

Final Report

University of Virginia's College at Wise New Library



Image Courtesy of Cannon Design

Macenzie Ceglar
Structural Option
Advisor: Heather Sustersic
9 April 2014

University of Virginia's College at Wise - New Library

Wise, VA

General Information

Full Height: 119'
Number of Stories: 6
Size: 68,000 GSF
Cost: \$43 Million
Date of Construction: Aug 2012 – Aug 2015
Project Delivery Method: Design-Bid-Build

Project Team

Owner: UVA at Wise
Architect: Cannon Design
Structural: Cannon Design
MEP: Thompson and Litton
Lighting: Lafleur Associates
Construction: Quesenberrys, Inc.
Civil: Thompson and Litton
Landscape: Hill Studio
AV/Acoustics: Shen Milsom Wilke
Foodservice: Culinary Advisors

Project Sponsor: 

Architecture

The goal of the façade design was to give the impression that the older existing buildings' architecture was based on the New Library's. This was achieved through use of materials such as brick and stone commonly found on the surrounding buildings.

Construction

Limited site area due to existing campus buildings impacted the construction by requiring offset staging and storage areas, along with the construction of a 500 foot service road.



Structural Systems

Foundation: Slab on grade with column piers, footings and foundation walls

Framing: Steel frame, composite wide flange steel members, and normal weight composite deck flooring

Lateral: 9 Reinforced concrete shear walls

Soil Retention: Temporary Leave-In-Place Soil Retention System, which includes the use of soil nails and shotcrete covering.

Mechanical

VAV system with a roof mounted chilled-water AHU and 145.9 ton chiller providing 41,300 CFM, and an economizer and an a heat recovery unit

Electrical/Lighting

Five 480/277 3-phase panel boards
Nine 280/120 3-phase panel boards

Wall switch and low voltage occupancy sensors used for lighting control

Executive Summary

The New Library at the University of Virginia's College at Wise, located in Wise, Virginia, will serve as a main link between the upper and lower campus areas, which are currently divided by a steep 60 foot hill. The new 6 story, 68,000 ft², library will be integrated into the hillside, and will provide students with an easier and safer path across campus. Construction on the New Library began in August 2012 and will be completed in August 2015.

The following report contains information on the analysis and redesign of the structural system for the New Library. A structural overview of the existing steel structural system is included in the first portion of the report, while the majority of the report is comprised of the structural redesign along with additional analyses completed during the semester.

The primary structural redesign was completed using a conventionally reinforced two-way concrete flat slab. Deflection issues in the longer span bays were addressed as part of this redesign. There was also an interest to investigate the feasibility of a post-tensioned concrete floor slab, which was completed as a secondary redesign. RAM Concept was used to aid in the design of the floor systems, and the program output was verified by hand.

Since there was an increase in seismic loads due to the increased weight of the structure, the existing lateral system was analyzed to verify that it would still be adequate under the increased loads. ETABS was used to aid in the analysis of the lateral system.

Due to the decision to integrate the building into the existing hillside, water infiltration of the structure was a major concern. To ensure that the foundation wall drainage system was adequate, an analysis and design of the drainage system was completed as part of the first breadth study, along with a study of the water proofing for the foundation walls and basement slab.

As part of the decision as to whether a concrete structural system was a feasible option, a cost and schedule analysis was completed for the second breadth study. Through this study it was determined that the concrete system did offer a significant savings in cost, and would also offer a slight decrease in project duration.

After completing the redesign of the structure it was determined that a concrete structural system was a feasible option for the structure of the New Library. The functionality of the system in terms of floor-to-ceiling heights and column sizes was similar to that of the steel system and in some cases showed improvement. The concrete system was also able to offer a significant cost savings, and would result in decrease in project duration of a little over a week as long as adequate laborers were available.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the following people for helping me make this year such a success:

- ♦ The engineers at Cannon Design for giving me the opportunity to use the New Library at the University of Virginia's College at Wise for my thesis, especially Rachel Chicchi who was my contact in obtaining all of the plans and information I needed.
- ♦ The engineers at SK&A, especially Walid Choueiri without whose help I never would have learned RAM Concept as well as I did, and Hakan Onel who provided me with some much needed ETABS advice.
- ♦ My parents, for always encouraging me to do whatever I wanted to in life, and my fiancé Travis, for always being there for me and always being right.
- ♦ The AE faculty, especially my advisor Professor Sustersic for giving me her time, advice, and guidance whenever I needed it.
- ♦ All of my classmates and friends, especially:

Natasha Beck

Angela Mincemoyer

Sikandar Porter-gill

Kristin Sliwinski

Alyssa Stangl

You guys have helped me keep my sanity and have given me some of the best memories over the last 5 years.

- ♦ My Lord and Savior Jesus Christ for always giving me the strength and guidance to overcome all obstacles.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Acknowledgments.....	4
Table of Contents.....	5
General Description of Building.....	7
Structural Overview of Existing System.....	8
Design Codes and Standards.....	20
Proposal.....	21
Problem Statement.....	21
Proposed Solution.....	21
Breadth Topics.....	22
Structural Depths.....	23
Primary Depth: Two-Way Concrete System.....	23
Floor System Design.....	23
Verification of Output.....	27
Deflection Checks.....	29
Reinforcement.....	31
Column Design.....	33
Secondary Depth: Post-Tensioned System.....	34
Pros, Cons, and Concerns.....	34
Initial Design.....	36
Laying Out the Tendons.....	37
Choosing the Initial Number of Tendons.....	38
Balancing the Tendons.....	39
Adjusting the Number of Tendons.....	40
Checking Deflections.....	41
The Final Layout.....	43
Conclusion.....	45
Lateral Analysis.....	46
Overview.....	46
Wind Loads.....	47
Seismic Forces.....	52
Lateral Earth Pressures.....	53
Member Spot Checks for Strength.....	54
Drift Checks.....	61
Stability Coefficient Check.....	64
Conclusion.....	66
MAE Coursework Integration.....	67
Breadth 1: Drainage System Study.....	68

Waterproofing the Wall	69
Waterproofing the Slab	71
Determining the Type of Drainage Required	72
Determining the Flow Rate	73
Determining the Size of the Pipe	74
Final Pipe Design:	74
Breadth 2: Cost and Schedule Analysis	75
Cost Analysis	75
Schedule Analysis	77
System Comparison	80
Conclusion	81
Appendix A: Design Loads	82
Appendix B: Floor Design Options – Conventional Reinf.	84
Appendix C: Verifying Model	89
Appendix C.1: EFM vs. FEM	89
Appendix C.2: One-way and Two-way Shear Checks	97
Appendix C.3: Shear Stud Rail Check	102
Appendix D: Deflections	108
Appendix E: Reinforcement	115
Appendix F: Column Design	117
Appendix G: PT Floor Design	133
Appendix G.1 Initial Tendon Elevations	134
Appendix G.2 Initial Number of Tendons (Banded Direction)	134
Appendix G.3: Final Balancing of Tendons	135
Appendix G.4: Max Tendons	136
Appendix H: Wind and Seismic Loads – ASCE 7-10	137
Appendix H.1 Wind Loads	137
Appendix H.2 Seismic Loads	147
Appendix I: Lateral System Analysis	152
Appendix J: Drainage Breadth	158
Appendix J.1 Bituthane System 4000 Tech Sheets	158
Appendix J.2: Preprufe 300R Plus Tech Sheets	164
Appendix J.3: Boring Locations	168
Appendix J.4: Allowable Piping Materials for Subsoil Drain Pipes	168
Appendix J.5: PVC Pipe Nomograph	169
Appendix K: Detailed Cost Estimate	170
Appendix L: Schedule Durations	178
References	82

General Description of Building

The New Library at the University of Virginia's College at Wise will be located directly between the existing lower and upper parts of the campus, as seen in **Figure 1**. The new 68,000 ft² building will be 6 stories tall and will cost approximately \$43 million.

Currently, there is a steep 60 foot hill dividing the UVA Wise campus. This had a large impact on the building's overall design. The New Library will be integrated into the hillside, shown in **Figure 2** and **Figure 3**, and will serve as a significant physical and architectural link between the two parts of campus. A long winding staircase is built into the existing hillside, and provides limited access for students. Students will be able to access the building from the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth levels and a 24 hour access zone will allow students to travel across campus more easily and safely after normal operating hours.

Structurally, the design includes a temporary retaining wall system and foundation walls which extend up to 68 feet below grade on the eastern corner of the building.

The University Architect wanted the New Library to bring a sense of cohesion to the existing buildings on campus. The design team was required to create a visual effect in which it would appear as if the surrounding buildings had been designed based on the New Library, thus creating an architectural link between the new building and the existing buildings. Architectural materials such as brick, stone, and cast stone, were chosen for the library's façade, as these are common to the existing buildings on campus. Along with numerous books and reference materials, the library will offer several other amenities to students including study rooms, conference rooms, smart workstations, and a café.



Figure 1: Site Location (Courtesy of Cannon Design)



Figure 2: New Library (Courtesy of Cannon Design)




Figure 3: South Elevation Showing Building's Depth into Hillside (Sheet A-3.01)

Structural Overview of Existing System

Brief Description of the Existing Structural System

The New Library at the University of Virginia's College at Wise sits on a foundation system that consists of column piers, spread and strip footings, and foundation walls. Each floor of the six story building is framed using a composite system consisting of composite steel wide flange members and composite decking. Concrete shear walls make up the building's lateral system, along with several foundation walls that aid in resisting lateral soil loads. The upper roof system is comprised of pre-engineered cold formed metal trusses and a separate lateral system consisting of cold formed shear walls. The following section explains these components in more detail.

Building Materials

Structural building materials used in the New Library's design, along with their specifications, are listed below in **Table 1** and **Table 2**.

Structural Steel		
Member	Grade	Fy (ksi)
Wide Flange Shapes and WT Sections	ASTM A992	50
Channels and Angles	ASTM A36	36
Pipe	ASTM A53, Grade B	30
Hollow Structural Sections	ASTM A500, Grade B	46
Base Plates	ASTM A36	36
All Other Steel Members	ASTM A36	36
High Strength Bolts, Nuts, and Washers	ASTM A-325 or A4-490 (Min. $\frac{3}{4}$ " ϕ)	

Table 1: Structural Steel Materials Specifications

Concrete and Reinforcing		
Use	Strength (psi)	Weight (pcf)
Footings	3000	150
Building Foundation Walls	5000	150
Slabs-On-Grade	3000	150
Slabs-On-Steel Deck	3000	150
All Other Concrete	4000	150
Use	Grade	
Typical Bars	ASTM A-615, Grade 60	
Welded Bars	ASTM A-706, Grade 60	
Welded Wire Fabric	ASTM A-185	

Table 2: Concrete and Reinforcing Specifications

Foundation System

S&ME, Inc. performed a geotechnical exploration of the proposed site for the New Library in January 2012. They recommended that the main library structure be supported on spread foundations bearing on bedrock with 8 kip per square foot (ksf) allowable bearing pressure. Due to the high bearing pressure, there was no need for soil improvements. It was also determined that the retaining walls need to be capable of resisting an equivalent fluid pressure of 47 pounds per cubic foot (pcf). See the lateral soil loads section for more details.

The final design for the building’s foundation followed the recommendations provided in the geotechnical report. The New Library will be supported on a shallow foundation which will consist of individual spread footings and continuous strip footings, both of which will bear on bedrock.

The individual spread footings are located under the steel columns. At interior columns, the spread footings are located directly at the base of the column (see **Figure 4**). At exterior columns the spread footings are located at the base of the column piers(see **Figure 5**).In both of these cases, the connection is most likely pinned due to the use of the minimum number of required anchor bolts (4), and the fact that no moment frames are used in the structure.




Figure 4: Typical Column Footing without Pier (Sheet S-3.01, Detail 2)




Figure 5: Typical Column Footing with Pier (S-3.01, Detail 1)

Continuous strip footings are located under the perimeter foundations walls. Many of the footings are stepped in order to limit the amount of excavation required.

One of the biggest challenges with the project was designing a way to resist the lateral soil forces on the building's structure. After discussing several options, the team chose to use a temporary leave-in-place soil retention system (which includes the use of soil nails and shotcrete covering). This system was determined to be the most cost effective and efficient solution. The temporary system allows the soil to be excavated down to the bearing grade and the shotcrete then doubles as one side of the formwork for the foundation walls, thus decreasing the cost of formwork for the project.

It is expected that the rock anchors will deteriorate over time. Thus, the foundation walls are designed to resist the full soil load once the superstructure is complete. This was done by designing the foundation walls with a fixed-base condition, providing sufficient rebar to resist flexure, eccentric footings, and lateral support at upper floor levels. The foundation wall and this design concept can be seen in **Figures 6** and **Figure 7**.




Figure 6: Foundation Wall(S-3.11, Detail 1)




Figure 7: Foundation Wall with Design Concepts

Slab Thicknesses

Two different slab-on-grade thicknesses are used in the building. A 5" slab-on-grade, reinforced with 6x6-W2.9xW2.9 welded-wire-fabric, is located at Levels 1 and 2. On level 1, these slabs are located in the 24-hour access zone, which is an area of moderate student traffic. On Level 2, there is also a small section in the south corner of the building that is on grade and utilizes a 5" S.O.G. An 8" slab-on-grade, reinforced with #5@18" each-way on both the top and the bottom is located on Level 1. It is supporting areas of high density storage where specialty compact shelving will be located. **Figure 8** and **Figure 9** show the extents of each slab thickness on Levels 1 and 2.




Figure 8: Level 1 Slab-On-Grade Thicknesses (S-1.01)

	5"
	8"




Figure 9: Level 2 Slab-On-Grade Thicknesses (S-1.02)

5"

Floor System

The New Library’s floor system is a composite steel system comprised of 4 ½” normal weight concrete reinforced with 6x6-W2.9xW2.9 welded-wire-fabric on 2” 18 gage steel deck (6 ½” total thickness). The 4 ½” topping provides the required 2 hour fire rating without the additional cost of spray-on fire proofing. The deck typically runs perpendicular to wide flange steel members, and in cases where the deck runs parallel to the members, #4 x 4’-0” rebar is placed at 18” on center to decrease cracking due to tensile forces in the concrete slab. Composite action is achieved by transfer of the load from the slab to the members by ¾” diameter x 3 ½” long shear studs.

Typical Bay: Floor

Multiple sized bays are used in the New Library. The typical beam span is 25’-4” and typical bay sizes range from 25’-4” to 31’-0”. Typical members used to frame Level 2 up through Level 6 are primarily W16x26 beams. Smaller beams, such as W14x22, are used in areas around the stairwells and larger beams, such as W18x35, are used in areas supporting general collections along with areas of high student traffic. Typical interior girders supporting these beams are W25x55 and spandrel girders vary in size depending on location. **Figure 10** below shows a 27’-4” bay with W16x26 beams.




Figure 10: Level 2 Framing Plan Showing Typical Bay (Sheet S-1.02)

Roof System

Two separate roof systems were used to complete the New Library. A lower roof covers the majority of the building between column lines 3-9 and A-E and supports an air handling unit and a chiller (mechanical well area). The framing is composite wide flange steel beams and a 6 1/2" NWC slab. The upper roof is designed to mimic the existing campus buildings and also serves to conceal the building's air handling unit and chiller.

Lower Roof

Bay sizes used in the lower roof framing of the New Library are the same as those used in the framing of the lower floors. The typical beam span is 25'-4" and typical bay sizes range from 25' 4" to 31'-0". Beams used to frame the lower roof are typically W18x35. This larger beam size is due to increased design loads based on the HVAC system. **Figure 12** below shows a 27'-4" bay with W18x35 beams.




Figure 12: Lower Roof Framing Plan Showing Typical Bay (Sheet S-1.07)

Upper Roof

The upper roof is a raised false mansard consisting of pre-engineered cold formed metal trusses and cold formed shear walls. This layout can be seen below in **Figure 13**. These trusses are triangular in shape and approximately 9'-7" tall, are covered by 1 1/2" type B roof deck, and sit on 6" load bearing CFMF studs. This can be seen below in **Figure 14**.




Figure 13: Upper Roof Framing Plan Showing Pre-engineered Trusses (Sheet S-1.08)

- Pre-engineered Light Gage Cold Formed Metal Trusses
- Mechanical Well Area
- Air Handling Unit
- Chiller




Figure 14: Cold Formed Metal Truss (S-6.01)

Lateral System

The lateral force resisting system for the New Library consists of ordinary reinforced concrete shear walls. There are nine 12” thick shear walls of varying length and height that make up this system. **Figure 15** shows the location of these shear walls and categorizes them based on their heights.

Each shear wall is reinforced with #5 rebar at a code maximum spacing of 18” each-way on each-face of the wall. This layout of reinforcing is typical with the exception of two walls that have condensed spacing in lower sections of the wall, especially in the horizontal direction. This condensed spacing is due to increased shear forces from soil loads.

Two of the walls located in the eastern corner of the building are introduced below grade as foundation walls. Levels 1 through 4 of this corner are located below grade at the location of the maximum retained soil. Once above-grade, soil loads no longer are the controlling load case and the walls are then designated as shear walls.




Figure 15: Floor Framing Plan Showing Shear Wall Locations (S-1.04)

- Shear Walls From Level 1 to Roof Level
- Shear Walls From Level 1 to Level 5
- Shear Walls From Level 5 to Roof Level

Design Loads

The following section focuses on topics concerning the loads used in the original structural design of the New Library. These topics include national codes used for live and lateral loadings, the determination of the design loads used, and the load paths for different loading conditions.

National Code for Live Loads and Lateral Loadings

Load	National Code	Section
Live	ASCE 7-05 Chapter 6, and UVA Facility Design Guidelines	5
Lateral	ASCE 7-05 Chapter 12	8

Table 3: National Code Chapter and Section for Live and Lateral Load

Gravity Loads

Live Loads

Design live load values are listed on sheet S-0.01 of the structural drawings. The majority of these loads were determined using Chapter 4 of ASCE7-05, with the exception of the design roof loads. The loads not found in ASCE 7-05 are listed in **Table 4** with an explanation of how they were determined.

Load	Determination of the Load
Roof area below sloped roof	The area below the sloped roof will most likely never see a live load, so the design team chose to simply provide a small allowance.
Roof mechanical area	The design team chose to blanket the roof with a live load instead of using the specific dead loads for the mechanical units. To determine a reasonable allowance the team used the largest PSF unit at the time and increased the load by 25%.
Minimum Roof Live Load	UVA Facility Design Guidelines specifies a minimum design roof live load.

Table 4: Live Loads Not Found in ASCE7-05

Dead Loads

Design dead loads are listed on sheet S-0.01 of the structural drawings. These loads were based on material weights and industry standards used at Cannon Design.

Snow Loads

Design snow loads must follow the UVA facility Design Guidelines. These guidelines state that ground snow loads are to be determined by case studies and other Virginia Unified Statewide Building Code requirements. The USBC adopts chapters 2-35 of IBC 2009 which references ASCE 7-05.

Lateral Loads

Wind Loads

Design wind loads were determined using Section 6.5 of ASCE 7-05. Section 6.5, Method 2, which is the analytical procedure for determining design wind loads for buildings of all heights.

Seismic Loads

Design seismic loads were determined using section 12.8 of ASCE 7-05. Section 12.8 prescribes the Equivalent Lateral Force Procedure for determining seismic design loads.

Soil Loads

From the geotechnical report performed by S&ME, Inc. it was determined that the foundation walls should be designed for an at-rest equivalent fluid pressure of 47 pcf. The soil loads on the foundation walls are then dependent on the height of the wall. **Figure 16** shows this distributed force on the foundation wall.




Figure 16: Equivalent Lateral Fluid Pressure

Design Codes and Standards

Below is a list of the design codes and standards used in the structural design of the New Library at the University of Virginia's College at Wise:

Codes Used in Original Design and Analysis

- **International Code Council**
 - IBC 2009 (Chapters 2-35 Adopted by Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code)
- **American Society of Civil Engineers**
 - ASCE 7-05: Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures
- **American Concrete Institute**
 - ACI 318-08: Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete
 - ACI 530-08: Building Code Requirements and Specifications for Masonry Structures
- **American Institute of Steel Construction**
 - AISC 360-05: Specifications for Structural Steel Buildings (Steel Construction Manual 13th Edition) - LRFD
- **University of Virginia Facilities Management and University Building Official**
 - Facility Design Guidelines

Below is a list of the design codes and standards used in the structural redesign of the New Library at the University of Virginia's College at Wise:

Codes Used in Redesign

- **International Code Council**
 - IBC 2012 (Chapters 2-35 Adopted by Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code)
- **American Society of Civil Engineers**
 - ASCE 7-10: Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures
- **American Concrete Institute**
 - ACI 318-11: Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete
 - ACI 530-11: Building Code Requirements and Specifications for Masonry Structures
- **University of Virginia Facilities Management and University Building Official**
 - Facility Design Guidelines

Proposal

Problem Statement

As previously discussed, the New Library utilizes a composite steel framing system, and the lateral system involves the use of ordinary reinforced concrete shear walls. Previous technical reports have shown that the existing gravity system and lateral system for the New Library are adequate to meet both strength and serviceability requirements.

Since no significant problems exist with the current steel structural system, a scenario has been created in which it is desired by the University to investigate the feasibility of a concrete framing system. As part of this investigation, the impact of the concrete system on the cost and construction schedule of the project should be compared to that of the existing steel system to allow the owner to make an informed decision. The architectural design of the New Library is based on the existing campus and surrounding buildings, so it is required that there is limited architectural impact with the system redesign.

Proposed Solution

The new structural system has been chosen to be a mild-steel reinforced two-way concrete slab with drop panels. This system will be analyzed using RAM Concept, which is one of the most efficient tools for designing concrete floor systems. It has already been determined that the existing shear walls are the most efficient lateral system and will be integrated with the new concrete system. ETABS will then be used to analyze the existing shear walls under anticipated increased seismic loads due to the increase in building mass. Columns will also be redesigned in concrete and will follow the existing column layout in order to minimize impact to the interior layout of the New Library.

The decision to use a two-way slab as the primary re-design was based on several factors. In Technical Report 3, a two-way flat slab was found to be the least expensive of the alternative concrete systems that were studied. Two-way systems with drop panels help to reduce the amount of negative reinforcement required at the columns and have become an industry standard. The bay sizes of the New Library are of a moderate span, approximately 25 feet, and are relatively square, which is ideal for a two-way slab system.

The largest bay in the New Library spans 31 feet. It is recognized that excessive deflections in this bay will be an area of concern with the alternate system. To address this issue alternative drop panel sizes and shallow beams will be investigated.

There is also an interest to investigate the option of a post-tensioned system as a secondary re-design. A schematic design of the full floor system will be designed using RAM Concept and will be compared to the two-way concrete system in order to determine if a complete PT floor option would be a practical option.

Breadth Topics

Construction Breadth

A comparative cost analysis will be performed in which the cost of the existing composite steel system will be compared to that of the redesigned two-way concrete system. This cost analysis will include materials, erection/formwork, and labor. Cost information for the existing steel system will be provided by Cannon Design, while cost information for the redesigned concrete system will be determined using RS Means.

A schedule analysis will also be performed in which the impact of this system change on the critical path and construction schedule will also be considered. The construction schedule and the critical path required for the concrete system will be compared to that of the existing steel system, which will be provided by Cannon Design.

Mechanical Breadth

Drainage at the base of the foundation/basement walls will be investigated. The location of the ground water levels in relation to the footings will be determined and the flow rate of the ground water and rain water will be calculated. It is assumed that a drainage system will be required. Thus, a drainage pipe and sump pump, if needed, will be sized based on the flow rate and code specifications.

Waterproofing for the foundation/basement walls and the effect of the water beneath the slab-on-grade will also be investigated.

MAE Requirement

Graduate level work will be incorporated into the structural system redesign. This will be done through the use of computer modeling. Material covered in AE530, Computer Modeling of Building Structures will be used extensively throughout the redesign. ETABS will be used in the analysis of the lateral system under ACSE7-10 wind and seismic loads and increased gravity loads due to the increased building weight. ETABS will be used to verify the shear walls for these increased loads. RAM Concept will be used in the design of the conventionally reinforced concrete slab and the post-tensioned concrete slab. This program will be learned through guided self-study for modeling of both conventionally reinforced concrete slabs and post-tensioned systems.

Structural Depths

Primary Depth: Two-Way Concrete System

Floor System Design

It was desired to investigate the possibility of a concrete gravity system for the New Library at the University of Virginia's College at Wise. It was determined that a two-way flat slab with drop panels would be the best choice for the system redesign. This system was chosen due to the decreased formwork and labor costs (as compared to the one-way system). The two-way system also is believed to work well for square spans of approximately 25 feet, which is similar to the majority of those found in the New Library.

For the design, RAM Concept was used as the primary modeling software. This program was chosen for its efficiency in designing concrete floor systems, along with its high recommendations from practicing engineers. Most of the floors in the New Library are similar in layout and required loading. As a typical floor, Level 5 was chosen to be redesigned. Level 5 is comprised primarily of areas for general collections, offices (including partitions), and reading rooms. The required design loadings for these areas per ASCE7-10 are 150psf, 80 psf, and 60 psf respectively. It was also decided that the areas designated as reading rooms were to be designed with a loading of 80 psf. This was done in order to match the design loading used by the original design team to allow for the most accurate comparison of the steel and concrete structural systems. All loads used in the design of the concrete system can be seen in Table A1 and Table A2 in Appendix A.

A base slab thickness was first chosen using the CRSI Manual. Based on the spans sizes and approximant factored superimposed floor loads a 10" slab was chosen as a base thickness. To determine the starting drop panel size ACI318-11 Section 13.2.5 was used. This section requires a minimum dimension of $L/6$ in each span direction, and a minimum total depth of $1.25h$.

After adjusting the initial drop panel sizes to pass punching shear checks, the required size of several drop panels was extremely large. For example, the drop panel at column 8B was almost 14'-0" wide and projected 1'-1" below the slab. Based on this information, it was determined that the required drop panel sizes were unacceptable and an alternative design was needed. **Figure 17** shows the floor layout, and **Table 5** shows the required drop panel sizes and thicknesses after initial adjustments.




Figure 17: Flat Slab with Drop Panels – RAM Concept Plan

Column	-X (FT)	+X (FT)	-Y (FT)	+Y (FT)	Thickness (IN)	Required an Increase in Size
3E	1.33	8.44	8.44	1.33	6	Yes
3D	1.33	8.44	8.44	8.44	9	Yes
3C	1.33	8.44	1.33	8.44	9	Yes
6E	10.33	9.11	8.44	1.33	4	Yes
6D	5.17	4.56	4.22	4.22	6	No
6C	6.20	5.47	3.83	5.07	2.5	Yes
8B	13.67	1.33	1.33	12.67	13	Yes

Table 5: Required Drop Panel Sizes After Initial Adjustments

It was quickly noticed that punching shear, around the columns and drop panels, was going to control the floor design. Several trial floor designs were investigated including the addition of edge beams, small interior framing beams, and shear studrails in place of drop panels. Several of the main trial layouts can be seen in Figures B1 – B5 in Appendix B.

Drop Panels were originally chosen over shear studrails because studrails are fairly new to the engineering community and were originally proprietary. After some research, it was determined that shear studrails are now widely produced and are no longer an increased cost on building projects. One company, Decon, has been producing studrails since the 1970’s and they state that their studrails actually “provide a lower overall in-place cost when compared to other existing punching shear control alternatives.”

Shear stud rails seemed like the best option for punching shear, but a drop panel was ultimately used due to the increase in stiffness required to decrease long term deflections. See the deflection check section for more details on this choice and the decision to also include a shallow beam in the two bays adjacent to column 6D along column line D.

The final floor design was comprised of a 10" two-way slab with mild-steel reinforcement. There is a 7'-0" x 7'-0" drop panel at column 6D, and a shallow 14" deep, 10'-0" wide beam along column line D spanning between column line 5 and 7. Edge beams and interior beams around floor openings were also included. **Figure 18** shows this final floor layout, and **Figure 19** and **20** show the beam mark plan along with the beam schedule.




Figure 18: Final Floor Design – RAM Concept Plan




Figure 19: Beam Mark Plan

MARK	SIZE		BOTTOM	REINFORCING				STIRRUPS			ADD'L HORIZ. REINFORCING EACH FACE
	WIDTH (IN)	DEPTH (IN)		L.E.	TOP		R.E.	TYPE	SIZE	SPACING (IN)	
					LEFT	RIGHT					
B-1	24	24	7	4	2	2	5	2 LEG	#4	11.5	1
B-2	24	24	8	8	3	3	11	2 LEG	#4	11.5	2
B-3	24	24	6	11	2	2	6	2 LEG	#4	11.5	2
B-4	24	30	8	6	4	4	8	2 LEG	#4	9	1
B-5	24	24	9	11	3	3	11	2 LEG	#4	6.5	1
B-6	24	30	8	11	2	2	7	2 LEG	#4	6.5	1
B-7	10	12	2	6	1	1	2	2 LEG	#4	5.5	1
B-8	24	24	8	10	3	3	5	2 LEG	#4	5	1
B-9	16	24	4	0	4	4	0	2 LEG	#4	7.5	1
B-1A	24	30	8	9	3	3	4	2 LEG	#4	12	1
B-2A	24	30	8	4	3	3	9	2 LEG	#4	12	1
B-3A	16	24	5	11	1	1	5	2 LEG	#4	7	0
B-4A	24	30	12	12	2	2	6	2 LEG	#4	12	0
B-5A	24	24	6	0	2	2	8	2 LEG	#4	10.5	1
B-6A	16	24	9	0	9	9	0	-	-	-	0
B-7A	24	24	6	6	1	1	6	2 LEG	#4	10.5	0

Figure 20: Beam Schedule

Verification of Output

Although the slab design was completed using design software it was important to verify the output. In order to verify the results produced by RAM Concept several checks were performed.

FEA vs. EFM

The first verification was to check the design moments giving by RAM Concept. Due to the limitations of the direct design method, the equivalent frame method was used to calculate the design moments by hand. The moments along column line 3 were calculated and the results were then verified using SP Slab. These calculations along with the SP Slab output can be seen in Appendix C.1.

Once the hand calculations were finished, they were compared to RAM Concept. It was determined that it was not possible to directly match the results given by RAM Concept by using the equivalent frame method. According to the RAM Concept user manual, the program uses finite element analysis to calculate moments in the slab. Finite element analysis allows the program to more accurately predict the elastic behavior of a slab as compared to traditional frame/strip analysis (equivalent frame method). RAM Concept also provides a more accurate distribution of forces across the design strip.

Although the results cannot directly be matched, it is possible to verify results within a certain percentage. The total design moment across the spans will be comparable, even though the distribution of negative/positive moments to the joints varies.

Therefore, to verify the moments provided by RAM Concept, the total moments for both the span segment and the column strip were calculated, and the totals for each method were compared. **Table 6** below shows the percent different in the design moments. Based on the percent difference it was determined that RAM Concept's force distribution was reasonable.

Percent Different in Total Design Moments			
	Hand Calculations/SP Slab	RAM Concept	% Difference
Total Moment in Span A-B	650.13	712.75	9%
Total Moment in Span B-C	806.82	777.11	4%
Total Moment in Both Spans	1456.95	1489.86	2%

Table 6: Design Moment Comparison

Wide Beam (One-way) Shear/ Punching (Two-way) Shear

Column 6D is a critical column due to the large tributary area and high live loading. RAM Concept designed the required shear studrails for this column, but the program also designed shear stirrups. Typically one-way shear does not control in two-way slabs, and there shouldn't have been shear stirrups along with the shear studrails. To determine if one-way shear reinforcement was required hand calculations were performed.

Table 7 and **Table 8** below shows the results of the one-way shear and two-way shear hand calculations as compared to RAM Concept. The full hand calculations can be seen in Appendix C.2.

One-Way Shear			
	RAM Concept	Hand Calculations	% Difference
Max Shear Demand	143.1 K	143.1 K	0%
Max Capacity	302.6K	278.4 K	8%
*Hand Calcs take shears at d away from the face of support, RAM shears taken at face of support			

Table 7: One-Way Shear Comparison

Two-Way Shear			
	RAM Concept	Hand Calculations	% Difference
Max Shear Demand	284.6 K	280 K	1.6%
Max Capacity	189.7 K	189.9 K	0.1%

Table 8: Two-Way Shear Comparison

These results verify that RAM Concept's outputs are reasonable. They also show that the slab is adequate for one-way shear but not for two-way shear.

Checking Shear Stud Rails

Although shear stud rails were not used in the conventionally reinforced floor design they were used for the post-tensioned floor design. Therefore, verification of RAM Concept's output was complete and is included in Appendix C.3.

Deflection Checks

It was noted in the proposal that deflection problems were to be expected due to the 31'-0" and 27'-4" spans. Once the basic floor design was completed the deflections were checked. Table 9.5(b) from ACI318-11, shown in **Figure 21** below, was used to determine a maximum permissible deflection of L/480.

TABLE 9.5(b)—MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE COMPUTED DEFLECTIONS

Type of member	Deflection to be considered	Deflection limitation
Flat roofs not supporting or attached to non-structural elements likely to be damaged by large deflections	Immediate deflection due to live load L	$\frac{L}{180}$
Floors not supporting or attached to nonstructural elements likely to be damaged by large deflections	Immediate deflection due to live load L	$\frac{L}{360}$
Roof or floor construction supporting or attached to nonstructural elements likely to be damaged by large deflections	That part of the total deflection occurring after attachment of nonstructural elements (sum of the long-term deflection due to all sustained loads and the immediate deflection due to any additional live load) [†]	$\frac{L}{480}$
Roof or floor construction supporting or attached to nonstructural elements not likely to be damaged by large deflections		$\frac{L}{240}$

Figure 21: Table 9.5(b) from ACI318-11

RAM Concept produces deflection contours based on the initial deflections. The deflections of primary concern were the ones that included initial and long term deflections. These long term deflections are due to creep and shrinkage and consider the effects of cracking. To view these deflections a time-history analysis must be run. RAM Concept accounts for long term deflections a little differently than what we would like, so some adjustments need to be made. An explanation of these adjustments can be seen in Appendix D.

After an initial run, the maximum deflection in the slab was found to be L/297 (span 5D-6D). **Table 9** below shows the most critical spans and their corresponding deflections.

Span	Span Length (FT)	Deflection	L/480	Pass/Fail
5D - 6D	31	1.33	0.775	Fail
6D - 7D	27.33	1.02	0.683	Fail
5E - 6D	40	1.43	1.0	Fail
6E - 7D	37.33	1.24	0.933	Fail
5C- 6D	40	1.33	1.0	Fail

Table 9: Initial Deflection Check

Several trial designs were completed to determine the best solution to the deflection problems. Options included load averaging, compression reinforcement, drop panels, and shallow beams. These trial designs can also be seen in appendix D.

The final design incorporated a 7'x7' drop panel at column 6D and two shallow 14" beams. The final deflection checks can be seen in **Table 10**.

Span	Span Length (FT)	Deflection	L/480	Pass/Fail
5D - 6D	31	0.709	0.775	Pass
6D - 7D	27.33	0.511	0.683	Pass
5E - 6D	40	0.875	1.0	Pass
6E - 7D	37.33	0.817	0.933	Pass
5C- 6D	40	0.827	1.0	Pass

Table 10: Final Deflection Check

Edge Deflection Check

Deflection checks at the edge of the slab were also completed to ensure the design met the required L/600 to prevent damage to the masonry façade due to cracking.

The sustained deflection of the slab was compared to the maximum permissible deflections. Initial deflections will not affect the façade due to the fact that it will not be placed on the structure until after these initial deflections have occurred. **Table 11** below shows the deflection checks.

Span	Span Length (FT)	Initial Deflections (in)	Final Deflections (in)	Sustained Deflections (in)	L/600 (in)	Pass/Fail
3C-D3	25.33	0.018	0.19	0.17	0.51	Pass
D3-E3	25.33	0.016	0.18	0.16	0.51	Pass
3E-4E	25.33	0.037	0.31	0.27	0.51	Pass
4E-5E	25.33	0.059	0.55	0.49	0.51	Pass
5E-6E	31	0.044	0.52	0.48	0.62	Pass
6E-7E	27.33	0.020	0.35	0.33	0.55	Pass
7E-8E	25.33	0.007	0.18	0.17	0.51	Pass
9E-9D	25.33	0.000	0.01	0.01	0.51	Pass
9D-9C	23.33	0.000	0.03	0.03	0.47	Pass
9C-8C	12.67	0.000	0.10	0.10	0.25	Pass
8B-7B	25.33	0.060	0.50	0.44	0.51	Pass
6C-5C	31	0.045	0.53	0.49	0.62	Pass
5C-4C	25.33	0.059	0.56	0.50	0.51	Pass
4C-3C	25.33	0.029	0.23	0.20	0.51	Pass

Table 11: Edge Deflection Checks

Reinforcement

The reinforcement for the floor slab is comprised of #5 bars running in both the latitude direction (E-W) and the longitude direction (N-S). **Figure 23** below shows a section through the floor slab showing the cover and location of the reinforcement in the floor slab (dimensions are given in inches). The location of this section can be seen in **Figure 22**.




Figure 22: Plan View Showing the Location of Section 'A'




Figure 23: Section 'A' Showing Location and Cover of Slab Reinforcement

RAM Concept lays out the reinforcement based on the calculated requirements. This layout is not always the most economical due to the fact that it uses the minimum number of bars in each individual design strip instead of a traditional mat layout. To adjust the reinforcement layout, a top and bottom mat was chosen based on the minimum required reinforcement and the additional required reinforcement was calculated. **Figure 24** below shows the layout of the reinforcement along with the reinforcement schedule. The calculations for the additional reinforcement required can be seen in Table E1-E4 in Appendix E.




Figure 24: Reinforcement Layout

Column Design

The existing steel columns and the partition walls encasing them are approximately 24"x24". It was desired to limit the size of the new concrete columns based on the existing interior design. Therefore, the beginning trial size was 24"x24". It was expected that this size would be larger than required for axial loads.

After completion of the floor design the columns were designed, and the selected size was verified. Excel was used to calculate the axial load on each column at level 1, and unbalanced moments were taken from RAM Concept. Several critical columns were chosen and designed using SP Column. Figure F1 showing the axial load calculations, along with the SP Column output, can be seen in Appendix F.

The final column design for typical columns was 24"x24" with (8) #8 longitude bars and #3 transverse ties. Column 6C and 7E did required additional longitudinal reinforcement on lower levels, and column 6D also required an increase in size. **Table 12** below shows a summary of these results.

Column	Level	Size	Reinforcement
6D	1-3	28" x 28"	(16) #8's
6C	1	24" x 24"	(12) #8's
7C	1	24" x 24"	(10) #8's

Table 12: Size and Reinforcement of Non-Typical Columns

The required axial and moment capacity was then compared to the available strength of the critical columns. It is recognized that the columns are over designed for capacity at upper levels, but this is due to the problems with punching shear. If the columns were made smaller the punching shear problems would be increased. When the columns are checked at level one, the ratio of capacity to required strength is much more economical. This ratio for the non-typical columns can be seen in Table 13 below, and additional column ratios can be seen in Table F1 in Appendix F.

Column	$\phi P_n/P_u$
6D	1.02
6C	1.02
7C	1.01

Table 13: Column Capacities

Secondary Depth: Post-Tensioned System

There was an interest to investigate a post-tensioned option for the floor system in the New Library. Before beginning, design research was done to determine the pros and cons of this type of system. Both the information gained from research and schematic floor designs were used to decide whether the system was a feasible option.

Pros, Cons, and Concerns

There are several advantages with the PT system:

- Reduced slab depth and floor weight
- Longer spans achieved more economically
- Deflection and vibration control
- Improved constructability

One major concern with the PT system is shortening. Once the tendons are stressed they pull the edges of the slab in towards the center of the structure. This is expected with the PT system, but can be an issue when there is an unfavorable arrangement of shear walls in the structure. **Figure 25**, courtesy of “Post-Tensioned Concrete: Practical Applications” by the engineers at Holbert Apple, shows the preferred arrangement of shear walls vs. unfavorable arrangements of shear walls. It is best to have the shear walls located in the center of the structure. When they are near the edges the floor shortens and induces stresses into both the slab and the shear walls.




Figure 25: Arrangements of Shear Walls: Preferred vs. Unfavorable

Based on this information the location of the shear walls in the New Library would be unfavorable for the PT system. **Figure 26** below shows the location of the shear walls in the New Library.




Figure 26: Location of Shear Walls in New Library

To avoid problems with shortening due to the location of the shear walls a pour strip would be used. This pour strip is a strip of the floor slab that is approximately 4' to 6' wide that is left open. An example of this can be seen in **Figure 27**. The pour strip remains open a minimum of 28 days (42 to 90 preferred) which gives time for the majority of shrinkage and creep to occur.



Figure 27: Example of a Pour Strip

Though possible, this method is often not favorable to construction workers due to the fact that it restricts site access to certain areas and can create a tripping hazard.

Shortening of the slab can also be an issue when there is foundation walls located next to the slab edge. Where this occurs the slab pulls away from the foundation walls, which also induce stresses into both the slab and the walls. To avoid this problem, slip joints must be added at the foundation walls. The slip joint will allow independent motion of the slab and the walls while allowing them to remain joined together.

PT systems are most beneficial in structures in which the tendons can span uninterrupted across several bays. In the New Library, there are often only two bays in the longitude direction, and although the latitude direction is several bays long, many of the bays are interrupted by the shear walls. This layout won't allow the tendons to be as efficient.

Initial Design

The PT system for the floor design was chosen to be an unbonded system with a banded–distributed tendon layout. When using the banded–distributed tendon layout the tendons are banded together in one direction over column lines, while tendons in the other direction are uniformly distributed across the slab. This layout can be seen in **Figure 28**. The banded–distributed layout was chosen because it is a common layout used in industry, and is easier for constructability due to the fact that weaving of the tendons is only required in one direction rather than a basket weave in two directions. This layout also allows for the maximum permissible tendon drape since the banded and distributed tendons generally do not cross at their high or low points, except at the supports.




Figure 28: Banded-Distributed Tendon Layout (Courtesy of PTI Tech Note 8)

The initial slab thickness for the slab in the PT system was chosen to be 8". This was chosen due to the fact that the slab thickness required for the conventionally reinforced slab was 10", and one typical advantage of the PT systems is a decreased floor thickness.

Concrete strength of the system was also increased to an f'_c of 5000psi, as compared to an f'_c of 4000psi used in the conventionally reinforced design. One reason for this increase was because in industry, PT systems are almost always designed using 5000psi concrete. Another reason for this choice was to increase the max allowable concrete stress. ACI318-11 Section 18.3.3 states that prestressed two-way slab systems shall be designed as a Class U system with $f_t \leq 6\sqrt{f'_c}$. This places an upper bound on the max tensile stress in the slab, and by increasing the f'_c to 5000psi this upper bound is also increased.

The drop cap and shallow beams were also not added until it could be determined if the additional stiffness would be required.

Laying Out the Tendons

The tendons for the floor slab are $\frac{1}{2}$ " diameter tendons. Banded tendons were run in the latitude direction (long direction) and distributed tendons were run in the longitude direction (short direction). See **Figure 29** and **Figure 30** below for an overview.




Figure 29: Tendons in the Latitude Direction




Figure 30: Tendons in the Longitude Direction

This layout was chosen to take advantage of the increased “d-value” in the longer direction. The banded tendons always go on the “outside” and the distributed tendons always go on the “inside”, thus giving the banded tendons a larger “d-value”. **Figure 31** below shows a section through the floor slab showing the cover and drape of the tendons at a column. The initial elevation of the tendons before balancing can be seen in Table G1 and Table G2 in Appendix G.1.




Figure 31: Section Showing Cover and Drape at Column

Choosing the Initial Number of Tendons

The initial number of tendons was based on the minimum precompression stress P/A (force/area). For an interior occupancy, an economical design with typical spans should be in the range of approximately 125psi – 175 psi.

For the banded direction the area used for this calculation was the design strip area. Once the force was determined, the number of tendons was calculated. It is an industry standard that in PT flat slab unbonded tendon construction, typically $\frac{1}{2}$ " diameter 7-wire tendons are used with an area of 0.153 in^2 , an ultimate strength of 270ksi, and low relaxation steel (this is based on ACI318-11 Section 18.12.6). The average force, after all stress losses, is designed to end up at 27 kips/tendon at the worst. Therefore, to determine the initial number of tendons the calculated force was divided by 27 kips. A sample calculation of this can be seen below next to **Figure 32**, and the initial number of tendons for all of the design strips can be seen in Table G3 in Appendix G.2.




Figure 32: Plan View Showing the Location of Span 1-1

Span 1-1

$$A = (24.33')(12/1')(8") = 2429 \text{ in}^2$$

$$P = (125\text{psi})(2429\text{in}^2) = 304\text{kips}$$

$$\text{Tendons} = \frac{304 \text{ kips}}{27 \text{ kips/tendon}} = 11 \text{ Tendons}$$

For the distributed tendon direction, a minimum of two tendons were run together. ACI318-11 Section 18.12.6 states that a minimum of two tendons must be provided in each direction over columns, so it is standard to run a minimum of two tendons together across the entire slab. For the distributed direction, the spacing between tendons was calculated using the minimum compression stress of 125psi. This calculation can be seen below.

$$125\text{psi}(8")(12"/1') = 12000 \text{ lb/in}$$

$$x = \frac{54000 \text{ lb}}{12000 \text{ lb/ft}} = 4.5 \text{ ft}$$

ACI318-11 Section 18.12.4 states that the maximum distributed direction tendon spacing is the minimum of 5 feet and eight times the slab thickness. For the floor system eight times the slab thickness is 5.33', so 4.5' is less than the maximums.

Balancing the Tendons

The tendons were balanced both after the initial layout and after the final layout was completed. Too much uplift in a tendon can cause deflection reversals that may cause cracking in the slab. Therefore, balancing the load in adjacent tendon spans helps to prevent this from happening.

The balancing load is based on the weight of the design strip. The lower limit for the strip was 50% of the design strip weight, while the upper limit was 125% of the design strip weight. These percentages are based on industry standards.

RAM Concept calculated the current balancing load for the design strip. If the balancing load exceeded the upper limit, then the upper limit was input into the program as the desired load. RAM Concept then adjusted the tendon elevation to decrease the balancing load to the upper limit, and the elevation was then manually adjusted to the nearest $\frac{1}{4}$ ". This occurred most often at locations in the slab where an exterior span was much shorter than an adjacent interior span.

If the balancing load was below the lower limit tendons needed to be added. Tendons were then only added after tendons had been added to pass for flexural requirements. This was done because most often this criterion will control the number of tendons rather than the lower limit.

Table G4 and Table G5 in Appendix G.3 shows the final balancing loads given by concept, whether they passed/failed, and the elevation adjustments.

Adjusting the Number of Tendons

As stated before, the upper bound on the maximum tensile stress in the slab is limited to $f_t \leq 6\sqrt{f'_c}$. Therefore, this often controls the slab design. After the initial layout was run it was determined that this was the case, and several of the design spans were failing due to this limitation.

The economical upper limit for the maximum precompression force is 350psi. If more tendons than this are required to meet the stress limitations, another design solution should be considered. Based on this force, the max number of tendons for each design strip was calculated in the same way the initial number was calculated. The design strips that were failing were determined, and the number of tendons in these strips was increased. Table G6 in Appendix G.4 shows the initial number of tendons in the banded direction for each design strip, the max number of tendons, and the new required number of tendons. For the distributed tendons, it was determined that a maximum of 6 tendons could be used.

Even with the maximum number of tendons span 11-1 and 11-2 still failed. This was expected due to the problems with these bays in the design of the two-way conventionally reinforced slab. The first solution was the addition of a 12" deep, 10 ft wide shallow beam spanning between column line 5 and 7 along column line D (shown in **Figure 33**). This was chosen due to the fact that it was successful in the previous design. Once this beam was added, the number of tendons for span 11-1 and 11-2 were able to be reduced below the maximum limit.




Figure 33: Shallow Beam along Column Line D

Checking Deflections

As stated before, ACI318-11 Section 18.3.3 states that prestressed two-way slab systems shall be designed as Class U systems. ACI318-11 Section 9.5.4.1 states that for Class U systems the deflections shall be calculated using gross section properties.

To account for creep and shrinkage without using cracked section properties, an additional load combination was input into RAM Concept.

$$2(\text{Self-Dead}) + 2(\text{Balance}) + 3(\text{Other Dead}) + 1.6(\text{Live})$$

This combination accounts for service instantaneous deflections and long term deflections. A factor of one is applied to service instantaneous deflections which include deflections due to the superimposed dead load plus the live load. A factor of two is applied to the long term deflections which include deflections due to the dead load self-weight, the superimposed dead load, and 30% of the sustained live load. The factor of two is the long term deflection factor for duration of 5 years or more found in ACI318-11 Section 9.5.2.5.

ACI318-11 Section 9.5.4 also states that the deflections for all prestressed concrete flexural members must be compared to the maximum permissible deflection values in Table 9.5(b). Therefore, a limit of L/480 was also used for the PT deflection checks.

Five critical spans were checked for deflections. Based on the maximum deflection limit of L/480 it was determined that the system was adequate for deflection requirements. The deflection for each critical span is shown in **Table 14** below.

Span	Span Length (FT)	Deflection	L/600	Pass/Fail
5D - 6D	31	0.578	0.620	Pass
6D - 7D	27.33	0.413	0.547	Pass
5E - 6D	40	0.667	0.800	Pass
6E - 7D	37.33	0.587	0.747	Pass
5C - 6D	40	0.659	0.800	Pass

Table 14: Critical Deflections

Edge deflections were also checked against the maximum permissible deflection limit of $L/600$ and were determined to be adequate. These deflections can be seen in **Table 15** below.

Span	Span Length (FT)	Deflections (in)	L/600 (in)	Pass/Fail
3C-D3	25.33	0.14	0.51	Pass
D3-E3	25.33	0.13	0.51	Pass
3E-4E	25.33	0.21	0.51	Pass
4E-5E	25.33	0.47	0.51	Pass
5E-6E	31	0.32	0.62	Pass
6E-7E	27.33	0.21	0.55	Pass
7E-8E	25.33	0.21	0.51	Pass
9D-9C	23.33	0.03	0.47	Pass
9C-8C	12.67	0.03	0.25	Pass
8B-7B	25.33	0.23	0.51	Pass
6C-5C	31	0.37	0.62	Pass
5C-4C	25.33	0.50	0.51	Pass
4C-3C	25.33	0.25	0.51	Pass

Table 15: Edge Deflections

The Final Layout

Unlike the conventionally reinforced slab, a drop panel at the column was not needed to limit deflections in the post-tensioned system. Therefore, only the shallow beam was required at column 6D. Although no drop panel was required for deflections, the shallow beam was not thick enough to eliminate punching shear at the face of the column. Instead of the addition of a drop panel to eliminate the punching shear, shear studrails were used. Shear studrails not only can cost less, but are also beneficial from a construction stand point due to the fact that it is easier to lay the tendons through the studs rather than having to weave them through the stirrups.

The final tendon layout is shown in the two figures below. **Figure 34** shows the banded tendons and **Figure 35** shows the distributed tendons.




Figure 34: Final Layout of Latitude Tendons




Figure 35: Final Layout of Latitude Tendons

Conclusion

By using a post-tensioned floor slab, the slab thickness was successfully reduced from 10", used in the conventionally reinforced floor system, to 8". This reduction in thickness would decrease the quantity of concrete required and increase the floor-to-ceiling heights.

Typically an increase in floor-to-ceiling height is beneficial, but in the New Library the floor-to-ceiling heights are not dictated by typical factors. Instead, the levels are based on the topography of the hillside, making the floor-to-floor heights 16'-0" to 18'-0". Thus, a 2" increase in floor-to-ceiling heights in the New Library is not significantly beneficial.

Although the decrease in slab thickness would decrease the overall cost of the system, the additional costs and complications associated with the PT system would most likely outweigh the savings. These complications include the pour strips required due to the location of the shear walls, and the detailing of the slip joints required due to the foundation walls.

So, although it is possible to use a post-tensioned slab in the New Library, it was determined that is not recommended based on the minimal savings and additional complications.

Lateral Analysis

Once the structural system was changed from steel to concrete it was expected that the weight of the building would increase, thus increasing the seismic forces on the structure. It was decided that the lateral system should be re-analyzed under these increased forces to determine if adjustment needed to be made. Wind forces were also recalculated using ASCE7-10. The recalculated wind and seismic loads can be seen in Appendix H.

For Technical Report 4, a 3D ETABS model was created and the New Library's Lateral System was analyzed under wind and seismic loads calculated using ASCE7-05. Modeling decisions, verification of the ETABS model, and tables showing the building properties can be seen in Appendix I.

Overview

The lateral system used in the New Library is ordinary reinforced shear walls. The seven individual shear walls are shown in red in **Figure 36** below, while the diaphragms for each level are shown in gray. These seven shear walls can be located on the floor plan, Figure I1, provided in Appendix I where they are numbered 1-7. All of the shear walls are 12", with the exception of shear wall 1 and 2 which are 16" and 33" at the base level.




Figure 36: 3D View of ETABS Model

Wind Loads

Wind loads were recalculated using ASCE7-10. The four different wind cases to be applied to the building in order to account to quartering winds and torsion effects still applied. **Table 16-24** below show the resulting forces for each wind, along with **Figure 37 – 40** which show the corresponding images from ASCE7-10.

Note: ASCE7-10 requires a minimum wind pressure of 16 PSF in the windward direction.

Case 1:

Wind Pressures (E-W Direction)					
Floor Height	Wall Length	Windward Pressure (PSF)	Leeward Pressure (PSF)	Trib Area (SF)	Force (K)
102	94.33	19.03	-9.49	849	24
84	94.33	18.07	-9.49	1604	44
68	94.33	17.11	-9.49	1509	40
52	94.33	16.00	-9.49	1509	38
36	94.33	16.00	-9.49	1604	41
18	94.33	16.00	-9.49	1698	43
Base Shear=					231

Table 16: Case 1: Wind Pressures (E-W Direction)

Wind Pressures (N-S Direction)					
Floor Height	Wall Length	Windward Pressure (PSF)	Leeward Pressure (PSF)	Trib Area (SF)	Force (K)
102	121.67	18.78	-12.07	1095	34
84	121.67	17.83	-12.07	2068	62
68	121.67	16.88	-12.07	1947	56
52	147	16.00	-12.07	2352	66
36	147	16.00	-12.07	2499	70
18	147	16.00	-12.07	2646	74
Base Shear=					362

Table 17: Case1: Wind Pressures (N-S Direction)




Figure 37: Wind Load Case 1

Case 2:

Wind Pressures (E-W Direction)								
Floor Height	Wall Length	Windward Pressure (PSF)	Leeward Pressure (PSF)	Trib Area (SF)	Force (K)	B _x (FT)	(±)e _x (FT)	(±)M _x (Ft-K)
102	94.33	16.00	-7.12	849	20	94.33	14.1	278
84	94.33	16.00	-7.12	1604	37	94.33	14.1	525
68	94.33	16.00	-7.12	1509	35	94.33	14.1	494
52	94.33	16.00	-7.12	1509	35	94.33	14.1	494
36	94.33	16.00	-7.12	1604	37	94.33	14.1	525
18	94.33	16.00	-7.12	1698	39	94.33	14.1	555
Base Shear=					203			

Table 18: Case 2: Wind Pressures (E-W Direction)

Wind Pressures (N-S Direction)								
Floor Height	Wall Length	Windward Pressure (PSF)	Leeward Pressure (PSF)	Trib Area (SF)	Force (K)	B _y (FT)	(±)e _y (FT)	(±)M _y (Ft-K)
102	121.67	16.00	-9.05	1095	27	121.67	18.3	501
84	121.67	16.00	-9.05	2068	52	121.67	18.3	946
68	121.67	16.00	-9.05	1947	49	121.67	18.3	890
52	147	16.00	-9.05	2352	59	147	22.1	1299
36	147	16.00	-9.05	2499	63	147	22.1	1381
18	147	16.00	-9.05	2646	66	147	22.1	1462
Base Shear=					316			

Table 19: Case 2: Wind Pressures (N-S Direction)




Figure 38: Wind Load Case 2

Case 3:

Note: Pressures in the X-Direction and Y-Direction are applied simultaneously.

Wind Pressures (E-W Direction)					
Floor Height	Wall Length	Windward Pressure (PSF)	Leeward Pressure (PSF)	Trib Area (SF)	Force (K)
102	94.33	16.00	-7.12	849	20
84	94.33	16.00	-7.12	1604	37
68	94.33	16.00	-7.12	1509	35
52	94.33	16.00	-7.12	1509	35
36	94.33	16.00	-7.12	1604	37
18	94.33	16.00	-7.12	1698	39
Base Shear=					203

Table 20: Case 3: Wind Pressures (E-W Direction)

Wind Pressures (N-S Direction)					
Floor Height	Wall Length	Windward Pressure (PSF)	Leeward Pressure (PSF)	Trib Area (SF)	Force (K)
102	121.67	16.00	-9.05	1095	27
84	121.67	16.00	-9.05	2068	52
68	121.67	16.00	-9.05	1947	49
52	147	16.00	-9.05	2352	59
36	147	16.00	-9.05	2499	63
18	147	16.00	-9.05	2646	66
Base Shear=					316

Table 21: Case 3: Wind Pressures (N-S Direction)




Figure 39: Wind Load Case 3

Case 4:

Note: Moments in the X-Direction and Y-Direction are applied at the same time.

Wind Pressures (E-W Direction)					
Floor Height	Wall Length	Windward Pressure (PSF)	Leeward Pressure (PSF)	Trib Area (SF)	Force (K)
102	94.33	16.00	-5.34	849	18
84	94.33	16.00	-5.34	1604	34
68	94.33	16.00	-5.34	1509	32
52	94.33	16.00	-5.34	1509	32
36	94.33	16.00	-5.34	1604	34
18	94.33	16.00	-5.34	1698	36
Base Shear=					187

Table 22: Case 4: Wind Pressures (E-W Direction)

Wind Pressures (N-S Direction)					
Floor Height	Wall Length	Windward Pressure (PSF)	Leeward Pressure (PSF)	Trib Area (SF)	Force (K)
102	121.67	16.00	-6.80	1095	25
84	121.67	16.00	-6.80	2068	47
68	121.67	16.00	-6.80	1947	44
52	147	16.00	-6.80	2352	54
36	147	16.00	-6.80	2499	57
18	147	16.00	-6.80	2646	60
Base Shear=					287

Table 23: Case 4: Wind Pressures (N-S Direction)

Wind Pressures (N-S Direction)								
Floor Height	Force - X (K)	Force - Y (K)	B _x (FT)	(±)e _x (FT)	B _y (FT)	(±)e _y (FT)	(±) M of same sign	(±) M of opposite sign
102	18	25	94.33	14.1	121.67	18.3	712	199
84	34	47	94.33	14.1	121.67	18.3	1345	376
68	32	44	94.33	14.1	121.67	18.3	1266	354
52	32	54	94.33	14.1	147	22.1	1638	726
36	34	57	94.33	14.1	147	22.1	1740	772
18	36	60	94.33	14.1	147	22.1	1843	817

Table 24: Case 4: Wind Pressures (N-S Direction)




Figure 40: Wind Load Case 4

Seismic Forces

The increased building weight due to the new concrete structural system was calculated and the seismic forces calculated in Technical Report 4 were adjusted accordingly. **Table 25** and **Table 26** below show both the applied forces and moments.

Code Provisions to Note:

-ASCE7-10 Section 12.8.4.2 requires that when the diaphragm is not flexible, the design for seismic forces shall include the accidental torsional moment caused by the assumed displacement of the center of mass each way from its actual location by a distance equal to 5 percent of the dimension of the structure perpendicular to the direction of the applied forces.

-Due to the fact that the building is assigned to seismic category B, ACSE7-10 Section 12.5.2 states that seismic forces are permitted to be applied independently in each of two orthogonal directions and orthogonal interaction effects are permitted to be neglected.

-The torsion amplification factor A_x is also taken as 1.0 due to the building being assigned to seismic category B.

Calculation of Story Forces (E-W Direction)										
Level	Height (FT)	Total Weight (K)	$w_i h_i^k$ (K-FT)	C_{vx}	f_i (K)	V_i (K)	B_y (Ft)	5% B_y (FT)	A_x (K)	M_z (Ft-K)
Roof	102	2410	963012	0.210	129.0	129.0	94.3	4.7	1.0	609
6	84	3238	1077339	0.234	144.3	273.4	94.3	4.7	1.0	681
5	68	3305	871800	0.190	116.8	390.2	94.3	4.7	1.0	551
4	52	3647	722020	0.157	96.7	486.9	94.3	4.7	1.0	456
3	36	4602	621328	0.135	83.2	570.2	94.3	4.7	1.0	393
2	18	5356	340687	0.074	45.6	615.8	94.3	4.7	1.0	215
SUM:		22558	4596186	1.000	615.8					2904

Table 25: Seismic Forces E-W Direction

Calculation of Story Forces (N-S Direction)										
Level	Height (FT)	Total Weight (K)	$w_i h_i^k$ (K-FT)	C_{vx}	f_i (K)	V_i (K)	B_x (Ft)	5% B_x (FT)	A_x (K)	M_z (Ft-K)
Roof	102	2410	963012	0.210	69.4	69.4	147.0	7.4	1.0	510
6	84	3238	1077339	0.234	77.7	147.1	147.0	7.4	1.0	571
5	68	3305	871800	0.190	62.8	209.9	147.0	7.4	1.0	462
4	52	3647	722020	0.157	52.0	262.0	121.7	6.1	1.0	317
3	36	4602	621328	0.135	44.8	306.7	121.7	6.1	1.0	272
2	18	5356	340687	0.074	24.6	331.3	121.7	6.1	1.0	149
SUM:		22558	3717431	1.000	331.3					2281

Table 26: Seismic Forces N-S Direction

Lateral Earth Pressures

The Library at the University of Wise Virginia's College at Wise has a unique feature in which it is integrated into the existing 60 foot hillside. For this technical report the impact of the soil loads on the structures lateral system were considered using an equivalent fluid pressure of 47 pcf provided in the geotechnical report. **Tables 27 -29** below show the applied soil loads.

It is also important to note that in this report the soil loads were strictly used as an applied lateral load. They do not serve a role in aiding the building it terms of drift control, and were not considered to be causing drift for this analysis.

East Elevation:

Lateral Soil Forces(K)				
Level	Column Line A-C	Column Line C-C1	Column Line C1-D1	Column Line D-E2
5	0	0	0	42
4	62	54	105	338
3	541	224	279	729
2	1179	427	485	1188

Table 27: Seismic Forces E-W Direction

North Elevation:

Lateral Soil Forces(K)					
Level	Column Line 1-3	Column Line 3-5	Column Line 5-7	Column Line 7-8	Column Line 8-9.2
5	0	0	0	152	25
4	0	0	0	496	201
3	0	0	111	900	446
2	72	386	888	152	705

Table 28: Seismic Forces E-W Direction

South Elevation:

Lateral Soil Forces(K)					
Level	Column Line 1-3	Column Line 3-6	Column Line 6-7	Column Line 7-8	Column Line 8-9.2
5	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	25
3	0	0	52	172	113
2	0	155	416	557	127

Table 29: Seismic Forces E-W Direction

Member Spot Checks for Strength

As part of the lateral analysis of the New Library the shear walls that were spot checked in Technical Report 4 were re-checked under the increased wind and seismic loads. **Figure 41** and **Figure 42** below show the shear diagrams for shear wall 2 and 6.




Figure 41: Moment Diagram for Shear Wall 2




Figure 42: Moment Diagram for Shear Wall 6

The largest shear forces in both the x-direction and y-direction were still caused by soil loads. Thus, soil loads dictated the controlling load combination for the analysis of the shear walls. It was determined that load combination 7 from IBC 2012 was still the controlling combination due to the increased seismic forces being larger than the increased wind forces:

$$0.9D + 1.0E + 1.6H$$

The following pages show the hand calculations for determining the controlling load combination along with the member spot checks.

Hand Check Shear Wall 2Determine Controlling Load Case

(2) $1.2D + 1.0E + L + 0.2S + 1.6H$

(6) $0.9D + 1.0W + 1.6H$

(7) $0.9D + 1.0E + 1.6H$

⇒ Load case (7) will control b/c soil is the controlling lateral forces and seismic is the second largest lateral forces

Determining Dead Load

Roof = $[(146 \text{ psf} \times 335 \text{ ft}^2)] / 1000 = 48.9^k$

Level 6 = $[(162 \text{ psf} \times 129.2 \text{ ft}^2) + (21.667)(1)(18)(150)] / 1000 = 79.4^k$

Level 5 = $[(162 \text{ psf} \times 129.2 \text{ ft}^2) + (21.667)(1)(16)(150)] / 1000 = 72.9^k$

Level 4 = $[(162 \text{ psf} \times 129.2 \text{ ft}^2) + (21.667)(1)(16)(150)] / 1000 = 72.9^k$

Level 3 = $[(162 \text{ psf} \times 129.2 \text{ ft}^2) + (21.667)(1)(16)(150)] / 1000 = 72.9^k$

Level 2 = $[(162 \text{ psf} \times 129.2 \text{ ft}^2) + (21.667)(3/2)(18)(150)] / 1000 = 181.8^k$

Total $P = 528.8^k$

Determine Seismic Loads

$E = E_h - E_v$ (ASCE 7-16 12.4.2)

$E_h = Q E_f \Rightarrow f = 1.0$ for SDC B

$E_h = 249$ (Seismic x-Direction (+M))

$E_v = 0.2 S_{DS} D$


$= 0.2 (0.221)(528.8)$

$= 23.4^k$

Loads

$P_u = 0.9(528.8) + (23.4) = 499.3^k$

$V_u = 1.0(249) + 1.6(23.4) = 381.7^k$



Check Strength of Shear Wall 2

$$\phi V_n \geq V_u = 3817^k$$

$$V_n = V_c + V_s$$

Determine V_c

$$V_c = 3.3 \lambda \sqrt{f_c} h d + (N_u d / 4 l_w) \quad (\text{ACI 318-11 Eq 11-27})$$

$$\lambda = 1.0$$

$$f_c = 4000 \text{ psi}$$

$$h = 33''$$

$$d = 0.8 l_w = 208''$$

$$N_u = 528.8^k$$

$$= [3.3(1)\sqrt{4000}(33)(208) + (528.8(208) / 4(260))] / 1000$$

$$= 1432.7^k$$

$$V_c = \left[0.6 \lambda \sqrt{f_c} + \frac{l_w (1.25 \lambda \sqrt{f_c} + 0.2 N_u / l_w h)}{\frac{M_u}{V_u} - \frac{l_w}{2}} \right] h d \quad (\text{eq 11-28})$$

* check to see if equation applies

$$\frac{M_u}{V_u} - \frac{l_w}{2} = \frac{99060}{3817} (12) - \frac{260}{2} = 181.4'' > 0'' \Rightarrow \text{Equation Applies}$$

$$= \left[0.6(1)\sqrt{4000} + \frac{260(1.25(1)\sqrt{4000} + 0.2(528.8 / (260(33))))}{181.4} \right] (33)(208) / 1000$$

$$= 1038.4^k$$

$$V_c = \min \left| \begin{array}{l} 1432.7 \\ 1038.4 \end{array} \right. \Rightarrow 1038.4^k$$

$$\phi V_c = 0.75(1038.4) = 778.8 < 3817^k$$

⇒ wall w/o shear reinforcement not adequate for shear strength.

Determine V_s

$$V_s = \frac{A_v f_y d}{S}$$

* Reinforcement = #8 @ 18" each face

$$A_v = \left(\frac{18'(12)}{18"} + 1 \right) (0.79)(2) = 20.54$$

$$f_y = 60 \text{ ksi}$$

$$d = 260"$$

$$S = 18"$$

$$= \frac{(20.54)(60)(260)}{18}$$

$$= 17801^k$$

Determine if strength is adequate

$$\phi V_n = 0.75 (1038.4 + 17801) = 13863.4$$

$$\Rightarrow 13863.4 > 3817^k \checkmark$$

\Rightarrow Shear wall w/ shear reinforcement adequate for shear strength under increased seismic loads.

Hand Check Shear Wall 6Determine Controlling Load Case

$$(1) 0.9D + 1.0E + 1.6H$$

Determine Dead Loads

$$\text{Roof} = [(146 \text{ psf})(296.37 \text{ ft}^2)]/1000 = 43.3^k$$

$$\text{Level 6} = [(162 \text{ psf})(18.02 \text{ ft}^2) + (23.33)(1)(18)(150)]/1000 = 65.9^k$$

$$\text{Level 5} = [(162 \text{ psf})(18.02 \text{ ft}^2) + (23.33)(1)(16)(150)]/1000 = 58.9^k$$

$$\text{Level 4} = [(162 \text{ psf})(18.02 \text{ ft}^2) + (23.33)(1)(16)(150)]/1000 = 58.9^k$$

$$\text{Level 3} = [(162 \text{ psf})(18.02 \text{ ft}^2) + (23.33)(1)(16)(150)]/1000 = 58.9^k$$

$$\text{Level 2} = [(162 \text{ psf})(18.02 \text{ ft}^2) + (23.33)(1)(18)(150)]/1000 = 65.9^k$$

$$\text{Total } P = 351.8^k$$

Determine Seismic Loads

$$E = E_h - E_v$$


$$E_h = Q E_p \\ = 238^k$$

$$E_v = 0.2 S_{DS} D \\ = 0.2(0.221)(351.8) \\ = 15.5^k$$

Loads

$$P_u = 0.9(351.8) + (15.5) = 332.12^k$$

$$Y_u = 1.0(238) + 1.6(2294) = 3908^k$$



$$M = 1.0(5811.8) + 1.6(49227.1) = 84575^{\text{ft-k}}$$

Check Strength of Shear Wall 6

$$\phi V_n > V_u = 3908 \text{ k}$$

$$V_n = V_c + V_s$$

Determine V_c

$$V_c = 3.3 \lambda \sqrt{f'_c} h d + (N u d / 4 l w)$$

$$\lambda = 1.0$$

$$f'_c = 4000 \text{ psi}$$

$$h = 12 \text{''}$$

$$d = 224 \text{''}$$

$$N u = 351.8$$

$$= [3.3(1)\sqrt{4000}(12)(224) + (351.8)(224)/4(280)] / 1000$$

$$= 561.1 \text{ k}$$

$$V_c = \left[0.6 \sqrt{f'_c} + \frac{l w (1.25 \lambda \sqrt{f'_c} + 0.2 N u / l w h)}{\frac{M_u - l w}{2}} \right] h d$$

* Check to see if eqn applies

$$\frac{M_u - l w}{2} = \frac{24575(12) - 280}{2} = 119.7 > 0 \quad \text{Equation Applies}$$

$$= \left[0.6(1)\sqrt{4000} + \frac{280(1.25(1)\sqrt{4000} + 0.2(352)/(280)(12))}{119.7} \right] (12)(224) / 1000$$

$$= 599 \text{ k}$$

$$V_c = \begin{cases} 561.1 \\ \text{min } 599 \end{cases} = 561.1 \text{ k}$$

$$\phi V_c = (0.75)(561.1) = 421 \text{ k} < 3908 \text{ k}$$

⇒ wall w/o shear reinforcement not adequate for shear strength

Determine V_s

$$V_s = \frac{A_v f_y d}{s}$$

$$\text{Reinforcement} = \#5 @ 18''$$

$$A_v = \left(\frac{18'(12)}{18} + 1 \right) (0.31)(2) = 8.06$$

$$f_y = 60 \text{ ksi}$$

$$d = 224 \text{ in}$$

$$= \frac{(8.06)(60)(224)}{18}$$

$$= 6018 \text{ k}$$

Determine if strength is adequate

$$\phi V_n = 0.75(561 + 6018) = 4934$$

$$\Rightarrow 4934 \text{ k} > 3408 \text{ k} \checkmark$$

\Rightarrow Shear wall w/ reinforcement adequate for shear strength under increased seismic loads.

Drift Checks

Drift Due to Wind

The maximum drift of the structure under service wind loads was checked based on the industry accepted value of $H/400$. The overall height of the structure is 102 feet resulting in an allowable drift of 3.06 in. **Table 30** below shows the maximum drift due to each load case produced by the ETABS model and its comparison to the standard. It is important to note that to determine the service loads the original ultimate wind loads were divided by a factor of 1.6.

Wind Load Cases			
Load Case	Maximum Drift (in)	Allowable Drift (in)	Pass/Fail
Wind Case 1 X-Direction	0.679	3.06	PASS
Wind Case 1 Y-Direction	2.321	3.06	PASS
Wind Case 2 X-Direction (+M)	0.853	3.06	PASS
Wind Case 2 X-Direction (-M)	0.315	3.06	PASS
Wind Case 2 Y-Direction (+M)	2.656	3.06	PASS
Wind Case 2 Y-Direction (-M)	1.869	3.06	PASS
Wind Case 3	2.528	3.06	PASS
Wind Case 4 (+Moments in Same Direction)	2.735	3.06	PASS
Wind Case 4 (-Moments in Same Direction)	1.756	3.06	PASS
Wind Case 4 (+Moments in Opposite Direction)	2.607	3.06	PASS
Wind Case 4 (-Moments in Opposite Direction)	1.995	3.06	PASS

Table 30: Structure Drifts Due to Wind Loads

Discussion of Results:

The lateral system passes for all of the applied wind loading cases, and is adequate to resist the wind loads based on the serviceability criteria of $H/400$.

Drift Due to Seismic

A check of the maximum drift of the structure under service seismic loads was checked based on the ACSE7-10 Table 12.12-1. The building's occupancy category is category III which gives an allowable story drift of 1.5% of the story height below the given level.

Table 31 – 34 below compare the actual drift percentage given by the ETABS model to the 1.5% allowable drift including the application of the story drift amplification factor that can be found in ASCE7-10 Section 12.8.6. A C_d of 4 (ordinary reinforced shear walls) and an I_e of 1.25 (Risk Category III) were used in the calculation of the drift amplification factor.

Seismic: X-Direction Loading (+Eccentricity)											
Story	Story Height	Story Drift X-Dir.	Story Drift w/ Amp. Factor	Story Drift (%)	Allow. Drift (%)	Pass/Fail	Story Drift Y-Dir.	Story Drift w/ Amp. Factor	Story Drift (%)	Allow. Drift (%)	Pass/Fail
Roof	18	0.00246	0.0079	0.79	1.5	PASS	0.00236	0.007549	0.75	1.5	PASS
6	16	0.00239	0.0076	0.76	1.5	PASS	0.00228	0.007283	0.73	1.5	PASS
5	16	0.00219	0.0070	0.70	1.5	PASS	0.00206	0.006602	0.66	1.5	PASS
4	16	0.00181	0.0058	0.58	1.5	PASS	0.00166	0.005312	0.53	1.5	PASS
3	18	0.00115	0.0037	0.37	1.5	PASS	0.00100	0.003190	0.32	1.5	PASS
2	18	0.00035	0.0011	0.11	1.5	PASS	0.00026	0.000832	0.08	1.5	PASS

Table 31: Story Drifts Due to Seismic Loads (X-Direction, +M)

Seismic: X-Direction Loading (-Eccentricity)											
Story	Story Height	Story Drift X-Dir.	Story Drift w/ Amp. Factor	Story Drift (%)	Allow. Drift (%)	Pass/Fail	Story Drift Y-Dir.	Story Drift w/ Amp. Factor	Story Drift (%)	Allow. Drift (%)	Pass/Fail
Roof	18	0.00159	0.0051	0.51	1.5	PASS	0.00121	0.00386	0.39	1.5	PASS
6	16	0.00154	0.0049	0.49	1.5	PASS	0.00116	0.00370	0.37	1.5	PASS
5	16	0.00141	0.0045	0.45	1.5	PASS	0.00104	0.00331	0.33	1.5	PASS
4	16	0.00116	0.0037	0.37	1.5	PASS	0.00081	0.00258	0.26	1.5	PASS
3	18	0.00073	0.0023	0.23	1.5	PASS	0.00044	0.00140	0.14	1.5	PASS
2	18	0.00025	0.0008	0.08	1.5	PASS	0.00011	0.00034	0.03	1.5	PASS

Table 32: Story Drifts Due to Seismic Loads (X-Direction, -M)

Seismic: Y-Direction Loading (+Eccentricity)

Story	Story Height	Story Drift X-Dir.	Story Drift w/ Amp. Factor	Story Drift (%)	Allow. Drift (%)	Pass/Fail	Story Drift Y-Dir.	Story Drift w/ Amp. Factor	Story Drift (%)	Allow. Drift (%)	Pass/Fail
Roof	18	0.00171	0.0055	0.55	1.5	PASS	0.00400	0.0147	1.47	1.5	PASS
6	16	0.00165	0.0053	0.53	1.5	PASS	0.00399	0.0146	1.46	1.5	PASS
5	16	0.00151	0.0048	0.48	1.5	PASS	0.00388	0.0135	1.35	1.5	PASS
4	16	0.00124	0.0040	0.40	1.5	PASS	0.00355	0.0114	1.14	1.5	PASS
3	18	0.00077	0.0024	0.24	1.5	PASS	0.00239	0.0077	0.77	1.5	PASS
2	18	0.00022	0.0007	0.07	1.5	PASS	0.00085	0.0027	0.27	1.5	PASS

Table 33: Story Drifts Due to Seismic Loads (Y-Direction, +M)

Seismic: Y-Direction Loading (-Eccentricity)

Story	Story Height	Story Drift X-Dir.	Story Drift w/ Amp. Factor	Story Drift (%)	Allow. Drift (%)	Pass/Fail	Story Drift Y-Dir.	Story Drift w/ Amp. Factor	Story Drift (%)	Allow. Drift (%)	Pass/Fail
Roof	18	0.00098	0.00314	0.31	1.5	PASS	0.00376	0.0120	1.20	1.5	PASS
6	16	0.00095	0.00304	0.30	1.5	PASS	0.00366	0.0117	1.17	1.5	PASS
5	16	0.00087	0.00277	0.28	1.5	PASS	0.00338	0.0108	1.08	1.5	PASS
4	16	0.00071	0.00226	0.23	1.5	PASS	0.00285	0.0091	0.91	1.5	PASS
3	18	0.00043	0.00136	0.14	1.5	PASS	0.00194	0.0062	0.62	1.5	PASS
2	18	0.00012	0.00037	0.04	1.5	PASS	0.00070	0.0022	0.22	1.5	PASS

Table 34: Story Drifts Due to Seismic Loads (Y-Direction, -M)

Discussion of Results:

The lateral system passes for all of the applied seismic loading cases for the criteria of an allowable story drift of 1.5%. The worst case drift was located at the roof level and was due to the loading in the y-direction. This was expected due to the fact the forces in the y-direction are acting perpendicular to the long direction of the building, thus seeing less resistance to drift.

Stability Coefficient Check

According to ASCE7-10 Section 12.8.7 P-delta effects on story shears and moments, the resulting member forces and moments, and the story drifts induced by these forces and moments, and the story drifts induced by these effects are not required to be considered where the stability coefficient (θ), as determined by equation 12.8-16, is equal to or less than 0.1.

$$\theta = \frac{P_x \Delta l_e}{V_x h_{sx} C_d} \quad (\text{Eqn. 12.8-16})$$

The stability coefficient for each seismic load case and each level of the structure was calculated and compared to 0.1. It was determined that all of the stability coefficients were less than 0.1 and P-delta effects did not need to be considered. **Tables 35 - 38** below show the calculated stability coefficients.

Seismic: X-Direction Loading (+Eccentricity)												
h_x (in)	P_x (K)	V_x (K)	Story Drift Ratio X-Direction	Story Drift with Amplification Factor	Story Drift (in)	Stability Coefficient (θ)	Less Than 0.1	Story Drift Ratio Y-Direction	Story Drift with Amplification Factor	Story Drift (in)	Stability Coefficient (θ)	Less Than 0.1
216	1716	129	0.00246	0.0079	1.70	0.0328	PASS	0.00236	0.00755	1.63	0.031	PASS
192	3519	273	0.00239	0.0076	1.47	0.0308	PASS	0.00228	0.00728	1.40	0.029	PASS
192	5342	390	0.00219	0.0070	1.35	0.0300	PASS	0.00206	0.00660	1.27	0.028	PASS
192	7304	487	0.00181	0.0058	1.11	0.0271	PASS	0.00166	0.00531	1.02	0.025	PASS
216	9475	570	0.00115	0.0037	0.79	0.0190	PASS	0.00100	0.00319	0.69	0.017	PASS
216	11680	616	0.00035	0.0011	0.24	0.0067	PASS	0.00026	0.00083	0.18	0.005	PASS

Table 35: Stability Coefficients Due to Seismic Loads (X-Direction, +M)

Seismic: X-Direction Loading (-Eccentricity)												
h_x	P_x (K)	V_x (K)	Story Drift Ratio X-Direction	Story Drift with Amplification Factor	Story Drift (in)	Stability Coefficient (θ)	Less Than 0.1	Story Drift Ratio Y-Direction	Story Drift with Amplification Factor	Story Drift (in)	Stability Coefficient (θ)	Less Than 0.1
216	1716	129	0.00159	0.0051	1.10	0.02	PASS	0.00121	0.0039	0.83	0.02	PASS
192	3519	273.3	0.00154	0.0049	0.94	0.02	PASS	0.00116	0.0037	0.71	0.01	PASS
192	5342	390.1	0.00141	0.0045	0.87	0.02	PASS	0.00104	0.0033	0.64	0.01	PASS
192	7304	486.8	0.00116	0.0037	0.71	0.02	PASS	0.00081	0.0026	0.49	0.01	PASS
216	9475	570	0.00073	0.0023	0.50	0.01	PASS	0.00044	0.0014	0.30	0.01	PASS
216	11680	615.6	0.00025	0.0008	0.17	0.00	PASS	0.00011	0.0003	0.07	0.00	PASS

Table 36: Stability Coefficients Due to Seismic Loads (X-Direction, -M)

Seismic: Y-Direction Loading (+Eccentricity)												
h_x	P_x (K)	V_x (K)	Story Drift Ratio X-Direction	Story Drift with Amplification Factor	Story Drift (in)	Stability Coefficient (\ominus)	Less Than 0.1	Story Drift Ratio Y-Direction	Story Drift with Amplification Factor	Story Drift (in)	Stability Coefficient (\ominus)	Less Than 0.1
216	1716	69	0.00171	0.0055	1.18	0.04	PASS	0.00400	0.0128	2.76	0.10	PASS
192	3519	147	0.00165	0.0053	1.02	0.04	PASS	0.00399	0.0128	2.45	0.10	PASS
192	5342	210	0.00151	0.0048	0.93	0.04	PASS	0.00388	0.0124	2.38	0.10	PASS
192	7304	262	0.00124	0.0040	0.76	0.03	PASS	0.00355	0.0114	2.18	0.10	PASS
216	9475	307	0.00077	0.0024	0.53	0.02	PASS	0.00239	0.0077	1.65	0.07	PASS
216	11680	331	0.00022	0.0007	0.15	0.01	PASS	0.00085	0.0027	0.59	0.03	PASS

Table 37: Stability Coefficients Due to Seismic Loads (Y-Direction, +M)

Seismic: Y-Direction Loading (-Eccentricity)												
h_x	P_x (K)	V_x (K)	Story Drift Ratio X-Direction	Story Drift with Amplification Factor	Story Drift (in)	Stability Coefficient (\ominus)	Less Than 0.1	Story Drift Ratio Y-Direction	Story Drift with Amplification Factor	Story Drift (in)	Stability Coefficient (\ominus)	Less Than 0.1
216	1716	69	0.00098	0.0031	0.68	0.02	PASS	0.00376	0.0120	2.60	0.09	PASS
192	3519	147	0.00095	0.0030	0.58	0.02	PASS	0.00366	0.0117	2.25	0.09	PASS
192	5342	210	0.00087	0.0028	0.53	0.02	PASS	0.00338	0.0108	2.08	0.09	PASS
192	7304	262	0.00071	0.0023	0.43	0.02	PASS	0.00285	0.0091	1.75	0.08	PASS
216	9475	307	0.00043	0.0014	0.29	0.01	PASS	0.00194	0.0062	1.34	0.06	PASS
216	11680	331	0.00012	0.0004	0.08	0.00	PASS	0.00070	0.0022	0.48	0.02	PASS

Table 38: Stability Coefficients Due to Seismic Loads (Y-Direction, -M)

Conclusion

The chosen lateral system for the New Library is ordinary reinforced concrete shear walls. It was determined that a lateral system redesign was unnecessary due to the fact that the new gravity system was designed in concrete and in several locations the shear walls aid in resisting lateral soil forces. Since the lateral system was not redesigned it was still important to verify that the members were adequate to resist the increased loads due to the new concrete gravity system. Initial wind and seismic loads were also recalculated using ASCE7-10.

After adjusting the loads, ETABS was used to distribute the forces to the shear walls and hand checks were completed for two of the walls. Based on the member spot checks, it was determined that the lateral system was adequate to resist the increased loads. Drift checks were also completed. The lateral system met serviceability requirements for max building drift due to wind loads and story drift due to seismic loads.

Based on this lateral analysis, the lateral system used in the New Library is adequate for both strength and serviceability under the increased loads.

MAE Coursework Integration

Coursework requirements for the MAE were integrated into several portions of this thesis. This was done through the use of computer modeling. Skills and knowledge of computer modeling were gained in AE 530, *Computer Modeling of Building Structures*, and through guided self-studies completed during the spring semester.

Both gravity system designs for the New Library were completed using RAM Concept, a structural analysis and design program used for elevated concrete slabs and mat foundations. RAM Concept was chosen due to the fact that it is one of the most efficient programs for designing concrete floor systems, and was highly recommended by professionals in industry. RAM Concept was learned through a guided self-study, and was used for modeling the conventionally reinforced concrete slab and post-tensioned slab. This self-study was completed through the completion of modeling tutorials provided on Bentley's website and in the RAM Concept user manual. Additional assistance was also provided by Heather Sustersic, my thesis advisor, and Walid Choueiri, Principle at SK&A Engineers.

The lateral system for the New Library was verified using the help of ETABS, a structural analysis program designed specifically for buildings. ETABS was one of the main modeling programs studied in AE530, and was used throughout the analysis of the lateral system in both the fall and spring semester. Wind and seismic loads were calculated by hand and then input into ETABS. ETABS then accurately distributed the forces to the members of the lateral force resisting system, comprised of ordinary reinforced shear walls. These forces were then used to verify the adequacy of the system.

As learned in AE 530, using a computer program as a "black box" with no knowledge of the topic can be dangerous and highly unethical. Therefore, results should always be checked to ensure that the program and the inputs are producing accurate results. The RAM Concept model was verified by hand and with the help of additional analysis programs such as SP Slab. These verifications can be seen in Appendix C. The ETABS model was verified using 2D hand analysis, and comprehension of modeling output. These verifications can be seen in Appendix I.

Breadth 1: Drainage System Study

One of the unique design features of the New Library at the University of Virginia's College at Wise is that it is to be integrated into a 60' hillside located in the middle of campus. This large grade difference raises a concern for water infiltration both at the base of the foundation walls and underneath the slab on grade. **Figure 43** shows an elevation view of the building and the depth of the hillside.




Figure 43: South Elevation Showing Depth of Footings (From Project Documents)

The current drainage system utilizes 8" diameter gravity drainage pipes at the base of the foundation walls and 4" diameter gravity drainage pipes located underneath the slab-on-grade. These drainage pipes empty into existing storm drain lines. It was desired that this drainage system be investigated and the size of the drainage pipe be verified. Water proofing for both the foundation walls and the slab were also designed.

Waterproofing the Wall

The drainage pipe is just one piece of the water proofing system that is required to guide the water away from the foundation wall. **Figure 44** below shows a schematic of the water proofing system that has been designed to direct the water to the drainage pipe.




Figure 44: Water Proofing System

The waterproofing membrane chosen was the Bituthene System 4000. This waterproofing membrane is produced by WR Grace who has been producing construction materials for the international construction industry for more than half a century. WR Grace's Bituthene waterproofing membranes have been used in a number of international projects including the New Terminal at the Las Vegas McCarran International Airport.

The System 4000 was chosen specifically for its excellent adhesion to the wall and its ability to reduce inventory and handling costs. The adhesion is achieved through the use of the System 4000 Surface Conditioner. This conditioner is a "water-based, latex surface treatment which imparts an aggressive, high tack finish to the treated substrate. It is specifically formulated to bind site dust and concrete efflorescence, thereby providing a suitable surface for the Bituthene System 4000 Waterproofing Membrane"- Tech Sheet. This conditioner is packaged in each roll of membrane which is the reason the system reduces inventory and handling costs. For more information on this system see the Tech Sheet in Appendix J.1.

Water Path

Figure 45 shows the path the water will take as it passes through the soil and into the drainage pipe.

1. Surface water enters through the **top soil**.
2. Water will then enter into a layer of **compacting clay**. This layer of clay is 10" – 12" thick at the wall and will thin out to just top soil approximately 12'-20' away from the building. The compact clay limits the amount of water that will pass into the backfill, and will direct the water away from the building.
3. Any water that penetrates the compact clay layer will enter into the **backfill** and will combine with existing ground water. The backfill is recommended by the geotechnical engineers on the project. This backfill should be comprised of full gradation soil with minimal fines. This will ensure voids in the fill to allow water to pass through.
4. Once in the backfill, the water goes into the **protection board**. This board is ½" thick and is comprised of a plastic layer and a geotextile membrane that faces away from the wall. The water enters the geotextile membrane and is directed down to the base of the wall.




Figure 45: Water Path

If the protection board fails, the water is stopped by the **Bituthene waterproofing membrane**. This material is a 1/16" thick waterproofing membrane that is ideal for waterproofing concrete structures below grade. This membrane will be applied to the wall and the footing. Once the water reaches this membrane it is directed down to the base of the wall.

5. At the base of the wall there is a **drainage pipe that is set down in a 2'x2' trench of VADOT 57 stone**, and this stone is then wrapped in a geotextile fabric. The geotextile fabric allows the water to pass through, but prevents the soil from passing through and clogging the drainage pipe. Once the water passes through the membrane it enters into the drainage pipe which will direct it to daylight. The size of the pipe is recommended by the geotechnical engineers.

Waterproofing the Slab

In order to prevent water infiltration through the slab a 2" thick concrete mud slab will be poured in place first. Mud slabs are beneficial on projects because they are much easier to deal with in wet weather conditions as compared to crushed stone or soil. They also provided a smooth, level surface for the floor slab.

WR Grace Preprufe 300R Plus membrane will be installed between the mud slab and the floor slab. This membrane is approximately 1/2" thick and is laid adhesive side up so it is ready to bond to the concrete floor slab. This forms a permanent, seamless seal against ground water. Preprufe 300R Plus is specifically designed to be used below slabs and its high tensile strength provides resistance against the stress of ground settlement. For more information on this membrane see the Tech Sheet in Appendix J.2.

Determining the Type of Drainage Required

Test borings for the site were completed by S&ME, Inc. to determine if water was present and at what elevation. If the elevation of the water is higher than the bottom of the footing then ground water will be a concern. If not, the drainage pipe will be strictly for the removal of surface water. At the time of boring, all bore holes were dry, but 48-72 hours later all of the holes except hole 5 (which was filled in) were found to have water in them. **Table 39** below shows the elevation of the water at the relevant boring locations along with the elevation of the bottom of the footing. A plan view of the locations of borings 3-8 can be seen in Figure J1 in Appendix J.3.

Based on this information, ground water at location 6, 7, and 8 will be a concern. This was to be expected based on the fact that all three of these locations are on the east side of the building which will be built into the existing hillside.

Compare Depth of Footing to Water Level Measurements				
Boring Number	Location	Top of Footing	Bottom of Footing	Elevation of Water Level
B-1	Outside of building footprint - West side	-	-	2484.0
B-2	Outside of building footprint - West side	-	-	2463.5
B-3	Outside of building footprint - North-west side	2476.5	2474.83	2471.6
B-4	Inside of building footprint	2476.5	2474.83	2474.4
B-5	Inside of building footprint	2476.5	2474.83	-
B-6	Inside of building footprint	2474	2472.33	2494.3
B-7	Outside of building footprint - East side	2476.5	2474.25	2503.0
B-8	Outside of building footprint - East side	2476.5	2474.25	2511.0

Table 39: Depth of Footing vs. Water Level

It is also important to note that test boring 6 is located under the building. This means that it is possible that water may seep into the rock/soil under the slab-on-grade. Therefore, drainage pipes will also need to be located beneath the floor slab.

Determining the Flow Rate

The drainage pipe size depends on the amount of water in gallons per minute (gpm) that needs removed from the site. To determine this amount, both the water observed on the site and water due to expected rain fall was used.

Observed Site Water:

To determine the gpm of the site water the depth of the water observed was multiplied by the area of the bore hole (all holes were 3 1/4" in diameter), divided by the number of hours to fill to that level, and then converted to gpm. **Table 40** shows this calculation for test boring 6, 7, and 8. From this, the water level at B-8 gave the critical flow rate.

Flow Rate of Ground Water						
Boring Number	Depth (FT)	Area of Bore Hole (FT ²)	Depth * Area (FT ³)	Number of Hours	Flow Rate (FT ³ /HR)	Flow Rate (gpm)
B-6	22	8.29	182.4	48	4	0.4738
B-7	46	8.29	381.4	72	5	0.6604
B-8	59	8.29	489.2	72	7	0.8470

Table 40: Flow Rate of Ground Water

Rain Water:

Appendix B of the International Plumbing Code 2012 gives average rainfall rates for Virginia. The average rainfall for Bristol, VA, which was the closest to Wise, VA, is listed as 2.7 in/hr or 0.028 gpm/SF.

An approximated tributary area from the building foundation wall to 10' away from the structure was used to calculate the total gpm from rainfall. This dimension was based on approximately half the distance from the foundation wall to the surrounding storm drain. This area around the perimeter of the building was approximately 2870 SF. This gives 80.4 gpm. If this rainfall is divided between two main pipes (one for each side of the building) then each pipe is expected to handle 40.2 gpm.

Including the rainwater and ground water the total gpm is approximately 41 gpm. This flow rate is relatively small, so a sump pump will not be used to remove the water. Instead gravity drainage pipes will be used to remove the water away from the site at a slope of 1%.

Determining the Size of the Pipe

Table 1102.5 of the IPC 2012 gives the allowable piping materials for drainage pipes (shown in Figure J.2 in Appendix J.4). Based on this information, perforated PVC piping was chosen as the piping for the drainage system.

To determine the required pipe size the nomograph for PVC pipe was used. This nomograph can be seen in Figure J.3 Appendix J.5.

Due to the flow being so minimal the minimum required pipe size is only 1 3/4", but IPC 2012 Section 1112.1 requires that the minimum drainage pipe size be at least 4". Therefore both the drainage pipes at the base of the foundation wall and under the slab-on-grade will be 4". This final pipe size shows that the existing drainage pipe design is adequate.

Final Pipe Design:

- 4" perforated PVC pipe at the base of the foundation walls
- (2) 4" perforated PVC pipe beneath the slab-on-grade

All drainage pipes will be gravity drainage pipes with a 1% slope.
All drainage pipes will drain to storm drain lines.




Figure 46: Location of Drainage Pipes

Breadth 2: Cost and Schedule Analysis

Cost Analysis

It was determined in Technical Report 3 that a concrete structural system should be less expensive than a steel structural system based on assembly estimates using RS Means. This breadth will compare the cost of the two-way conventionally reinforced concrete system to the existing steel system through a detailed cost analysis to determine if this is accurate.

Steel Estimate

A detailed estimate of the steel system was provided by the engineers at Cannon Design. The items included for comparison in this estimate are broken down and shown in **Table 41**. The total cost of the steel structural system was about \$1.5 million with the structural floor framing being the primary cost. The cost of the system was approximately 3% of the total project cost which was approximately \$43 Million.

Item	Amount
Fiber Reinforcement	28,317
Normal Weight Fill	144,125
Finish Elevated Slab	67,830
Cure and Protect Slab	10,755
Wide Flange Steel Column	208,893
Structural Floor Framing	742,673
Metal Floor Deck	178,797
Spray Fire Proofing	102,629
Total Cost	\$ 1,484,019

Table 41: Steel System Estimate

Concrete Estimate

A detailed cost estimate of the concrete structural system was completed using RS Means. The system was broken down into five main categories which were formwork, structural concrete, finishing, placement, and reinforcement. The total cost of each category including waste, and the total cost including adjustment factors for time and location can be seen in **Table 42**. A breakdown of each detailed estimate along with the applicable waste and adjustment factors can be seen in Appendix K.

Item	Amount
Formwork	553,622
Structural Concrete	273,961
Finishing	42,863
Placement	51,167
Reinforcement	231,115
Total Cost	\$ 1,268,200

Table 42: Concrete System Estimate

The total amount of concrete and reinforcement was estimated based on the level 5 floor design completed using RAM Concept. The amount of concrete and reinforcing for the other floors in the structure was extrapolated based on the typical design and the percent increase required to complete the other floors.

Some special considerations taken into account for the concrete system estimate were the placement method, the elevated slab concrete mix, and the column forms. The placement of the concrete was assumed to be by pump rather than a crane and bucket. This assumption was made based on the recommendations that a 7-story building was of reasonable height for construction to be completed using a concrete pump.

To decrease the concrete system schedule, an accelerated concrete mix was specified to be used for the elevated slabs. In order to account for this in the cost analysis, the cost of the structural concrete for the elevated slabs was estimated to be \$8 more than the cost per cubic yard given in RS Means.

Since all of the columns except two are 24" x 24" it was decided that the column forms would be rented instead of built. This decision was estimated to increase the system cost by approximately \$2 per month, but would significantly decrease the project schedule.

Cost Comparison

After completing the cost analysis and comparison of both systems it was determined that the concrete structural system would be less expensive than the steel structural system. The cost of the steel system was about \$24.50/SF as compared to the redesigned concrete system cost of \$21.00/SF. The total savings in cost is approximately 15%.

Schedule Analysis

Along with a cost analysis of the existing composite steel system vs. the redesigned concrete system, a schedule analysis was also completed in order to provide a complete comparison of both systems. It was expected that the concrete system’s total duration time would be longer than that of the composite steel system due to the typical increased time required for formwork.

Steel Schedule

The project schedule for the New Library was provided by Cannon Design. The structural steel portion of the project is projected to take approximately 119 days, and is expected to last from March 3, 2014 until August 15, 2014. The schedule is mainly comprised of steel erection, stair erection, and decking. **Figure 47** below shows the structural steel portion of the schedule. The tasks in green are the remaining work to be completed while the tasks in red are the critical remaining work to be completed.




Figure 47: Structural Steel Schedule (Courtesy of Cannon Design)

Concrete Schedule

The construction of the concrete gravity system followed a similar pattern for each level of the building. First, the columns were completed by placing the reinforcement, setting the formwork, and then placing the concrete. Next, the beams and elevated slabs were completed following the same process, and shoring was used to support the elevated slabs until the columns reached adequate strength. Once the slabs were finished the next level of columns were started and this process was repeated for each level of the structure. The total time for the concrete structure to be completed was determined to be approximately 112 days.

Most of the daily output values for each activity were determined using RS Means. From these values the duration of each item was calculated, and can be seen in Appendix L. Most of the tasks were also based on the use of one crew, with the exception of formwork and slab finishing. The time required to complete the formwork for the elevated slabs was determined based on the use of three crews due to the extended amount of time required for formwork. For example, with one crew it would have taken 24 days to form one elevated slab. The time required to finish the elevated slabs was then determined based on the use of two crews. Time required for the formwork for the columns was also significantly less due to the fact that the column forms were rented, rather than built on site.

The schedule for the concrete system was created using Microsoft Project. **Figure 48** below shows the completed schedule. The critical path of the new structure was primarily impacted by the time required to form and finish the slabs, even with the increased number of crews. By using shoring and reshoring, the slabs could be formed before the columns were completed, and the use of an accelerated concrete mixture in the slab allowed a decrease in schedule time.




Figure 48: Structural Concrete Schedule Created using Microsoft Project

Schedule Comparison

The total construction time for the concrete system was approximately 112 days. This is 7 days shorter than the steel construction length, which is 119 days. Typically concrete systems require a longer construction length than steel system, but with increased crews and efficient scheduling the concrete system can actually require a shorter construction time.

One thing to keep in mind is the fact that concrete construction requires skilled labors to complete the work. The concrete system schedule heavily depends on the efficiency of the workers and the team in charge of the job site. This impact would be to be taken into consideration before making the decision to use a concrete structural system.

Construction of both the steel system and the concrete system would be completed in August. Considering the fact that the New Library is located in the middle of the campus at the University of Virginia's College at Wise, this means that construction of either structural system would be completed before students returned for fall semester.

System Comparison

The existing structural system for the New Library is composite steel, and the redesign was completed using reinforced concrete. It was desired to determine the feasibility of a concrete structural system as compared to the existing steel system.

One consideration in using a concrete system instead of a steel system was the allowable construction type of the New Library. The existing steel structural system was classified as Type IB. Using Table 503 from IBC 2012, it was determined that the New Library's construction type is required to be Type IA or IB based on its A-3 occupancy group and height of six stories. Table 601 from IBC 2012 gives the required fire-resistance ratings for building element in order to achieve a given construction type, and section 722 provides fire resistance ratings based on the thickness of structural elements and the cover to reinforcement. The primary structural members including the slab, beams, and columns all have a fire-resistance rating of 2 hrs. Based on this, the fire-resistance rating of the concrete structure is 2hrs and the construction type is Type 1B. The existing steel system was also classified as Type 1B, so there was no change in construction type.

The average depth of members of the existing steel floor system as compared to members of the redesigned concrete system can be seen in **Table 43** below.

Member	Steel	Concrete
Slab/Floor Depth (in)	6.5	10
Interior Beam Depth (in)	16	-
Interior Girder Depth (in)	24	24
Maximum Edge Beam Depth (in)	30	30

Table 43: Depth of Floor System

Based on the depth comparison, it can be seen that the floor-to-ceiling height with the concrete system will be approximately 6.5"-12" less than the existing floor system. Typically this is beneficial but in the New Library the floor-to-floor heights are dictated by the topography of the hillside rather than the structure, and the existing floor-to-floor heights are 16'-18'. Therefore, the reduction in depth is not as beneficial in the New Library.

As seen in the construction analysis portion of this report, the concrete structure offers a savings in cost of 15% as compared to the existing steel system. The concrete system also does not pose a negative impact on the construction schedule, and could actually decrease the schedule time by a little over one week.

Based on this information it was determined that it is feasible to use a concrete structural system in the New Library, especially from a cost savings stand point.

Conclusion

This report consisted of an analysis and redesign of the New Library at the University of Virginia's College at Wise. During the fall semester, analyses of the existing composite steel gravity system and concrete shear wall lateral system were completed. It was determined that the original designs were adequate for both strength and serviceability criteria, so a scenario was created in which the feasibility of a concrete structural system was to be considered.

The primary structural redesign was completed using a conventionally reinforced two-way concrete flat slab. This system was chosen based on the typical cost savings of a two-way system as compared to other concrete floor systems. Also, the bay sizes in the New Library are relatively square which is beneficial in a two-way system. It was recognized that there would be deflection issues in the longer bays, so deflection solutions were investigated as part of the redesign.

There was also an interest to investigate the feasibility of a post-tensioned concrete floor slab, which was completed as a secondary redesign. From this it was determined that a post-tensioned slab would not be a good choice due to slab shortening complications with the shear walls and foundation walls. RAM Concept was used to aid in the design of the floor systems, and the program output was verified by hand.

The existing ordinary reinforced concrete shear walls were determined to be the most efficient lateral system for the New Library. Although the system was not redesigned, it was analyzed under increased seismic loads. Based on hand calculations and computer output from ETABS, it was determined that the existing system was adequate for both strength and serviceability.

As part of the first breadth study, an analysis and design of the foundation wall drainage system was completed, along with a study of the water proofing for the foundation walls and basement slab. This was done to ensure that there would be no water infiltration due to the building's integration into the hillside.

For the second breadth study, a cost and schedule analysis was completed to help determine the feasibility of the concrete system. Through this study it was determined that the concrete system would offer a savings in cost and a decrease in the construction schedule.

It was determined that a two-way, conventionally reinforced concrete system would be a feasible option for the structural system as long as adequate laborers are available. The steel and concrete systems are similar in size and depth, with the concrete system offering a small increase in floor-to-ceiling height. The concrete system will offer a significant cost savings, and will also result in a slight decrease in project duration.

References

- ACI Committee 318. (2011). *ACI 318-11: Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete* . Farmington Hills, MI: American Concrete Institute.
- American Society of Civil Engineers. (2010). *ASCE 7-10: Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures*. Reston, VA: American Society of Civil Engineers.
- Apple, R. P. (2008, October 17). Post-tensioned Concrete - Practical Applications . Olney , MD.
- CRSI Engineering Practice Committee . (2008). *CRSI Design Handbook* (Tenth ed.). Schaumburg, IL: Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute .
- Institute, P.-T. (2004). Design of Post-Tensioned Slabs Using Unbonded Tendons .
- International Code Council, Inc. (2012). *IBC 2012: International Building Code*. Country Club Hills, IL: International Code Council, Inc.
- International Code Council, Inc. (2012). *IPC 2012: International Plumbing Code*. Country Club Hills, IL: International Plumbing Code Council.
- RS Means. (2010). *RS Means Building Construction and Cost Data* (68th ed.). Kingston , MA.
- W.R. Grace Waterproofing. (2008). Waterproofing Las Vegas McCarran International Airport's New Terminal 3. Cambridge, MA.
- W.R. Grace Waterproofing. (2013). Bituthene 3000 and Bituthene Low Temperature. Cambridge, MA.
- W.R. Grace Waterproofing. (2013). Bituthene System 4000. Cambridge , MA.
- Wight, J. K., & MacGregor, J. G. (2012). *Reinforced Concrete Mechanics & Design* (Sixth ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc. .

Note: Various course notes were also used in the completion of this thesis report.

Appendix A: Design Loads

The following loads were those used in the design of the two-way concrete floor system and the concrete columns. It should be noted though that RAM Concept automatically includes the self-weight of the slab in the design loads.

Roof Loads	
Dead Loads	
10" Slab	125 PSF
Insulation + Roof Board	11 PSF
Misc. Dead	10 PSF
Live Loads	
Roof Live	30 PSF
Mechanical Well	150 PSF

Table A1: Roof Loads

Floor Loads	
Dead Loads	
10" Slab	125 PSF
24"x 30" Beams	500 PLF
24"x 24" Beams	350 PLF
16"x 24" Beams	233 PLF
Misc. Dead	16.5 PSF
Live Loads	
General Collections	150 PSF
Office + Corridors	80 PSF
Reading Rooms	80 PSF
Stairs	100 PSF
Exterior Wall Loads	
Masonry	91.875 PSF
Curtain Wall	30 PSF

Table A2: Floor Loads

Pattern loading:

ACI 318-11 Section 13.7.6.2 states that when the live load accedes $\frac{3}{4}$ of the dead load pattern live loading must be considered in the design of the slab system. Therefore, pattern loading was used in the design of the floor slabs. Also, RAM Concept fully considers any pattern loading effects while considering loading factors, and envelope results.

Appendix B: Floor Design Options – Conventional Reinf.

Option 1: Flat Slab with Drop Panels (Original)




Figure B1: Floor Option 1

Column	-X	+X	-Y	+Y	Thickness (in)	Required Increased Size
3E	1.33	8.44	8.44	1.33	6	Yes
3D	1.33	8.44	8.44	8.44	9	Yes
3C	1.33	8.44	1.33	8.44	9	Yes
6E	10.33	9.11	8.44	1.33	4	Yes
6D	5.17	4.56	4.22	4.22	6	No
6C	6.20	5.47	3.83	5.07	2.5	Yes
8B	13.67	1.33	1.33	12.67	13	Yes

Table B1: Floor Option 1 Drop Panel Sizes

Slab: 10"

→ This floor design was unacceptable due to the large drop panel sizes required to resist the punching shear. There was also a large concern that the required deflection limits for the masonry façade would not be met.

Option 2: Flat Slab with Drop Panels and Beams




Figure B2: Floor Option 2


Column	-X	+X	-Y	+Y	Thickness	Required Increased Size
3E	1.33	4.22	4.22	1.33	6	No
3D	1.33	4.22	4.22	4.22	9	No
3C	1.33	4.22	1.33	4.22	9	No
6D	5.17	4.56	4.22	4.22	6	No

Table B2: Floor Option 2 Drop Panel Sizes

Slab: 10"

Beam Sizes: 16x24 & 24x24

→ This floor design showed improvement in the decreased drop panel sizes, and the edge beams provided increase stiffness to help limit deflections. All drop panels were sufficient based on the L/6 requirement, but all required increased thickness due to punching shear failures at the perimeter of the columns.

Option 3: Flat Slab with Shear Stud Rails*Figure B3: Floor Option 3*

Slab: 10"

Studs: 1/2" Diameter

→ This floor design was primarily created in the interest of determining the required number of shear studrails if no beams or drop panels were to be used. It can be seen that the majority of the shear studrails would be unnecessary if edge beams were added, which would be needed anyway in order to limit deflections.


Option 4: Flat Slab with Shear Stud Rails and Beams

Figure B4: Floor Option 4

Slab: 10"

Studs: ½" Diameter

Beam Sizes: 16x24 & 24x24

→ This floor design showed improvement in the decreased number of shear studrails, and the edge beams provided increased stiffness to help limit deflections. It was determined that studrails near beams were minimal and an increased beams size would eliminate the need for these studrails.


Option 5: Flat Slab with Shear Stud Rails and Larger Beams

Figure B5: Floor Option 5

Slab: 10"

Studs: ½" Diameter

Beam Sizes: 24x30 & 24x24

→ This floor design was determine to be the best choice due to the decreased number of shear stud rails, and the edge beams provided increase stiffness to help limit deflections.

Appendix C: Verifying Model

Appendix C.1: EFM vs. FEM

Column Line 3

$f'_c = 4000 \text{ psi}$
 height = 16 ft
 Slab = 10 in

80 psf Live Load (reducible)
 150 psf Live Load (unreducible)

• 16.5 psf SID Load

* For this side by side comparison the loading will be simplified to 150 psf on the lower bay + 80 psf on the upper bay

* No live load reductions

Span A-B \Rightarrow using Table A-14

$C_1 = 24''$
 $l_1 = 26.8' \Rightarrow 321.6''$
 $C_2 = 24''$
 $l_2 = 14' \Rightarrow 168''$

$C_1/l_1 = 0.075$
 $C_2/l_2 = 0.143$

$\Rightarrow M = 0.0845 w_u l_2 l_1^2$

$\Rightarrow K = 4.196 EI / l_1 = 4.196 E (114000) / 321.6 = 1487 E_c$

$\Rightarrow \text{COF} = 0.514$

Determine the moment of inertia.

$\bar{y} = \frac{(24 \times 20)(10) + (10 \times 168)(25)}{(24 \times 20) + (10 \times 168)} = 21.67$

$I = \left(\frac{24(20)^3}{12} + \frac{168(10)^3}{12} \right) + \left((24 \times 20)(21.67 - 10)^2 + (168 \times 10)(21.67 - 25)^2 \right)$
 $= 30,000 + 84,000 = 114,000 \text{ in}^4$

Span B-C

$$C_1/l_1 = 0.75$$

$$C_2/l_2 = 0.143$$

$$M = 0.0845 w_u l_1^2$$


$$K = 1487 E_c$$

$$\text{COF} = 0.514$$

Coef. for Equivalent Columns

Column A

- the torsional member is the 24x24 beam
- torsional cross section is condition (c)



$$C = \sum \left(1 - 0.63 \frac{x}{y} \right) \frac{x^3 y}{3}$$

$$= \left(1 - 0.63 \frac{24}{24} \right) \frac{24^3 (24)}{3} + \left(1 - 0.63 \frac{10}{14} \right) \frac{10^3 (14)}{3}$$

$$= 40919 + 2567$$

$$= 43486 \text{ in}^4$$

$$K_t = \sum \frac{9EC}{l_2(1-C_2l_2)^3} = \frac{9E(43486)}{304(1-24/304)^3} = 1648E$$

\uparrow 2533(12)

provision due to beam parallel to span

$$K_t (I_{sb}/I_s)$$

$$I_{sb} = 114000$$

$$I_s = \frac{1}{2}(168)(10)^3 = 14000$$

$$K_t (I_{sb}/I_s) = (1648E)(114000/14000) = 13419E$$

$$\Sigma K_c = K E I_c / l_c \quad (\text{From A-17})$$

$$I_c = \frac{(24)^4}{12} = 27648$$

Column Below + above

$$l_c = 192''$$

$$l_u = 192 - 30 = 162''$$

$$l_c / l_u = 1.19$$

$$t_a = 25$$

$$t_b = 5$$

$$t_a / t_b = 5$$

$$\Rightarrow \Sigma K_c = \frac{(7.388) E (27648)}{192} \times 2 = 2128 E$$

$$\text{COF} = 0.52$$

K_{ec}


$$\frac{1}{K_{ec}} = \frac{1}{\Sigma K_c} + \frac{1}{K_t}$$

$$\frac{1}{K_{ec}} = \frac{1}{2128 E} + \frac{1}{13419 E}$$

$$\underline{\underline{K_{ec} = 1837 E \quad \text{COF} = 0.52}}$$

Column B

- the torsional member is the slab



$$C = \left(1 - 0.63 \frac{10}{24}\right) \frac{10^3 (24)}{3} = 5900 \text{ in}^4$$

$$K_t = \frac{9E(5900)}{304(1 - 24/304)^3} = 223.5E$$

$$* K_t (I_s / I_{cc}) = 223.5 (114000 / 14000) = 1820E$$

$$\Sigma K_c = KEI_c / l_c$$


$$I = 27648$$

$$K_c = 2128E$$

$$K_{ec} : \frac{1}{K_{ec}} = \frac{1}{2128E} + \frac{1}{1820E}$$

$$K_{ecB} = 981E \quad \text{COF} = 0.52$$

Column C



$$C = \left(1 - 0.63 \left(\frac{24}{24} \right) \right) \frac{24^3 (24)}{3} + \left(1 - 0.63 \left(\frac{10}{44} \right) \right) \left(\frac{10^3 \cdot 44}{3} \right)$$

$$= 40919 + 12567$$

$$= 53486 \text{ in}^4$$

$$K_t = \frac{9E(53486)}{30^4(1 - 24/30)^3} = 2067E$$

$$* K_t (I_s / I_{sb}) = 2067E \left(\frac{114000}{14000} \right) = 16831E$$

$$\Sigma K_c =$$

$$I = 27648$$

$$K_c = 2128E$$

$$K_{ec} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{K_{ec}} = \frac{1}{2128E} + \frac{1}{16831E}$$

$$K_{ec} = 1889E \quad \text{COF} = 0.52$$

Distribution Factors

$$DF_{col A} = \frac{1837E}{1837E + 1487E} = 0.553$$

$$DF_{A-B} = \frac{1487E}{1837E + 1487E} = 0.447$$

$$DF_{B-A} = \frac{1487E}{1487E + 981E + 1487E} = 0.376$$

$$DF_{col B} = \frac{981E}{1487E + 981E + 1487E} = 0.248$$

$$DF_{BC} = \frac{1487E}{1487E + 981E + 1487E} = 0.376$$

$$D_{C-B} = \frac{1487E}{1487E + 1889E} = 0.440$$

$$D_{col C} = \frac{1889E}{1889E + 1497E} = 0.560$$

Load CasesSpan A-B

$$q_L = 80 \text{ psf} (14) = 1120 \text{ pif}$$

$$q_D = 16.5 + 150 \left(\frac{10}{12}\right) = 141.5 \text{ psf} (14) = 1981 \text{ pif}$$

$$q_{beams} = 150 (20 \times 24 / 144) = 500 \text{ pif}$$

$$q_u = 1.2(1981 + 500) + 1.6(1120) = 4769 \text{ pif}$$

$$M = 0.0845 (4769)(25.33)^2 = 259 \text{ k}$$

Span B-C

$$q_L = 150 (14) = 2100 \text{ pif}$$

$$q_D = 16.5 + 150 \left(\frac{10}{12}\right) = 141.5 (14) = 1981 \text{ pif}$$

$$q_{beams} = 150 (20 \times 24 / 144) = 500 \text{ pif}$$


$$q_u = 1.2(1981 + 500) + 1.6(2100) = 6337 \text{ pif}$$

$$M = 0.0845 (6337)(25.33)^2 = 344 \text{ k}$$


Moment Distribution

FEM	Joint A			Joint B		Joint C		
	COF = 0.514						COF = 0.514	
	0.553 col	0.447 slab	0.376 slab	0.248 col	0.376 slab	0.440 slab	0.560 col	
	0	259	-259	0	344	-344	0	
B1	-143.2	-115.8	-32.0	-21.1	-32.0	151.4	192.6	
C1		-16.4	X -59.5		77.8	X -16.4		
B2	9.1	7.3	-6.9	-4.5	-6.9	7.2	9.2	
C2		-3.5	X 3.8		3.7	X -3.5		
B3	-1.9	-1.6	-2.8	-1.9	-2.8	-1.5	2.0	
C3		-1.4	X 0.8		-0.8	X -1.4		
B4	0.8	0.6	-0.6	0.4	-0.6	0.6	0.8	
Sum	-131.4	131.4	X -356	-27	384	X -203	203	

SP Slab Output:



Ram Concept Moments



Comparison of Hand Calculations and RAM Concept

Design Moments – Per Joint						
Method	M _A ⁻	M _{AB} ⁺	M _{AB} ⁻	M _{BC} ⁻	M _{BC} ⁺	M _C ⁻
EFM/SP Slab	128.66	155.87	365.60	391.10	221.16	194.56
RAM Concept	79.67	272.17	360.91	364.41	312.30	100.40

Percent Different in Total Design Moments			
	Hand Calculations/SP Slab	RAM Concept	% Difference
Total Moment in Span A-B	650.13	712.75	9%
Total Moment in Span B-C	806.82	777.11	4%
Total Moment in Both Spans	1456.95	1489.86	2%

Appendix C.2: One-way and Two-way Shear Checks

The following are hand calculations for one-way and two-way shear at column D6.

Column D6

Column = 24" x 24"
Slab t = 10"
Cover = 0.75"
Rebar = #7 (long + trans)

$$d = 10 - 0.75 - \frac{7}{8} = 8.375 \text{ in}$$

Loads

$$D = 16.5 \text{ psf}$$

$$SW = 150 \left(\frac{19}{2}\right) = 125 \text{ psf}$$

$$L = 150 \text{ psf}$$

$$W_u = 1.2(16.5 + 125) + 1.6(150)$$

$$= 410 \text{ psf}$$

$$= 0.410 \text{ ksf}$$

CS1:

$$V_u = 0.410 (13.8' \times 25.3') = 143.1 \text{ kips}$$

$$V_c = 2 \sqrt{f'_c} b_w d = 2(1) \sqrt{4000} (25.3 \times 12) (8.375) / 1000 = 322 \text{ kips}$$

$$\phi V_c = 0.75 (322) = 241.5 \text{ k}$$

$$\Rightarrow 241.5 \text{ k} > 143.1 \text{ k} \checkmark$$

CS2:

$$V_u = 0.410 (11' \times 29.2') = 131.7 \text{ k}$$

$$V_c = 2(1) \sqrt{4000} (29.2 \times 12) (8.375) / 1000 = 371.2 \text{ k}$$

$$\phi V_c = 0.75 (371.2) = 278.4 \text{ k}$$

$$\Rightarrow 278.4 \text{ k} > 131.7 \text{ k}$$

\Rightarrow Passes for one-way Shear

Shear output from RAM Concept

CSI: At the column face

	<u>Max Demand</u>	<u>Max Capacity</u>
LMS	5.635	64.44
CS	130.8	177.3
RMS	$\frac{7.127}{143.6^k}$	$\frac{64.4}{306.1^k}$

CS2: At the column face

	<u>Max Demand</u>	<u>Max Capacity</u>
LMS	7.378	79.41
CS	127.1	159.7
RMS	$\frac{6.578}{141.1^k}$	$\frac{63.48}{302.6^k}$

% Difference between Hand Calcs & RAM ConceptMax Demand \Rightarrow 0%Max Capacity $\Rightarrow \frac{302.6 - 278.4}{278.4} \times 100 = 8\%$

Punching (Two-way) Shear

$$V_u = 0.410 \left[(25.3 \times (15.5 + 13.7)) - (32.375/10)^2 \right] = 300 \text{ k}$$

$$V_c : \begin{cases} (2 + 4/\beta) \lambda \sqrt{f_c} b_o d \\ (\frac{\alpha_o \cdot d}{b_o} + 2) \lambda \sqrt{f_c} b_o d \end{cases}$$

$$\text{min } 4 \lambda \sqrt{f_c} b_o d$$

$$\beta = 24/24 = 1$$

$$\lambda = 1.0$$

$$\alpha = 40$$

$$b_o = (32.375) \times 4 = 129.5 \text{ in}$$

$$V_c : \left. \begin{cases} (2 + 4/1) = 6 \\ (\frac{40(8.375)}{129.5} + 2) = 4.6 \end{cases} \right\} 4 \lambda \sqrt{f_c} b_o d \text{ controls}$$


$$\text{min } 4$$

$$V_c = 4(1) \sqrt{4000} (129.5)(8.375) / 1000 = 274.4 \text{ k}$$

$$\phi V_c = 0.75(274.4) = 206 \text{ k}$$

$$\Rightarrow 206 \text{ k} < 300 \text{ k} \Rightarrow \text{shear reinforcement required}$$

Punching Shear - eccentric shear considering moment
- moment about y-axis



$$v_{u1} = \frac{V_u}{b_{od}} + \gamma_v \frac{M_u(c')}{J_c}$$

$$v_{u2} = \frac{V_u}{b_{od}} - \gamma_v \frac{M_u(c)}{J_c}$$

Knowns

$$V_u = 300 \text{ k}$$

$$b_{od} = 129.5(8.375) = 1085 \text{ in}^2$$

$$c = c' = 32.375/2 = 16.2 \text{ in}$$

$$\begin{aligned} J_c &= \frac{1}{2} b_1^2 b_2 d + \frac{b_1^3 d}{6} + \frac{b_1 d^3}{6} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (32.375)^2 (32.375)(8.375) + \frac{(32.375)^3 (8.375)}{6} + \frac{(32.375)(8.375)^3}{6} \\ &= 142097 + 1463 + 378 \\ &= 143938 \text{ in}^4 \end{aligned}$$

$$\gamma_f = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{b_1/b_2}} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{1}} = 0.6$$

$$\gamma_v = (1 - \gamma_f) = (1 - 0.6) = 0.4$$


$$M_u = 4.49 \text{ k}$$

$$v_{u1} = \left[\frac{300 \text{ k}}{1085 \text{ in}^2} + \frac{(0.4)(4.49 \text{ k} \times 12)(16.2)}{143938} \right] 1000 = 279 \text{ psi}$$

$$v_{u2} = \left[\frac{300 \text{ k}}{1085 \text{ in}^2} - \frac{(0.4)(4.49 \text{ k} \times 12)(16.2)}{143938} \right] 1000 = 274 \text{ psi}$$

$$\phi v_c = 206/(1085) \times 1000 = 189.9 \text{ psi}$$

- moment about X-axis



$$V_u = 300^k$$

$$b_o d = 1085 \text{ in}^2$$

$$c = c' = 16.2 \text{ in}$$

$$J_c = 143938 \text{ in}^4$$

$$\gamma = 0.4$$

$$M_u = 6.92^k$$

$$v_{u1} = \left[\frac{300}{1085} + \frac{(0.4)(6.92 \times 12)(16.2)}{143938} \right] 1000 = 280 \text{ psi}$$

$$v_{u2} = \left[\frac{300}{1085} - \frac{(0.4)(6.92 \times 12)(16.2)}{143938} \right] 1000 = 273 \text{ psi}$$

$$\phi v_c = 189.9 \text{ psi} < 280 \text{ psi} \Rightarrow \text{Shear Reinf. required}$$

RAM Concept Output (from punching Shear audit)

$$b_o = 129.5 \text{ in}$$

$$d = 8.375 \text{ in}$$

$$\text{Max absolute stress} = 284.6 \text{ psi}$$

$$\text{Allowable Stress} = 189.7 \text{ psi}$$

% Difference between hand calcs + RAM Concept

$$\text{Max Absolute} = \frac{284.6 - 280}{280} \times 100 = 1.6\%$$

$$\text{Allowable Stress} = \frac{189.7 - 189.9}{189.7} \times 100 = 0.1\%$$

Appendix C.3: Shear Stud Rail Check

RAM Concept specifies the number of stud rails and the number of studs per rail required for two-way shear reinforcement. In order to check this specified design, Decon STDesign was used. Decon STDesign is a program that designs shear stud rails for individual columns.

The version of Decon used to verify the required stud rails uses ACI318-05, unlike RAM Concept which used ACI318-11 as the design code. In order to perform an accurate verification, RAM Concept was run using ACI318-05 as the design code. The results were then compared, and can be seen in **Table C1**.

Note: Both designs were completed using ½” studs

Shear Stud Rail Design		
	RAM Concept	Decon STDesign
Stud Rails per Column	12	12
Studs per Stud Rail	12	13
Stud Spacing	3.75 in	3.75

Table C1: Shear Studrail Comparison

These results show that RAM Concept’s design was accurate. Further output from both programs can be seen on the next few pages.

The following is output from Decon STDesign and RAM Concept. Key comparisons between Decon STDesign and RAM Concept were the studrail designs and the calculated shear resistances/stresses.

STDesign 3.1 Decon® Studrail® Design

Connection 1, Page 1

PROJECT DATA

Project name: Untitled Project
Project number: UVA Column 6D Check
Engineer: MAC
Date: 06 February 2014
File path: G:\THESIS\Spring\Stud Rail Check\Column 6D studrails.srp

INPUT DATA

Connection name: Connection 1

General:

Design code: ACI 318-05
System of units: US (in, k, k-ft, psi)

Connection:

Connection location: Interior
Column dimension, c_x : 24.00 in
Column dimension, c_y : 24.00 in

Loads:

V_u : 292.4 k
 M_{ux} : -6.920 k-ft
 M_{uy} : -4.490 k-ft

Openings:

None.

Slab:

Effective depth, d : 8.375 in
Slab thickness: 10.00 in
Top cover: 0.750 in
Bottom cover: 0.750 in
Concrete compressive strength, f'_c : 4000 psi
Concrete density: Normal weight
Prestress, f_{pc} : 0.000 psi

Studrails:

2003/2006 IBC ductility requirement: No
Stud yield strength, f_{yv} : 5.000×10^4 psi
Stud diameter: 0.5 in
Typical stud spacing, S : Automatic
End stud spacing, S_0 : Automatic
Number of studrails: Automatic

Connection 1, Page 2

STUDRAIL SUMMARY

Number of studrails per column: 12
 Number of studs per studrail: 12
 Stud diameter: 0.5 in

Typical stud spacing, S : 3.750 in
 End stud spacing, S_0 : 3.750 in
 Overall height of studrail: 8.500 in

OUTPUT DATA**Inner Critical Section (d/2 outside of column face):****Common Properties**

Area, A_c : 1085 in²

Natural Axis Properties

Centroid coordinate, e_x : 0.0 in

Centroid coordinate, e_y : 0.0 in

Section moment of inertia, I_x : 1.895×10^5 in⁴

Section moment of inertia, I_y : 1.895×10^5 in⁴

Section product of inertia, I_{xy} : 0.0 in⁴

Natural Axis Loads

V_u : 292.4 k

M_{ux} : -6.920 k-ft

M_{uy} : -4.490 k-ft

Stresses

Maximum shear stress, v_u : 274.3 psi
 at $x = -16.19$ in, $y = 16.19$ in

Critical Section Perimeter, b_0 : 129.5 in

Principal Axis Properties

Centroid coordinate, e_1 : 0.0 in

Centroid coordinate, e_2 : 0.0 in

Section moment of inertia, I_1 : 1.895×10^5 in⁴

Section moment of inertia, I_2 : 1.895×10^5 in⁴

Principal axis rotation, (theta): 0.0 degrees

Moment fraction, γ_{v1} : 0.400

Moment fraction, γ_{v2} : 0.400

Principal Axis Loads

V_u : 292.4 k

M_{u1} : -6.920 k-ft

M_{u2} : -4.490 k-ft

Shear resistance, ϕv_n (concrete only):
 189.7 psi

Shear resistance, ϕv_n (with Studrails):
 276.8 psi

Shear resistance, ϕv_n (upper limit):
 284.6 psi

Outer Critical Section (d/2 outside of reinforced zone):**Common Properties**

Area, A_c : 3156 in²

Natural Axis Properties

Centroid coordinate, e_x : 0.0 in

Centroid coordinate, e_y : 0.0 in

Section moment of inertia, I_x : 5.251×10^6 in⁴

Section moment of inertia, I_y : 5.251×10^6 in⁴

Section product of inertia, I_{xy} : 0.0 in⁴

Natural Axis Loads

V_u : 292.4 k

M_{ux} : -6.920 k-ft

M_{uy} : -4.490 k-ft

Stresses

Maximum shear stress, v_u : 93.09 psi
 at $x = -13.11$ in, $y = 61.19$ in

Critical Section Perimeter, b_0 : 376.8 in

Principal Axis Properties

Centroid coordinate, e_1 : 0.0 in

Centroid coordinate, e_2 : 0.0 in

Section moment of inertia, I_1 : 5.251×10^6 in⁴

Section moment of inertia, I_2 : 5.251×10^6 in⁴

Principal axis rotation, (theta): 0.0 degrees

Moment fraction, γ_{v1} : 0.400

Moment fraction, γ_{v2} : 0.400

Principal Axis Loads

V_u : 292.4 k

M_{u1} : -6.920 k-ft


M_{u2} : -4.490 k-ft

Shear resistance, ϕv_n : 94.87 psi


Design Comments:

None.

PLAN VIEW



ELEVATION VIEW



RAM Concept

Design At Start of Final Design Check

12 Total Rails

13 Studs/Rail

Stud Area = 0.196 sq. in.

Stud Yield Stress = 50 ksi

First Stud Spacing = 3.375 inches

Typical Stud Spacing = 3.75 inches

Gamma-F Fractions about Punch Check Axes

Min Mr Fraction = -26.99 kip-ft

Max Mr Fraction = 38.51 kip-ft

Min Ms Fraction = -30.7 kip-ft

Max Ms Fraction = 50.26 kip-ft

Analyzing 1 Column Sections

Section Analysis - Audit ID = 1

Section Properties:

Perimeter Length = 130.5 inches

Perimeter Average Depth = 8.625 inches

Properties about Punch Check Axes

Elastic Centroid Location:

x = 0 inches

y = 0 inches

Ix = 199600 in⁴

Iy = 199600 in⁴

Ixy = 0 in⁴

Properties about Principal Axes

Angle to Principal x-axis = 0 degrees

Ix = 199600 in⁴

Iy = 199600 in⁴

Ixy = 0 in⁴

x width = 32.62 inches

y width = 32.62 inches

Gamma-Vx = 0.4

Gamma-Vy = 0.4

Maximum Absolute Stress = 274.1 psi

Allowable Stress = 189.7 psi

Unreinforced Stress Ratio = 1.445

Reinforced Strength Ratio = 0.9964

Analyzing 1 Cutoff Sections

Section Analysis - Audit ID = 2

Section Properties:

Perimeter Length = 395.9 inches

Perimeter Average Depth = 8.625 inches

Properties about Punch Check Axes

Elastic Centroid Location:

x = 0.003937 inches

y = 0.003937 inches

Ix = 6240000 in⁴Iy = 6240000 in⁴Ixy = 0.01513 in⁴

Properties about Principal Axes

Angle to Principal x-axis = 0 degrees

Ix = 6240000 in⁴Iy = 6240000 in⁴Ixy = 0.01513 in⁴

x width = 129.4 inches

y width = 129.4 inches

Gamma-Vx = 0.4

Gamma-Vy = 0.4

Maximum Absolute Stress = 61.91 psi

Allowable Stress = 94.87 psi

Unreinforced Stress Ratio = 0.6525

Status:

OK with SSR

Appendix D: Deflections

RAM Concept uses an effective curvature ratio (ECR) to calculate both instantaneous and long term deflections for both cracked and uncracked sections. The default ECR is 3.35. This value comes from ACI 209. The problem with this value is that many practicing engineers feel that it is too conservative.

ACI318-11 Section 9.5.2.5 says that for long term deflections a factor of 2 may be used for calculating deflections over a period of 5 years or more if no compression reinforcement is used. A factor of 1 is used to account for short term deflections. Thus, an ECR = 3 is used in RAM Concept's calculation of long term deflections.

To account for the effects of cracked sections RAM Concept uses a simpler approach that most often gives a conservative design. Once the moment due to the service load exceeds the moment due to cracking the program then considered the ratio of the moment due to service loads to the moment due to cracking. The ECR is then multiplied by this ratio. For example:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\text{service}}/M_{\text{crack}} &= 2 \\ \text{ECR} &= 3 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{New ECR: } 3 \times 2 = 6$$

RAM Concept also does not account for the difference in live load vs dead load. A weighted average of the loads can be calculated by hand to achieve a lower ECR. This is done by using the following equation:

$$\frac{\text{Live Load}}{\text{Live} + \text{Dead}} (1.6) + \frac{\text{Dead Load}}{\text{Live} + \text{Dead}} (\text{ECR}) = \text{New ECR}$$

The 1.6 factor comes from the approximation of 30% of the sustained live load multiplied by the creep and shrinkage factor plus 1 from the instantaneous deflections. In this case the creep and shrinkage factor is 2 of which 30% is 0.6.

The limit for deflections is L/480. This comes from ACI318-11 Table 9.5(b). It is expected that there will be non-structural elements likely to be damaged by large deflections. Edge deflections will be held to a stricter criterion of L/600 to prevent damaged to the masonry façade.

The following pages show the process of checking deflections and making adjustments so they pass.

Deflection Adjustments

It was determined that the bays located between column lines 5-7 and E-C were the worst case conditions for deflections in the slab. This was expected due to the large spans of 27'-4" and 31'-0". **Figure D1** below shows the location of these bays with respect to the floor plan.




Figure D1: Bays with Worst Case Deflections

Options if deflections fail:

- Use a weighted average to adjust ECR
- Add compression reinforcement
- Add drop panel/shallow beam
 - This option is the least favorable do to the fact that it means increased formwork, and can have a negative impact on the architecture and the other building system.

Initial Deflections with ECR = 3

The initial deflection contours are shown in **Figure D2**, and initial deflections are shown in **Table D1**. No adjustments have been made to the ECR.




Figure D2: Initial Deflection Contours

Span	Span Length (FT)	Deflection	L/480	Pass/Fail
5D - 6D	31	1.33	0.775	Fail
6D - 7D	27.33	1.02	0.683	Fail
5E - 6D	40	1.43	1.0	Fail
6E - 7D	37.33	1.24	0.933	Fail
5C- 6D	40	1.33	1.0	Fail

Table D1: Initial Deflections

From this trial it was determined that Span 5D-6D was the controlling span for deflections.

Trial 1 – Weighted Loads

The first alteration was the use of the weighted loading condition. Calculation of the new ECR was:

$$\frac{80}{80 + 141.5}(1.6) + \frac{141.5}{80 + 141.5}(3) = 2.5$$

Where:

Live Load = 80 psf (conservative since bay sees both 80psf and 150 psf)

Dead Load = 141.5 psf (Slab self-weight of 125psf and 16.5psf misc. dead load)

Figure D3 shows the deflection contours along with Table D2 which shows the new deflections.




Figure D3: Initial Deflection Contours

Span	Span Length (FT)	Deflection	L/480	Pass/Fail
5D - 6D	31	1.27	0.775	Fail

Table D2: Critical Deflection with Weighted Loading Condition

Accounting for the weighted loading condition made a small difference but did not adjust the output enough to meet criteria.

Trial 2 – Compression Reinforcement

The second alteration was the use of compression reinforcement. By adding compression reinforcement the long term deflection factor changes (ACI318-11 Section 9.5.2.5). Once this deflection factor changes the factor used in the weighted average also changes.

To determine the compression steel required to meet the deflection limit, the required ECR was determined. To meet $L/480$ the deflection of the slab needed to be limited to 0.775 in (from the 31'-0" span). After several runs of the program it was determined that an ECR of less than 1 was required to meet this criterion. **Table D3** show the deflections based on the ECR.

ECR	Deflection (in)
2.5	1.27
1.5	1.1
1	1.01

Table D3: ECR vs. Deflection

This requirement was unrealistic due to the fact that at a minimum the instantaneous deflections are 1. Therefore it was determined that a drop panel or a shallow beam would be required to limit the deflections.

Trial 3 – Drop Panels and Shallow Beams

Before adding a shallow beam along the span 5D – 6D a drop panel was added to the column at 6D. This column was a critical column when dealing with punching shear, so a drop panel would also eliminate the need for shear stud rails.

The first drop panel trial size was based on the minimum size required to resist punching shear, and was made square for simplification. The dimensions are shown in **Table D4**.

Column	-X	+X	-Y	+Y	Thickness
6D	6	6	6	6	16

Table D4: Dimension of Drop Panel at 6D

Deflections with this drop panel and an ECR of 2.5 were calculated, and the deflection was 1". The deflection for each of the critical spans can be seen in **Table D5**.

Span	Span Length (FT)	Deflection	L/480	Pass/Fail
5D - 6D	31	1.0	0.775	Fail
6D - 7D	27.33	0.669	0.683	Pass
5E - 6D	40	1.07	1.0	Fail
6E - 7D	37.33	0.971	0.933	Fail
5C - 6D	40	1.04	1.0	Fail

Table D5: Deflections with Addition of Drop Panel

Since the slab was still failing in multiple locations it was decided that a larger drop panel (7'x7') would be provided. **Table D6** shows the resulting deflections.

Span	Span Length (FT)	Deflection	L/480	Pass/Fail
5D - 6D	31	0.955	0.775	Fail
6D - 7D	27.33	0.592	0.683	Pass
5E - 6D	40	1.03	1.0	Fail
6E - 7D	37.33	0.92	0.933	Pass
5C - 6D	40	0.986	1.0	Pass

Table D6: Deflections with 7'x7' Drop Panel

At this point the deflection failures were concentrated between column line 5 and 6. There were two options:

- Increase the drop panel size to an 8'x 8' drop
- Add a shallow beam (7 x 4" below the slab) along column line D between column line 5 and 6

Both options were considered in order to choose the best design. The resulting deflections for the added drop panel are shown in **Table D7**, and the resulting deflections for the shallow beam are shown in **Table D8**.

Span	Span Length (FT)	Deflection	L/480	Pass/Fail
5D - 6D	31	0.943	0.775	Fail
6D - 7D	27.33	0.614	0.683	Pass
5E - 6D	40	1.02	1.0	Fail
6E - 7D	37.33	0.943	0.933	Fail
5C - 6D	40	0.974	1.0	Pass

Table D7: Deflections with 8'x8' Drop Panel

Span	Span Length (FT)	Deflection	L/480	Pass/Fail
5D - 6D	31	0.709	0.775	Pass
6D - 7D	27.33	0.511	0.683	Pass
5E - 6D	40	0.875	1.0	Pass
6E - 7D	37.33	0.817	0.933	Pass
5C - 6D	40	0.827	1.0	Pass

Table D8: Deflections with Shallow Beam

It was determined that a larger drop panel was not a good option. Even though deflections at span 5D-6D and 5E-6D improved, many of the deflections at other locations worsened.

The 7' x 7' drop cap with the 4" shallow beam proved to be the most effective in reducing the deflections.

Appendix E: Reinforcement

Note: For span designations please see the reinforcement plan within the body of the report.

Calculation of Additional Bottom Bars

Latitude Reinforcement					
Span	Span Width (FT)	A_{req} (in ² /ft)	A_{prov} (in ² /ft)	Additional Reinforcement Required (in ² /ft)	Additional Bars
MS - 1	16	0.31	0.23	0.08	5
CS - 1	12.4	0.37	0.23	0.14	#5 @ 16
MS - 2	16	0.31	0.23	0.08	5
CS - 2	8.6	0.29	0.23	0.06	4
MS - 3	6.15	0.25	0.23	0.02	2
CS - 3	7.17	0.37	0.23	0.14	#5 @ 16
MS - 4	15.3	0.29	0.23	0.06	4
CS - 4	12.4	0.62	0.23	0.39	#5 @ 8
MS - 5	15.3	0.29	0.23	0.06	4
CS - 5	12.4	0.46	0.23	0.23	#5 @ 16
CS - 7	12.5	0.25	0.23	0.02	2
MS - 6	9.8	0.25	0.23	0.02	2

Table E1: Additional Bottom Latitude Reinforcement

Longitude Reinforcement					
Span	Span Width (FT)	A_{req} (in ² /ft)	A_{prov} (in ² /ft)	Additional Reinforcement Required (in ² /ft)	Additional Bars
MS - 7	7.3	0.31	0.23	0.08	5
MS - 8	15.3	0.27	0.23	0.04	3
MS - 9	15.3	0.27	0.23	0.04	3
CS - 10	12.7	0.31	0.23	0.08	5
CS - 11	12.7	0.34	0.23	0.11	6
MS - 10	14.7	0.27	0.23	0.04	3
MS - 11	14.7	0.31	0.23	0.08	5
CS - 13	12.7	0.27	0.23	0.04	3

Table E2: Additional Bottom Longitude Reinforcement

Calculation of Additional Top Bars

Latitude Reinforcement					
Span	Span Width (FT)	A_{req} (in ² /ft)	A_{prov} (in ² /ft)	Additional Reinforcement Required (in ² /ft)	Additional Bars
MS - 1	16	0.74	0.23	0.51	#5 @ 4
CS - 1 (Left)	12.4	0.37	0.23	0.14	#5 @ 16
CS - 1 (Right)	12.4	0.53	0.23	0.30	#5 @ 8
MS - 2/3	16	0.37	0.23	0.14	#5 @ 16
CS - 2 (Left)	7.15	0.37	0.23	0.14	#5 @ 16
CS - 2 (Right)	7.15	0.53	0.23	0.30	#5 @ 8
MS - 3/5	9.4	0.46	0.23	0.23	#5 @ 16
CS - 3 (Left)	7.17	0.37	0.23	0.14	8
CS - 3 (Right)	7.17	0.37	0.23	0.14	8
MS - 4	15.3	0.41	0.23	0.18	#5 @ 16
CS - 4 (Left)	12.4	1.24	0.23	1.01	#5 @ 2
CS - 4/5	12.4	1.86	0.23	1.63	#5 @ 2
CS - 5/6	12.4	0.62	0.23	0.39	#5 @ 16
CS - 6 (Right)	12.4	0.25	0.23	0.02	2
CS - 7 (Left)	12.5	0.53	0.23	0.3	#5 @ 8
CS - 7(Right)	12.5	0.31	0.23	0.08	5

Table E3: Additional Top Latitude Reinforcement

Longitude Reinforcement					
Span	Span Width (FT)	A_{req} (in ² /ft)	A_{prov} (in ² /ft)	Additional Reinforcement Required (in ² /ft)	Additional Reinforcement
MS - 7	19.9	0.41	0.23	0.18	#5 @ 16
CS - 8 (Left)	9.2	0.31	0.23	0.08	5
CS - 8 (Right)	9.2	0.41	0.23	0.18	#5 @ 16
CS - 9 (Left)	12.7	0.37	0.23	0.14	#5 @ 16
CS - 9 (Right)	12.7	0.27	0.23	0.04	3
MS - 8/9	21.5	0.31	0.23	0.08	5
CS -10 (Left)	12.7	0.62	0.23	0.39	#5 @ 8
CS - 10/11	12.7	0.93	0.23	0.7	#5 @ 4
CS - 11 (Right)	12.7	0.34	0.23	0.11	6
MS - 10 (Left)	14.7	0.37	0.23	0.14	#5 @ 16
MS - 10/11	14.7	0.31	0.23	0.08	5
CS - 14 (Left)	14.6	0.37	0.23	0.14	#5 @ 16
CS - 12/14	12.7	0.46	0.23	0.23	#5 @ 16
CS - 12/13	12.7	0.74	0.23	0.51	#5 @ 4
CS - 13	12.7	0.25	0.23	0.02	2
CS - 15 (Left)	9.5	0.62	0.23	0.39	#5 @ 8
CS - 15 (Right)	9.5	0.31	0.23	0.08	5

Table E4: Additional Top Longitude Reinforcement

Appendix F: Column Design

Figure F1 below shows the calculation of the total factored axial load on each column at level 1. Also listed is the total factored moment in the r-direction (x-direction) and s-direction (y-direction) taken from RAM Concept. The worst case axial load and moments are highlighted in red while the possible critical cases for combined axial and moment are highlighted in pink.


Table F1 below shows the comparison of required strength to available strength of these critical columns.

Column	$\phi M_n/M_u$	$\phi P_n/P_u$
3D	3.10	1.07
6E	3.40	1.25
6D	7.74	1.02
6C	4.49	1.02
7C	7.53	1.01
7E	4.53	1.44
8B	6.26	2.49

Table F1: Column Capacity

Column Location	Level	Trib Area (SF)	Floor to Floor Height (FT)	Floor Dead Loads (PSF)	Column Self Weight (lbs)	Beam Self Weight (lbs)	Wall Load (lbs)	Live (PSF)	Reduced Live Load (PSF)	Floor D'A _s	L*A _s	L _c *A _s	1.2D	1.6L	0.5L _c	Total	Column Total (K)	Mr	Ms	
3E	Lower Roof	178	6	146	-	10765	27345	30	N/A	26020	-	5347	76956	-	2673	79630	695	31.34	56.89	
	Level 6	178	18	135	10800	10765	39562	80	N/A	24060	14258	-	102225	22812	-	125038				
	Level 5	178	16	135	9600	10765	37235	80	N/A	24060	14258	-	97992	22812	-	120805				
	Level 4	178	16	135	9600	10765	37235	80	N/A	24060	14258	-	97992	22812	-	120805				
	Level 3	178	16	135	9600	10765	37235	80	N/A	24060	14258	-	97992	22812	-	120805				
	Level 2	178	18	135	10800	10765	41889	80	N/A	24060	14258	-	105018	22812	-	127830				
3D	Lower Roof	321	6	146	-	12665	27926	30	N/A	46837	-	9624	104915	-	4812	109727	1123	10.18	89.77	
	Level 6	321	18	135	10800	12665	39562	150	N/A	43309	48121	-	127603	76993	-	204596				
	Level 5	321	16	135	9600	12665	37235	150	N/A	43309	48121	-	123370	76993	-	200364				
	Level 4	321	16	135	9600	12665	37235	150	N/A	43309	48121	-	123370	76993	-	200364				
	Level 3	321	16	135	9600	12665	37235	150	N/A	43309	48121	-	123370	76993	-	200364				
	Level 2	321	18	135	10800	12665	41889	150	N/A	43309	48121	-	130396	76993	-	207389				
3C	Lower Roof	178	6	146	-	12665	27926	30	N/A	26020	-	5347	79934	-	2673	82608	809	37.67	48.97	
	Level 6	178	18	135	10800	12665	39562	150	N/A	24060	26733	-	104505	42773	-	147278				
	Level 5	178	16	135	9600	12665	37235	150	N/A	24060	26733	-	100272	42773	-	143046				
	Level 4	178	16	135	9600	12665	37235	150	N/A	24060	26733	-	100272	42773	-	143046				
	Level 3	178	16	135	9600	12665	37235	150	N/A	24060	26733	-	100272	42773	-	143046				
	Level 2	178	18	135	10800	12665	41889	150	N/A	24060	26733	-	107297	42773	-	150071				
4E	Lower Roof	232	6	146	-	7388	27926	30	28	33838	-	6953	82883	-	3477	86460	715	17.15	26.22	
	Level 6	232	18	135	10800	7388	39562	80	76	31289	17534	-	106847	28085	-	134932				
	Level 5	232	16	135	9600	7388	37235	80	59	31289	13770	-	102614	23032	-	124646				
	Level 4	232	16	135	9600	7388	37235	80	52	31289	12094	-	102614	19350	-	121964				
	Level 3	232	16	135	9600	7388	37235	80	48	31289	11094	-	102614	17751	-	120365				
	Level 2	232	18	135	10800	7388	41889	80	45	31289	10412	-	109640	16660	-	126300				
4C	Lower Roof	160	6	146	-	6333	27926	30	N/A	23299	-	4787	69069	-	2394	71463	722	19.58	31.64	
	Level 6	160	18	135	10800	6333	39562	150	N/A	21543	23937	-	93886	38299	-	132185				
	Level 5	160	16	135	9600	6333	37235	150	N/A	21543	23937	-	89653	38299	-	127952				
	Level 4	160	16	135	9600	6333	37235	150	N/A	21543	23937	-	89653	38299	-	127952				
	Level 3	160	16	135	9600	6333	37235	150	N/A	21543	23937	-	89653	38299	-	127952				
	Level 2	160	18	135	10800	6333	41889	150	N/A	21543	23937	-	96678	38299	-	134973				
5E	Lower Roof	258	6	146	-	11115	31052	30	N/A	37626	-	7731	95751	-	3866	99617	805	37.99	39.39	
	Level 6	258	18	135	10800	11115	43990	80	73	34791	18776	-	120836	30041	-	150877				
	Level 5	258	16	135	9600	11115	41403	80	57	34791	14786	-	116290	23658	-	139948				
	Level 4	258	16	135	9600	11115	41403	80	51	34791	13019	-	116290	20830	-	137120				
	Level 3	258	16	135	9600	11115	41403	80	46	34791	11965	-	116290	19144	-	135434				
	Level 2	258	18	135	10800	11115	46578	80	44	34791	11246	-	123941	17994	-	141934				
5C	Lower Roof	177	6	146	-	5425	31052	30	N/A	25906	-	5323	74860	-	2662	77521	785	22.93	1.385	
	Level 6	177	18	135	10800	5425	43990	150	N/A	23954	26616	-	101003	42585	-	143589				
	Level 5	177	16	135	9600	5425	41403	150	N/A	23954	26616	-	96458	42585	-	139044				
	Level 4	177	16	135	9600	5425	41403	150	N/A	23954	26616	-	96458	42585	-	139044				
	Level 3	177	16	135	9600	5425	41403	150	N/A	23954	26616	-	96458	42585	-	139044				
	Level 2	177	18	135	10800	5425	46578	150	N/A	23954	26616	-	104109	42585	-	145694				
6E	Lower Roof	369	6	146	-	10208	32154	30	N/A	53929	-	11081	115549	-	5541	121090	962	102.3	21.04	
	Level 6	369	18	135	10800	10208	45552	80	64	49866	29550	-	139711	47280	-	186990				
	Level 5	369	16	135	9600	10208	42873	80	51	49866	18919	-	135055	30270	-	165325				
	Level 4	369	16	135	9600	10208	42873	80	45	49866	16803	-	135055	26885	-	161940				
	Level 3	369	16	135	9600	10208	42873	80	42	49866	15541	-	135055	24866	-	159921				
	Level 2	369	18	135	10800	10208	48232	80	40	49866	14681	-	142926	23489	-	166415				
6D	Lower Roof	739	-	146	-	-	-	-	150	N/A	107857	-	110812	129429	-	55406	184835	1730	32.05	41.88
	Level 6	739	18	135	10800	-	-	-	150	N/A	99731	110812	-	132637	177300	-	309937			
	Level 5	739	16	135	9600	-	-	-	150	N/A	99731	110812	-	131197	177300	-	308497			
	Level 4	739	16	135	9600	-	-	-	150	N/A	99731	110812	-	131197	177300	-	308497			
	Level 3	739	16	135	9600	-	-	-	150	N/A	99731	110812	-	131197	177300	-	308497			
	Level 2	739	18	135	10800	-	-	-	150	N/A	99731	110812	-	132637	177300	-	309937			
6C	Lower Roof	369	6	146	-	16690	31052	30	N/A	53929	-	11081	122005	-	5541	127546	1267	49.55	31.08	
	Level 6	369	18	135	10800	14641	43990	150	N/A	49866	55406	-	143156	88650	-	231805				
	Level 5	369	16	135	9600	13046	41403	150	N/A	49866	55406	-	136697	88650	-	225347				
	Level 4	369	16	135	9600	9994	41403	150	N/A	49866	55406	-	133035	88650	-	221685				
	Level 3	369	16	135	9600	9858	41403	150	N/A	49866	55406	-	132871	88650	-	221521				
	Level 2	369	18	135	10800	18057	46578	150	N/A	49866	55406	-	150360	88650	-	239010				
6.7A	Lower Roof	92	6	146	-	2955	-	30	N/A	13378	-	2749	16053	-	1374	17428	243	3.112	2.968	
	Level 6	92	18	135	10800	2955	-	100	N/A	12370	9163	-	31350	14660	-	46010				
	Level 5	92	16	135	9600	2955	-	100	N/A	12370	9163	-	29910	14660	-	44570				
	Level 4	92	16	135	9600	2955	-	100	N/A	12370	9163	-	29910	14660	-	44570				
	Level 3	92	16	135	9600	2955	-	100	N/A	12370	9163	-	29910	14660	-	44570				
	Level 2	92	18	135	10800	2955	-	100	N/A	12370	9163	-	31350	14660	-	46010				
7E	Lower Roof	333	6	146	-	4783	29029	30	N/A	48687	-	10004	98998	-	5002	104000	838	77.61	33.19	
	Level 6	333	18	135	10800	4783	41124	80	66	45018	22164	-	122070	35463	-	157534				
	Level 5	333	16	135	9600	4783	38705	80	53	45018	17626	-	117727	28202	-	145929				
	Level 4	333	16	135	9600	4783	38705	80	47	45018	15615	-	117727	24985	-	142712				
	Level 3	333	16	135	9600	4783	38705	80	43	45018	14417	-	117727	23067	-	140795				
	Level 2	333	18	135	10800	4783	43543	80	41	45018	13599	-	124973	21758	-	146732				
7D	Lower Roof	667	6	146	-	-	-	-	150	N/A	97373	-	100041	116948	-	50020	166868	956		

SP Column Output: Column 3D



STRUCTUREPOINT - spColumn v4.81 (TM)
 Licensed to: Penn State University Park. License ID: 59919-1033951-4-22545-2CF68
 E:\THEISIS\Spring\Columns\3D\SP Column - 3D.col

Page 2
 04/02/14
 08:43 PM

General Information:

```

=====
File Name: E:\THEISIS\Spring\Columns\3D\SP Column - 3D.col
Project:  UVA Library
Column:   3D                               Engineer: MAC
Code:     ACI 318-11                       Units: English

Run Option: Design                         Slenderness: Not considered
Run Axis:  Biaxial                         Column Type: Structural
    
```

Material Properties:

```

=====
f'c = 4 ksi                               fy = 60 ksi
Ec = 3605 ksi                             Es = 29000 ksi
Ultimate strain = 0.003 in/in
Beta1 = 0.85
    
```

Section:

```

=====
Rectangular: Width = 24 in                Depth = 24 in

Gross section area, Ag = 576 in^2
Ix = 27648 in^4                            Iy = 27648 in^4
rx = 6.9282 in                             ry = 6.9282 in
Xo = 0 in                                   Yo = 0 in
    
```

Reinforcement:

```

=====
Bar Set: ASTM A615
Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)  Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)  Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)
-----
# 3      0.38      0.11  # 4      0.50      0.20  # 5      0.63      0.31
# 6      0.75      0.44  # 7      0.88      0.60  # 8      1.00      0.79
# 9      1.13      1.00  # 10     1.27      1.27  # 11     1.41      1.56
# 14     1.69      2.25  # 18     2.26      4.00
    
```

Bar selection: Minimum number of bars
 Asmin = 0.01 * Ag = 5.76 in^2, Asmax = 0.08 * Ag = 46.08 in^2

Confinement: Tied; #3 ties with #10 bars, #4 with larger bars.
 phi(a) = 0.8, phi(b) = 0.9, phi(c) = 0.65

Layout: Rectangular
 Pattern: Equal Bar Spacing (Cover to transverse reinforcement)
 Total steel area: As = 6.32 in^2 at rho = 1.10%
 Minimum clear spacing = 8.62 in

8 #8 Cover = 1.5 in


Factored Loads and Moments with Corresponding Capacities:

```

=====
Design/Required ratio PhiMn/Mu >= 1.00
No.      Pu      Mux      Muy      PhiMnx      PhiMny      PhiMn/Mu  NA depth  Dt depth  eps_t  Phi
      kip      k-ft     k-ft     k-ft     k-ft     k-ft
-----
1      1123.00    10.18    89.77    31.87    281.00    3.130    23.52    23.93    0.00005  0.650
    
```

*** End of output ***

SP Column Output: Column 6C



spColumn v4.81. Licensed to: Penn State University Park. License ID: 59919-1033951-4-22545-2CF68

File: E:\THESIS\Spring\Columns\6C\SP Column - 6C.col
 Project: UVA Library
 Column: 3D
 Engineer: MAC

$f_c = 4$ ksi	$f_y = 60$ ksi	$A_g = 576$ in ²	12 #8 bars
$E_c = 3605$ ksi	$E_s = 29000$ ksi	$A_s = 9.48$ in ²	$\rho = 1.65\%$
$f_c = 3.4$ ksi		$X_o = 0.00$ in	$I_x = 27648$ in ⁴
$e_u = 0.003$ in/in		$Y_o = 0.00$ in	$I_y = 27648$ in ⁴
Beta1 = 0.85		Min clear spacing = 5.41 in	Clear cover = 1.87 in

 Confinement: Tied
 $\phi(a) = 0.8, \phi(b) = 0.9, \phi(c) = 0.65$

STRUCTUREPOINT - spColumn v4.81 (TM)
 Licensed to: Penn State University Park. License ID: 59919-1033951-4-22545-2CF68
 E:\THEISIS\Spring\Columns\6C\SP Column - 6C.col

Page 2
 04/02/14
 08:17 PM

General Information:

```

=====
File Name: E:\THEISIS\Spring\Columns\6C\SP Column - 6C.col
Project: UVA Library
Column: 3D                               Engineer: MAC
Code: ACI 318-11                          Units: English

Run Option: Design                        Slenderness: Not considered
Run Axis: Biaxial                          Column Type: Structural
    
```

Material Properties:

```

=====
f'c = 4 ksi                               fy = 60 ksi
Ec = 3605 ksi                             Es = 29000 ksi
Ultimate strain = 0.003 in/in
Beta1 = 0.85
    
```

Section:

```

=====
Rectangular: Width = 24 in                Depth = 24 in

Gross section area, Ag = 576 in^2
Ix = 27648 in^4                            Iy = 27648 in^4
rx = 6.9282 in                             ry = 6.9282 in
Xo = 0 in                                   Yo = 0 in
    
```

Reinforcement:

```

=====
Bar Set: ASTM A615
Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)   Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)   Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)
-----
# 3      0.38      0.11   # 4      0.50      0.20   # 5      0.63      0.31
# 6      0.75      0.44   # 7      0.88      0.60   # 8      1.00      0.79
# 9      1.13      1.00   # 10     1.27      1.27   # 11     1.41      1.56
# 14     1.69      2.25   # 18     2.26      4.00
    
```

Bar selection: Minimum number of bars
 Asmin = 0.01 * Ag = 5.76 in^2, Asmax = 0.08 * Ag = 46.08 in^2

Confinement: Tied; #3 ties with #10 bars, #4 with larger bars.
 phi(a) = 0.8, phi(b) = 0.9, phi(c) = 0.65

Layout: Rectangular
 Pattern: Equal Bar Spacing (Cover to transverse reinforcement)
 Total steel area: As = 9.48 in^2 at rho = 1.65%
 Minimum clear spacing = 5.41 in

12 #8 Cover = 1.5 in


Factored Loads and Moments with Corresponding Capacities:

```

=====
Design/Required ratio PhiMn/Mu >= 1.00
No.      Pu      Mux      Muy      PhiMnx      PhiMny      PhiMn/Mu NA depth Dt depth  eps_t  Phi
      kip      k-ft     k-ft     k-ft       k-ft       k-ft
-----
1      1267.00    49.55    31.08    222.39     139.50     4.488    28.03    29.40    0.00015  0.650
    
```

*** End of output ***

SP Column Output: Column 6D



STRUCTUREPOINT - spColumn v4.81 (TM)
 Licensed to: Penn State University Park. License ID: 59919-1033951-4-22545-2CF68
 e:\thesis\spring\columns\6d\sp column - 6d.col

Page 2
 04/02/14
 06:25 PM

General Information:

```

=====
File Name: e:\thesis\spring\columns\6d\sp column - 6d.col
Project:   UVA Library
Column:   3D                               Engineer: MAC
Code:     ACI 318-11                       Units: English

Run Option: Design                         Slenderness: Not considered
Run Axis:  Biaxial                          Column Type: Structural
    
```

Material Properties:

```

=====
f'c   = 4 ksi                               fy   = 60 ksi
Ec    = 3605 ksi                            Es   = 29000 ksi
Ultimate strain = 0.003 in/in
Beta1 = 0.85
    
```

Section:

```

=====
Rectangular: Width = 28 in                 Depth = 28 in

Gross section area, Ag = 784 in^2
Ix = 51221.3 in^4                          Iy = 51221.3 in^4
rx = 8.0829 in                             ry = 8.0829 in
Xo = 0 in                                  Yo = 0 in
    
```

Reinforcement:

```

=====
Bar Set: ASTM A615
Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)   Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)   Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)
-----
# 3    0.38    0.11   # 4    0.50    0.20   # 5    0.63    0.31
# 6    0.75    0.44   # 7    0.88    0.60   # 8    1.00    0.79
# 9    1.13    1.00   # 10   1.27    1.27   # 11   1.41    1.56
# 14   1.69    2.25   # 18   2.26    4.00
    
```

Bar selection: Minimum area of steel
 Asmin = 0.01 * Ag = 7.84 in², Asmax = 0.08 * Ag = 62.72 in²

Confinement: Tied; #3 ties with #10 bars, #4 with larger bars.
 phi(a) = 0.8, phi(b) = 0.9, phi(c) = 0.65

Layout: Rectangular
 Pattern: Equal Bar Spacing (Cover to transverse reinforcement)
 Total steel area: As = 12.64 in² at rho = 1.61%
 Minimum clear spacing = 4.81 in

16 #8 Cover = 1.5 in


Factored Loads and Moments with Corresponding Capacities:

```

=====
Design/Required ratio PhiMn/Mu >= 1.00
No.      Pu      Mux      Muy      PhiMnx      PhiMny      PhiMn/Mu NA depth Dt depth  eps_t  Phi
        kip      k-ft     k-ft     k-ft        k-ft        k-ft
-----
1      1730.00    32.05    41.88    247.97      324.03      7.737   33.43   35.60   0.00019  0.650
    
```

*** End of output ***

SP Column Output: Column 6E



spColumn v4.81. Licensed to: Penn State University Park. License ID: 59919-1033951-4-22545-2CF68

STRUCTUREPOINT - spColumn v4.81 (TM)
 Licensed to: Penn State University Park. License ID: 59919-1033951-4-22545-2CF68
 E:\THEISIS\Spring\Columns\6E\SP Column - 6E.col

Page 2
 04/02/14
 08:55 PM

General Information:

=====
 File Name: E:\THEISIS\Spring\Columns\6E\SP Column - 6E.col
 Project: UVA Library
 Column: 3D Engineer: MAC
 Code: ACI 318-11 Units: English

 Run Option: Design Slenderness: Not considered
 Run Axis: Biaxial Column Type: Structural

Material Properties:

=====
 f'c = 4 ksi fy = 60 ksi
 Ec = 3605 ksi Es = 29000 ksi
 Ultimate strain = 0.003 in/in
 Beta1 = 0.85

Section:

=====
 Rectangular: Width = 24 in Depth = 24 in

 Gross section area, Ag = 576 in^2
 Ix = 27648 in^4 Iy = 27648 in^4
 rx = 6.9282 in ry = 6.9282 in
 Xo = 0 in Yo = 0 in

Reinforcement:

=====
 Bar Set: ASTM A615

Size	Diam (in)	Area (in^2)	Size	Diam (in)	Area (in^2)	Size	Diam (in)	Area (in^2)
# 3	0.38	0.11	# 4	0.50	0.20	# 5	0.63	0.31
# 6	0.75	0.44	# 7	0.88	0.60	# 8	1.00	0.79
# 9	1.13	1.00	# 10	1.27	1.27	# 11	1.41	1.56
# 14	1.69	2.25	# 18	2.26	4.00			

Bar selection: Minimum number of bars
 Asmin = 0.01 * Ag = 5.76 in^2, Asmax = 0.08 * Ag = 46.08 in^2

Confinement: Tied; #3 ties with #10 bars, #4 with larger bars.
 phi(a) = 0.8, phi(b) = 0.9, phi(c) = 0.65

Layout: Rectangular
 Pattern: Equal Bar Spacing (Cover to transverse reinforcement)
 Total steel area: As = 6.32 in^2 at rho = 1.10%
 Minimum clear spacing = 8.62 in

8 #8 Cover = 1.5 in


Factored Loads and Moments with Corresponding Capacities:

=====
 Design/Required ratio PhiMn/Mu >= 1.00

No.	Pu kip	Mux k-ft	Muy k-ft	PhiMnx k-ft	PhiMny k-ft	PhiMn/Mu	NA depth in	Dt depth in	eps_t	Phi
1	962.00	102.30	21.04	347.95	71.56	3.401	21.93	26.20	0.00058	0.650

*** End of output ***

SP Column Output: Column 7C



STRUCTUREPOINT - spColumn v4.81 (TM)
 Licensed to: Penn State University Park. License ID: 59919-1033951-4-22545-2CF68
 E:\THEISIS\Spring\Columns\7C\SP Column - 7C.col

Page 2
 04/02/14
 08:31 PM

General Information:

```

=====
File Name: E:\THEISIS\Spring\Columns\7C\SP Column - 7C.col
Project: UVA Library
Column: 3D                               Engineer: MAC
Code: ACI 318-11                          Units: English

Run Option: Design                         Slenderness: Not considered
Run Axis: Biaxial                          Column Type: Structural
    
```

Material Properties:

```

=====
f'c = 4 ksi                               fy = 60 ksi
Ec = 3605 ksi                             Es = 29000 ksi
Ultimate strain = 0.003 in/in
Beta1 = 0.85
    
```

Section:

```

=====
Rectangular: Width = 24 in                 Depth = 24 in

Gross section area, Ag = 576 in^2
Ix = 27648 in^4                             Iy = 27648 in^4
rx = 6.9282 in                               ry = 6.9282 in
Xo = 0 in                                     Yo = 0 in
    
```

Reinforcement:

```

=====
Bar Set: ASTM A615
Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)   Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)   Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)
-----
# 3      0.38      0.11   # 4      0.50      0.20   # 5      0.63      0.31
# 6      0.75      0.44   # 7      0.88      0.60   # 8      1.00      0.79
# 9      1.13      1.00   # 10     1.27      1.27   # 11     1.41      1.56
# 14     1.69      2.25   # 18     2.26      4.00
    
```

Bar selection: Minimum number of bars
 Asmin = 0.01 * Ag = 5.76 in^2, Asmax = 0.08 * Ag = 46.08 in^2

Confinement: Tied; #3 ties with #10 bars, #4 with larger bars.
 phi(a) = 0.8, phi(b) = 0.9, phi(c) = 0.65

Layout: Rectangular
 Pattern: Equal Bar Spacing (Cover to transverse reinforcement)
 Total steel area: As = 7.90 in^2 at rho = 1.37%
 Minimum clear spacing = 5.41 in

10 #8 Cover = 1.5 in


Factored Loads and Moments with Corresponding Capacities:

```

=====
Design/Required ratio PhiMn/Mu >= 1.00
No.      Pu      Mux      Muy      PhiMnx      PhiMny      PhiMn/Mu  NA depth  Dt depth  eps_t  Phi
      kip      k-ft     k-ft     k-ft     k-ft     k-ft
-----
1      1244.00    19.76    25.21    148.75     189.78     7.528     28.54     29.86     0.00014 0.650
    
```

*** End of output ***

SP Column Output: Column 7E



STRUCTUREPOINT - spColumn v4.81 (TM)
 Licensed to: Penn State University Park. License ID: 59919-1033951-4-22545-2CF68
 E:\THEISIS\Spring\Columns\7E\SP Column - 7E.col

Page 2
 04/02/14
 08:24 PM

General Information:

```

=====
File Name: E:\THEISIS\Spring\Columns\7E\SP Column - 7E.col
Project:   UVA Library
Column:   3D                               Engineer: MAC
Code:     ACI 318-11                       Units: English

Run Option: Design                         Slenderness: Not considered
Run Axis:  Biaxial                         Column Type: Structural
    
```

Material Properties:

```

=====
f'c = 4 ksi                               fy = 60 ksi
Ec = 3605 ksi                             Es = 29000 ksi
Ultimate strain = 0.003 in/in
Beta1 = 0.85
    
```

Section:

```

=====
Rectangular: Width = 24 in                Depth = 24 in

Gross section area, Ag = 576 in^2
Ix = 27648 in^4                            Iy = 27648 in^4
rx = 6.9282 in                             ry = 6.9282 in
Xo = 0 in                                   Yo = 0 in
    
```

Reinforcement:

```

=====
Bar Set: ASTM A615
Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)   Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)   Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)
-----
# 3      0.38      0.11   # 4      0.50      0.20   # 5      0.63      0.31
# 6      0.75      0.44   # 7      0.88      0.60   # 8      1.00      0.79
# 9      1.13      1.00   # 10     1.27      1.27   # 11     1.41      1.56
# 14     1.69      2.25   # 18     2.26      4.00
    
```

Bar selection: Minimum number of bars
 Asmin = 0.01 * Ag = 5.76 in^2, Asmax = 0.08 * Ag = 46.08 in^2

Confinement: Tied; #3 ties with #10 bars, #4 with larger bars.
 phi(a) = 0.8, phi(b) = 0.9, phi(c) = 0.65

Layout: Rectangular
 Pattern: Equal Bar Spacing (Cover to transverse reinforcement)
 Total steel area: As = 6.32 in^2 at rho = 1.10%
 Minimum clear spacing = 8.62 in

8 #8 Cover = 1.5 in



Factored Loads and Moments with Corresponding Capacities:

```

=====
Design/Required ratio PhiMn/Mu >= 1.00
No.      Pu      Mux      Muy      PhiMnx      PhiMny      PhiMn/Mu  NA depth  Dt depth  eps_t  Phi
      kip      k-ft     k-ft     k-ft     k-ft     k-ft
-----
1      838.00    77.61    33.19    350.02     149.68     4.510    21.50    29.13    0.00106  0.650
    
```

*** End of output ***

SP Column Output: Column 8B



24 x 24 in

Code: ACI 318-11
 Units: English
 Run axis: Biaxial
 Run option: Design
 Slenderness: Not considered
 Column type: Structural
 Bars: ASTM A615
 Date: 04/02/14
 Time: 20:28:53

spColumn v4.81. Licensed to: Penn State University Park. License ID: 59919-1033951-4-22545-2CF68

File: E:\THESIS\Spring\Columns\8B\SP Column - 8B.col

Project: UVA Library

Column: 3D

Engineer: MAC

$f_c = 4$ ksi

$f_y = 60$ ksi

$A_g = 576$ in²

8 #8 bars

$E_c = 3605$ ksi

$E_s = 29000$ ksi

$A_s = 6.32$ in²

$\rho = 1.10\%$

$f_c = 3.4$ ksi

$X_o = 0.00$ in

$I_x = 27648$ in⁴

$e_u = 0.003$ in/in

$Y_o = 0.00$ in

$I_y = 27648$ in⁴

Beta1 = 0.85

Min clear spacing = 8.62 in

Clear cover = 1.87 in

Confinement: Tied

$\phi(a) = 0.8$, $\phi(b) = 0.9$, $\phi(c) = 0.65$

STRUCTUREPOINT - spColumn v4.81 (TM)
 Licensed to: Penn State University Park. License ID: 59919-1033951-4-22545-2CF68
 E:\THEISIS\Spring\Columns\8B\SP Column - 8B.col

Page 2
 04/02/14
 08:28 PM

General Information:

```

=====
File Name: E:\THEISIS\Spring\Columns\8B\SP Column - 8B.col
Project:   UVA Library
Column:   3D                               Engineer: MAC
Code:     ACI 318-11                       Units: English

Run Option: Design                         Slenderness: Not considered
Run Axis:  Biaxial                         Column Type: Structural
    
```

Material Properties:

```

=====
f'c = 4 ksi                               fy = 60 ksi
Ec = 3605 ksi                             Es = 29000 ksi
Ultimate strain = 0.003 in/in
Beta1 = 0.85
    
```

Section:

```

=====
Rectangular: Width = 24 in                Depth = 24 in

Gross section area, Ag = 576 in^2
Ix = 27648 in^4                            Iy = 27648 in^4
rx = 6.9282 in                             ry = 6.9282 in
Xo = 0 in                                   Yo = 0 in
    
```

Reinforcement:

```

=====
Bar Set: ASTM A615
Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)   Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)   Size Diam (in) Area (in^2)
-----
# 3      0.38      0.11   # 4      0.50      0.20   # 5      0.63      0.31
# 6      0.75      0.44   # 7      0.88      0.60   # 8      1.00      0.79
# 9      1.13      1.00   # 10     1.27      1.27   # 11     1.41      1.56
# 14     1.69      2.25   # 18     2.26      4.00
    
```

Bar selection: Minimum number of bars
 Asmin = 0.01 * Ag = 5.76 in^2, Asmax = 0.08 * Ag = 46.08 in^2

Confinement: Tied; #3 ties with #10 bars, #4 with larger bars.
 phi(a) = 0.8, phi(b) = 0.9, phi(c) = 0.65

Layout: Rectangular
 Pattern: Equal Bar Spacing (Cover to transverse reinforcement)
 Total steel area: As = 6.32 in^2 at rho = 1.10%
 Minimum clear spacing = 8.62 in

8 #8 Cover = 1.5 in

Factored Loads and Moments with Corresponding Capacities:

```

=====
Design/Required ratio PhiMn/Mu >= 1.00
No.      Pu      Mux      Muy      PhiMnx      PhiMny      PhiMn/Mu  NA depth  Dt depth  eps_t      Phi
      kip      k-ft     k-ft     k-ft     k-ft     k-ft
-----
1      484.00    35.84    57.86    217.56     351.22     6.070     16.51     29.97     0.00245    0.682
    
```

*** End of output ***

Appendix G: PT Floor Design

Below are images of the latitude design spans numbered and the floor plan with the grid shown. The design spans and column line locations are referenced in the following tables, so these images are provided for reference.




Figure G1: Latitude Span Segments




Figure G2: Floor Plan with Grid Lines

Appendix G.1: Initial Tendon Elevations

Note: Elevations measured from soffit.

Latitude Direction		
Member	Location	Elevation of Tendon (in)
30" Beam	High	29
	Middle	26
	Low	23
24" Beam	High	23
	Middle	20
	Low	17
Slab	High	7
	Middle	4
	Low	1

Table G1: Elevation of Tendons – Latitude Direction

Longitude Direction		
Member	Location	Elevation of Tendon (in)
30" Beam	High	28.5
	Middle	26
	Low	23.5
24" Beam	High	22.5
	Middle	20
	Low	17.5
Slab	High	6.5
	Middle	4
	Low	1.5

Table G2: Elevation of Tendons – Longitude Direction

Appendix G.2: Initial Number of Tendons (Banded Direction)

Span Number	Slab Depth (in)	Strip Width (FT)	Strip Width (in)	Strip Area (in ²)	Initial Force (K)	Number of Tendons
5-1	8	14.3	172	1373	172	7
5-2	8	14.3	172	1373	172	7
5-3	8	14.3	172	1373	172	7
5-4	8	14.3	172	1373	172	7
5-5	8	14.3	172	1373	172	7
1-1	8	25.3	304	2429	304	12
11-1	8	24.3	292	2333	292	11
11-2	8	25.3	304	2429	304	12
11-3	8	25.3	304	2429	304	12
11-4	8	20.7	248	1987	248	10
2-1	8	14	168	1344	168	7
2-2	8	14.3	172	1373	172	7
2-3	8	14	168	1344	168	7
2-4	8	25.3	304	2429	304	12
2-5	8	25.3	304	2429	304	12
2-6	8	14	168	1344	168	7
17-1	8	16	192	1536	192	8
16-1	8	14.1	169	1354	169	7
6-1	8	9.2	110	883	110	5
7-1	8	6.8	82	653	82	4

Table G3: Initial Number of Tendons – Banded Direction

Appendix G.3: Final Balancing of Tendons

Latitude Tendons

Span Number	Slab Depth (in)	Strip Width (FT)	Strip Area in (ft ²)	Weight in k/Ft of Strip	Upper Limit	Lower Limit	Balancing Load Given by Concept	Pass/Fail	Adjusted Tendon Elevation	New Balanced Load
5-1	8	14.3	10	1.43	1.788	0.715	1.978	FAIL		1.653
5-2	8	14.3	10	1.43	1.788	0.715	2.045	FAIL	2.5	1.771
5-3	8	14.3	10	1.43	1.788	0.715	0.780	PASS		
5-4 (1)	8	14.3	10	1.43	1.788	0.715	0.430	PASS		
5-4 (2)							0.469			
5-5 (1)	8	14.3	10	1.43	1.788	0.715	0.693	PASS		
5-5 (2)							1.003			
1-1 (1)	8	25.3	17	2.53	3.163	1.265	2.279	PASS		
1-1 (2)							0.306			
6-1	8	10.5	7	1.05	1.313	0.525	3.517	FAIL	5	1.223
11-1 (1)	8	24.3	16	2.43	3.038	1.215	2.253	PASS		
11-1 (2)							0.632			
11-2	8	25.3	17	2.53	3.163	1.265	3.728	FAIL	6	3.107
11-3	8	25.3	17	2.53	3.163	1.265	2.003	PASS		
11-4	8	20.7	14	2.07	2.588	1.035	4.853	FAIL	3.25	2.525
2-1	8	7	5	0.7	0.875	0.350	1.978	FAIL	25.8	0.7866
2-1 M	8	14	9	1.4	1.750	0.700	0.876	PASS		
2-2	8	14.3	10	1.43	1.788	0.715	2.103	FAIL	2.5	1.779
2-2 M	8	14.3	10	1.43	1.788	0.715	1.168	PASS		
2-3	8	14	9	1.4	1.750	0.700	0.747	PASS		
							0.780			
2-4	8	25.3	17	2.53	3.163	1.265	0.978	PASS		
							1.004			
2-5	8	25.3	17	2.53	3.163	1.265	1.335	PASS		
2-6	8	14	9	1.4	1.750	0.700	2.921	FAIL	3	1.683
Span 6-7 Along B	8	6.8	5	0.68	0.850	0.340	0.614	PASS		
17-1	8	16	11	1.6	2.000	0.800	0.878	PASS		

Table G4: Balancing of Latitude Tendons

Longitude Tendons

Vertical Column Lines	Horizontal Column Lines	Slab Depth (in)	Strip Width (FT)	Strip Area in (ft ²)	Weight in k/Ft of Strip	Upper Limit	Lower Limit	Balancing Load Given by Concept	Pass/Fail	Adjusted Tendon Elevation	New Balanced Load
3-4	E-D	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	0.2851	PASS		
	D-C	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	0.2851	PASS		
4-5	E,2-E	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	1.519	FAIL	4.75	0.4556
	E-D	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	0.3113	PASS		
	D-C	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	0.8402	FAIL	3	0.3081
	C-B,8	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	1.519	FAIL	4.75	0.4556
5-6	E-D	8	4.43	3	0.44	0.554	0.222	0.2851	PASS		
	D-C	8	4.43	3	0.44	0.554	0.222	0.1939	PASS		
6-7	E-D	8	3.9	3	0.39	0.488	0.195	0.3801	PASS		
	D-C (Discontinuous)	8	3.9	3	0.39	0.488	0.195	0.3957	PASS		
	D-C (Continuous)	8	3.9	3	0.39	0.488	0.195	0.459	PASS		
	C-B (Discontinuous - Short)	8	3.9	3	0.39	0.488	0.195	2.674	FAIL	26.25	0.2674
	C-B (Discontinuous - Long)	8	3.9	3	0.39	0.488	0.195	2.036	FAIL	3.5	0.2327
	C-B (Continuous - Short)	8	3.9	3	0.39	0.488	0.195	0.4768	PASS		
	C-B (Continuous - Long)	8	3.9	3	0.39	0.488	0.195	0.6383	FAIL	2.75	0.4787
	B-A	8	3.9	3	0.39	0.488	0.195	0.8251	FAIL	3.25	0.4401
7-8	E-D (Discontinuous)	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	0.2173	PASS		
	E-D (Continuous)	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	0.3801	PASS		
	D-C	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	0.5564	FAIL	2	0.5008
	C-B (Discontinuous)	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	0.2226	PASS		
	C-B (Continuous)	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	0.3878	PASS		
8-9	Stairs	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	0.8897	FAIL	4.75	0.4448
	E-D (Discontinuous)	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	1.037	FAIL	3.5	0.4897
	E-D (Continuous)	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	1.367	FAIL	4.75	0.4786
	D-C	8	4.22	3	0.42	0.528	0.211	0.3878	PASS		

Table G5: Balancing of Longitude Tendons

Appendix G.4: Max Tendons

Span Number	Slab Depth (in)	Strip Width (FT)	Strip Width (in)	Strip Area (in ²)	Initial Force (K)	Number of Tendons	Pass/Fail	Max Number of Tendons	New Number of Tendons
5-1	8	14.3	172	1373	172	7	PASS	18	-
5-2	8	14.3	172	1373	172	7	FAIL	18	17
5-3	8	14.3	172	1373	172	7	PASS	18	-
5-4	8	14.3	172	1373	172	7	PASS	18	-
5-5	8	14.3	172	1373	172	7	PASS	18	-
1-1	8	25.3	304	2429	304	12	FAIL	32	26
11-1	8	24.3	292	2333	292	11	FAIL	31	*Fails with max tendons
11-2	8	25.3	304	2429	304	12	FAIL	32	*Fails with max tendons
11-3	8	25.3	304	2429	304	12	PASS	32	-
11-4	8	20.7	248	1987	248	10	PASS	26	-
2-1	8	14	168	1344	168	7	PASS	18	-
2-2	8	14.3	172	1373	172	7	FAIL	18	17
2-3	8	14	168	1344	168	7	FAIL	18	17
2-4	8	25.3	304	2429	304	12	PASS	32	-
2-5	8	25.3	304	2429	304	12	PASS	32	-
2-6	8	14	168	1344	168	7	PASS	18	-
17-1	8	16	192	1536	192	8	PASS	20	-
16-1	8	14.1	169	1354	169	7	FAIL	18	Ignore
6-1	8	9.2	110	883	110	5	PASS	12	-
7-1	8	6.8	82	653	82	4	FAIL	9	7

Table G6: Maximum Number of Tendons per Design Strip

Appendix H: Wind and Seismic Loads – ASCE 7-10Appendix H.1: Wind Loads

1) Risk Category (Table 1.5-1)

⇒ III

2) Basic Wind Speed (Fig. 26.5)

$V = 115 \text{ mph}$

3) Wind Load Parameters

3a) Directionality Factor, K_d (Table 26.6-1)

$K_d = 0.85$

3b) Exposure Category (26.7.3)

⇒ B

3c) Topographical Factor, K_{zt} (26.8 + Table 26.8-1)

⇒ $K_{zt} = 1.0$

3d) Gust Effect Factor, G (26.9)

i) Determine Building Natural Frequency, n_a (26.8)

- Building meets requirements

① Building Height < 300ft ✓

② Building Height < $4L_{eff}$ ✓

$$n_a = 385 (C_w)^{0.5} / H$$

$$C_w = \frac{100}{A_B} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{H}{h_i} \right)^2 \frac{A_i}{\left[1 + 0.83 \left(\frac{h_i}{D_i} \right)^2 \right]}$$

Shear Wall 1 (At CL 6.8) - NS

$$A_B \approx (173' \times 51') + (42' \times 72') = 11,847 \text{ ft}^2$$

$$H = 102'$$

$$h_i = 102'$$

$$A_i = \frac{12''}{12} \times 14' = 14 \text{ ft}^2$$

$$D_i = 14'$$

$$\left(\frac{102}{102}\right)^2 \frac{14}{\left[1 + 0.83\left(\frac{102}{14}\right)^2\right]} = 0.311$$

Shear Wall 2 (At CL B.2) - EW

$$H = 102'$$

$$h_i = 102'$$

$$A_i = \frac{12''}{12} \times 21' = 21 \text{ ft}^2$$

$$D_i = 21'$$

$$\left(\frac{102}{102}\right)^2 \frac{21}{\left[1 + 0.83\left(\frac{102}{21}\right)^2\right]} = 0.466$$

Shear Wall 3 (At west stair wall) - NS

$$H = 102'$$

$$h_i = 68'$$

$$A_i = \frac{12''}{12} \times 8.6' = 8.6 \text{ ft}^2$$

$$D_i = 8.6'$$

$$\left(\frac{102}{68}\right)^2 \frac{8.6}{\left[1 + 0.83\left(\frac{102}{8.6}\right)^2\right]} = 0.366$$

Shear Wall 4 (At South Stair wall) - EW

$$H = 102'$$

$$h_i = 102'$$

$$A_i = \frac{12''}{12} \times 20.33' = 20.33 \text{ ft}^2$$

$$D_i = 20.33'$$

$$\left(\frac{102}{102}\right)^2 \frac{20.33}{\left[1 + 0.83\left(\frac{102}{20.33}\right)^2\right]} = 0.929$$

Shear Wall 5 (At CL5) - NS

$$\begin{aligned}
 H &= 102' \\
 h_i &= 102' \\
 A_i &= \frac{12''}{12} \times 12' = 12 \text{ ft}^2 \\
 D_i &= 12'
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\left(\frac{102}{102}\right)^2 \frac{12}{\left[1 + 0.83\left(\frac{102}{12}\right)^2\right]} = 0.197$$

Shear Wall 6 (At CLD) - EW

$$\begin{aligned}
 H &= 102' \\
 h_i &= 102' \\
 A_i &= \frac{12''}{12} \times 25.2 = 25.2 \text{ ft}^2 \\
 D_i &= 25.2'
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\left(\frac{102}{102}\right)^2 \frac{25.2}{\left[1 + 0.83\left(\frac{102}{25.2}\right)^2\right]} = 1.726$$

Shear Wall 7 (At CL4) - NS

$$\begin{aligned}
 H &= 102' \\
 h_i &= 102' \\
 A_i &= \frac{12''}{12} \times 20' = 20 \text{ ft}^2 \\
 D_i &= 20'
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\left(\frac{102}{102}\right)^2 \frac{20}{\left[1 + 0.83\left(\frac{102}{20}\right)^2\right]} = 0.885$$

Shear Wall 8 (At East Stair Wall) - NS

$$\begin{aligned}
 H &= 102' \\
 h_i &= 34' \\
 A_i &= \frac{12''}{12} \times 10' = 10 \text{ ft}^2 \\
 D_i &= 10'
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\left(\frac{102}{34}\right)^2 \frac{10}{\left[1 + 0.83\left(\frac{34}{10}\right)^2\right]} = 8.495$$

Shear Wall 9 (AE CLE) - EW

$$H = 102'$$

$$h_i = 34'$$

$$A_i = \frac{12''}{12} \times 23.3' = 23.3 \text{ ft}^2$$

$$D_i = 23.3'$$

$$\left(\frac{102}{34} \right)^2 \frac{23.3}{\left[1 + 0.83 \left(\frac{34}{23.3} \right)^2 \right]} = 75.776$$

North-South

$$\sum \left(\frac{H}{h_i} \right)^2 \frac{A_i}{\left[1 + 0.83 \left(\frac{h_i}{D_i} \right)^2 \right]} = 0.311 + 0.366 + 0.197 + 0.885 + 8.495$$

$$= 10.254$$

$$C_{w,NS} = \frac{100}{11,847} (10.254) = 0.0866$$

$$n_{a,NS} = 385 (0.0866)^{0.5} / 102 = \underline{\underline{1.11 \text{ Hz}}}$$

East-West

$$\sum \left(\frac{H}{h_i} \right)^2 \frac{A_i}{\left[1 + 0.83 \left(\frac{h_i}{D_i} \right)^2 \right]} = 0.466 + 0.929 + 1.726 + 75.776$$

$$= 78.897$$

$$C_{w,EW} = \frac{100}{11,847} (78.897) = 0.6660$$

$$n_{a,EW} = 385 (0.6660)^{0.5} / 102 = \underline{\underline{3.08 \text{ Hz}}}$$

$\Rightarrow n_a > 1.0 \text{ Hz}$ in both directions \Rightarrow Rigid Structure

w) Rigid Buildings (6.5.8.1)

$$G = 0.925 \left(\frac{(1 + 1.7g_v I_z Q)}{1 + 1.7g_v I_z} \right)$$

$$g_a = 3.4$$

$$g_v = 3.4$$

$$I_z = C \left(\frac{33}{z} \right)^{1/6} = 0.30 \left(\frac{33}{0.6(102)} \right)^{1/6} = 0.271 \quad * z > z_{min} = 30'$$

N-S Direction $\Rightarrow Q = \sqrt{\frac{1}{1 + 0.63 \left(\frac{B+h}{L_z} \right)^{0.63}}}$

$$B = 147'$$

$$h = 83.33'$$

$$L_z = L \left(\frac{z}{33} \right)^{\bar{E}} = 320 \left(\frac{0.6(102)}{33} \right)^{1/3} = 393.15$$

$$Q = \sqrt{\frac{1}{1 + 0.63 \left(\frac{147 + 102}{393.15} \right)^{0.63}}} = \underline{\underline{0.824}} \text{ (N-S)}$$

E-W Direction $\Rightarrow B = 94.33'$

$$h = 102$$

$$L_z = 393.15$$

$$Q = \sqrt{\frac{1}{1 + 0.63 \left(\frac{94.33 + 102}{393.15} \right)^{0.63}}} = \underline{\underline{0.843}} \text{ (E-W)}$$

N-S Direction $\Rightarrow G = 0.925 \left(\frac{(1 + 1.7(3.4)(0.280)(0.824))}{1 + 1.7(3.4)(0.280)} \right) = \underline{\underline{0.824}} \text{ (N-S)}$

E-W Direction $\Rightarrow G = 0.925 \left(\frac{(1 + 1.7(3.4)(0.280)(0.843))}{1 + 1.7(3.4)(0.280)} \right) = \underline{\underline{0.835}} \text{ (E-W)}$

3e) Enclosure Classification (26.10)

⇒ enclosed

3f.) Internal Pressure Coef., GCpi (Table 26.11-1)

⇒ GCpi = ± 0.18

4) Velocity Pressure Exposure Coeff., Kz or Kh (Table 27.3-1)

$$Z_g = 1200 \quad \alpha = 7.0$$

$$K_z(18') = 2.01 (18/1200)^{2/7} = 0.61$$

$$K_z(36) = 2.01 (36/1200)^{2/7} = 0.74$$

$$K_z(52) = 2.01 (52/1200)^{2/7} = 0.82$$

$$K_z(68) = 2.01 (68/1200)^{2/7} = 0.89$$

$$K_z(84) = 2.01 (84/1200)^{2/7} = 0.94$$

$$K_z(102) = 2.01 (102/1200)^{2/7} = 0.99$$

5) Velocity Pressure, qz (27.3.2)

$$q_z = 0.00256 K_z K_{zt} K_d V^2$$

$$K_{zt} = 1.0$$

$$K_d = 0.85$$

$$V^2 = 13225$$

$$q_z = 0.00256 K_z (1.0)(0.85)(13225) = 28.78 K_z$$

$$q_z(18) = 17.56$$

$$q_z(36) = 21.30$$

$$q_z(52) = 23.60$$

$$q_z(68) = 25.61$$

$$q_z(84) = 27.05$$

$$q_z(102) = 28.49$$

6) External Pressure Coefficient, Cp (Fig 27.4-1 to 27.4-7)

$$C_{p,w} = 0.8$$

N-S Direction

$$\frac{L}{B} = \frac{94.67}{147} = 0.64$$

$$C_{p,l} = -0.5$$

E-W Direction

$$\frac{L}{B} = \frac{147}{94.67} = 1.56$$

$$C_{p,l} = -0.388$$

Roof Pressure Coeff. $\theta = \tan^{-1}(5/12) = 26.1^\circ > 10^\circ$

N-S Direction (windward)

$$h/L = 110.5/94.67 = 1.17 \geq 1.0$$

$$C_{p,w} = -0.456, 0.044$$

N-S Direction (leeward)

$$\theta = 26.1 > 20^\circ$$

$$C_{p,l} = -0.6$$

* For mansard roofs, the top horizontal surface + leeward inclined surface shall be treated as leeward surfaces from table (Fig 27.4-1 note 8.)

E-W Direction (windward)

$$h/L = 110.5/147 = 0.75 \Rightarrow 0.5 < 0.75 < 1.0$$

$$C_{p,w} = -0.367, 0.122$$

E-W Direction (leeward)

$$\theta = 26.1 > 20^\circ$$

$$C_{p,l} = -0.6$$

Summary of C_p Values

		Walls	Roof
N-S Direction	windward	0.8	-0.456, 0.044
	leeward	-0.5	-0.6
E-W Direction	windward	0.8	-0.367, 0.122
	leeward	-0.388	-0.6

7) Calculate Wind Pressures on Each SurfaceWind Pressure for walls

⇒ See Excel Sheet for Pressures

Wind Pressure for Roofs

$$P = q_h G C_p$$

$$q_h = q_z(110.5)$$

$$= 0.00256 \left[2.01 \left(\frac{110.5}{1200} \right)^{2.7} \right] (0.85)(13225)$$

$$= 29.3$$

N-S (windward)

$$P = 29.3 (0.824)(-0.456) = -11.01 \text{ psf}$$

$$P = 29.3 (0.824)(0.044) = 1.06 \text{ psf}$$

N-S (Leeward)

$$P = 29.3 (0.824)(-0.6) = -14.49 \text{ psf}$$

E-W Direction (windward)

$$P = 29.3 (0.835)(-0.367) = -8.98 \text{ psf}$$

$$P = 29.3 (0.835)(0.122) = 2.98 \text{ psf}$$

E-W Direction (Leeward)


$$P = 29.3 (0.835)(-0.6) = -14.68 \text{ psf}$$

8. Calculate Wind Pressure, P

Wind Pressures (N-S Direction)					
Floor Height	q_z	Windward Pressure (PSF)	Leeward Pressure (PSF)	Trib Area (SF)	Force (K)
18	17.56	16.00	-12.07	2646	74
36	21.3	16.00	-12.07	2499	70
52	23.6	16.00	-12.07	2352	66
68	25.61	16.88	-12.07	2352	68
84	27.05	17.83	-12.07	2499	75
102	28.49	18.78	-12.07	1323	41
Base Shear=					394

Wind Pressures (E-W Direction)					
Floor Height	q_z	Windward Pressure (PSF)	Leeward Pressure (PSF)	Trib Area (SF)	Force (K)
18	17.56	16.00	-9.49	1698	43
36	21.3	16.00	-9.49	1604	41
52	23.6	16.00	-9.49	1509	38
68	25.61	17.11	-9.49	1509	40
84	27.05	18.07	-9.49	1604	44
102	28.49	19.03	-9.49	849	24
Base Shear=					231

NOTE: ASCE 7 - 10 Section 27.4.7 specifies that wind pressures must be greater than 16psf



Appendix H.2: Seismic Loadsi) Exemptions (11.1.2)

- Building not exemp

ii) Design Spectral Response Acceleration (11.4)a) Site Class (11.4.2)

- B

b) Acceleration Parameters (11.4.3 + Chp 22)

$$S_s = 0.332g$$

$$S_1 = 0.094g$$

c) Check to see if adjust for site Class (11.4.2 + 11.4.3)

$$S_{Ds} = \frac{2}{3} S_{Ms} = \frac{2}{3} (0.332) = 0.221$$

$$S_{D1} = \frac{2}{3} S_{M1} = \frac{2}{3} (0.094) = 0.063$$

* Cant use simplified method b/c building
doesn't meet requirements (12.14)

3) Seismic Design Category (11.6)

Occupancy Category III \Rightarrow B
 $0.167 < S_{Ds} < 0.33$

4) Analysis Procedure Selection (12.6)

\Rightarrow Equivalent lateral force Analysis

5) Determine R (Table 12.2-1)

\Rightarrow Ordinary Reinforced Shear Walls $\Rightarrow R=4$

6) Importance Factor (Table 1.5-2)

\Rightarrow Risk Category III $\Rightarrow I_c = 1.25$

7) Find Period T (12.8.2.1)

$$T_a = C_t h_n^x$$

$$h_n = 119'$$

$$C_t = 0.02$$

$$x = 0.75$$

$$T_a = (0.02)(119)^{0.75} = 0.721$$

8) Determine T_L (Fig. 22-12 to 22-16)

$$\Rightarrow T_L = 12 \text{ sec}$$

9) Determine Seismic Response Coefficients, C_s (12.8.1.1)

$$C_s \leq \frac{S_D S}{R/I} = \frac{0.221}{(4/1.25)} = 0.0691$$

$$\text{Check } T_a = 0.721 < T_L = 12$$

$$C_s \leq \frac{S_{D1}}{T(R/I)} = \frac{0.063}{.721(4/1.25)} = 0.0273$$

$$C_s = \begin{array}{l} 0.0691 \\ \min \quad 0.0273 \end{array} \Rightarrow 0.0273$$

* C_s shall not be less than

$$\begin{array}{l} 0.044(0.221)(1.25) = 0.012 \Rightarrow 0.012 \\ \max \quad 0.01 \end{array}$$

$$\Rightarrow C_s = 0.0273 > 0.012 \checkmark$$

10) Calculate the seismic weight

Roof

$$\text{Dead Load} = (125 + 11 + 10)(9905 \text{ SF})/1000 = 1447^k$$

$$\text{Distributed Line Load} = (133.1)(357)/1000 = 47.5^k$$

$$\text{Mechanical Equipment} = (15 + 50) = 65^k$$

$$\text{Total Load} = \underline{1559.5^k}$$

Floor

$$\text{Dead Loads: Slab} = 125 \text{ psf}$$

$$\text{Misc. Dead} = 10 \text{ psf}$$

$$24" \times 30" \text{ Beams} = 500 \text{ plf}$$

$$24" \times 24" \text{ Beams} = 350 \text{ plf}$$

$$16 \times 24 \text{ Beams} = 233 \text{ plf}$$

\Rightarrow See excel sheet for weight calculations

Calculation of Loads:

Calculation of Floor Weights									
Level	Slab + Partitions + Misc DL (PSF)	Floor Area (SF)	24"x30" Beams (PLF)	24"x30" Beams (LF)	24"x24" Beams (PSL)	24"x24" Beams (LF)	16"x24" Beams (PLF)	16"x24" Beams (LF)	Weight (K)
Roof	146	9905	500	122	350	223	233	78	1716
6	162	10258	500	122	350	178	233	78	1803
5	162	10379	500	122	350	178	233	78	1823
4	162	11115	500	145.3	350	202	233	78	1962
3	162	12513	500	145.3	350	152	233	78	2171
2	162	12859	500	145.3	350	98	233	63	2205

Calculation of Effective Seismic Weight				
Level	Area of General Collections (SF)	Live Load (PSF)	Total Load (K)	25% of Live Load (K)
Roof	0	150	0	0
6	3146	150	472	118
5	3034	150	455	114
4	372	150	56	14
3	4364	150	655	164
2	796	150	119	30


* ACSE 12.7.2 - General collections are considered as live load storage

Calculation of Column Weights					
Level	Column Height Below (FT)	Column Height Above (FT)	Column Weight Below (PLF)	Column Weight Above (PLF)	Column Weight (K)
Roof	9	0	10800	0	97
6	8	9	10800	10800	184
5	8	8	10200	10800	168
4	8	8	12000	10200	178
3	9	8	7800	12000	166
2	9	9	3600	7800	103

Wall Weights	
Typical exterior wall:	91.875 PSF
16" foundation wall:	200 PSF
24" foundation wall:	300 PSF
30" foundation wall:	375 PSF
33" foundation wall:	412.5 PSF

Calculation of Exterior Wall Weights															
Level	Wall Height Below (FT)	Wall Height Above (FT)	Length of Exterior Wall Below (FT)	Length of Exterior Wall Above (FT)	Length of 16" Foundation Wall Below (FT)	Length of 16" Foundation Wall Above (FT)	Length of 24" Foundation Wall Below (FT)	Length of 24" Foundation Wall Above (FT)	Length of 30" Foundation Wall Below (FT)	Length of 30" Foundation Wall Above (FT)	Length of 33" Foundation Wall Below (FT)	Length of 33" Foundation Wall Above (FT)	Weight of Exterior Wall (K)	Weight of Foundation Walls (K)	Total Wall Weight (K)
Roof	9	0	492	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	407	0	407
6	8	9	492	492	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	768	0	768
5	8	8	453	492	0	0	77	0	0	0	0	0	695	186	881
4	8	8	377	453	0	0	121	77	0	0	35	0	611	591	1202
3	9	8	270	377	13	0	172	121	31	0	79	35	500	1290	1791
2	9	9	54	270	258	13	173	172	90	31	79	79	267	2411	2679

Calculation of Shear Wall Weights																					
Level	Wall Height Below (FT)	Wall Height Above (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 1 Below (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 1 Above (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 2 Below (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 2 Above (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 3 Below (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 3 Above (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 4 Below (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 4 Above (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 5 Below (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 5 Above (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 6 Below (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 6 Above (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 7 Below (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 7 Above (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 8 Below (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 8 Above (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 9 Below (FT)	Length of Shear Wall 9 Above (FT)	Total Wall Weight (K)
Roof	9	0	14	0	21	0	0	0	15.2	0	12	0	25.6	0	20	0	10	0	23.3	0	190
6	8	9	14	14	21	21	0	0	19.3	15.2	12	12	25.6	25.6	20	20	10	10	23.3	23.3	365
5	8	8	14	14	21	21	8.6	0	20.3	19.3	12	12	25.6	25.6	20	20	0	10	0	23.3	340
4	8	8	14	14	21	21	8.6	8.6	20.3	20.3	12	12	25.6	25.6	20	20	0	0	0	0	292
3	9	8	14	14	21	21	8.6	8.6	20.3	20.3	12	12	25.6	25.6	20	20	0	0	0	0	310
2	9	9	14	14	30	21	8.6	8.6	20.3	20.3	12	12	25.6	25.6	20	20	0	0	0	0	340




12. Vertical Distribution of Forces

E-W Direction											
k=	1.11	Cs=	0.0273								
Vb=	615.8 Kips										
Calculation of Story Forces											
Level	Floor-to-Floor Height (FT)	Floor Dead Loads (K)	Wall Loads (K)	Shear Wall Weights (K)	Column Loads (K)	Total Weight = w_i (K)	h_i (FT)	$w_i h_i^k$ (K-FT)	C_{vx}	F (K)	
Roof	9	1716	407	190	97	2410	102	963012	0.210	129	
6	17	1921	768	365	184	3238	84	1077339	0.234	144	
5	16	1937	881	320	168	3305	68	871800	0.190	117	
4	16	1976	1202	292	178	3647	52	722020	0.157	97	
3	17	2335	1791	310	166	4602	36	621328	0.135	83	
2	18	2234	2679	340	103	5356	18	340687	0.074	46	
						Sum=		Sum=	4596186	1.000	616

N-S Direction											
k=	1.11	Cs=	0.0147								
Vb=	331.3 Kips										
Calculation of Story Forces											
Level	Floor-to-Floor Height (FT)	Floor Dead Loads (K)	Wall Loads (K)	Shear Wall Weights (K)	Column Loads (K)	Total Weight = w_i (K)	h_i (FT)	$w_i h_i^k$ (K-FT)	C_{vx}	F (K)	
Roof	9	1716	407	190	97	2410	102	963012	0.210	69	
6	17	1921	768	365	184	3238	84	1077339	0.234	78	
5	16	1937	881	320	168	3305	68	871800	0.190	63	
4	16	1976	1202	292	178	3647	52	722020	0.157	52	
3	17	2335	1791	310	166	4602	36	621328	0.135	45	
2	18	2234	2679	340	103	5356	18	340687	0.074	25	
						Sum=		Sum=	4596186	1.000	331

Note: Building periods originally calculated using approximate T_a equation. Once lateral model was complete building periods for both directions were able to be determined and a C_s value for each direction was calculated.



Appendix I: Lateral System Analysis

Location of Shear Walls




Figure I1: Location of Shear Walls

Modeling Decisions

Due to the large soil loads on the structure, the design involves a significant number of foundation walls. For this analysis, only the shear walls were modeled. This modification was made in order to be able to analyze the shear walls under the full lateral forces without the foundation walls providing increase lateral resistance. The foundation walls are designed to act as either a pinned or fixed connection at the base with supports at each floor level. Due to this design, the soil forces were still used in the analysis of the building's lateral system, even though no foundation walls were modeled.

The shear walls were modeled as membranes. Membranes have no out-of-plane stiffness and therefore will take no out-of-plane shear forces.

Shear wall 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7 were modeled with pin supports at the base. In the structure these shear walls are supported either by strip footings with spread footings at each end, or just by strip footings. These base conditions do not justify the use of a fixed connection in the model.

Shear walls 3 and 4 were modeled with fixed supports at the base. In the structure these shear walls rest on a mat foundation that is located in the North-East corner of building. This base condition justifies the use of a fixed condition in the model.

The diaphragm was modeled as rigid. This allowed the transfer of lateral forces to the shear walls without providing extra resistance. The floor system in the New Library is a composite floor system which allows the lateral forces to be transferred to the shear walls.

The openings in the diaphragm and shear walls were not modeled. This was due to the complexity of modeling the struts and collectors required to channel the diaphragm loads into the shear walls along the full wall length. This decision had minimal negative impact on the model.

All of the wall sections were modeled to consider the effects of cracked sections on the deflection of the lateral system. Per ACI318-11 8.8.2, the member stiffness should be modified through section properties which decreased the wall section stiffness by 65%.

For the 2D verification of the model a slight separation between core walls was added in order to ensure that the program would not treat the shear walls as a C or modified WF section. ETABS uses finite element analysis to distribute the forces. By doing this the program considers an effective length for the shear walls. The walls could be verified by hand when there are connected, but effective wall lengths would need to be approximated. For member spot checks and drift checks the walls were reconnected.

Verification of Model

Before using the lateral model to distribute the shear forces to the shear walls, the model was checked to determine if it was reporting accurate data. This was done by applying a 1000 kip load in the x-direction to the center of mass at the roof level. The first verification was of the story forces and story moments, shown in **Figure I2**. This was done to make sure that each story was receiving 1000 kips and each story was receiving a moment equal to 1000 multiplied by the story's distance from the roof level.

Story	Load Case/Combo	Location	P kip	VX kip	VY kip	T kip-ft	MX kip-ft	MY kip-ft
Roof	TEST - X	Bottom	0	-1000	0	54330	0	-18000
Level 6	TEST - X	Bottom	0	-1000	0	54330	0	-34000
Level 5	TEST - X	Bottom	0	-1000	0	54330	0	-50000
Level 4	TEST - X	Bottom	0	-1000	0	54330	0	-66000
Level 3	TEST - X	Bottom	0	-1000	0	54330	0	-84000
Level 2	TEST - X	Bottom	0	-1000	0	54330	0	-102000

Figure I2: Story Forces and Moments

The next verification was that of the in-plane shear force contours, shown in **Figures I3** and **Figure I4**. It was verified that the three shear walls acting in the x-direction had the largest contour lines due to the direct shear forces, while the remaining four shear walls had minimal contour lines due to torsional shear forces.




Figure I3: Shear Force Contours – In-Plane Shear Wall




Figure I4: Shear Force Contours – Lateral System

The last verification was a brief check of the distribution of forces to each lateral element at level 2.

Distribution

In order to check the distribution of forces, the relative stiffness of each element was calculated. **Table I1** below shows the relative stiffness of each shear wall, and **Table I2** shows the forces from ETABS. **Figure I5** below shows the direction of direct shear forces and torsional shear forces in shear walls 2, 4, and 6. Based on the relative stiffness of each shear wall, it is expected that SW2 would have the highest shear forces followed by SW 6 and 4 respectively. The shear forces from the model match this expectation. It is also important to notice that the torsional shears will cause the shear in SW2 to decrease while increasing the shear in SW4 and SW6. The shear forces from the model also match these expectations.

Relative Stiffness of Shear Walls						
Shear Wall	E (ksi)	h (in)	b (in)	t (in)	k (K/in)	Relative K X-Direction
2	3605	216	260.0	33	38805	1
4	3605	216	238.3	12	12485	0.322
6	3605	216	280.0	12	15599	0.402

Table I1: Relative Stiffness of Shear Walls

Shear Forces from ETABS	
Shear Wall	Shear Force (k)
2	450.148
4	249.338
6	300.514

Table I2: ETABS Shear Forces




Figure I5: Direction of Shear Forces

Summation of Forces

The equilibrium of the model was then verified in both the x and y directions. Figure I6 below shows the shear forces in each shear wall in the model.




Figure I6: Shear Forces

$$\sum F_x = 1000 - 450.148 - 249.338 - 300.514 = 0$$

$$\sum F_y = -59.264 - 7.956 + 15.398 + 51.882 = 0$$

Torsional Forces (With Respect to CR)

It was also important to notice that the torsional shears were in the correct direction with respect to the center of rigidity. The offset between the center of mass and center of rigidity will cause a clockwise rotation. All shears to the left of the CR are in the -Y direction and all shears to the right of the CR are in the +Y direction.

Building Properties

Below **Table I3** shows the location of the center of mass for each level of the New Library. The center of mass for each level was calculated by hand. ETABS is able to calculate the center of mass for the structure, but this requires the mass of the structure to be included in the program. Due to the fact that this was strictly a lateral model, and no gravity elements were included, no masses were to be added to the model. The center of mass was used in the application of seismic forces.

Center of Mass		
Level	X-Direction	Y-Direction
Roof	121.72	54.00
6	125.67	54.62
5	122.09	56.01
4	120.31	59.34
3	110.01	59.04
2	113.20	54.33

Table I3: Center of Mass

Below **Table I4** shows the location of the center of rigidity for each level of the New Library. ETABS calculates the center of rigidity of each level in the model.

Center of Rigidity		
Level	X-Direction	Y-Direction
Roof	94.3337	50.0655
6	94.8591	49.1726
5	95.367	48.0842
4	96.0189	46.5582
3	97.0962	44.51
2	100.0302	41.9675

Table I4: Center of Rigidity

Below **Table I5** shows the location of the center of rigidity for each level of the New Library. ETABS calculates this location automatically when a wind load is applied, and the locations were verified.

Center of Pressure		
Level	X-Direction	Y-Direction
Roof	113	46.344
6	113	46.344
5	113	46.344
4	100.333	46.344
3	100.333	46.344
2	100.333	46.344

Table I5: Center of Pressure

Appendix J: Drainage Breadth

Appendix J.1: Bituthane System 4000 Tech Sheets

Grace Below Grade Waterproofing

BITUTHENE® SYSTEM 4000

Self-adhesive HDPE waterproofing membrane with super tacky compound for use with patented, water-based System 4000 Surface Conditioner

Description

Bituthene® System 4000 is a 1.5 mm (1/16 in.) flexible, pre-formed waterproof membrane which combines a high performance, cross laminated, HDPE carrier film with a unique, super tacky, self-adhesive rubberized asphalt compound.

System 4000 Surface Conditioner is a unique, water-based, latex surface treatment which imparts an aggressive, high tack finish to the treated substrate. It is specifically formulated to bind site dust and concrete efflorescence, thereby providing a suitable surface for the Bituthene System 4000 Waterproofing Membrane.

Conveniently packaged in each roll of membrane, System 4000 Surface Conditioner promotes good initial adhesion and, more importantly, excellent permanent adhesion of the Bituthene System 4000 Waterproofing Membrane. The VOC (Volatile Organic Compound) content of this product is 100 g/L.


Architectural and Industrial Maintenance Regulations limit the VOC content in products classified as Architectural Coatings. Refer to Technical Letters at graceconstruction.com for most current list of allowable limits.

Advantages

- **Excellent adhesion**—special adhesive compound engineered to work with high tack System 4000 Surface Conditioner
- **Cold applied**—simple application to substrates, especially at low temperatures
- **Reduced inventory and handling costs**—System 4000 Surface Conditioner is included with each roll of membrane
- **Wide application temperature range**—excellent bond to self and substrate from 25°F (-4°C) and above

Product Advantages

- Excellent adhesion
- Cold applied
- Reduced inventory and handling costs
- Wide application temperature range
- Overlap security
- Cross laminated, high density polyethylene carrier film
- Flexible
- Ripcord



Drawings are for illustration purposes only.
Please refer to graceconstruction.com for specific application details.

- **Overlap security**—minimizes margin for error under site conditions
- **Cross laminated, high density polyethylene carrier film**—provides high tear strength, puncture and impact resistance
- **Flexible**—accommodates minor structural movements and will bridge shrinkage cracks
- **Ripcord**[®]—this split release on demand feature allows the splitting of the release paper into two (2) pieces for ease of installation in detailed areas

Use

Bituthene is ideal for waterproofing concrete, masonry and wood surfaces where in-service temperatures will not exceed 135°F (57°C). It can be applied to foundation walls, tunnels, earth sheltered structures and split slab construction, both above and below grade. (For above grade applications, see *Above Grade Waterproofing Bituthene System 4000*.)

Bituthene is 1/16 in. (1.5 mm) thick, 3 ft (0.9 m) wide and 66.7 ft (20 m) long and is supplied in rolls. It is unrolled sticky side down onto concrete slabs or applied onto vertical concrete faces primed with System 4000 Surface Conditioner. Continuity is achieved by overlapping a minimum 2 in. (50 mm) and firmly rolling the joint.

Bituthene is extremely flexible. It is capable of bridging shrinkage cracks in the concrete and will accommodate minor differential movement throughout the service life of the structure.

Application Procedures

Safety, Storage and Handling Information

Bituthene products must be handled properly. Vapors from solvent-based primers and mastic are harmful and flammable.

For these products, the best available information on safe handling, storage, personal protection, health and environmental considerations has been gathered. Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) are available at graceconstruction.com and users should acquaint themselves with this information. Carefully read detailed precaution statements on product labels and the MSDS before use.

Surface Preparation

Surfaces should be structurally sound and free of voids, spalled areas, loose aggregate and sharp protrusions. Remove contaminants such as grease, oil and wax from exposed surfaces. Remove dust, dirt, loose stone and debris. Concrete must be properly dried (minimum 7 days for normal structural concrete and 14 days for lightweight structural concrete).

If time is critical, Bituthene Primer B2 or Bituthene Primer B2 LVC may be used to allow priming and installation of membrane on damp surfaces or green concrete. Priming may begin in this case as soon as the concrete will maintain structural integrity. Use form release agents which will not transfer to the concrete.

Remove forms as soon as possible from below horizontal slabs to prevent entrapment of excess moisture. Excess moisture may lead to blistering of the membrane. Cure concrete with clear, resin-based curing compounds which do not contain oil, wax or pigment. Except with Bituthene Primer B2 or Bituthene Primer B2 LVC, allow concrete to thoroughly dry following rain. Do not apply any products to frozen concrete.

Repair defects such as spalled or poorly consolidated areas. Remove sharp protrusions and form match lines. On masonry surfaces, apply a parge coat to rough concrete block and brick walls or trowel cut mortar joints flush to the face of the concrete blocks.

Temperature

- Apply Bituthene System 4000 Membrane and Conditioner only in dry weather and when air and surface temperatures are 25°F (-4°C) or above.
- Apply Bituthene Primer B2 or Bituthene Primer B2 LVC in dry weather above 25°F (-4°C). (See separate product information sheet.)

Conditioning

Bituthene System 4000 Surface Conditioner is ready to use and can be applied by spray or roller. For best results, use a pump-type air sprayer with fan tip nozzle, like the Bituthene System 4000 Surface Conditioner Sprayer, to apply the surface conditioner.

Apply Bituthene System 4000 Surface Conditioner to clean, dry, frost-free surfaces at a coverage rate of 300 ft²/gal (7.4 m²/L). Coverage should be uniform. Surface conditioner should not be applied so heavily that it puddles or runs. **Do not apply conditioner to Bituthene membrane.**

Allow Bituthene System 4000 Surface Conditioner to dry one hour or until substrate returns to its original color. At low temperatures or in high humidity conditions, dry time may be longer.

Bituthene System 4000 Surface Conditioner is clear when dry and may be slightly tacky. In general, conditioning should be limited to what can be covered within 24 hours. In situations where long dry times may prevail, substrates may be conditioned in advance. Substrates should be reconditioned if significant dirt or dust accumulates.

Before surface conditioner dries, tools should be cleaned with water. After surface conditioner dries, tools should be cleaned with mineral spirits. Mineral spirits is a combustible liquid which should be used only in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations. **Do not use solvents to clean hands or skin.**

Corner Details

The treatment of corners varies depending on the location of the corner. For detailed information on Bituthene Liquid Membrane, see separate product information sheet.

- At wall to footing inside corners
 - Option 1:** Apply membrane to within 1 in. (25 mm) of base of wall. Treat the inside corner by installing a ¾ in. (20 mm) fillet of Bituthene Liquid Membrane. Extend Bituthene Liquid Membrane at least 2½ in. (65 mm) onto footing, and 2½ in. (65 mm) onto wall membrane.
 - Option 2:** Treat the inside corner by installing a ¾ in. (20 mm) fillet of Bituthene Liquid Membrane. Apply 12 in. (300 mm) wide strip of sheet membrane centered over fillet. Apply wall membrane over inside corner and extend 6 in. (150 mm) onto footing. Apply 1 in. (25 mm) wide troweling of Bituthene Liquid Membrane over all terminations and seams within 12 in. (300 mm) of corner.

- At footings where the elevation of the floor slab is 6 in. (150 mm) or more above the footing, treat the inside corner either by the above two methods or terminate the membrane at the base of the wall. Seal the termination with Bituthene Liquid Membrane.

Joints

Properly seal all joints with waterstop, joint filler and sealant as required. Bituthene membranes are not intended to function as the primary joint seal. Allow sealants to fully cure. Pre-strip all slab and wall cracks over ¼ in. (1.5 mm) wide and all construction and control joints with 9 in. (230 mm) wide sheet membrane strip.

Application on Horizontal Surfaces

(Note: Preprufe[®] pre-applied membranes are strongly recommended for below slab or for any application where the membrane is applied before concreting. See Preprufe product information sheets.)

Apply membrane from the low point to the high point so that laps shed water. Overlap all seams at least 2 in. (50 mm). Stagger all end laps. Roll the entire membrane firmly and completely as soon as possible. Use a finoleum roller or standard water-filled garden roller less than 30 in. (760 mm) wide, weighing a minimum of 75 lbs (34 kg) when filled. Cover the face of the roller with a resilient material such as a ½ in. (13 mm) plastic foam or two wraps of indoor-outdoor carpet to allow the membrane to fully contact the primed substrate. Seal all T-joints and membrane terminations with Bituthene Liquid Membrane at the end of the day.

Protrusions and Drains

Apply membrane to within 1 in. (25 mm) of the base of the protrusion. Apply Bituthene Liquid Membrane 0.1 in. (2.5 mm) thick around protrusion. Bituthene Liquid Membrane should extend over the membrane a minimum of 2½ in. (65 mm) and up the penetration to just below the finished height of the wearing course.

Vertical Surfaces

Apply membrane in lengths up to 8 ft (2.5 m). Overlap all seams at least 2 in. (50 mm). On higher walls apply membrane in two or more sections with the upper overlapping the lower by at least 2 in. (50 mm). Roll all membrane with a hand roller.

Terminate the membrane at grade level. Press the membrane firmly to the wall with the butt end of a hardwood tool such as a hammer handle or secure into a reglet. Failure to use heavy pressure at terminations can result in a poor seal. A termination bar may be used to ensure a tight seal. Terminate the membrane at the base of the wall if the bottom of the interior floor slab is at least 6 in. (150 mm) above the footing. Otherwise, use appropriate inside corner detail where the wall and footing meet.

Membrane Repairs

Patch tears and inadequately lapped seams with membrane. Clean membrane with a damp cloth and dry. Slit fishmouths and repair with a patch extending 6 in. (150 mm) in all directions from the slit and seal edges of the patch with Bituthene Liquid Membrane. Inspect the membrane thoroughly before covering and make any repairs.

Drainage

Hydroduct® drainage composites are recommended for both active drainage and protection of the membrane. See Hydroduct product information sheets.

Protection of Membrane

Protect Bituthene membranes to avoid damage from other trades, construction materials or backfill. Place protection immediately in temperatures above 77°F (25°C) to avoid potential for blisters.

- On vertical applications, use Hydroduct 220 Drainage Composite. Adhere Hydroduct 220 Drainage Composite to membrane with Preprufe Detail Tape. Alternative methods of protection are to use 1 in. (25 mm) expanded polystyrene or ¼ in. (6 mm) extruded polystyrene that has a minimum compressive strength of 8 lbs/in.² (55 kN/m²). Such alternatives do not provide

System 4000 Surface Conditioner Sprayer

The Bituthene System 4000 Surface Conditioner Sprayer is a professional grade, polyethylene, pump-type, compressed air sprayer with a brass fan tip nozzle. It has a 2 gal (7.6 L) capacity. The nozzle orifice and spray pattern have been specifically engineered for the optimum application of Bituthene System 4000 Surface Conditioner.

Hold nozzle 18 in. (450 mm) from substrate and squeeze handle to spray. Spray in a sweeping motion until substrate is uniformly covered.

Sprayer should be repressurized by pumping as needed. For best results, sprayer should be maintained at high pressure during spraying.

To release pressure, invert the sprayer and spray until all compressed air is released.



Maintenance

The Bituthene System 4000 Surface Conditioner Sprayer should perform without trouble for an extended period if maintained properly.

Sprayer should not be used to store Bituthene System 4000 Surface Conditioner. The sprayer should be flushed with clean water immediately after spraying. For breaks in the spray operation of one hour or less, invert the sprayer and squeeze the spray handle until only air comes from the nozzle. This will avoid clogging.

Should the sprayer need repairs or parts, call the maintenance telephone number on the sprayer tank (800-323-0620).

positive drainage to the system. If ¼ in. (6 mm) extruded polystyrene protection board is used, backfill should not contain sharp rock or aggregate over 2 in. (50 mm) in diameter. Adhere polystyrene protection board with Preprufe Detail Tape.

- In mud slab waterproofing, or other applications where positive drainage is not desired and where reinforced concrete slabs are placed over the membrane, the use of ¼ in. (6 mm) hardboard or 2 layers of ⅛ in. (3 mm) hardboard is recommended.

Insulation

Always apply Bituthene membrane directly to primed or conditioned structural substrates. Insulation, if used, must be applied over the membrane. Do not apply Bituthene membranes over lightweight insulating concrete.

Backfill

Place backfill as soon as possible. Use care during backfill operation to avoid damage to the waterproofing system. Follow generally accepted practices for backfilling and compaction. Backfill should be added and compacted in 6 in. (150 mm) to 12 in. (300 mm) lifts.

For areas which cannot be fully compacted, a termination bar is recommended across the top termination of the membrane.

Placing Steel

When placing steel over properly protected membrane, use concrete bar supports (dobies) or chairs with plastic tips or rolled feet to prevent damage from sharp edges. Use special care when using wire mesh, especially if the mesh is curled.

Approvals

- City of Los Angeles Research Report RR 24386
- Miami-Dade County Code Report NOA 04-0114.03
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) HUD Materials Release 628E
- Bituthene 4000 Membranes carry a Underwriters' Laboratory Class A Fire Rating (Building Materials Directory, File #R7910) when used in either of the following constructions:
 - Limited to noncombustible decks at inclines not exceeding ¼ in. (6 mm) to the horizontal 1 ft (0.3 m). One layer of Bituthene waterproofing membrane, followed by one layer of ⅛ in. (3 mm) protection board, encased in 2 in. (50 mm) minimum concrete monolithic pour.
 - Limited to noncombustible decks at inclines not exceeding ¼ in. (6 mm) to the horizontal 1 ft (0.3 m). One layer of Bituthene waterproofing membrane, followed by one layer of DOW Styrofoam PD Insulation Board [2 in. (50 mm) thick]. This is covered with one layer of 2 ft x 2 ft x 2 in. (0.6 m x 0.6 m x 50 mm) of concrete paver topping.

Warranty

Five year material warranties covering Bituthene and Hydroduct products are available upon request. Contact your Grace sales representative for details.

Technical Services

Support is provided by full time, technically trained Grace representatives and technical service personnel, backed by a central research and development staff.

Supply

Bituthene System 4000	3 ft x 66.7 ft roll (200 ft ²) [0.9 m x 20 m (18.6 m ²)]
Roll weight	83 lbs (38 kg) gross
Palletization	25 rolls per pallet
Storage	Store upright in dry conditions below 95°F (+35°C).
System 4000 Surface Conditioner	1 x 0.625 gal (2.3 L) bottle in each roll of System 4000 Membrane
Ancillary Products	
Surface Conditioner Sprayer	2 gal (7.6 L) capacity professional grade sprayer with specially engineered nozzle
Bituthene Liquid Membrane	1.5 gal (5.7 L) pail/125 pails per pallet or 4 gal (15.1 L) pail/48 pails per pallet
Preprufe Detail Tape	2 in. x 50 ft (50 mm x 15 m) roll/16 rolls per carton
Bituthene Mastic	Twelve 30 oz (0.9 L) tubes/carton or 5 gal (18.9 L) pail/36 pails per pallet
Complementary Material	
Hydroduct	See separate data sheets

Equipment by others: Soft broom, utility knife, brush or roller for priming

Physical Properties for Bituthene 4000 Membrane

Property	Typical Value	Test Method
Color	Dark gray-black	
Thickness	1/16 in. (1.5 mm) nominal	ASTM D3767—method A
Flexibility, 180° bend over 1 in. (25 mm) mandrel at -25°F (-32°C)	Unaffected	ASTM D1970
Tensile strength, membrane, die C	325 lbs/in. ² (2240 kPa) minimum	ASTM D412 modified ¹
Tensile strength, film	5,000 lbs/in. ² (34.5 MPa) minimum	ASTM D882 modified ¹
Elongation, ultimate failure of rubberized asphalt	300% minimum	ASTM D412 modified ¹
Crack cycling at -25°F (-32°C), 100 cycles	Unaffected	ASTM C836
Lap adhesion at minimum application temperature	5 lbs/in. (880 N/m)	ASTM D1876 modified ²
Peel strength	9 lbs/in. (1576 N/m)	ASTM D903 modified ³
Puncture resistance, membrane	50 lbs (222 N) minimum	ASTM E154
Resistance to hydrostatic head	210 ft (70 m) of water	ASTM D5385
Permeance	0.05 perms (2.9 ng/m ² sPa) maximum	ASTM E96, section 12—water method
Water absorption	0.1% maximum	ASTM D570

Footnotes:

1. The test is run at a rate of 2 in. (50 mm) per minute.
2. The test is conducted 15 minutes after the lap is formed and run at a rate of 2 in. (50 mm) per minute at 40°F (5°C).
3. The 180° peel strength is run at a rate of 12 in. (300 mm) per minute.

Physical Properties for System 4000 Surface Conditioner

Property	Typical Value
Solvent type	Water
Flash point	>140°F (>60°C)
VOC* content	91 g/L
Application temperature	25°F (-4°C) and above
Freeze thaw stability	5 cycles (minimum)
Freezing point (as packaged)	14°F (-10°C)
Dry time (hours)	1 hour**

* Volatile Organic Compound

** Dry time will vary with weather conditions

www.graceconstruction.com

For technical assistance call toll free at 866-333-3SBM (3726)

Bituthene, Preprufe, Hydroduct and Ripcord are registered trademarks of W. R. Grace & Co.—Conn.

We hope the information here will be helpful. It is based on data and knowledge considered to be true and accurate and is offered for the users' consideration, investigation and verification, but we do not warrant the results to be obtained. Please read all statements, recommendations or suggestions in conjunction with our conditions of sale, which apply to all goods supplied by us. No statement, recommendation or suggestion is intended for any use which would infringe any patent or copyright. W. R. Grace & Co.—Conn., 62 Whittemore Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02140. In Canada, Grace Canada, Inc., 294 Clements Road, West, Ajax, Ontario, Canada L1S 3C6.

This product may be covered by patents or patents pending.
BIT-220H Printed in U.S.A. 10/13

Copyright 20013 W. R. Grace & Co.—Conn.
FA/PDF

GRACE

Appendix J.2: Preprufe 300R Plus Tech Sheets

Grace Below Grade Waterproofing

PREPRUFE® 300R Plus & 160R Plus

Pre-applied waterproofing membranes that bond integrally to poured concrete for use below slabs or behind basement walls on confined sites

Description

Preprufe® 300R Plus & 160R Plus membranes are unique composite sheets comprising, a thick HDPE film, an aggressive pressure sensitive adhesive a weather resistant protective coating and an adhesive to adhesive seam overlap.

Unlike conventional non-adhering membranes, which are vulnerable to water ingress tracking between the unbonded membrane and structure, the unique Preprufe bond to concrete prevents ingress or migration of water around the structure.

The Preprufe R Plus System includes:


- **Preprufe 300R Plus**—heavy-duty grade for use below slabs and on rafts (i.e. mud slabs). Designed to accept the placing of heavy reinforcement using conventional concrete spacers.
- **Preprufe 160R Plus**—thinner grade for blindside, zero property line applications against soil retention systems.
- **Preprufe Tape LT**—for covering cut edges, roll ends, penetrations and detailing (temperatures between 25°F (-4°C) and 86°F (+30°C)).
- **Preprufe Tape HC**—as above for use in Hot Climates (minimum 50°F (10°C)).
- **Bituthene® Liquid Membrane**—for sealing around penetrations, etc.
- **Adecor® ES**—waterstop for joints in concrete walls and floors
- **Preprufe Tieback Covers**—preformed cover for soil retention wall tieback heads
- **Preprufe Preformed Corners**—preformed inside and outside corners

Preprufe 300R Plus & 160R Plus membranes are applied either horizontally to smooth prepared concrete, carton forms or well rolled and compacted earth or crushed stone substrate; or vertically to permanent formwork or adjoining structures. Concrete is then cast directly against the adhesive side of the membranes. The specially developed Preprufe adhesive layers work together to form a continuous and integral seal to the structure.

Preprufe can be turned up the inside face of slab formwork but is not recommended for conventional twin-sided formwork on walls, etc. Use Bituthene® self-adhesive membrane or Procor® fluid applied membrane to walls after removal of formwork for a fully bonded system to all structural surfaces.

Advantages

- **Forms a unique continuous adhesive bond to concrete poured against it**—prevents water migration and makes it unaffected by ground settlement beneath slabs
- **Fully-adhered adhesive to adhesive watertight laps and detailing**
- **Provides a barrier to water, moisture and gas**—physically isolates the structure from the surrounding ground
- **Easy roll/kick out installation**—reduces installation time and cost
- **Release Liner free**—expedites installation and reduces construction site waste
- **Solar reflective**—reduced temperature gain
- **Simple and quick to install**—requiring no priming or fillets
- **Can be applied to permanent formwork**—allows maximum use of confined sites
- **Self protecting**—can be trafficked immediately after application and ready for immediate placing of reinforcement
- **Unaffected by wet conditions**—cannot activate prematurely
- **Inherently waterproof, non-reactive system:**
 - not reliant on confining pressures or hydration
 - unaffected by freeze/thaw, wet/dry cycling
- **Chemical resistant**—effective in most types of soils and waters, protects structure from salt or sulphate attack



Drawings are for illustration purposes only.
Please refer to graceconstruction.com for specific application details.

Installation

The most current application instructions, detail drawings and technical letters can be viewed at graceconstruction.com. For other technical information contact your local Grace representative.

Preprufe Plus has colored zip strips at the top and bottom of the seam area on the edge of the roll. Both zip strips cover an aggressive adhesive. Once the yellow zip strip on the top of the membrane and the blue zip strip on the bottom of the membrane are removed, a strong adhesive to adhesive bond is achieved in the overlap area.

Substrate Preparation

All surfaces—It is essential to create a sound and solid substrate to eliminate movement during the concrete pour. Substrates must be regular and smooth with no gaps or voids greater than 0.5 in. (12 mm). Grout around all penetrations such as utility conduits, etc. for stability (see Figure 1).

Horizontal—The substrate must be free of loose aggregate and sharp protrusions. Avoid curved or rounded substrates. When installing over earth or crushed stone, ensure substrate is well compacted to avoid displacement of substrate due to traffic or concrete pour. The surface does not need to be dry, but standing water must be removed.

Vertical—Use concrete, plywood, insulation or other approved facing to sheet piling to provide support to the membrane. Board systems such as timber lagging must be close butted to provide support and not more than 0.5 in. (12 mm) out of alignment.

Membrane Installation

Preprufe can be applied at temperatures of 25°F (-4°C) or above. When installing Preprufe in cold or marginal weather conditions <40°F (<4°C) the use of Preprufe Tape LT is recommended at all laps and detailing. Preprufe Tape LT should be applied to clean, dry surfaces and the release liner must be removed immediately after application. Alternatively, Preprufe Plus Low Temperature (LT) is available for low temperature condition applications. Refer to Preprufe Plus LT data sheet for more information.

Horizontal substrates—Kick out or roll out the membrane HDPE film side to the substrate with the yellow zip strip facing towards the concrete pour. End laps should be staggered to avoid a build up of layers. Leave yellow and blue zip strips on the membrane until overlap procedure is completed.

Accurately position succeeding sheets to overlap the previous sheet 3 in. (75 mm) along the marked selvedge with the blue zip strip on top of the yellow zip strip. Ensure the underside of the succeeding sheet is clean, dry and free from contamination before attempting to overlap. Peel back and remove both the yellow and blue zip strips in the overlap area to achieve an adhesive to adhesive bond at the overlap. Ensure a continuous bond is achieved without creases and roll firmly with a heavy roller.

Refer to Grace Tech Letter 15 for information on suitable rebar chairs for Preprufe.

Vertical substrates—Mechanically fasten the membrane vertically using fasteners appropriate to the substrate with the yellow zip strip facing towards the concrete pour. The membrane may be installed in any convenient length. Fastening can be made through the selvedge using a small and low profile head fastener so that the membrane lays flat and allows firmly rolled overlaps. Accurately position succeeding sheets to overlap the previous sheet 3 in. (75 mm) along the marked selvedge with the blue zip strip on top of the yellow zip strip. Ensure the underside of the succeeding sheet is clean, dry and free from contamination before attempting to overlap. Peel back and remove both the yellow and

blue zip strips in the overlap area to achieve an adhesive to adhesive bond at the overlap. Roll firmly to ensure a watertight seal.

Roll ends and cut edges—Overlap all roll ends and cut edges by a minimum 3 in. (75 mm) and ensure the area is clean and free from contamination, wiping with a damp cloth if necessary. Allow to dry and apply Preprufe Tape LT (or HC in hot climates) centered over the lap edges and roll firmly (see Figure 2). Immediately remove tinted plastic release liner from the tape.

Details

Refer to Preprufe Field Application Manual, Section V Application Instructions or visit graceconstruction.com. This manual gives comprehensive guidance and standard details.

Membrane Repair

Inspect the membrane before installation of reinforcement steel, formwork and final placement of concrete. The membrane can be easily cleaned by power washing if required. Repair damage by wiping the area with a damp cloth to ensure the area is clean and free from dust, and allow to dry. Repair small punctures (0.5 in. (12 mm) or less) and slices by applying Preprufe Tape centered over the damaged area and roll firmly. Remove the release liner from the tape. Repair holes and large punctures by applying a patch of Preprufe membrane, which extends 6 in. (150 mm) beyond the damaged area. Seal all edges of the patch with Preprufe Tape, remove the release liner from the tape and roll firmly. Any areas of damaged adhesive should be covered with Preprufe Tape. Remove tinted plastic release liner from tape. Where exposed selvedge has lost adhesion or laps have not been sealed, ensure the area is clean and dry and cover with fresh Preprufe Tape, rolling firmly. Alternatively, use a hot air gun or similar to activate adhesive and firmly roll lap to achieve continuity.

Pouring of Concrete

Ensure the plastic release liner is removed from all areas of Preprufe Tape.

It is recommended that concrete be poured within 56 days (42 days in hot climates) of application of the membrane. Following proper ACI guidelines, concrete must be placed carefully and consolidated properly to avoid damage to the membrane. Never use a sharp object to consolidate the concrete. Provide temporary protection from concrete over splash for areas of the Preprufe membrane that are adjacent to a concrete pour.

Removal of Formwork

Preprufe membranes can be applied to removable formwork, such as slab perimeters, elevator and lift pits, etc. Once the concrete is poured the formwork must remain in place until the concrete has gained sufficient compressive strength to develop the surface bond. Preprufe membranes are not recommended for conventional twin-sided wall forming systems.



A minimum concrete compressive strength of 1500 psi (10 N/mm²) is recommended prior to stripping formwork supporting Preprufe membranes. Premature stripping may result in displacement of the membrane and/or spalling of the concrete.

Refer to Grace Tech Letter 17 for information on removal of formwork for Preprufe.

Figure 1




Figure 2




Detail Drawings

Details shown are typical illustrations and not working details. For a list of the most current details, visit us at graceconstruction.com. For technical assistance with detailing and problem solving please call toll free at 866-333-3SBM (3726).


Wall base detail against permanent shutter




Bituthene wall base detail (Option 1)




Procor wall base detail (Option 1)



Bituthene wall base detail (Option 2)



Procor wall base detail (Option 2)



- | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 Preprufe 300R Plus | 5 Procor | 8 Hydroduct® |
| 2 Preprufe 160R Plus | 6 Bituthene Liquid Membrane | 9 Adcor ES |
| 3 Preprufe Tape | 7 Protection | 10 Preprufe CJ Tape |
| 4 Bituthene® | | |

Supply

Dimensions (Nominal)	Preprufe 300R Plus Membrane	Preprufe 160R Plus Membrane	Preprufe Tape (LT or HC*)
Thickness	0.046 in. (1.2 mm)	0.032 in. (0.8 mm)	
Roll size	3 ft. 10 in. x 102 ft. (1.17m x 31.15m)	3 ft. 10 in. x 120 ft. (1.17m x 36.6m)	4 in. x 49 ft (100 mm x 15 m)
Roll area	392 ft ² (36 m ²)	460 ft ² (42 m ²)	
Roll weight	108 lbs (50 kg)	92 lbs (42 kg)	4.3 lbs (2 kg)
Minimum side/end laps	3 in. (75 mm)	3 in. (75 mm)	3 in. (75 mm)
* LT denotes Low Temperature (between 25°F (-4°C) and 86°F (+30°C)) HC denotes Hot Climate (50°F (>+10°C))			
Ancillary Products			
Bituthene Liquid Membrane—1.5 US gal (5.7 liter) or 4 US gal (15.1 liter)			

Physical Properties

Property	Typical Value 300R Plus	Typical Value 160R Plus	Test Method
Color	white	white	
Thickness	0.046 in. (1.2 mm)	0.032 in. (0.8 mm)	ASTM D3767
Lateral Water Migration Resistance	Pass at 231 ft (71 m) of hydrostatic head pressure	Pass at 231 ft (71 m) of hydrostatic head pressure	ASTM D5385, modified ¹
Low temperature flexibility	Unaffected at -20°F (-29°C)	Unaffected at -20°F (-29°C)	ASTM D1970
Resistance to hydrostatic head	231 ft (71 m)	231 ft (71 m)	ASTM D5385, modified ²
Elongation	500%	500%	ASTM D412, modified ³
Tensile strength, film	4000 psi (27.6 MPa)	4000 psi (27.6 MPa)	ASTM D412
Crack cycling at -9.4°F (-23°C), 100 cycles	Unaffected, Pass	Unaffected, Pass	ASTM C836 ⁴
Puncture resistance	221 lbs (990 N)	100 lbs (445 N)	ASTM E154
Peel adhesion to concrete	5 lbs/in. (880 N/m)	5 lbs/in. (880 N/m)	ASTM D903, modified ⁵
Lap peel adhesion at 72°F (22°C)	8 lbs/in. (1408 N/m)	8 lbs/in. (1408 N/m)	ASTM D1876, modified ⁶
Lap peel adhesion at 40°F (4°C)	8 lbs/in. (1408 N/m)	8 lbs/in. (1408 N/m)	ASTM D1876, modified ⁶
Permeance to water vapor transmission	0.01 perms (0.6 ng/(Pa x s x m ²))	0.01 perms (0.6 ng/(Pa x s x m ²))	ASTM E96, method B

Footnotes:

- Lateral water migration resistance is tested by casting concrete against membrane with a hole and subjecting the membrane to hydrostatic head pressure with water. The test measures the resistance of lateral water migration between the concrete and the membrane.
- Hydrostatic head tests of Preprufe Membranes are performed by casting concrete against the membrane with a lap. Before the concrete cures, a 0.125 in. (3 mm) spacer is inserted perpendicular to the membrane to create a gap. The cured block is placed in a chamber where water is introduced to the membrane surface up to the head indicated.
- Elongation of membrane is run at a rate of 2 in. (50 mm) per minute.
- Concrete is cast against the Preprufe membrane and allowed to cure (7 days minimum)
- Concrete is cast against the protective coating surface of the membrane and allowed to properly dry (7 days minimum). Peel adhesion of membrane to concrete is measured at a rate of 2 in. (50 mm) per minute at room temperature.
- The test is conducted 15 minutes after the lap is formed (per Grace published recommendations) and run at a rate of 2 in. (50 mm) per minute at 72°F (22°C).

Specification Clauses

Preprufe 300R Plus or 160R Plus shall be applied with its adhesive face presented to receive fresh concrete to which it will integrally bond. Only Grace Construction Products approved membranes shall be bonded to Preprufe. All Preprufe system materials shall be supplied by Grace Construction Products, and applied strictly in accordance with their instructions. Specimen performance and formatted clauses are also available.

NOTE: Use Preprufe Tape to tie-in Procor with Preprufe.

Health and Safety

Refer to relevant Material Safety data sheet. Complete rolls should be lifted and carried by a minimum of two persons.

www.graceconstruction.com

For technical assistance call toll free at 866-333-3SBM (3726)

Adcor is a trademark and Preprufe, Bituthene and Hydroduct are registered trademarks of W. R. Grace & Co.—Conn. Procor is a U.S. registered trademark of W. R. Grace & Co.—Conn., and is used in Canada under license from PROCOR LIMITED.

We hope the information here will be helpful. It is based on data and knowledge considered to be true and accurate and is offered for the users' consideration, investigation and verification, but we do not warrant the results to be obtained. Please read all statements, recommendations or suggestions in conjunction with our conditions of sale, which apply to all goods supplied by us. No statement, recommendation or suggestion is intended for any use which would infringe any patent or copyright. W. R. Grace & Co.—Conn., 62 Whittemore Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02140. In Canada, Grace Canada, Inc., 294 Clements Road, West, Ajax, Ontario, Canada L1S 3C6.

This product may be covered by patents or patents pending.
PF-189 Printed in U.S.A. 02/13

Copyright 2013. W. R. Grace & Co.—Conn.
FAJPDF

Appendix J.3: Boring Locations




Figure J1: Test Boring Locations (From Geotechnical Report)

Appendix J.4: Allowable Piping Materials for Subsoil Drain Pipes

MATERIAL	STANDARD
Asbestos-cement pipe	ASTM C 508
Cast-iron pipe	ASTM A 74; ASTM A 888; CISPI 301
Polyethylene (PE) plastic pipe	ASTM F 405; CSA B182.1; CSA B182.6; CSA B182.8
Polyvinyl chloride (PVC) Plastic pipe (type sewer pipe, PS25, PS50 or PS100)	ASTM D 2729; ASTM F 891; CSA B182.2; CSA B182.4
Stainless steel drainage systems, Type 316L	ASME A 112.3.1
Vitrified clay pipe	ASTM C 4; ASTM C 700

Figure J2: IPC2012 Table 1102.5

Appendix J.5: PVC Pipe Nomograph




Figure J3: PVC Pipe Nomograph

Appendix K: Detailed Cost Estimate

Formwork - Exterior Beams - 03 11 13. 20 (1500)							
Level	Dim.	L. F.	S.F.C.A.	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
				1.02	6.15	0	7.17
Lower Roof	24" x 30"	72	468	477.36	2878.20	0.00	3355.56
	24" x 24"	222.5	1335	1361.70	8210.25	0.00	9571.95
6	24" x 30"	72	468	-	2878.20	0.00	2878.20
	24" x 24"	178.2	1069	-	6575.58	0.00	6575.58
5	24" x 30"	72	468	-	2878.20	0.00	2878.20
	24" x 24"	178.2	1069	-	6575.58	0.00	6575.58
4	24" x 30"	95.3	619	631.84	3809.62	0.00	4441.46
	24" x 24"	201.5	1209	1233.18	7435.35	0.00	8668.53
3	24" x 30"	95.3	619	-	3809.62	0.00	3809.62
	24" x 24"	151.9	911	-	5605.11	0.00	5605.11
2	24" x 30"	95.3	619	-	3809.62	0.00	3809.62
	24" x 24"	97.6	586	-	3601.44	0.00	3601.44
Total			9442	\$ 3,704	\$ 58,067	\$ -	\$ 61,771

Formwork - Interior Beams - 03 11 13. 20 (2500)							
Dim.	Level	L. F.	S.F.C.A.	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
				2.57	6.05	0	8.62
24" x 30"	Lower Roof	50	324	831.91	1958.39	0.00	2790.29
	6	50	324	831.91	1958.39	0.00	2790.29
	5	50	324	-	1958.39	0.00	1958.39
	4	50	324	-	1958.39	0.00	1958.39
	3	50	324	-	1958.39	0.00	1958.39
	2	50	324	-	1958.39	0.00	1958.39
Dim.	Level	L. F.	S.F.C.A.	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
				1.41	5.25	0	6.66
16" x 24"	Lower Roof	78.2	365	-	1915.90	0.00	1915.90
	6	78.2	365	514.56	1915.90	0.00	2430.46
	5	78.2	417	588.06	2189.60	0.00	2777.66
	4	78.2	365	-	1915.90	0.00	1915.90
	3	78.2	365	-	1915.90	0.00	1915.90
	2	62.7	293	-	1536.15	0.00	1536.15

Formwork - Interior Beams - 03 11 13. 20 (2000)							
Dim.	Level	L. F.	S.F.C.A.	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
				1.71	5.4	0	7.11
10" x 12"	Lower Roof	16.7	45	76.15	240.48	0.00	316.63
	6	16.7	45	76.15	240.48	0.00	316.63
	5	16.7	45	-	240.48	0.00	240.48
	4	16.7	45	-	240.48	0.00	240.48
	3	16.7	45	-	240.48	0.00	240.48
	2	16.7	45	-	240.48	0.00	240.48
Total			4379	\$ 2,919	\$ 24,583	\$ -	\$ 27,502

Formwork - Columns - 03 11 13. 25 (6500)								
Level	Dim.	Height	Number	S.F.C.A.	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
					0.74	5.3	0	6.04
6	24" x 24"	18	18	2592	-	13737.60	0.00	13737.60
5	24" x 24"	16	18	2304	-	12211.20	0.00	12211.20
4	24" x 24"	16	17	2176	-	11532.80	0.00	11532.80
3	24" x 24"	16	20	2560	1894.40	13568.00	0.00	15462.40
2	24" x 24"	18	13	1872	-	9921.60	0.00	9921.60
1	24" x 24"	18	6	864	-	4579.20	0.00	4579.20
Total				12368	\$ 1,895	\$ 65,551	\$ -	\$ 67,445

Formwork - Elevated Slabs - 03 11 13. 35 (2250)					
Level	S.F.	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
		5	4.05	0	9.05
Lower Roof	10738	-	43486.88	0.00	43486.88
6	8885	-	35984.25	0.00	35984.25
5	8885	-	35984.25	0.00	35984.25
4	11448	-	46364.40	0.00	46364.40
3	11448	57240.00	46364.40	0.00	103604.40
2	8967	44835.00	36316.35	0.00	81151.35
Total	60371	\$ 102,075	\$ 244,501	\$ -	\$ 346,576

Formwork Total (+10% Waste)
\$ 553,622

Structural Concrete - Exterior Beams - 03 31 05.35 (0300)							
Level	Dim.	L. F.	CY	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
				103	0	0	103
Lower Roof	24" x 30"	72	8.9	915.56	0	0	915.56
	24" x 24"	222.5	19.2	1980.52	0	0	1980.52
6	24" x 30"	72	8.9	915.56	0	0	915.56
	24" x 24"	178.2	15.4	1586.20	0	0	1586.20
5	24" x 30"	72	8.9	915.56	0	0	915.56
	24" x 24"	178.2	15.4	1586.20	0	0	1586.20
4	24" x 30"	95.3	11.8	1211.84	0	0	1211.84
	24" x 24"	201.5	17.4	1793.60	0	0	1793.60
3	24" x 30"	95.3	11.8	1211.84	0	0	1211.84
	24" x 24"	151.9	13.1	1352.10	0	0	1352.10
2	24" x 30"	95.3	11.8	1211.84	0	0	1211.84
	24" x 24"	97.6	8.4	868.76	0	0	868.76
Total			151	\$ 15,550	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,550

Structural Concrete - Interior Beams -03 31 05.35 (0300)							
Dim.	Level	L. F.	CY	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
				103	0	0	103
24" x 30"	Lower Roof	50	6.1	633.26	0	0	633.26
	6	50	6.1	633.26	0	0	633.26
	5	50	6.1	633.26	0	0	633.26
	4	50	6.1	633.26	0	0	633.26
	3	50	6.1	633.26	0	0	633.26
	2	50	6.1	633.26	0	0	633.26
	Dim.	Level	L. F.	CY	Material	Labor	Equipment
				103	0	0	103
16" x 24"	Lower Roof	78.2	4.5	464.05	0	0	464.05
	6	78.2	4.5	464.05	0	0	464.05
	5	78.2	4.5	464.05	0	0	464.05
	4	78.2	4.5	464.05	0	0	464.05
	3	78.2	4.5	464.05	0	0	464.05
	2	62.7	3.6	372.07	0	0	372.07

Dim.	Level	L. F.	CY	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
				103	0	0	103
10" x 12"	Lower Roof	16.7	0.09	8.85	0	0	8.85
	6	16.7	0.09	8.85	0	0	8.85
	5	16.7	0.09	8.85	0	0	8.85
	4	16.7	0.09	8.85	0	0	8.85
	3	16.7	0.09	8.85	0	0	8.85
	2	16.7	0.09	8.85	0	0	8.85
Total			64	\$ 6,545	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,545

Structural Concrete - Columns - 03 31 05.35 (0300)								
Level	Dim.	Height	Number	CY	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
					103	0	0	103
6	24" x 24"	18	18	48	4944.00	0	0	4944.00
5	24" x 24"	16	18	43	4394.67	0	0	4394.67
4	24" x 24"	16	17	40	4150.52	0	0	4150.52
3	24" x 24"	16	20	47	4882.96	0	0	4882.96
2	24" x 24"	18	13	35	3570.67	0	0	3570.67
1	24" x 24"	18	6	16	1648.00	0	0	1648.00
Total				229	\$ 23,591	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,591

Structural Concrete - Slab and Drop Cap - 03 31 05.35 (0300)											
Level	Slab S.F.	Slab Thick. (ft)	Drop Panel S.F.	Drop Panel Thick. (ft)	Shallow Beam S.F.	Shallow Beam Thick.	CY	Material	Labor	Equip.	Total
								111	0	0	111
Lower Roof	10738	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	336.70	37373.91	0	0	37373.91
6	8885	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	279.53	31027.38	0	0	31027.38
5	8885	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	279.53	31027.38	0	0	31027.38
4	11448	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	358.63	39808.03	0	0	39808.03
3	11448	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	358.63	39808.03	0	0	39808.03
2	8967	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	282.06	31308.30	0	0	31308.30
Total							1895.07	\$ 210,354	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 210,354

Structural Concrete Total (+7% Waste)
\$ 273,962

Finishing - Slabs - 03 31 29.30 (0200)					
Level	Slab S.F.	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
		0	0.71	0	0.71
Lower Roof	10738	0	7624	0	7623.6
6	8885	0	6308	0	6308.4
5	8885	0	6308	0	6308.4
4	11448	0	8128	0	8128.1
3	11448	0	8128	0	8128.1
2	8967	0	6367	0	6366.6
Total	60370.5	\$ -	\$ 42,864	\$ -	\$ 42,864

Placing Concrete - Exterior Beams - 03 31 05.70 (0200)							
Level	Dim.	L. F.	CY	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
				0	25	8.9	33.9
Lower Roof	24" x 30"	72	9	0	222.22	79.11	301.33
	24" x 24"	222.5	19	0	480.71	171.13	651.84
6	24" x 30"	72	9	0	222.22	79.11	301.33
	24" x 24"	178.2	15	0	385.00	137.06	522.06
5	24" x 30"	72	9	0	222.22	79.11	301.33
	24" x 24"	178.2	15	0	385.00	137.06	522.06
4	24" x 30"	95.3	12	0	294.14	104.71	398.85
	24" x 24"	201.5	17	0	435.34	154.98	590.32
3	24" x 30"	95.3	12	0	294.14	104.71	398.85
	24" x 24"	151.9	13	0	328.18	116.83	445.01
2	24" x 30"	95.3	12	0	294.14	104.71	398.85
	24" x 24"	97.6	8	0	210.86	75.07	285.93
Total			151	\$ -	\$ 3,775	\$ 1,344	\$ 5,118

Placing Concrete - Interior Beams -03 31 05.70 (0200)							
Dim.	Level	L. F.	CY	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
				0	25	8.9	33.9
24" x 30"	Lower Roof	49.8	6	0	153.70	54.72	208.42
	6	49.8	6	0	153.70	54.72	208.42
	5	49.8	6	0	153.70	54.72	208.42
	4	49.8	6	0	153.70	54.72	208.42
	3	49.8	6	0	153.70	54.72	208.42
	2	49.8	6	0	153.70	54.72	208.42

Dim.	Level	L. F.	CY	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
				0	25	8.9	33.9
16" x 24"	Lower Roof	78.2	5	0	112.63	40.10	152.73
	6	78.2	5	0	112.63	40.10	152.73
	5	78.2	5	0	112.63	40.10	152.73
	4	78.2	5	0	112.63	40.10	152.73
	3	78.2	5	0	112.63	40.10	152.73
	2	62.7	4	0	90.31	32.15	122.46

Placing Concrete - Interior Beams -03 31 05.70 (0050)							
Dim.	Level	L. F.	CY	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
				0	38	13.3	51.3
10" x 12"	Lower Roof	16.7	0	0	3.26	1.14	2.91
	6	16.7	0	0	3.26	1.14	2.91
	5	16.7	0	0	3.26	1.14	2.91
	4	16.7	0	0	3.26	1.14	2.91
	3	16.7	0	0	3.26	1.14	2.91
	2	16.7	0	0	3.26	1.14	2.91
Total			64	\$ -	\$ 1,596	\$ 568	\$ 2,154

Placing Concrete - Columns - 03 31 05.70 (0800)								
Level	Dim.	Height	Number	CY	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
					0	24.5	8.7	
6	24" x 24"	18	18.00	48.00	0	1176.00	417.60	1593.60
5	24" x 24"	16	18.00	42.67	0	1045.33	371.20	1416.53
4	24" x 24"	16	17.00	40.30	0	987.26	350.58	1337.84
3	24" x 24"	16	20.00	47.41	0	1161.48	412.44	1573.93
2	24" x 24"	18	13.00	34.67	0	849.33	301.60	1150.93
1	24" x 24"	18	6.00	16.00	0	392.00	139.20	531.20
Total				230	\$ -	\$ 5,612	\$ 1,993	\$ 7,605

Placing Concrete - Slab and Drop Panel - 03 31 05.70 (1500)

Level	Slab S.F.	Slab Thick. (ft)	Drop Panel S.F.	Drop Panel Thick. (ft)	Shallow Beam S.F.	Shallow Beam Thick.	CY	Material	Labor	Equip.	Total
								0	14.15	5	19.15
Lower Roof	10738	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	336.70	0	4764.33	1683.51	6447.84
6	8885	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	279.53	0	3955.29	1397.63	5352.92
5	8885	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	279.53	0	3955.29	1397.63	5352.92
4	11448	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	358.63	0	5074.63	1793.15	6867.78
3	11448	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	358.63	0	5074.63	1793.15	6867.78
2	8967	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	282.06	0	3991.10	1410.28	5401.39
Total							1896	\$ -	\$ 26,816	\$ 9,476	\$ 36,291

Placing Concrete Total
\$ 51,167

Reinforcement Bars - Beams - 03 21 10. 60 (0100)

Level	Tons	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
		800	935	0	1735
Lower Roof	10.2	8136	9509.4	0	17645.8
6	10.2	8136	9509.4	0	17645.8
5	10.0	7976	9322.4	0	17298.8
4	9	7576	8854.9	0	16431.3
3	9	7576	8854.9	0	16431.3
2	9	7576	8854.9	0	16431.3
Total		46,979	\$ 54,906	-	\$ 101,885

Reinforcement Bars - Columns - 03 21 10. 60 (0250)

Level	Height	Number	Tons	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
				800	650	0	1450
Lower Roof	18	18	3	2768.26	2249.21	0	5017.5
6	16	18	3	2460.67	1999.30	0	4460.0
5	16	17	3	2323.97	1888.22	0	4212.2
4	16	20	3	2734.08	2221.44	0	4955.5
3	18	13	2	1999.30	1624.43	0	3623.7
2	18	6	1	922.75	749.74	0	1672.5
Total			16.5	\$ 13,210	\$ 10,733	-	\$ 23,942

Reinforcement Bars - Slabs - 03 21 10. 60 (0400)					
Level	Tons	Material	Labor	Equipment	Total
		850	515	0	1365
Lower Roof	12.3	10480.5	6350.0	0	16830.5
6	10.2	8631.0	5229.4	0	13860.4
5	10.2	8631.0	5229.4	0	13860.4
4	13.1	11169.0	6767.1	0	17936.1
3	13.1	11169.0	6767.1	0	17936.1
2	10.2	8631.0	5229.4	0	13860.4
Total		\$ 58,712	\$ 35,573	-	\$ 94,284

Reinforcement Total (+10% Waste)

\$ 231,115

Adjustment Factors

Time: Assuming an Inflation Rate of 3%

$$\frac{BCI\ 2014}{BCI\ 2010} = 1.09$$

$$[1 + (0.25 * 0.03)] = 1.0075$$

Multiplier = 1.09 * 1.0075 = 1.1

Location: No location multiplier used. Recommended multiplier would be 0.79 for Bristol, VA. This is not accurate due to the building being located on a University Campus.

Appendix L: Schedule Durations

Formwork - Exterior Beams - 03 11 13. 20 (1500)					
Level	Dim.	L. F.	S.F.C.A.	Daily Output	Durations
Lower Roof	24" x 30"	72	468	795	0.59
	24" x 24"	222.5	1335	795	1.68
6	24" x 30"	72	468	795	0.59
	24" x 24"	178.2	1069	795	1.34
5	24" x 30"	72	468	795	0.59
	24" x 24"	178.2	1069	795	1.34
4	24" x 30"	95.3	619	795	0.78
	24" x 24"	201.5	1209	795	1.52
3	24" x 30"	95.3	619	795	0.78
	24" x 24"	151.9	911	795	1.15
2	24" x 30"	95.3	619	795	0.78
	24" x 24"	97.6	586	795	0.74
Total			9442	9540	12

Formwork - Interior Beams - 03 11 13. 20 (2500)					
Dim.	Level	L. F.	S.F.C.A.	Daily Output	Durations
24" x 30"	Lower Roof	50	324	960	0.34
	6	50	324	960	0.34
	5	50	324	960	0.34
	4	50	324	960	0.34
	3	50	324	960	0.34
	2	50	324	960	0.34
Dim.	Level	L. F.	S.F.C.A.	Daily Output	Durations
16" x 24"	Lower Roof	78.2	365	921	0.40
	6	78.2	365	921	0.40
	5	78.2	417	921	0.45
	4	78.2	365	921	0.40
	3	78.2	365	921	0.40
	2	62.7	293	921	0.32

Formwork - Interior Beams - 03 11 13. 20 (2000)					
Dim.	Level	L. F.	S.F.C.A.	Daily Output	Durations
10" x 12"	Lower Roof	16.7	45	900	0.05
	6	16.7	45	900	0.05
	5	16.7	45	900	0.05
	4	16.7	45	900	0.05
	3	16.7	45	900	0.05
	2	16.7	45	900	0.05
Total			4379	16686	5

Formwork - Columns - 03 11 13. 25 (6500)							
Level	Dim.	Height	Number	S.F.C.A.	Daily Output	Calculated Durations	Actual Durations
6	24" x 24"	18	380	2.27	380	2.27	1
5	24" x 24"	16	380	4.93	380	4.93	2
4	24" x 24"	16	380	6.74	380	6.74	2
3	24" x 24"	16	380	5.73	380	5.73	2
2	24" x 24"	18	380	6.06	380	6.06	2
1	24" x 24"	18	380	6.82	380	6.82	2
Total				12368	32280	33	11

Formwork - Elevated Slabs - 03 11 13. 35 (2250)			
Level	S.F.	Daily Output	Durations
Lower Roof	10738	1440	6.23
6	8885	1440	7.95
5	8885	1440	7.95
4	11448	1440	6.17
3	11448	1440	6.17
2	8967	1440	7.46
Total	60371	8640	78

Finishing - Slabs - 03 31 29.30 (0200)			
Level	Slab S.F.	Daily Output	Durations
Lower Roof	10738	2530	4.2
6	8885	2530	3.5
5	8885	2530	3.5
4	11448	2530	4.5
3	11448	2530	4.5
2	8967	2530	3.5
Total	60371	5180	24

Placing Concrete - Exterior Beams - 03 31 05.70 (0200)					
Level	Dim.	L. F.	CY	Daily Output	Durations
Lower Roof	24" x 30"	72	9	90	0.10
	24" x 24"	222.5	19	90	0.21
6	24" x 30"	72	9	90	0.10
	24" x 24"	178.2	15	90	0.17
5	24" x 30"	72	9	90	0.10
	24" x 24"	178.2	15	90	0.17
4	24" x 30"	95.3	12	90	0.13
	24" x 24"	201.5	17	90	0.19
3	24" x 30"	95.3	12	90	0.13
	24" x 24"	151.9	13	90	0.15
2	24" x 30"	95.3	12	90	0.13
	24" x 24"	97.6	8	90	0.09
Total			151	1080	2

Placing Concrete - Interior Beams -03 31 05.70 (0200)					
Dim.	Level	L. F.	CY	Daily Output	Durations
24" x 30"	Lower Roof	49.8	6	90	0.07
	6	49.8	6	90	0.07
	5	49.8	6	90	0.07
	4	49.8	6	90	0.07
	3	49.8	6	90	0.07
	2	49.8	6	90	0.07
Dim.	Level	L. F.	CY	Daily Output	Durations
16" x 24"	Lower Roof	78.2	5	90	0.05
	6	78.2	5	90	0.05
	5	78.2	5	90	0.05
	4	78.2	5	90	0.05
	3	78.2	5	90	0.05
	2	62.7	4	90	0.04

Placing Concrete - Interior Beams -03 31 05.70 (0050)					
Dim.	Level	L. F.	CY	Daily Output	Durations
10" x 12"	Lower Roof	16.7	0	60	0.001
	6	16.7	0	60	0.001
	5	16.7	0	60	0.001
	4	16.7	0	60	0.001
	3	16.7	0	60	0.001
	2	16.7	0	60	0.001
Total			64	1440	1

Placing Concrete - Columns - 03 31 05.70 (0800)						
Level	Dim.	Height	Number	CY	Daily Output	Durations
6	24" x 24"	18	18.00	48.00	92	0.17
5	24" x 24"	16	18.00	42.67	92	0.38
4	24" x 24"	16	17.00	40.30	92	0.52
3	24" x 24"	16	20.00	47.41	92	0.44
2	24" x 24"	18	13.00	34.67	92	0.46
1	24" x 24"	18	6.00	16.00	92	0.52
Total				229	552	3

Placing Concrete - Slab and Drop Panel - 03 31 05.70 (1500)									
Level	Slab S.F.	Slab Thick. (ft)	Drop Panel S.F.	Drop Panel Thick. (ft)	Shallow Beam S.F.	Shallow Beam Thick.	CY	Daily Output	Durations
Lower Roof	10738	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	336.70	160	2.10
6	8885	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	279.53	160	1.75
5	8885	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	279.53	160	1.75
4	11448	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	358.63	160	2.24
3	11448	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	358.63	160	2.24
2	8967	0.83	49	0.5	355.6	0.33	282.06	160	1.76
Total							1895	960	12

Reinforcement Bars - Beams - 03 21 10. 60 (0100)			
Level	Tons	Daily Output	Durations
Lower Roof	10.2	1.6	6.4
6	10.2	1.6	6.4
5	10.0	1.6	6.2
4	9	1.6	5.9
3	9	1.6	5.9
2	9	1.6	5.9
Total		9.6	3.7

Reinforcement Bars - Columns - 03 21 10. 60 (0250)					
Level	Height	Number	Tons	Daily Output	Durations
Lower Roof	18	18	3	2.3	0.5
6	16	18	3	2.3	1.1
5	16	17	3	2.3	1.5
4	16	20	3	2.3	1.3
3	18	13	2	2.3	1.3
2	18	6	1	2.3	1.5
Total			16.5	13.8	8

Reinforcement Bars - Slabs - 03 21 10. 60 (0400)			
Level	Tons	Daily Output	Durations
Lower Roof	12.3	2.9	3.5
6	10.2	2.9	4.5
5	10.2	2.9	4.5
4	13.1	2.9	3.5
3	13.1	2.9	3.5
2	10.2	2.9	4.3
Total		17.4	24