Retrofit of Concrete Moment Frames with Masonry Infill in High Seismic Zones

Pembo, Philippines

A Senior Project presented to the Faculty of the Architectural Engineering Department California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

> In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Bachelor of Science

> > by

Patricia Pope

Madeleine Rasmussen

Zorana Tat

June 2019

© 2019 Patricia Pope, Madeleine Rasmussen, Zorana Tat

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND INTENT

Global Considerations

Seismic events happen all throughout the world and each country has a slightly different way of handling the design of structures subjected to seismic forces. The goal of this project is to provide citizens of the Philippines with an effective way to retrofit their potentially unsafe buildings in the event of an earthquake. However, this retrofit manual will be able to help globally in other third world countries that have similar building techniques. In order to achieve this type of solution, we had to come up with options that took into account the lack of access to tools, materials, and skilled construction.

Social Considerations

When beginning to address the impact of our solution, it was important to consider the means of a typical family in the Philippines in order to complete the project outlined herein. In many third world countries, including the Philippines, governing bodies have adopted some form of a building code intended to be used when designing and constructing a building. In practice, however, the governing bodies do not regulate or enforce this building code, resulting in poor design and construction practices. This in turn, results in poorly built structures.

The type of masonry infilled structures addressed in this report can fail in many ways, but the deadliest is when failure occurs within the CMU infill wall. Large seismic events can cause the walls to crack diagonally in shear, as well as cause out of plane failure. Out of plane failure is characterized by the CMU infill falling out from the concrete moment frame.

When out of plane failure occurs, there are many consequences that can occur. Firstly, out-of-plane failure can be detrimental due to its ability to cause fatalities. During a seismic event, the masonry can fall out from the wall, possibly landing on people inside the building or in the spaces around the building below. This can potentially result in a massive loss of life within the area. Secondly, when masonry falls out of plane there can be significant damages to any vehicles or personal property of the occupants when wall debris falls to the streets below. Most importantly, walls falling inhibits the ability of rescue vehicles to reach affected areas after an earthquake. When this failure occurs, a lot of time and money must be spent to clean up and bulldoze the fallen debris. Due major hazards of the results of out of plane failure, it should be avoided in any case.

Cultural Considerations

Poorly built structures in third world countries are constructed partly due to the lack of financial means to hire an engineer and construct a safe building. This lack of

means is demonstrated by how residential construction is expanded. In the United States, when a family is growing, the existing culture is to buy a new home, or to buy new land to expand a home, or to build a new house. In the Philippines, due to extremely high prices for land, it is typical for families to build a new story on top of their currently existing home. In combination with the lack of engineering and specialty in seismic design, this method of expansion can have catastrophic results in the event of a large earthquake.

Environmental Considerations

When masonry infilled structures fail in shear or out of plane, they must be entirely replaced. Because these failure types are very common, when an earthquake hits this area, many buildings will need to have major replacements. The buildings would fail and produce significant amounts of debris which would overflow the landfills. Replacing an entire building (or many buildings) can have a large impact on the environment due to the need for new materials to be mass manufactured and transported to the site. The manufacturing process releases dangerous air emissions, releases wastewater contaminants, and drains the earth's resources. The retrofit idea proposed in this manual would significantly lessen the amount of materials required to make a building safe during an earthquake, thus reducing the need for buildings to be completely rebuilt or replaced.

Economic Considerations

Special considerations were taken in order to provide a low-cost solution that would be accessible to as many people as possible.

When approaching a solution to the problem at hand, we maintained a focus on engineering retrofit ideas that are feasible for the Philippine people and the economic climate they face. Typical construction in the United States employs the use of specialized products like Simpson Strong Tie connections and expensive/specialized building methods which are not available in the Philippines. (i.e. use of cranes, welding, etc.). These building methods require high levels of skilled labor to construct which is expensive, this results in average people building their own homes to save money. This is directly contrasted with the level of specialized labor and products available for sale within the local economy in the Philippines. Because of this lack of specialized products and labor, the buildings in the Philippines are very simple. This created the challenge of engineering a retrofit solution that Philippine people in the field would be able to accomplish. In creating a retrofit idea, we always came back to the idea of creating a solution that is simple enough for village contractors to implement themselves. By creating a simple solution that is easy to understand and implement, there can be many opportunities for buildings to get retrofitted without the use of skilled labor. In doing this, local contractors can complete the retrofit themselves using local materials and our manual provided to them.

Team Evaluations

By Tricia Pope:

Maddie:

Easy to work with and got tasks done on time. Maddie became an expert on the building systems and created construction documents quickly and easily. She was not able to attend all of our group meetings but always made sure to keep up with the decisions/work assigned at meetings.

Zorana:

Extremely passionate and enthusiastic about the project. She worked to come up with solutions throughout the entire length of the project and was constantly updating and enhancing the project as we went. Zorana worked on the small details and inner workings of the project tirelessly while also keeping in mind the broader concerns of social/cultural/economic/etc.

By Madeleine Rasmussen:

Tricia:

Laid back and easy to work with. Had valuable input throughout project and was instrumental to formatting and coding excel sheets used to calculate values. Attended group meetings and was productive in working throughout them. Maybe could speak up more so we can hear all the great things she has to bring to the table.

Zorana:

Was very enthusiastic about the project which made working with her fun. Took initiative which is appreciated but sometimes needs to delegate and trust others a bit better when completing various project tasks. Made models for presentation and attended group meetings. Had a large role in final retrofit solution idea/and calculations associated

By Zorana Tat:

Tricia:

Tricia contributed by formatting the excel spreadsheets for the calculations. Tricia was able to demonstrate a firm understanding of the initial calculations such as load combinations, unit load take off, and load flow.

Maddie:

Maddie completed the AutoCAD drawings of the details. Maddie demonstrated a firm understanding of construction.

What did you learn on your own while working on the project?

Tricia Pope:

What I found most valuable throughout this project was how to take the mindset of an engineer with the limitations of materials/labor/etc. in a different country. I learned a lot about how other parts of the world approach engineering and building safety by going through the building codes and design examples from the Philippines and Nepal.

Madeleine Rasmussen:

Throughout this project I learned just how fortunate we are in the United States to have a building code that is adapted nationwide and is strictly enforced. I have grown a new appreciation for these entities that make sure our structures are safe and enforce building codes. In completing this project I have come to respect and understand what building officials and inspectors do and why we need them as a society. This project taught me how to think outside the box and take a specific problem and come up with a solution that is applicable using various skills. In researching masonry retrofits I gained an expanded knowledge for the behavior of this material and the buildings that they make up. Lastly, I learned about the cultural needs for different building economies and how to consider them when engineering.

Zorana Tat:

I learned how to think with a retrofit mindset as well as work around existing cultural building techniques. An easy "retrofit" idea would be to remove the inadequate existing structure and build a new one, however this project showed me how to build around existing structures as well as how avoid being invasive to the existing tenants.

 In addition, I learned how to adjust to different cultural building materials and techniques. A third world country such as the Philippines has a very different building culture from the United States. The United States has access to many different types of materials and specialized skill sets. The United States also has strict regulations on building permits as well as ensuring a licensed professional is working on the building. The Philippines has engineers and builders with the skillset to build, however those people are expensive and there is no government regulation on the building code. This results in average people building when and how they want.

What methodology did you use to learn on your own?

Tricia Pope:

The main approach I took to learning on my own was spending a lot of time reading various resources. To learn about the building system we worked with, I read the chapter of the masonry code pertaining to participating vs. non-participating masonry infill. Additionally, I spent time working to understand the foreign building codes by reading and comparing the design practices to those I know from the United States.

Madeleine Rasmussen:

Utilizing our resources and studying previous explorations where CMU walls occur were both crucial to learning tools throughout this project. Curiosity was a huge part of being able to learn on my own. By having a desire to delve deeper into the information I came across, I was able to understand the "WHY" in various engineering designs.

Zorana Tat:

To learn on my own I utilized the skillset of the faculty on campus and the existing retrofit ideas on the Build change website. For example, I received notes on how to design a concrete moment frame from the Civil Engineering 552 Advanced Concrete Design class taught by Professor Chadwell. I also gained knowledge by speaking to my advisor Professor James Mwangi who had firsthand experience in the Philippines.

GENERAL NOTES

NOTES:

(1) TYPICAL MEMBER SIZES DETERMINED BASED ON NEPAL NATIONAL BUILDING CODE (NBC 205: 1994)

(2) MEMBER SIZES WERE CONVERTED FROM SI UNITS TO ENGLISH UNITS TO CARRY OUT CALUCLATIONS

(3) DETERMINATION OF SEISMIC COEFFICIENTS BASED ON NATIONAL STRUCTURAL CODE OF THE PHILIPPINES: VOLUME 1, SIXTH EDITION, FOURTH PRINTING, 2013 (NSCP)

(4) ANALYSIS BASED ON 2 STORY BUILDING. ROOF LEVEL REFERRED TO AS STORY II

ABBREVIATIONS:

LFRS - LATERAL FORCE RESISTING SYSTEM

REINF - REINFORCEMENT

TYP. - TYPICAL

- (N) NEW
- (E) EXISTING

CONC. - CONCRETE

CMU - CONCRETE MASONRY UNIT

UNO - UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE

O.C. - ON CENTER

EMBED. - EMBEDMENT

EA. - EACH

STRUCTURAL MATERIALS

MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS: Typical unless noted otherwise in calculations.

MASONRY:

3-Cell Blocks, 15 cm X 20 cm X 40 cm Typical Masonry Grouted with Density 22 (kN/m^3)

CONCRETE:

Slab on grade: f'c = 4000 psi Concrete Overlay: f'c = 4000 psi Concrete Framing: f'c = 4000 psi

REINFORCING STEEL:

4T16, T08, & T06 Fe415 STEEL BARS.

STORY I (FLOOR) FRAMING PLAN

K2

SI UNITS

ENGLISH UNITS

ssuming CMU are fully grouted

Residential Basic Floor Area 1997 1998 1997 1998 UNIFORM LIVE LOAD

L1

SEISMIC COEFFICIENTS

NOTES:

(1) COEFFICIENTS DETERMINED USING NSCP C101-10

 $\overline{\text{CALCULATE STRUCTRUAL PERIOD}, T = C_t h_n^{(3/4)}}$

 $\boxed{T(\text{l}) = \boxed{0.174895993}}$
 $\boxed{T(\text{l}) = \boxed{0.280240446}}$

0.280240446

NOTES: PORTAL METHOD (1) PORTAL METHOD ASSUMING INFLECTION POINT AT MIDSPAN OF COLUMNS (2) ASSUMING INFLECTION POINT AT MIDSPAN OF COLUMNS

 $\overline{}$

10702 10702

10702

ਮੁੱ⊟
Disper
E SINCE LFRS IS SYMMETRIC IN EACH ORTHOGANAL DIRECTION, ONE REPRESENTATIVE CALCULATION WILL BE CARRIED OUT (1) ρ=1.3 DUE TO LACK OF REDUNDANCY IN SYSTEM

 $E_h = \rho Q_E$
 $E_v = 0.2 S_{DS} D$

SEISMIC LOAD COMBINATIONS (ASCE 7-10: 12.4.2.3)
NOTE: Q_E= F_X AT STORY LEVEL, AT SPECIFIC LINE SEISMIC LOAD COMBINATIONS (ASCE 7-10: 12.4.2.3) E i \in pQ E_E pQ E_E and $\mathsf{E}\in\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathsf{E}\in\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathsf{E}\in\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathsf{E}\in\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathsf{E}\in\mathbb{C}$ if $\mathsf{E}\in\mathbb{C}$ if $\mathsf{E}\in\mathbb{C}$ if $\mathsf{E}\in\mathbb{C}$ if $\mathsf{E}\in\mathbb{C$

 E $= 0.2$ S $_\mathrm{DS}$ D

 Γ

GOVERNING LOAD COMBINATION - GRAVITY

GOVERNING LOAD COMBINATION - GRAVITY

GOVERNING LOAD COMBINATION - GRAVITY

OUT OF PLANE BENDING

DETERMINE OUT OF PLANE BENDING FORCE

FORMULAS (ASCE 7-16 13.3.1): $\mathsf{F_p}= 0.4^*(\mathsf{a_p})^*(\mathsf{S_{DS}})^*(\mathsf{W_p})$ * $(1$ +2*(z/h))/($\mathsf{R_p/l_p})$ $F_{p,\text{max}}$ =1.6*S_{DS}*I_p*W_p $F_{p,min=}0.3*S_{DS}*I_p*W_p$

FORMULAS

 $M_{u} = w^*L^2/8$

78.30224237
19.68 $\frac{W_p (psf)}{h (ft)}$

NOTES:

(1) CODE REFERENCE: ASCE7-16: 13.3-1

DESIGN MASONRY OUT OF PLANE SHEAR REINFORCEMENT

RISA Outputs

spColumn v6.00 Computer program for the Strength Design of Reinforced Concrete Sections Copyright - 1988-2019, STRUCTUREPOINT, LLC. All rights reserved

Structure Point

Licensee stated below acknowledges that STRUCTUREPOINT (SP) is not and cannot be responsible for either the accuracy or adequacy of the material supplied
as input for processing by the spColumn computer program. Furthermor as much in processing by the spotulini computer program. Fundaming, STRUCTUREPOINT has endeavored to produce spotuline respect to
not and cannot be certified infallible. The final and only responsibility for analysis, desi

Contents

List of Figures

J.

STRUCTUREPOINT - spColumn v6.00
Licensed to: Cal Poly University. License ID: 69418-1064577-4-2356E-22641
u:\1 senior project\sp col\col 450mm x 450mm ground floor.col

1. General Information

2. Material Properties

2.1. Concrete

2.2. Steel

3. Section

3.1. Shape and Properties

Page | 3
6/7/2019
1:58 PM

A4

STRUCTUREPOINT - spColumn v6.00
Licensed to: Cal Poly University. License ID: 69418-1064577-4-2356E-22641
u:\1 senior project\sp col\col 450mm x 450mm ground floor.col

3.2. Section Figure

Figure 1: Column section

4. Reinforcement

4.1. Bar Set: ASTM A615

4.2. Confinement and Factors

4.3. Arrangement

Page | 4
6/7/2019
1:58 PM

5. Factored Loads and Moments with Corresponding Capacities

Page | 5
6/7/2019
1:58 PM

spColumn v6.00 Computer program for the Strength Design of Reinforced Concrete Sections Copyright - 1988-2019, STRUCTUREPOINT, LLC. All rights reserved

Structure Point

Licensee stated below acknowledges that STRUCTUREPOINT (SP) is not and cannot be responsible for either the accuracy or adequacy of the unterinal supplied as input for processing by the spColumn computer program. Furthermo

Contents

List of Figures

 $\overline{}$

Page | 2
6/7/2019
2:02 PM

STRUCTUREPOINT - spColumn v6.00
Licensed to: Cal Poly University. License ID: 69418-1064577-4-2356E-22641
u:\1 senior project\sp col\col 450mm x 450mm roof.col

1. General Information

2. Material Properties

2.1. Concrete

2.2. Steel

3. Section

3.1. Shape and Properties

A10

STRUCTUREPOINT - spColumn v6.00
Licensed to: Cal Poly University. License ID: 69418-1064577-4-2356E-22641
u:\1 senior project\sp col\col 450mm x 450mm roof.col

3.2. Section Figure

Figure 1: Column section

4. Reinforcement

4.1. Bar Set: ASTM A615

4.2. Confinement and Factors

4.3. Arrangement

Page | 4
6/7/2019
2:02 PM

STRUCTUREPOINT - spColumn v6.00
Licensed to: Cal Poly University. License ID: 69418-1064577-4-2356E-22641
u:\1 senior project\sp col\col 450mm x 450mm roof.col

Including the Science of the Committee

5. Factored Loads and Moments with Corresponding Capacities

Page | 5
6/7/2019
2:02 PM

if 3.1 is NOT COMPLIANT, then see DET-03 & DET-04 for column jacket retrofit **cket retrofit if 3.1 is NOT COMPLIANT, then see DET-03 & DET-04 for column ja**

CAL POLY

PEMBO, PHILIPPINES

 $\overline{\mathsf{R}}$

