



# TECHNICAL REPORT ONE

## **1776 Wilson Boulevard**

Arlington Virginia

Joshua Urban

Structural Option

Advisor: Dr. Thomas Boothby

September 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011

## Table of Contents

xecutive Summary2
troduction3
te Conditions4
ructural System Overview
Foundation6
Floor System
Roof System
Columns
Lateral System9
esign Codes10
laterial Properties
esign Loads11
esign Analysis12
Wind Loads13
Seismic Loads15
Spot Checks
onclusions17
ppendices
Appendix A: Framing Plans19
Appendix B: Wall Sections and Assemblies22
Appendix C: Wind Loads26
Appendix D: Seismic Loads
Appendix E: Snow Loads
Appendix F: Spot Checks45

### **Executive Summary**

Technical report one serves as a structural concepts and existing conditions report centered on the 1776 Wilson Boulevard project located in Arlington Virginia. Research was done on the location and structural system used for this project and the latest codes and standards were used to perform analysis and checks.

1776 Wilson utilizes a post tensioned concrete structure with two lateral force resisting systems that work together to resist and transfer the lateral loads. The geotechnical report done on the site led to the choice of a shallow four inch slab on grade foundation. The floors are flat slab reinforced concrete slabs with drop panels at the column locations. Post tensioning begins at the second story where the office spaces begin and continues to the top floor, including the penthouse. High strength concrete is utilized in order to create open spaces and high ceiling heights, especially on the ground floor where there is enough space to have tenant mezzanines. The two lateral systems used are reinforced concrete shear walls on the bottom three stories and ordinary reinforced concrete moment frames on the upper stories.

The lateral loads were calculated using ASCE 7-10. Wind loads were found using the Main Wind Force Resisting System (MWFRS) directional procedure and the penthouse was treated separately using chapter 29. Some simplification was done to the floor plan and the treatment of the two lateral force resisting systems. A more detailed analysis will follow once a better understanding of how the two systems work together is gained. The Equivalent Lateral Force Method was used for seismic loads. After the analysis, it was determined that the seismic base shear controls the over turning moment.

Spot checks were performed on an interior column at the ground level and a portion of a two way post tensioned slab. Only gravity loads were taken into account for the column check so my designed column which matched the size of the actual column used will end up being larger once lateral loads are considered which could explain the use of 8000 psi concrete compared to the 5000 psi I used for the check. The slab check included thickness, precompression stress, stresses immediately after jacking, and stresses at service loads in accordance with ACI 318-08. Two stresses at service loads were not within permissible limits by code. Assumptions made due to lack of information at this time could be the cause of this. It is important to note that more information was gained concerning the tendons used that will change the check done. This information was not gained in time to include in this report but will be used in a more detailed analysis of the floor slabs for a future technical report.

### Introduction

Located in the Rosslyn/Ballston corridor of Arlington Virginia, 1776 Wilson Boulevard will be a Class A office building with retail space and three and a half levels of below grade parking. Currently under construction, the building is to be built on a previously contaminated Brownfield site that has been redeveloped. Scheduled to finish in August of 2012, 1776 Wilson will be approximately 249,000 SF and the lump sum contract is valued at 63.5 million dollars.

Designed by RTKL Associates, the three and half level parking garage will be able to hold over 200 cars, all 26,000 SF of retail space will be located on the ground floor, and the upper four floors will contain 108,000 SF of flexible office space perfect for a building that currently searching for future tenants. The retail space will have a high ceiling making it possible for tenant mezzanines. Most of the mechanical equipment will be located in a penthouse on top of the building. Besides the flexible office space, one of



the biggest interior aspects of the building is the luminous lobby that complements the generous amount of day lighting the building will receive. 1776 Wilson will also provide downtown convenience, it is to be located within walking distance of two metro stations and several retail outlets and restaurants are within close proximity of the site.

Fig. 1 Lobby Rendering

1776 Wilson Boulevard also goes above and beyond the norm when it comes to sustainability; the project is designed to be LEED Platinum. The numerous green features include a 17,000 SF green roof, photovoltaic solar panels on the roof, and an incentive program aimed at educating tenants on the sustainability features of the building.



Fig. 2 Green Roof Rendering

Arlington County's C-0-2.5 zoning district will house the finished building; this area generally serves commercial office buildings, hotels, and apartments. The upper floors will be considered separate mixed use occupancy while the parking levels are non separated mixed use. A generous amount of glazing helps create a well and naturally lit interior. Typical one inch thick windows with a U value ranging from 0.26 to 0.28 decorate the facades along with aluminum framed curtain walls. The rest of the façade features pre cast concrete and masonry panels. The roof consists of a combination of 10 and 12 inch thick post-tensioned slabs with roof pavers. The PV solar panels will add 6.6 to 6.8 psf to the roof dead load. In addition to the roof pavers, the roof will be insulated and covered by garden covering. Where roof pavers and garden covering aren't present, elastomeric cementitious topped insulation is used.

## Site Conditions

The site is essentially rectangular with approximate dimensions of 275 feet in the North to South direction and 125 to 200 feet in the East to West direction. This provides a total foot print area of approximately 45,500 SF. The existing site grades slope slightly from the North to the South. The surrounding area includes both residential and commercial buildings; the site itself was occupied by one to two story buildings before the project began.



Fig. 3 Aerial View of Site

The results found in the geotechnical report for the project were based on nine soil borings. Ground cover at the site was variable and consisted of one of the following:

- 1-3 inches of asphalt with 1-21 inches of gravel below
- 2 inches of gravel
- 4 to 6 inches of top soil

Below the ground cover, a geotechnical report provided by ECS Mid-Atlantic done on the site broke the soil down into three stratums:

Stratum	Name	Description
I	Fill/Possible Fill	17-36 feet below site grades consisting of various amounts of sand, gravel, and clay
II	Natural Alluvial/Marine Solids	28-52 feet below site grades and under stratum 1, this stratum consists of poorly graded sand, clayey sand, and low plasticity clay with varying gravel content
III	Residual Soils/Weathered Rock	Below stratum 2 and consists of Micaceous silty sand with rock fragments.

**Table 1 Soil Stratums** 

It was also known that this particular area has high groundwater flow. The ground water is to be controlled by a dewatering system that will need to be put in place during below grade construction.

1776 Wilson falls into Arlington's C-0-2.5 zoning district. This district is used for office buildings, commercial uses including retail, as well as hotels and apartments. The ratio of maximum office and/or commercial floor area to site area is 2.5:1. No office building is to exceed 12 stories, excluding penthouse spaces, by site plan approval. All penthouses are limited to one floor. Each plot is to have a minimum average width of 100 feet and a minimum area of 20,000 square feet.





### Structural System Overview

### Foundation

The geotechnical report called for a shallow foundation system on the stratum one and two soils with a designed bearing capacity of 10,000 psf. The shallow system will consist of a 4 inch thick slab on grade with 6"x6"-8/8 W.W.F. lap mesh 6 inches in all directions and concrete footings. The slab is poured over 10 mil polyethylene and 6 inches of washed gravel. Control joints are placed at 20 feet on center for all exterior slabs. Interior slabs are to be poured in 600 SF panels with control joints placed 30 feet on center. The interior slabs are also to be laid over a layer of vapor barrier which sits on top of 6 inches of washed gravel. Groundwater on the site must be at least two feet below the foundation subgrade level, all of these levels should be mud matted after excavation.

All footings are to penetrate at least one foot into undisturbed soil or compacted fill. All exterior footings must be at least 2'6" below the finished grade, this also holds true for footings in unheated spaces such as garages. The typical wall footing will be 12 inches deep and extend 6 inches past the face of the wall. Disturbed earth under footings will be replaced with 2000 psi concrete. The footings will be 4000 psi concrete and the slab on grade will be 5000 psi.



Dr. Thomas Boothby September 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011

### Floor System

This project uses a post tensioned concrete structure. Each floor consists of flat slabs with drop panels at the column locations ranging in thickness from 4" slab on grades to 12" thick reinforced concrete slabs. Some portions of the building have thicker slabs but 8-12" is the typical size. The drop panels are mostly 8 to 10" thick. Post tensioning is put to use starting on the second floor and the column layouts create typical 30' by 30' bays with 30' by 45' bays also present. The high strength concrete used for the framing system of the building allows for these bays as well as reducing the total weight of the building, the typical strength is 6000 psi.



Fig. 6 Typical Post Tensioned Slab Tendon Profile

### **Roof System**

The roof system of 1776 Wilson consists of 8 and 10 inch thick post tensioned two way slabs. The roof area is covered by either vegetation from the green roof, roof pavers, or a concrete wearing slab. Below the roof surface consists of filter fabric which is accompanied by a deck drainage mat where there is vegetation. Four inches of roof insulation is used as well as hot rubberized asphalt for the waterproofing assembly. The roof areas will see added load due to the solar panels and racking system, these will add 6.6 to 8 psf to the roof dead load.

### Columns

The column layouts of 1776 Wilson are uniform and create typical 30 feet by 30 feet bays, with some 30 feet by 45 feet bays as mentioned earlier. The reinforced concrete columns on the upper floors are typically 22x22 inches and 12x30 inches; the lower levels are typically 24x24 inches. Reinforcement ranges from #8 to #11 bars. High strength concrete is used to keep column sizes down and to help maintain the 9' 3" ceiling heights called for in the plans and drawings, as well as a tall ground floor that provides enough room for tenant mezzanines.

Floor	Sizes	Reinforcement	Compressive Strength (ksi)
5 <sup>th</sup>	22x22, 12x30	4#10, 8#11, 4#9	Typically 5, some columns are 6
4 <sup>th</sup>	22x22, 12x30	4#10, 8#10, 4#9	Typically 5, some columns are 6
3 <sup>rd</sup>	22x22, 12x30	4#9, 4#10, 4#11, 8#10, 8#11	Typically 5, some columns are 6 and 8
2 <sup>nd</sup>	22x22, 12x30	4#10, 4#11, 8#10, 12#11, 6#9	Typically 5, some columns are 6
1st	24x24, 12x30, 24x29 ¾*	4#11, 8#9, 8#10, 8#11 12#11,	Typically 8, some columns are 10
Basement Levels	24x24, 12x30, 32x18, 24x18, 12x18*	4#11, 12#11, 8#11, 4#10, 6#9, 8#9	Typically 8 at the B1 level, 6 below, some columns are 10

**Table 2 Column Schedule Summary** 











3/4"=1'-0"

Fig. 7 Column Details

1

### Lateral System

1776 Wilson Boulevard incorporates a combination of ductile reinforced concrete moment frames and reinforced concrete shear walls. The top two stories hold the ordinary moment frames while the shear walls populate the bottom three stories. Simplifications were made for the wind analysis done and ASCE 7-10 offers a way to calculate seismic loads for buildings with different lateral force resisting systems. More information on those calculations can be found in the wind and seismic sections of this report.

The lateral loads start at the roof diaphragm and travel through the columns that help make up the reinforced concrete moment frames to the floor diaphragm. Once the lateral loads reach the shear walls of the lower stories, the walls resist lateral loads and moments about their strong axis. They can also resist transferred gravity loads from tributary members of the structure. The lateral loads will be transferred through the walls to the floor diaphragm where eventually they will be dispersed into the soil once they reach the foundation.

An important note concerning the lateral force resisting systems of 1776 Wilson is that a better understanding of how the two systems work together needs to be gained before a more detailed analysis of the systems can take place. This will be addressed in a future technical report that focuses on a more in depth lateral system analysis and confirmation.

### Design Codes

The following documents were used and referenced in the making of this technical report:

- ACI 318-08 Building Code Requirements for Concrete Buildings published by the American Concrete Institute
- ASCE 7-10 Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures published by the American Society of Civil Engineers
- IBC 2006 International Building Code published by the International Code Council, Inc

#### Other reference notes:

Some information in this report was gathered from a geotechnical report done by ECS Mid-Atlantic, LLC. This report also is the source for the aerial site image used (fig. 3). A structural report done by Innovative Engineering, Inc. was referenced for information on additional loads added to the structure due to the solar panels. Finally, all images used for figures were provided graciously by Skanska USA.

### Materials

The following table summarizes the materials and their strengths that are used in the current design for 1776 Wilson.

Strength
F'c = 4ksi
F'c=5ksi
F'c=5,6,8, and 10ksi
F'c=3ksi
ASTM-A615, Grade 60
ASTM-A185

Table 3 Materials

Post Tensioned Concrete – tendons consist of steel strands that conform to ASTM A-416, Fpu=270,000 psi. Tendons are stressed after reaching 75% design strength of concrete.

Masonry – concrete masonry units conform to ASTM C 90 Grade 1, minimum f'm=1500 psi. Above grade mortar will be type S conforming to ASTM C 270, below grade will be type M, and veneer face brick will be type N.

### Design Loads

The live and dead loads used for the designed building were listed on the drawings; ASCE 7-05 and IBC 2006 were mainly used in the design to arrive at these loads. For the analysis done in this technical report, loads were taken from ASCE 7-10 or assumed. Due to lack of certain information, some assumptions may have been off leading to discrepancies in the calculations. This is true mostly for the slab spot check, which will be addressed in the spot checks section of this report. A more detailed analysis will be done once certain loads are verified.

Occupancy	Design	ASCE 7-10
Office lobbies 1 <sup>st</sup> floor corridors	100 psf	100 psf
Offices	50 psf	50 psf
<b>Corridors above first floor</b>	80 + 20 psf for partitions	80 psf
Roof	30 psf	20 psf
Stairs and exit ways	100 psf	100 psf
Storage	125 psf	125 psf
Fitness center	100 psf	100 psf

Table 4 Live Load Summary

Floor	Design Load
Normal weight concrete	150 pcf
MEP/ceiling	15 psf
Drop panels	Same as normal weight concrete

**Table 5 Floor Dead Loads** 

Roof	Design Load
Normal Weight Concrete	150 pcf
Solar panels and racking system	6.6-8 psf
Roof paver, insulation, and	24 psf
waterproofing	

Table 6 Roof Dead Loads

The snow loads for this analysis were taken from ASCE 7-10 chapter 7. Table 5 summarizes the snow load factors used. The ground snow load was decreased for the Arlington area in the transition from ASCE 7-05 to ASCE 7-10, it dropped from 30 psf to 25 psf. Snow drift calculations were done but were not taken into account for other calculations. My calculations for the snow loads and snow drift loads can be found in Appendix E.

Snow Load Criteria	Value
Exposure Factor	Ce = 0.9
Thermal Factor	Ct = 1.0
Importance Factor	ls = 1.0
Ground Snow Load	Pg = 25 psf
Flat Roof Snow Load	Pf = 15.75 psf
Snow Density	17.25 lb/ft^3

Table 7 Snow Load Information

### Wind Loads

Wind loads for 1776 Wilson were calculated with accordance to ASCE 7-10 using the main wind force resisting system (MWFRS) directional procedure. This allowed for the determination of wind loads in both the north-south and east-west directions. The velocity pressure was found to be 23.03 psf which is larger than the 17 psf called out in the structural notes for the building. When 1776 Wilson was designed, ASCE 7-05 was used and the basic wind speed for Arlington Virginia was 90 miles per hour but the latest edition of ASCE 7 increased the basic wind speeds and Arlington now has 105 miles per hour. A quick velocity pressure check was done using 90 mph and the result was 17 psf.

For the purposes of tech report one, the floor plan of the building was simplified as well as the facades in order to get a general idea of the wind loads. The method used does not take into account nearby structures and the north façade in particular will need a more detailed and in depth analysis due to the irregularity of the façade and the impact that will have on wind loads. These will be taken into consideration for a future technical report. My calculations for the wind loads can be found in Appendix C.



Fig. 8 N-S Elevation With Wind Data



Fig. 9 E-W Elevation With Wind Data



Fig. 10 North Facade In Plan View

### Seismic Loads

The seismic loads for the building were calculated in accordance with ASCE 7-10 chapters 11 and 12 and the equivalent lateral force method was used. There were two sets of numbers for each lateral force resisting system, the shear walls and the moment frames. These sets consisted of the response modification coefficient (R), the over strength factor ( $\Omega$ ), and the deflection amplification factor (Cd). Only the R value was involved in the calculations at this point and the set chosen depended on which R value was lower. According to section 12.2.3.1, if the upper system's R value is lower than the lower system's R value, you are to use the values for the upper system, in this case the reinforced concrete moment frames.

The various thicknesses in slabs were taken into account for total building seismic weight. The slabs (which range from 8 inches to 16 inches thick) were broken down and an area was calculated for each so as to make sure my numbers weren't too conservative. More detailed information on dead loads for the building is still to be determined and will be included in a more detailed seismic analysis for a future tech report. My calculations for the seismic loads can be found in Appendix D.



Fig. 11 E-W Elevation With Seismic Data

### Spot Checks

As mentioned in the executive summary, two spot checks were carried out for this tech report. The first was a spot check of column D-6 at the ground floor. Only compressive axial forces were taken into consideration for this spot check, the inclusion of lateral loads will increase the column size. Based on the results of the spot check, the column is more than adequate to carry the loads. I designed the column with a strength of 5000 psi but the actual design uses 8000 psi concrete. My spot check led to a 24"x24" column which is the same size as the designed column. The lateral loads will increase the size and reinforcement which could explain the decision to use high strength concrete. This allows for the column size to be minimized which fits in with the building's theme of wanting to reduce self-weight.



Fig. 12 First Floor Framing Plan - column d-6 is called out as well as the tributary area

The slab spot check was done on the second story where the post tensioned slabs start. The first check was to determine a thickness; the result was an 8" thick slab which agreed with the designed slab. Next, precompression stress was checked against ACI maximum and minimum limits, the stress of 222 psi met the criteria and was acceptable. The final checks on the slab were stress checks immediately after jacking and at service load. There were two instances at service load where the stress was not within permissible code limits. Some assumptions were made concerning the tendons that could account for this. Information regarding the tendons was gained but not in time to include in this report, a more detailed analysis will be done taking this information into account for a future tech report. Spot check calculations can be found in Appendix F.

### Conclusions

The first technical report serves as an investigation into the structural system chosen for the 1776 Wilson project as well as the existing conditions. The goal was to gain a better understanding of the system and how it works. A breakdown of different elements in the system has been detailed in this report and calculations were performed to verify the design. The spot check for the column resulted in the same size but with a lower strength. Only gravity loads were taken into account for that spot check, once lateral loads are considered the size should increase. Choosing a higher concrete strength at that point will help decrease the column size.

The spot check done on the two way post tensioned flat slab was done with assumptions made on tendon information not known at the time of preparing this report. These assumptions could have thrown the design off resulting in two stresses at service loads not being within permissible code limits. As previously mentioned, more detailed information on the tendons became available but not in time to be included in this report. Another analysis with the verified numbers will be done and a more thorough check of the existing slab will be completed.

Another main portion of this technical report was an analysis of lateral loads on the lateral force resisting systems of the building. The seismic loads were determined to control the base shear of the building and the over turning moment as well. A more detailed lateral load analysis will be performed for a future tech report and will carry a better understanding of how the two different lateral force resisting systems work together. For this report, simplifications were made in the wind analysis to get a basic idea of the pressures until more knowledge on the system was gained, at which point more accurate calculations can be performed.

Future Considerations: lateral soil loads, wind loads for north façade, roof uplift, and considering lateral loads for gravity members are considerations that will be fulfilled in future technical reports.

## APPENDIX A

Framing Plans







\*Note – these framing plans will be difficult to see as a hard copy, especially the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floors. An electronic version of these plans will be put on the CPEP page for this project that will be easier to view.

## APPENDIX B

Wall Sections and Assemblies



Fig. 18 Wall Sections

#### Dr. Thomas Boothby September 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011





EXTERIOR WALL ASSEMBLY W3 SCALE 5'-1'4" LOCATION: EXTERIOR WALLS W3A: BYCK ON BOTH SIDES





SCALE 3"=1"-0" LOCATION: EXTERIOR WALLS



EXTERIOR WALL ASSEMBLY W1





Fig. 20 Exterior Wall Assemblies (continued)

## APPENDIX C

Wind Loads

## Summary Tables

<b>Risk Categ</b>	gory	II		
Basic Win	d Speed	105 mph		
Exposure		В		
Kd		0.85		
Kzt		1		
Gf (N-S)		0.84		
Gf (E-W)		0.82		
1.0 m 1	N	-5	E-V	0.0
windward	тср	0.8		0.8
Leeward (	р	-0.37		-0.5
Sidewall (	Ср	-0.7		-0.7
Roof Cp				
First	Value			
	(0-h/2)	-0.9		-0.9
	(h/2-h)	-0.9		-0.9
	(h-2h)	-0.5		-0.5
	(>2h)	-0.3		-0.3
Second	Value	-0.18		-0.18
z (ft)	Kz	qz (psf)		
0-15	0.5	7 13	.67	
20	0.6	2 14	.87	
25	0.6	6 15	.83	
30	0.	7 16	.79	
40	0.7	6 18	.23	
50	0.8	1 19	.43	
60	0.8	5 20	.39	
70	0.8	9 21	.35	
80	0.9	3 22	.31	
90	0.9	6 23	.03	

Pressures (psf)		N-S		E-W	
Leeward		-7.1	L <b>6</b>	-9.	44
Windward					
0-15	ift	9.1	9	8.	97
:	20	1	L <b>O</b>	9.	75
	25	10.6	54	10	).4
	30	11	.3	11.	01
4	40	12.2	25	11.	96
	50	13.0	)6	12.	75
(	60	13	.7	13	3.4
	70	14.3	35		14
	80	1	.5	14.	64
9	90	15	.5	15.	11
Penthouse		26	.1	14.	65
Story Forces (k)	N-	S	E-\	N	1
Roof		27		37.9	
5th		49.4		70	
4th		45.5		67.6	
3rd		43.1		79.3	
2nd		62.4		116	
Base Shear		222.5		344.2	
	_		N	<u> </u>	E
Overturning Mon	nor	ot (ft_k)		11690	
Activiting Mon	nei	ie fre iv		11000	·



Used  
Wind Directionality factor: 
$$K_{00} = 0.55$$
 (robe 26.6-1)  
Topographic factor:  $K_{00} = 100$  (rote to set 2.19)  
Gust Effect Factor: Duilding new height =  $55 < 300^{\circ}$   
 $L_{eff} = \frac{2i}{2}h_{1}$   
 $L_{eff} = \frac{3i}{5}(5\pi.5) + u_{1}^{2}(5\pi.5) + u_{1}^{2}(5\pi$ 





		Wind
5	Design wind Pressure => p=qG_ECp-	q: (CCpi) q=qz (windward) q=qn (Leeward) q:=qn (endowed)
	<u>N-5</u>	E-W_
	Windward $C_{p} = 0.8$ Leeward $C_{p} = -0.37$ $\frac{L}{0} = \frac{378.63}{164.5} = 1.67$ Sidewall $C_{p} = -0.7$	Windward Cp = 0.8 Leenard Cp = -0.5 $\frac{L}{B} = \frac{100.5}{271.42} = 0.578$ Sidenaul Cp = -0.7
phile	Borf Co = BOOF 1 (55)	Roof Co => Roof 2
R.	1 = 0.198 Slope < 10"	$\frac{h}{L} = \frac{83}{166.5} = 0.498 < 5$
	11+ Value: -0.9 (0- 35) -0.9 (3-1) -0.5 (1-2h) -0.3 (22h)	Same values as N-S
	2" Value: - 0.18	
0	- Roof 2 (837) Some Values	
	Sample calculations	
	N-S Windward	Et Lindward
	$P = q_z (0.84)(0.8) - 30.3(20.8)$ = 0.673 qz + 3.47 mt (up to reat 1)	P= q2(0.82)(0.8) - 230(2018) = 0.656 q2 + 4/15
	$P = 0.672q_2 - 23.03(20.18)$ = 0.673q_2 + 4.15 pre (mate For f 1)	Leeward
		p=23.03(0.82)+0.5) =+9.44psf
	Leeward	
0	p= 23.03 (0.84) (-0.37) =-7.16 psf (roof 2)	Internal pressures isually cared ignore right side of p equation.

			1	1	10.3	
	windward	TTTTT	TEFFE		Wing	7 11
	TIL	N- 5	E-W			1.1.
	0-15 Ft	9.19 pst	8.9705			
-	20	10	9.75			
	25	10.64	10.4			
	30	11.3	ILOL			
	40	12,35	11.56			
	50	13.20	17.15			
	70	14.75	14			
	80	15	H.64			
ġ	90	15.5	- <i>13-</i> 11			
VIDV	11111					
X	Story	Forces (N	-5)			
	949 (28.3,)	=> 10.64 (-)	$\left(\frac{1.3}{2}\right)(166.5) + 11.3(\frac{1}{2})$	$\left(\frac{2}{2},\frac{3}{2}\right)(166.5) = 37$	6 K	
	and a s	121	V	No. A an		111
	310 (-11.67)	) = 10.25( 亍	)(166.5)+ 12.25( 3	$\mathcal{M}(delevis) = \mathcal{F}(delevis)$	3 K	
	4 ** (55')	=> 13.06 (13.3	)(11, 3)+ 12.7/12	2/11/01-20		
U		2		(uders) - St	IC A	
	5** (68.3') :	=> 13.7 (17.3)	(166.15) + 14.35 (14.6	)(166.5) = 32."	7 K	
	Reof (83)	)=> 15(14.67)	(45)=10.34			
			ional ional			
		(E-4	-)			
	200 \$ 10.	4 (3.3) (278.42)	) + 11.01 (17.3) (278.40)	=61.4K		
	300 => 11.0	16 (17.7) (27842)	+ 11.96 (17.3) (278.43	) = 44.3 K		
	$4^{++} \Rightarrow 13.75 \left(\frac{13.3}{3}\right)(37843) + 13.4 \left(\frac{17.3}{3}\right)(173.43) = 39.3 \text{ K}$					
	0 = 13.4	(=)(1/3:13)	1+ 14 ( - 3 ( 113, 43 )	- 33.3 K		
	Roof => 14	.64 (H.67) (173	3.42) = 18.6 K			
-						
						-

		Wind	
	add Leeward		
9	N-5 2nd => 37.6+ 7.16(20.83)(10.5) 1000	= 62.4 K $2^{-10}$ $G_{1.4} + 9^{+1}(20.83)(278,13) = 116 K$	
	3rd => 43.1K	3rd=> 79.3K	
	4th => 45.5 K	4th => 67.6 K	
	5 => 77.7K	5 <sup>+n</sup> ⇒ 70 K	
_CIV41	Deer -1 of IX	Rcof ⇒ 37.9 K	
R	N-S Base Shear = 227.5K		
	E-W Base shear = 344.2 K	to levest print of elevation	
	N-S over twrning moment = (6	2.4× 28.3)+ (43.1×41.67)+ (45.5×55)+(49.4×68.3)	
	V +,	(27×83) = 11680 Ft.K	
0	E-W overtunning moment = (116× 28.3)+(79.3×41.67)+(67.6×55) +(70×68.3)+(37.9×83)=18232 Ft.K		
	which have for Polynuss		
	Sect. 29.5-1		
	$F = q_z G C_{\varphi} A_{\varphi}$	g== Kz+= 0.99 (100)	
	F== 23.75 (. 54) (. 7 3) (59 2)	Perthase roof is at 95° 9z = 23.75 psf	
	= 36.1 psf	G = 0.83 (E-W) G = 0.84 (N-S)	
	FEW = 23.75(0.82)(1.32)(570)	CF => h = 95 = 2 Interpolate	
	= 14.65 psf	D 47.5 $\frac{2-1}{7-1} = \frac{x-1.3}{14-1.3}$	
0		(z = 1.3) (z = 1.3) (z = 1.3) (z = 1.3)	
		Aq= 570 44 (E-W)	

## APPENDIX D

Seismic Loads

## Summary Tables

Site Class	D
Ss	12.50%
S1	6%
Fa	1.6
Fv	2.4
Sms	0.2
Sm1	0.144
Sds	0.133
Sd1	0.096
Category	В
PGA	6%
Site Coefficient	1.6

R	3
Ω	3
Cd	2.5
Cs	0.032

Story	Weight (k)
Roof	4296
5th	3611
4th	3723
3rd	5219
2nd	5419
Total	22268
Base Shear	712.6

Story	Force (k)
Roof	235
5th	155.3
4th	122.4
3rd	121.5
2nd	77.7

Overturning Moment (ft-k)	44110

	Josh Urban	AE Senior Thesis	Seismic	
	Site Class: D	(Table 20.3-1)		
	$S_5 = 12.5 ^{\circ}/_{\circ}$ (Fig. 5 $S_1 = 6^{\circ}/_{\circ}$ (Fig. 3)	02-1) 02-1)		
	Fa=1.6 (Table Fr=2.4 (Table	11.4-1, site dess D 11.4-2, site dess D	5r ± 0.25) 5(± 0,1)	
4	$S_{ms} = F_{a}S_{s} = 0.2$ $S_{m_{1}} = F_{b}S_{1} = 0.144$	$S_{ps} = \frac{\partial}{\partial 3} S_{p_1}$ $S_{p_1} = \frac{\partial}{\partial 3} S_{p_2}$	$m_5 = 0.133$ $m_1 = 0.096$	
diam	Table 11-6-1 ⇒ 505 Table 11.6-7 ⇒ 0.00	< 0.167 => risk «colego 57 < 50 < 0.133 => 1	TY II => Cadegory A isk lategory II => Category B	
	PGA= 6% (Fig. 22-	7)		
	Site CoEfficient : 1	= PGA = 1.6 (Table II	.8-1 ⇒ P&A = 0.1 Site Class D)	
	Response Modifice	tion Coefficient :	R (Table 12.0-1)	
	Floors 1-3 = or Floors 4-5 = or	dinaty reinf. cone.	sheat challs ⇒ R=5 Moment Frane ⇒ R=3	
~	Overstrengths Fact	ror: sz. (table 12.	ə-1)	
	Floors 1-3=> J Floors 4-5 => J	2,=3		
	Deflection Amplifica	tion Factor : Co (	(Table 12.2-1)	
	Floors 1-3 => ( Floors 4-5 => (	22= 41/2 22= 21/2		
	Controlling Va	Les Sed. 12.2.3	1.1 ⇒ upper system R is buer that	7
	R= 3 Q= 3		the laver system R, use	
	Cd= 2.5		upper system values For	
0			both systems.	

Seismic Lise Equivalent Lateral Force Method Eqn. 12.8-1 => V = CSW Seisnie Response Coefficient: Cs (Reter to sec. 12.8.1)  $G = \frac{S_{DS}}{\left(\frac{\pi}{T}\right)} = \frac{0.133}{\left(\frac{3}{T}\right)} = 0.0443 \quad (\text{Moment Frame})$ (Table 1.5-2=>risk category I)  $T_L = 80$  $T_a = C_{\pm} b_a^{\times}$  $h_{17} = 97.33 \text{ (from lowest point to perthouse)}$  $C_{4} = 0.016 \text{ Table 13.8-2}$ x = 0.91 Table 13.8-2= 0.016 (97.33)" = 0.985 0 T connet exceed (LITA = 1.7(0.985)= 1.675 CL=1.7 (Table 12.8-1= 50 40.1)  $T \leq T_{L} \Rightarrow C_{S} \text{ should not exceed} : C_{S} = \frac{S_{D_{1}}}{T(\frac{R}{T_{c}})} = \frac{0.096}{0.985(\frac{T}{T_{c}})} = 0.032 < C_{S} \chi$ Lise (s=0.03) W= effective substain Weight Reaf DL =  $\left(\frac{12}{12} \times 150\right) + \frac{34}{9}$  psf + 8.0 psf = 182 psf 19" NW Kork. Foot pavers Selar PV Pore load Slab insulation Later proting ROOF CONSISTS OF 10" + 10" thick slabs, use 10 to be conservative Roof Snow Load 4L, & use L, = 30pst Floor Dead Loads = 8", 12", 14", + 16"  $\left(\frac{8}{13} \times 150\right) + 15 = 115 \text{ psf}$   $13' \Rightarrow 165 \text{ psf}$   $16' \Rightarrow 315 \text{ psf}$  $14' \Rightarrow 190 \text{ psf}$ 19 per is extra essured allowance







## APPENDIX E

Snow Loads





## APPENDIX F

Spot Checks



		Spot checks =
	Ag (4rda) = Pu = 910 0.4(52+5ypy) = 0.4(5+60×.4	$\frac{y}{0.50} = 386 \ln^2$
	Try 20×20	
	$= \frac{M_{\rm W}}{P_{\rm W}} = \frac{563}{916} = 0.55  \text{Fr} = 6$	16 in
avany	$\frac{e}{h} = \frac{6.6}{20} = 0.33$	
3	y= <u>20-2(2.5)</u> =0.75 20	
	Determine by from interaction diagr	aus
	$\frac{\phi P_n}{A_g} = \frac{P_u}{A_g} = \frac{q_{u}}{20 \times 3}$	2 ×J.J8xs;
	Agh = Mu = 503×1 Agh Agh = 20×20×	9 = 0.75.
	R=0.043 = economical W	alles for Rg range from 1=2%
	choese lan	ur cross section
-	Tey 23×32	
	x= 22-2(25) = 0.77	Interpolate
	$\frac{P_{4x}}{A_{0}} = \frac{910}{22\times22} = 1.88$	8=0.9= eg=0.022
-	$\frac{M_{\rm H}}{\Lambda} = \frac{503 \times 12}{12} = 0.62$	Try larget Size





	Spot Checks
	Class U (ACT 18.3.3)
	$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$
	= 3\$40 th 3
	allouable Stresses
'OV	at time of jacking (ACI 1841.1)
Ann	$f'c_i = 3000 \text{ pr}$
~	Compression = 0.6 fin= 0.6 (3000)= 1800 pr;
	$Tension = 3 \sqrt{Fc}$ = $3\sqrt{3000}$ = $V_{c}^{4}$
	at service loads (ACI 18.4.2 a)
	f'z= 6000 psi
	Compression = 0.45 F'C = 0.45 (6000) = 3700 psi
	$Torsion = b \sqrt{ic}$ $= b \sqrt{bbvo}$
	= 465 ps1
	assume 60% target load balance of slab self weight
	0.6 (100) = 60 psf
0	Tenden locations Ext. Support => 4° In Support => 7° In Span bottom => 1° End Span bottom => 1.75° Gassime the Span governs

1997  

$$U_{b} = .6U_{b}u_{b}^{2} = 60 \times 36 = 1800 \text{ pf}$$

$$P = \frac{V_{b}u_{a}^{2}}{86m_{a}} = \frac{1800}{8(\frac{130}{2})^{2}} = 648 \text{ K}$$

$$P = \frac{V_{b}u_{a}^{2}}{86m_{a}} = \frac{648}{8(\frac{130}{2})^{2}} = 648 \text{ K}$$

$$= 4 \text{ of tendors} = \frac{648}{24.68} = 34.4 \Rightarrow 34 \text{ tendors}$$

$$Gotbol Force = 34 (36.6) = (38.4 \text{ K})$$

$$Gotpost U_{b} \text{ for actual force}$$

$$U_{a} \leq \frac{635.4}{645} = 0.485 (100) = 1773 \text{ plf}$$
Determine Precompression stress  

$$P_{a} = \frac{635.4}{36.6} = 331.7 \text{ psi} > 105 \text{ psi} (6m) \text{ J}$$

$$U_{b} = \frac{635.458(640)}{36.6} = 33.84 \text{ M/p}$$

$$U_{b} = \frac{635.458(640)}{36.6} = 3.84 \text{ M/p}$$

$$U_{b} = (100\%)_{a} \Rightarrow 3.84 \text{ M/p}$$

$$U_{b} = (100\%)_{a} \Rightarrow 3.84 \text{ M/p}$$



	Spot Checks-
	Check Stresses
	Stage 1: immediately after jacking (ACI 18.4.1)
	$I_{rtt}: F_{tep} = \frac{(-67.5 + 48.4 \chi_{12} \chi_{1000})}{3840} - 322 = -382 \text{ pri} < 1800 \text{ pri} \\ (comp)$
	Fint = (67.5-48.4)(10)(000) - 200 = -160 pri <1800 pri V 3840 (10-9)
	End: $f_{rep} = \frac{(-316+154.8)(32100)}{3840} - 200 = -413 pri < 1800 pri  (comp)$
AMBAD	$F_{bot} = \frac{(316 - 154.8)(13)(100)}{3840} - 300 = -30.75psi < 1800 psi / (200) = -300 psi / (200) psi / (200) = -300 psi / (200) psi / (200) psi / (200) = -300 psi / (200) = -300 psi / (200) psi / (200) = -300 psi / (200) psi / (200)$
3	Support: frop = (270-194)(12/140) - 200 = 15.5 ps: <164 ps: 104 ps: </104 ps: </104</td
	Fbot = (-270+194)(12)(1000) - 222 = -459.5 psi 2 1800 psi V 3840 (comp)
	Stage 2: at service load (18.7.7 + 18.4.2)
	Int: Ftop = (-67.5-50.6+48.4)(1000)(2) 201 = -4391psi × 2700psi / 3840 (comp)
	Foot = (67.5+50.6-48.4×1000)(02 221=-3.19x1 × 2700 psi / 3840 (comp)
	End: $f_{top} = \frac{(-216 - 162 + 154.8)(1000)(13)}{3840} = 221 = -918 psi < 2700 psi $
	Fbot = (316+162-154,8)(1000/20) 221 = 476 psi >465 psi X 3840 (tons)
	Support: Filop = (270+202.5-194)(12)(1000) - 221 = 649 ps1 > 465 ps: X (tens)
	Stresses are not within permissible code limits.