

**LIFE-CYCLE RISK ASSESSMENT OF REINFORCED
CONCRETE STRUCTURES UNDER
EARTHQUAKE AND FIRE**

AKSHAY SATISHKUMAR BAHETI



**Indian Institute of
Technology Delhi**



**THE UNIVERSITY
OF QUEENSLAND
AUSTRALIA**

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

&

THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

JUNE 2024

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2024



Indian Institute of
Technology Delhi



THE UNIVERSITY
OF QUEENSLAND
AUSTRALIA

**LIFE-CYCLE RISK ASSESSMENT OF REINFORCED
CONCRETE STRUCTURES UNDER
EARTHQUAKE AND FIRE**

by

Akshay Satishkumar Baheti

M. Tech. Structural Engineering, B. Tech. (H.) Civil Engineering



0000-0002-8172-1103

A thesis submitted,

in fulfilment of the requirements for the joint degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

to the

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

&

THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

JUNE 2024

Dedicated to

my family

Supervisor Certification

This is to certify that the thesis entitled "**Life-Cycle Risk Assessment of Reinforced Concrete Structures under Earthquake and Fire**", being submitted by **Mr Akshay Satishkumar Baheti** to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi and The University of Queensland for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** is a record of bonafide research work carried out by him. **Mr Baheti** has worked under our guidance and supervision and has fulfilled the requirements for the submission of this thesis, which, to our knowledge, has reached the requisite standard. The results, contained in this thesis, are original and have not been submitted, in part or full, to any other University or Institute for the award of any other degree or diploma.



Vasant Matsagar

Professor, Dogra Chair, and Head,
Department of Civil Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi,
Hauz Khas, New Delhi - 110 016, India.



David Lange

Associate Professor,
School of Civil Engineering,
University of Queensland,
St Lucia - 4076, Australia.

This page is intentionally left blank

Acknowledgements

I extend my deepest gratitude to those who have contributed to the successful completion of this doctoral dissertation. This journey would not have been possible without the support, guidance, and encouragement of numerous individuals.

First and foremost, I sincerely thank my supervisors, Prof. Vasant Matsagar (IIT Delhi) and Prof. David Lange (UQ), for their unwavering support, invaluable insights, and constructive feedback throughout the research process. Their mentorship has been instrumental in shaping the direction and quality of this dissertation.

I am grateful to my academy student milestone committee (ASMC) members, Prof. Puneet Mahajan (chairperson), Prof. Dipti Ranjan Sahoo (IITD expert), and Prof. Joe Gattas (UQ expert), for their timely review and positive comments on my work during my candidature. Their thoughtful feedback and suggestions have significantly enriched the content and rigour of the dissertation. I am also grateful to my thesis examiners for their constructive feedback that has helped me further improve the quality of the thesis.

I thank the UQ-IIT Delhi Research Academy for allowing me to work at the world-renowned institutes, IIT Delhi and UQ, which proved beneficial for conducting this research. I am indebted to my colleagues and fellow researchers from the Multi-Hazard Protective Structures (MHPS) Laboratory (IIT Delhi) and the Fire Lab (UQ), who have shared their knowledge and experiences, providing inspiration and support throughout the research journey. Their camaraderie has made this academic endeavour more fulfilling.

Heartfelt appreciation goes to my family – parents, in-laws, sister, sister-in-law, brothers-in-law, and niece Saanvi for their unwavering support, love, and understanding during the highs and lows of this challenging pursuit. Their encouragement has been a constant source of motivation. I extend a special thanks to my wife, Madhumati, and son, Aarush, who stood shoulder to shoulder during my entire PhD journey.

Finally, I want to express my gratitude to those who may not be explicitly mentioned but have significantly shaped my academic and personal journey. Your contributions have not gone unnoticed and are sincerely appreciated.



Akshay Baheti

(June 2024)

This page is intentionally left blank

ABSTRACT

Life-cycle assessment of civil engineering infrastructure is necessary for better management of resources during maintenance, strengthening, and repair actions for sustainable development. Current design practices typically consider the structural risk of various loads and their combination at the design stage and do not account for the change in the risk over the service life of a structure. A structure is subjected to multiple hazards over its lifespan, which have a certain permanent effect, though negligible sometimes, which may severely affect its performance to future significant hazard and result in disproportionate structural damages. Therefore, the present doctoral study discusses a holistic risk-based design framework that considers ageing effects in addition to major or minor structural damages on account of independent hazards. The framework is illustrated for independent action of earthquake and fire hazards on reinforced concrete (RC) structures while considering continuous structural deterioration on account of chloride- and carbonation-induced corrosion over the service life.

The earthquake-resistant design is well-developed and applies an objective-based design philosophy through design standards around the world. On the other hand, the response of structures to fire is predominantly articulated in terms of the time of exposure to a nominal fire, such as ISO 834 standard fire. This is despite the fact that this time of exposure is poorly correlated to structural response to fire. The present study discusses a framework for obtaining the most appropriate intensity measure (IM) correlated to the structural response to fire, which in turn is described in terms of an engineering demand parameter (EDP). Such a correlation between IM and EDP leads to reduced uncertainty of structural response to fire. The approach is based on the estimation of certain attributes of the correlation between IM and EDP, including: efficiency, practicality, proficiency, sufficiency, and scaling robustness. The methodology is subsequently demonstrated in application to obtain the most appropriate IM for RC slab, beam, and column elements individually. The appropriateness of a candidate IM is validated through several models that are generated for each member type by varying material and geometric properties, as well as by considering a range of fire models. A single IM is recommended for each structural member at the end of the analysis, independent of any fire model.

Many design regulations around the globe rely on member deflection as a governing criterion for resistance assessment in fire. The deflection evaluation in fire is generally achieved by conducting expensive experiments or computationally expensive finite element analyses, which often restricts practising engineers from using robust performance-based

design philosophy for typical structures in fire. Instead, they rely on objective design guidelines, often resulting in inefficient sizes of RC members. Therefore, semi-empirical relations are derived in the current study to determine the maximum deflection of the RC beam and column in fire. Plausible variables that could affect the overall deflection of the member are first identified, and their proportionality is subsequently determined by performing one-on-one regression analysis. Furthermore, these relations are developed in terms of the most suitable fire IM, which makes them applicable irrespective of the type of fire framework. The credibility of the deflection equations is validated through visual analysis followed by the three popular error indicator parameters – Pearson's correlation coefficient, relative root mean squared error, and performance index. Results indicate that all deflection equations accurately predict the RC member behaviour under fire.

A methodology is devised to obtain building fragility curves for fire using the most suitable IM and regression equations from the current study. The methodology is subsequently used to assess the life-cycle risk in RC structures for independent multi-hazard action of earthquake and fire while considering appropriate structural degradation over the service life. The change in the structure's performance in fire over its service life is also evaluated for the multi-hazard effects of earthquake and fire. The results from this study indicate that there is a significant increase in the risk of post-earthquake fire if minor damage due to earthquake not addressed. Similarly, it is shown that an RC member's performance in fire decreases significantly over its service life due to environmental effects.

ABSTRACT IN HINDI (सार)

शाश्वत विकास के लिए रखरखाव, सुदृढीकरण, और मरम्मत कार्यों के दौरान संसाधनों के बेहतर प्रबंधन के लिए आधारभूत संरचना का जीवन-चक्र मूल्यांकन आवश्यक है। वर्तमान रचना प्रथाएँ आम तौर पर प्रथम चरण में विभिन्न भागों और उनके सम्मिश्रण के संरचनात्मक जोखिम पर विचार करती हैं और किसी संरचना के सेवा जीवन पर जोखिम में बदलाव को ध्यान में नहीं रखती हैं। एक संरचना को अपने जीवनकाल में कई खतरों का सामना करना पड़ता है, जिनका एक निश्चित स्थायी प्रभाव, जो कभी-कभी नगण्य होता है, भविष्य में विशाल खतरों के लिए गंभीर रूप से प्रभावित कर सकता है और परिणामस्वरूप असंगत संरचनात्मक क्षति हो सकती है। इसलिए, वर्तमान अध्ययन एक समग्र जोखिम-आधारित रचना ढांचे पर चर्चा करता है जो स्वतंत्र खतरों के कारण बड़े या छोटे संरचनात्मक नुकसान के अलावा रचनाओं के उम्र बढ़ने के प्रभावों पर भी विचार करता है। सेवा जीवन के दौरान क्लोराइड-और कार्बोनेशन-प्रेरित जंग के कारण निरंतर संरचनात्मक गिरावट पर विचार करते हुए प्रबलित कंक्रीट संरचनाओं पर भूकंप और आग के खतरों की स्वतंत्र कार्रवाई के लिए ढांचे का उपयोग किया गया है।

भूकंप-रोधी उद्देश्य-आधारित रचना अच्छी तरह से विकसित है और दुनिया भर के डिज़ाइन मानक इसे लागू करते हैं। दूसरी ओर, आग के प्रति संरचनाओं का प्रतिरोध मुख्य रूप से ISO 834 आग जैसी नाममात्र आग के समय के संदर्भ में किया जाता है। यह इस तथ्य के बावजूद है कि यह समय का आग में संरचनात्मक प्रतिक्रिया से बहुत कम संबंध है। वर्तमान अध्ययन में आग के प्रति संरचनात्मक प्रतिक्रिया से संबंधित सबसे उपयुक्त तीव्रता माप प्राप्त करने के लिए एक रूपरेखा बनाई गयी है। तीव्रता और प्रतिक्रिया के बीच इस तरह के सहसंबंध से आग के प्रति संरचनात्मक प्रतिक्रिया की अनिश्चितता कम हो जाती है। यह सहसंबंध कुछ विशेषताओं के अनुमान पर आधारित है, जिसमें शामिल हैं: निपुणता, व्यावहारिकता, प्रवीणता, पर्याप्तता और भार के उतारचढ़ाव के प्रति विभिन्नता। प्रबलित कंक्रीट से बने मंजिल, तंडी, और खम्बे के लिए सबसे उपयुक्त तीव्रता माप प्राप्त करने के लिए इस रूपरेखा का उपयोग किया गया है। एक उम्मीदवार तीव्रता माप की उपयुक्तता को कई सामग्री और ज्यामितीय उदाहरणों के माध्यम से मान्यता दी गई है। यह सहसंबंध विभिन्न अग्नि प्रारूप पर विचार करके उत्पन्न होते हैं। विश्लेषण के अंत में प्रत्येक संरचनात्मक सदस्य के लिए किसी भी अग्नि प्रारूप से स्वतंत्र, एकल तीव्रता माप की सिफारिश की गयी है।

दुनिया भर में कई रचना नियम आग में प्रतिरोध मूल्यांकन के लिए एक शासी मानदंड के रूप में सदस्य झुकाव पर निर्भर करते हैं। आग में झुकाव आकलन में महंगे प्रयोगों या जटिल तकनीकों की आवश्यकताएँ अक्सर सामान्य अभियंता को आग में उद्देश्य-आधारित रचना का उपयोग करने से

प्रतिबंधित करती है। अतः वे वस्तुनिष्ठ रचना दिशानिर्देशों पर भरोसा करते हैं, जिसके परिणामस्वरूप अक्सर प्रबलित कंक्रीट संरचना अनुपयुक्त रहती है। इसलिए, आग में प्रबलित कंक्रीट तंडी और खम्बे के अधिकतम झुकाव को निर्धारित करने के लिए वर्तमान अध्ययन में विशिष्ट समीकरण प्रस्थापित किए गए हैं। सदस्य के झुकाव को प्रभावित करने वाले चीजों को पहले पहचाना गया है, और उनकी आनुपातिकता बाद में एक-पर-एक प्रतिगमन विश्लेषण करके निर्धारित की गयी है। इसके अलावा, इन संबंधों को सबसे उपयुक्त अग्नि तीव्रता माप के संदर्भ में विकसित किया गया है, जो उन्हें अग्नि ढांचे के प्रकार की परवाह किए बिना लागू करता है। झुकाव समीकरणों की विश्वसनीयता को तीन लोकप्रिय त्रुटि संकेतक मापदंडों - पियर्सन के सहसंबंध, गुणांक सापेक्ष त्रुटि, और प्रदर्शन सूचकांक के बाद दृश्य विश्लेषण के माध्यम से मान्य किया गया है। परिणाम दर्शाते हैं कि सभी समीकरण आग के तहत प्रबलित कंक्रीट सदस्य के झुकाव की सटीक भविष्यवाणी करते हैं।

वर्तमान अध्ययन से सबसे उपयुक्त तीव्रता माप और झुकाव समीकरणों का उपयोग करके आग के लिए नाजुकता वक्र प्राप्त करने के लिए एक पद्धति तैयार की गई है। इस पद्धति का उपयोग बाद में सेवा जीवन पर उचित संरचनात्मक गिरावट पर विचार करते हुए भूकंप और आग की स्वतंत्र संयुक्त-खतरे की कार्रवाई के लिए प्रबलित कंक्रीट संरचनाओं में जीवन-चक्र जोखिम का आकलन करने के लिए किया गया है। भूकंप और आग के संयुक्त-प्रभावों के लिए इसकी सेवा अवधि के दौरान आग में संरचना के प्रदर्शन में परिवर्तन का भी मूल्यांकन किया जाता है। इस अध्ययन के नतीजों से संकेत मिलता है कि अगर भूकंप के कारण होने वाली मामूली क्षति पर ध्यान नहीं दिया गया तो भूकंप के बाद आग में भारी नुकसान होने का खतरा काफी बढ़ जाता है। इसी तरह, यह दिखाया गया है कि प्रबलित कंक्रीट सदस्य के सेवा जीवन में पर्यावरणीय प्रभावों कारण आग का प्रतिरोध करने की क्षमता काफी कम हो जाती है।

Declaration by author

This thesis is composed of my original work, and contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference has been made in the text. I have clearly stated the contribution by others to jointly authored works that I have included in my thesis. I have clearly stated the contribution of others to my thesis as a whole, including statistical assistance, survey design, data analysis, significant technical procedures, professional editorial advice, financial support and any other original research work used or reported in my thesis. The content of my thesis is the result of work I have carried out since the commencement of my higher degree by research candidature and does not include a substantial part of work that has been submitted to qualify for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution. I have clearly stated which parts of my thesis, if any, have been submitted to qualify for another award.

I acknowledge that an electronic copy of my thesis must be lodged with the University Library and, subject to the policy and procedures of The University of Queensland, the thesis be made available for research and study in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968 unless a period of embargo has been approved by the Dean of the Graduate School.

I acknowledge that copyright of all material contained in my thesis resides with the copyright holder(s) of that material. Where appropriate I have obtained copyright permission from the copyright holder to reproduce material in this thesis and have sought permission from co-authors for any jointly authored works included in the thesis.



(Akshay Satishkumar Baheti)

This page is intentionally left blank

Publications included in this thesis

1. **Baheti, A.**, Lange, D., and Matsagar, V. "Semi-empirical equations to evaluate maximum deflection in RC beam and column under fire", *Journal of Structural Engineering* (Accepted, In press).
2. **Baheti, A.**, Lange, D., and Matsagar, V. (2021). "Multi-hazard nonlinear analysis of RC structures under earthquake and fire in its current state", in *Proceedings of the 12th Asia-Oceania Symposium on Fire Science and Technology (AOSFST)*, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.
3. **Baheti, A.**, Lange, D., and Matsagar, V. (2022). "A study to determine suitable and robust intensity measures for reinforced concrete slab subjected to fire", in *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Structures in Fire (SiF)*, 1219-1229, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong.
4. **Baheti, A.**, Lange, D., and Matsagar, V. (2024). "Efficient and reliable fire risk assessment of RC column", in *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Structures in Fire (SiF)*, University of Coimbra, Portugal.

Submitted manuscripts included in this thesis

1. **Baheti, A.**, Lange, D., and Matsagar, V. "A framework to determine appropriate intensity measures for a structure subjected to fire", *Structural Safety* (under review).
2. **Baheti, A.**, Lange, D., and Matsagar, V. "Appropriate fire intensity measures for RC beam and column", *Engineering Structures* (under review).
3. **Baheti, A.**, Lange, D., and Matsagar, V. "Service-life multi-hazard risk assessment of structures: framework and application", *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering* (under review).

Other publications during candidature

- **Baheti, A. S.**, and Matsagar, V. A. (2022). "Wind and seismic response control of dynamically similar adjacent buildings connected using magneto-rheological dampers", *Infrastructures*, 7(12), 167.
- Bhaskar, P., **Baheti, A.**, and Matsagar, V. (2022). "Service-life damage assessment of a reinforced concrete structure under multi-hazard seismic and wind actions", *Transactions of the Indian National Academy of Engineering*, 7(3), 1017-1031.

This page is intentionally left blank

Contributions by others to the thesis

All chapters

Editorial suggestions were provided by the candidate's supervisors, Prof. Vasant Matsagar and Prof. David Lange, and the ASMC members, Prof. Puneet Mahajan, Prof. Dipti Ranjan Sahoo, and Prof. Joe Gattas.

Statement of parts of the thesis submitted to qualify for the award of another degree

No works submitted towards another degree have been included in this thesis.

Research involving human or animal subjects

No animal or human subjects were involved in this research.

This page is intentionally left blank

Financial support

This research was supported by an Indian Institute of Technology Delhi Research Scholarship, University of Queensland Living allowance, and a Research grant from the UQ-IITD Research Academy.

The research work was also supported by the Government of India's Ministry of Education under its Scheme for Promotion of Academic and Research Collaboration (SPARC) for the project "Fire Safety in Underground Tunnels" (Project Code: P920).

Keywords

service-life assessment, reinforced concrete, earthquake, fire, corrosion, fire fragility analysis; performance-based fire design, regression equations, member deflection in fire, nonlinear structural analysis.

Australian and New Zealand standard research classifications (ANZSRC)

ANZSRC code: 400506, Earthquake Engineering, 10%

ANZSRC code: 400507, Fire Safety Engineering, 70%

ANZSRC code: 401005, Risk Engineering, 20%

Fields of research (FoR) classification

FoR code: 4005, Civil Engineering, 80%

FoR code: 4010, Engineering Practice and Education, 20%

This page is intentionally left blank

Table of Contents

	Page
Supervisor Certification	i
Acknowledgements	iii
ABSTRACT	v
ABSTRACT IN HINDI (संक्षेप)	vii
Declaration by author	ix
Publications included in this thesis	xi
Submitted manuscripts included in this thesis	xi
Other publications during candidature	xi
Contributions by others to the thesis	xiii
Statement of parts of the thesis submitted to qualify for the award of another degree	xiii
Research involving human or animal subjects	xiii
Financial support	xv
Keywords	xv
Australian and New Zealand standard research classifications (ANZSRC)	xv
Fields of research (FoR) classification	xv
Table of Contents	xvii
List of Figures	xxiii
List of Tables	xxxvii
List of Symbols	xxxix
List of Abbreviation	xliii
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE SURVEY	1-14
1.1 Life-Cycle Assessment	1
1.2 Structural Reliability	1
1.3 Multi-Hazard Scenario for Structures	3
1.3.1 State of the art in concurrent multi-hazards	4
1.3.2 State of the art in cascading multi-hazards	4
1.3.3 State of the art in independent multi-hazards	5
1.4 Structural Response to Earthquake	5
1.4.1 Earthquake-resistant design of structures	5

	1.4.2 Review of earthquake damage surveys	6
1.5	Structures in Fire	8
	1.5.1 Compartment fire dynamics	9
	1.5.2 Fire models	9
	1.5.3 Fire-induced damages in RC structures	11
1.6	Summary of Literature Review and Identification of Research Gaps	12
1.7	Objectives of the Doctoral Research	13
1.8	Organisation of the PhD Thesis	13
Chapter 2	LIFE-CYCLE MULTI-HAZARD RISK ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK	15-30
2.1	General	15
2.2	Multi-Hazard Risk Assessment Framework	16
2.3	Life-Cycle Damage Analysis of a Medium-Rise RC Building	18
	2.3.1 Details of 5-storey reinforced concrete structure	19
	2.3.2 Corrosion-induced structural degradation	20
	2.3.3 Seismic analysis of 5-storey frame structure	24
	2.3.4 Thermo-mechanical analysis of 5-storey frame structure	26
2.4	Closing Remarks	29
Chapter 3	APPROPRIATE FIRE INTENSITY MEASURE	31-66
3.1	General	31
3.2	Framework for Determining the Appropriate IM for the Structure	32
	3.2.1 Desirable traits for a suitable IM	34
	3.2.1.1 Efficiency	34
	3.2.1.2 Practicality	34
	3.2.1.3 Proficiency	34
	3.2.1.4 Sufficiency	34
	3.2.1.5 Scaling robustness	35
	3.2.2 Framework design and discussion	36
3.3	IM and EDP Identification for RC Structural Members	38

3.3.1	Identification of candidate EDPs	38
3.3.2	Identification of candidate IMs	39
3.4	Fire Models	40
3.5	Appropriate Fire IM for RC Slab	44
3.5.1	Numerical modelling	44
3.5.2	Results and discussion	46
3.6	Appropriate Fire IM for RC Beam	52
3.6.1	Fixed-fixed beam	54
3.6.2	Propped cantilever beam	58
3.6.3	Simply supported beam	59
3.7	Appropriate Fire IM for RC Column	61
3.8	Closing Remarks	65
Chapter 4	DEFLECTION EQUATIONS FOR RC MEMBERS IN FIRE	67-92
4.1	General	67
4.2	Numerical Modelling	69
4.2.1	Structural models	69
4.2.2	Fire models	71
4.3	Regression Coefficients	72
4.3.1	Variable identification	72
4.3.2	Regression coefficient evaluation	73
4.4	Regression Expression: Development and Evaluation	73
4.4.1	Performance evaluation criteria	73
4.4.2	Deflection calculation in a fixed-fixed beam subjected to fire	75
4.4.3	Deflection calculation in propped cantilever beam subjected to fire	79
4.4.4	Deflection calculation in a simply supported beam subjected to fire	84
4.4.5	Deflection calculation in column subjected to fire	88
4.5	Illustrative Example	91
4.6	Closing Remarks	91

Chapter 5	SERVICE-LIFE RISK ASSESSMENT OF RC STRUCTURES UNDER EARTHQUAKE AND FIRE	93-110
5.1	General	93
5.2	Numerical Modelling	93
	5.2.1 Structural details	93
	5.2.2 Mathematical modelling	94
5.3	Service-Life Fragility Analyses of RC Structures	97
	5.3.1 Earthquake excitation	97
	5.3.2 Methodology for fire fragility assessment	100
	5.3.3 Fire fragility assessment	104
	5.3.4 Multi-hazard scenario of earthquake and fire	105
5.4	Life-Cycle Risk Assessment of RC Buildings	107
5.5	Life-Cycle Assessment of Factor of Safety against Fire	108
5.6	Closing Remarks	110
Chapter 6	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	111-114
6.1	Summary	111
6.2	Conclusions	112
6.3	Limitations and Future Scope of the Doctoral Study	114
	REFERENCES	115-134
Appendix A	Introduction to OpenSees and Validation Studies	135-154
A.1	General	135
A.2	Brief Description of OpenSees Commands in Seismic Analysis of Structure	135
A.3	Validation Studies in OpenSees for Seismic Excitation of Structures	140
	A.3.1 Homogeneous material	140
	A.3.2 Reinforced concrete structures	145
A.4	Brief Description of OpenSees Commands in Thermal Analysis of Structure	147
A.5	Validation Studies for Slab in Fire using OpenSees	148
	A.5.1 Heat transfer analysis	148
	A.5.2 Thermo-mechanical analysis of RC slab	150
A.6	Validation Studies for RC Beam in Fire using OpenSees	151

A.7	Validation Studies for RC Column in Fire using OpenSees	153
Appendix B	Supplementary Results of Chapter 3	155-170
Appendix C	Supplementary Results of Chapter 5	171-194
Appendix D	Selected MATLAB and OpenSees Codes	195-212
D.1	MATLAB code for Life-Cycle Seismic Fragility Analysis of the 4-Storey Residential Building	195
D.2	OpenSees Code for Seismic Analysis of 4-Storey Building	198
D.3	OpenSees Model for Heat Transfer Analysis of RC Column	203
D.4	MATLAB Code for Life-Cycle Multi-Hazard Earthquake and Fire Analysis	203
	VITA	213

This page is intentionally left blank

List of Figures

Figure No.	Figure Caption	Page No.
2.1	Framework for the service-life risk-based design of a structure	17
2.2	Schematic of: (a) the building elevation, (b) the building plan, and (c) cross sections of RC elements in the 5-storey building	20
2.3	Change in: (a) reinforcement diameter, (b) steel rebar yield strength, (c) core concrete strength, and (d) cover concrete strength in Column C1 (ref. Figure 2.2) over the service life of the structure	24
2.4	(a) Site-specific response spectrum-compatible earthquake time history; (b) variation of damage index over the service life of base columns of the 5-storey structure	26
2.5	Comparison of fire resistance period of structural elements under different exposure conditions to ISO 834 fire for multi-hazard earthquake and fire scenario	29
3.1	Framework for obtaining an appropriate IM for an EDP in a structure subjected to fire	37
3.2	chematic presentation of: (a) time and temperature-based candidate IMs, and (b) few heat flux-based candidate IMs considered in this study	40
3.3	(a) Floor plan of the structure under consideration (Law <i>et al.</i> , 2011); (b) Temperature-time profiles obtained with different fire frameworks for $f_d = 780 \text{ MJ/m}^2$ and $\zeta = 0$	43
3.4	Schematic of the RC slab (Slab-2, ref. Table 3.2) subjected to uniform fire at its bottom surface and ambient air condition at the top surface. (note: all the dimensions are in 'm' unless stated otherwise)	45
3.5	Statistical interpretation of responses of the six RC slab models subjected to various fire profiles for assessing: (a) efficiency, (b) practicality, (c) proficiency, and (d) relative sufficiency of the correlation of 12 candidate IMs with EDP δ_{\max}	47

3.6	Variation of the EDP δ_{\max} with the shortlisted candidate IMs when the simply supported RC Slab-2 is subjected to 350 random fire profiles from four fire frameworks	49
3.7	Statistical interpretation of responses of the six RC slab models subjected to various fire profiles for assessing: (a) efficiency, (b) practicality, (c) proficiency, and (d) relative sufficiency of the correlation of 12 candidate IMs with EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$	50
3.8	Variation of the EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$ with the shortlisted candidate IM when the simply supported RC Slab-2 is subjected to 350 random fire profiles from four fire frameworks	51
3.9	Schematic of RC beam section (Beam-1, ref. Table 3.5), with reinforcement details for different support conditions, subjected to uniform fire on three sides	53
3.10	Variation of the EDP δ_{\max} with the shortlisted candidate IMs when the fixed-fixed RC Beam-1 is subjected to 600 random fire profiles from three fire frameworks	54
3.11	Variation of the EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$ with the shortlisted candidate IMs when the fixed-fixed RC Beam-1 is subjected to 600 random fire profiles from three fire frameworks	58
3.12	Variation of the EDP δ_{\max} with the shortlisted candidate IMs when the propped cantilever RC Beam-1 is subjected to 600 random fire profiles from three fire frameworks	59
3.13	Variation of the EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$ with the shortlisted candidate IMs when the propped cantilever RC Beam-1 is subjected to 600 random fire profiles from three fire frameworks	60
3.14	Variation of the EDP δ_{\max} with the shortlisted candidate IMs when the simply supported RC Beam-1 is subjected to 600 random fire profiles from three fire frameworks	60
3.15	Variation of the EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$ with the shortlisted candidate IMs when the simply supported RC Beam-1 is subjected to 600 random fire profiles from three fire frameworks	61

3.16	Schematic of RC column section (Column-1, ref. Table 3.7) subjected to uniform fire on all sides (note: all dimensions are in 'm' unless otherwise stated)	62
3.17	Variation of the EDP δ_{\max} with the shortlisted candidate IMs when the RC Column-1 is subjected to 600 random fire profiles from three fire frameworks	63
3.18	Variation of the EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$ with the shortlisted candidate IMs when the RC Column-1 is subjected to 600 random fire profiles from three fire frameworks	64
3.19	Variation of the EDP dp_{300} with the shortlisted candidate IMs when the RC Column-1 is subjected to 600 random fire profiles from three fire frameworks	65
4.1	Schematic of: (a) RC beam section (Beam-1) subjected to uniform fire on three sides; (b) RC column section (Column-1) subjected to uniform fire along four sides (note: all dimensions are in 'm' unless otherwise stated)	69
4.2	Comparison of the fixed-fixed Beam-1 deflection, under the application of UDL and fire, obtained using regression expressions and the OpenSees model for various load ratios and random fire profiles from different frameworks	76
4.3	Box plots showing the 5 to 95 percentile range of the performance parameters calculated for regression expression for displacement in the fixed-fixed beam when subjected to uniformly distributed load over its entire span and ISO 834 fire	77
4.4	Comparison of the fixed-fixed Beam-1 deflection under the application of a point load and fire, obtained using regression expressions and the OpenSees model for various load ratios and random fire profiles from different frameworks	78
4.5	Box plots showing the 5 to 95 percentile range of the performance parameters calculated for regression expression for displacement in the fixed-fixed beam when subjected to point load at its centre and ISO 834 fire	79

4.6	Comparison of the propped cantilever Beam-1 deflection, under the application of UDL and fire, obtained using regression expressions and the OpenSees model for various load ratios and random fire profiles from different frameworks	81
4.7	Box plots showing the 5 to 95 percentile range of the performance parameters calculated for regression expression for displacement in propped cantilever beam when subjected to uniformly distributed load over its entire span and ISO 834 fire	82
4.8	Comparison of the propped cantilever Beam-1 deflection under the application of a point load and fire, obtained using regression expressions and the OpenSees model for various load ratios and random fire profiles from different frameworks	83
4.9	Box plots showing the 5 to 95 percentile range of the performance parameters calculated for regression expression for displacement in the propped cantilever beam when subjected to point load at its centre and ISO 834 fire	84
4.10	Comparison of the simply supported Beam-1 deflection under the application of UDL and fire, obtained using regression expressions and the OpenSees model for various load ratios and random fire profiles from different frameworks	85
4.11	Box plots showing the 5 to 95 percentile range of the performance parameters calculated for regression expression for displacement in the simply supported beam when subjected to uniformly distributed load over its entire span and ISO 834 fire	86
4.12	Comparison of the simply supported Beam-1 deflection under the application of a point load and fire, obtained using regression expressions and the OpenSees model for various load ratios and random fire profiles from different frameworks	87
4.13	Box plots showing the 5 to 95 percentile range of the performance parameters calculated for regression expression for displacement in the simply supported beam when subjected to point load at its centre and ISO 834 fire	88

4.14	Comparison of the axially loaded Column-1 deflection obtained using regression expression and OpenSees model for various load ratios and random fire profiles from different frameworks	90
4.15	Box plots showing the 5 to 95 percentile range of the performance parameters derived for regression expression for displacement in an axially loaded column subjected to ISO 834 fire	90
4.16	(a) Reinforcement temperature profile and (b) deflection profile of the simply supported beam, Beam-1, subjected to various fire scenarios	92
5.1	Schematic of the column section in a: (a) 4-storey residential building, (b) 5-storey hospital building, and (c) 6-storey office building (note: all the dimensions are in 'm' unless otherwise specified)	94
5.2	Change in: (a) reinforcement diameter, (b) yield strength of steel, (c) surface crack width, and (d) cover concrete strength of a ground story column of the residential building on account of chloride- and carbonation-induced corrosion and earthquake-induced damage over its service life	96
5.3	Column section definition during the heat transfer analysis	97
5.4	(a) 100 site-specific response-spectrum compatible earthquake ground motions; (b) comparison of mean response spectrum of 100 spectrum-compatible ground motions with design response spectrum (BIS, 2016b)	98
5.5	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the ground storey of the 4-storey RC residential building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	99
5.6	Service-life variation of Park and Ang damage index with earthquake intensity in a column at the: (a) ground storey, (b) first storey, (c) second storey, and (d) top storey of the 4-storey RC residential building	100

5.7	Comparison of the fragility curves obtained for an RC column under different load ratios and subjected to random parametric fire profiles	103
5.8	Comparison of the fragility curves obtained for an RC column under different load ratios and subjected to random travelling fire profiles	103
5.9	Service-life fire fragility curves for ground storey column in the residential building considering: (a) no earthquake; (b) earthquake at $t = 20$ year; (c) earthquake at $t = 40$ year; (d) earthquake at $t = 60$ year	105
5.10	Service-life fire fragility curves, considering the strength criteria alone, for ground storey column in the residential building considering: (a) no earthquake; (b) earthquake at $t = 20$ year; (c) earthquake at $t = 40$ year; (d) earthquake at $t = 60$ year	106
5.11	Fire hazard curves for random numbers of: (a) parametric fire and (b) travelling fire profiles	108
5.12	Service-life fire risk assessment of a ground-storey column in the residential building considering: (a) all failure criteria and (b) strength-based failure criteria under single and multi-hazard scenarios	109
5.13	Service-life ISO 834 fire resistance period of a ground-storey column in the residential building considering: (a) all failure criteria and (b) strength-based failure criteria under single and multi-hazard scenarios	109
A.1	'Fiber' section formulation in OpenSees	137
A.2	Schematic representation of material: (a) elastic perfectly plastic, and (b) elastic plastic with strain hardening	140
A.3	(a) SDOF system described in Illustrative Example 6.1 of Paz and Leigh (2004); (b) time history of the ground motion to which structure is subjected; (c) comparison of displacement time history obtained from OpenSees model and benchmark problem, and (d) comparison of resultant force deformation curve	141

A.4	(a) Schematic of an SDOF system (Wong and Yang, 2002) subjected to 1994 Northridge earthquake excitation; comparison of: (b) displacement time history, (c) base moment time history, and (d) absorbed energy by the system obtained from OpenSees model and results from Wong and Yang (2002)	142
A.5	(a) Schematic representation of 2D 3-storey frame subjected to 1940 Imperial Valley ground excitation (Datta, 2010); Comparison of base moment (at point A) time histories between OpenSees model and Datta (2010) for: (b) column following elastic perfectly plastic nature, and (c) column following elastic plastic with hardening behaviour	143
A.6	(a) Schematic representation of a 5-storey frame subjected to time-scaled 1940 Imperial Valley ground excitation (Chopra, 1995); comparison of: (b) top-storey displacement time history, (c) normalised base shear time history, and (d) force-deformation curve obtained from the OpenSees model and Chopra (1995)	144
A.7	Comparison of: (a) first-storey acceleration, and (b) first-storey drift response obtained from numerical model in OpenSees and experimental results by Hou <i>et al.</i> (2017)	146
A.8	Comparison of: (a) first-storey drift ratio, and (b) third-storey drift ratio response from numerical model and experimental results by Li <i>et al.</i> (2016)	147
A.9	Temperature-dependent behaviour of: (a) concrete, and (b) steel reinforcement (CEN, 2004)	148
A.10	Validation of a numerical model for heat transfer analysis of RC slab with Jiang <i>et al.</i> (2021)	150
A.11	(a) Schematic representation of homogeneous cantilever beam subjected to thermo-mechanical action; (b) comparison of vertical displacement of the tip of the cantilever beam among OpenSees element models and Jiang <i>et al.</i> (2021)	151

A.12	Comparison of the free end deflection of RC cantilever beam among OpenSees element models and Jiang <i>et al.</i> (2021) for: (a) only mechanical action, and (b) thermo-mechanical action	152
A.13	Comparison of mid-point deflection of the beam with varied end conditions and subjected to varying degrees of ISO 834 fire	153
A.14	Comparison of: (a) column temperature profile obtained from the OpenSees model with experimental results, and (b) column deflection profiles from OpenSees and ABAQUS® models with experimental results	154
B.1	Statistical interpretation of responses of the thirteen fixed-fixed RC beam models subjected to various fire profiles for assessing: (a) efficiency, (b) practicality, (c) proficiency, and (d) relative sufficiency of the correlation of 12 candidate IMs with EDP δ_{\max}	155
B.2	Statistical interpretation of responses of the thirteen fixed-fixed RC beam models subjected to various fire profiles for assessing: (a) efficiency, (b) practicality, (c) proficiency, and (d) relative sufficiency of the correlation of 12 candidate IMs with EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$	157
B.3	Statistical interpretation of responses of the thirteen propped cantilever RC beam models subjected to various fire profiles for assessing: (a) efficiency, (b) practicality, (c) proficiency, and (d) relative sufficiency of the correlation of 12 candidate IMs with EDP δ_{\max}	159
B.4	Statistical interpretation of responses of the thirteen propped cantilever RC beam subjected to various fire profiles for assessing: (a) efficiency, (b) practicality, (c) proficiency, and (d) relative sufficiency of the correlation of 12 candidate IMs with EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$	161
B.5	Statistical interpretation of responses of the thirteen simply supported RC beam models subjected to various fire profiles for assessing: (a) efficiency, (b) practicality, (c) proficiency, and (d) relative sufficiency of the correlation of 12 candidate IMs with EDP δ_{\max}	163

B.6	Statistical interpretation of responses of the thirteen simply supported RC beam subjected to various fire profiles for assessing: (a) efficiency, (b) practicality, (c) proficiency, and (d) relative sufficiency of the correlation of 12 candidate IMs with EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$	165
B.7	Statistical interpretation of responses of the five RC column models subjected to various fire profiles for assessing: (a) efficiency, (b) practicality, (c) proficiency, and (d) relative sufficiency of the correlation of 10 candidate IMs with EDP δ_{\max}	167
B.8	Statistical interpretation of responses of the five RC column models subjected to various fire profiles for assessing: (a) efficiency, (b) practicality, (c) proficiency, and (d) relative sufficiency of the correlation of 10 candidate IMs with EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$	168
B.9	Statistical interpretation of responses of the five RC column models subjected to various fire profiles for assessing: (a) efficiency, (b) practicality, (c) proficiency, and (d) relative sufficiency of the correlation of 10 candidate IMs with EDP dp_{300}	169
C.1	Change in: (a) reinforcement diameter, (b) yield strength of steel, (c) surface crack width, and (d) cover concrete strength of a ground story column of a 5-storey hospital building on account of chloride- and carbonation-induced corrosion and earthquake-induced damage over its service life	171
C.2	Change in: (a) reinforcement diameter, (b) yield strength of steel, (c) surface crack width, and (d) cover concrete strength of a ground story column of a 6-storey office building on account of chloride- and carbonation-induced corrosion and earthquake-induced damage over its service life	172
C.3	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the first storey of the 4-storey RC residential building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	172

C.4	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the third storey of the 4-storey RC residential building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	173
C.5	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the top storey of the 4-storey RC residential building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	173
C.6	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the ground storey of the 5-storey RC hospital building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	174
C.7	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the first storey of the 5-storey RC hospital building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	174
C.8	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the second storey of the 5-storey RC hospital building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	175
C.9	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the third storey of the 5-storey RC hospital building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	175
C.10	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the top storey of the 5-storey RC hospital building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	176
C.11	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the ground storey of the 6-storey RC office building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	176

C.12	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the first storey of the 6-storey RC office building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	177
C.13	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the second storey of the 6-storey RC office building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	177
C.14	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the third storey of the 6-storey RC office building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	178
C.15	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the fourth storey of the 6-storey RC office building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	178
C.16	Service-life seismic fragility curves for various damage states in an internal column on the top storey of the 6-storey RC office building considering the effects of chloride and carbonation-induced corrosion deterioration	179
C.17	Service-life variation of Park and Ang damage index with earthquake intensity in a column at the: (a) ground storey, (b) first storey, (c) second storey, and (d) third storey of the 5-storey RC hospital building	179
C.18	Service-life variation of Park and Ang damage index with earthquake intensity in a column at the: (a) ground storey, (b) first storey, (c) second storey, and (d) third storey of the 6-storey RC office building	180
C.19	Service-life fire fragility curves for first storey column in the residential building considering: (a) no earthquake; (b) earthquake at $t = 20$ year; (c) earthquake at $t = 40$ year; (d) earthquake at $t = 60$ year	181

C.20	Service-life fire fragility curves, considering strength criteria alone, for the first-storey column in the residential building considering: (a) no earthquake; (b) earthquake at $t = 20$ year; (c) earthquake at $t = 40$ year; (d) earthquake at $t = 60$ year	182
C.21	Service-life fire fragility curves for a ground-storey column in the hospital building considering: (a) no earthquake; (b) earthquake at $t = 20$ year; (c) earthquake at $t = 20$ year; (c) earthquake at $t = 40$ year; (d) earthquake at $t = 60$ year	183
C.22	Service-life fire fragility curves, considering strength criteria alone, for a ground-storey column in the hospital building considering: (a) no earthquake; (b) earthquake at $t = 20$ year; (c) earthquake at $t = 40$ year; (d) earthquake at $t = 60$ year	184
C.23	Service-life fire fragility curves, considering strength criteria alone, for the first-storey column in the hospital building considering: (a) no earthquake; (b) earthquake at $t = 20$ year; (c) earthquake at $t = 40$ year; (d) earthquake at $t = 60$ year	185
C.24	Service-life fire fragility curves for a ground-storey column in the office building considering: (a) no earthquake; (b) earthquake at $t = 20$ year; (c) earthquake at $t = 40$ year; (d) earthquake at $t = 60$ year	186
C.25	Service-life fire fragility curves for a first-storey column in the office building considering: (a) no earthquake; (b) earthquake at $t = 20$ year; (c) earthquake at $t = 40$ year; (d) earthquake at $t = 60$ year	187
C.26	Service-life fire fragility curves, considering the strength criteria alone, for a ground-storey column in the office building considering: (a) no earthquake; (b) earthquake at $t = 20$ year; (c) earthquake at $t = 40$ year; (d) earthquake at $t = 60$ year	188
C.27	Service-life fire fragility curves, considering strength criteria alone, for the first-storey column in the office building considering: (a) no earthquake; (b) earthquake at $t = 20$ year; (c) earthquake at $t = 40$ year; (d) earthquake at $t = 60$ year	189

C.28	Service-life fire risk assessment of a first-storey column in the residential building considering: (a) all failure criteria and (b) strength-based failure criteria under single and multi-hazard scenarios	189
C.29	Service-life fire risk assessment of a ground-storey column in the office building considering: (a) all failure criteria and (b) strength-based failure criteria under single and multi-hazard scenarios	190
C.30	Service-life fire risk assessment of a first-storey column in the office building considering: (a) all failure criteria and (b) strength-based failure criteria under single and multi-hazard scenarios	190
C.31	Service-life ISO 834 fire resistance period of a first-storey column in the residential building considering: (a) all failure criteria and (b) strength-based failure criteria under single and multi-hazard scenarios	191
C.32	Service-life ISO 834 fire resistance period of a ground-storey column in the hospital building considering: (a) all failure criteria and (b) strength-based failure criteria under single and multi-hazard scenarios	191
C.33	Service-life ISO 834 fire resistance period of a first-storey column in the hospital building considering: (a) all failure criteria and (b) strength-based failure criteria under single and multi-hazard scenarios	192
C.34	Service-life ISO 834 fire resistance period of a ground-storey column in the office building considering: (a) all failure criteria and (b) strength-based failure criteria under single and multi-hazard scenarios	192
C.35	Service-life ISO 834 fire resistance period of a first-storey column in the office building considering: (a) all failure criteria and (b) strength-based failure criteria under single and multi-hazard scenarios	193

This page is intentionally left blank

List of Tables

Table No.	Table Caption	Page No.
2.1	Load parameters as per various Indian Standards	21
2.2	Load combinations for design of RC structure (BIS, 2000)	21
3.1	Plausible intensity measure (IM) candidates considered in this study	41
3.2	Details of the RC slab models considered in this study	46
3.3	Results of the sufficiency and scaling robustness of candidate IMs in terms of p -values for the EDP δ_{\max} of RC slab	48
3.4	Results of the sufficiency and scaling robustness of candidate IMs in terms of p -values for the EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$ of RC slab	51
3.5	Details of the RC beam models considered in this study	52
3.6	Summary of IM-EDP correlation results for RC members subjected to fire (to be read in conjunction with respective figures and tables)	55
3.7	Details of the RC column models considered in this study (Ni and Gernay, 2020)	62
4.1	Details of the RC beam models considered in this study	68
4.2	Details of the RC column models considered in this study	69
4.3	Regression coefficients for various variables in deflection prediction in reinforced concrete (RC) members subjected to fire	71
B.1	Results of the sufficiency and scaling robustness of candidate IMs in terms of p -values for the EDP δ_{\max} in RC fixed-fixed beam	156
B.2	Results of the sufficiency and scaling robustness of candidate IMs in terms of p -values for the EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$ in RC fixed-fixed beam	158
B.3	Results of the sufficiency and scaling robustness of candidate IMs in terms of p -values for the EDP δ_{\max} in RC propped cantilever beam	160

B.4	Results of the sufficiency and scaling robustness of candidate IMs in terms of p -values for the EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$ in RC propped cantilever beam	162
B.5	Results of the sufficiency and scaling robustness of candidate IMs in terms of p -values for the EDP δ_{\max} in the RC simply supported beam	164
B.6	Results of the sufficiency and scaling robustness of candidate IMs in terms of p -values for the EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$ in the RC simply supported beam	166
B.7	Results of the sufficiency and scaling robustness of candidate IMs in terms of p -values for the EDP δ_{\max} in the RC column	167
B.8	Results of the sufficiency and scaling robustness of candidate IMs in terms of p -values for the EDP $\dot{\delta}_{\max}$ in the RC column	168
B.9	Results of the sufficiency and scaling robustness of candidate IMs in terms of p -values for the EDP dp_{300} in the RC column	169

List of Symbols

Various symbols that are consistent throughout the thesis are mentioned here. Certain local symbols defined only once for explaining a specific theory or equation, e.g., symbols B , C , D , used in Equation 1.1, are omitted from the list.

Latin symbols

A_{st}	Area of steel reinforcement
b	Member width
c	Concrete cover thickness or clear cover to reinforcement
D	Member depth
D_a	Chloride diffusion coefficient
DI	Damage index
dp_{300}	300 °C isotherm depth
d_r	Reduced diameter of the steel reinforcement bar
dt	Time step
E	Young's modulus
f_c	Core concrete strength
f_{ck}	Characteristic compressive strength of concrete
f_d	Fire load density
f_r	Load ratio
f_y	Yield strength of steel reinforcement bar
H	Height
h	Convection heat transfer coefficient
I	Second moment of area
k	Stiffness
L	Length
M	Moment
m	mass
O	Opening factor
\emptyset	Reinforcement bar diameter
P	Concentrated force

P_f	Probability of failure
Q	Energy
\dot{q}_{net}''	Net heat flux
R	Pearson's correlation coefficient
RS	Relative sufficiency
s_f	Fire spread rate
T	Temperature
T_a	Ambient air temperature
T_g	Gas temperature
$T_{r,\text{avg}}$	Average reinforcement bar temperature
t	Time
V	Base shear
W	Plan width
w	Uniformly distributed load
w_{cr}	Surface crack width
y	Practicality
Z	Decision variable

Greek symbols

$\beta_{EDP IM}$	Efficiency
δ	Member deflection
$\dot{\delta}$	Rate of deflection
ε	Emissivity
ε_c	Concrete strain
ϕ	Hazard risk
λ	Hazard intensity
ρ	Performance index
σ	Stefan-Boltzmann constant
ω	Natural frequency
ξ	Damping ratio
$\xi_{EDP IM}$	Proficiency

This page is intentionally left blank

List of Abbreviations

AUC	Area under time-temperature curve
CA	Cloud analysis
CIR	Cumulative incident radiation
DL	Dead load
DS	Damage state
DV	Damage variable
EDP	Engineering demand parameter
EDSF	Equivalent duration standard fire
EL	Earthquake load
FF	Fixed-fixed
HRR	Heat release rate
IM	Intensity measure
IS	Indian Standard
iTFM	Improved travelling fire methodology
LCFF	Large compartment fire framework
LL	Live load
MSA	Multiple stripe analysis
OPC	Ordinary Portland cement
PBSD	Performance-based structural design
PC	Propped cantilever
PEER	Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research
PF	Parametric fire
PGA	Peak ground acceleration
PL	Point load
RC	Reinforced concrete
RRMSE	Relative root mean squared error
SS	Simply supported
typ.	Typical (same value at similar locations)
UDL	Uniformly distributed load
WL	Wind load