ज्ञान-विज्ञान विमुक्तये
Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4

COMPARITIVE STUDY OF COLLAPSE BEHAVIOR OF G+3 RCC BUILDING FRAME WITH AND WITHOUT SHEAR WALL

Sonika Agrawal[1], Rajeev Chandak[2]
[1] M.E. Research Scholar (Structural Engineering), Department of Civil Engineering, Jabalpur Engineering College, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, India
[2]Head of Department, Department of Civil Engineering, Jabalpur Engineering College, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, India

Abstract: This investigation deals with the effect of progressive collapse behaviour of G+3 RCC building frame with and without shear wall. Progressive collapse is generally defined as small or local structural failure results in damage and failure of the adjoining members and in turn, causing total collapse of the building or a disproportionately large part of it. Progressive collapse of building structures is initiated by loss of one or more vertical load carrying members, usually columns. After one or more columns fail, an alternative load path is needed to transfer the load to other structural elements. If the neighbouring elements are not designed to resist the redistributed loads, failure will happen with further load redistribution until equilibrium is reached, resulting in partial or total collapse of the structure. The study includes the investigation of critical columns for a 4 storey RCC building with and without shear wall. The height of building is 3.2m at each floor. The behavioural changes investigated, under critical load path of the building subjected to a sudden collapse of load bearing member. This RCC building is designed as per relevant Indian codes and investigation is carried out considering the load path where maximum behavioural changes occur in terms of displacement, vertical reaction and axial forces after removal of load

ज्ञान-विज्ञान विमुक्तये
Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4

bearing member due to progressive collapse. The numerical investigation is carried out using commercially available software STAAD Pro. It is observed that ground floor columns are most critical for load transfer and joint displacement when subjected to progressive collapse.

Keywords: Progressive collapse, RCC building, Shear wall, STAAD Pro

1. INTRODUCTION

Prevention or mitigation of progressive collapse appears to be an important issue in the development of several structural design codes. They highlight the necessity of providing sufficient structural integrity, ductility, and redundancy to indirectly compensate the risk of disproportional collapse.

Awareness on the issue of progressive collapse took place after the structural failure of Ronan point in 1968. After the terrorist attack on Murrah federal office building in 1995 more and more research efforts were put to understand the progressive collapse. But it is important to note that collapse of the World Trade Centre (commonly known as 9/11) has led to the detailed investigations for the enhancement of robustness of structures in order to save precious loss of life and property under such attacks.

As per ASCE progressive collapse is defined as “The spread of local damage, from an initiating event, from element to element, eventually resulting in the collapse of entire structure or a disproportionately large part of it; also known as disproportionate collapse”. The General Services Administration, USA adopts the basic definition of that “Progressive collapse is a situation where local failure of a primary structural component leads to the collapse of adjoining members which in turn leads to additional collapse”. Department of defence (DoD) offers another definition as “A progressive collapse is a chain reaction of failure of building members to an extent disproportionate to the original localized damage”. Progressive collapse is deformation of any load bearing element which initiate the local failure and transfer of additional load progression to the adjoining elements to generate disproportionate collapse. An increasing number of progressive collapse around the world lead more disastrous event leading to loss of life, injuries and large number of death. Considering this an important issue, United States Department of Defence (DOD) and United States General Services Administration (GSA), and Euro codes published a string of various guidelines and specifications.

Alternate load path analysis is more adoptable because of its risk free approach and mainly focus on the performance of building after removal of critical support to ensure the safety of the building. There are four substitute analytical techniques drawn in alternate load path approach i.e. linear static analysis, nonlinear static analysis, linear dynamic and nonlinear dynamic analysis. In linear static analysis full factored load is applied on the damaged structure at once. After the static analysis DCR (Demand capacity ratio) can be computed to determine the extent of damage zone. This method is inconvenient if structure elements and joints connection have the DCR value less than 2 i.e. the structure have possesses several cracks and damage in that case other method is suitable . The advantage of this conservative method lie in its simplicity, fast to complete it and this method is applicable for the building with maximum of 10 floors. Nonlinear static analysis accounts for the nonlinearity of material and geometry, consist step by step iteration thus making this method time consuming. Hence analysis is done based on load history from zero to full factored load applied on the structure and iterations are continued until the structure model gets stabilized whereas nonlinear dynamic analysis represent the nonlinearities of material and geometry and express the actual behaviour of structure while undergoes inelastic deformation.

2. Progressive collapse guidelines

ज्ञान-विज्ञान विमुक्तये
Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4

American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE 7, [3]), General Services Administration [8], Department of Defence (Unified Facilities Criteria, [4], and National Institute of Standards and Technology[12] have developed criteria and guidelines to evaluate, design and improve structural integrity and progressive collapse resistance of existing and new buildings. ASCE 7 [3] provides design load combinations including abnormal loads and associated probabilities. It also presents general direct and indirect design approaches to ensure structural integrity following local damage to a primary load-carrying member

3. ANALYTICAL MODEL

A RCC building with and without shear wall is designed according to Indian codes. Fig. 1 shows a 3 storey building and the plan of building is asymmetric throughout the height. The height of building is 3.2m at each floor and the elevation of building with and without shear wall is shown in fig. 2 and fig. 3 respectively. For each storey the size of all beams is designed and kept constant with a dimension 230 mm x 300 mm and column size is 230 mm x 450 mm. Building is designed according to IS codes for dead and live load combination.

ज्ञान-विज्ञान विमुक्तये
Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4



Fig. 1: Floor plan

Dead load = 4 KN/m^2

Live load = 3 KN/m^2

Member dead load (wall load) = 15 KN/m^2

Parapet wall dead load = 5 KN/m^2

ज्ञान-विज्ञान विमुक्तये
Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4



Fig. 2: Elevation of building without shear wall: FRAME 1

ज्ञान-विज्ञान विमुक्तये
Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4



Fig. 3: Elevation of building with shear wall: FRAME 2

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A RCC building is designed according to Indian code. We have considered 4 storey building along having floor height of 3.2 m and the depth of foundation is to be 1.5 m. All column are of 230 mm x 450 mm. All beam sizes are 230 mm x 300 mm. Consider two loads i.e. dead load and live load. In dead load consider the self-weight of the structure, wall weight of 15 KN/m, parapet wall weight of 5 KN/m, floor weight of 4 KN/m^2 and in live load of 4

Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4

KN/sqm. The combination of both the Loads is considered according to Indian standards code IS 456. Concrete grade considered is M25 and steel grade Fe 415. The exterior column of ground floor is removed one by one in a series to find out the critical columns. Similarly with the same loading condition and same beam and column section a RCC G+3 building with shear wall (with opening) is also designed and analyzed in same way by removing exterior column one by one .Comparative study of various parameters like axial forces on column, node displacement at top nodes of removed column and support reactions in vertical direction of both the frame (with and without shear wall) is carried out



Fig. 4: Numbering of columns of ground floor

ज्ञान-विज्ञान विमुक्तये
Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4

4.1 Comparison of Forces in axial forces of columns



Fig. 5: Comparison of Axial forces in columns of GF

The above graph shows the axial forces in all the columns of GF of the frame 1 i.e. without shear wall and frame 2 i.e. with shear wall. There is large difference in axial forces in column number 56, 57, 60 & 61 because these are the support of shear wall.

Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4



Fig. 6: Comparison of forces in X direction of all column of GF when column no. 51 removed

Considering this scenario, column number 51 is removed as shown in Fig. 6 and it is observed that large redistribution of forces is observed in the nearest column number 52 and 55 which took place due to removal of this single column. The increase in percentage of additional loading due to the accidental collapsing of structural member number 51 and results in transfer of load to adjacent member number 52 is about 53% in case of frame 1 i.e. frame without shear wall while increase in axial load in adjacent column number is 51% in case of frame 2 i.e. frame with shear wall.

4.2 Comparison of support reaction

Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4

The graph shows the support reaction in vertical direction of all the supports columns of the frame 1 i.e. without shear wall and frame 2 i.e. with shear wall. It is found that values of reaction at support number 26, 27, 30 &31 is more because these are the support of shear wall.



Fig. 7: Comparison of support reaction values

Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4



Fig. 8: Reaction comparison when column no. 51 is removed

From the above graph when the column number 51 is removed the support reaction (Y direction) is increased in the adjacent support number 22 and 25 by 51% & 30% respectively in case of frame without shear wall while it is 42% & 24% in case of frame with shear wall.

5.3 Comparison of Node Displacement

ज्ञान-विज्ञान विमुक्तये
Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4



Fig. 9: Comparison of Displacement of the top nodes of columns of GF

The above graph shows the node displacement at the top of columns of the frame 1 i.e. without shear wall and frame 2 i.e. with shear wall. It can be concluded from the above graph that the displacement of the frame with shear wall is little more than the displacement of the frame without shear wall except the nodes at which shear wall support .The node displacement at node number 46, 47, 50 and 51 is reduced tremendously.

ज्ञान-विज्ञान विमुक्तये
Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4



Fig. 10: Comparison of displacement when column no. 51 is removed

The above graph shows that when the column 51 is removed the node displacement at the top node of removed column 51 is increased by 30 times of the displacement from the initial condition (without column removed condition) in case of frame 1 i.e. without shear wall and 27 times of the displacement from the initial condition (without column removed condition) in case of frame 1 i.e. with shear wall.

6. CONCLUSION

In this work, the main objective was to investigate the behaviour of the four storey asymmetric RCC building with and without shear wall due to progressive collapse. Studies are carried out to investigate the behaviour of progressive collapse for axial forces in columns, support reactions and node displacement subjected to sudden loss of a vertical support member. Ground floor columns are removed one by one, and the study of progressive collapse initiation on a typical reinforced concrete frame is done with the help of a STAAD Pro. This simple analysis can be used to quickly analyse the structures for different failure

ज्ञान-विज्ञान विमुक्तये
Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4

conditions and then optimize it for various threat scenarios. Based on this investigation following conclusions are drawn:

1. It is found that larger redistribution of axial forces is more in adjacent columns of removed column than the columns located far from the removed column. Removal of column number 53,66,58 exhibit most critical condition in case of axial force redistribution shows that columns of mid part of frame is critical than other column of building.
2. Percentage increase in axial forces is more in frames of without shear wall than the frames with shear wall.
3. Redistribution of axial force is also depending on the distance and symmetry of the structure. If the adjacent columns with same property and specification are located at same distance from the removed column than the percentage increase in axial load is also same.
4. It is found larger redistribution of support reaction is more in adjacent support of the support of removed column than the supports located far from the support of removed column. Removal of column number 53,52,58 exhibit most critical condition in case of support reaction redistribution shows that columns of mid part of frame is critical than other column of building.
5. Percentage of increase in support reaction is more in frames of without shear wall than the frames with shear wall.
6. From the joint displacement scenario the displacement of the top nodes of the removed column increases tremendously and it is more for the frame of without shear wall than the for the frame of with shear wall.

It can be concluded that from node displacement criteria maximum change occurs in node number 53, 54 and 44 in both the frame cases i.e. frame without shear wall and with shear wall due to removal of column 54, 63 and 64. Hence from the node displacement criteria critical columns are 54, 63 and 64.

REFERENCES

[1] Leslaw Kwasniewski (2010), Non-linear dynamic simulations of progressive collapse for a multi-story building, Engineering Structures, 32 (2010) 1223-1235.

[2] Meng- Hao Tsai (2011), Progressive Collapse Analysis of an RC Building with Exterior Non-Structural Walls, The Twelfth East Asia-Pacific Conference on Structural Engineering and Construction, 14, 377–384, 2011.

[3] Anshuman. S, D. Bhunia, B. Ramjiyani (2011), “Solution of Shear Wall Location in Multi-Storey Building;” International Journal of Civil and Structural Engineering, 2(2), pp. 493-506.

[4] H.R. Tavakoli, A. RashidiAlashti (2012), Evaluation of progressive collapse potential of multi-story moment resisting steel frame buildings under lateral loading, Scientia Iranica A ,20 (1), 77–86, 2013.

[5] S. Agrawal, S.D. Charkha (2012), “Effect of Change in Shear Wall Location on Storey Drift of Multi-storey Building Subjected to Lateral Loads”; International Journal of EngineeringResearch and Applications, Vol. 2, Issue 3, pp.1786-1793.

[6] Kasliwal S. K., M. R. Wakchaure, Anantwad S (2012), “Effects of Numbers and Positions of Shear Walls on Seismic Behaviour of Multi-storey Structure;” International Journal of Advanced and Innovative Research; pp.189-193.

[7] Brian I. Song, HalilSezen (2013), Experimental and analytical progressive collapse assessment of a steel frame building, Engineering Structures, 56, 664–672.

[8] P.P Chandurkar, P.S. Pajgade (2013), "Seismic analysis of RCC building with and without shear wall" IJMER, Vol.3, Issue 3, pp- 1805 -1810.

ज्ञान-विज्ञान विमुक्तये
Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4

[9] R. J. Prajapati& V. R. Patel (2013), "Effect of Different Position of Shear Wall on Deflection in High Rise Building," International Journal of Advances in Engineering & Technology, Vol. 6, Issue 4, pp. 1848-1854.

[10] VenkataSairam Kumar N (2014), Shear walls – A review, International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology, 3(2), 9691-9694.

[11] Varsha R. Harne (2014), Comparative study of strength of RC Shear wall at different location on multistoried Residential building, International Journal of civil Engineering Research, 5(4), pp 391-400.

[12] Ugale Ashish B., RautHarshlata R, Effect of steel plate shear wall on behaviour of structure, International Journal of civil Engineering Research, 5 (3), pp 295-300.

[13] Anshuman. S, DipenduBhunia, BhavinRamjiyani, "Solution of shear wall location in multistorey building", International Journal of Civil and Structural Engineering, Volume 2, No 2, 2011.

[14] M. krishna Chaitanya (2015), Progressive collapse of structures, International Journal of Mechanical Civil and Control Engineering, 1(1), 23-29.

[15] Honghao Li, XianghuiCai, Lei Zhang, Boyi Zhang, Wei Wang (2017), Progressive collapse of steel moment-resisting frame subjected to loss of interior column: Experimental tests, Engineering Structures, 150, 203–220, 2017.

[16] Samrat Prakash Khokale (2017), Progressive Collapse of Shear wall Structure Under Accidental Load, 540-549.

[17] MD Goel, D. Agrawal, A. Choubey (2017), collapse behaviour of RCC building under blas load, 11th International Symposium on plasticity and Impact Mechanics, 173, 1943-1950.

[18] IS 1893 (Part1):2002 "Criteria for earthquake resistant design of structure,"

ज्ञान-विज्ञान विमुक्तये
Airo National Research Journal
ISSN: 2321-3914 UGC Approval Number: 63014
Volume: 16, December2018 Issue 4

[19] IS 13920.1993, "Ductile detailing of reinforced concrete structure subjected to seismic forces".

[20] General Provision and building, New Delhi, India.

[21] Bureau of Indian Standard, IS-456(2000), "Plain and Reinforced Concrete Code of Practice".