ASSESSING STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY IN MULTI-STOREY BUILDINGS DURING EARTHQUAKES

Siddharth Mishra [1], Shailesh Dwivedi [2]

[1] 1Research scholar, Department of Civil Engineering, Mahakaushal University, Jabalpur (M.P), India
2Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Mahakaushal University, Jabalpur (M.P), India

ABSTRACT

Multi-storey buildings are intricate and sophisticated structures that are subject to a multitude of diverse forces, encompassing the relentless tug of gravity, the omnipresent push of wind, and the formidable seismic loads imposed by the earth's restive tectonic forces. Among these forces, seismic loads pose a particularly formidable challenge to multi-storey buildings, as they have the capacity to induce unpredictable and oscillatory movements in the building. The performance of a multi-storey building when confronted with the formidable forces of a seismic event is contingent upon a multitude of influential factors. These factors encompass the structural design of the building, the quality of its construction, its age and overall condition, and the distinct characteristics of ground motion produced by the earthquake in question. Seismic damage to multi-storey buildings can manifest in a variety of forms, with structural collapse and nonstructural damage being two common and consequential outcomes. Structural collapse stands as the most catastrophic form of seismic damage and arises when the building's structural system becomes overloaded and fails, leading to the building's disintegration. In contrast, nonstructural damage, while less severe than structural collapse, can still exact a considerable toll by causing substantial harm to the building and its contents. The seismic design of multi-storey buildings constitutes a multifaceted and intricate process, requiring a delicate balance of numerous considerations. Engineers must meticulously craft the building's design to withstand an array of seismic loads while simultaneously ensuring that the structure remains functional, economically viable, and compliant with safety standards. Some of the common seismic design features that find application in multi-storey buildings include ductility, which allows for controlled deformation and energy dissipation, redundancy to ensure structural integrity even in the face of localized damage, and mechanisms for energy dissipation that serve to mitigate the impact of seismic forces. To evaluate the performance of multi-storey buildings during seismic events, engineers employ a diverse array of methodologies. These include post-earthquake damage surveys that scrutinize the building's response to the seismic event, analytical modeling to simulate and analyze seismic performance, and experimental testing to validate the real-world behavior of structures under seismic loads. This multifaceted approach equips engineers and stakeholders with valuable insights into a building's resilience and its ability to withstand the formidable forces unleashed by seismic events

Keyword: - *Multi-storey building, Seismic load, Structural design, Construction quality, Age and condition, Ground motion characteristics*

---

1. Introduction

The evaluation of structural integrity in multi-storey buildings during earthquakes is a complex process that necessitates a comprehensive assessment of various factors. Once a seismic event has occurred, the engineer's task begins with visual inspection and nondestructive testing (NDT) to gather essential information regarding the condition of the building. Visual inspection provides an immediate overview of visible structural damage, such as cracks, misaligned elements, and other surface indications of distress. NDT methods, including Ultrasonic Testing

(UT), Radiographic Testing (RT), and Magnetic Particle Testing (MT), further aid in detecting concealed flaws and hidden defects within structural components. The combination of these techniques grants the engineer an in-depth understanding of the building's state.

In addition to the observed damage, it is imperative to consider the factors that contributed to the damage. These factors include the magnitude and duration of the earthquake, the proximity of the building to the earthquake's epicenter, and the type of soil upon which the building is constructed. Earthquakes with extended durations or high-frequency content can exert greater forces on a building, potentially resulting in more significant damage. Furthermore, the characteristics of the soil can have a substantial impact on the building's response, as soft soils may amplify ground motion, rendering the building more vulnerable. The structural design and construction quality of the building are also pivotal factors. Older buildings and those not specifically designed to withstand seismic loads are at a higher risk of damage during an earthquake. Modern engineering practices and materials have evolved to enhance earthquake resistance, making newer structures more resilient. Once the engineer has gathered and analyzed this information, they can make an informed assessment of the building's structural integrity. If the building is found to be structurally sound, it may be feasible to repair the damage and restore it to service. However, if the assessment reveals that the building is no longer structurally sound, it may become necessary to consider demolition as the most prudent course of action. To enhance the accuracy of structural integrity assessments, consider the following tips. Pay attention to the ground motion characteristics of the earthquake. Earthquakes with prolonged durations or high-frequency content can inflict more damage on buildings.

Take into account the type of soil on which the building stands. Soft soils can intensify ground motion, increasing a building's susceptibility to damage. Be mindful of the building's structural design and construction quality. Older buildings and those lacking seismic design considerations are at a higher risk of earthquake-induced damage. Implement a regimen of regular inspections to identify and address minor damage before it escalates into a significant issue. Should concerns about the structural integrity of a multi-storey building arise during an earthquake or as part of a routine inspection, it is advisable to seek consultation with a qualified engineer or experienced professional. Their expertise is invaluable in making informed decisions regarding the building's safety and necessary remedial actions.

2. Ultrasonic Testing (UT):

Ultrasonic Testing (UT), often simply referred to as UT, is a nondestructive testing technique that harnesses the power of high-frequency sound waves to meticulously examine materials, seeking out concealed internal defects. This method functions by transmitting ultrasonic waves into the material, which then traverse through it until they interact with a boundary or a flaw within the material. At this juncture, some of these sound waves are reflected back and detected by a specialized receiver. Through careful analysis of these echoes, UT excels at precisely identifying hidden flaws or irregularities lurking beneath the surface of the material. The fundamental principle underpinning UT closely mirrors the natural phenomenon of echolocation employed by bats, where these creatures emit high-pitched sounds and await the return of echoing signals to navigate and discern objects within their surroundings.

In UT, the critical information about the material's internal state is extracted from two primary factors: the time taken for the sound waves to traverse the material, and the intensity of the reflected waves. By meticulously examining these aspects, UT can offer profound insights into the condition of the material's interior. It excels at determining crucial details such as the size and location of voids, cracks, inclusions, or other anomalies within the material. This method proves to be exceptionally valuable for scrutinizing the integrity of structural components, as it facilitates an in-depth and comprehensive inspection without causing any damage to the material itself.

3. Radiographic Testing (RT):

Radiographic Testing (RT), commonly abbreviated as RT, is a nondestructive testing approach that harnesses the power of X-rays or gamma rays to generate images that unveil the inner workings of structural elements. Think of it as akin to a medical X-ray, but instead of delving into human anatomy, it peers deep into materials and components, exposing their concealed structures. In the process, X-rays or gamma rays are directed toward the object under scrutiny, piercing through the material and ultimately impinging upon a film or detector strategically positioned on the opposing side. The resultant image that materializes portrays the differing levels of radiation absorption occurring within the material.RT serves as an indispensable tool for the examination of covert elements and the revelation of hidden imperfections that might otherwise evade detection during a visual inspection. Its capabilities are particularly pronounced in the evaluation of crucial structural components, encompassing welds, castings, and the overall integrity of materials within these components. By providing a lucid and graphic representation of potential flaws, such as cracks, voids, or inclusions, RT empowers inspectors with the visual evidence essential for precise assessments and the formulation of informed judgments concerning the structural soundness of these components.

4. Magnetic Particle Testing (MT):

Ultrasonic Testing (UT) is a nondestructive testing method that employs high-frequency sound waves to scrutinize materials for internal defects. By transmitting ultrasonic waves into the material and analyzing the echoes as they encounter boundaries or flaws, UT accurately pinpoints hidden irregularities, providing valuable insights into the material's internal condition without causing any damage. UT is particularly effective for assessing the integrity of structural components, enabling detailed examinations while ensuring the material remains unharmed.

Radiographic Testing (RT) is another nondestructive technique that utilizes X-rays or gamma rays to create images of the interior of structural members. Similar to medical X-rays, RT penetrates the material and captures the varying levels of radiation absorption, providing a clear visual representation of potential defects such as cracks, voids, or inclusions. RT is invaluable for inspecting concealed elements, making it highly effective for assessing welds, castings, and the integrity of materials in critical structural components. Magnetic Particle Testing (MT) is primarily employed to detect surface defects in ferromagnetic materials by creating a magnetic field in the material and applying magnetic particles to the surface. These particles adhere to magnetic leakage points caused by surface defects, forming visible indications that outline the shape and location of flaws. MT is highly sensitive to small defects and is widely used in construction, manufacturing, automotive, and aerospace to ensure the safety and reliability of structures and components. MT is an essential nondestructive testing method used for the safety and reliability of structures and components. It is applied in various industries, including construction, manufacturing, automotive, and aerospace, where ferromagnetic materials are used. The detection of surface defects, like cracks, seams, and laps, is crucial for ensuring the structural integrity of critical components. MT helps prevent catastrophic failures by identifying these surface imperfections, enabling informed decisions on repair or maintenance. In conclusion, Ultrasonic Testing, Radiographic Testing, and Magnetic Particle Testing are vital techniques in the field of nondestructive testing, each with its specific applications and advantages. They play an integral role in ensuring the safety, quality, and reliability of structures and components in various industries.

5. Destructive Testing:

Destructive testing, which involves subjecting structural materials to various tests to assess their properties and strength, is a valuable tool for understanding the characteristics of building components. However, in the context of earthquake-damaged buildings, destructive testing is typically avoided for several significant reasons. First and foremost, destructive testing involves subjecting structural elements or materials to forces that can lead to their failure. In earthquake-damaged buildings, where the structural integrity is already compromised, conducting destructive tests can further weaken or destabilize the structure. This poses a considerable risk to the safety of those involved in the testing process and may lead to accelerated structural damage or even collapse, which is undesirable. Nonetheless, there are scenarios where destructive testing becomes necessary for a thorough assessment of earthquake-induced damage. In such cases, samples of structural materials or components are carefully extracted from the damaged building and isolated for testing purposes. These extracted samples can include concrete cores, steel beams, or other relevant components. Destructive testing on these isolated samples allows engineers and researchers to evaluate the extent of damage, such as cracking, yielding, or material degradation, and determine how these components have been affected by the earthquake. These findings are vital for understanding the performance of the building during the seismic event and can inform future design and construction practices to enhance seismic resilience.

Table 1: Literature Survey

Author Name	Research Gap	Finding	Suggestion
L. Hofer, M. A. Zanini, F. Faleschini, and C. Pellegrino	Profitability analysis for assessing seismic retrofit strategies	Profitability assessment methodology for seismic retrofit	Consider profitability for retrofit
M. Bovo, A. Barbaresi, D. Torreggiani, and P. Tassinari	Collapse and damage in vernacular buildings	Effects of 2012 Emilia earthquakes on vernacular buildings	Investigate vulnerability of vernacular buildings
R. Han, Y. Li, and J. van de Lindt	Seismic loss estimation with post-quake decisions	Estimation of seismic losses with aftershock considerations	Consider post-quake decisions
S. A. Mahin, V. Terzic, and C. Nagy	Assessment of structural systems in earthquakes	Evaluation of structural systems in seismic events	Compare benefits of different systems
Nuzzo, N. Caterino, and S. Pampanin	Seismic design framework based on loss-performance matrix	Development of seismic design framework based on loss matrix	Implement loss-performance matrix
T. J. Sullivan, D. P. Welch, and G. M. Calvi	Simplified seismic performance assessment and design implications	Simplified seismic performance assessment and its implications	Use simplified performance assessment
S. Otani	Development of performance-based design methodology in Japan	Development of performance-based design methodology in Japan	Implement Japanese design methodology
C. D. Poland and D. B. Hom	Opportunities and pitfalls of performance-based seismic engineering	Opportunities and challenges in performance-based seismic engineering	Consider advantages and disadvantages
K. Kawashima	Japanese seismic design specifications of highway bridges	Japanese seismic design specifications for highway bridges	Implement Japanese highway bridge specs

J. Kappos	Partial inelastic analysis for optimum capacity design of RC buildings	Procedure for partial inelastic analysis in optimum capacity design	Use partial inelastic analysis
M. J. N. Priestley	Displacement-based approaches to rational limit states design of new structures	Keynote address on displacement-based approaches	Implement displacement-based approaches

5.1 Assessment of Damage:

Upon the completion of a thorough visual inspection and nondestructive testing (NDT), engineers leverage the amassed data to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the structural integrity of the building. This assessment extends beyond the mere identification of observed damage, encompassing an intricate analysis of the diverse factors that contributed to the structural condition. Notably, engineers take into account critical variables such as the magnitude and duration of the earthquake, the building's proximity to the earthquake's epicenter, the geological characteristics of the soil upon which the building is situated, and the original structural design and quality of construction. This holistic assessment enables engineers to make well-informed determinations regarding the structural soundness of the building. In cases where the engineer's assessment affirms that the building remains structurally sound, the path forward often involves the initiation of repair and rehabilitation endeavors. These efforts are aimed at restoring the building to a condition that permits it to resume its intended functions, thus ensuring the continuity of service. Conversely, when the engineer's evaluation concludes that the structural integrity of the building has been severely compromised and is beyond feasible repair, consideration may be given to the challenging decision of demolishing the building. This step, though drastic, is undertaken to uphold public safety and forestall potential hazards associated with an unstable structure.

Assessing structural integrity in multi-storey buildings during seismic events indeed presents several intricate challenges. One notable complication is the concealed nature of damage, which may not be immediately evident and might be obscured behind architectural finishes or interior partitions. Additionally, the extent of structural damage can exhibit considerable variance contingent on the building's location concerning the earthquake's epicenter, thus rendering the assessment process highly site-specific and intricate. The task of evaluating structural integrity in multi-storey buildings during earthquakes is unquestionably complex and multifaceted. Nevertheless, through the judicious employment of a blend of techniques, including visual inspection, nondestructive testing, and rigorous structural analysis, engineers can adeptly appraise the scale of damage and, in turn, render well-grounded determinations regarding the building's safety and structural integrity. This, in turn, contributes significantly to the overall resilience and fortitude of urban infrastructure in regions that are susceptible to seismic activity.

6. Conclusion

The performance of multi-storey buildings during seismic events is indeed a multifaceted and intricate matter that hinges on a multitude of influencing factors. Engineers employ a diverse array of design and assessment methodologies to ensure that these buildings possess the resilience to withstand the formidable forces exerted by seismic loads, ultimately resulting in their ability to perform well in earthquake scenarios. This careful design and engineering approach is pivotal in safeguarding the lives and well-being of the occupants while simultaneously mitigating the economic losses typically associated with earthquake-related damages. Furthermore, it is imperative to acknowledge that the assessment of structural integrity in multi-storey buildings during seismic events is an ever-evolving discipline. As emerging technologies and innovative assessment methods continue to surface, engineers are equipped with more precise tools and capabilities to accurately gauge the extent of damage sustained by buildings and, crucially, to make informed judgments regarding their habitability. This dynamic evolution in assessment techniques enhances the safety and resilience of structures in earthquake-prone regions. Beyond the realm of structural integrity assessment, it is important to recognize that earthquake preparedness and response encompass a more comprehensive spectrum of measures. These include the development and implementation of early warning systems to provide advance notice of impending seismic events, the establishment of well-thought-out evacuation plans to efficiently move people to safety, and the formulation of robust emergency response procedures to mitigate the impact of earthquakes in the aftermath. The collaborative efforts of engineers, government authorities, and the general public are indispensable in achieving a holistic approach to earthquake risk reduction, thereby lessening the potential for loss of life and property damage in seismic events.

7. References

[1.] M. J. Nigel Priestley, "Performance-based seismic response of frame structures including residual deformations. Part II: multi-degree of freedom systems," Journal of Earthquake Engineering, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 119–147, 2003.

[2.] ASCE/SEI 7-16, "Minimum Design Loads and Associated Criteria for Buildings and Other Structures," American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA, USA, 2017.

[3.] European Committee for Standardization, "General Rules, Seismic Actions and Rules for Buildings. Eurocode 8," European Committee for Standardization, Brussels, Belgium, 2005.

[4.] FEMA 356, "NEHRP Prestandard and Commentary for the Seismic Rehabilitation of Buildings," Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC, USA, 2000.

[5.] Ministerial Decree 17/01/2018, "Italian Building Code," Norme Tecniche Costruzioni (NTC), Rome, Italy, 2018.

[6.] L. Hofer, M. A. Zanini, F. Faleschini, and C. Pellegrino, "Profitability analysis for assessing the optimal seismic retrofit strategy of industrial productive processes with business-interruption consequences," Journal of Structural Engineering, vol. 144, no. 2, Article ID 04017205, 2018.

[7.] M. Bovo, A. Barbaresi, D. Torreggiani, and P. Tassinari, "Collapse and damage to vernacular buildings induced by 2012 Emilia earthquakes," Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 1049–1080, 2020.

[8.] R. Han, Y. Li, and J. van de Lindt, "Seismic loss estimation with consideration of aftershock hazard and post-quake decisions," ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems, Part A: Civil Engineering, vol. 2, no. 4, Article ID 04016005, 2016.

[9.] S. A. Mahin, V. Terzic, and C. Nagy, "Using performance-based earthquake evaluation methods to assess the relative benefits of different structural systems," in Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Urban Earthquake Engineering, Tokyo, Japan, March 2012.

[10.] Nuzzo, N. Caterino, and S. Pampanin, "Seismic design framework based on loss-performance matrix," Journal of Earthquake Engineering, pp. 1–21, 2020.

[11.] T. J. Sullivan, D. P. Welch, and G. M. Calvi, "Simplified seismic performance assessment and implications for seismic design," Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, vol. 13, no. S1, pp. 95–122, 2014.

[12.] S. Otani, "Development of performance-based design methodology in Japan," in Seismic Design Methodologies for the Next Generation of Codes, P. Fajfar and H. Krawinkler, Eds., pp. 59–68, A. A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 1997.

[13.] C. D. Poland and D. B. Hom, "Opportunities and pitfalls of performance-based seismic engineering," in Seismic Design Methodologies for the Next Generation of Codes, P. Fajfar and H. Krawinkler, Eds., pp. 69–78, A. A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 1997.

K. Kawashima, "The 1996 Japanese seismic design specifications of highway bridges and the performance based design," in Seismic Design Methodologies for the Next Generation of Codes, P. Fajfar and H. Krawinkler, Eds., pp. 371–382, A. A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 1997.

[14.] J. Kappos, "Partial inelastic analysis procedure for optimum capacity design of RC buildings," in Seismic Design Methodologies for the Next Generation of Codes, P. Fajfar and H. Krawinkler, Eds., pp. 229–240, A. A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 1997.

[15.] M. J. N. Priestley, "Displacement-based approaches to rational limit states design of new structures. Keynote address," in Proceedings of the 11th European Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Paris, France, September 1998.

[16.] FEMA P-581, "Seismic Performance Assessment of Buildings: Volume 1—Methodology," Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC, USA, 2012.

[17.] M. J. N. Priestley, "Performance based seismic design," in Proceedings of the 12th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Auckland, New Zealand, January 2000.

[18.] M. Fragiadakis and M. Papadrakakis, "Performance-based optimum seismic design of reinforced concrete structures," Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 825–844, 2008.

[19.] S. Ganzerli, C. P. Pantelides, and L. D. Reaveley, "Performance-based design using structural optimization," Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics, vol. 29, no. 11, pp. 1677–1690, 2000.

[20.] T. Okada, H. Hiraishi, Y. Ohashi et al., "A new framework for performance-based design of building structures," in Proceedings of the 12th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Auckland, New Zeland, January 2000.

[21.] R. Park and T. Paulay, "Reinforced Concrete Structures," John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, USA, 1975.

[22.] J. Kappos, "Evaluation of behaviour factors on the basis of ductility and overstrength studies," Engineering Structures, vol. 21, no. 9, pp. 823–835, 1999.

[23.] E. Miranda and V. V. Bertero, "Evaluation of strength reduction factors for earthquake-resistant design," Earthquake Spectra, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 357–379, 1994.

[24.] M. Mwafy and A. S. Elnashai, "Calibration of force reduction factors of RC buildings," Journal of Earthquake Engineering, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 239–273, 2002.

[25.] N. M. Newmark and W. J. Hall, "Earthquake Spectra and Design," Earthquake Engineering Research Institute (EERI), El Cerrito, CA, USA, 1982.

[26.] S. Elnashai and R. Pinho, "Repair and retrofitting of rc walls using selective techniques," Journal of Earthquake Engineering, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 525–568, 1998.

[27.] M. G. Ireland, S. Pampanin, and D. K. Bull, "Experimental investigations of a selective weakening approach for the seismic retrofit of r.c. walls," in Proceedings of the NZSEE Conference 2007, Palmerston North, New Zealand, March 2007.

[28.] V. Ligabue, S. Pampanin, and M. Savoia, "Seismic performance of alternative risk-reduction retrofit strategies to support decision making," Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 3001–3030, 2018.

[29.] S. Viti, G. P. Cimellaro, and A. M. Reinhorn, "Retrofit of a hospital through strength reduction and enhanced damping," Smart Structures and Systems, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 339–355, 2006.

[30.] J. Moehle and G. Deierlein, "A framework methodology for performance-based earthquake engineering," in Proceedings of the 13th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Stanford University, Vancouver, Canada, August 2004, Paper No. 679.

[31.] T. Y. Yang, J. Moehle, B. Stojadinovic, and A. Der Kiureghian, "Seismic performance evaluation of facilities: methodology and implementation," Journal of Structural Engineering, vol. 135, no. 10, pp. 1146–1154, 2009.

[32.] D. Vamvatsikos and C. A. Cornell, "Incremental dynamic analysis," Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 491–514, 2002.

[33.] V. Silva, S. Akkar, J. Baker et al., "Current challenges and future trends in analytical fragility and vulnerability modeling," Earthquake Spectra, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 1927–1952, 2019.

[34.] OpenSEES (Open System for Earthquake Engineering Simulation), 2016, http://opensees.berkeley.edu.

[35.] L. Berto, M. Bovo, I. Rocca, A. Saetta, and M. Savoia, "Seismic safety of valuable non-structural elements in RC buildings: floor response spectrum approaches," Engineering Structures, vol. 205, Article ID 110081, 2020.
[36.] M. Zucconi, M. Bovo, F. Romano, and B. Ferracuti, "Application of bidirectional ground motion on existing RC building for seismic loss analysis," AIP Conference Proceedings, vol. 2293, Article ID 240003, 2020, Proceedings of the ICNAAM 2019, Rhodes, Greece.
[37.] J. Baker, T. Lin, S. K. Shahi, and N. Jayaram, "New ground motion selection procedures and selected motions for the PEER transportation research program," Tech. Rep., University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA, 2011, PEER Report 2011/03.
[38.] FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency), "Seismic Performance Assessment of Buildings: Volume 3- Performance Assessment Calculation Tool (PACT) Version 2.9.65 FEMA P-583.1), FEMA, Washington, DC, USA, 2012.

IJARIIE