

University of Technology, Sydney
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology

**The Effect of Connection Flexibility on the Seismic Performance of
Industrial Racking Systems**

by

Ahmad Firouzianhaji

PhD Thesis

January 2016

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student:

Date: 11 Jun 2015

Acknowledgment

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisors, Dr. Ali Saleh and Prof. Bijan Samali for their continuous support throughout my Ph.D study and research, for their patience, motivation, enthusiasm, and immense knowledge. There was absolutely no way I could have completed my PhD without your guidance and support from day one.

I am also grateful to my colleagues in the Engineering Department of DEXION Australia Pty Ltd., specially Mr. Peter Geoghegan and Mr. Lawrence Mok for sharing their expertise, immense knowledge and valuable guidance and encouragement extended to me.

Also, I would like to appreciate contribution of DEXION Australia Pty Ltd., in providing partial financial support on this project and providing their previous experimental test results.

I take this opportunity to express gratitude to all of the Department faculty members for their help and support.

I would like to offer my special thanks to my wife for being so supportive and my only family member in Australia.

Last but not the least, my Mom and Dad for their continues support and prayers. Also to my younger brother who has always given me positive energy to continue, not give up.

Table of Contents:

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Chapter 1: Introduction, Literature review and research significance | 1 |
| 1.1 Background | 1 |
| 1.2 Literature Review | 6 |
| 1.2.1 Racking Design Codes and Specifications..... | 7 |
| 1.2.2 Behaviour of Beam to Upright Connections..... | 8 |
| 1.2.3 Base Plate Connections..... | 12 |
| 1.2.4 Stability analysis of the rack structures in their down aisle direction.. | 14 |
| 1.2.5 Upright frame analysis | 19 |
| 1.3 Objective and Scope | 21 |
| 1.4 Methodology | 23 |
| 1.4.1 Structural testing and Numerical investigations | 23 |
| 1.5 Outline | 25 |
| 1.6 Publications | 27 |
| 1.6.1 Technical papers..... | 27 |
| 2. Chapter 2: Modelling of beam to upright connections | 29 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 29 |
| 2.2 Monotonic behaviour of beam to upright connections..... | 32 |
| 2.2.1 Experimental investigations | 32 |
| 2.2.1.1 Test Observations | 35 |
| 2.2.1.2 Beam-End Connector (BEC) test results..... | 36 |
| 2.2.1.3 Parametric analysis..... | 39 |
| 2.2.1.3.1 Beam depth | 39 |
| 2.2.1.3.2 Upright thickness | 41 |
| 2.2.1.3.3 Ultimate and Yield Rotation (θ_u & θ_y)..... | 43 |
| 2.2.2 Numerical Analysis of beam end connectors..... | 44 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----|
| 2.2.2.1 | Comparison of experimental and FEA results..... | 49 |
| 2.2.3 | Analytical model | 52 |
| 2.2.3.1 | Bi-Linear Moment Rotation curves..... | 57 |
| 2.3 | Behaviour of beam to upright connections under cyclic loads..... | 58 |
| 2.3.1 | Experimental investigations | 61 |
| 2.3.1.1 | Presentation of test data..... | 63 |
| 2.3.1.2 | Test observations | 64 |
| 2.3.2 | Finite Element Analyses | 67 |
| 2.3.3 | Simplified Hysteresis models..... | 68 |
| 2.3.3.1 | Overview of different Hysteresis Models..... | 68 |
| 2.3.3.1.1 | Cyclic Kinematic Model..... | 69 |
| 2.3.3.1.2 | Peak Oriented Model (Takeda Model) | 70 |
| 2.3.3.1.3 | Cyclic Pivot Model | 71 |
| 2.3.3.2 | Beam to upright boltless connection modelling..... | 72 |
| 2.3.3.2.1 | Proposed Method to Derive Equivalent Cyclic Backbone | 74 |
| 2.3.3.2.2 | Connection cyclic test simulation | 76 |
| 2.4 | Conclusions | 85 |
| 3. | Chapter 3: Analysis of Base Plate Connections..... | 87 |
| 3.1 | Introduction and literature review | 87 |
| 3.2 | Geometry, Anchoring configuration and behaviour of base plate connections in down aisle direction..... | 90 |
| 3.3 | Experimental Study | 91 |
| 3.3.1 | Test Results and Discussion..... | 95 |
| 3.4 | Stability analyses of upright base plates..... | 100 |
| 3.5 | FE Modelling and discussion of results | 102 |
| 3.5.1 | FE Modelling | 102 |
| 3.5.2 | FE Results and Discussion..... | 104 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 3.6 Theoretical Analysis | 110 |
| 3.6.1 Calculating the Base Plate Connection's stiffness | 115 |
| 3.7 Base Plate Connections under Horizontal Cyclic Forces | 116 |
| 3.7.1 Hysteretic Modelling of Base Plate Connections..... | 119 |
| 3.8 Behaviour of Base Plate Connections in Cross Aisle direction | 123 |
| 3.9 Conclusions | 126 |
| 4. Chapter 4: Modelling of bracing connections in Cross Aisle Frames | 128 |
| 4.1 Introduction and literature review | 128 |
| 4.2 Experimental Investigations | 131 |
| 4.3 Numerical Investigation and comparison with experimental results | 133 |
| 4.4 Theoretical Analysis..... | 138 |
| 4.4.1 Stiffness calculation | 138 |
| 4.4.1.1 Stiffness calculation | 142 |
| 4.5 Conclusions | 143 |
| 5. Chapter 5 : Shake Table Tests (Experimental Study) | 145 |
| 5.1 Introduction and background..... | 145 |
| 5.1.1 Christchurch earthquake collapse observations | 145 |
| 5.1.2 Theoretical Background..... | 151 |
| 5.2 Experimental Investigation..... | 156 |
| 5.2.1 Stage one of the Experimental Study | 162 |
| 5.2.2 Stage two of the Experimental Study..... | 165 |
| 5.2.2.1 Test 1: 1940 El-Centro Earthquake, Non-Scaled in time domain.. | 168 |
| 5.2.2.2 Test 2:1940 El Centro Earthquake, Scaled down in time domain by factor of two | 176 |
| 5.2.2.3 Damping of the System | 192 |
| 5.3 Conclusions | 196 |
| 6. Chapter 6: Finite Element Simulations | 197 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 6.1 Introduction and Literature Review..... | 197 |
| 6.1.1.1 Equivalent Static Lateral Force Method..... | 199 |
| 6.1.2 Modal Analysis | 200 |
| 6.1.3 Non-Linear Time History Dynamic Analysis (NLTH)..... | 201 |
| 6.1.4 Non-Linear Static Pushover (NLPO)..... | 203 |
| 6.1.5 Incremental Dynamic Analysis (IDA) | 205 |
| 6.1.6 Preliminary Investigations | 206 |
| 6.1.6.1 Frame Capacity..... | 208 |
| 6.1.6.2 Hysteresis Behaviour and Energy absorption | 210 |
| 6.1.6.3 Second order (P-Delta) effects | 212 |
| 6.1.6.4 Incremental Dynamic Analyses..... | 213 |
| 6.1.6.4.1 1940 El Centro Earthquake (Far Field Earthquake) | 215 |
| 6.1.6.4.2 1994 Northridge Earthquake (Near Field Earthquake)..... | 219 |
| 6.1.6.4.3 Discussion of analyses results..... | 222 |
| 6.1.6.5 Non-Linear Static Push-Over Analysis | 223 |
| 6.2 Shake Table Test Simulation..... | 229 |
| 6.2.1 Discussion of results | 234 |
| 6.3 Conclusions | 237 |
| 7. Chapter 7: Full Frame Cyclic Tests (Push - Pull) | 239 |
| 7.1 Introduction and Literature Review..... | 239 |
| 7.2 Experimental Study / Test Setup | 243 |
| 7.2.1 Structural response and behaviour | 249 |
| 7.2.2 Ductility Evaluation | 251 |
| 7.2.3 Cyclic test vs Shake table test results..... | 254 |
| 7.3 Displacement based method seismic analysis and design by using Capacity Curve..... | 255 |
| 7.3.1 Stability Analysis | 255 |
| 7.3.1.1 Stability of the frames under seismic actions..... | 259 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| 7.3.2 | Step by step displacement based method | 260 |
| 7.3.3 | Example of displacement based design method (Using Non-Linear Static Analysis) | 264 |
| 7.4 | Conclusions | 269 |
| 8. | Chapter 8: Conclusions and Recommendations for further studies | 271 |
| 8.1 | Summary and Conclusion | 271 |
| 8.2 | Recommendations for future research | 278 |
| Appendices | | 280 |
| Appendix A: | Experimental beam to upright Connection bending test results | 280 |
| Appendix B: | Theoretical analysis of beam to upright connections | 297 |
| B.1 | Example of using mathematical equations of ultimate and yield moment | 297 |
| Appendix C: | Response of different connection models | 300 |
| Appendix D: | Proposing the appropriate response modification factor (R factor) | 305 |
| D.1 | NLTH and ESLF comparison | 305 |
| D.1.1 | Results | 306 |
| References: | | 309 |

Table of Figures:

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1.1. A typical low rise rack structure..... | 2 |
| Figure 1.2. Spine bracing and Plan bracing..... | 3 |
| Figure 1.3. Regular selective rack system (Dexion design manual)..... | 4 |
| Figure 1.4. Double deep selective rack system..... | 5 |
| Figure 1.5. Drive in rack system (Gilbert 2010)..... | 6 |
| Figure 1.6. Cantilever rack system..... | 6 |
| Figure 1.7. Base plate assembly (DEXION Installation Manual, DEXION AUSTRALIA Pty Ltd.)..... | 13 |
| Figure 1.8. 2D analytical model of a down aisle frame (Davies 1992)..... | 15 |
| Figure 1.9. Analytical model of a down aisle frame proposed by Stark and Tilburgs (1979)..... | 15 |
| Figure 1.10. Analytical model of a down aisle frame proposed by Davies (Davies, 1992)..... | 17 |
| Figure 1.11. Analytical model of a down aisle frame proposed by Godley et al. (2000)..... | 17 |
| Figure 2.1. Typical beam to upright connections using boltless beam end connectors(DEXION Pty Ltd.)..... | 29 |
| Figure 2.2: AS4084:2012 Figure 7.2.2.2, explaining method to determine the rotational stiffness of beam to upright connections (AS 4087, 2012, p. 70)..... | 31 |
| Figure 2.3 a and b: Moment-Rotation curve and experimental test set up..... | 33 |
| Figure 2.4. Test rig of beam end connector bending test with a specimen during testing..... | 35 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 2.5: Typical failure modes observed in beam end connector and upright | 36 |
| Figure 2.6: Typical failure modes in different beam end connectors. Top left: tearing at hook near top of connector. Bottom left: bending of connector hooks cutting into upright slots. Right: Bending of connector plate | 36 |
| Figure 2.7: Typical moment rotation curve of the beam end connector test..... | 37 |
| Figure 2.8: Normalized moment – rotation monotonic curves of 19 different beam to upright connection configurations..... | 38 |
| Figure 2.9: (a) Effect of beam depth on the non-dimensional ultimate moment; (b) Effect of beam depth on the ultimate moment | 40 |
| Figure 2.10: The effect of beam depth on non-dimensional initial stiffness | 41 |
| Figure 2.11: Different non-dimensional moment rotation curves for two different upright thicknesses | 41 |
| Figure 2.12: The slope discontinuity in the moment rotation curve due to contact of connector face to upright flange..... | 42 |
| Figure 2.13: Amount of Ultimate rotations of the connections. | 43 |
| Figure 2.14: Amount of Yield rotations of the connections..... | 43 |
| Figure 2.15 Typical Finite Element Model | 45 |
| Figure 2.16 Typical three-linear stress strain diagram..... | 45 |
| Figure 2.17: Deformed connection with Von- Mises stress contours..... | 46 |
| Figure 2.18 Connector plate hooks and contact areas..... | 47 |
| Figure 2.19: Typical plastic deformation of connection after test | 49 |
| Figure 2.20: Test results against results of FE models with shell/Solid elements | 50 |
| Figure 2.21: Box 80-40 FE Vs. Experiment | 51 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 2.22: Box 140-50 FE Vs. Experiment | 52 |
| Figure 2.23: Box 105-50 FE Vs. Experiment | 52 |
| Figure 2.24: Hook failure; Test observation and FE Von-Mises stress contour | 54 |
| Figure 2.25: Geometrical dimensions | 54 |
| Figure 2.26: Analytical model of the connection using Component Method | 55 |
| Figure 2.27: Yielding of the metal near the hole leads to this failure mode | 56 |
| Figure 2.28: Geometric dimensions | 57 |
| Figure 2.29: Simplified Bi-Linear Moment Rotation curve..... | 58 |
| Figure 2.30. Plastic hinge in the Upright | 61 |
| Figure 2.31. Test rig of beam end connector cyclic bending test with a specimen ... | 62 |
| Figure 2.32. Displacement time history at load point of cyclic cantilever | 62 |
| Figure 2.33. Hysteresis curve..... | 63 |
| Figure 2.34. Typical Moment-Rotation curve of mean of the 3rd cycle peaks obtained in both directions | 64 |
| Figure 2.35. Typical failure mode in the connections with thinner material which causes slippage and rigid motion in the connection..... | 66 |
| Figure 2.36. Typical failure mode in the connections with thicker material | 66 |
| Figure 2.37. Hysteresis curve for thinner upright (1.6 mm) | 66 |
| Figure 2.38. Hysteresis curve for thicker upright (2.5 mm)..... | 66 |
| Figure 2.39. Hysteresis curve for thicker upright (2.5 mm) (Experimental results vs. FE result)..... | 68 |
| Figure 2.40: Backbone curve (Ibarra, Medina & Krawinkler, 2005, p. 1492)..... | 69 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 2.41. Kinematic Hysteretic Model (Medina & Krawinkler, 2003, p. 26)..... | 70 |
| Figure 2.42: Takeda Hysteretic Model (Medina & Krawinkler 2003, p. 26) | 70 |
| Figure 2.43: Takeda Model from SAP2000 User Manual(Computers and Structures Inc., 2009, p. 261) | 71 |
| Figure 2.44: Pivot Model from SAP2000 User Manual. (Computers and Structures Inc., 2009, p. 262) | 72 |
| Figure 2.45: Beam-Upright Connection Hysteresis Feature..... | 73 |
| Figure 2.46: Proposed Equivalent Cyclic Backbone from Static Monotonic Test (Reyes, 2013, p. 59). | 75 |
| Figure 2.47: Initial and Secant stiffness..... | 76 |
| Figure 2.48: SAP2000 Beam-Upright Connection Cyclic Test Simulation (Reyes, 2013, p. 55) | 76 |
| Figure 2.49: Pivot Model | 78 |
| Figure 2.50: Slippage and Pinching effect can be modeled by defining appropriate ‘ β ’ value | 78 |
| Figure 2.51: Hysteresis features of the beam – upright connection..... | 78 |
| Figure 2.52: Two extreme cases of the unloading path for different values of (α).... | 79 |
| Figure 2.53: An example of Pivot Model (The parallel unloading paths is because the ‘ η ’ is assumed to be zero) | 79 |
| Figure 2.54. Beam – Upright connection back bones | 80 |
| Figure 2.55 Experimental and Numerical Cyclic Test Comparison using EqCyc-KIN Link | 80 |
| Figure 2.56. Experimental and Numerical Cyclic Test Comparison using EqCyc-TAK Link..... | 80 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 2.57. Experimental and Numerical Cyclic Test Comparison using EqCyc-PIV Link | 81 |
| Figure 2.58. Experimental and Numerical Cyclic Test Comparison using LabCyc-PIV Link..... | 81 |
| Figure 2.59. Connection Energy Dissipation Comparison..... | 82 |
| Figure 2.60: Comparison of hysteresis loops of different connections..... | 84 |
| Figure 3.1: The proposed method of deriving a Bi-Linear moment rotation curve from experimental result (AS 4084, 2012, p. 70) | 88 |
| Figure 3.2: The proposed method of deriving a Bi-Linear moment rotation curve from experimental result (AS 4084, 2012. p. 70) | 89 |
| Figure 3.3: Typical base plate connection..... | 91 |
| Figure 3.4: Different base plate connections (red dots indicate the position of anchor bolts)..... | 91 |
| Figure 3.5. Base plate connection test concept with two specimens tested simultaneously as proposed in BS EN 15512:2009 | 93 |
| Figure 3.6: Base Plate Test forces and displacements | 94 |
| Figure 3.7: Test Setup | 94 |
| Figure 3.8: Base Plate Test arrangement..... | 95 |
| Figure 3.9: Test results for base plate type 1 | 96 |
| Figure 3.10: Test results for base plate type 2 | |
| Figure 3.11: Test results for base plate type 3 | 96 |
| Figure 3.12: Total Moment (Mb) –Moment due to lateral force only (M1).Connection type 2al force only (M1).Connection type 1. | 97 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 3.13: Total Moment (Mb) –Moment due to lateral force only (M1).Connection type 2 | 97 |
| Figure 3.14: Total Moment (Mb) –Moment due to lateral force only (M1).Connection type 3. | 98 |
| Figure 3.15: Ultimate rotations for base plate type 1 | 98 |
| Figure 3.16: Ultimate rotations for base plate type 2 | 99 |
| Figure 3.17: Ultimate rotations for base plate type 3 | 99 |
| Figure 3.18: Simplified model of the base plate connection..... | 101 |
| Figure 3.19: M1-Mb diagram (base plate Type 1)..... | 102 |
| Figure 3.20: Stress-strain law used in FE model..... | 104 |
| Figure 3.21: Numerical model | 105 |
| Figure 3.22: Comparison of base plate types 1 and 2, under different axial compression forces..... | 106 |
| Figure 3.23: FE simulation results | 107 |
| Figure 3.24: FE simulation results against Experimental results..... | 108 |
| Figure 3.25: Initial Stiffness – Axial Force relations..... | 109 |
| Figure 3.26: FE and Experimental results of connection types 1, 2 and 4..... | 109 |
| Figure 3.27: FE results of connection types 3, 5 and 6..... | 110 |
| Figure 3.28: Initial Stiffness – Axial Force relation | 110 |
| Figure 3.29: Failure mechanism for the upright base plates (Godley, 2007, p. 438) | 111 |
| Figure 3.30: Deformed shaped with vertical displacement contour for connection type 1 | 112 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 3.31: Failure mechanism with vertical displacement contour for connection type 2..... | 112 |
| Figure 3.32: Failure mechanism with vertical displacement contour for connection type 3..... | 112 |
| Figure 3.33: Failure mechanism with vertical displacement contour for connection type 4..... | 112 |
| Figure 3.34: Failure mechanism with vertical displacement contour for connection type 5..... | 113 |
| Figure 3.35: Failure mechanism with vertical displacement contour for connection type 6..... | 113 |
| Figure 3.36. Yield line mechanism for the base plate type 4..... | 114 |
| Figure 3.37: Base Plate Type 4, M_b versus M_1 | 115 |
| Figure 3.38: Cyclic curves of base plate type 3 | 117 |
| Figure 3.39: Cyclic load protocol..... | 118 |
| Figure 3.40: Cyclic and monotonic curves of base plates..... | 120 |
| Figure 3.41: Different stiffness related to each cycle | 121 |
| Figure 3.42: Pivot Model from SAP2000 User Manual. | 121 |
| Figure 3.43: Multi Linear backbone definition in SAP 2000..... | 122 |
| Figure 3.44: Comparison of FE cyclic results (ABAQUS) and pivot cyclic model (SAP 2000)..... | 123 |
| Figure 3.45: Base plate model in cross aisle direction..... | 124 |
| Figure 3.46: FE Base plate model under uplift | 125 |
| Figure 3.47: Cyclic load protocol..... | 125 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 3.48: Uplift-Displacement hysteresis Curves | 126 |
| Figure 4.1. Upright frame test set up for measuring the shear stiffness of an upright frame (EN 15512, 2009, p. 112) | 129 |
| Figure 4.2. Upright frame test set up for measuring the combined shear and bending stiffness of an upright frame (AS 4084, 2012, p. 91)..... | 129 |
| Figure 4.3 Shear frame displacement under transversal loads (Gilbert, 2010, p. 82) | 131 |
| Figure 4.4. Test rig | 132 |
| Figure 4.5. Schematic test setup..... | 132 |
| Figure 4.6. Experimental Force – Displacement curves | 133 |
| Figure 4.7. Failure modes (Tearing of the bracing member and bolt bending) | 133 |
| Figure 4.8. FE Model details..... | 135 |
| Figure 4.9. FE results vs. Experiment..... | 135 |
| Figure 4.10. FE analysis result with von-mises stress contour | 136 |
| Figure 4.11. Different brace member arrangements in the open upright section..... | 137 |
| Figure 4.12. Bolts in different bracing arrangements at failure with von-mises stress contour..... | 137 |
| Figure 4.13. Back to back brace stiffness vs. front to front brace stiffness | 138 |
| Figure 4.14. Theoretical model of the joint..... | 139 |
| Figure 4.15. Joint stiffness component along brace..... | 140 |
| Figure 4.16. Equivalent models of a bolted brace member..... | 141 |
| Figure 4.17. Numerical, analytical and experimental results of upright frame analysis | 142 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 4.18. Base plate model in cross aisle direction..... | 143 |
| Figure 5.1: Down aisle mechanism..... | 148 |
| Figure 5.2: Down aisle mechanism..... | 148 |
| Figure 5.3. Connector bending during the 2011 magnitude-6.3 Christchurch Earthquake (Bruneau et al. (2011))..... | 148 |
| Figure 5.4. Down aisle mechanism-connection failure during the 2010 magnitude-8.8 Chile Earthquake (adopted from: www.FEMA.gov)..... | 148 |
| Figure 5.5: Down aisle mechanism- weld failure during the 2010 magnitude-8.8 Chile Earthquake (adopted from: www.FEMA.gov)..... | 148 |
| Figure 5.6: Down aisle mechanism-impacting the structural components | 148 |
| Figure 5.7: Cross aisle frame mechanism - upright splice failure..... | 149 |
| Figure 5.8: Base plate deterioration in cross aisle direction | 149 |
| Figure 5.9: Base plate deterioration in down aisle direction..... | 150 |
| Figure 5.10: Progressive collapse of the entire system..... | 150 |
| Figure 5.11: Frame instability because of twisting of the upright close to bracing junction..... | 150 |
| Figure 5.12. Entire rack instability due to distortional buckling of an upright at the bottom level..... | 151 |
| Figure 5.13. A MDOF Model representing a three-storey frame | 153 |
| Figure 5.14. Evaluating damping from frequency-response curve (Chopra, 1995, p. 79) | 154 |
| Figure 5.15. Test set up, Schematic views and dimensions of Down Aisle frame (on the left) and | 157 |
| Figure 5.16. Location of position sensors (LVDT's)..... | 158 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 5.17. Location of accelerometers..... | 158 |
| Figure 5.18. a) Accelerometer attached to the block b) Accelerometer attached to the frame | 159 |
| Figure 5.19. a) LVDT attached to the frame b) LVDT attached to the block..... | 160 |
| Figure 5.20. Concrete blocks were tightened to the timber pallets | 161 |
| Figure 5.21. Concrete blocks chained to the timber pallet..... | 161 |
| Figure 5.22. Comparison of experimental and numerical results for acceleration at the top storey level (20% 1940 El Centro record)..... | 162 |
| Figure 5.23. Comparison of experimental and numerical results for displacement at the top storey level (20% 1940 El-Centro record). | 163 |
| Figure 5.24. Comparison of experimental and numerical results for displacement at the top storey level (10% 1940 El Centro record)..... | 163 |
| Figure 5.25. FFT of sine sweep test of the specimen before being exposed to any seismic actions | 164 |
| Figure 5.26. First and second modes of vibration observed in sine sweep test | 165 |
| Figure 5.27. Pallet Sliding test set up..... | 167 |
| Figure 5.28. Rack frame and support structures (a. Test rig, b. Schematic plan view) | 167 |
| Figure 5.29. Structural response under 20% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Non-Scaled in time domain..... | 170 |
| Figure 5.30. Structural response under 40% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Non-Scaled in time domain..... | 171 |
| Figure 5.31. Structural response under 60% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Non-Scaled in time domain..... | 172 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 5.32. Structural response under 70% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Non-Scaled in time domain..... | 173 |
| Figure 5.33. Structural response under 80% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Non-Scaled in time domain..... | 174 |
| Figure 5.34. Lateral displacement of the rack..... | 176 |
| Figure 5.35. Structural response under 40% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Scaled down in time domain by a factor of 2..... | 178 |
| Figure 5.36. Structural response under 40% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Scaled down in time domain by a factor of 2 (After running higher intensities)..... | 179 |
| Figure 5.37. Structural response under 60% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Scaled down in time domain by a factor of 2..... | 180 |
| Figure 5.38. Structural response under 80% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Scaled down in time domain by a factor of 2..... | 181 |
| Figure 5.39. Structural response under 100% 1940 El Centro earthquake record / Scaled down in time domain by a factor of 2..... | 182 |
| Figure 5.40. Structural response under 100% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Scaled down in time domain by factor of 2 (After running higher intensities) | 183 |
| Figure 5.41. Structural response under 120% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Scaled down in time domain by a factor of 2..... | 184 |
| Figure 5.42. Structural response under 140% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Scaled down in time domain by a factor of 2..... | 185 |
| Figure 5.43. Structural response under 160% 1940 El Centro earthquake record / Scaled down in time domain by a factor of 2..... | 186 |
| Figure 5.44. Structural response under 160% 1940 El Centro earth quakerecord / Scaled down in time domain by a factor of 2 (After running higher intensities)..... | 187 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 5.45. Structural response under 180% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Scaled down in time domain by a factor of 2..... | 188 |
| Figure 5.46. Structural response under 200% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Scaled down in time domain by a factor of 2* | 189 |
| Figure 5.47. Structural response under 200% 1940 El-Centro earthquake record / Scaled down in time domain by a factor of 2..... | 190 |
| Figure 5.48. Lateral displacements of the rack | 192 |
| Figure 5.49. Sine Sweep test results of the Non-Scaled test in time domain..... | 194 |
| Figure 5.50. Sine Sweep test results of the Scaled test in time domain..... | 194 |
| Figure 6.1. Representing deflections as sum of modal components. (Clough and Penzien, 1993, p. 220)..... | 201 |
| Figure 6.2. Motion based on linearly varying acceleration (Clough and Penzien, 1993, p. 121) | 202 |
| Figure 6.3. Numerical NLPO analysis using linear and uniform ‘fixed’ load patterns. | 203 |
| Figure 6.4. Static Push Over curve; actual and elastoplastic idealization (Chopra, 1995, p. 246) | 205 |
| Figure 6.5. Finite Element model of entire rack frame. (Reyes 2013, p. 66)..... | 207 |
| Figure 6.6. Deflection Response of KIN & SDOF Equivalent to 95% El Centro. Instability and collapses occurs at ~40s. (Reyes 2013)..... | 211 |
| Figure 6.7. Kinematic link response to 95% El Centro (Reyes 2013)..... | 211 |
| Figure 6.8. El-Centro 1940 Accelerogram. Unfactored Max PGA = 0.35g | 213 |
| Figure 6.9. Northridge 1994 Accelerogram. Unfactored Max PGA = 0.84g | 214 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 6.10. Schematic of IDA Analysis Process and Outputs. Note the figure shows three scaled El-Centro 1940 records, leading to three points on the IDA curve. (Reyes, 2013, p. 93) | 215 |
| Figure 6.11. Total amount of strain energy in the connections when subjected to 30% and 40% El-Centro (1940) earthquake..... | 216 |
| Figure 6.12. Total amount of strain energy in the connections when subjected to 120% El-Centro earthquake. | 217 |
| Figure 6.13. Moment rotation behaviour of the connections at different levels | 218 |
| Figure 6.14. Inter-storey drift of the system at different load intensities (soft storey mechanism is obvious)..... | 219 |
| Figure 6.15. Total amount of strain energy in the connections when subjected to 50% 1994 Northridge earthquake..... | 220 |
| Figure 6.16. Moment rotation behaviour of the connections at different levels | 221 |
| Figure 6.17. PGA vs. Max inter-storey drift ratio IDA curves for 3 different earthquakes..... | 222 |
| Figure 6.18. 'Dynamic Pushover' style IDA results in the format of base shear coefficient vs. drift for 3 different earthquakes..... | 222 |
| Figure 6.19. Numerical NLPO analysis using linear and uniform load patterns. | 224 |
| Figure 6.20. Comparison of static and 'dynamic pushover' curves with respect to top storey drift. | 225 |
| Figure 6.21. Triangular Load Pattern Pushover Curve with respect to top storey drift. | 226 |
| Figure 6.22. Rectangular Load Pattern Pushover Curve with respect to top storey drift..... | 226 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 6.23. Triangular Load Pattern Pushover Curve with respect to max inter-storey drift..... | 227 |
| Figure 6.24. Rectangular Load Pattern Pushover Curve with respect to max inter-storey drift..... | 228 |
| Figure 6.25. FE model, Elevation and Side views..... | 229 |
| Figure 6.26. Experimental and Numerical Cyclic Test Comparison using LabCyc-PIV Link..... | 230 |
| Figure 6.27. (a) and (b): Numerical analysis results vs Experimental test results (60% 1940 El Centro Earthquake – Not Scaled in time domain)..... | 232 |
| Figure 6.28. (a), (b) and (c): Numerical analysis results against Experimental test results (70% 1940 El Centro Earthquake – Not Scaled in time domain)..... | 233 |
| Figure 6.29. (a), (b) and (c): Numerical analysis results vs Experimental test results (80% 1940 El Centro Earthquake – Not Scaled in time domain)..... | 234 |
| Figure 6.30. Moment – Rotation hysteresis curves of the beam to upright connections at first and second beam levels (60% 1940 El Centro Earthquake record)..... | 235 |
| Figure 6.31. Moment – Rotation hysteresis curves of the beam to upright connections at first and second beam levels (70% 1940 El Centro Earthquake record)..... | 235 |
| Figure 6.32. Moment – Rotation hysteresis curves of the beam to upright connections at first and second beam levels (80% 1940 El Centro Earthquake record)..... | 236 |
| Figure 6.33. Moment – Rotation hysteresis curves of the beam to upright connections at first and second beam levels (100% 1940 El Centro Earthquake record)..... | 236 |
| Figure 7.1: Push-Over test set up in both directions (Rosin et al., 2009, p. 59) | 240 |
| Figure 7.2: Schematic view of the shake table test set up (Rosin et al., 2009, p. 60) | 240 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 7.3: Failure of the frame as result of push over test (Rosin et al. 2009, p. 63) | 241 |
| Figure 7.4: Hysteresis response of the frame in both directions of (a) down aisle, and (b) cross aisle (Rosin et al., 2009, p. 63 & 67) | 242 |
| Figure 7.5: Overall drift of the system in cross aisle direction (Rosin et al., 2009, p. 65) | 243 |
| Figure 7.6: Heavy steel plates were locked to the structures laboratory floor by using welded shear connectors | 244 |
| Figure 7.7: Steel plates were used to sandwich the upright | 246 |
| Figure 7.8: Schematic set up 3-D view (concrete blocks on the timber pallets are not shown in this figure) | 246 |
| Figure 7.9: Double hinged connection between spreader beam to the sandwich plates | 247 |
| Figure 7.10: Imposed displacement history | 247 |
| Figure 7.11: Frame at ultimate drift | 248 |
| Figure 7.12: Summary of the instrumentation applied to the specimen (concrete blocks on the timber pallets are not shown in this figure) | 248 |
| Figure 7.13: Connection zone after the test | 249 |
| Figure 7.14: Hysteresis response of the frame | 250 |
| Figure 7.15: Strength deterioration and stiffness degradation after a few cycles of loading | 251 |
| Figure 7.16: Experimental envelop curve vs the Bi-Linear and Linear push curves | 252 |
| Figure 7.17: Deformed shape of the FE Model (Rendered view) | 253 |
| Figure 7.18: Finite Element analysis result vs. Experimental cyclic envelop curve | 253 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 7.19: Static cyclic test vs Dynamic shake table test results | 254 |
| Figure 7.20: IDA curve and the Cyclic curve with the amplitude close to the maximum seismic displacement | 255 |
| Figure 7.21. Braced and un-braced frames | 256 |
| Figure 7.22. Equilibrium states of a system with Bi-Linear connection characteristic | 259 |
| Figure 7.23. Typical Beam-Upright Connection Non-Linear Features (Reyes, 2013, p. 53) | 260 |
| Figure 7.24: Assumed failure mode under seismic actions..... | 261 |
| Figure 7.25: Displacement response spectrum..... | 262 |
| Figure 7.26: Multi degree of freedom model vs Single degree of freedom model .. | 262 |
| Figure 7.27: The inelastic top level displacement, $\Delta pTop$, the horizontal projection of the linear push curve from the corresponding elastic top level displacement, $\Delta eTop$ | 263 |
| Figure 7.28: Capacity curve and the linear push curve | 264 |
| Figure 7.29: Reading the elastic top level displacement from displacement response spectrum | 265 |
| Figure 7.30: Reading $\Delta pTop$ | 265 |
| Figure 7.31: Displacement loading for structural analysis..... | 266 |
| Figure 7.32: Deformed shape of the system after analysis | 269 |
| Figure A.1. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-80x40x1.5-90G beam end connectors | 284 |
| Figure A.2. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-80x40x1.5-90H beam end connectors | 285 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure A.3. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-80x40x1.5-100R beam end connectors | 285 |
| Figure A.4. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-85x50x1.5-90G beam end connectors | 286 |
| Figure A.5. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-85x50x1.5-90H beam end connectors | 286 |
| Figure A.6. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-85x50x1.5-100R beam end connectors | 287 |
| Figure A.7. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-90x40x1.5-90G beam end connectors | 287 |
| Figure A.8. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-90x40x1.5-90H beam end connectors | 288 |
| Figure A.9. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-90x40x1.5-100R beam end connectors | 288 |
| Figure A.10. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-100x40x1.5-90G beam end connectors | 289 |
| Figure A.11. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-100x40x1.5-90H beam end connectors | 289 |
| Figure A.12. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-100x40x1.5-100R beam end connectors | 290 |
| Figure A.13. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-105x50x1.5-90G beam end connectors | 290 |
| Figure A.14. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-105x50x1.5-90H beam end connectors | 291 |
| Figure A.15. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-105x50x1.5-100R beam end connectors | 291 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure A.16. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-130x40x1.5-90G beam end connectors | 292 |
| Figure A.17. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-130x40x1.5-90H beam end connectors | 292 |
| Figure A.18. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-130x40x1.5-100R beam end connectors | 293 |
| Figure A.19. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-140x50x1.6-90G beam end connectors | 293 |
| Figure A.20. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-140x50x1.6-90H beam end connectors | 294 |
| Figure A.21. Moment rotation curves for C-BT-B-140x50x1.6-100R beam end connectors | 294 |
| Figure B1. Analytical result vs. Test result..... | 298 |
| Figure B.2. Analytical result vs. Test result..... | 298 |
| Figure B.3. Analytical result vs. Test result..... | 299 |
| Figure C.1. Response of KIN-MON to 60% 1940 El-Centro earthquake..... | 300 |
| Figure C.2. First Storey KIN-MON Link response to 60% 1940 El-Centro earthquake. Upper storey links remain linear..... | 300 |
| Figure C.3. Deflection Response of KIN-EQV to 60% 1940 El-Centro earthquake..... | 301 |
| Figure C.4. First Storey KIN-EQV Link response to 1940 60% El-Centro earthquake. Upper storey links remain linear..... | 301 |
| Figure C.5. Deflection Response of TAK-EQV to 60% 1940 El-Centro earthquake..... | 301 |
| Figure C.6. First Storey TAK-EQV Link response to 60% 1940 El-Centro. Upper | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| storey links remain linear..... | 302 |
| Figure C.7. Deflection Response of PIV-EQV to 60% 1940 El-Centro earthquake..... | 302 |
| Figure C.8. First Storey PIV-EQV Link response to 60% 1940 El-Centro earthquake. Upper storey links remain linear..... | 302 |
| Figure C.9. Deflection Response of PIV-CYC to 60% 1940 El-Centro earthquake..... | 303 |
| Figure C.10. First Storey PIV-CYC Link response to 60% 1940 El-Centro earthquake..... | 303 |
| Figure C.11. Second Storey PIV-CYC Link response to 60% 1940 El-Centro. Third and fourth storey links also remain linear..... | 303 |
| Figure C.12. Energy Dissipated by PIV-EQV when Subjected to 60% 1940 El-Centro earthquake..... | 304 |

List of Tables:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 2-1: Material properties..... | 48 |
| Table 2-2: Finite Element models..... | 48 |
| Table 2-3. Beam End Connector Cyclic Bending Test..... | 67 |
| Table 2-4 Backbone-Hysteresis Models for Beam-Upright Connections..... | 77 |
| Table 2-5. Calibrated Pivot Model Parameters for 'Type A' Beam-Upright Connections..... | 79 |
| Table 3-1. Material Properties | 104 |
| Table 4-1. SAP and ABAQUS models vs test results..... | 135 |
| Table 4-2. Numerical, Analytical and Experimental results | 143 |
| Table 5-1. Section profiles | 160 |
| Table 5-2. Summary of the experimental tests..... | 162 |
| Table 5-3. Peak responses of structure under seismic actions | 175 |
| Table 5-4. Peak responses of structure under time scaled seismic actions | 191 |
| Table 5-5. Dynamic features of the system under 1940 El-Centro test record/Non scaled in time domain..... | 194 |
| Table 5-6. Dynamic features of the system under 1940 El-Centro test record/Scaled in time domain | 195 |
| Table 6-1. Summary of El Centro scaling at collapse when using different connection models. | 209 |
| Table 6-2. Response of Rack Modelled with Different Connection models to 60% El-Centro (1940) ground motion | 210 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 6-3. R Factor Calculation via PGA Ratio with respect to ‘first significant yield point’ selection..... | 223 |
| Table 6-4. R factor calculation from triangular load pushover with respect to top storey drift..... | 226 |
| Table 6-5. R factor calculation from rectangular load pushover with respect to top storey drift..... | 227 |
| Table 6-6. R factor calculation from triangular load pushover with respect to max inter-storey drift..... | 227 |
| Table 6-7 R factor calculation from rectangular load pushover with respect to max inter-storey drift..... | 228 |
| Table 6-8. Recommended Seismic Design Factors for ESLF design of unbraced down-aisle steel pallet racks..... | 228 |
| Table 6-9. Calibrated Pivot Model Parameters for 'Type A' Beam-Upright Connections..... | 231 |
| Table 7-1. Seismic Analysis Assumptions..... | 268 |
| Table 7-2. Comparison of different analysis methods..... | 268 |
| Table A-1. Beam End Connector Test Results..... | 280 |
| Table A-2. Yield and Ultimate rotations of the connections..... | 295 |
| Table B-1. Geometrical characteristics of the connections..... | 297 |
| Table D-1. 100% 1940 El-Centro NLTH vs. ESLF comparison for different R factors. Rectangular load pattern..... | 306 |
| Table D-2. 100% 1940 El-Centro NLTH vs. ESLF comparison for different R factors. Triangular load pattern..... | 306 |
| Table D-3. 50% 1940 El-Centro NLTH vs. ESLF comparison for different R factors. Triangular load pattern..... | 307 |

Table D-4. 50% 1940 El-Centro NLTH vs. ESLF comparison for different R factors.
Rectangular load pattern.....307

NOTATION

The following symbols are used through the thesis unless notified otherwise:

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| A_{brace} | Cross section area of bracing members |
| $A^*_{bracing\ member}$ | Modified cross section area of the bracing member |
| $A_{bracing\ member}$ | Cross section area of the bracing member |
| A_d | Cross sectional area of the bracing members |
| C | Damping matrix, or; Number of storey levels |
| D | Upright width, or; Nominal diameter of bolt |
| D_{EqCyc} | First yield rotation on the moment-rotation backbone |
| E | Elasticity modulus |
| F_1 | Vertical force applied by Jack 1 |
| F_2 | Horizontal force at pin above upright |
| f_a, f_b | The calculated frequencies at a response amplitude of ' $1/\sqrt{2}$ ', of the peak response amplitude |
| $f_b(\theta)$ | Moment rotation function of base plate connections |
| $f_c(\theta)$ | Moment rotation function of beam to upright connections |
| f_n | Forcing frequency at resonance and |
| f_o | First yield force in the push over curve |
| F_{ult} | Upright – hook interaction |
| f_y | The force at which the structure starts to yield (yield strength) |
| H | Beam spacing , or; Storey height |
| I | Second moment of inertia of the upright member about an axis perpendicular to the upright frame |
| I_b | Second moment of area of the beam, or; Moment of inertia of bolt section |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| K | Stiffness matrix, or; Stiffness of a SDOF system |
| k | A factor depending on the position of the loads |
| $k_{1YEqCyc\ Initial}$ | Stiffness of the equivalent moment rotation backbone |
| K_{avg} | Average stiffness of the moment rotation curve |
| $K_{bearing}$ | Bearing stiffness |
| K_{bolt} | Stiffness of the bolts in the bracing connection |
| K_i | Initial Stiffness |
| K_{joint} | Stiffness of the bracing connection in vertical direction The joint stiffness in the direction of the bracing member |
| K'_{joint} | Stiffness of the bracing member |
| K_{member} | Stiffness of the bracing member |
| K^*_{member} | Equivalent stiffness of the bracing members |
| K_s | Initial secant stiffness |
| K_{shear} | Stiffness of the shear frame excluding base plates |
| $K_{shear\ total}$ | Stiffness of the shear frame including base plates Stiffness of the base plate connection under uplift forces |
| K_{uplift} | Stiffness of the base plate connection under uplift forces |
| L | Vertical distance from the load point to the connector's free edge, or; Distance between pin above upright and bottom of the base plate, or; The total height of the upright frame |
| L_b | Distance between upright flanges, or; Length of the beam Total mass of a SDOF system, or; Moment in the beam to upright connection |
| \bar{m} | Non-dimensional moment |
| \bar{m}_u | Non-dimensional ultimate moment |
| M | Mass matrix, or; Moment in the beam to upright connections |
| M_{1Y} | First yield point on the moment-rotation backbone |
| M_b | Base plate moment |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| M_{BU} | Ultimate moment of the beam end connector |
| M_{CU} | Ultimate moment of the beam |
| M_i | The effective or modal mass for mode i |
| m_j | Lumped mass at degree of freedom j |
| M_{max} | Maximum allowable moment of the base plate |
| M_p | Plastic moment of the base plate |
| $M_{p,b}$ | Plastic moment of the beam |
| M_{ult} | Base plate moment, including second order effects |
| M_u | Ultimate moment |
| $M_{max-ups}$ | Maximum moment in first storey uprights |
| M_y | Yield moment |
| N^* | Design value of the vertical action on the frame |
| N | Number of beams at every levels |
| N_b | Number of base plate connections |
| N_{brace} | Number of bracing members in tension |
| N_{brc} | Number of bracing members in the upright frame |
| N_c | Number of beam to upright connection |
| N_{cr} | Elastic critical load |
| P | Pallet load distributed at every beam |
| p_{cr} | Maximum allowable load at every beam level |
| P_E | External work in the down aisle direction |
| R | Seismic Reduction Factor |
| $S_{j,ini}$ | The initial stiffness of the connection |
| S_p | Factor for redundancy of structure |
| S_{ti} | Transverse shear stiffness of an upright frame |
| T | Fundamental period of structure |
| t_b | Brace member thickness |
| t_c | Connector's thickness |
| t_u | Upright member thickness |
| U | Total displacement response of a MDOF structure, or; Internal work in the down aisle frame |
| U_E | External energy in the base plate assembly |
| U_I | Internal energy in the base plate assembly |

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| | Ultimate deformation of the system in the push over curve |
| u_m | |
| u_o | First yield displacement |
| \ddot{u}_g | Ground acceleration |
| | The displacement at which the structure starts to yield (yield displacement) |
| u_y | |
| $V_{base\ shear}$ | Seismic base shear in the structure |
| | Elastic base shear at the maximum monitored displacement of the top beam level |
| V_e | |
| | Inelastic base shear at the maximum monitored displacement of the top beam level |
| V_{max} | |
| W | The total potential energy of the system |
| $Y_n(t)$ | Time varying displacement function |
| α | Parameters for developing hysteresis curves, or; Imperfection (out of plumb), or; Seismic intensity factor, or; The angle between the frame bracing member and the direction perpendicular to the upright |
| β | Reduction factor for the cross section area of the bracing members, or; Parameters for developing hysteresis curves |
| δ_1 to δ_4 | Displacements at positions 1 to 4, respectively |
| δ_{ci} | Maximum allowable rotation of the connection |
| δ_{Fail} | Final point on the moment-rotation backbone |
| δ_L | Horizontal deflection at the bottom of the storey |
| δ_U | Horizontal deflection at the top of the storey |
| Δ_e | Equivalent elastic response displacement |
| $\Delta_{e,top}$ | Top storey elastic displacement |
| $\Delta_{p,top}$ | Inelastic top level displacement |
| Δ_s | Stability displacement limit |
| ζ | Damping ratio |
| η | Parameters for developing hysteresis curves |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| θ | Drift of the down aisle frame excluding imperfection |
| θ_1 | Maximum first storey inter-storey drift ratio, |
| θ_b | Relative rotation of base plate connection |
| $\theta_{b,p}$ | The value of θ_b at failure. |
| θ_D | The minimum required rotation of the connector to allow a Plastic mechanism to occur |
| $\theta_{top\ storey}$ | Maximum top storey drift ration |
| θ_u | Ultimate rotation of the beam to upright connections |
| θ_{ult} | Ultimate rotation of the base plate connectionn |
| θ_y | Yield rotation |
| λ | The factor to convert the multi degree of freedom model to the equivalent single degree of freedom model |
| μ | Ductility of structure |
| σ | Normal stress |
| σ_{ult} | Maximum stress at upright-hook interaction |
| τ | Shear stress |
| Φ | Dynamic Mode shape matrix, or; Frame imperfection |
| $\bar{\Phi}$ | Non-dimensional rotation |
| Φ_b | The angle between horizontal and diagonal braces |
| Φ_b | The angle between horizontal and diagonal braces |
| $\Phi_{i,j}$ | Relative deformed shape displacement for mode i at degree of freedom j |
| Φ_{max} | Largest value of the sway index |
| Φ_n | Time-independent vector of the system's n th mode shape and |
| $\Phi\mu, R_\mu, q$ | Ductility of structure |
| γ | The angle between brace member and the horizontal direction |
| φ | Sway rotation equal to 0.02 Rad, or; Total drift of the down aisle frame including imperfection |
| Ω | Over Strength Factor |

Abstract

Industrial racking systems are load bearing structures for the warehouse storage of goods. They are normally fabricated and assembled from cold-formed perforated open thin-walled vertical members and can be 4 meters to 40 meters high. To resist lateral actions such as seismic loads, racking structures rely typically on flexible boltless beam to upright connections along the storage aisles and braced frames in the transverse cross-aisle direction. Compared to their self weight, industrial racks carry very heavy pallet loads as opposed to other conventional structures. High slenderness ratio, heavy pallet loads, connection flexibility and low degree of redundancy make rack structures very different from conventional steel structures. Therefore, in the racking industry special analysis and design codes are adopted which require specific experimental tests to determine the performance of the key structural components. However the current standards do not give sufficient guidance for seismic design. This PhD research investigates both numerically and experimentally the effect of different connections on the performance of industrial racking systems. The research focus is on three critical connections: (a) Beam-upright connection; (b) Floor connection (Base-plate connection); and (c) Bolted brace connection. Courtesy of Dexion Australia, part of the research was based on test results conducted on their racking components. More than 70 beam to upright connection tests including monotonic and cyclic tests, 15 base plate tests under combined axial and bending loads and 4 full cross aisle shear frame tests were studied. FE models were then developed and verified against the test results. Further FE analyses revealed the behaviour of the aforementioned local connections under monotonic and cyclic actions and as a result simple theoretical models were proposed. After deep investigations on the performance of different connections of a typical rack structure, more than 20 full scaled shake table tests were conducted to reveal the dynamic features of a rack structure and one full scaled static cyclic push over test was performed to evaluate the system deterioration under cyclic actions. Both dynamic and static full scaled tests were accurately modeled using the proposed beam to upright connection model. A new performance based seismic analysis approach was proposed at the end of the thesis which showed much more accurate results compared to the seismic analysis approach in the current racking codes and specifications.