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General Information

Building Type: Hospital
Building Size: 600,000 SF
Height: 135 ft
Construction: July 2009-July2012
Cost: $\$ 400$ million
Delivery: Design-Bid-Build

## Architecture

- 85-bed tower and outpatient center
- Glass curtain walls dominate the majority of the façade.
- Other materials include metal and terracotta panels.
- Main features of the building: curved curtain wall, deep canopies, and green roofs


## Structure

- Concrete spread footings placed on improved soils
- Framing system consists of concrete columns and beams
- 12-14" elevated two-way flat slab with drop panels
- Lateral system comprises of shear walls located in elevator core and stairways


## MEP

Nemours Children's Hospital as a part of The Nemours Foundation gains power from the Central Energy Plant (CEP) attached to the hospital. The CEP contains the main electrical and mechanical distribution systems, except for the AHUs.

## CEP

- Three 1300 ton dual cell cooling towers
- Three 1300 ton centrifugal chillers
- Three water tube boilers
- Main and 15 kV chiller source transfer switching
- Four 2250 kW generators


## Hospital

- Thirty-two AHUs located on the 1st floor mezzanine or 7th floor mechanical room.
- Mix use of VAV and CV boxes


## Project Team

Owner: The Nemours Foundation
CM/GC: Skanska USA Building
Architects: Stanley Beaman \& Sears
Perkins + Will
Engineers: (Civil) Harris Civil Engineers
(Structural) Simpson, Gumpertz \& Heger
(Landscape Architect) AECOM
(MEP\&T) TLC Engineering for Architecture
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## Executive Summary:

Nemours Children's Hospital as a part of The Nemours Foundation (NCHTNF) is a 7-story building located in Orlando, Florida. The entire complex consists of a hospital, clinic, loading dock data center, central energy plant (CEP), and parking facility. The 600,000 square foot hospital consists of two components: a bed tower and outpatient center. The combined components will provide 85 beds, emergency department, diagnostics and ambulatory programs, educational and research centers, and an outpatient clinic. Stanley Beaman \& Sears and Perkins + Will are the architects of the project. Harris Civil Engineers, Simpson Gumpertz \& Heger, AECOM, and TLC Engineering for Architecture are responsible for the engineering design of NCHTNF. Skanska USA Building is acting as the construction manager and general contractor of the design-bid-build project, which is scheduled to be completed July 2012 after ground was broken July 2009.

This thesis focuses on redesigning the lateral system using concrete moment frames instead of the current concrete shear walls. The existing structure uses 157 mph design wind speed, far surpassing the minimum code level. This lateral analysis studies if concrete moment frames are feasible for 110 mph , the minimum design wind speed for Orlando, in addition to the 157 mph case. Pending a practical design, concrete moment frames create an open floor plan by eliminating shear walls. These changes alter the weight of the building, so the foundation needs to be reevaluated.

Additionally, a flat plate system is considered rather than the current flat slab. Flat plate designs eliminate drop panels and column capitals, thus producing a more cost effective slab system with a reduction of formwork. The slab-column connections require detailed analyses to determine if the connection can withstand the moment transfer and applied shear. If the slab-column connections cannot carry the load, solutions are presented and studied to mitigate the moment transfer.

In addition to the lateral and floor system redesign, two breadth topics are explored. One topic is a daylighting study of the sun management of a south facing façade. This determines if the current louvers can adequately control the sun. Additionally, an alternative interior sun control system is presented. The second breath topic examines the structural system of the façade, for both constructability and maintainability. An aluminum mullion design is presented as an alternate to the current silicone structural sealant; comparisons of advantages and disadvantages of each drive the final decision.

## Building Introduction:

NCHTNF is a 7-story building located in Orlando, Florida, shown in Figure 1. The entire complex consists of a hospital, clinic, loading dock data center, central energy plant (CEP), and parking facility. The 600,000 square foot hospital consists of two components: a bed tower and outpatient center. The combined components will provide 85 beds, emergency department, diagnostics and ambulatory programs, educational and research centers, and an outpatient clinic. Stanly Beaman \& Sears and Perkins + Will are the architects of the project. Harris Civil Engineers, Simpson Gumpertz \& Heger, AECOM, and TLC Engineering for Architecture are responsible for the engineering design of NCHTNF. Skanska USA


Figure 1 - Location of NCHTNF. Courtesy The Nemours Foundation. Building is acting as the construction manager and general contractor of the design-bid-build project, which is scheduled to be completed July 2012 after ground was broken July 2009.


Figure 2 - Nemours Children's Hospital as a part of The Nemours Foundation. Courtesy The Nemours Foundation.

The design of this $\$ 400$ million building uses 2007 Florida Building Code with 2009 updates. The Florida Building Code is based on the International Building Code and subsidiary related codes. The building is classified as $\mathrm{I}-2$ while the clinic can be considered business class, the hospital is industrial because of overnight patients, thus making the entire project industrial. The site is an undeveloped parcel of land that underwent clearing and mass grading to reach its current topography. The site location does not have any restrictions presiding over the NCHTNF's design.

The primary structure is concrete with curtain walls dominating the majority of the façade. The glass curtain walls vary between metal sunscreen systems, fritt patterns, and insulated spandrels. Other building materials include ribbed metal panel system, terracotta tile wall system, terrazzo wall panels, and composite metal panels to complement the glass systems in the curtain walls. A curved curtain wall, deep canopies, and two green roof gardens provide additional architectural features to the building design.

NCHTNF is designed to withstand the effects of a category 3 hurricane using 157 mph design wind speed. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, describes a category 3 hurricane as an event where devastating damage will occur, resulting in injury and death. The Nemours Foundation wants NCHTNF to be listed as a place of refuge, more technically known as an Enhanced Hurricane Protection Area, during a category 3 hurricane. This requires the building's design to at least meet NOAA's classification of a category 3 hurricane, having sustained winds of $110-130 \mathrm{mph}$. To qualify as an Enhanced Hurricane Protection Area, the hospital is designed to these standards with a factor of safety.

The building envelope's design is more complex than most to meet the Enhanced Hurricane Protection Area standards. The modular curtain wall, constructed by Trainor, is designed with 30,000 feet of dual sealant joints to allow weeping between the two joints. A probe test is specified to be conducted after the sealant has cured to ensure the joint is working properly. The north side of the building features a curved curtain wall supported by slanted structural columns. The deep canopies and fritt pattern glass, acting as sun shading devices to provide adequate shading


Figure 3 - Installation of Sun shading Device. Courtesy SGH. from the Florida sun, are prevalent throughout the building. An example of the one of the sun shading devices is shown in Figure 3. NCHTNF incorporates several different roofing systems to accommodate different functions of the roof. A fluid-applied membrane acts as the roofing system for the patient accessible roof gardens. Thermoplastic membrane roofing and SBS-modified bituminous membrane roofing comprise the other roofs on the building. A lab in Florida tested a mock-up of NCHTNF against conditions generated by a category 3 hurricane. A 2-story 10-bay mock-up is required to pass various tests to ensure the building envelope will be able to sustain the effects of a category 3 hurricane. Laminated glass and extensive use of roof fasteners help the building envelope meet the standards of the hurricane test.

The design of NCHTNF follows the USGBC's LEED prerequisites and credits needed for certification based on LEED for New Construction 2.2. The building has two green roof gardens on the second and fourth floor roofs as mentioned in the paragraph above. The green roofs double as outdoor gardens for patients as well as sustainability features for the building. NCHTNF has numerous sunshades to block the sun from the vast glass façades. Deep canopies provide shade for large spaces on the south façade of the building. The building's design implements Fritt pattern and insulated spandrel glass systems. These devices block some of the intense Florida sun to lessen the load on the HVAC system of the building.

## Structural Overview:

NCHTNF bears on spread footings on either improved or natural soils, shown in Figure 4. The hospital and clinic portion of the building predominately consist of reinforced concrete, with the exception of steel framed mechanical penthouses. The loading dock data center and central energy plant are primarily steel framed structures. The lateral system is comprised of shear walls, most of which continue through the entire building height. NCHTNF uses unusual framing techniques for the wave and sloped curtain wall backup.


Figure 4 - Foundation Plan of NCHTNF. Courtesy SGH.

## Foundation:

PSI, the geotechnical firm, performed nineteen borings across the site in January 2009. The soils generally consist of varying types of fine sands graded relatively clean to slightly silty in composition. The boring blow counts record the upper layers of sand to be of medium dense condition, while the lower layers of sand are generally loose to medium dense condition.

PSI recommends utilizing shallow foundations only if the foundation design implements soil improvement to increase the allowable bearing capacity used in the design. PSI proposes another foundation solution, if soil improvement is not desirable implement a pile foundation system. These reinforced augercast piles withstand considerably higher foundation loads than the shallow foundation system. The downside of augercast piles are they can bulge or neck where very loose soils are encountered, requiring stringent monitoring and quality control. Due to the specialized nature of the augercast piles for this project, spread footings with soil improvement is chosen as the foundation system for the NCHTNF.

Additionally, the water table is measured only 4 feet below the surface raises concerns about excavations. The sump system dewaters shallow excavations while deeper excavations require well-pointing or horizontal sock drains for proper dewatering.

## Floor System:

NCHTNF has numerous types of floor construction due to different design requirements in different sections of the building. The building contains $5^{\prime \prime}-6$ " normal weight concrete as the slab on grade. A few sections of the foundation system utilize mat foundations, varying from 2' to $4^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$ normal weight concrete. The hospital and clinic are built with normal weight elevated two-way flat slabs, with and without drop panels, varying in depth from 9"-14". A typical structural floor plan detailing a typical $30^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}$ bay is shown in Figures 5 and 6. The loading dock data center and central energy plant are constructed with a 4-1/2" 1-way slab on $3^{\prime \prime}-20$ GA. composite metal deck, which is supported by a steel frame system. Some specialty areas, such as the green roof and the slab over the lecture hall, vary slightly from the typical slab in the remainder of the building.

There are 29 different concrete beam sizes in the NCHTNF. The beams range from $16^{\prime \prime} \times 20^{\prime \prime}$ to $89^{\prime \prime} \times 48^{\prime \prime}$. The hospital and clinic predominately consist of $15^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}$ bays with a few $15^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}$ and $30^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}$ bays to accommodate for the elevator and stair core. The bays in the loading dock data center are irregular. They vary from the smallest being $21^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$ to the largest being $30^{\prime}$ $x 45^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$. The central energy plant also has a variety of bay sizes, ranging from $22^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ to $22^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}-7$ ".


Figure 5 - Level 1 Typical Structural Bay ( $3 \times$ x30') Key Plan. Courtesy SGH.


Figure 6 - Level 1 Typical Structural Bay ( $30^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}$ ). Courtesy SGH.

## Framing System:

The columns supporting the NCHTNF are mostly reinforced concrete columns. Steel columns support the mechanical penthouse on the $7^{\text {th }}$ floor. The concrete columns supporting the hospital and clinic typically start at a dimension of $30^{\prime \prime} \times 30^{\prime \prime}$ and taper to $22^{\prime \prime} \times 22^{\prime \prime}$ by Level 6 . The mechanical penthouse is constructed with $\mathrm{W} 12 \times 53$ columns on both the hospital and clinic. W14x109, W10x49, W10x60, and W14x68 mainly support the loading dock data center. HSS8x8 and HSS12x8 dominate the central energy plant's supporting structure along with a few W12x65 and W12x79 columns.

## Lateral System:

Shear walls resist lateral loads in the hospital and clinic of the NCHTNF. These walls are 12-14" thick and tie into mat foundations with dowels matching the typical wall reinforcement, mostly \#8 bars. The shear walls are located in the elevator/stair core in the hospital and in the elevator bays and lecture hall in the clinic, which are highlighted below in green in Figure 7. Also, the central energy plant has one shear wall, the rest of the lateral system of the CEP being braced framing which, discussed in the next paragraph. A few shear walls include knockout panels to plan for future openings.


Figure $\mathbf{7}$ - Level 1 Structural Floor Plan Highlighting the Lateral System. Courtesy SGH.

Steel concentrically braced frames resist lateral loads in the loading dock data center and central energy plant, highlighted above in orange in Figure 7. Diagonal members, HSS6x6 and HSS5x5, brace into W14, W16, and W21 beams in the loading dock data center. Diagonal members, HSS8x8 and HSS8x8, brace into W18 and W21 beams respectively in the central energy plant. As mentioned above, the central energy plant has one shear wall along with the steel concentrically braced frame system. The loading dock data center and CEP will not be analyzed in this report.

The load path in NCHTNF starts with the wind load against the façade of the building. Once the load is applied to the façade it is transferred to the diaphragms on each floor. The diaphragms then transfer the load to the lateral elements, being reinforced concrete shear walls in the hospital and clinic and steel concentrically braced frames in the loading dock data center and CEP. These lateral elements transfer the load to the foundation system, the final step of the load path of NCHTNF.

## Roof System:

NCHTNF has several different roofing systems to accommodate different functions of the roof. A fluid-applied membrane acts as the roofing system for the roof garden that is accessible to patients and also doubles as a green roof. The fluid-applied membrane utilizes type IV extruded polystyrene board insulation. The other roofs on the building are constructed with thermoplastic membrane roofing and SBS-modified bituminous membrane roofing. Each of these roofs use polyisocyanurate board insulation, which is type II glass fiber mat facer. The other roofing system is $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}-18 \mathrm{GA}$. metal roof deck, located on the loading deck data center, central energy plant, and mechanical penthouses on the $7^{\text {th }}$ floor.


Figure 8 - Green Roof Rendering. Courtesy SGH.


Figure 9 - Green Roof Rendering. Courtesy SGH.

## Thesis Objective:

## Structural Analysis and Design:

## Problem Statement:

A primary design principle of NCHTNF is remembering the structure is first and foremost a children's hospital. The importance of an open floor plan is paramount, seeing as the goal is to not make the patients feel confined in the hospital. NCHTNF current design uses 39 shear walls for the lateral force resisting system. The central core in the hospital, where the majority of shear walls are located, has limited floor space due to the placement of shear walls, highlighted in figures $11 \& 13$. Similarly, floor space is limited in a portion of the clinic due to shear walls shown in figures $10 \& 12$. Additionally, the shear walls require coordination with MEP systems to provide penetrations for ducts and conduit passing through the walls without losing structural integrity of the wall.


Figure 10-3D Hospital ETABS Model


Figure 12-3D Clinic ETABS Model


Figure 11 - First Floor Hospital ETABS Model


Figure 13 - First Floor Clinic ETABS Model

The design of typical hospitals strives to have large floor to ceiling heights. The more vertical space provided allows for a less complicated coordination in the ceiling plenum. NCHTNF currently uses a flat slab floor system. This allows the slab to be supported without beams or girders, which results in higher floor to ceiling heights. These higher clearances provide more space for MEP equipment, which eases the coordination process. On the contrary, drop panels require additional time to construct because the construction process requires more formwork than with a two-way flat plate system.

## Problem Solution:

The lateral system of NCHTNF will be redesigned using concrete moment frames. This reduces the number of shear walls in the building, which creates a more open floor plan. A study to determine whether the moment frames can be integrated within the slab depth, which might require changing the slab thickness, will be performed. The floor system is analyzed as a flat plate system in efforts to keep the high floor to ceiling heights and remove the need for drop panels. Removing the drop panels from the floor design may reduce construction time and cost because the formwork for the drop panels will not be required.

In addition to analyzing the proposed lateral system redesign using the existing 157 mph design wind speed, the minimum required code wind speed of 110 mph is studied too. These analyses focus on the feasibility of implementing concrete moment frames as the lateral system. Also, using the 110 mph can be justified as an adequate design wind speed for an Enhanced Hurricane Protected Area based on historical max wind speed data.

The lateral and floor systems changes result in a reduction in the overall weight of the building. The foundation of the building needs to be analyzed to determine if either the bearing force or overturning moment have been exceeded with the change in weight. Gravity members require evaluation to determine if they need a redesign with the combination of lateral and gravity loads. Additionally, a model of the building needs to be constructed to check drift limitations and torsion with the adjusted lateral system.

## Design Goals:

The overall design goal of this project is to design a lateral system producing a more flexible architectural layout. An additional underlying theme is reducing the current design wind load on the building, while still meeting the Enhanced Hurricane Protection Area standards mentioned in the introduction of this report. Other goals to be met throughout this project include:

- Do not decrease the amount of useable space per floor
- Eliminate the need for drop panels, which require supplementary formwork
- Analyze the feasibility of concrete moments by hand, Structure Point, SAP, and ETABS
- Evaluate non-structural systems affected by designing the building to withstand a hurricane, such as the façade louvers and structural sealant.


## Breadth Studies:

The façade of the building is predominately glass, as per the owner's request. An analysis of the sun shading system, consisting of specifically calculated size louvers, studies the existing control of the sun's exposure into the building. The analysis centers on studying the year-round daylighting of the building in an effort to maximize the performance of the glass wall system. An alternative sun controlling device is presented regardless of the outcome of the analysis of the current system.


Figure 14 - NCHTNF East Façade. Courtesy SGH.

The other study examines the efficiency of the sealant of the current façade, a section view of the façade is shown in Figure 14. An alternate façade structural system is investigated to compare efficiency of each system. The focus on waterproofing the building, seeing as one of the design focuses is making the building hurricane proof, determines the final choice of design. The new system considers the effects of thermal, air, and moisture infiltration along with the life cycle cost of the wall system.

## MAE Requirements:

The MAE requirement for this report is met by modeling NCHTNF in ETABS. Generating computer models in various structural analysis programs is the curriculum of AE 597A - Computer Modeling of Buildings. This class explains how to manipulate building models, within structural analysis computer programs, and study the given results. Additionally, the MAE requirement is met with incorporating course material from AE 542 - Building Enclosure Science and Design. This course studies design and analysis of building façades, which applies to NCHTNF.

## Structural Analysis and Design:

## Introduction:

## Concrete Moment Frames:

Concrete moment frames with a flat plate slab are analyzed as an alternative to the current shear wall system in NCHTNF. Moment frames are feasible when the building is below 8-10 stories, which NCHTNF's 8 story height falls within the requirement ${ }^{1}$. The moment frames give the floor plan flexibility for layout and ease MEP coordination by eliminating cumbersome shear walls. Designing and modeling moment frames with the proposed slab-column connections is a subject that has not been completely developed. Much of this design process combines of a variety of ideas from different research papers and textbooks.

Gravity and lateral loads need to be simultaneously analyzed when designing a slab-column moment frame. Since, flat plate system designs primarily focus on solely resisting gravity loads, many researchers study if a flat plate can withstand combined lateral and gravity loads. The main issue is overestimating the lateral stiffness of the slab-column frame during the design process, which underestimates the lateral deflections ${ }^{2}$. $\beta$, the cracked stiffness modifier, is a point of disagreement between researchers because this modifier has been assigned a range of values. The modifier helps negate the overestimation of lateral stiffness, giving reason to why it has not received an exact value. Figure 15 shows the given range of $\beta$ values. In regards to slab-column connections, many researchers have decided on their own specific value of $\beta$. For example, Wight and MacGregor suggest using $\beta=0.33$ for both interior and exterior connections as well as positive and negative sections. Other designers might disagree and suggest applying $\beta=0.5$ for positive bending regions and $\beta=0.33$ for negative bending regions. For this analysis, $\beta=0.33$ is used throughout, which is described in more detail in the modeling section ${ }^{3}$.


Figure 15 - Alpha and Beta Values for Slab-Column Connections. Courtesy Wight \& MacGregor

[^0]A slab-column connection experiences combined shear and moment transfer, so the capacity of the slab needs to be evaluated accordingly. The moment transfer is partially transferred by flexure with the remainder by shear; this is explained during the lateral system design section. The shear capacity must exceed that of the amount being transferred and if not, there are feasible solutions ${ }^{4}$. Examples being, the slab can be made deeper or expanding the cross section of a column increases the shear capacity of the slab-beam and decrease the shear and moment transfer. Also, stud rails, interior beams, and edge beams can be employed to mitigate the shear and moment transfer problem.

Equivalent Frame Method is commonly used for analysis of a flat plate structure subject to lateral loads. Of course finite element analysis is preferred, but this method gives a good base reference to compare a design to ${ }^{5}$. One drawback to equivalent frame method is the difficulty of applying it to buildings with openings in the slab. Slab openings are ignored in this analysis to simplify calculations. Additionally, some researchers believe the Effective Beam Width Method is more accurate than the Equivalent Frame Method when analyzing lateral loads on a flat plate system. According to research, Equivalent Frame Method may not produce accurate slab moments and lateral deflections while Equivalent Beam Width Method produces satisfactory results ${ }^{6}$.

[^1]
## Hurricane Design:

As mentioned earlier in this report, NCHTNF is designed using 157 mph wind speed. This wind speed represents a category 3 hurricane, which has the possibility of creating catastrophic building failure, with a factor of safety. ASCE 7-05 requires NCHTNF to be built using a minimum of 110 mph design wind speed, so the chosen design wind speed far exceeds the code ${ }^{7}$. Appendix A shows the wind load calculations used for the 110 mph design speed. The orange star represents Orlando, which is within the green line, representing 110 mph design wind speed, shown in Figure 16. The reasoning of designing NCHTNF for 157 mph is The Nemours Foundation wants the building to be an area of refuge for the event of a hurricane crossing over Orlando. Besides the increased wind speed, no other considerations are taken into account to make NCHTNF an area of refuge.


Figure 16 - Design Wind Speeds. Courtesy ASCE 7-05.

[^2]Research has shown in a 56 year data gathering time period, 79 mph is the highest recorded wind speed in Orlando, reference Figure $17^{8}$. Even though hurricanes make landfall in Florida, their winds dissipate once they reach inland Orlando. Seeing as the probability of experiencing 157 mph is extremely low, this thesis focuses using the 110 mph design wind speed instead of 157 mph . Additionally, calculations determine whether concrete moment frames can be designed using 157 mph design wind speed.

| Florida | YRS | JAN |  | FEB |  | MAR |  | APR |  | MAY |  | JUN |  | JUL |  | AUG |  | SEP |  | OCT |  | NOV |  | DEC |  | ANN |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | DR | SP | DR | SP | DR | SP | DR | SP | DR | SP | DR | SP | DR | SP | DR | SP | DR | SP | DR | SP | DR | SP | DR | SP | DR | SP |
| APALACHICOLA, FL | 48 | E | 48 | E | 42 | E | 54 | SE | 51 | SE | 47 | E | 55 | N | 63 | NE | 59 | E | 67 | NW | 56 | SE | 47 | SE | 42 | E | 67 |
| DAYTONA BEACH, FL | 57 | 26 | 43 | 20 | 44 | 24 | 58 | 18 | 46 | 22 | 48 | 33 | 40 | 34 | 43 | 15 | 69 | 11 | 58 | 5 | 53 | 50 | 39 | 34 | 40 | 15 | 69 |
| FORT MYERS, FL | 54 | 25 | 40 | 25 | 39 | 35 | 46 | 20 | 39 | 32 | 44 | 31 | 48 | 18 | 45 | 14 | 50 | 5 | 92 | 35 | 62 | 30 | 32 | 33 | 35 | 5 | 92 |
| JACKSONVILLE, FL | 25 | 30 | 38 | 30 | 39 | 22 | 44 | 32 | 46 | 29 | 34 | 28 | 39 | 26 | 57 | 11 | 38 | 80 | 46 | 21 | 31 | 33 | 38 | 31 | 40 | 26 | 57 |
| KEY WEST, FL | 29 | 27 | 41 | 12 | 57 | 22 | 54 | 1 | 58 | 13 | 46 | 18 | 40 | 12 | 61 | 18 | 61 | 12 | 62 | 15 | 71 | 12 | 47 | 26 | 39 | 15 | 71 |
| MIAMI, FL | 48 | 24 | 46 | 19 | 55 | 4 | 46 | 24 | 35 | 32 | 52 | 13 | 37 | 25 | 43 | 12 | 86 | 6 | 69 | 15 | 69 | 7 | 38 | 32 | 38 | 12 | 86 |
| ORLANDO, FL | 56 | 25 | 42 | 25 | 46 | 24 | 46 | 2 | 50 | 35 | 51 | 32 | 64 | 14 | 46 | 12 | 79 | 60 | 61 | 5 | 48 | 26 | 46 | 20 | 35 | 12 | 79 |
| PENSACOLA, FL | 33 | 31 | 40 | 13 | 40 | 16 | 39 | 33 | 43 | 12 | 39 | 29 | 46 | 27 | 76 | 14 | 56 | 12 | 77 | 22 | 39 | 21 | 35 | 20 | 36 | 12 | 77 |
| TALLAHASSEE, FL | 46 | 23 | 46 | 9 | 40 | 27 | 48 | 19 | 35 | 29 | 40 | 3 | 44 | 22 | 39 | 2 | 58 | 8 | 46 | 20 | 32 | 16 | 40 | 28 | 37 | 2 | 58 |
| TAMPA, FL | 53 | 32 | 44 | 32 | 50 | 29 | 43 | 28 | 44 | 36 | 46 | 31 | 67 | 32 | 58 | 11 | 38 | 34 | 56 | 21 | 40 | 25 | 40 | 36 | 45 | 31 | 67 |
| WEST PALM BEACH, FL | 56 | 29 | 48 | 11 | 48 | 27 | 51 | 32 | 55 | 27 | 45 | 9 | 71 | 34 | 46 | 13 | 86 | 26 | 64 | 13 | 83 | 10 | 39 | 36 | 38 | 13 | 86 |

Figure 17 - Florida Max Wind Speeds. Courtesy SERCC.

[^3]Design Codes:
The standards and codes of this structural analysis and design are the same used with the original design of NCHTNF:

| Design Codes |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Code | Description |
| Florida Building Code 2007* | With 2009 Updates |
| Florida Statutes 471 \&553 | Main Hospital/Clinic, CEP, \& Loading Dock <br> Data Center are all considered "Threshold <br> Buildings"* |
| ASCE/SEI 7-05 | Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and <br> Other Structures |
| AISC 360-05 | Specifications for Structural Steel Buildings |
| AISC | Code of Standard Practice |
| AWS D1.1 | Structural Welding Code - Steel |
| ACI | $301-$ Specification for Structural Concrete |
| ACI | $302-$ Concrete Floor and Slab Construction |
|  | $318-$ General Design of Reinforced Concrete |
|  | Not Otherwise Specified |
|  |  |

Figure 18 - Standards and Codes used in Design

[^4]The chart below lists the structural materials used in the design for NCHTNF:

| Material Properties |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Material |  | Strength |
| Steel | Grade | $\mathrm{fy}=\mathrm{ksi}$ |
| Wide Flange Shapes | A992 | 50 |
| Hollow Structural Shapes | A500, GR. B | 45 |
| Plates | A36 | 36 |
| Angles | A36 | 36 |
| Reinforcing Steel | A615 | 60 |
| Welded Wire Reinforcement | A497 | N/A |
| Welding Electrodes | E70XX | 70 |
| Concrete | Weight (pcf) | $\mathrm{f}^{\prime} \mathrm{c}=\mathrm{psi}$ |
| Footings/Mat Foundation | 145 | 4,000 |
| Foundation Piers | 145 | 4,000 |
| Foundation Walls $\leq 5^{\prime}$ Tall | 145 | 4,000 |
| Foundation Walls $>5^{\prime}$ Tall | 145 | 5,000 |
| Slab-On-Grade | 145 | 4,000 |
| Elevated Slabs | 145 | 5,000 |
| Columns | 145 | 6,000 |
| Shear Walls | 145 | 5,000 |
| Beams | 145 | 5,000 |
| Concrete On Metal Deck | 145 | 4,000 |
| Masonry | Grade | Strength $=$ ksi |
| Concrete Masonry Units | C90 | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{y}}=2.8$ |
| Mortar | C270, Type S | $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}{ }_{\mathrm{m}}=1.8$ |

Figure 19 - Material Properties Used in Design

## Lateral Design:

## Portal Method:

The portal method estimates forces in members of laterally loaded multistory frames. The design process is based on a few assumptions ${ }^{9}$ :

- Shears in the interior columns are twice as large as the shears in the exterior columns
- A point of inflection occurs at mid-height of each column
- A point of inflection occurs at mid-span of each girder


Figure 20 - Level 1 Structural Floor Plan Highlighting the Expansion Joint and Frames Analyzed. Courtesy SGH.

As mentioned before, NCHTNF is split into two different buildings for analysis purposes at the expansion joint, reference Figure 20. A "worst case scenario" frame is analyzed in each direction for both the hospital and clinic, shown in Figure 20 highlighted in dark grey. These frames are not standardized in height, so further assumptions are taken when performing the portal method. These assumptions modify the given assumptions to fit NCHTNF's irregular frames. The distribution factors applied to each column reflect an estimate of the stiffness of the individual assembly. These rough estimates are solely based on the geometry of the frames. Lateral forces resulting from 157 mph determined in Technical Report III are used for this lateral analysis. Lateral forces due to 110 mph design wind speed are determined using the same techniques used in Technical Report III, sample calculations found in Appendix A. The columns experience small axial loads due to the irregularity in height, but this is assumed as 0 kips because the axial load values are negligible. The portal frame analysis encompasses studying the frames with the loading for both 157 mph and 110 mph , sample calculations located in Appendix B. Even though this analysis is purely a lateral study, it provides an approximation to give a base point to start designing the columns and slab.

[^5]
## Moment Transfer:

The transfer of moment from the column to the slab governs the design of slab-column connection. This ultimately determines if a slab has the capacity to withstand the transfer or if other solutions, such as stud rails or edge beams, are necessary.


Figure 21 - Flexure Transfer Fraction Equation. Courtesy Wight \& MacGregor.

ACl 318-08 section 13.5 .3 states when a gravity load and lateral forces cause transfer of moment between slab and column, a fraction of the unbalanced moment shall be transferred by flexure ${ }^{10}$. A fraction of the unbalanced moment, which this moment is calculated using the portal method, is considered to transfer by flexure within the effective beam width. The fraction transferred by flexure is calculated using the equation in Figure 21. Then, multiplying the fraction by the unbalanced moment determines the moment transferred by flexure, the rest being transferred by shear. Sample calculations can be found in Appendix C.

From this point, all the shear acting on the slab is calculated to determine if it exceeds the shear capacity of the effective slab beam. Appendix $D$ shows the complete steps determining the total shear. Cells highlighted in red have exceeded $4 \sqrt{ } \mathrm{ff}^{\prime} \mathrm{c}$, meaning the slab-column connection cannot carry the moment transfer. This calculation determines the concrete moment frames with flat plate system is only applicable in certain areas of the building. The failed connections will need additional resistance for the applied shear.

Additionally, the 157 mph wind load case analysis stops at this point. Three out of four of the frames have the first three floors completely failing when the total shear is compared to the shear capacity. In conclusion, concrete moment frames are not a feasible choice for 157 mph wind load with NCHTNF.

[^6]
## Shear Solutions:

There are many solutions to increase the shear capacity of the connection or decrease the transfer of moments. One simple solution is increase the size of columns, but the NCHTNF columns are already sufficiently large. Increasing the slab depth increases the shear capacity, but the slab is already $12^{\prime \prime}$ and a deeper slab is not feasible. Drop panels and column capitals help the moment transfer without requiring interior beams. This solution is not practical because the existing slab system already employs drop panels, which one of the goals of this thesis is removing these. Another solution is using stud rails at the slab-column connection. This adds shear capacity without adding additional concrete to the system. One last system is designing edge beams. The edge beams directly address the issue of inefficient shear capacity at the exterior slab-column connections without completely disrupting the open floor to ceiling heights. This thesis studies both stud rails and edge beams, which are both feasible solutions.

Specifically for slab-column connections, stud rails consist of rows of vertical studs attached to a plate on the top end, as shown in Figure 22. The shear studs rails are placed at the corner of columns and protrude out perpendicularly into the slab from this point ${ }^{11}$. ACI Chapter 11 states shear studs are capable of resisting shear and some moment ${ }^{12}$. Stud rails are only effective if their shear capacity is less than the shear being mitigated, which is the case for NCHTNF. The shear studs will require less formwork than the edge beams while still providing enough shear capacity for the slab-column connections. Sample calculations can be found in Appendix G.


Figure 22 - Example of Stud Rail Layout. Courtesy Wight \& MacGregor.

[^7]Edge beams help diminish the shear transfer between the slab-column connection, see Appendix $H$ for an edge beam design. These concrete beams increase the stiffness at the perimeter of the building, which in turn alleviates a lot of the shear stress from the interior connections. Stiffening of the structure helps the deflection, which is needed because the calculated deflections surpass the code limits; discussed in detail in the ETABS Models section. This method also solves the shear capacity issue, but potentially creates another issue at the same time. Making the outer columns stiffer also makes the inner columns more obsolete. The shear is mitigated, but the outer frames need to be reanalyzed with the new stiffness to determine if they can carry the load. This would make an interesting study to determine if NCHTNF could be designed with edge beams and perimeter concrete moment frames, but time did not permit this study.

## Structure Point Models:

Structure Point is a program analyzing column and slab designs for individual stories of a building under the assumption that the columns are fixed-fixed, as shown in Figure 23. The fixed condition forces the program to only analyze gravity loads, not a combination of lateral and gravity loads. Similar to the portal frame analysis, the Structure Point models provide a benchmark design for the concrete moment frames. Additionally, Structure Point takes into account changes in moment of inertia throughout the length of the slab. This is an advantage


Figure 23 - Example of end conditions in Structure Point Models. Courtesy Wight \& MacGregor. because programs like SAP and ETABS do not automatically compute calculations with the changed moment of inertia values. In conclusion, column dimensions, slab depth, and rebar sizing are determined using Structure Point. These results are used in SAP and ETABS models, which are discussed in the upcoming sections.

## SAP Models:

Unlike Structure Point, SAP allows models to be studied under combined lateral and gravity loads. Also, SAP is beneficial for studying two dimensional frames instead of studying the entire building. It is advantageous to create a frame of reference to check the complete building model with. Additionally, SAP provides the means to manually inserting changes in the moment of inertia in the slab. Three elements are drawn and connected by two link elements to model the change in moment of inertia, shown in Figures 24 and 25.


Figure 24 - SAP Model of Frame
Figure 25 - SAP Model Detail of Link Elements

The two outer pieces represent the effective moment of inertia, which is determined from Figure 15. The inner piece represents the typical modified moment of inertia of the slab ${ }^{13}$. The link elements show the computer program the three line elements need to act as one while exhibiting different properties. The slab is modeled as the effective beam width to represent the portion of the slab that exhibits beam-like tendencies. A further explanation of the effective beam width theory can be found in the structural analysis and design introduction. Also, the lateral loads applied to the frame are determined based on an assumption. Due to symmetry, it is assumed the lateral loads distribute evenly to each frame. So a fraction of the total lateral load is applied to this frame. This assumption can be verified in ETABS with a complete building analysis, which is discussed in the next section.

[^8]|  | Int. Column |  | Ext. Column |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Moment (ft-k) | Shear (k) | Moment (ft-k) | Shear (k) |
| Excel | 1013 | 135 | 506 | 68 |
| SAP | 1643 | 110 | 290 | 20 |

Figure 26 - Comparison of Calculated Versus Computer Generated Values

The SAP moment and shear outputs, as shown in Figure 26, are comparable to those from the Excel calculations. These numbers further verify the need for additional shear capacity, as was discussed earlier in this report. The moment outputs for the columns are within the interactions diagrams, diagrams located in Appendix E. Additionally, a slab capacity check can be found in Appendix F. Also, the SAP story displacements are within the code limits, see Figure 27. The ETABS deflections are not within the code limits; this will be discussed in the EATBS section. This analysis verifies the Excel calculations and also provides a check for the ETABS model.

|  | Deflections |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SAP (in) | ETABS (in) |
| Story 6 | 2.92 | 3.38 |
| Story 5 | 2.50 | 3.21 |
| Story | 1.99 | 2.93 |
| Story 3 | 1.46 | 2.52 |
| Story 2 | 0.93 | 1.98 |
| Story 1 | 0.41 | 0.87 |
|  | Code Limit | 2.93 |

Figure 27 - Frame and Building Deflections

## ETABS Models:

The clinic portion of NCHTNF is modeled as a three dimensional structure in ETABS. This model includes all lateral resisting structural elements in the building as designed. Analysis assumptions included in the ETABS model include, but are not limited to:

- Rigid diaphragms modeled at each floor
- Structural members modeled with specific material property
- Wind loads are applied at the center of pressure
- Columns and the slab effective beam width are modeled as line elements
- Slab is also modeled as a shell element
- All restraints at the ground level are pinned

As an initial study, two ETABS models are created to compare the outputs of modeling the slab as a shell element with line elements representing the effective beam width of the slab (nonshell) and modeling the slab only as a shell element (shell), Figures 28 and 29 respectively. Additionally, each floor system is assigned a rigid diaphragm to provide adequate story displacement data. After applying gravity and lateral loads, the analyses significantly differed. The displacements significantly contrasted along with the moment and shear outputs. In conclusion, the non-shell model provides a more accurate representation of how NCHNF reacts to lateral and gravity loads.


The non-shell element's deflections exceed the code limitations, as shown in Figure 27, so the building needs additional stiffness. One solution is using edge beams, as was mentioned earlier in this report. The edge beams mitigate the shear capacity issues as well as make the building stiffer, resisting the lateral forces. The only issue with edge beams is the beams take the majority of the load to the perimeter of the building with the increase in stiffness, so the building needs to be reanalyzed to study placing the lateral system on the perimeter of the building.

As mentioned in the SAP section, the lateral loads are equally divided between each frame, assuming equal stiffness. To verify this assumption, take a section cut at each story and divide the story shear by the total base shear. Continue this method for each floor to determine the stiffness of the concrete moment frame. This analysis is not performed in this report due to time constraints. In conclusion, the ETABS model provides shear and moment outputs due to the gravity and lateral loads. Also, this model determines edge beams need to be installed to control the excessive deflections.

## Torsion:

Lateral loads applied to a building induce torsion when the center of pressure and the center of mass are not located at the same point. If the center of pressure is not equal with the center of mass then a moment equal to the force multiplied by the eccentricity is produced. A formal torsion calculation is not necessary due to the building and lateral system's complete symmetry.

## Foundation Check:

The critical overturning moment results in the direction with least depth, which is $90^{\prime}$ for NCHTNF. Wind loads control the design of the building, so the overturning moment is calculated using the wind forces per floor and individual heights. The resisting moment must exceed the overturning moment and is calculated by multiplying the weight of the building by the moment arm of half the width of the building. In summary, the resisting moment is much larger than the overturning moment. Figure 30 shows the calculation of both the overturning and resting moments.

The weight of the building decreases only slightly with the change from concrete moment frames to shear walls. This weight difference marginally changes the axial load on the column, which is still below the soil capacity given by the geotechnical engineer. Sample calculations can be found in Appendix I. So, the foundation does not require any redesigning due to the changes with the lateral system.

| Overturning Moments |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Story | Wind Force (k) | Elevation (ft) | Moment (k-ft) |
| 6 | 102 | 97.5 | 9,945 |
| 5 | 100 | 82.5 | 8,250 |
| 4 | 97 | 67.5 | 6,548 |
| 3 | 93 | 52.5 | 4,883 |
| 2 | 112 | 37.5 | 4,200 |
| 1 | 100 | 15 | 1,500 |
|  |  | $\Sigma$ | 35,326 |
|  |  | $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{r}}=15,700 \mathrm{kx} 45^{\prime}=$ | 706,500 |

Figure 30-Overturning and Resisting Moment Calculation

## Conclusion:

This structural analysis and design has determined concrete moment frames are not beneficial for a design wind speed of 157 mph , but can be implemented for 110 mph . A two-way flat plate system can work if the extra shear capacity is addressed by using edge beams or stud rails. The models verify the hand calculations as well as providing data on story deflections. Edge beams will have to be used to stiffen the building to prevent the current excessive deflections. An additional analysis will have to be performed to study if perimeter concrete moment frames will be able to support NCHTNF with the addition of edge beams. In conclusion, the concrete moment frames are a feasible lateral system to implement in NCHTNF.

## Daylighting Analysis:

A majority of the façades on NCHTNF are predominately glass systems. These exterior glass walls promote unfavorable heating conditions, which escalates the strain on the mechanical equipment. To solve this problem, the façade design incorporates louvers to control the sun's exposure to the building. This breadth focuses on analyzing the efficiency of the louvers for different times of day and specific days of the year on the south façade of the clinic. Additionally, a discussion about the use of sun shades instead of louvers is presented.

Daylighting a building has been a topic of discussion in the recent years with the emergence of green building. Natural light is the most sustainable source of light for interiors, promoting green building and high performance design. Another advantage is daylighting is a free source of light for a building. On the contrary, daylighting is not a reliable light source. The source of light is dependent on the time of day, season, and weather conditions. Even though this form of lighting is cheap, it is hard to control the quantity and direction. This is why many buildings use daylighting to supplement the electric lighting in an effort to balance the benefits and drawbacks of each system. An additional advantage to daylighting a building, unrelated to costs and energy savings, is positive psychological effects on the building occupants. Studies have shown providing an exterior view from a patient's recovery room increase their recovery time ${ }^{14}$. The Nemours Foundation wants a predominately glass façade building, so controlling the daylight of the building is implemented, hence the louvers.


Figure 31 - Louver Detail. Courtesy SGH.

Initially, the sun's path across NCHTNF is analytically studied using an Excel spreadsheet, found in Appendix J. The summer and winter solstices are studied because they represent the most extreme conditions of the sun's angles the building experiences. The Excel spreadsheet calculates angles showing where the sun's light passes over the building ${ }^{15}$. These sun angles are applied to the louver, louver design shown in Figure 31, to determine if it blocks the sun's light from entering the building's window. Additionally, the Excel calculations are verified with a Google SketchUp model. The model, reference Figure 32, shows the louvers adequately block the sun from the windows for only the summer solstice. Even though heat gain might not be problematic in the winter due to solar energy, the issue of glare requires attentions.

[^9]

Figure 32 - Analysis of louvers during summer and winter solstices


Figure 33 - Sun Shade Example. Courtesy lutron.com
Keeping with the theme of hurricane resistant design, the exterior louvers have the potential to become windborne debris in the event of a hurricane. Instead of using this form of passive solar shading, sun shades can be installed on the interior of the glass wall systems to block the sun's direct light. This eliminates any chance of the shading device becoming a windborne element because it is completely inside the building. An added benefit to this solution is it is


Figure 34 - Electricity Use in Office Buildings. Courtesy lutron.com.
more versatile with the integration of technology. Lutron promotes an automated shading system that adjusts its position in regards to the position of the sun and the intensity of the sun light, an example is shown in Figure 33. 43\% of a building's electricity is spent on lighting fixtures in a health care facility, see Figure 34 , which is a figure that should be strived to be reduced. The automated shades can be linked to the lighting system in the building, so the light fixtures react to the actions of the shades. If the shades rise to allow indirect sun light into the building, the lights automatically turn off ${ }^{16}$. This technologically intensive system is much more expensive than the louvers, but the versatility of the sun shading system has its advantages over louvers. Additionally, the automated sun shades are the most expensive sun shade system, so cheaper solutions are available.

[^10]
## Building Envelope Performance Analysis:

NCHTNF predominately uses silicone structural sealant with minimal aluminum mullions as the structural system for the glass façade. Ultimately this sealant is chosen because the architect does not want the distinct lines aluminum mullions create in the design of the exterior of the building. This analysis studies the multiple advantages and disadvantages of using a silicone structural sealant versus a urethane sealant or aluminum mullions. Additionally an underlying theme of constructing a façade is quality control, involving various forms of testing procedures. The testing procedures of silicone structural sealant used in the field and warehouse are outlined and compared to those of aluminum mullions. Finally, an aluminum mullion design is presented as a substitution to the existing silicone structural sealant.

## Comparison of Sealants and Mullions:



Figure 35 - Performing Probing Sealant Test. Courtesy SGH

Structural sealant typically lasts longer than urethane sealants in high UV exposure settings, which are the conditions NCHTNF experiences. Also, this sealant tends to make better bonds with metal and glass than urethane sealants. NCHTNF's façades are predominately metal and glass, making the silicone sealant much more beneficial. Furthermore, the silicone sealants are typically more watertight on day one, but of course deteriorate with time. Ultimately, SGH decided to use the silicone structural sealant for the façade design.

A disadvantage of any type of structural sealant is the detailed testing procedure. Structural sealant requires a probe test, specifically ASTM C1521 Standard Practice for Evaluating Adhesion of Installed Weatherproofing Sealant Joints. The sealant needs to be fully cured before it is tested, details concerning the testing process will be further discussed. Also, the substrate has to be completely clean and free of any debris and construction dust to ensure a proper bond between the sealant and façade material. In addition, this sealant naturally collects more dirt than aluminum mullions and looks dirtier over time. Also, sealants typically have a lifespan of 10-20 years. Tremco, the sealant manufacturer, does not provide any warranties for the sealant installed on NCHTNF. Aluminum mullions last longer than 10-20 years and do not require nearly as much maintenance. Finally, structural sealant systems tend to be more expensive than aluminum mullions designs.


Figure 36 - Sealant Curing on Paper. Courtesy SGH.


Figure 37 - Example of a Cup Test. Courtesy SGH.

Structural sealant requires a sealant probe test, ASTM C1521 Standard Practice for Evaluating Adhesion of Installed Weatherproofing Sealant Joints. This test requires testing every inch of the sealant. Before the test is performed, the sealant needs to be completely cured, which effects the installation schedule. Figure 35 shows a worker probing the sealant joint between the precast panels. It is extremely important for the substrate to be clean and free of any debris and construction dust because otherwise the sealant will fail.

As another method of quality control, Trainor, the facade manufacturer, implements simple sealant tests in the warehouse. The first test is placing a swatch of sealant on a piece of paper and allowing it to cure, see Figure 36. If the oils bleed out or the sealant never cures, the sealant has failed and a new batch needs to be made. An additional test to ensure quality control is the cup test, example shown in Figure 37. A popsicle stick is pushed into a cup full of sealant. After the sealant has cured, the popsicle stick is pulled out of the sealant. If the popsicle stick pulls out of the sealant, the sealant fails. The point of these two tests is simplicity in performance and the results are easily understood, so the factory workers can readily determine if the sealant is to a standard of installation.

## NCHTNF Current Façade:

The current façade of NCHTNF uses a dual sealant waterproofing system with silicone structural sealant. Simpson Gumpertz \& Heger perform the sealant probe test of the building, which is comprised of testing both interior and exterior sealant joints throughout every inch of the building façade. This system is chosen largely due to aesthetic reasons, but this structural sealant is just as capable of waterproofing a building as aluminum mullions.

Seeing as how waterproofing is not an issue between using structural sealant versus aluminum mullions, the aluminum mullions are being designed to be compared for cost differences in this analysis. As mentioned before, the silicone structural sealant is more expensive and requires detailed testing to assure quality control. Aluminum mullions do not require a complicated installation and are cheaper, thus aluminum mullions should be implemented instead of structural sealant. The wind loading on the building results in an 8 mm thick aluminum mullion, calculations can be found in Appendix K.

## Graduate Course Integration:

The thesis topic chosen directly uses knowledge gained in two graduate level courses. NCHTNF is modeled and analyzed in ETABS, which reflects the course theme from AE 597A, Computer Modeling of Buildings. This model is used to evaluate the building under lateral and gravity loads. The Building Enclosure Study includes material learned from AE 542, Building Enclosure Science and Design. Specifically, designing aluminum mullions and learning about façade products is covered in this class, which is applied to the façade study.

## Final Summary:

The overall design goal of this thesis is met by designing a lateral system that creates a more flexible floor plan layout. A complicated design process filled with smaller studies leads to this overall conclusion. Summaries of each smaller study are presented below:

First, this report studies the feasibility of concrete moment frames for the current 157 mph design wind speed and the code minimum 110 mph design speed. The transfer of moment between the column and slab fails for the first three floors of NCHTNF using the 157 mph . Thus, it is determined the existing lateral system consisting of shear walls is much more sufficient than concrete moment frames. The 110 mph design yields a few places that fail with the moment transfer at the slab-column connection. It is determined that edge beams need to be employed to mitigate the shear failures at the slab-column connections and stiffen the building to control the excessive deflections. The deflections are determined to be an issue using the ETABS model.

Additionally, wind data is studied to determine if the 157 mph wind speed is necessary to design to for the building to be an area of refuge in the event of a large scale hurricane in Orlando. The maximum wind speeds in Orland for the past 56 years have only peaked at 79 mph , so it is fair to say the code minimum value of 110 mph is a valid design value. NCHTNF should never see 157 mph because the hurricane's wind speeds have usually diminished significantly once they are that far inland.

Also, the façade's sun controlling system and structural system are studied. The existing louvers adequately shade the building in the summer, but not in the winter. This creates issues for glare and unwanted extreme heating conditions. Automatic sun shades are presented as a solution to the louvers. This new design will also remove the need for the louvers, which can become windborne debris in a hurricane event. In addition to this lighting study, the structural design of the façade is studied. The main focus is determining which system will perform better during a hurricane. It is determined that although both the sealant and mullion systems are both equivalent in waterproofing, the aluminum mullions are a cheaper design option.

In summary, the concrete moment frames are a feasible lateral design for NCHTNF if edge beams are implemented to mitigate the excessive shear transfer and building deflection. The thesis design can be classified as successful because the initial design goals were met:

- The amount of useable space per floor is not decreased
- Drop panels are eliminated from the slab design
- Concrete moment frames are found feasible by hand, Structure Point, SAP, and ETABS
- Façade is analyzed and suggestions are presented to give it the ability to withstand a hurricane better.
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## Appendix A: 110 mph Wind Load Calculation

## A. 1 Wind Pressures

Table A.1-1 Hospital North-South Wind Calculations

| North - South Hospital (MWFRS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor | Elevation | $z$ | $k_{z}$ | $q_{2}$ | 9 h | Windward(psf) | Leeward (psf) | Trib. Area (ft ${ }^{2}$ ) | Force (k) |
| Ground | 89.1 | 0 | 0.85 | 25.74 | 40.88 | 12.35 | -9.50 | 2137.5 | 47 |
| 1 | 104.1 | 15 | 0.85 | 25.74 | 40.88 | 12.35 | -9.50 | 5343.75 | 117 |
| 2 | 126.6 | 37.5 | 1.025 | 31.04 | 40.88 | 14.90 | -9.50 | 5343.75 | 130 |
| 3 | 141.6 | 52.5 | 1.1 | 33.31 | 40.88 | 15.99 | -9.50 | 4275 | 109 |
| 4 | 156.6 | 67.5 | 1.16 | 35.12 | 40.88 | 16.86 | -9.50 | 4275 | 113 |
| 5 | 171.6 | 82.5 | 1.22 | 36.94 | 40.88 | 17.73 | -9.50 | 4275 | 116 |
| 6 | 186.6 | 97.5 | 1.26 | 38.15 | 40.88 | 18.31 | -9.50 | 4275 | 119 |
| Penthouse | 201.6 | 112.5 | 1.29 | 39.06 | 40.88 | 18.75 | -9.50 | 5343.75 | 151 |
| Roof | 224.1 | 135 | 1.35 | 40.88 | 40.88 | 19.62 | -9.50 | 3206.25 | 93 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2F | 995 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Overturning Moment ( $k^{*} f t$ ) | 134000 |

Table A.1-2 Hospital East-West Wind Calculations

| East - West Hospital (MWFRS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor | Elevation | z | $k_{2}$ | $q_{z}$ | 9 h | Windward(psf) | Leeward (psf) | Trib. Area (ft ${ }^{2}$ ) | Force (k) |
| Ground | 89.1 | 0 | 0.85 | 25.74 | 40.88 | 12.64 | -9.79 | 1125 | 25 |
| 1 | 104.1 | 15 | 0.85 | 25.74 | 40.88 | 12.64 | -9.79 | 2812.5 | 63 |
| 2 | 126.6 | 37.5 | 1.025 | 31.04 | 40.88 | 15.24 | -9.79 | 2812.5 | 70 |
| 3 | 141.6 | 52.5 | 1.1 | 33.31 | 40.88 | 16.36 | -9.79 | 2250 | 59 |
| 4 | 156.6 | 67.5 | 1.16 | 35.12 | 40.88 | 17.25 | -9.79 | 2250 | 61 |
| 5 | 171.6 | 82.5 | 1.22 | 36.94 | 40.88 | 18.15 | -9.79 | 2250 | 63 |
| 6 | 186.6 | 97.5 | 1.26 | 38.15 | 40.88 | 18.74 | -9.79 | 2250 | 64 |
| Penthouse | 201.6 | 112.5 | 1.29 | 39.06 | 40.88 | 19.19 | -9.79 | 2812.5 | 82 |
| Roof | 224.1 | 135 | 1.35 | 40.88 | 40.88 | 20.08 | -9.79 | 1687.5 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SF | 537 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Overturning Moment ( $k^{*} f t$ ) | 72500 |

Table A.1-3 Clinic North-South Wind Calculations

| North - South Clinic (MWFRS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor | Elevation | z | $k_{z}$ | $q_{z}$ | 9 h | Windward(psf) | Leeward (psf) | Trib. Area (ft ${ }^{2}$ ) | Force (k) |
| Ground | 89.1 | 0 | 0.85 | 25.74 | 40.88 | 12.35 | -9.50 | 1830 | 40 |
| 1 | 104.1 | 15 | 0.85 | 25.74 | 40.88 | 12.35 | -9.50 | 4575 | 100 |
| 2 | 126.6 | 37.5 | 1.025 | 31.04 | 40.88 | 14.90 | -9.50 | 4575 | 112 |
| 3 | 141.6 | 52.5 | 1.1 | 33.31 | 40.88 | 15.99 | -9.50 | 3660 | 93 |
| 4 | 156.6 | 67.5 | 1.16 | 35.12 | 40.88 | 16.86 | -9.50 | 3660 | 97 |
| 5 | 171.6 | 82.5 | 1.22 | 36.94 | 40.88 | 17.73 | -9.50 | 3660 | 100 |
| 6 | 186.6 | 97.5 | 1.26 | 38.15 | 40.88 | 18.31 | -9.50 | 3660 | 102 |
| Penthouse | 201.6 | 112.5 | 1.29 | 39.06 | 40.88 | 18.75 | -9.50 | 4575 | 129 |
| Roof | 224.1 | 135 | 1.35 | 40.88 | 40.88 | 19.62 | -9.50 | 2745 | 80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SF | 852 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Overturning Moment (k*ft) | 115000 |

Table A.1-4 Clinic East-West Wind Calculations

| East - West Clinic (MWFRS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor | Elevation | Z | $k_{z}$ | $q_{z}$ | 9 h | Windward(psf) | Leeward (psf) | Trib. Area (ft ${ }^{2}$ ) | Force (k) |
| Ground | 89.1 | 0 | 0.85 | 25.74 | 40.88 | 12.64 | -9.79 | 675 | 15 |
| 1 | 104.1 | 15 | 0.85 | 25.74 | 40.88 | 12.64 | -9.79 | 1687.5 | 38 |
| 2 | 126.6 | 37.5 | 1.025 | 31.04 | 40.88 | 15.24 | -9.79 | 1687.5 | 42 |
| 3 | 141.6 | 52.5 | 1.1 | 33.31 | 40.88 | 16.36 | -9.79 | 1350 | 35 |
| 4 | 156.6 | 67.5 | 1.16 | 35.12 | 40.88 | 17.25 | -9.79 | 1350 | 37 |
| 5 | 171.6 | 82.5 | 1.22 | 36.94 | 40.88 | 18.15 | -9.79 | 1350 | 38 |
| 6 | 186.6 | 97.5 | 1.26 | 38.15 | 40.88 | 18.74 | -9.79 | 1350 | 39 |
| Penthouse | 201.6 | 112.5 | 1.29 | 39.06 | 40.88 | 19.19 | -9.79 | 1687.5 | 49 |
| Roof | 224.1 | 135 | 1.35 | 40.88 | 40.88 | 20.08 | -9.79 | 1012.5 | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SF | 322 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Overturning Moment ( $k^{*} f t$ ) | 43500 |

## Appendix B: Portal Method Analysis

## B. 1 Hand Calculation



## B. 2 Hospital (N-S) 157mph <br> 



##  






















 | dist. of forces 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Grid 19(E-W Hospital) |  |










| moment (K) | 162.3 | tt-1 | moment (L) | 202.8 | tt-k | moment (M) | 405.7 | ft-1 | moment (N) | 405.7 | t-k | ment (P) | 240.5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| axial (K) | 32.1 | k | axial (L) | 0.0 | k | axial (M) | 0.0 | k | axial ( N ) | 56.1 | k |  |  |  |
| shear (K) | 21.6 | k | shear (L) | 27.0 | k | shear (M) | 54.1 | k | shear (N) | 54.1 | k |  |  |  |






| shear (V) | 54.7 | k | shear $(\mathrm{W})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |





## B. 4 Clinic ( $N$-S) 157 mph

| story force (k) ${ }^{18}$ |  |  | height (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 22.5 |
| 47 |  |  |  | 15 |
| 70 |  |  |  | 15 |
| 93 |  |  |  | 15 |
| 115 |  |  |  | 15 |
| 136 |  |  |  | 15 |
| 161 |  |  |  | 22.5 |
| 184 |  |  |  | 15 |
|  | 30 | 30 | 30 | width (ft) | $\stackrel{\text { sum }}{6}$

Grid N (N-SClinic)



| moment (K) | 169.7 | t-k | moment (L) | 339.4 | t-k \|moment (M) | 339.4 |  | moment (N) | 169 | t -k moment (P) | $251.5 \mathrm{ft}-\mathrm{k}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| axial (K) | 16.8 | k | axial (L) | 0.0 k | axial (M) | 0 | k | axial ( N ) | 16.8 | k |  |
| shear (K) | 22.6 | k | shear (L) | 45.3 k | shear (N) | 45.3 |  | shear | 22.6 |  |  |


| ${ }^{\text {k }}$ |  |  | M | N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 93 |  |  |  |  | axial ( 0 ) | 30.4 | k | axial (R) | 0.0 k | axial (S) | 0 k | axial (T) |  | k | moment(0) | 45.56 |
| a |  |  | s | T | shear (Q) | 38.1 | k | $\frac{\operatorname{shajar}}{\text { sher }}$ (R) | $76.2{ }^{\text {2 }}$ | shear (S) | 76.2 | shear (T) | 38.1 | k |  |  |


| a | R | $s$ | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 93 | z | z |  | moment (V) | 429.3 | ft-k | moment (W) | 858.6 ft | - ${ }^{\text {moment ( }}$ ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 858.6 |  | moment (Y) | 429.3 | ft-k | moment (z) | 715.14 |  |
| 115 |  |  |  | axial (V) | 47.7 | k | axial (W) | 0.0 k | axial ( X ) | 0 |  | axial (Y) | 47.7 | k |  |  |  |
| v | w | x | Y | shear (V) | 57.2 | k | shear (W) | 114.5 k | shear (X) | 114.5 |  | shear (Y) | 57.2 | k |  |  |  |


| $v$ | w | x | Y |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 115 AE | AE | AE |  | moment (AA) | 599.2 | ft-k | moment (AB) | 1198.3 | ft-k | moment (AC) | 1198.3 | ft-k | moment (AD) | 599.2 | ft -k | moment (AE) | 1028.5 |  |
| 136 |  |  |  | axial (AA) | 68.6 | k | axial (AB) | 0.0 |  | axial (AC) |  | k | axial (AD) | 68.6 | k |  |  |  |
| AA | AB | AC | AD | shear (AA) | 79.9 | k | shear (AB) | 159.8 |  | shear (AC) | 159.8 | k | shear (AD) | 79.9 | k |  |  |  |



dis. offores 0.8
Girid10(EWClinic)























## B. 6 Hospital (N-S) 110mph

| storforece (k) ${ }_{12}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | height(tt) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.5 |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 104 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.5 |
| 119 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | widhth(ti) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | sum |
| dist. oforese 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.8 |  | 0.1 | 15.9 |

Gride (N.SHospital)






















|  |  |  | Grid 19 (E-W Hospital) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | A |  | B | c | D |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | A |  | в | c | D |
| 8 |  |  |  |  | J | 1 | 1 |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | E |  | F | G | H |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | E |  | F | G | H |
| 22 |  |  |  |  | P | , | P |  |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | K |  | L | M | N |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | K |  | L | M | N |
|  |  |  |  |  | $u$ | $u$ | $u$ |  |
| 3344 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Q |  | R | s | T |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | a |  | R | s | T |
| 44 |  |  |  |  | $z$ | $z$ | z |  |
| 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | v |  | w | x | Y |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | v |  | w | x | Y |
| 54 |  |  |  |  | А ${ }^{\text {H }}$ | AH | AH |  |
| 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AA | AB | AC | AD |  | AE | AF | AG |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA |  | AB | AC | AD |  | AE | AF | AG |
| 64 ${ }_{6}{ }_{4}$ | AP | AP | AP |  | AP | AP | AP |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Al | AJ | AK | AL |  | AM | AN | AO |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Al |  | AJ | AK | AL |  | AM | AN | AO |
| 76 <br> 86 | AX | AX | AX |  | AX | AX | AX |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AQ | AR | AS | ${ }_{\text {at }}$ |  | AU | AV | AW |








| moment $(V)$ | 201.3 | $\mathrm{ft}-\mathrm{k} \mid$ moment $(\mathrm{W})$ | 251.6 | $\mathrm{ft}-\mathrm{k}$ | moment $(\mathrm{X})$ | 503.1 | $\mathrm{ft}-\mathrm{k}$ | moment $(\mathrm{Y})$ | 503.1 | $\mathrm{ft}-\mathrm{k}$ | moment $(Z)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |








## B. 8 Clinic (N-S) 110mph
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## Appendix C: Moment Transfer Analysis

C. 1 Hospital (N-S) 157 mph

C. 2 Hospital (E-W) 157mph


## C. 3 Clinic ( $N-S$ ) 157mph

Grid $N$ Clinic
$\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{f}}=1 /\left(1+(2 / 3)\left(v\left(\mathrm{~b}_{1} / \mathrm{b}_{2}\right)\right)\right.$

| $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{f}}=1 /\left(1+(2 / 3)\left(v\left(b_{1} / b_{2}\right)\right)\right.$ |
| :--- |
| Floor 6 |
|  |
|  |


| Floor 5 |
| :--- |
|  |
|  |

C. 4 Clinic (E-W) 157mph

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| gaidnoic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | etal |  |  |  |  |  |  | itul |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ital |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | inal |  |  |  |  |  |  | inal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | etal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1)\|l|hayw |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (1)\|lubivek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | willuplilub |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| fiwi | a | 3in |  | 0 | 150 |  | fivx | a | $8{ }^{\text {g }}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{56}$ |  | flab | a | ain |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {LS }}$ |  | fla | a | fisin |  |  | bis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | b | 3 n |  |  |  | 4 |  | b | $2{ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | b | 2 n |  |  |  |  |  |  | b | rin |  |  |  | a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * | 08 |  | 8 |  |  |  | * | 18 |  | 2 |  |  | a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | a |  | * | 02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | b | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | b | 150 |  |  |  |  |  | $b$ | h | 140 |  |  |  |  |  |  | b |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | H1 | mante | trasteratreare |  |  |  |  | 1 | Izande | Expluere |  |  |  |  |  | $1{ }^{1 / 4}$ | 1axste | mambluex |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{1 / 4}$ | mantr | tuaterabluere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1382A.ti | trasemeldyer |  |  |  |  |  | mantik | tusterebtyer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | tanamely ber |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | tumeratbear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| fax | a | \% ${ }^{\text {n }}$ |  |  |  |  | fum | a | sin |  |  |  |  |  | flus | a | ain |  |  |  |  |  | flw | a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $b$ | 3 n |  |  |  |  |  | b | $2{ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 m |  |  |  |  |  |  | , | 2 n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * | as |  |  |  |  |  | * | as |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  | * | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | H1 | mustix | tratereftrave |  |  |  |  | 4 | 129296 | sturevtrue |  |  |  |  |  | (4) | 2 mabat | tasamblume |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{* 1}$ | Bizath | tuaterabluere |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | madatk | traberebevier |  |  |  |  |  | 823Ats | tosterextbear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | tusteretbler |  |  |  |  |  |  | zsyntit | tuderatb bear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| fiva | a | xin 3 ln |  |  |  |  | fiva | a | ${ }_{2 i n}^{2 i n}$ |  |  |  |  |  | flow |  | $\underbrace{2 i n}$ |  |  |  |  |  | flax | b | ${ }_{\text {gin }}^{\text {min }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{4}$ | ${ }_{08}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{20}$ |  | ${ }^{6}$ |  |  | a |  |  | ${ }^{208}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | b | ${ }_{0}^{20}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | a | [5] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{41}$ | musist | trasteratrane |  |  |  |  | (1) | 35 man | tusamerbluexe |  |  |  |  |  | /4/ | 3 gratic |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{41}$ | w3Sth | tuaterstimex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3223 fik | trosterebtiear |  |  |  |  |  | wxylth | tomemerbyer |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 3994ti | traterely |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 manit | traterather |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| fiw 3 |  | \% ${ }^{\text {n }}$ |  |  |  |  | flu | a | Qin |  |  |  |  |  | flus | b | ${ }_{6 i n}$ |  | $\cdots$ |  | 43 |  | fux | a | Sisin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3 n |  |  |  |  |  | b | 2 in |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{min}^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | b | 3 in |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |  | * | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | b |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 6 6s96t | transfered byflexure |  |  |  |  | 141 |  | transfered byflexure |  |  |  |  |  | $1{ }^{1 / 4}$ |  | transfered byflexure |  |  |  |  |  | \|il |  | transfered byflexure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | transferred byshear |  |  |  |  |  |  | tusterembly, |  |  |  |  |  |  | 548974 | transfered by shear |  |  |  |  |  |  | spl2fel | tusacremblyen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| fim? | b | \% |  |  |  |  | fim2 | a | ${ }^{\text {fin }}$ |  |  | 3 | 15 |  | fiom | a | ${ }_{\text {fin }}$ |  | 3 |  | ${ }^{\text {LS }}$ |  | five | a | ${ }^{315}$ |  |  | 3 S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | a | 3 n |  |  |  |  |  | b | 3 n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 n |  |  |  |  |  |  | b | yn |  |  |  | a |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * | 18 |  |  |  |  |  | + | as |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | as |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | * | 03 |  | ${ }_{3} 5$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | b | 151 |  |  |  |  |  | $b^{2}$ | - | [5] |  |  |  |  |  |  | b |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (1) | Imxati | trasteratrave |  |  |  |  | (1) | S918.6 | tomemembue |  |  |  |  |  | +1/ | 9,1846 | tanamablime |  |  |  |  |  | \|il | mextid | tuaterablime |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 812374. | traterebevter |  |  |  |  |  | sgighe | tosterefebter |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ssight |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 mbjint | tuderatber |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| fiv1 | a | \% |  |  |  |  | flow | 4 | 6in |  |  |  |  |  | flow | a | 6in |  |  |  |  |  | fly 1 | a | nsin |  |  | 4is |  | flow | a | sin |  |  | u | 153 |  | fix1 | 4 | Min |  |  | 4 | 197 |  |
|  | b | 3in |  |  |  |  |  | b | $3 \mathrm{~m}^{\text {n }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | , | 3 n |  |  |  |  |  |  | b | 3 n |  |  |  |  |  | b | un |  |  |  |  |  |  | $b$ | 2 n |  |  |  |  | b |
|  | * | 18 |  |  |  |  |  | * | aso |  |  |  |  |  |  | * | 00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | * | 19 |  |  |  | a |  | * | 18 |  |  |  |  | a |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sis |  |  |  |  |  |  | , | , |  |  |  |  |  |  | P |  |  |
|  | H1 | yxatit | trasemedrame |  |  |  |  | $1{ }^{1}$ |  | traterabluex |  |  |  |  |  | $1{ }^{1}$ | 19 9954. | taxamexthere |  |  |  |  |  | $1{ }^{10}$ | urshel | tuatuablime |  |  |  |  | \% 4 | IMSAdik | rasembleus |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1238384 | wsemembeur |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | maxtik | trasteraby |  |  |  |  |  | 118970 | traterablyer |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 L | traturublear |  |  |  |  |  |  | manatb | umberuther |  |  |  |  |  | 1 2014tik | matereblider |  |  |  |  |  |  | H128.4.6 | matemblider |  |  |  |  |


C. 6 Hospital (E-W) 110 mph


| April 4, 2012 | Nemours Children's Hospital as a part of The Nemours Foundation | Page 58 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## C. 7 Clinic ( $N-S$ ) 110 mph

| Grid $N$ Clinic |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $v=1 /\left(1+(2 / 3) v\left(b_{b} / b_{2}\right)\right)$ |  |



C. 8 Clinic (E-W) 110mph


| April 4, 2012 | Nemours Children's Hospital as a part of The Nemours Foundation | Page 60 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Appendix D: Combined Shear \& Moment Transfer (Slab-Column Connection Shear Check)

## D. 1 Hand Calculation



## D． 2 Hospital 157mph

| Level 6 |  | column er | column Bz |  | ncb |  | nco |  | nck | mn co | n ch | Soumn |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }_{\text {bo }}$ | ${ }_{12}^{194}$ | ${ }_{1}^{120}$ | 160 | 160 |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{194}$ |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {c }}$ | ${ }_{32}^{12}$ | 12 17 | 12 17 | 12 17 | 12 17 | 12 17 | 12 17 | 12 17 | 12 17 | ${ }_{32}^{12}$ |  |
|  | vo | 0.41 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | ${ }_{0.41}$ |  |
|  | M | 1102 | 1102 | 1102 | 1102 | 1102 | 1102 | 1102 | 1102 | 1102 | 1102 |  |
|  | vo． | 53.33 | 106.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \％ | 77733.1223 | ${ }^{324224}$ | 324224 | 324224 | 324224 | 324224 | 324224 | 324224 | 324224 | 77733.1223 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{b}_{1}$ |  | ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }^{34}$ |  | ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }^{32}$ |  |
|  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { b }}}^{\mathrm{b}_{2}}$ | 46 20 | 34 22 22 | ${ }_{22}^{34}$ | ${ }_{22}^{34}$ | ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }_{22}^{34}$ | 34 22 22 | 34 22 22 | 34 22 22 | ${ }_{20}^{46}$ |  |
|  | ${ }_{c}$ | 34 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | ${ }_{39}$ |  |
|  | vo | 0.221131009 | 0.085507872 | 0．085507872 | 0．08550872 | 0.085507872 | 0．085507872 | 0．085507872 | 0.085507872 | 0．085507872 | 0.221131009 |  |
| Level 5 | b。 | 194 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 176 |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{32}^{12}$ | ${ }_{17}^{12}$ | 12 17 | 12 17 |  |  | 12 17 | 12 17 | 12 17 | ${ }_{32}^{12}$ |  |
|  | M | $\xrightarrow{0.41} 1875$ | 0．52 <br> 1885 <br> 185 | 0．52 1875 | 0．52 1875 | （1．52 | （1．52 | （1．32 | （0．52 | － | （e．ti |  |
|  | $\mathrm{v}_{0}$ |  |  | 106.5 | ${ }^{106.5}$ |  |  | 106.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | \％ | 7773.11243 | ${ }_{324224}$ | ${ }_{324224}$ | ${ }_{324224}$ | 324224 | ${ }_{324224}$ | ${ }_{324224}$ | 324224 | ${ }_{324224}$ | 77733．11243 |  |
|  | ${ }^{b_{1}}$ |  | ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }^{34}$ |  | ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }^{34}$ | 34 | 34 | 32 |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {ck }}$ | 46 20 | 34 22 22 | ${ }_{22}^{34}$ | 34 22 22 | ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }_{22}^{34}$ | 34 22 22 | 34 22 22 | 34 22 20 |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | ${ }_{39}^{20}$ | ${ }_{22}^{22}$ | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | ${ }_{22}^{22}$ | ${ }_{22}^{22}$ | ${ }_{22}^{22}$ | ${ }_{39}^{20}$ |  |
|  | v。 | 0.354355188 | 0.10659369 | 0.10659369 | 0.10659369 | 0.10656936 | 0.10656936 | 0.106569369 | 0.10656936 | 0.101526756 | 0.354535188 |  |
| Level 4 | b | ${ }^{124}$ | ${ }^{176}$ | ${ }_{17}^{176}$ | ${ }_{17}^{17}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{176}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{32}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | 12 19 | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{32}^{12}$ |  |
|  | m | （e．41 | 0．511 <br> 2861 | 0.51 <br> 2861 |  | 0.51 <br> 2861 | 0.51 <br> 2861 | 0.51 <br> 2861 | 0.51 <br> 2861 | 0.51 <br> 2861 | 0.41 <br> 2881 |  |
|  | va |  | 106．5 | 106．5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ， | 7773.11243 | 44992 | 499920 | 499920 | 49922 | 49920 | 499920 | 449920 | 499920 | 77733.1223 |  |
|  |  | 32 46 48 | （ 38 | （ 38 | －${ }_{38}^{38}$ |  | （ ${ }_{38}^{38}$ | （ ${ }_{38}^{38}$ | （38 <br> 38 <br> 88 |  | 32 48 |  |
|  | $c_{1}$ | 20 | ${ }^{26}$ | 26 | 26 | ${ }^{26}$ | ${ }^{26}$ | ${ }^{26}$ | ${ }^{26}$ | ${ }^{26}$ | 20 |  |
|  | $c_{2}$ | ${ }^{34}$ | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | ${ }^{34}$ |  |
|  | vo | 0.52883883 | 0.111723085 | 0.111723085 | 0.111723085 | 0.111723085 | 0.111723085 | 0.111723085 | 0.111723085 | 0.111723085 | 0.528838839 |  |
| Level 3 | $\mathrm{b}_{0}$ | 194 | 176 | 176 | 176 |  | 176 | 176 | 176 | ${ }^{176}$ | 194 |  |
|  | d | ${ }_{32}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{19}^{12}$ | ${ }_{32}^{12}$ |  |
|  |  | 0．a1 | 1.51 <br>  <br> 0.51 <br> 1005 |  | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 0．51 } \\ \hline 101 \\ \hline 005 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | （1．51 | 0．51 |  |  |  | 0．a1 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{M}_{0}$ | ${ }_{5}^{4031} 8$ | 4041 1006.5 | 4091 106.5 | 4041 106.5 | 4091 106.5 | 4041 106.5 | 4041 106.5 | 4041 1006.5 | 4091 106．5 | 4091 53.33 |  |
|  | ， | 77733．11243 | 449920 | 499920 | 499920 | 499920 | ${ }_{4} 49920$ | 499920 |  |  | 77733.1223 |  |
|  | b $b_{1}$ $b_{2}$ | 哏32 | （ ${ }_{38}^{38}$ | （ 38 | （ 38 |  | （38 <br> 38 | 38 <br> 38 <br> 8 |  |  | 32 48 48 |  |
|  | S | 20 | ${ }^{26}$ | ${ }_{26} 26$ | ${ }_{26} 26$ | 268 | ${ }^{26}$ | ${ }_{26}{ }^{36}$ | ${ }^{26}$ | 26 | ${ }_{20}$ |  |
|  |  |  | 26 |  | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | ${ }^{26}$ | ${ }^{34}$ |  |
|  | v． | 0.72852133 | 0.13699796 | 0.136997796 | 0.13699779 | 0.136997796 | 0.136997796 | 0.136997796 | 0.13699796 | 0.136997796 | 0.72852133 |  |
| Level 2 | 。 | 156 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 148 |  |
|  | d | ${ }_{30}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{32}^{12}$ |  |
|  | \％ | $\underset{\substack{0.46 \\ 7827}}{\substack{\text { che }}}$ | O．50 <br> 78827 <br> 1080 | $\underset{\substack{\text { 0．50 } \\ 7827}}{ }$ | （0．50 | 0．50 <br> 7827 | （0．50 | （0．50 | O．50 <br> 7827 | － | 0．91 |  |
|  | N。 | 7827 53.33 | 7827 106.5 | 7827 106.5 |  | 7827 106.5 | 7827 | 7827 106.5 | 7827 106.5 |  | ${ }_{\substack{7827 \\ 583}}^{\text {723 }}$ |  |
|  | ， | 125874 | 600800 | 60asoo | 609800 | 608800 | 60asoo | soasoo |  |  | 7773.1223 |  |
|  | b $b_{1}$ $b_{2}$ | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{46}^{32}$ |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {ck }}$ | ${ }_{30}{ }^{42}$ | 42 30 | ${ }_{30}^{42}$ | ${ }_{30}^{42}$ | ${ }_{30}^{42}$ | ${ }_{30}^{42}$ | 30 | ${ }_{30}^{42}$ | 32 | 46 20 |  |
|  | ${ }_{c_{2}}$ | 30 | 30 | ${ }^{30}$ | 30 | 30 | 30 | зо | 30 | 30 | ${ }_{39}$ |  |
|  | vo | 0.87597699 | 0.181339717 | 0.181339717 | 0.18133971 | 0.18133971 | 0.181339717 | 0.18133971 | 0.181339717 | 0.18133971 | ${ }^{1.381983237}$ |  |
| Level 1 | $\mathrm{b}_{0}$ | 156 | 192 | 192 | 192 |  | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 124 |
|  |  | ${ }_{30}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ |  | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{21}^{12}$ | ${ }_{22}^{12}$ |
|  | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{\text { M }}$ | 0．46 | 0．50 $\begin{gathered}\text { 13283 } \\ \text { 130 }\end{gathered}$ | （13283 | （13283 | （13283 | （13283 | （13283 | 0．50 $\begin{gathered}\text { 13283 } \\ \text { 130 }\end{gathered}$ | 0．50 $\begin{gathered}\text { 0．50 } \\ \text { 1383 }\end{gathered}$ | 0．50 $\begin{array}{r}1383 \\ \text { 130 }\end{array}$ | （0．47 |
|  | va |  |  |  |  |  |  | 106.5 | 106.5 | 106.5 | ${ }_{5}^{153.33}$ |  |
|  | ， | 125874 | 609800 | 609800 | 608800 | 608800 | 608800 | 608800 | 608800 |  |  |  |
|  | ， | ${ }_{12}^{22}$ | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{12}^{42}$ |  | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{12}^{42}$ | ${ }_{42}^{42}$ | ${ }_{12} 2$ | ${ }_{12}^{42}$ | ${ }^{34}$ |
|  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { a }}}^{\mathrm{b}_{2}}$ | ${ }_{30}^{42}$ | 42 30 | 42 30 | ${ }_{30}^{42}$ | 42 30 | 42 30 | ${ }_{30}^{42}$ | 42 30 | ${ }_{30}{ }_{3}$ | 30 | 34 <br> 22 <br> 2 |
|  | $c_{2}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | 30 | ${ }^{30}$ |  |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Hospita ( } \mathrm{E} \text { W) } \\
\text { Level } 6
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Level } 1
\end{aligned}
$$

## D. 3 Clinic 157mph



## D. 4 Hospital 110 mph



## D. 5 Clinic 110mph

evel

## Omph

$$
\leq 2820 \leq 3 \leq 00 \pi
$$

.

## Appendix E: Column Interaction Diagrams

## E. 1 N-S Clinic Frame 10 Exterior Column Interaction Diagram


E. 2 N-S Clinic Frame 10 Interior Column Interaction Diagram


## Appendix F: Slab Capacity Check

## F. 1 Hand Calculation



For a generalized gravity spot check Direct Design Method wrll beused even though not all the requirements were met.

$$
\text { SDL }=12 \text { pst (typical floor) } \quad L_{k}: 80(0.25+\cdot 15 / \sqrt{2(30)(30)})=48 \text { pst }
$$

$D L=$ self weight of concrete
$L L=80 p s t$
$W_{0}=1.2 W_{D}+1.6 W$
$W_{0}=1.2\left[\left(12^{11} / 12^{\prime \prime}\right)(14 s p c f)+12 p s t\right]+16[48 p s t]$
$w_{0}=265.2$ p5

* 30'—
slab thickness
$\ln / 3 B$ (Table 95 c wlo drop panel int panels) ( $30^{\prime}-30^{\prime \prime} / 12^{*}$ ) $\times 12^{\prime \prime} / 33^{\prime \prime}=10^{\prime \prime}$ Siab minimum
$\rightarrow 12$ "slab used in design
Frame $A=$ Frame $B$ blc of symmery
$M_{0}=1 / 8 \omega_{0} l_{2} l_{n}^{2}=1 / 8(0.265 \mathrm{ksf})\left(30^{\prime}\right)\left(30^{\circ}-30^{\circ} / 12^{\prime \prime}\right)^{2}=751.5 \mathrm{ft} \cdot \mathrm{K}$





## Appendix G: Stud Rail Check

G. 1 Hand Calculation


## Appendix H: Edge Beam Design

## H. 1 Hand Calculation








## Appendix I: Foundation Check

## I. 1 Hand Calculation



## Appendix J: Daylighting Spreadsheet

J. 1 Sun Angle Calculations - Summer Solstice Example

Solar Time, Solar Geometry, and Daylight Availability


Note: Calculations determine by Caitlin Behm. Excel template created during AE497D with Professor Kevin Houser.

## Nemours Children's Hospital as a part of The Nemours Foundation

J. 2 Sun Angle Calculations - Summer Solstice Complete 24 Hours Study

Available Illuminance Calculations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | = User entered values |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | = Computed values |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Chart Titles ==> |  | Solar Altitude | Solar Azimuth | Elevation Azimuth | Incident | Profile |  | Sun | Sun | Sky | Total |  |
| Clock Time <br> (AM/PM <br> Format) | Clock Time (Decimal Format) | Solar Time (Decimal Format) | Solar <br> Time (Clock Format) | Solar <br> Time <br> Angle (radians) | Altitude <br> Angle | Azimuth Angle | Solar <br> Elevation <br> Azimuth <br> (degrees) | Incident Angle (degrees) | Profile <br> Angle (degrees) | Direct <br> Normal Solar Illuminance (Ix) | Direct Horizontal Solar Illuminance (Ix) | Direct <br> Vertical Solar Illuminance ( Ix ) | Horizontal Unobstructed Sky Illuminance (lx) | Total Horizontal Illuminance (Ix) |  |
| 12:00 AM | 0.00 | -1.45 | - |  | $-34.0^{\circ}$ | -24.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -24.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $40.8{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12:30 AM | 0.50 | -0.95 | - |  | $-36.3^{\circ}$ | -16.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -16.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $39.3{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1:00 AM | 1.00 | -0.45 | - |  | $-37.6^{\circ}$ | $-7.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $-7.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $38.3{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1:30 AM | 1.50 | 0.05 | 12:03 AM |  | $-38.0^{\circ}$ | $0.9{ }^{\circ}$ | $0.9{ }^{\circ}$ | $38.0^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2:00 AM | 2.00 | 0.55 | 12:33 AM |  | $-37.4^{\circ}$ | $9.6{ }^{\circ}$ | $9.6{ }^{\circ}$ | $38.5{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2:30 AM | 2.50 | 1.05 | 1:03 AM |  | $-35.9^{\circ}$ | $17.9^{\circ}$ | $17.9^{\circ}$ | $39.5{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3:00 AM | 3.00 | 1.55 | 1:33 AM |  | $-33.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $25.7^{\circ}$ | $25.7^{\circ}$ | $41.2^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3:30 AM | 3.50 | 2.05 | 2:03 AM |  | $-30.2^{\circ}$ | $32.9^{\circ}$ | $32.9{ }^{\circ}$ | $43.5{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4:00 AM | 4.00 | 2.55 | 2:33 AM |  | -26.3 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $39.3{ }^{\circ}$ | $39.3^{\circ}$ | $46.1^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4:30 AM | 4.50 | 3.05 | 3:03 AM |  | -21.9 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $45.1^{\circ}$ | $45.1^{\circ}$ | $49.1^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5:00 AM | 5.00 | 3.55 | 3:33 AM |  | -17.0 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $50.2^{\circ}$ | $50.2^{\circ}$ | $52.3^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5:30 AM | 5.50 | 4.05 | 4:03 AM |  | -11.8 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $54.9{ }^{\circ}$ | $54.9{ }^{\circ}$ | $55.7^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6:00 AM | 6.00 | 4.55 | 4:33 AM |  | -6.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $59.0^{\circ}$ | $59.0^{\circ}$ | $59.2^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6:30 AM | 6.50 | 5.05 | 5:03 AM |  | -0.5 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $62.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $62.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $62.8^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7:00 AM | 7.00 | 5.55 | 5:33 AM |  | $5.5^{\circ}$ | $66.2^{\circ}$ | $66.2^{\circ}$ | $66.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $13.4{ }^{\circ}$ | 14,257 | 1,361 | 5,717 | 5,589 | 6,950 |  |
| 7:30 AM | 7.50 | 6.05 | 6:03 AM |  | $11.6^{\circ}$ | $69.5{ }^{\circ}$ | $69.5{ }^{\circ}$ | $69.9^{\circ}$ | $30.3{ }^{\circ}$ | 45,209 | 9,076 | 15,542 | 7,745 | 16,821 |  |
| 8:00 AM | 8.00 | 6.55 | 6:33 AM |  | $17.8^{\circ}$ | $72.5{ }^{\circ}$ | $72.5{ }^{\circ}$ | $73.3^{\circ}$ | $46.9{ }^{\circ}$ | 64,767 | 19,811 | 18,567 | 9,373 | 29,184 |  |
| 8:30 AM | 8.50 | 7.05 | 7:03 AM |  | $24.1^{\circ}$ | $75.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $75.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $76.7^{\circ}$ | $60.6{ }^{\circ}$ | 77,008 | 31,498 | 17,762 | 10,713 | 42,211 |  |
| 9:00 AM | 9.00 | 7.55 | 7:33 AM |  | $30.6{ }^{\circ}$ | $78.2^{\circ}$ | $78.2^{\circ}$ | $79.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $70.8^{\circ}$ | 85,138 | 43,286 | 15,041 | 11,852 | 55,138 |  |
| 9:30 AM | 9.50 | 8.05 | 8:03 AM |  | $37.0^{\circ}$ | $80.9{ }^{\circ}$ | $80.9{ }^{\circ}$ | $82.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $78.2^{\circ}$ | 90,803 | 54,696 | 11,408 | 12,830 | 67,526 |  |
| 10:00 AM | 10.00 | 8.55 | 8:33 AM |  | $43.6{ }^{\circ}$ | $83.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $83.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $85.5^{\circ}$ | $83.5{ }^{\circ}$ | 94,882 | 65,397 | 7,443 | 13,668 | 79,065 |  |
| 10:30 AM | 10.50 | 9.05 | 9:03 AM |  | $50.1^{\circ}$ | $86.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $86.8^{\circ}$ | $87.9^{\circ}$ | $87.3^{\circ}$ | 97,879 | 75,131 | 3,513 | 14,380 | 89,511 |  |
| 11:00 AM | 11.00 | 9.55 | 9:33 AM |  | $56.7^{\circ}$ | -89.9 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -89.9 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $89.9{ }^{\circ}$ | $89.9{ }^{\circ}$ | 100,097 | 83,685 | 130 | 14,972 | 98,658 |  |
| 11:30 AM | 11.50 | 10.05 | 10:03 AM |  | $63.3^{\circ}$ | -85.9 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -85.9 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $88.1^{\circ}$ | $87.9^{\circ}$ | 101,725 | 90,886 | 3,304 | 15,451 | 106,337 |  |
| 12:00 PM | 12.00 | 10.55 | 10:33 AM |  | $69.9^{\circ}$ | -80.5 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -80.5 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $86.7^{\circ}$ | $86.5{ }^{\circ}$ | 102,887 | 96,592 | 5,877 | 15,818 | 112,410 |  |
| 12:30 PM | 12.50 | 11.05 | 11:03 AM |  | $76.3^{\circ}$ | -71.6 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -71.6 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $85.7^{\circ}$ | $85.6^{\circ}$ | 103,661 | 100,693 | 7,754 | 16,076 | 116,769 |  |
| 1:00 PM | 13.00 | 11.55 | 11:33 AM |  | $82.1^{\circ}$ | -51.6 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-51.6^{\circ}$ | $85.1^{\circ}$ | $85.1^{\circ}$ | 104,096 | 103,112 | 8,871 | 16,227 | 119,338 |  |
| 1:30 PM | 13.50 | 12.05 | 12:03 PM |  | $84.9{ }^{\circ}$ | $8.0^{\circ}$ | $8.0^{\circ}$ | $84.9{ }^{\circ}$ | $84.9{ }^{\circ}$ | 104,218 | 103,804 | 9,192 | 16,269 | 120,073 |  |
| 2:00 PM | 14.00 | 12.55 | 12:33 PM |  | $81.0^{\circ}$ | $57.6^{\circ}$ | $57.6^{\circ}$ | $85.2^{\circ}$ | $85.2^{\circ}$ | 104,033 | 102,755 | 8,706 | 16,205 | 118,960 |  |
| 2:30 PM | 14.50 | 13.05 | 1:03 PM |  | $75.0^{\circ}$ | $73.9^{\circ}$ | $73.9^{\circ}$ | $85.9{ }^{\circ}$ | $85.8{ }^{\circ}$ | 103,531 | 99,986 | 7,429 | 16,032 | 116,018 |  |
| 3:00 PM | 15.00 | 13.55 | 1:33 PM |  | $68.5^{\circ}$ | $81.7^{\circ}$ | $81.7^{\circ}$ | $87.0^{\circ}$ | $86.8{ }^{\circ}$ | 102,682 | 95,548 | 5,403 | 15,752 | 111,300 |  |
| 3:30 PM | 15.50 | 14.05 | 2:03 PM |  | $62.0^{\circ}$ | $86.8^{\circ}$ | $86.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $88.5^{\circ}$ | $88.3^{\circ}$ | 101,432 | 89,525 | 2,698 | 15,362 | 104,887 |  |
| 4:00 PM | 16.00 | 14.55 | 2:33 PM |  | $55.4{ }^{\circ}$ | -89.4 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-89.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $89.7{ }^{\circ}$ | $89.6{ }^{\circ}$ | 99,695 | 82,034 | 585 | 14,860 | 96,894 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 16.50 | 15.05 | 3:03 PM |  | $48.8{ }^{\circ}$ | -86.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-86.2^{\circ}$ | $87.5^{\circ}$ | $86.6^{\circ}$ | 97,336 | 73,222 | 4,303 | 14,244 | 87,466 |  |
| 5:00 PM | 17.00 | 15.55 | 3:33 PM |  | $42.2^{\circ}$ | -83.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-83.2^{\circ}$ | $85.0^{\circ}$ | $82.6{ }^{\circ}$ | 94,146 | 63,271 | 8,264 | 13,507 | 76,778 |  |
| 5:30 PM | 17.50 | 16.05 | 4:03 PM |  | $35.7^{\circ}$ | -80.4 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-80.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $82.2^{\circ}$ | $76.9^{\circ}$ | 89,791 | 52,402 | 12,196 | 12,641 | 65,043 |  |
| 6:00 PM | 18.00 | 16.55 | 4:33 PM |  | $29.2^{\circ}$ | -77.6 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -77.6 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $79.2^{\circ}$ | $69.0^{\circ}$ | 83,709 | 40,883 | 15,698 | 11,632 | 52,516 |  |
| 6:30 PM | 18.50 | 17.05 | 5:03 PM |  | $22.8{ }^{\circ}$ | -74.8 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -74.8 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $76.0^{\circ}$ | $58.1^{\circ}$ | 74,905 | 29,071 | 18,128 | 10,456 | 39,527 |  |
| 7:00 PM | 19.00 | 17.55 | 5:33 PM |  | $16.5^{\circ}$ | -71.9 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-71.9^{\circ}$ | $72.6^{\circ}$ | $43.6{ }^{\circ}$ | 61,494 | 17,489 | 18,346 | 9,066 | 26,555 |  |
| 7:30 PM | 19.50 | 18.05 | 6:03 PM |  | $10.3{ }^{\circ}$ | -68.8 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -68.8 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $69.2^{\circ}$ | $26.7^{\circ}$ | 39,836 | 7,134 | 14,163 | 7,360 | 14,494 |  |
| 8:00 PM | 20.00 | 18.55 | 6:33 PM |  | $4.2^{\circ}$ | -65.6 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -65.6 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $65.6^{\circ}$ | $10.2^{\circ}$ | 7,526 | 557 | 3,106 | 5,016 | 5,572 |  |
| 8:30 PM | 20.50 | 19.05 | 7:03 PM |  | $-1.7^{\circ}$ | -62.0 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -62.0 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $62.1^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9:00 PM | 21.00 | 19.55 | 7:33 PM |  | $-7.4{ }^{\circ}$ | -58.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -58.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $58.5{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9:30 PM | 21.50 | 20.05 | 8:03 PM |  | -12.9 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -54.0 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-54.0{ }^{\circ}$ | $55.0^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10:00 PM | 22.00 | 20.55 | 8:33 PM |  | -18.0 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -49.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -49.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $51.6^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10:30 PM | 22.50 | 21.05 | 9:03 PM |  | -22.8 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -44.0 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -44.0 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $48.4{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11:00 PM | 23.00 | 21.55 | 9:33 PM |  | -27.1 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-38.1^{\circ}$ | $-38.1^{\circ}$ | $45.5^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11:30 PM | 23.50 | 22.05 | 10:03 PM |  | $-30.9^{\circ}$ | -31.5 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-31.5^{\circ}$ | $43.0^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: Calculations determine by Caitlin Behm. Excel template created during AE497D with Professor Kevin Houser.

## J. 3 Sun Angle Calculations - Winter Solstice Example

Solar Time, Solar Geometry, and Daylight Availability


Note: Calculations determine by Caitlin Behm. Excel template created during AE497D with Professor Kevin Houser.

## Nemours Children's Hospital as a part of The Nemours Foundation

J. 4 Sun Angle Calculations - Winter Solstice Complete 24 Hours Study

Available Illuminance Calculations

|  | = User entered values |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | = Computed values |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Chart Titles ==> |  | Solar <br> Altitude | Solar <br> Azimuth | Elevation Azimuth | Incident | Profile |  | Sun | Sun | Sky | Total |  |
| Clock Time (AM/PM Format) | Clock Time (Decimal Format) | Solar Time (Decimal Format) | Solar <br> Time (Clock Format) | Solar <br> Time Angle (radians) | Altitude Angle | Azimuth Angle | Solar Elevation Azimuth (degrees) | Incident Angle (degrees) | Profile <br> Angle (degrees) | Direct <br> Normal Solar Illuminance (Ix) | Direct Horizontal Solar Illuminance (Ix) | Direct <br> Vertical Solar Illuminance (Ix) | Horizontal Unobstructed Sky Illuminance (Ix) | Total Horizontal Illuminance (Ix) |  |
| 12:00 AM | 0.00 | -0.39 | - |  | $-82.7^{\circ}$ | -47.7 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-47.7^{\circ}$ | $85.1^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12:30 AM | 0.50 | 0.11 | 12:06 AM |  | $-84.7^{\circ}$ | $16.0^{\circ}$ | $16.0^{\circ}$ | $84.9{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1:00 AM | 1.00 | 0.61 | 12:36 AM |  | $-80.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $60.2^{\circ}$ | $60.2^{\circ}$ | $85.2^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1:30 AM | 1.50 | 1.11 | 1:06 AM |  | $-74.3^{\circ}$ | $75.0^{\circ}$ | $75.0^{\circ}$ | $86.0^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2:00 AM | 2.00 | 1.61 | 1:36 AM |  | $-67.8^{\circ}$ | $82.3^{\circ}$ | $82.3^{\circ}$ | $87.1^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2:30 AM | 2.50 | 2.11 | 2:06 AM |  | -61.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $87.2^{\circ}$ | $87.2^{\circ}$ | $88.7^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3:00 AM | 3.00 | 2.61 | 2:36 AM |  | -54.7 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-89.1^{\circ}$ | -89.1 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $89.5{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3:30 AM | 3.50 | 3.11 | 3:06 AM |  | -48.1 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-85.8^{\circ}$ | $-85.8^{\circ}$ | $87.2^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4:00 AM | 4.00 | 3.61 | 3:36 AM |  | $-41.5^{\circ}$ | -82.9 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-82.9{ }^{\circ}$ | $84.7^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4:30 AM | 4.50 | 4.11 | 4:06 AM |  | $-35.0^{\circ}$ | $-80.1^{\circ}$ | $-80.1^{\circ}$ | $81.9^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5:00 AM | 5.00 | 4.61 | 4:36 AM |  | $-28.5^{\circ}$ | $-77.3^{\circ}$ | -77.3 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $78.9^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5:30 AM | 5.50 | 5.11 | 5:06 AM |  | -22.10 | -74.5 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -74.5 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $75.6{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6:00 AM | 6.00 | 5.61 | 5:36 AM |  | $-15.8^{\circ}$ | $-71.6^{\circ}$ | -71.6 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $72.3^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6:30 AM | 6.50 | 6.11 | 6:06 AM |  | -9.6 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -68.5 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -68.5 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $68.8^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7:00 AM | 7.00 | 6.61 | 6:36 AM |  | $-3.6{ }^{\circ}$ | -65.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -65.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $65.3{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7:30 AM | 7.50 | 7.11 | 7:06 AM |  | $2.3^{\circ}$ | -61.6 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -61.6 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $61.7^{\circ}$ | $4.8{ }^{\circ}$ | 743 | 30 | 353 | 3,909 | 3,939 |  |
| 8:00 AM | 8.00 | 7.61 | 7:36 AM |  | $8.0^{\circ}$ | -57.8 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -57.8 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $58.1^{\circ}$ | $14.8{ }^{\circ}$ | 30,396 | 4,229 | 16,055 | 6,581 | 10,810 |  |
| 8:30 AM | 8.50 | 8.11 | 8:06 AM |  | $13.4{ }^{\circ}$ | -53.5 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -53.5 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $54.6{ }^{\circ}$ | $21.9^{\circ}$ | 55,709 | 12,945 | 32,248 | 8,272 | 21,217 |  |
| 9:00 AM | 9.00 | 8.61 | 8:36 AM |  | $18.6{ }^{\circ}$ | -48.7 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -48.7 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $51.3^{\circ}$ | $27.0^{\circ}$ | 71,117 | 22,645 | 44,490 | 9,546 | 32,191 |  |
| 9:30 AM | 9.50 | 9.11 | 9:06 AM |  | $23.3{ }^{\circ}$ | -43.4 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-43.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $48.1^{\circ}$ | $30.7^{\circ}$ | 80,899 | 32,016 | 54,009 | 10,551 | 42,567 |  |
| 10:00 AM | 10.00 | 9.61 | 9:36 AM |  | $27.6^{\circ}$ | -37.4 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-37.4^{\circ}$ | $45.2^{\circ}$ | $33.3{ }^{\circ}$ | 87,387 | 40,467 | 61,536 | 11,348 | 51,815 |  |
| 10:30 AM | 10.50 | 10.11 | 10:06 AM |  | $31.3^{\circ}$ | -30.7 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-30.7^{\circ}$ | $42.7^{\circ}$ | $35.3^{\circ}$ | 91,779 | 47,654 | 67,428 | 11,969 | 59,623 |  |
| 11:00 AM | 11.00 | 10.61 | 10:36 AM |  | $34.3{ }^{\circ}$ | $-23.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $-23.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $40.7^{\circ}$ | $36.6{ }^{\circ}$ | 94,727 | 53,354 | 71,858 | 12,433 | 65,787 |  |
| 11:30 AM | 11.50 | 11.11 | 11:06 AM |  | $36.5^{\circ}$ | -15.4 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -15.4 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $39.2^{\circ}$ | $37.5^{\circ}$ | 96,595 | 57,413 | 74,908 | 12,750 | 70,163 |  |
| 12:00 PM | 12.00 | 11.61 | 11:36 AM |  | $37.7^{\circ}$ | $-6.9^{\circ}$ | $-6.9^{\circ}$ | $38.3^{\circ}$ | $37.9^{\circ}$ | 97,587 | 59,732 | 76,617 | 12,927 | 72,658 |  |
| 12:30 PM | 12.50 | 12.11 | 12:06 PM |  | $38.0^{\circ}$ | $1.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $1.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $38.1^{\circ}$ | $38.0^{\circ}$ | 97,804 | 60,255 | 76,999 | 12,966 | 73,221 |  |
| 1:00 PM | 13.00 | 12.61 | 12:36 PM |  | $37.3^{\circ}$ | $10.5{ }^{\circ}$ | $10.5^{\circ}$ | $38.6{ }^{\circ}$ | $37.8^{\circ}$ | 97,267 | 58,971 | 76,059 | 12,869 | 71,840 |  |
| 1:30 PM | 13.50 | 13.11 | 1:06 PM |  | $35.7^{\circ}$ | $18.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $18.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $39.7^{\circ}$ | $37.2^{\circ}$ | 95,923 | 55,909 | 73,787 | 12,633 | 68,543 |  |
| 2:00 PM | 14.00 | 13.61 | 1:36 PM |  | $33.1{ }^{\circ}$ | $26.5{ }^{\circ}$ | $26.5{ }^{\circ}$ | $41.5^{\circ}$ | $36.1^{\circ}$ | 93,632 | 51,143 | 70,162 | 12,255 | 63,399 |  |
| 2:30 PM | 14.50 | 14.11 | 2:06 PM |  | $29.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $33.6{ }^{\circ}$ | $33.6{ }^{\circ}$ | $43.7^{\circ}$ | $34.5{ }^{\circ}$ | 90,133 | 44,794 | 65,129 | 11,727 | 56,521 |  |
| 3:00 PM | 15.00 | 14.61 | 2:36 PM |  | $25.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $40.0^{\circ}$ | $40.0^{\circ}$ | $46.4^{\circ}$ | $32.3^{\circ}$ | 84,960 | 37,042 | 58,576 | 11,035 | 48,076 |  |
| 3:30 PM | 15.50 | 15.11 | 3:06 PM |  | $21.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $45.7^{\circ}$ | $45.7^{\circ}$ | $49.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $29.2^{\circ}$ | 77,276 | 28,151 | 50,269 | 10,155 | 38,307 |  |
| 4:00 PM | 16.00 | 15.61 | 3:36 PM |  | $16.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $50.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $50.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $52.7^{\circ}$ | $25.0^{\circ}$ | 65,503 | 18,545 | 39,723 | 9,047 | 27,593 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 16.50 | 16.11 | 4:06 PM |  | $11.2^{\circ}$ | $55.3^{\circ}$ | $55.3^{\circ}$ | $56.1^{\circ}$ | $19.2^{\circ}$ | 46,549 | 9,024 | 25,971 | 7,624 | 16,648 |  |
| 5:00 PM | 17.00 | 16.61 | 4:36 PM |  | $5.6{ }^{\circ}$ | $59.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $59.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $59.6{ }^{\circ}$ | $11.0^{\circ}$ | 16,139 | 1,582 | 8,165 | 5,653 | 7,234 |  |
| 5:30 PM | 17.50 | 17.11 | 5:06 PM |  | -0.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $63.2^{\circ}$ | $63.2^{\circ}$ | $63.2^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6:00 PM | 18.00 | 17.61 | 5:36 PM |  | -6.1 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $66.6{ }^{\circ}$ | $66.6{ }^{\circ}$ | $66.8{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6:30 PM | 18.50 | 18.11 | 6:06 PM |  | $-12.2^{\circ}$ | $69.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $69.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $70.3^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7:00 PM | 19.00 | 18.61 | 6:36 PM |  | -18.5 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $72.8^{\circ}$ | $72.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $73.7^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7:30 PM | 19.50 | 19.11 | 7:06 PM |  | $-24.8^{\circ}$ | $75.7^{\circ}$ | $75.7^{\circ}$ | $77.0^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8:00 PM | 20.00 | 19.61 | 7:36 PM |  | $-31.3^{\circ}$ | $78.5^{\circ}$ | $78.5{ }^{\circ}$ | $80.2^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8:30 PM | 20.50 | 20.11 | 8:06 PM |  | -37.7 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $81.3^{\circ}$ | $81.3^{\circ}$ | $83.1^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9:00 PM | 21.00 | 20.61 | 8:36 PM |  | -44.3 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $84.1^{\circ}$ | $84.1^{\circ}$ | $85.8{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9:30 PM | 21.50 | 21.11 | 9:06 PM |  | $-50.8^{\circ}$ | $87.1^{\circ}$ | $87.1^{\circ}$ | $88.2^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10:00 PM | 22.00 | 21.61 | 9:36 PM |  | $-57.4^{\circ}$ | $-89.5^{\circ}$ | -89.5 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $89.7{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10:30 PM | 22.50 | 22.11 | 10:06 PM |  | -64.0 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $-85.3^{\circ}$ | -85.3 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $88.0^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11:00 PM | 23.00 | 22.61 | 10:36 PM |  | $-70.6{ }^{\circ}$ | -79.7 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -79.7 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $86.6{ }^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11:30 PM | 23.50 | 23.11 | 11:06 PM |  | $-76.9^{\circ}$ | -70.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | -70.2 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $85.6^{\circ}$ | No Sun | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: Calculations determine by Caitlin Behm. Excel template created during AE497D with Professor Kevin Houser.

## Appendix K: Aluminum Mullion Design

K. 1 Hand Calculation


|  | Caltlin Behm | AE Senior Thes | Mullion Desic | 2/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (tops. | Deflection$\therefore t=8 \mathrm{~mm} \text { for aluminum mullion design }$$\square$ |  |  |  |
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