

## Executive Summary

This report contains a detailed description and preliminary analysis of the structure of Parkridge Center - Phase VI. The scope of this report is limited to basic gravity analysis of columns, beams, and girders and a simplified lateral check of the lateral resisting elements within the building. It was found in this report that the assumed loading and distributions of loads throughout the building were within allowable tolerances; with checked members ending up at or within one member size of the original design by the projects structural engineer.

The only area within this report that falls outside these tolerances is in the calculation of the building seismic base shear. The calculated result is approximately $42 \%$ larger than that used by the original designers. The primary reasoning for this difference is in my own inexperience with the seismic design criteria. Although this loading fell outside the tolerances it is a conservative error which would result in larger member sizes than those in the original design.


## I ntroduction

A seven story steel building with a composite floor system and sloping columns on its south face, Parkridge Center - Phase VI is to be the "crown jewel" of the office complex it is located in. The building utilizes an open plan on the 6 stories above the lobby. Its mechanical system, a variable air volume system, is set up to service each half of the building separately through two individual duct loops.

The main structural challenges with this building are its sloping columns and the garden located on the west side of the roof. The sloping columns will require special attention with regards to the moment created at the base of the building and transferred to the foundation. The challenges with garden will be primarily focused on loading from the individual elements for example the weight of a mature tree can vary depending on the conditions it is grown under.

## Structural System Description

## Foundation and Slab on Grade

The foundation is comprised of shallow footings ranging in size from 5'-0" x $5^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime} \times$ $12^{\prime \prime}$ to $20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime} \times 20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime} \times 42^{\prime \prime}$. The specified concrete strength of the footings is 4000 PSI. The allowable bearing pressure on the soil was found to be 3000 PSF by the geotechnical engineer. The slab on grade shall be 4 " thick and reinforced with $6 x 6$ 10/10 Welded Wire Mesh (WWM) on a 6 mil vapor barrier. Also beneath the slab on grade there shall be 4" of drainage fill. There are no floors below grade in this building.

## Typical Floor

Each floor contains the same three by ten bay core. The south most exterior bay on each floor varies based on the slope of the columns on the south face creating larger floor area on higher level floors. Floors 2 thru 5 contain extra floor area on the north side of the building above the arcade. The North-South ( $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ ) spans of the core three bays are $37^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ for the exterior bays and $35^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ for the interior bay. The East-West ( $\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{W}$ ) spans of the core bays are $25^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ for the first bay and then $25^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ for the remaining bays. Intermediate beams are spaced at the third points of each bay and span in the N-S direction. Typical beam sizes for the core bays are W21's for the interior girders, W18's for the exterior girders, and W16's for the intermediate
beams. Each beam is cambered to $1-1 / 4$ " this was done most likely to minimize ponding of concrete at center span.

## Floor System

Each floor above grade uses a composite deck made up of $31 / 4$ " Lightweight concrete on 2 "-20 gage steel deck. The total floor thickness is $51 / 4$ ". The slab itself is to be reinforced with $6 \times 6-10 / 10$ WWM.

## Columns

Each column extends 3 floors and is spliced above the slab. The columns along the south face of the building, column line A.1, are sloped outward from the ground to the roof. Typical sizes for the sloped columns begin at a $\mathrm{W} 12 \times 65$ at the roof to the $7^{\text {th }}$ floor, W12x96 from the $7^{\text {th }}$ floor to the $4^{\text {th }}$ floor, and W12x152 from the $4^{\text {th }}$ floor to the foundation.

## Lateral System

Five braced frames make up the lateral system for the building. There are two frames in the N -S direction and three frames in the E-W direction. The diagonal members of the frames are HSS $10 \times 10 \times 1 / 2$ for the $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ frames and HSS $8 \times 8 \times 1 / 2$ for the E-W frames. Frames two and three are connected by two intermediate frames at the roof. The diagonal members of the two intermediate frames are HSS 8x8x1/4. Frame three is an eccentric braced frame while all the other frames are concentrically braced.

## Codes

The codes used in the design of Parkridge Center - Phase VI are as follows:

- International Building Code 2000 (IBC 2000)
o 1607.0 - Live Loads
o 1609.0 - Wind Loads
o 1614.0-1620.0 - Seismic Loading
- American Concrete Institute (ACI)
o 301 - Structural Concrete for Buildings
o 315 - Manual of Standard Practice for Detailing Reinforced Concrete Structures
o 318 - ACI Building Code Requirements for Reinforced Concrete For this review I have chosen to check the design using IBC 2003, ASCE7-05, and the latest version of ACI were applicable. Using the most recent codes may yield different results than obtained by the original designers; however the differences will be limited to changes in the applicable sections of each code.


## Gravity Loads

| Live Loads - I BC Table 1607.1 |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| Roof Garden | 100 PSF |
| Roof | 18 PSF |
| Offices | 50 PSF |
| Corridors | 80 PSF |
| Stair and Exits | 100 PSF |
| Lobbies and First Floor Corridors | 100 PSF |

To be consistent with the original design a value of 100 PSF will be used as the live load on a typical floor.

| Snow Load <br> Chapter $\mathbf{7}$ ASCE7-05 |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\mathrm{Pg}_{\mathrm{e}}$ | 30 PSF |
| $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{e}}$ | 0.9 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{t}}$ | 1.0 |
| I | 1.0 |
| $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{f}, \min }$ | 20 PSF |
| $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{f}, \text { Calculated }}$ | 18.9 PSF |
| $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{f}}$ | 20 PSF |

The roof live load will be taken to be equal to the calculated snow load of 20 PSF.

| Dead Loads |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Typical Floor |  |  |  |
| Composite Floor System | 41 PSF | Estimated Using United Steel Deck Catalog |  |
| Misc. (Self wt., finishes, etc.) | 10 PSF | Per discussion with Structural Engineer |  |
| Ponding of Concrete | 10 PSF | Per discussion with Structural Engineer |  |
| Roof |  |  |  |
| Deck | 2 PSF | Estimated Using United Steel Deck Catalog |  |
| Insulation | 3 PSF |  |  |
| Roofing | 20 PSF |  |  |
| Curtain Wall |  |  |  |
| Glass Curtain Wall | .215 KLF | Per Discussion with Structural Engineer |  |
| Pre-cast Assembly | .55 KLF | Per Discussion with Structural Engineer |  |
| Roof Garden |  |  |  |

The dead loads listed above combined with the 100 PSF live load on the floor system should allow for flexible tenant uses in the space provided on each floor.

## Wind

The Following wind loads were calculated using chapter 6 of ASCE7-05.
For wind pressure distributions and wind shear distributions see diagrams 1-4 in the appendix.
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| Total Worst Case Wind Load |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Each Direction |  |
| $z$ | P |
| $0-15$ | 21.172 |
| 20 | 21.810 |
| 25 | 22.319 |
| 30 | 22.829 |
| 40 | 23.594 |
| 50 | 24.231 |
| 60 | 24.741 |
| 70 | 25.251 |
| 80 | 25.761 |
| 90 | 26.143 |
| 100 | 26.398 |
| 115.17 | 26.881 |
|  |  |


| Wind Shear Force at each floor (Kips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E-W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Width | Floor | Height 1 | Load 1 | Height 2 | Load 2 | Height 3 | Load 3 | Shear | Factored |
| 127.92 | 2 | 7.50 | 21.17 | 5.00 | 21.81 | 1.67 | 22.32 | 39.02 | 62.43 |
| 127.92 | 3 | 3.33 | 22.32 | 5.00 | 22.83 | 5.00 | 23.59 | 39.21 | 62.73 |
| 127.92 | 4 | 5.00 | 23.59 | 8.33 | 24.23 |  |  | 40.92 | 65.47 |
| 127.92 | 5 | 1.67 | 24.23 | 10.00 | 24.74 | 1.67 | 25.25 | 42.20 | 67.52 |
| 127.92 | 6 | 8.33 | 25.25 | 5.00 | 25.76 |  |  | 43.39 | 69.43 |
| 127.92 | 7 | 5.00 | 25.76 | 9.17 | 26.14 |  |  | 47.13 | 75.41 |
| 127.92 | Roof | 0.83 | 26.14 | 6.67 | 26.40 |  |  | 25.30 | 40.48 |
| 45 | Penthouse Roof | 9.25 | 26.88 |  |  |  |  | 11.19 | 17.90 |
| N-S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Width | Floor | Height 1 | Load 1 | Height 2 | Load 2 | Height 3 | Load 3 | Shear | Factored |
| 270.00 | 2 | 7.50 | 21.17 | 5.00 | 21.81 | 1.67 | 22.32 | 82.36 | 131.78 |
| 270.00 | 3 | 3.33 | 22.32 | 5.00 | 22.83 | 5.00 | 23.59 | 82.76 | 132.41 |
| 270.00 | 4 | 5.00 | 23.59 | 8.33 | 24.23 |  |  | 86.37 | 138.19 |
| 270.00 | 5 | 1.67 | 24.23 | 10.00 | 24.74 | 1.67 | 25.25 | 89.07 | 142.51 |
| 270.00 | 6 | 8.33 | 25.25 | 5.00 | 25.76 |  |  | 91.59 | 146.55 |
| 270.00 | 7 | 5.00 | 25.76 | 9.17 | 26.14 |  |  | 99.48 | 159.17 |
| 270.00 | Roof | 0.83 | 26.14 | 6.67 | 26.40 |  |  | 53.40 | 85.44 |
| 212 | Penthouse Roof | 9.25 | 26.88 |  |  |  |  | 52.71 | 84.34 |

For more detailed wind calculations please see tables 1 and 2 in the appendix.


The preceding image shows the distribution of the factored wind shear on each level. The factored wind shear is equal to 1.6 * the wind shear, this was then compared to the factored seismic shear which has a factor of 1 in the load cases discussed in this report.

## Seismic

The following seismic loads were calculated using Chapter 12 of ASCE7-05. The calculated seismic base shear varies from that used by the original designers by approximately $+42 \%$. The seismic base shear value in this report is overly conservative. My own inexperience with the seismic code and interpretation of the loading has contributed to this higher base shear value.



The calculations of building weight and base shear can be found in Table 3 and 4 in the appendix.

## Other Loading

Loading that is not specifically addressed in this report is the application of mechanical systems on the roof these loads were estimated and used in the calculation of the buildings overall weight for a seismic base shear calculation. The column, beam, and girder checks that will be discussed later in this report were done in a location that is not directly affected by the mechanical equipment loads.

Also, the sky garden loading specifically from the pre-engineered trellis and mature trees, these items will be addressed in later reports.

The loading effects from the sloping columns were also omitted from this report and will be addressed in later reports.

## I ndividual Member Spot Checks

For the purposes of this report one (1) intermediate beam, girder, column, and lateral braced frame have been chosen to spot check the estimated loading against that of the original designers. All discrepancies in member size and magnitude of loads will be discussed in this section.

It was determined that the original design was done using the LRFD method. All loading on the members shall be factored and all load combinations will be checked to determine the governing combination.

## Intermediate Beam "Beam 1"

The method used to check the loading on the intermediate beam was tributary area. The end conditions of the beam were assumed to be pin-pin as there is no moment connection indicated at this location on the drawings. The composite beam tables (Table 3-19, pg 3-156 to 3-189) and shear stud capacity table (Table 3-21, pg. 3207) in the $13^{\text {th }}$ edition of the AISC Manual of Steel construction were used to obtain the member sizes and amount of shear studs required. The following image will illustrate the location and tributary area of "Beam 1"


For this case I determined that the live load was reducible and ended up with a design live load of 85.27 PSF which is within the allowable limits of 0.5 * the original live load.

To simplify the process an excel spreadsheet was made to calculate the maximum moment on the beam from its applied loading as well as maximum shear. Then the user only need estimate a value for "a" and do a preliminary hand calculation of $Y_{2}$ to come up with a starting member size and plastic neutral axis (PNA) location to check. The spreadsheet then interpolates between values of $\Phi M_{n}$ if necessary and calculates the required number of shear studs based on $\Sigma Q_{n}$. This spreadsheet can be viewed in the appendix and is labeled as table 5 and 6.

From the excel calculations a $\mathrm{W} 16 \times 31$ with 16 shear studs was selected. The original member is a W16x31 with 26 shear studs and is cambered at $1-1 / 4$ ". The variation in amount of shear studs could be related to the amount of assumed studs per rib as well as serviceability issues. The original beam is cambered at $1-1 / 4$ " to help prevent ponding of concrete at the mid span of the beam and also to keep the beam with in serviceability requirements. I have not addressed serviceability requirements in this report but will address them in later reports.

## "Girder 1"

The method used to check "Beam 1" also apply to "Girder 1", also the same excel spreadsheet was used to speed up the process. The following image shows the location and tributary area of "Girder 1".


The calculated member for "Girder 1 " is a $\mathrm{W} 21 \times 44$ with 31 shear studs. The original design calls for a W21x44 with 20 shear studs spaced at $(9,2,9)$ along the beams length. The variation in amount of shear studs here is most likely based on the original designers assumptions as to the amount of composite action achieved at "Girder 1". The distribution of shear studs is based on the fact that there are two intermediate beams framing into this girder effectively placing zero (0) shear in the section between the two intermediate beams eliminating the need for shear to be transferred from the slab to the steel member. This also is a reason why my calculation contains more shear studs; a more detailed analysis would yield the same results as the original designer.

## "Column 1"

"Column 1" was chosen in a location as to be minimally effected by the mechanical systems on the roof as I felt my estimated loads in some of those locations would lead to large discrepancies in sizes. It was also chosen because it is a gravity column and is much quicker to check. The following image shows the location and tributary area of "Column 1 " which is located along column line 3.


The tributary area method was also used in determining the loading on "column 1"; Live load reductions were not considered in the design of the column. Second order effects were also not considered in the design of the column.

The hand calculation of "Column 1" can be found in the appendix and is labeled hand calc. - 1.

The calculated member at the base of the building for "Column 1" is a W14x145. The original design calls for a W14×132. My calculation ended in an increased member by one size. The calculated Axial load was 1612 Kips with a $K=0.7$ for a fixed-pin condition and $L=15 \mathrm{ft}$. $K L_{\text {eff }}=10.5 \mathrm{ft}$. interpolating I found that a $\mathrm{W} 14 \times 132$ has a $\Phi P_{n}=1605$ Kips. My design is within a reasonable amount of error and conservative when compared to the original design. The main source of error here is over estimation of loads.

## Lateral Braced Frame "Frame 1"

"Frame 1" is located in the eastern quadrant of the building and spans in the eastwest direction. The distributions of the lateral forces to "Frame 1" were assumed to be half the applied factored shear force. This was made assuming both Frame 1 and Frame 4 are made up of the same members.
"Frame 1" was chosen as its design is controlled by wind, because of the discrepancies in my calculated seismic base shear I felt this would provide a better check of member sizes.

The general layout and applied forces can be seen in the image on the following page.

Taking the load down to the base of the frame I developed the following free body diagram at the intersection of the diagonals between the foundation level (FND) and the $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor.
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To simplify the design I have sized the worst case and assigned that size to all other lateral members, this is consistent with what the original designers called for.

My spot check yielded that an HSS $10 \times 10 \times 5 / 16$ section is sufficient for the loading. The original design calls for HSS $10 \times 10 \times 1 / 2$ sections. The original design was probable bumped up to a HSS $10 \times 10 \times 1 / 2$ for serviceability issues. My design is within acceptable limits of the original.

The hand calculation for "Frame 1" can be found in the appendix and is labeled hand calc. - 2.

## Impact from foundation on Superstructure

With the shallow footings used in this building special consideration will have to be taken when transfer moment and shear down into the foundation. The sloping columns will also create a higher overturning moment.

## Appendix
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## Typical Building Footprint



Wind Pressures E-W Diagram 1


Wind Pressure N-S Diagram 2
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## Factored Wind Shear E-W Diagram 3



Factored Wind Shear N-S Diagram 4


Wind Load Calculation Spreadsheet - Table 1 and 2


| Windward |  | Leeward |  | Sidewall |  | Roof |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E-W |  | E-W |  | E-W |  | E-W |  |
| $z$ | P | z | P | z | P | 0 to h/2 | -14.275 |
| 0-15 | 15.168 | 0-15 | -6.004 | 0-15 | -10.140 | $\mathrm{h} / 2$ to h | -14.275 |
| 20 | 15.805 | 20 | -6.004 | 20 | -10.140 | h to 2h | -6.004 |
| 25 | 16.315 | 25 | -6.004 | 25 | -10.140 | $>2 \mathrm{~h}$ | -1.869 |
| 30 | 16.825 | 30 | -6.004 | 30 | -10.140 |  |  |
| 40 | 17.590 | 40 | -6.004 | 40 | -10.140 |  |  |
| 50 | 18.227 | 50 | -6.004 | 50 | -10.140 |  |  |
| 60 | 18.737 | 60 | -6.004 | 60 | -10.140 |  |  |
| 70 | 19.247 | 70 | -6.004 | 70 | -10.140 |  |  |
| 80 | 19.756 | 80 | -6.004 | 80 | -10.140 |  |  |
| 90 | 20.139 | 90 | -6.004 | 90 | -10.140 |  |  |
| 100 | 20.394 | 100 | -6.004 | 100 | -10.140 |  |  |
| 115.17 | 20.877 | 115.17 | -6.004 | 115.17 | -10.140 |  |  |
| N-S |  | N-S |  | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ |  | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ |  |
| z | P | z | P | z | P | 0 to h/2 | -13.897 |
| 0-15 | 14.948 | 0-15 | -1.742 | 0-15 | -9.846 | $\mathrm{h} / 2$ to h | -13.897 |
| 20 | 15.572 | 20 | -1.742 | 20 | -9.846 | h to 2 h | -5.794 |
| 25 | 16.072 | 25 | -1.742 | 25 | -9.846 | $>2 \mathrm{~h}$ | -1.742 |
| 30 | 16.571 | 30 | -1.742 | 30 | -9.846 |  |  |
| 40 | 17.320 | 40 | -1.742 | 40 | -9.846 |  |  |
| 50 | 17.945 | 50 | -1.742 | 50 | -9.846 |  |  |
| 60 | 18.444 | 60 | -1.742 | 60 | -9.846 |  |  |
| 70 | 18.944 | 70 | -1.742 | 70 | -9.846 |  |  |
| 80 | 19.443 | 80 | -1.742 | 80 | -9.846 |  |  |
| 90 | 19.818 | 90 | -1.742 | 90 | -9.846 |  |  |
| 100 | 20.067 | 100 | -1.742 | 100 | -9.846 |  |  |
| 115.17 | 20.541 | 115.17 | -1.742 | 115.17 | -9.846 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intermediate Tables for Wind Load Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kz, Kh |  |  | G |  |  |
| z, ft. | C |  | B, E-W | 121.43 | ft |
| 0-15 | 0.85 |  | B, N -S | 267 | ft |
| 20 | 0.90 |  | h | 115.17 | ft |
| 25 | 0.94 |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | 0.98 |  | I | 500 | ft |
| 40 | 1.04 |  | z, bar | 69.102 | ft |
| 50 | 1.09 |  | z,min | 15 | ft |
| 60 | 1.13 |  | e,bar | 0.2 |  |
| 70 | 1.17 |  |  |  |  |
| 80 | 1.21 |  | c | 0.2 |  |
| 90 | 1.24 |  |  |  |  |
| 100 | 1.26 |  | Iz | 0.176821 |  |
| 115.17 | 1.30 |  | gq | 3.4 |  |
| 120 | 1.31 |  | gv | 3.4 |  |
| 140 | 1.36 |  |  |  |  |
| 160 | 1.39 |  | Lz | 579.65 |  |
| 180 | 1.43 |  |  |  |  |
| 200 | 1.46 |  | Q, E-W | 0.858 |  |
| 250 | 1.53 |  | Q, N-S | 0.821 |  |
| 300 | 1.59 |  |  |  |  |
| 350 | 1.64 |  | G, E-W | 0.859 |  |
| 400 | 1.69 |  | G, N-S | 0.841 |  |
| 450 | 1.73 |  |  |  |  |
| 500 | 1.77 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | L/B, E-W | 0.45 |  |
|  |  |  | L/B, N-S | 2.20 |  |
| z, ft. | q |  |  |  |  |
| 0-15 | 15.771 |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | 16.699 |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 17.441 |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | 18.183 |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | 19.297 |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | 20.224 |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | 20.967 |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | 21.709 |  |  |  |  |
| 80 | 22.451 |  |  |  |  |
| 90 | 23.008 |  |  |  |  |
| 100 | 23.379 |  |  |  |  |
| 115.17 | 24.082 | <----------- qh |  |  |  |

## Seismic Building Weight and Base Shear - Table 3 \& 4

| Calculation of Building Weight |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ASCE7-05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DL |  | Weight |  |
| Floor | -- | SF | -- | KSF | -- | kips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | 32079.313 | SF | 0.061 | KSF | 1956.838 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| kips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 31705.554 | SF | 0.061 | KSF | 1934.039 | kips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 32242.852 | SF | 0.061 | KSF | 1966.814 | kips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 31415.809 | SF | 0.061 | KSF | 1916.364 | kips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 31807.059 | SF | 0.061 | KSF | 1940.231 | kips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 32198.309 | SF | 0.061 | KSF | 1964.097 | kips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roof | 19485.282 | SF | 0.025 | KSF | 487.132 | kips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Garden | 6371.666 | SF | 0.16 | KSF | 1019.467 | kips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mechanical | 6750.000 | SF | 0.14 | KSF | 945.000 | kips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Penthouse roof | 6750.000 | SF | 0.025 | KSF | 168.750 | kips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total: | 14298.731 | kips |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Precast Panels |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wall | Perimeter |  | Height |  | DL |  | Weight |  |
| 1 | 765.813 | LF | 15.00 | Ft | 0.036 | KSF | 413.54 | kips |
| 2 | 810.978 | LF | 13.33 | Ft | 0.036 | KSF | 389.27 | kips |
| 3 | 801.849 | LF | 13.33 | Ft | 0.036 | KSF | 384.89 | kips |
| 4 | 809.401 | LF | 13.33 | Ft | 0.036 | KSF | 388.51 | kips |
| 5 | 784.479 | LF | 13.33 | Ft | 0.036 | KSF | 376.55 | kips |
| 6 | 788.229 | LF | 13.33 | Ft | 0.036 | KSF | 378.35 | kips |
| 7 | 791.979 | LF | 15.00 | Ft | 0.036 | KSF | 427.67 | kips |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total: | 2758.78 | kips |


| Total Building Weight: | 17057.508 | Kips |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
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## Composite Beam and Girder Spreadsheet - Tables 5 \& 6




## Column 1 - Hand Calc 1



## STRUCTURAL DESIGN GROUP, LIMITED <br> CONSULTING STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS <br> Gaithersburg, Maryland • Miami, Florida

Job THESIS - Coumal CHEck SHEET NO. OF DATE CALCULATED BY SCALE


Frame 1 - Hand Calc 2



$\xrightarrow{t} \sum F_{x}=\operatorname{sio} \cdot 2^{k}-R_{0_{1}} \cos \left(\theta_{2}\right)-R_{\theta_{2}} \cos \left(\theta_{2}\right)=0$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
+\quad\left[F_{y}=-R_{D_{1}} \operatorname{Sin}\left(Q_{2}\right)+R_{D_{D_{2}}} S_{1}\right. \\
R_{D_{1}}=R_{D_{2}}
\end{array}
$$

$\sum F_{x}=510.2-2 R_{D_{1}} \cos \left(\theta_{2}\right)=0$
$-2 R_{p_{1}} C_{0 .}\left(\theta_{2}\right)=-510.2$
$R_{1}, \cos \left(\theta_{2}\right)=\frac{510.2}{2}$
$R_{D_{2}}=R_{D_{1}}=\frac{510.2}{2 \cdot \cos \left(\theta_{2}\right)}=\frac{510.2}{2 \cos (40.6)}=335.98^{k}$
$F_{7}=46^{\mathrm{kxi}}(0.90)=41.4 \leftarrow$ controuss
$F_{u}=58 \mathrm{ksi}(0.75)=43.5$


