A.H., (1960a) “Shear Diaphragms of Light Gage Steel”, Journal of the Structural Division, ASCE, 86(11), 111-139.

Nilson, A.H.,(1960b) “Diaphragm Action in Light Gage Steel Construction,” American Iron and Steel Institute.

Nilson, A.H., (1969a) “H.H. Robertson DC Deck Used in Shear Diaphragms,” Test 69-1, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.

Nilson, A.H., (1969b) “H.H. Robertson DC Deck Used in Shear Diaphragms,” Test 69-2, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.

Seismic Design for Buildings, Tri-Services Manual,(1982) (TM 5-809-10; NAVFAC P-355; AFM 88-3, Chapter 13), U.S. Government Printing Office, Philadelphia, PA.

S.B. Barnes Associates for R.C. Mahon, (1959) “Test Program on Mahon Steel Decks...Used as Diaphragms,”, Detroit, 34, Michigan.

APPENDIX A – DIAPHRAGM TEST RESULTS

In the following section a presentation of the test results that were observed is given. Each of the diaphragm test specimens were subjected to a single load at Corner C. This load was meant to represent a static load that causes shear forces on the diaphragm. All together 20 different diaphragm tests were performed. These tests had variations in profile, thickness, material strength, and fastener configuration.

For each test a summary of the section properties and configurations are included. The tabulated data that the graphs are derived from is included on a CD located at the back of this document. The data for each of the diaphragm tests will include the deflections read by the displacement transducers and the load readings from the load cell. For each of the displacement transducers the positive direction sign convention can be found in Figure 3-11. Also included in each of these tabulated values are the corrected deflections for both the corner displacement transducers and the diagonal displacement transducers. Also a list of the corresponding values for the bare frame at the appropriate deflections for each test is present to determine the maximum load resisted by the diaphragm itself.

Test 1:
Wheeling 4.5 in 20 Ga. – Screw Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	#12 TEK Screw/rib at ends #12 TEK Screw/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 36 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0365 in
Deck Height:	4.5 in
$F_y = 107.4$ ksi	$F_u = 108.6$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:		11905 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners	3.934 in
	Diagonals	3.702 in
Design Load:	Corners	10749 lbs
	Diagonals	11019 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners	4.89 kips/in
	Diagonals	4.62 kips/in



**Figure A-1: Load vs. Displacement
Wheeling 4.5 in 20 Ga.**

Test 2:

United Steel Deck 4.5 in 20/20 Ga. – Screw Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	#12 TEK Screw/rib at ends #12 TEK Screw/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 36 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0359/0.0359 in (deck/pan)
Deck Height:	4.5 in
$F_y = 46.2/48.9$ ksi	$F_u = 56.8/58.4$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	11865 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 2.831 in Diagonals 2.758 in
Design Load:	Corners 11311 lbs Diagonals 11311 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 55.1 kips/in Diagonals 191.11 kips/in



**Figure A-2: Load vs. Displacement
United Steel Deck 4.5 in 20/20 Ga.**

Test 3:

Consolidated Systems 7.5 in 18 Ga. – Screw Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	24
Structural Fastener	#12 TEK Screw/rib at ends #12 TEK Screw/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 36 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0465 in
Deck Height:	7.5 in
$F_y = 49.7$ ksi	$F_u = 60.8$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	9288 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 5.119 in Diagonals 4.956 in
Design Load:	Corners 8091 lbs Diagonals 8011 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 6.72 kips/in Diagonals 9.53 kips/in



**Figure A-3: Load vs. Displacement
Consolidated Systems 7.5 in 18 Ga.**

Test 4:

United Steel Deck 4.5 in 18/18 Ga. – Screw Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	#12 TEK Screw/rib at ends #12 TEK Screw/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 36 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0472/0.0475 in. (deck/pan)
Deck Height:	4.5 in
$F_y = 46.6/49.7$ ksi	$F_u = 59.1/60.1$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	13434 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 2.365 in Diagonals 2.119 in
Design Load:	Corners 12962 lbs Diagonals 13002 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 33.15 kips/in Diagonals 133.88 kips/in



**Figure A-4: Load vs. Displacement
United Steel Deck 4.5 in 18/18 Ga.**

Test 5:

United Steel Deck 7.5 in 18/20 Ga. – Screw Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	#12 TEK Screw/rib at ends #12 TEK Screw/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 36 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0475 in/ 0.0358 in. (deck/pan)
Deck Height:	7.5 in
$F_y = 47.2/49.2$ ksi	$F_u = 59/59.3$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	14723 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 3.190 in Diagonals 3.043 in
Design Load:	Corners 14089 lbs Diagonals 14089 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 53.3 kips/in Diagonals 167.24 kips/in



**Figure A-5: Load vs. Displacement
United Steel Deck 7.5 in 18/20 Ga.**

Test 6:

Consolidated Systems 7.5 in 16 Ga. – Screw Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	24
Structural Fastener	#12 TEK Screw /rib at ends #12 TEK Screw /ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 36 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0595 in
Deck Height:	7.5 in
$F_y = 44.5$ ksi	$F_u = 59.6$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	12227 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 3.830 in Diagonals 3.628 in
Design Load:	Corners 11311 lbs Diagonals 11311 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 7.05 kips/in Diagonals 7.36 kips/in



**Figure A-6: Load vs. Displacement
Consolidated Systems 7.5 in 16 Ga.**

Test 7:
Wheeling 4.5 in 20 Ga. – Pin Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/rib at ends Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 36 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0360 in
Deck Height:	4.5 in
$F_y = 108.4$ ksi	$F_u = 109.7$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	11985 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 1.983 in Diagonals 3.715 in
Design Load:	Corners 11593 lbs Diagonals 11110 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 12.17 kips/in Diagonals 5.4 kips/in



**Figure A-7: Load vs. Displacement
Wheeling 4.5 in 20 Ga.**

Test 8:
Wheeling 4.5 in 16 Ga. – Pin Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/rib at ends Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 36 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0590 in
Deck Height:	4.5 in
$F_y = 91.1$ ksi	$F_u = 92.3$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:		12831 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners	1.277 in
	Diagonals	1.077 in
Design Load:	Corners	12831 lbs
	Diagonals	12831 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners	14.16 kips/in
	Diagonals	18.81 kips/in



**Figure A-8: Load vs. Displacement
Wheeling 4.5 in 16 Ga.**

Test 9:

Consolidated Systems 7.5 in 18 Ga. – Pin Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	24
Structural Fastener	Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/rib at ends Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 36 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0460 in
Deck Height:	7.5 in
$F_y = 50.1$ ksi	$F_u = 60.9$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	9530 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 6.604 in Diagonals 6.426 in
Design Load:	Corners 8131 lbs Diagonals 8131 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 3.08 kips/in Diagonals 2.59 kips/in



**Figure A-9: Load vs. Displacement
Consolidated Systems 7.5 in 18 Ga.**

Test 10:

United Steel Deck 7.5 in 18/20 Ga. – Pin Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/rib at ends Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 36 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0474 in/ 0.0358 in (deck/pan)
Deck Height:	7.5 in
$F_y = 46.7/49.3$ ksi	$F_u = 58.8/59.7$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	11865 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 2.111 in Diagonals 1.818 in
Design Load:	Corners 11472 lbs Diagonals 11865 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 34.34 kips/in Diagonals 53.14 kips/in



**Figure A-10: Load vs. Displacement
United Steel Deck 7.5 in 18/20 Ga.**

Test 11:

United Steel Deck 7.5 in 16/18 Ga. – Pin Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels:	12
Structural Fastener:	Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/rib at ends Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener:	#12 TEK Screw @ 36 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0597 in/ 0.0471 in. (deck/pan)
Deck Height:	7.5 in
$F_y = 46.2/48.8$ ksi	$F_u = 58.7/58.9$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	10737 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 1.490 in Diagonals 1.216 in
Design Load:	Corners 10737 lbs Diagonals 10737 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 35.88 kips/in Diagonals 63.8 kips/in



**Figure A-11: Load vs. Displacement
United Steel Deck 7.5 in 16/18 Ga.**

Test 12:
Wheeling 4.5 in 18 Ga. – Weld Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	3/4" Diameter Weld/rib at ends
	3/4" Diameter Weld/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 12 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0462 in
Deck Height:	4.5 in
F _y = 94.8 ksi	F _u = 97.6 ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	34085 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 4.447 in
	Diagonals 4.179 in
Design Load:	Corners 33064 lbs
	Diagonals 33019 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 9.97 kips/in
	Diagonals 9.82 kips/in



**Figure A-12: Load vs. Displacement
Wheeling 4.5 in 18 Ga.**

Test 13:

United Steel Deck 4.5 in 20/20 Ga. – Weld Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	3/4" Diameter Weld/rib at ends
	3/4" Diameter Weld/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 12 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0358/0.0355 in. (deck/pan)
Deck Height:	4.5 in
F _y = 45.4/49.8 ksi	F _u = 56.3/59.5 ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	25269 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 1.704 in
	Diagonals 1.464 in
Design Load:	Corners 25269 lbs
	Diagonals 25269 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 52.21 kips/in
	Diagonals 271.77 kips/in



**Figure A-13: Load vs. Displacement
United Steel Deck 4.5 in 20/20 Ga.**

Test 14:
Wheeling 6 in 20/20 Ga. – Weld Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	¾" Diameter Weld/rib at ends
	¾" Diameter Weld/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 12 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0359 in
Deck Height:	6 in
F _y = 92.4 ksi	F _u = 94 ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:		45235 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners	2.467 in
	Diagonals	2.270 in
Design Load:	Corners	45235 lbs
	Diagonals	45235 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners	30.09 kips/in
	Diagonals	32.13 kips/in



**Figure A-14: Load vs. Displacement
Wheeling 6 in 20/20 Ga.**

Test 15:
Vulcraft 3 in 16/16 Ga. – Pin Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/rib at ends Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	Button Punch @ 12 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0592 in
Deck Height:	3 in
$F_y = 43$ ksi	$F_u = 56.4$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	11733 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 1.761 in Diagonals 1.641 in
Design Load:	Corners 11733 lbs Diagonals 11733 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 14.88 kips/in Diagonals 20.47 kips/in



**Figure A-15: Load vs. Displacement
Vulcraft 3 in 16/16 Ga.**

Test 16:
Vulcraft 3 in 20/20 Ga. – Pin Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/rib at ends Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	Button Punch @ 12 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0461 in
Deck Height:	3 in
$F_y = 41.4$ ksi	$F_u = 56.6$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	8898 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 1.924 in Diagonals 1.781 in
Design Load:	Corners 8416 lbs Diagonals 8898 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 11.47 kips/in Diagonals 16.91 kips/in



**Figure A-16: Load vs. Displacement
Vulcraft 3 in 20/20 Ga.**

Test 17:
Wheeling 6 in 16/16 Ga. – Pin Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/rib at ends Hilti Pin X-ENP-19 L15/ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#12 TEK Screw @ 12 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0576 in
Deck Height:	6 in
$F_y = 85.8$ ksi	$F_u = 88.6$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	60133 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 1.138 in Diagonals 0.832 in
Design Load:	Corners 60133 lbs Diagonals 60133 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 82.54 kips/in Diagonals 217.08 kips/in



**Figure A-17: Load vs. Displacement
Wheeling 6 in 16/16 Ga.**

Test 18:

Vulcraft 3 in 18/18 Ga. – Screw Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	#12 TEK Screw /rib at ends #12 TEK Screw /ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#10 TEK Screw @ 12 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0464 in
Deck Height:	3 in
$F_y = 41.4$ ksi	$F_u = 56$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	29675 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 3.321 in Diagonals 3.088 in
Design Load:	Corners 28834 lbs Diagonals 28879 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 96.35 kips/in Diagonals 397.8 kips/in



**Figure A-18: Load vs. Displacement
Vulcraft 3 in 18/18 Ga.**

Test 19:
Vulcraft 3 in 20/20 Ga. – Screw Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels	12
Structural Fastener	#12 TEK Screw /rib at ends #12 TEK Screw /ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener	#10 TEK Screw @ 12 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0460 in
Deck Height:	3 in
$F_y = 41.5$ ksi	$F_u = 56.2$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	21170 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 4.222 in Diagonals 4.060 in
Design Load:	Corners 20295 lbs Diagonals 20295 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 72.25 kips/in Diagonals 172.31 kips/in



**Figure A-19: Load vs. Displacement
Vulcraft 3 in 18/18 Ga.**

Test 20:

Wheeling 6 in 20/20 Ga. – Screw Test

Diaphragm Setup:


Width:	24 ft
Span:	24 ft
No. of Panels:	12
Structural Fastener:	#12 TEK Screw /rib at ends #12 TEK Screw /ft at sides
Side-lap Fastener:	#10 TEK Screw @ 12 in o/c

Steel Deck:

Measured Thickness:	0.0358 in
Deck Height:	6 in
$F_y = 92$ ksi	$F_u = 93.8$ ksi

Results

Maximum Applied Load:	41786 lbs
Deflection at Max. Load:	Corners 1.556 in Diagonals 1.237 in
Design Load:	Corners 41786 lbs Diagonals 41786 lbs
Stiffness Evaluation:	Corners 39.78 kips/in Diagonals 67.02 kips/in



**Figure A-20: Load vs. Displacement
Wheeling 6 in 20/20 Ga.**

APPENDIX B – REDUCED COUPON AND DIAPHRAGM DATA

Table B-1: Corrected Deflection at Maximum Load

Test	Deflection At Max Load (in)	
	Corner	Diag
1 (1)	3.934	3.702
2 (6)	2.831	2.758
3 (4)	5.119	4.956
4 (7)	2.365	2.119
5 (8)	3.287	3.043
6 (5)	3.83	3.628
7 (11)	1.983	3.7148
8 (10)	1.277	1.078
9 (13)	6.604	6.426
10 (15)	2.111	1.818
11 (16)	1.49	1.216
12 (18)	4.447	4.179
13 (19)	1.704	1.464
14 (20)	2.467	2.27
15 (12)	1.761	1.641
16 (14)	1.967	1.815
17 (17)	1.1378	0.83184
18 (3)	3.3209	3.0876
19 (2)	4.2219	4.06
20 (9)	1.5564	1.2372




Figure B-1: Deflection at Maximum Load Comparison, Corner vs. Diagonals

Table B-2: SDIDDM03 Strength

Test No.	SDI			Test Su (lbs/ft)	% Difference
	Q _f (lbs)	Q _s (lbs)	S _u (lbs/ft)		
1 (1)	2233	771	164	191	17
2 (6)	1637	771	149	201	35
3 (4)	2227	1020	198	143	-28
4 (7)	2161	1018	196	230	17
5 (8)	3798	771	202	250	23
6 (5)	2565	1284	244	201	-18
7 (11)	1938	771	156	206	32
8 (10)	3149	1284	258	228	-12
9 (13)	2534	1020	206	144	-30
10 (15)	4281	771	214	203	-5
11 (16)	5364	1020	276	190	-31
12 (18)	7194	1020	554	501	-10
13 (19)	3271	771	373	383	3
14 (20)	5320	1743	738	685	-7
15 (12)	5897	858	520	208	-60
16 (14)	3732	309	233	149	-36
17 (17)	5897	2903	1354	1066	-21
18 (3)	3871	1020	527	511	-3
19 (2)	2925	771	398	360	-10
20 (9)	4459	1542	757	741	-2
Average					-7

Table B-3 SDIDDM03 Strength with Shear Limitation

Test No.	SDI w/ Shear Limitation			Test Su (lbs/ft)	% Difference
	Qf (lbs)	Qs (lbs)	Su(lbs/ft)		
1 (1)	2000	771	158	191	21
2 (6)	1637	771	149	201	35
3 (4)	2000	1020	193	143	-26
4 (7)	2000	1018	192	230	19
5 (8)	2000	771	158	250	58
6 (5)	2000	1284	230	201	-13
7 (11)	1938	771	156	206	32
8 (10)	3149	1284	258	228	-12
9 (13)	2534	1020	206	144	-30
10 (15)	4281	771	214	203	-5
11 (16)	4720	1020	260	190	-27
12 (18)	7194	1020	529	501	-5
13 (19)	3271	771	369	383	4
14 (20)	4034	1743	707	685	-3
15 (12)	4720	858	486	208	-57
16 (14)	3732	309	233	149	-36
17 (17)	4720	2000	951	1066	12
18 (3)	2000	1020	473	511	8
19 (2)	2000	771	372	360	-3
20 (9)	2000	1542	653	741	13

Average -1

APPENDIX C - DIAPHRAGM TEST FASTENER FAILURE MATRIX

In the following section a table is presented that shows the fastener failures that were present in each diaphragm test. There are many different failure modes that were observed and each one was given a symbol to organize the tables more efficiently. The typical failure modes present for the pin and screw tests are:

N – Nothing

NA – No Attachment (Top sheet had no edge distance therefore not considered to be attached)

S – Shear

P – Pull Over or Pull Out (Pull out applies to the pins only)

L – Local Buckling

R – Roll

B – Bearing

T – Edge Tear Out

D – Displacement from button punch failure

For a welded test the same designations apply but a few additional ones were added. These additions were done to explain the structural welds and their separation from the sheet material.

NP – No Penetration

1 – 25 % Release

2 – 50 % Release

3 – 75 % Release

4 – 100 % Release




Table C-1: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #1

N	B	L	N	L	N	L	B	L	N	L	N	L	B	L	N	L	B	L	N	L	S	L	B	N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		R		S		R		S		R		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		S		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		S		S		R		R		R		R		S		R		S		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N																								N
N		S		S		R		S		S		R		S		R		S		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N	B	P	N	B	N	B	B	P	N	B	N	B	B	P	N	B	N	P	N	B	B	P	B	N

Table C-2: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #2

N	B	B	N	B	N	B	N	B	B	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	B	L	B	N
N																								N
N																								N
N		S		R		S		R		S		R		R		R		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		S		R		S		R		R		R		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N		R		R		B		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		B		R		S		B		R		R		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		R		S		R		R		R		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N																								N
N	B	B	N	B	N	B	N	B	B	B	N	B	N	B	N	B	N	B	N	B	B	B	B	N

Table C-3: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #3

N	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	N	B	B	B	N	N	B	B	N	N	N	B	N	N	N	B	N	
N																								N	
N																								N	
N	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N	
N																								N	
N																								N	
N	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N	
N																								N	
N																								N	
N	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N	
N																								N	
N																								N	
N	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	N	
N																								N	
N																								N	
N	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N	
N																								N	
N																								N	
N	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	R	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N	
N																								N	
N																								N	
N	P	B	B	N	B	N	N	N	N	B	B	N	N	B	B	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	B	B	N

Table C-4: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #4

N	B	B	B	B	N	B	N	B	N	B	B	S	N	B	N	L	N	B	B	S	B	S	N	N
N																								N
N																								N
N		T		B		R		R		B		T		B		R		R		R		S		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		T		R		T		R		B		T		R		R		R		R		S		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		T		R		B		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		T		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		T		R		R		R		R		S		B		T		R		R		S		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		T		B		B		R		R		R		B		R		R		R		S		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		B		B		R		R		R		T		R		S		R		R		S		N
N																								N
N																								N
N	B	B	B	B	N	B	N	B	N	B	B	L	N	B	N	B	N	S	S	S	S	B	N	N

Table C-5: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #5

N	N	L	N	S	N	B	S	L	N	L	N	B	N	B	S	B	N	B	N	B	S	S	S	N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		B		R		R		R		B		R		R		B		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		B		R		R		R		B		R		R		B		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		B		R		R		R		B		R		R		B		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		B		R		R		R		B		B		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		B		R		R		R		B		R		R		B		N
N																								N
N																								N
N																								N
N		R		R		R		B		R		R		R		B		R		R		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N	S	B	N	B	N	B	S	B	N	B	N	B	N	B	S	B	N	B	N	B	S	P	S	N

Table C-6: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #6

N	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	S	S	S	B	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
N																								N
N																								N
N	S	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	R	R	S	R	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N
N																								N
N																								N
N	S	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	R	R	N
N																								N
N																								N
N	S	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	R	R	N
N																								N
N																								N
N	S	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	R	R	N
N																								N
N																								N
N	S	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	R	R	N
N																								N
N																								N
N	S	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	R	R	N
N																								N
N																								N
N	S	B	B	B	N	N	B	N	N	S	S	S	B	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Table C-7: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #7

N	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		R		S		R		R		R		R		R		S		R		R		R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		R		S		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		S		R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		R		S	N
N																							N
N																							N
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Table C-8: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #8

N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
N																								N
N																								N
N		N		S		N		S		N		N		S		S		N		S		N		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		N		S		N		S		N		N		S		S		N		S		N		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		N		S		N		S		N		N		S		R		N		S		N		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		N		S		N		S		N		N		S		R		N		S		N		N
N																								N
N																								N
N																								N
N		N		S		N		S		N		N		S		S		N		S		N		N
N																								N
N																								N
N	N	N	N	P	N	N	N	P	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Table C-9: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #9

N	B	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
N																							N
N																							N
N	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	N
N																							N
N																							N
N	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Table C-10: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #10

N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
N																								N
N																								N
N		T		T		T		T		T		B		R		R		R		R		B		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		T		T		T		T		T		B		R		B		B		T		T		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		T		T		T		T		T		B		B		R		R		B		R		N
N																								N
N		T		T		T		T		T		R		B		R		R		B		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		T		T		T		T		T		B		B		R		R		B		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N		T		T		T		T		T		R		B		B		R		B		R		N
N																								N
N																								N
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	N	N	N

Table C-11: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #11

N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		T		R		NA		R		R		R		T		T		T		T		T	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		T		R		NA		R		R		R		T		T		T		T		T	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		T		R		NA		R		R		R		T		T		T		T		T	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		T		R		NA		R		R		R		T		NA		T		T		T	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		T		R		T		R		R		R		T		T		T		T		T	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		NA		R		T		R		R		R		T		T		R		T		T	N
N																							N
N																							N
N		NA		R		T		R		R		R		T		T		T		T		T	N
N																							N
N																							N
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Table C-12: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #12

N	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N	2	C	N	C	3	C	N	N	N	N	1	N	N	C	N	C	2	C	N	C	1	NP	N	N

Table C-13: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #13

N	N	1	N	N	1	N	1	N	N	1	1	1	1	N	N	N	N	N	N	2	4	N	4	N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N		N
N	N	1	N	1	N	1	2	N	1	N	1	N	N	1	N	1	N	1	N	3	2	N	2	N

Table C-14: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #14

N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	3	N	N	N	N	N	N	2	N	N	3	4	N	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	N		
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R			R		N
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Table C-18: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #18

N	N	N	N	S	S	N	S	S	N	S	S	S	N	S	N	S	S	S	N	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	N	N	N	N	N	
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N		N
N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N

Table C-19: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #19

N	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	N	S	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			
N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	N	S	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	N	S	S	N	N	S	S	N	N	S	N	N

Table C-20: Fastener Failure Matrix for Test #20

N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			N			S
N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S



**American
Iron and Steel
Institute**

1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 705
Washington, DC 20036
www.steel.org



Research Report RP-08-9