

La Jolla Commons Phase II Office Tower

Alyssa Stangl | Structural Option Faculty Advisor | Dr. Hanagan

Photos Provided Courtesy of HINES

San Diego, California



• Building Introduction

- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Location | San Diego, California SDC D 13 Stories + Penthouse | 198' – 8"
- 2 Levels | Underground parking
- 462,301 GSF
- Design-Bid-Build
- Construction Dates | April 2012 May 2014
- Building Cost | \$78,000,000

Building Introduction



• Building Introduction

- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- **Owner** | Hines \bullet
- Tenant | LPL Financial \bullet
- Architect | AECOM
- **Structural Engineer** | Nabih Youssef Associates \bullet

Project Team



Building Introduction

- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Large open floor plans
- Office use only \bullet
- Similar architecture to LJC Tower I
- 198'-8" height limited by FAA
- LEED-CS Gold & NetZero

Architectural Overview



Image from Project Documents Provided Courtesy of HINES



• Building Introduction

- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Large open floor plans
- Office use only \bullet
- Similar architecture to LJC Tower I
- 198'-8" height limited by FAA
- LEED-CS Gold & NetZero

Architectural Overview

Image from Project Documents Provided Courtesy of HINES





Core – Elevators, Stairs, Mech

Office Space



Building Introduction

- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- \circ Conclusions

- Large open floor plans
- Office use only
- Similar architecture to LJC Tower I
- 198'-8" height limited by FAA
- LEED-CS Gold & NetZero

Architectural Overview





• Building Introduction

- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Floor System
- Lateral System
 - Shear Walls
 - Collectors

Existing Structural Overview

Gravity System Mat foundation

Image from Project Documents Provided Courtesy of HINES







• Building Introduction

- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- - Mat foundation
- 10" 14" Thickness
 - Lateral System
 - Shear Walls
 - Collectors

Existing Structural Overview

Gravity System

Floor System

- Two-Way, Flat Plate Concrete Slab
- 18" Spandrel Beam

Image from Project Documents Provided Courtesy of HINES



18" Thick Spandrel Beam 10" Thick Core Slab 14" Thick Slab



• Building Introduction

- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Gravity System
 - Foundation
 - Floor System
- Lateral System
 - Shear Walls
 - **Existing Torsional Irregularity**
 - Collectors

Existing Structural Overview







• Building Introduction

- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Gravity System
 - Foundation
 - Floor System
- Lateral System \bullet
 - Shear Walls
 - Collectors
 - N-S Direction at Lower Levels

Existing Structural Overview

Image from Project Documents Provided Courtesy of HINES





- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Redesign the building in steel \bullet
- Modify lateral system to eliminate existing \bullet torsional irregularity
- **Determine Impact** \bullet
 - Architecture
 - Serviceability Walking induced vibrations Cost and schedule

Design Scenario

Proposed Solution

- Use original column locations ullet
- Determine configuration of composite steel beams to control vibrations
- Add steel moment frames to building \bullet perimeter to control torsion
- Determine floor-to-ceiling height impact \bullet
- Compare costs and schedules

- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

Gravity Redesign



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

Preliminary Vibrations Analysis

- \bullet
- \bullet
- **Design Selection:**
- 1.5VLR20

Source: The Preliminary Assessment for Walking-Induced Vibrations in Office Environments by Dr. Linda Hanagan and Taehoo Kim

Vibrations due to human excitation Control peak acceleration of the bay

• 4.25" LW Topping

7.5' – 8' beam spacing

Deck Configuration fo Concrete Strength Steel Grade Deck Type Topping (in) LW/NW? Total Slab Thickness (in Class Select C1 Select C2 Evaluate C1 + C2 C1 + C2 < 0.5?

| r Vi | ibration Control |
|------|------------------|
| | 3000 psi |
| | 50 |
| | 1.5VLR20 |
| | 4.25 |
| | LW |
|) | 5.75 |
| | 4 |
| | 0.413 |
| | 0.019 |
| | 0.432 |
| | GOOD |

- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - **Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout**
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Short
- Long
- Long Direction Selected

Gravity System Layout

Which direction to span infill beams?



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - **Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout**
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Which direction to span infill beams? Short
- Long \bullet
- Long Direction Selected

Gravity System Layout



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - **Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout**
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Short
- Long \bullet
- Long Direction Selected

| | Infill Beam Compa | irison |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | Steel Weight (lbs) | Number of Members |
| Long Direction | 212936 | 155 |
| Short Direction | 179608 | 225 |

Gravity System Layout

Which direction to span infill beams?



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- \circ Conclusions

Gravity System Layout







- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- RAM SS used to develop gravity designs \bullet Composite steel beams Steel columns
- Several designs verified by hand calculations



RAM Gravity Model

| | Gravity Loads | |
|-------|---------------|------------|
| | Dead (PSF) | Live (PSF) |
| ore | 90 | 250 |
| Space | 90 | 80 |



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Common Member Sizes: \bullet
 - W21x44 (28) infill exterior bays W24x62 (32) infill interior bays W21x50 (18) exterior girder



Beam Designs

| | VV244 | 2(28) | + | + <u>-w</u> h | <u>835(2</u> | <u>د م</u> | Meder | 20) | | | 22 |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----|
| VV21×44 (20) | W21x44 (20) | W21×44 (20) | W21×44 (28) | W21x44 (28) | W21x44 (28) | W21x44 (28) | W21x44 (28) | W21x44 (28) | W21x44 (28) | W21x44 (28) | |
| w | 6/26(16 | <u>_</u> | | 1/21/50 | (18) | | | W21x50 | (18) | | |

| 1 | | + | | V | | 1 |
|-----------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------|----------------|
| | W21x44 (28) | | 14 (B)X | W12×1 | W21×44 (28) | |
| | VV21×44 (28) | | 4 (8) | - 4/12×1 | W21x44 (28) | h |
| 0(18) | VV21×44 (28) | | 4 (8) W12×14 (8) | 6(3(⁵) | W21x44 (28) | 0(18) |
| | W21x44 (28) | | 4 (9) WIZX14 (9) | W12x1 | W21×44 (28) | W215 |
| [| W21×44 (28) | | 4 (B) 10/12/14 (B) | | W21x44 (28) | |
| н— | W21x44 (28) | | 4 (8) | - <u>112×1</u> | W21x44 (28) | — ਸਿ |
| 1(18) | VV21x44 (28) | 3(28) | W16x26 (22) | 2(24) | W21x44 (28) |)(18) |
| | W21x44 (28) | W248 | W16x26 (12) | 1/1/24462 | W21x44 (28) | W21x5 |
| | W21×44 (28) | 35 | N12x14 (8) | | ISCI WY HOW | í |
| —) [•] | W21x44 (28) | | 50012x14 (8) | | W21×44 (28) | b |
| 10(18) | W21x44 (28) | | 2 <u>x14</u> pj | | W21x44 (28) | D(18) |
| V21x | W21x44 (28) | 5(20) | <u>VIE ≦1 (42)</u> | 6(20) | W21×44 (28) | W21x |
| - | W21x44 (28) | W62 | V18x35 (20) | <u>W60</u> | W21×44 (28) | 1 |
| 4 | W21x44 (28) | 2) | | 2) | W21×44 (28) | |
| 1(18) | W21×44 (28) | 18:35(2 | V16x26 (22) | 18:35(2 | W21×44 (28) | (18) |
| <u>w2160</u> | VV21×44 (28) | - W | V16x26 (22) | | W21×44 (28) | W2160 |
| | W21x44 (28) | | V16x26 (26) | | W21×44 (28) | |
| -म | W21x44 (20) | 2 (28) | V16x26 (32) | 2 (28) | W21×44 (20) | <u>)</u> Ди |
| <u>v2884</u> | W21x44 (20) | W244 | V16x26 (32) | W244 | (02) x44 (20) | B/26(16 |
| | W21x44 (20) | | V16x26 (32) | | (02) X4X (20) | W |
| 1 | W21x44 (44) | 68 | (CT) CCx41V | H | M07x84 | |
| | W21x44 (20) | W24 | | | | |
| | (018x35 (16) | | | | | |





- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- \circ Conclusions

- Spliced every 2 stories
- Each column line has consistent column depth

Column Designs



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - **Beam and Column Designs**
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Spliced every 2 stories \bullet
- Each column line has consistent column depth **Exterior Column Line**

Column Designs



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - **Beam and Column Designs**
 - Final Vibrations Analysis \bullet
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Spliced every 2 stories \bullet
- Each column line has consistent column depth Exterior Column Line **Interior Column Line**

Column Designs



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - **Final Vibrations Analysis** \bullet
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- \bullet

Final Vibrations Analysis

AISC Design Guide 11 analysis on a typical bay for walking induced vibrations

Determine combined panel weight and natural frequency to determine bay peak acceleration

• $P_0 = 65 \text{ lb}$ From AISC DG 11 – Table 4.1 $\beta = 0.03$ • a₀/g < 0.5% —

$$\frac{a_0}{g} \ge \frac{a_p}{g} \rightarrow 0.5\% \ge 0.38\%$$



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

Lateral Redesign





- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- \circ Conclusions

- Reduced building weight
 → Seismic loads decreased
- Building height unchanged
 → Wind loads unchanged
- Seismic controls

Lateral System

| | Base Shear (Kip) | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Wind N-S | Wind E-W | Seismic N-S | Seismic E-W | | | | | | | |
| Concrete | 583 | 1615 | 7698 | 7698 | | | | | | | |
| Steel | 583 | 1615 | 4935 | 4408 | | | | | | | |

- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- \circ Conclusions



Eccentricity = 10'

Existing Lateral System Layout

COR

COM -







- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- \circ Conclusions



Eccentricity = 1'

New Lateral System Layout

COR

COM





- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- \circ Conclusions

- Rigid diaphragms
- Wall shell elements neglect out of plane stiffness
- Stiffness reduction based on ACI 318-11
- Panel zone deformations considered
- Base constraints

RAM Model



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis \bullet
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - **Moment Frames**
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- - SDC D
 - 198' > 65'

Special Moment Frames

Special moment frames required by ASCE 7-10

Designed to be "clean column" Strong panel zone

Strength and joint optimizations for seismic



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

$$\frac{\sum M_{pc}^{*}}{\sum M_{pb}^{*}} > 1.0 \ (Provisions \ Eq. E3)$$



Special Moment Frames



Strong Column Weak Beam

- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- \circ Conclusions



Special Moment Frames



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis \bullet
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

Special Concrete Shear Walls

Thickness not reduced to control drift

Reinforcing redesigned for reduced loads According to ACI 318-11 Ch. 21



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions



Image from Project Documents Provided Courtesy of HINES

Special Concrete Shear Walls

Shear Wall U Level 2– Reinforcing redesign 7000 PSI NW Concrete, 18" Thick



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls

Architecture Breadth

- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions



Architecture Breadth



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls

Architecture Breadth

- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- concrete

Floor-to-Ceiling Height

Building height limited to 198'-8" by FAA

Steel creates a deeper structural system than

Loss of floor-to-ceiling space



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis \bullet
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls

• Architecture Breadth

- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions \bigcirc

1'-6" Decrease in floor-to-ceiling height

Raised Floor

Concrete Slab **Ceiling Level**

Office Space



Floor-to-Ceiling Height



Concrete

Steel

- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

Construction Breadth



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- steel system

Concrete System Cost

Cost information provided by Hines

Concrete chosen because it was cheaper than

Approximately \$61 per SF

Original Concrete Structur

Cost Per SF

Structural Square Footage

% General Conditions

Total Original Structure Cost

General Conditions Cost

Original Structure Cost w/ out General Conditions

| re Co | ost | Summary |
|-------|-----|------------|
| | \$ | 61.46 |
| | | 462,301 SF |
| | | 14% |
| | \$ | 28,413,000 |
| | \$ | 3,978,000 |
| | \$ | 24,435,000 |

- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- 2009

Steel System Cost

Based on cost information from RS Means

Approximately \$65 per SF

Total Steel Structure Cos Item Concrete on Metal Deck Structural Steel Framing Shear Walls Foundation Walls Lower Level Concrete Slabs Lower Level Concrete Colun Mat Foundation **Total Cost Final Modified Cost**

| st (2009 | RS | 5 Means) |
|----------|----|------------|
| | Co | st |
| | \$ | 3,050,000 |
| | \$ | 9,052,000 |
| | \$ | 4,310,000 |
| | \$ | 1,929,000 |
| | \$ | 2,796,000 |
| nns | \$ | 198,000 |
| | \$ | 4,055,000 |
| | \$ | 25,391,000 |
| | \$ | 30,072,000 |

- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- \bullet

Cost Comparison

23 % Increase in cost for steel system

Validates original decision by designers to design structure in concrete



| mparis | on | |
|--------|----|------------|
| Cost | \$ | 24,435,000 |
| | \$ | 30,072,000 |
| | | 23% |

- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Superstructure duration | 240 days

Concrete System Schedule

Schedule information provided by Hines

| Activity | Activity | Orig – | | | 1000 C100 |
|----------|--|--------|---|------|---|
| ID | Description | Dur F | M | IAMJ | 2012 JAISIONID JIFIMIAIMIJ JAISIONID JIFIMIAIMIJ JAISI |
| CO02500 | Place and Finish | 1 | | | Place and Finish |
| CO02510 | Layout & Control (Afternoon) | 1 | | | Layout & Control (Afternoon) |
| CO02520 | Cure | 1 | L | | I Cure |
| CO02530 | Strip & Sandblast CJ | 1 | L | | Strip & Sandblast CJ |
| CO02570 | Splice & Support Column (Grids K to C) | 2 | L | | I Splice & Support Column (Grids K to C) |
| CO02610 | One Side Shear Walls (Y to Q) | 2 | L | | I One Side Shear Walls (Y to Q) |
| CO02620 | Reinforcing Shear Walls | 3 | Γ | | Reinforcing Shear Walls |
| CO02580 | Reinforcing Inspection at Columns | 2 | L | | Reinforcing Inspection at Columns |
| CO02590 | Close Columns | 2 | L | | I Close Columns |
| CO02630 | Inspection of Shear Walls | 1 | L | | Inspection of Shear Walls |
| CO02600 | Place Columns | 2 | L | | I Place Columns |
| CO02640 | Close Shear Walls | 3 | T | | I Close Shear Walls |
| CO02650 | Place Shear Walls | 1 | L | | I Place Shear Walls |
| CO02660 | Strip and Clean Shear Walls | 2 | L | | I Strip and Clean Shear Walls |
| CO02540 | Strip & Reshore 100% | 2 | L | | Strip & Reshore 100% |
| CO02550 | Reshore 50% | 1 | L | | I Reshore \$0% |
| CO02555 | Form & Place Built - Up Slab | 5 | Г | | Form & Place Built - Up Slab |
| CO02560 | Remove Reshore | 1 | L | | Remove Reshore |
| LEVEL 3 | | | Г | | |
| CO03010 | Form Deck 10 (Grids 1-8 and Y-Q) | 4 | L | | Form Deck 10 (Grids 1-8 and Y-G) |
| CO03030 | Install Reinforcing at Deck and Beams | 4 | L | | I Install Reinfording at Deck and Beams |
| CO03020 | Slab Edge/Screeds/Embeds/Blockouts | 2 | L | | Slab Edge/Screeds/Embeds/Blockouts |
| CO03040 | MEP | 1 | | | I MEP |
| CO03050 | Inspection | 1 | | | Inspection |
| CO03060 | Place and Finish | 1 | | | I Place and Finish |
| CO03070 | Layout & Control (Afternoon) | 1 | | | I Layout & Control (Afternoon) |

Image Extracted from Project Schedule Provided Courtesy of HINES

- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Schedule produced in Microsoft Project
- **Durations from RS Means 2009** \bullet
- Superstructure duration | 230 days

Steel System Schedule

| | Task Name 💂 | Duration | May 1 | | June 1 | | Ju | ily 1 | A | ugust 1 | | Sep |
|----|----------------------------------|-----------|-------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|-------|-----|
| | | | 4/27 | 5/11 | 5/25 | 6/8 | 6/22 | 7/6 | 7/20 | 8/3 | 8/17 | 8/ |
| 9 | Decking - Level 3 | 9.8 days | | Decking - L | evel 3 | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Fireproofing - Levels 2 and 3 | 8 days | | , Fir | reproofing - | Levels 2 a | ind 3 | | | | | |
| 11 | □ Levels 4 and 5 | 42.1 days | | | Levels | s 4 and 5 | | | | | | |
| 12 | Column Erection - Levels 4 and 5 | 3 days | | <mark>D Column</mark> | Erectio n - L | evels 4 an | d 5 | | | | | |
| 13 | Rebar SW - Level 4 and 5 | 4 days | | Rebar S | W - Level 4 | and 5 | | | | | | |
| 14 | Form SW - Level 4 and 5 | 12 days | | - | For | m SW - Le | vel 4 and 5 | 5 | | | | |
| 15 | Place SW - Level 4 and 5 | 1.5 days | | | <mark>а</mark> н | ace SW L | evel 4 a nd | 5 | | | | |
| 16 | Floor Framing- Level 4 | 2.8 days | | | | Floor Fra | aming- Le | vel 4 | | | | |
| 17 | Decking - Level 4 | 7.5 days | | | | | Decking - L | evel 4 | | | | |
| 18 | Floor Framing - Level 5 | 4 days | | | | Flo | or Framing | g - Level 5 | | | | |
| 19 | Decking - Level 5 | 9.8 days | | | | - | D | ecking - Level | 5 | | | |
| 20 | Fireproofing - Levels 4 and 5 | 8 days | | | | | | Firepro | oofing - Leve | ls 4 and 5 | | |
| 21 | $\overline{}$ Levels 6 and 7 | 43.3 days | | | | | | | Levels 6 an | d 7 | | , |
| 22 | Column Erection - Levels 6 and 7 | 3 days | | | | | - | Column Erec | tion - Levels | 6 and 7 | | |
| 23 | Rebar SW - Level 6 and 7 | 4 days | | | | | | Rebar SW - | Level 6 and | 7 | | |
| 24 | Form SW - Level 6 and 7 | 12 days | | | | | | - | Form SV | /-Level 6 a | ind 7 | |
| 25 | Place SW - Level 6 and 7 | 1.5 days | | | | | | | Place St | V - Level 6 | and 7 | |
| 26 | Floor Framing - Level 6 | 4 days | | | | | | | + | | | |





- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- \bullet
- \bullet

Schedule Comparison

Only 2 weeks time savings

Not worth the 23% cost increase

• If time savings were more significant, cost increase may have been offset

| | Task Name | Duration | May 1 | | June 1 | L | J | July 1 | | August 1 | | Sep |
|----|----------------------------------|-----------|-------|-----------|---------------------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-----|
| | | | 4/27 | 5/11 | 5/25 | 6/8 | 6/22 | 7/6 | 7/20 | 8/3 | 8/17 | 8/ |
| 9 | Decking - Level 3 | 9.8 days | | Decking - | · Level 3 | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Fireproofing - Levels 2 and 3 | 8 days | | | Fireproofing | - Levels 2 | and 3 | | | | | |
| 11 | Levels 4 and 5 | 42.1 days | | | Leve | ls 4 and 5 | | | | | | |
| 12 | Column Erection - Levels 4 and 5 | 3 days | | Colum | n Erection - I | Levels 4 a | nd 5 | | | | | |
| 13 | Rebar SW - Level 4 and 5 | 4 days | | Rebar | r SW - Level | 4 and 5 | | | | | | |
| 14 | Form SW - Level 4 and 5 | 12 days | | - | Fo | rm SW - L | evel 4 and | 5 | | | | |
| 15 | Place SW - Level 4 and 5 | 1.5 days | | | ۰. ۲ | Hace SW | Level 4 a n | id 5 | | | | |
| 16 | Floor Framing- Level 4 | 2.8 days | | | | Floor F | raming- L | evel 4 | | | | |
| 17 | Decking - Level 4 | 7.5 days | | | | | -Decking - | Level 4 | | | | |
| 18 | Floor Framing - Level 5 | 4 days | | | | E I | loor Frami | ng - Level 5 | | | | |
| 19 | Decking - Level 5 | 9.8 days | | | | - | \' | Decking - Leve | el 5 | | | |
| 20 | Fireproofing - Levels 4 and 5 | 8 days | | | | | - | , Firep | roofing - Lev | els 4 and 5 | | |
| 21 | $\overline{}$ Levels 6 and 7 | 43.3 days | | | | | | | Levels 6 a | nd 7 | | |
| 22 | Column Erection - Levels 6 and 7 | 3 days | | | | | | , Column Ere | ection - Leve | ls 6 and 7 | | |
| 23 | Rebar SW - Level 6 and 7 | 4 days | | | | | 4 | Rebar SW | - Level 6 and | 17 | | |
| 24 | Form SW - Level 6 and 7 | 12 days | | | | | | | Form S | W - Level 6 a | and 7 | |
| 25 | Place SW - Level 6 and 7 | 1.5 days | | | | | | | Place S | W - Level 6 | and 7 | |
| 26 | Floor Framing - Level 6 | 4 days | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | |





- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

- Designed a feasible steel gravity system with vibration reducing characteristics
- Designed special steel moment frames
- Eliminated torsional irregularity
- Reduced floor-to-ceiling heights
- Increased cost for steel structure is not offset by reduction in project schedule

Conclusions



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions

Special Thanks to:

Hines

Nabih Youssef Associates

AE Faculty | especially Dr. Linda Hanagan & Prof. Sustersic

Benjamin Barben

My loving family, boyfriend, friends, and classmates

Acknowledgements



- Building Introduction
- Design Scenario and Proposed Solution
- Gravity Redesign
 - Preliminary Vibrations Analysis and Layout
 - Beam and Column Designs
 - Final Vibrations Analysis
- Lateral Redesign
 - Layout \bullet
 - Moment Frames
 - Shear Walls
- Architecture Breadth
- Construction Breadth
- Conclusions



Questions and Comments?











Architecture Breadth



- Building height limited to 198'-8" by FAA
- Steel creates a deeper structural system than
 - concrete
- Loss of floor-to-ceiling space

Appendix List

Floor-to-Ceiling Height





Concrete Slab

Ceiling Level

Office Space

1'-6" Decrease in floor-to-ceiling height

Raised Floor

Appendix List

Floor-to-Ceiling Height



Concrete

Steel



| Required Fire-Resistance Ratings | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Element | Construction Type | Required Rating (hours) | | | | | |
| Primary Floor Framing Members | Type 1B | 2 | | | | | |
| Secondary Floor Framing Members | Type 1B | 2 | | | | | |
| Structural Columns | Type 1A | 3 | | | | | |



Fire Protection Breadth

TABLE 601 FIRE-RESISTANCE RATING REQUIREMENTS FOR BUILDING ELEMENTS (HOURS)

| BUILDING ELEMENT | | PEI | TYP | TYPE II TYPE III | | EIII | TYPE IV | YPE IV TYPE V | |
|--|---------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------|---------------------------|------------------|--------|
| | | В | Ad | В | Ad | В | HT | Ad | в |
| Primary structural frame ^g (see Section 202) | 3ª | 2ª | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | HT | 1 | 0 |
| Bearing walls Exterior ^{f, g} Interior | 3 3ª | 2 2ª | 1 1 | 0 0 | 2 1 | 2 0 | 2 1/HT | 1 1 | 0 0 |
| Nonbearing walls and partitions Exterior | | | See Table 602 | | | | | | |
| Nonbearing walls and partitions Interior ^e | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | See Section 602.4.6 | 0 | 0 |
| Floor construction and associated secondary members (see Section 202) | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | HT | 1 | 0 |
| Roof construction and associated secondary members (see Section 202) | | 1 ^{b,c} | 1 ^{b.c} | 0° | 1 ^{b.c} | 0 | НТ | 1 ^{b,c} | 0 |

For SI: 1 foot = 304.8 mm.

- a. Roof supports: Fire-resistance ratings of primary structural frame and bearing walls are permitted to be reduced by 1 hour where supporting a roof only.
- b. Except in Group F-1, H, M and S-1 occupancies, fire protection of structural members shall not be required, including protection of roof framing and decking where every part of the roof construction is 20 feet or more above any floor immediately below. Fire-retardant-treated wood members shall be allowed to be used for such unprotected members.
- . In all occupancies, heavy timber shall be allowed where a 1-hour or less fire-resistance rating is required.
- d. An approved automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 shall be allowed to be substituted for 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction, provided such system is not otherwise required by other provisions of the code or used for an allowable area increase in accordance with Section 506.3 or an allowable height increase in accordance with Section 504.2. The 1-hour substitution for the fire resistance of exterior walls shall not be permitted.
- e. Not less than the fire-resistance rating required by other sections of this code.
- f. Not less than the fire-resistance rating based on fire separation distance (see Table 602).
- g. Not less than the fire-resistance rating as referenced in Section 704.10

Design No. N708

February 08, 2014



 $h_2 = h_1 [(W_1 / D_1) + 0.60] / [(W_2 / D_2) + 0.60]$ (Equation 7-17)

where:

- = Thickness of sprayed fire-resistant material in h_{-} inches.
- = Weight of the structural steel beam or girder in Wpounds per linear foot.
- = Heated perimeter of the structural steel beam in Dinches.

Appendix List

1.5" of SFRM

Fire Protection Breadth

Subscript 1 refers to the beam and fire-resistant material thickness in the *approved* assembly.

| Required Spray Fireproofing Thickness | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|--|--|
| 722.5.2.2.1 Requirements | 722.5.2.1 Requirements | | | | | | |
| Min W/D for Substitute | 0.37 | OK | | | | | |
| Beam: | | | | | | | |
| Min Thickness of | 0.375 | in | | | | | |
| Protection: | | | | | | | |
| Unrestrained/restrained? | Unrestrained (to be conservative) | | | | | | |
| Min Fire Rating: | 1 hour | | | | | | |
| Required Fire Rating: | 2 hour | | | | | | |
| Minimum Beam Size: | W12x14 | | | | | | |
| Heated Perimeter: | 0.405 | | | | | | |
| Assembly Tested | Min Beam Size h1 W1/D1 W2/D2 h2 | | | | h2 | | |
| N708 | W8x28 | 1.00 | 0.819 | 0.405 | 1.412 | | |



- The outer layer must be 5/8 inches thick. The inner layers will be 5/8 inch thick wall board as well. The wallboard is installed without any horizontal joints. 1 inch long self-drilling screws shall be spaced as required for the installation of the first layer of wall board.
- 28 MSG galvanized metal corner bead 2.
- 18 SWG annealed wire, space 6 inches from each end and at 1'-9" intervals 3.
- May be finished with 3/32" thick gypsum veneer plaster. Joints reinforced. 4.
- Laminated with joint cement. 5.
- 1 inch long self-drilling screws spaced at 12" center to center 6.
- Minimum column size of W10X49. 9/16 flange thickness and 5/16 inch web thickness. 14.4 square inch area.

Appendix List

Fire Protection Breadth



- 4.25 LW topping provided
- Adequate for 2 hour fire resistance between levels





Appendix List

Fire Protection Breadth

TABLE 707.3.10 FIRE-RESISTANCE RATING REQUIREMENTS FOR FIRE BARRIER ASSEMBLIES OR HORIZONTAL ASSEMBLIES BETWEEN FIRE AREAS

| CUPANCY GROUP | FIRE-RESISTANCE RATING (hours) |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| H-1, H-2 | 4 |
| F-1, H-3, S-1 | 3 |
| B, E, F-2, H-4, H-5, I, M, R, S-2 | 2 |
| U | 1 |

Restrained Assembly Rating

2 Hr. (continued)

| Туре | Concrete |
|------------------|-------------------|
| of | Thickness & |
| Protection | Type (1) |
| | 2" NW&LW |
| Sprayed Fiber | 2 1/2" NW&LW |
| | 2 1/2 ' LW |
| | 2 1/2" NW |
| | 3 1/4' LW |
| Inprotected Deck | 3 1/4 ' LW |
| | 4 1⁄2" NW |





Fire Protection Breadth



Spread of fire (unprotected)

In an unprotected curtain wall, or in one protected with low-melt glass fiber insulation, there are three ways in which fire can spread from floor to floor.

- 1. Through the space between the slab edge and the curtain wall.
- 2. Through the window head mullion and then up through the cavity of the curtain
- 3. Out through the broken vision glass and back in through the curtain wall.





THERMAFIBER Life-Safety Fire Containment Products compartmentalize fire, preventing it from spreading from the floor of origin up to the floor above by:

- 1. Filling the slab-edge/curtain wall gap with Thermafiber Safing Insulation
- 2. Protecting the vertical mullions
- 3. Providing a vertical barrier to fire using Thermafiber Curtain Wall or FireSpan Insulation



Appendix List

Shear Wall Modeling

Shear Wall Modeling Method





- Shell elements connected at nodes caused an irregular distribution of torsional forces within the wall core
- Bentley suggested disconnecting the shear walls and adding gravity framing elements to eliminate a "framing tables" error
- Does not count on flanged walls to take out of plane loads or to help in flexure
- Eliminated odd torsionally anomaly

Appendix List



Appendix List

Model Verification

Center of N Center of Rigi Floor N

Seismic Lo

Wind Lo

2D Ana

Appendix List

Model Verification

| Model Verification Summary | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | % Error X-Direction | % Error Y-Direction | | | | | |
| / lass | 0.284% | 1.265% | | | | | |
| idity | 2.813% | 1.681% | | | | | |
| / lass | 11% | | | | | | |
| bads | 15% | | | | | | |
| bads | s 0.25% 3.31% | | | | | | |
| lysis | 10 - 20 % | | | | | | |

Appendix List

Dual System Check

Appendix List

8

Dual System Check



Dual System Ch X-Direction Direct Shear (kip) % of To ltem Frame 1 595.21 Frame 2 643.37 Shear Walls 2020.00 Total Shear 3258.58 kip **Y-Direction Direct** % of To Shear (kip) Item Frame 3 35.61 Frame 4 32.41 97. Shear Walls 2941.00 **Total Shear** 3009.02 kip

| ieck | |
|-----------|------------|
| Shear | |
| tal Shear | Dual Syste |
| .27% | No |
| .74% | No |
| .99% | - |
| | |
| | |
| Shear | |
| tal Shear | Dual Syste |
| | |

m?

| al Shear | Dual System? |
|----------|--------------|
| 8% | No |
| 8% | No |
| 74% | _ |
| | |

Lateral System Verification

Appendix List



- Drifts for wind and seismic were verified to meet code and industry standard requirements (Cd=5, R=6)
- Torsional analysis was performed at each story under the different seismic load cases and found to no longer have an irregularity
- Stability coefficients were verified
- Overturning moment was checked under the controlling load case

Appendix List

Lateral System Verification

| Wind Displacement Determination | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|--|--|--|
| Load Case | X - Deflection (in) | Y - Deflection (in) | L/400 (in) | Pass/Fail? | | | |
| Wind_ASCE710_1_X | 1.91 | 0.00 | 5.940 | Pass | | | |
| Wind_ASCE710_1_Y | 0.00 | 2.11 | 5.940 | Pass | | | |
| Wind_ASCE710_2_X+E | 1.43 | -0.01 | 5.940 | Pass | | | |
| Wind_ASCE710_2_X-E | 1.43 | 0.01 | 5.940 | Pass | | | |
| Wind_ASCE710_2_Y+E | 0.01 | 1.68 | 5.940 | Pass | | | |
| Wind_ASCE710_2_Y-E | -0.01 | 1.49 | 5.940 | Pass | | | |
| Wind_ASCE710_3_X+Y | 1.43 | 1.58 | 5.940 | Pass | | | |
| Wind_ASCE710_3_X-Y | 1.43 | -1.58 | 5.940 | Pass | | | |
| Wind_ASCE710_4_X+Y_CW | 1.07 | 1.11 | 5.940 | Pass | | | |
| Wind_ASCE710_4_X+Y_CCW | 1.08 | 1.27 | 5.940 | Pass | | | |
| Wind_ASCE710_4_X-Y_CW | 1.07 | -1.26 | 5.940 | Pass | | | |
| Wind_ASCE710_4_X-Y_CCW | 1.08 | -1.10 | 5.940 | Pass | | | |

- Drifts for wind and seismic were verified to meet code and industry standard requirements (Cd=5, R=6)
- Torsional analysis was performed at each story under the different seismic load cases and found to no longer have an irregularity
- Stability coefficients were verified

Appendix List

 Overturning moment was checked under the controlling load case



| Seismic Story Drift Check | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|--|--|
| | | $C_d^* \delta_x$ | | Allowable Drift (in) | Pass/Fail? | | | |
| vei | | X-Direction | Y-Direction | Allowable Drift (in) | X-Direction | Y-Direction | | |
| Roof | 24.33 | 5.15 | 2.04 | 5.839 | Pass | Pass | | |
| ΥH | 14.5 | 3.08 | 1.22 | 3.480 | Pass | Pass | | |
| 13 | 14 | 2.83 | 1.02 | 3.360 | Pass | Pass | | |
| .2 | 14 | 2.87 | 1.01 | 3.360 | Pass | Pass | | |
| 1 | 14 | 2.89 | 1.00 | 3.360 | Pass | Pass | | |
| L O | 14 | 2.89 | 0.97 | 3.360 | Pass | Pass | | |
| 9 | 14 | 2.85 | 0.93 | 3.360 | Pass | Pass | | |
| 8 | 14 | 2.76 | 0.88 | 3.360 | Pass | Pass | | |
| 7 | 14 | 2.62 | 0.82 | 3.360 | Pass | Pass | | |
| 6 | 14 | 2.41 | 0.74 | 3.360 | Pass | Pass | | |
| 5 | 14 | 2.13 | 0.64 | 3.360 | Pass | Pass | | |
| 4 | 14 | 1.76 | 0.53 | 3.360 | Pass | Pass | | |
| 3 | 14 | 1.29 | 0.40 | 3.360 | Pass | Pass | | |
| 2 | 15 | 0.78 | 0.27 | 3.600 | Pass | Pass | | |
| Overall D | isplacement= | 36.32 | 12.46 | | | | | |

- Drifts for wind and seismic were verified to meet code and industry standard requirements (Cd=5, R=6)
- Torsional analysis was performed at each story under the different seismic load cases and found to no longer have an irregularity
- Stability coefficients were verified
- Overturning moment was checked under the controlling load case



Appendix List

Lateral System Verification

| Check for Torsional Irregularities X Direction | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------|---------------------|--|--|
| Loval | S | S | S | S | Does a torsional | | |
| Levei | 0 _A | Ο _B | O _{avg} | OMAX | irregularity exist? | | |
| PH | 0.6268 | 0.6269 | 0.63 | 0.6269 | No | | |
| Level 13 | 0.5762 | 0.5764 | 0.58 | 0.5764 | No | | |
| Level 12 | 0.5846 | 0.5847 | 0.58 | 0.5847 | No | | |
| Level 11 | 0.5887 | 0.5888 | 0.59 | 0.5888 | No | | |
| Level 10 | 0.5877 | 0.5878 | 0.59 | 0.5878 | No | | |
| Level 9 | 0.5788 | 0.5789 | 0.58 | 0.5789 | No | | |
| Level 8 | 0.5614 | 0.5615 | 0.56 | 0.5615 | No | | |
| Level 7 | 0.5320 | 0.5321 | 0.53 | 0.5321 | No | | |
| Level 6 | 0.4901 | 0.4902 | 0.49 | 0.4902 | No | | |
| Level 5 | 0.4330 | 0.4331 | 0.43 | 0.4331 | No | | |
| Level 4 | 0.3582 | 0.3582 | 0.36 | 0.3582 | No | | |
| Level 3 | 0.2116 | 0.2637 | 0.24 | 0.2637 | No | | |

- Drifts for wind and seismic were verified to meet code and industry standard requirements (Cd=5, R=6)
- Torsional analysis was performed at each story under the different seismic load cases and found to no longer have an irregularity
- Stability coefficients were verified

Appendix List

 Overturning moment was checked under the controlling load case





Lateral System Verification

| Building Resisting Moment | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------|------|--|
| orst Case Resistance - Y Direction | | | |
| al Building Weight = | 82296 | kip | |
| Moment Arm = | 57.5 | ft | |
| Factory of Safety= | 0.67 | | |
| M _{resisting} = | 3170446 | ft-k | |

Check Ov

Worst Case Resist

Overturning Moment =

Resisting Moment =

Okay?

Worst Case Moment for Building Overturning Seismic Y Direction - Load Case: Y + YET **381110** | ft-k

| erturning | | | |
|--------------------|--------|--|--|
| ance - Y Direction | | | |
| 381,110 | ft-kip | | |
| 3,170,446 | ft-kip | | |
| Pass | | | |

Appendix List

Vibrations Analysis

- LL = 11 PSF
- Superimposed DL = 40 PSF
- Concrete weight = 50 pcf (Lightweight)
- Floor thickness = 5.75"
- 1.5VLR20 with 4.25" LW topping
- $P_0 = 65lb$
- β = 0.03
- $a_0/g = 0.5\%$

Appendix List

- **Beam Properties:**
- W_i = 153 kip $f_{i} = 4.39 \text{ Hz}$
- W_g = 205.3 kip $f_{g} = 4.86 Hz$
- **Combined Mode Properties:** $f_{n} = 3.36 \text{ Hz}$ $W_{total} = 174.5 \text{ kip}$

Vibrations Analysis



 $a_p/g < a_0/g$

(28)

(28)

 (\mathbf{R})



W21x50(18)