A REVIEW SEISMIC PERFORMANCE OF STEEL FRAMED BUILDING FROM PUSHOVER ANALYSIS WITH BRACING SYSTEMS

[1] Md.Zeshan Danish,[2]Kamni Laheriya,[3]Sheetal Verma

[1] M.tech Schlor, Civil Department, SSSUTMS, M.P.India
[2] Assistant Professor, Civil Department, SSSUTMS, M.P.India
[3] Assistant Professor, Civil Department, SSSUTMS, M.P.India

ABSTRACT

In last decades Steel structure has played an important role in construction Industry. It is important to plan a structure to perform well under seismic loads. The seismic execution of a multi-story steel outline building is planned by the arrangements of the current Indian code (IS 800 -2007). The shear capacity of the structure can be increased by introducing Steel bracings in the structural system. Bracings can be used as retrofit as well. There are „n" numbers of possibilities to arrange Steel bracings such as D, K, and V type eccentric bracings. A run of the mill six-story steel outline building is intended for different sorts of whimsical bracings as per the IS 800-2007. D, K, and V are the different types of eccentric bracings considered for the present study. Execution of each casing is considered through nonlinear static examination.

Keywords: *Pushover analysis, Steel frames, Bracings, Behaviour factor*

INTRODUCTION

In last decades Steel structure plays an important role in the construction industry. It is important to plan a structure to perform well under seismic burdens. Shear capacity of the structure can be increased by introducing Steel bracings in the structural system. Bracings can be used as retrofit as well. There are „n" numbers of possibilities are there to arrange Steel bracings. Such as D, K, and V type eccentric bracings. Outline of such structure ought to have great flexibility property to perform well under seismic burdens. To estimate ductility and other properties for each eccentric bracing Pushover analysis is performed.

A straightforward PC based push-over investigation is a method for execution based outline of building systems subject to seismic tremor stacking. Pushover investigation achieves much significance in the previous decades because of its effortlessness and the viability of the outcomes. The present study develops a push-over analysis for different eccentric steel frames designed according to IS-800 (2007) and ductility behavior of each frame.

STEEL

Steel is by far most useful material for building construction in the world. Today steel industry is the essential or key industry in any nation. It quality of around ten times that of solid, steel is the perfect material of current development. It's mainly advantages are strength, speed of erection, prefabrication, and demount ability. Structural steel is used in load-bearing frames in buildings, and as members in trusses, bridges, and space frames. Steel, in any case, requires fire and erosion security. In steel structures, claddings and isolating dividers are comprised of stone work or different materials, and often a concrete foundation is provided. Steel is also used in conjunction frame and shear wall construction. Due to its large strength to weight ratio, steel structures tend to be more economical than concrete structures for tall buildings and large span buildings and bridges. Steel structures can be constructed very fast and this enables the structure to be used early thereby leading to overall economy steel offers much better compressive and tensile strength than concrete and enables lighter constructions.

To get the most advantage out of steel, steel structures ought to be planned and ensured to oppose consumption and fire. They ought to be composed and itemized for simple creation and erection. Good quality control is essential to ensure proper fitting of the various structural elements. The impacts of temperature ought to be considered in plan. Steel structures are malleable and strong and can withstand extreme loadings, for example, quakes. Steel structures can be effectively repaired and retrofitted to convey higher burdens. Steel is one of the friendliest natural building materials – steel is 100% recyclable.

To get the most advantage out of steel, steel structures ought to be composed and ensured to oppose erosion and fire. They ought to be planned and itemized for simple creation and erection. Good quality control is essential to ensure proper fitting of the various structural elements. The effects of temperature should be considered in design. To prevent development of cracks under fatigue and earthquake loads the connections and in particular the welds should be designed and detailed properly. Unique steels and defensive measures for erosion and fire are accessible and the architect ought to be comfortable with the choices accessible. Since steel is created in the industrial facility under better quality control, steel structures have higher unwavering quality and security.

LITERATURE REVIEW

- **Humar and Wright (1977)** studied the dynamic behaviour of multi-storeyed steel frame buildings with setbacks. The observations made based on a detailed parametric study are as follows. The fundamental period decreased by 35% for a setback of 90% (i.e., tower occupying 10% of the base area). The higher mode vibration of setback buildings made substantial contribution to their seismic response; these contributions increased with the slenderness of the tower. The contribution of the higher modes increased to 40% for a setback of 90%. For very slender towers the transition region between the tower and the base was, in some cases, subjected to very large storey shears. This increase in shear force was found to be as high as 300% to 400% for a setback of 90%. Storey drift ratios and storey shears for tower portions of setback buildings were substantially larger than for building without setbacks. For the tower portion, the increase in inter-storey drift was found to be four times compared to that of a regular structure. This increase was influenced by the extent of the setback. It was also observed that beam ductility deman in the tower portion showed a large increase with increase in the slenderness of the tower. The column ductility demands in the tower portion also showed a similar trend.

- **Shahrooz and Moehle (1990)** studied the effects of setbacks on the earthquake response of multi-storeyed buildings. In an effort to improve design methods for setback structures, an experimental and analytical study was undertaken. A six-storey moment resisting reinforced concrete space frame with 50% setback in one direction at mid-height was selected. The analytical study focused on the test structure. The displacement profiles were relatively smooth over the height. Relatively large inter-storey drifts at the tower base junction were accompanied by a moderate increase in damage at that level. Overall, the predominance of the fundamental mode on the global translational response in the direction parallel to the setback was clear from the displacement and inertia force profiles. The distribution of lateral forces was almost always similar to the distribution specified by the UBC code; no significant peculiarities in dynamic response were detected. To investigate further, an analytical study was also carried out on six generic reinforced concrete setback frames.

- **Wood (1992)** Investigated the seismic behaviour of reinforced concrete frames with steps and setbacks. Two small-scale reinforced concrete 9-storeyed test framed structures (one -with steps and the other with setbacks) were constructed and subjected to simulated ground motion. The displacement, acceleration and the shear force responses of these frames were compared with those of seven previously tested regular frames. The setback structure comprises two-storey base with seven additional storeys in the tower portions. The stepped structure includes a three-storey tower, a three-storey middle section and a three storey base. The displacement and shear force responses of these two frames were governed primarily by the first mode. Acceleration response at all levels exhibited the contribution of higher modes. The mode shapes for both the frames indicated kinks at the step locations. However, distributions of maximum storey shear were well represented by the equivalent lateral force distributions for all frames as given in UBC for regular frames. The differences between the linear dynamic analyses of regular, stepped and setback frames were not significant.

- **Ghobarah A. et al., (1997)** The control of inter story drift can also be considered as a means to provide uniform ductility over the stories of the building. A story drift may result in the occurrence of a weak story that may cause catastrophic building collapse in a seismic event. Uniform story ductility over all stories for a building is usually desired in seismic design.

- **Foley CM. (2002)** A review of current state-of-the-art seismic performance-based design procedures and presented the vision for the development of PBD optimization. It is recognized that there is a pressing need for developing optimized PBD procedures for seismic engineering of structures.

- **R. Hasan and L. Xu, D.E. Grierson (2002)** Conducted a simple computer-based push over analysis technique for performance-based design of building frameworks subject to earthquake loading. And found that rigidity-factor for elastic analysis of semi-rigid frames, and the stiffness properties for semi-rigid analysis are directly adopted for push over analysis.

- **B. AKBAS.et.al. (2003)** Conducted a push over analysis on steel frames to estimate the seismic demands at different performance levels, which requires the consideration of inelastic behaviour of the structure.

- **X.-K. Zou et al., (2005)** Presented an effective technique that incorporates Pushover Analysis together with numerical optimization procedures to automate the Pushover drift performance design of reinforced concrete buildings. PBD using nonlinear pushover analysis, which generally involves tedious computational effort, is highly iterative process needed to meet code requirements

- **Oğuz, Sermin et al. (2005)** Ascertained the effects and the accuracy of invariant lateral load patterns Utilized in pushover analysis to predict the behaviour imposed on the structure due to randomly Selected individual ground motions causing elastic deformation by studying various levels of Nonlinear response. For this purpose, pushover analyses using various invariant lateral load Patterns and Modal Pushover Analysis were performed on reinforced concrete and steel moment resisting frames covering a broad range of fundamental periods. The accuracy of approximate Procedures utilized to estimate target displacement was also studied on frame structures. Pushover analyses were performed by both DRAIN-2DX and SAP2000. The primary observations from the study showed that the accuracy of the pushover results depended strongly on the load path, the characteristics of the ground motion and the properties of the structure.

PUSHOVER ANALYSIS – AN OVERVIEW

The utilization of the nonlinear static investigation (weakling examination) came in to rehearse in 1970‟s yet the capability of the sucker investigation has been perceived for most recent two decades years. This method is mostly used to assess the quality and float limit of existing structure and the seismic interest for this structure subjected to chosen quake. This technique can be utilized for checking the sufficiency of new basic plan also. The adequacy of sucker examination and its computational effortlessness acquired this technique to a few seismic rules (ATC 40 and FEMA 356) and configuration codes (Euro code 8 and PCM 3274) in most recent couple of years.

Weakling investigation is characterized as an examination wherein a numerical model specifically fusing the nonlinear load-distortion attributes of individual parts and components of the building will be subjected to monotonically expanding sidelong loads speaking to idleness powers in a seismic tremor until a „target displacement‟ is surpassed. Target uprooting is the most extreme relocation (versatile in addition to inelastic) of the working at rooftop expected under chosen seismic tremor ground movement. The auxiliary Pushover examination surveys execution by assessing the power and twisting limit and seismic request utilizing a nonlinear static investigation calculation. The seismic request parameters are story floats, worldwide dislodging (at rooftop or some other reference point), story powers, and part misshapening and segment powers. The investigation represents material inelasticity, geometrical nonlinearity and the redistribution of inner powers. Reaction attributes that can be acquired from the weakling investigation are outlined as takes after:

an) Estimates of power and uprooting limits of the structure. Succession of the part yielding and the advance of the general limit bend.

b) Estimates of power (hub, shear and minute) requests on conceivably weak components and disfigurement requests on bendable components.
c) Estimates of global displacement demand, corresponding inter-storey drifts and damages on structural and non-structural elements expected under the 20earthquake ground motion considered.
d) Sequences of the failure of elements and the consequent effect on the overall structural stability.
e) Distinguishing proof of the basic districts, when the inelastic disfigurements are required to be high and ID of quality abnormalities (in design or in height) of the building. Weakling examination conveys every one of these advantages for an extra computational exertion (demonstrating nonlinearity and change in investigation calculation) over the straight static investigation. Well-ordered methodology of weakling investigation is examined straightaway.

PUSHOVER ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Weakling examination can be executed as either constrain controlled or relocation controlled relying upon the physical idea of the heap and the conduct anticipated from the structure. Power controlled alternative is helpful when the heap is referred to, (for example, gravity stacking) and the structure is relied upon to have the capacity to help the heap. Removal controlled technique ought to be utilized when indicated floats are looked for, (for example, in seismic 2 1 stacking), where the extent of the connected load isn't known ahead of time, or where the structure can be required to lose quality or end up temperamental.

Some PC programs (e.g. Seismostruct , DRAIN-2DX [44], Nonlinear form of SAP2000 [14], ANSYS [2]) can demonstrate nonlinear conduct and perform weakling examination specifically to acquire limit bend for two as well as three dimensional models of the structure. At the point when such projects are not accessible or the accessible PC projects couldn't perform weakling examination straightforwardly (e.g. ETABS [13], RISA [45], SAP90 [12]), a progression of successive versatile investigations are performed and superimposed to decide a power dislodging bend of the general structure. A removal controlled sucker investigation is essentially made out of the accompanying advances:

1. A two or three-dimensional model that represents the overall structural behaviour is created.
2. Bilinear or tri-linear load-deformation diagrams of all important members that affect lateral response are defined.
3. Gravity loads composed of dead loads and a specified portion of live loads are applied to the structural model initially.
4. A pre -defined lateral load pattern which is distributed along the building height is then applied.
5. Lateral loads are increased until some member(s) yield under the combined effects of gravity and lateral loads.
6. Base shear and roof displacement are recorded at first yielding.
7. The structural model is modified to account for the reduced stiffness of yielded member(s).
8. Gravity loads are evacuated, and another parallel load augmentation is connected to the adjusted basic model with the end goal that extra member(s) yield. Note that a different investigation with zero introductory conditions is performed on changed auxiliary model under each incremental horizontal load. Therefore, part powers toward the finish of an incremental horizontal load examination are acquired by including the powers from the present investigation to the total of those from the past additions. As such, the consequences of each incremental sidelong load investigation are superimposed.
9. Similarly, the lateral load increment and the roof displacement increment are added to the corresponding previous total values to obtain the accumulated values of the base shear and the roof displacement.
10. Steps 7, 8 and 9 are repeated until the roof displacement reaches a certain level of deformation or the structure becomes unstable.
11. The roof displacement is plotted with the base shear to get the global capacity(pushover) curve of the structure .

References:

1.Akbas, B., Kara, F.I., and Tugsal, U.M. (2007), “Comparison of Pushover Analysis and Nonlinear Dynamic Time History Analysis on Low-, Medium-, and High-Rise Steel Frames”, Project No. 02-A-02-01-03, Scientific Research ProjectFund, Gebze Institute of Technology

2. Applied Technology Council, ATC-40. Seismic evaluation and retrofit of concrete Buildings, California, 1996;

.

3.American Institute of Steel Construction Inc.– Steel Construction Manual (13thEdition)

4.AS 4100 ;1998 –Australian Code for Design of Steel Structures

5.Bandyopadhyay T K and GuhaArijit, “Steel Structures” – Seminar on Revision of National Building Code(NBC) organized by Indian Institute of Engineers, Delhi Centre, 2002.

6. Bandyopadhyay T K and GuhaArijit, “Code Stipulations – Indian & International Codes and Revision of IS800” Course at SV University College of Engineering, Tirupati, 2003

7. Bandyopadhyay T K and GuhaArijit, (2004), “Structural Member Design Based on Draft IS: 800 (Limit States Method)” -published in INSDAG journal, SteelIn Construction

8. Bandyopadhyay T K and GuhaArijit, (2005), "Structural Member Design Based on Draft IS: 800 (Limit StatesMethod), Members subjected to Combined Bending and Axial Forces” - published in INSDAG journal,

9. Chopra AK, Goel RK (2001), “A modal pushover analysis procedure to estimate seismic Demands for buildings: Theory and preliminary evaluation”, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Centre, University of California, Berkeley.

10. Duggal.S.K. „Limit State Design of Steel Structrues,Tata McGraw Hill Education

11. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA),(1997).NEHRP provisions for the seismic rehabilitation of buildings. Rep FEMA 273 and 274. Washington, DC: FEMA.

12. IS 1893 Part 1 (2002),”Indian Standard Criteria for Earthquake Resistant Design of Structures”, Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi

13. IS: 800 (1984), General Construction in Steel – Code of Practice, Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi, 2007.