Optimum Seismic Protection for New Building

NSF-RA-E-73-581

Construction in Eastern Metropolitan Areas

NSF Grant GK-27955

Internal Study Report No. 33

A REVIEW OF RECENT MATHEMATICAL MODELS MADE ON ACTUAL BUILDINGS AND THE ACCURACY OF THE PREDICTED PERIODS

> M. H. Ackroyd R. V. Whitman

> > May, 1973

Department of Civil Engineering

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Cambridge, Massachusetts

ASRA INFORMATION RESOURCES NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

REPORT DOCUMENTATION 1REPORT NO. PAGE 1* * </th <th>50272 -101</th> <th></th> <th>······</th> <th>·</th>	50272 -101		······	·
4. mese same Zeere Review of Recent Wathematical Models Made on ACtual 5. neeret can Buildings and the Accuracy of the Predicted Predicts (Dethinung May 1973 Seismic Protection for New Building Construction in Eastern New York N. H. Acknyd, R. V. Whitman N. H. Acknyd, R. V. Whitman New Seismic Protection Math New Anothe N. H. Acknyd, R. V. Whitman New Seismic Protection Math New Assachusetts Institute of Technology Department metatoria New Seismice New Cambridge, Massachusetts D2139 Co G (C27955) 10. Seismic Protection and Access Co Co 1200 G Street, N.W. New Seismic Protection Math New Maccess New Seismic Protection Seismic	REPORT DOCUMENTATION1. REPORT NO.PAGENSF-RA-E-73-581	2.	3. Recipient's	Accession No.
Builtings and the Accuracy of the Predicted Periods (uptimum	4. Title and Subtitle Review of Recent Mathematical	Models Made on Act	Udl 5. Report Da	te
Metropolitan Areas, Internal Study Report 33) * Admotion * Admotion * Admotion * M. H. Ackroyd, R. V. Whitman No. 33 * * <	Buildings and the Accuracy of the Predict Seismic Protection for New Building Const	ed Periods (Optimu ruction in Fasterr	Im May	1973
7. Autority M. H. A. Akroyd, R. V., Whitman 8. Performe Organization Ners, Ne. Mo., 33 9. Performe Organization Ners and Autors: 10. Project/tast/Ners, Unit Ne. Massachusetts Institute of Technology Department of Civil Engineering 10. Project/tast/Ners, Unit Ne. Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139 10. Organization Ners and Autors: Iz. Sectoring Organization Ners and Autors: 11. Divised Nerson Autors: Engineering and Applied Science (EAS) National Science Foundation 11. Trise of Nerson Autors: 18. Autors: dumit 200 words 13. 19. Supplementary Notes 14. 19. Washington, D. C. 20550 14. 19. Supplementary Notes 15. 19. Supplementary Notes 15. 19. Supplementary Notes 11. 19. Suplementasuple is a Disorphore 12. <td><u>Metropolitan Areas</u>, Int<u>ernal Study</u> Report</td> <td>33)</td> <td>ı o.</td> <td></td>	<u>Metropolitan Areas</u> , Int <u>ernal Study</u> Report	33)	ı o.	
In The Table Opty is the initial information No. 33 Preferring Organization Name and Address IL Project/Table/Xerowork Unit No. Massachusetts Institute of Echinology Department of Civil Ingincering Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139 IL Contraction Contraction No. Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139 IC Contraction Name and Address Engineering and Applied Science (EAS) National Science Foundation IB Type of Report & Period Covered National Science Foundation IS Type of Report & Period Covered 16 Abstract (Unit 200 wress) 14. 16 Abstract (Unit 200 wress) 14. 17 A set of the Period Science (EAS) 14. 18 Dog Street, N.W. 14. 19 Abstract (Unit 200 wress) 14. 10 Abstract (Unit 200 wress) 14. 11 Abstract (Unit 200 wress) 15. 12 Abstract (Unit 200 wress) 16. 13 Type of Report 4 & Period Covered 16. 14 Abstract (Unit 200 wress) 16. 15 Abstract (Unit 200 wress) 16. 16 Abstract (Unit 200 wress) <td>7. Author(s) M H Ackrovd R V Whitman</td> <td></td> <td>8. Performin</td> <td>g Organization Rept. No.</td>	7. Author(s) M H Ackrovd R V Whitman		8. Performin	g Organization Rept. No.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology Department of Civil Engineering Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139 II. Centeradity or Grantity No. 12. Spentering Organization Name and Address Engineering and Applied Science (EAS) National Science Foundation 1800 G Street, N.W. Mashington, D.C. 20550 13. Type of Reson & Period Coursed 14. Abstract Unit 200 werdet This report reviews recent analytical studies made on actual buildings for which both mathematical models have been developed and experimental measurements have been made to determine the fundamental periods of vibration. Three case studies are presented: a concrete shear wall building; a steel moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building. These are followed by a brief review of analytical studies for which the measured period is obtained by ambient vibration tests, man-excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests only. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Decoment Analyse a. Decontors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Steaties/OsesEnded terms 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No of Page 22. No. of Page 23. Appl. 18. Abelleting / OsesEnded terms 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Page 22. No. of Page 23. Appl. 19. Security Class (This Page) 22. No. of Page 23. Appl.	9. Performing Organization Name and Address		NO.	33 Geoly (Merch Linite No.
Department of Civil Engineering Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139 11. Contractors or Granitation Name and Adoress Engineering and Applied Science (EAS) National Science Foundation 1800 6 Street, N.W. Mashington, D.C. 20550 13. Tree of Report & Period Covered 14. Asstract Unit 200 words) 14. 15. Suggementary Notes 14. 16. Asstract Unit 200 words) 14. 17. Suggementary Notes 14. 18. Suggementary Notes 14. 18. Suggementary Notes 14. 19. Asstract Unit 200 words) 15. 19. Asstract Unit 200 words) 15. 19. Asstract Unit 200 words) 16. 19. Suggementary Notes 16. 19.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology		IG. Project/	ask/work Unit No.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139 Co Ge GK27955 13. Spectraine Organization Name and Address Engineering and Applied Science (EAS) National Science Foundation 1800 G Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20550 13. Supplementary Notes 34. Address Concrete shear vall buildings for which both mathematical models have been developed and experimental measurements have been made to determine the fundamental periods of vibration. Three case studies are presented: a concrete shear wall building; for which both mathematical models have been developed and experimental measurements have been made to determine the fundamental periods of vibration. Three case studies are presented: a concrete shear wall building; a steel moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building. These are followed by a brief review of analytical studies for which the measured period is obtained by ambient vibration tests, man-excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests only. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Decument Analysis a Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Mathematical models b. lownthese/OwenEaded terms 28. Avainability Statement NTIS 29. Security Class (This Report) 21. No of Page 20. Avainable 21. No of Page 21. No of Page 22. Avainable 23. Avainable 24. Avainable 24. Avainable 25. Security Class (This Report) 25. Security Class (This Page) 26. Security Class (This Page) 27. Decument Analysis 26. COSATI Field/Broup 27. Security Class (This Page) 27. Security Class (This Page) 28. Avainable 29. Security Class (This Page) 20. Security Class (This Page) 21. No of Page 21. No	Department of Civil Engineering		11. Contract(C) or Grant(G) No.
12. Spennoning Organization Names and Address [60] GK27955 12. Segmenting and Applied Science (EAS) 13. True of Report & Period Covered National Science Foundation 14. 18:00 G Street, N.M. 14. Washington, D.C. 20550 14. 13. Supplementary Netes 14. 14. 14. 15. Supplementary Netes 14. 16. Austrest (Limit 200 words) 14. 16. Austrest (Limit 200 words) 14. 17. Decommentary Netes 14. 18. Austrest (Limit 200 words) 14. 19. Supplementary Netes 14. 19. Supplementary Netes 14. 19. Austrest (Limit 200 words) 15. 19. Austrest (Limit 200 words) 14. 19. Austrest (Limit 200 words) 14. 19. Austrest (Limit 200 words) 14. 19. Austrest (Limit 200 words) 15. 19. Austrest (Limit 200 words) 16. 19. Austrest (Limit 200 words) 16. 19. Austrest (Lim	Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139		(C)	
12. Security Class Class Name and Advess 13. Type of Report & Period Covered Engineering and Applied Science (EAS) 14. National Science Foundation 14. 18. Supplementary Notes 14. 19. Supplementary Notes 15. Supplementary Notes 19. Supplementary Notes 10. 19. Supplementary Notes 11. 19.			^(G) GK27	955
Intering and Applied Science (LAS) National Science Foundation 1800 G Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20550 15. Supplementary Noiss 16. Asstrat (Limit 200 words) This report reviews recent analytical studies made on actual buildings for which both mathematical models have been developed and experimental measurements have been made to determine the fundamental periods of vibration. Three case studies are presented: a concrete moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Document Analysis a. Desentors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Analysis an Desentors Framed structures Steel construction Concrete structures Buildings Framed structures Steel construction Concrete structures Buildings b. Identifiers/DepareEnded Terms 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages c. COSANI Field/Group 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages c. COSANI Field/Group 19. Security Class (12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address		13. Type of I	Report & Period Covered
1800 G Street, N.W. Nashington, D.C. 2050 15. Supplementary Notes 16. Asstract (Limit 200 weres) 17. Supplementary Notes 18. Supplementary Notes 19. Asstract (Limit 200 weres) 19. Supplementary Notes 19. Supplementary Notes 19. Asstract (Limit 200 weres) 19. Supplementary Notes 19. Asstract (Limit 200 weres) 11. Supplementary Notes 19. Asstract (Limit 200 weres) 11. Supplementary Notes 19. Asstract (Limit 200 weres) 11. Supplementary Notes 12. Asstract (Limit 200 weres) 13. Supplementary Notes 14. Machine (Limit 200 weres) 15. Supplementary Notes 15. Supplementary Notes 15. Supplementary Notes 16. Astract (Limit 200 weres) 17. Decument Analysis a Concrete shear wall building; a steel moment-resisting frame building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. 17. Decument Analysis a Descriptors 17. Decument Analysis a Descriptors 18. Asstract Call models 19. Security Class (This Report) 10. Asstract Call models 11. Supplementary Opentended forms<	National Science Foundation			
Washington, D.C. 20550 15. Supplementary Notes This report reviews recent analytical studies made on actual buildings for which both mathematical models have been developed and experimental measurements have been made to determine the fundamental periods of vibration. Three case studies are presented: a concrete shear wall building; asteel moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building. These are followed by a brief review of analytical studies for which the measured period is obtained by ambient vibration tests, man-excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests only. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Decomment Analysis a Desensors Steel construction Concrete structures Buildings Framed structures Steel construction Concrete structures Buildings * cosANI Field/Group 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages * cosANI Field/Group 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages * cosANI Field/Group 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages * a COSANI Field/Group 22. Fincl 22. Fincl 23	1800 G Street, N.W.		14.	
15. Supplementary Notes 16. Abstract (Limit. 200 words) This report reviews recent analytical studies made on actual buildings for which both mathematical models have been developed and experimental measurements have been made to determine the fundamental periods of vibration. Three case studies are presented: a concrete shear wall building; a steel moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building. These are followed by a brief review of analytical studies for which the measured period is obtained by ambient vibration tests, man-excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests 0.19. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Decument Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Wibration tests Buildings Framed structures Buildings b. Identifiers/OpenEnded Terms 19. Security Class (this Record) 21. No. of Pages c. COSATI Field/Uncup 19. Security Class (this Record) 21. No. of Pages a. Assibility Statement NTIS 29. Security Class (this Record) 21. No. of Pages 30. Security Class (this Record)	Washington, D.C. 20550			
16. Abstract (Limit: 200 works) This report reviews recent analytical studies made on actual buildings for which both mathematical models have been developed and experimental measurements have been made to determine the fundamental periods of vibration. Three case studies are presented: a concrete shear wall building; a steel moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building. These are followed by a brief review of analytical studies for which the measured period is obtained by ambient vibration tests, man-excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests only. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Decument Analysis a. Descriptors Steel construction Mathematical models Concrete structures Steel construction Notables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Decument Analysis a. Descriptors Steel construction Concrete structures Steel construction Nationatical models Concrete structures buildings Framed structures b. lamitiles/logone	15. Supplementary Notes			
16. Adstract (Limit 200 words) This report reviews recent analytical studies made on actual buildings for which both mathematical models have been developed and experimental measurements have been made to determine the fundamental periods of vibration. Three case studies are presented: a concrete shear wall building; a steel moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building. These are followed by a brief review of analytical studies for which the measured period is obtained by ambient vibration tests, man-excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests only. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Document Analysis & Descriptors Steel construction Mathematical models C. COSATI Field/Group Concrete structures Buildings b. Identifiers/Open Ended Terms 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages c. COSATI Field/Group 21. No. of Pages 22. Price 23. Adv c. COSATI Field/Group See Instructions on Reverse 21. No. of Pages 21. No. of Pages 20. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 22. Price 23. Adv				
16. Astruct Limit 200 words) This report reviews recent analytical studies made on actual buildings for which both mathematical models have been made to determine the fundamental periods of vibration. Three case studies are presented: a concrete shear wall building; a steel moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building. These are followed by a brief review of analytical studies for which the measured period is obtained by ambient vibration tests, man-excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests only. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models Concrete structures Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures Limit description La Availability Statement 19. Security Class (This Recort) 21. No. of Pages Attribuilders/Open Ended Terms 20. Security Class (This Recort) 21. No. of Pages 20. Security Class (This Recort) 21. No. of Pages 20. Security Class (This Recort) 21. No. of Pages 30. Sec Instructures on Reverse Sec I	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Intermedication models have been developed and experimental measurements have been made to determine the fundamental periods of vibration. Three case studies are presented: a concrete shear wall building; a steel moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building. These are followed by a brief review of analytical studies for which the measured period is obtained by ambient vibration tests, man-excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests only. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental measured period is obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Decument Analysis a. Descriptore Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models Concrete structures Buildings Vibration tests Buildings 21. No. of Pages a. codAll Field/Group 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages a. Mathematical models 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages b. Identifiers/OpenEnded Terms 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages c. codAll Field/Group 22. Price 20. Price 20. Price 18. Availability Starement	16. Abstract (Limit: 200 words)	1		
been made to determine the fundamental periods of vibration. Three case studies are presented: a concrete shear wall building; a steel moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building. These are followed by a brief review of analytical studies for which the measured period is obtained by ambient vibration tests, man-excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests only. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 12. Document Analysis a Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models Concrete structures Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures Steel construction b. Identifiers/Open Ended Terms 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 2. Price Action NTIS 2. Price Action 2. Brock 2. Price Action 2. Brock 2. Price Action 2. Security Class (This Report) 2. Price 2. Price Set Instructions on Reverse OPTIONAL FORM 222 (ACTION) <td>Inis report reviews recent analytical stu</td> <td>ales made on actua</td> <td>al buildings T</td> <td>or which ts have</td>	Inis report reviews recent analytical stu	ales made on actua	al buildings T	or which ts have
are presented: a concrete shear wall building; a steel moment-resisting frame building; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building. These are followed by a brief review of analytical studies for which the measured period is obtained by ambient vibration tests, man-excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests only. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Earthquake resistant structures Earthquake resistant structures Buildings Framed structures b. Identifiers/Open Ended Terms a. COSATI Field/Group 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 22. Price 23. Appl 23. Model See ANSI-233-18) See Instructions on Reverse OPTIONAL FORM 222 (4-77 (Former's NILS)	been made to determine the fundamental pe	riods of vibration	1. Three case	studies
bilding; and a concrete moment-resisting frame building. These are followed by a brief review of analytical studies for which the measured period is obtained by ambient vibration tests, man-excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests only. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models Concrete structures Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures Buildings b. Identifiers/Open Ended Terms 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 36. ANSI-233.18) See Instructions on Reverse 00FIONAL FORM 222 (4-77 (Formula - 50))	are presented: a concrete shear wall bui	lding; a steel mor	ment-resisting	frame
a Drier review Of analytical studies for which the Medsured period is obtained by ambient vibration tests, an excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests only. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models 17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models 17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures Buildings b. identifiers/Open.Ended Terms 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages a. COSATI Field/Group 22. Price 22. Price 18. Availability Statement 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages NTIS 22. Price 22. Price See ANSI-233.18) See Instructions on Reverse OPTIONAL FORM 272 (4-77 (Formeret NTL-56)) <td>building; and a concrete moment-resisting</td> <td>frame building.</td> <td>These are fol</td> <td>lowed by</td>	building; and a concrete moment-resisting	frame building.	These are fol	lowed by
anisotic evides of the state and the state of the st	a priet review of analytical studies for ambient vibration tests man-excited vibr	which the measured	1 period is ob vrced vibratio	tained by n tests
tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained. A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models Concrete structures Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures Buildings b. Identifiers/OpenEnded Terms 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price 22. Price 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price 22. Price Stee ANSI-239.18 See Instructions on Reverse OPTIONAL FORM 272 (4-73)	only. Each review gives a brief descript	ion of the buildir	ig, the experi	mental
A review of studies is reported in which the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experienced during earthquake excitation. Two tables summarize the results of the studies and list the percentage differences between the computed and observed periods for each building. 17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models Vibration tests Framed structures b. Identifiers/OpenEnded Terms See ANSI-Z39.18) See Instructions on Reverse (Comparing Class (This Page) See Instructions on Reverse (Comparing Class (This Page)	tests performed, the mathematical model u	ised, and a summary	of results o	btained.
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Stearthquake structures Stearthfild/Group 18. Availability Statement NTIS Steartify Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 20. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 22. Price 23. April Steartify Class (This Report) 22. Price 22. Price 22. Price 23. April Stearty Class (This Report) 22. Price 23. April	A review of studies is reported in which	the periods comput	ted by the mat	hematical excitation
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models Concrete structures Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms 18. Availability Statement 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages NTIS 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price See ANSI-239.18) See Instructions on Reverse OPTIONAL FORM 222 (4-27)	Two tables summarize the results of the s	tudies and list th	ne percentage	differences
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models Concrete structures Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures Buildings b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages Mathematical models 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages Mathematical models 19. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price Mathematical models 19. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price Mathematical models 19. Security Class (This Page) 0PTIONAL FORM 222 (G-77 (Formeric NTIS-33))	between the computed and observed periods	for each building].	
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models Concrete structures Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms 18. Availability Statement NTIS 20. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 449 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price 403 - Ao/ See ANSI-239.18)				
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Mathematical models Mathematical models Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms 20. Security Class (This Report) 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 449 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price 403 - Aol See ANSI-239.18)				
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Mathematical models Concrete structures Mathematical models Concrete structures Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms c. COSATI Field/Group 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 18. Availability Statement 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages MTIS 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price See ANSI-Z39.18) See Instructions on Reverse OPTIONAL FORM 272 (4-77				
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors Earthquake resistant structures Mathematical models Mathematical models Concrete structures Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms 18. Availability Statement NTIS See ANSI-Z39.18) See ANSI-Z39.18)				
Earthquake resistant structures Steel construction Mathematical models Concrete structures Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms 19. Security Class (This Report) 18. Availability Statement 19. Security Class (This Page) 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price 36e ANSI-Z39.18) See Instructions on Reverse	17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Mathematical models Concrete structures Vibration tests Buildings Framed structures b. identifiers/Open-Ended Terms b. identifiers/Open-Ended Terms 19. Security Class (This Report) 18. Availability Statement 19. Security Class (This Report) NTIS 20. Security Class (This Page) See ANSI-Z39.18) See Instructions on Reverse	Earthquake resistant structures	Steel construct	tion	
Framed structures b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms c. COSATI Field/Group 18. Availability Statement NTIS 20. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 49 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price 40 See ANSI-Z39.18) See Instructions on Reverse	Mathematical models Vibration tests	Concrete struct	tures	
b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms c. COSATI Field/Group 18. Availability Statement NT I S See ANSI-Z39.18) Definition of Pages 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 19. Security Class (This Report) 22. Price 40.3 - A 01 (Formerty NTIS-35)	Framed structures	burruniys		
c. COSATI Field/Group 18. Availability Statement NTIS See ANSI-Z39.18) C. COSATI Field/Group 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 4/9 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price A03 - A01 (Formeriv NTIS-35)	b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms			
c. COSATI Field/Group 18. Availability Statement NTIS See ANSI-Z39.18) C. COSATI Field/Group 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 49 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price A03 - A01 (Formerly NTIS-35)				
c. COSATI Field/Group 18. Availability Statement NTIS See ANSI-Z39.18) C. COSATI Field/Group 19. Security Class (This Report) 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price AOI OPTIONAL FORM 272 (4-77 (Formeriv NTIS-35)				
c. COSATI Field/Group 18. Availability Statement NTIS See ANSI-Z39.18) C. COSATI Field/Group 19. Security Class (This Report) 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price A03 - A01 (Formerly NTIS-35)				
18. Availability Statement NTIS 19. Security Class (This Report) 21. No. of Pages 49 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price 40.3 - A01 See ANSI-Z39.18) See Instructions on Reverse OPTIONAL FORM 272 (4-77 (Formeriv NTIS-35)	c. COSATI Field/Group			
NTIS 20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price A03 - A01 See ANSI-Z39.18) See Instructions on Reverse OPTIONAL FORM 272 (4-77 (Formerly NTIS-35)	18. Availability Statement	19. Security (Class (This Report)	21. No. of Pages
20. Security Class (This Page) 22. Price 22. Price 20.3 A03 A01 See ANSI-Z39.18) See Instructions on Reverse OPTIONAL FORM 272 (4-77 (Formerly NTIS-35)	NTIS			49
See ANSI-Z39.18) See Instructions on Reverse OPTIONAL FORM 272 (4-77 (Formeriv NTIS-35)		20. Security C	Class (This Page)	22. Price A0.3. A01
	(See ANSI-Z39.18) See Instr	uctions on Reverse		OPTIONAL FORM 272 (4-77 (Formerly NTIS-35)

ł

Optimum Seismic Protection for New Building

Construction in Eastern Metropolitan Areas

NSF Grant GK-27955

Internal Study Report No. 33

A REVIEW OF RECENT MATHEMATICAL MODELS MADE ON ACTUAL BUILDINGS AND THE ACCURACY OF THE PREDICTED PERIODS

M. H. AckroydR. V. Whitman

May, 1973

Any opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Department of Civil Engineering

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Cambridge, Massachusetts

ľ

32

U.

و ب ب

PREFACE

The response of buildings to earthquake ground motion has been a subject of widespread concern, particularly to the engineer involved in the seismic design of structures. The current design practice has been based both on analytical studies in structural dynamics and on the actual behavior of structures during earthquakes. Mathematical models of buildings have been tested in an effort to correlate theoretical and experimental results. Ideally, the engineer would like to be able to fabricate a model which can describe a theoretical response which closely approximates what has been actually observed. Moreover, in the design phases, the engineer would like to be able to select a model which can reliably predict the dynamic response of the building to a given ground motion. However, at present there is no well defined modeling scheme which is known to give consistently accurate results. A number of detailed studies have been made of actual buildings, resulting in varied degrees of accuracy. The inaccuracies of the models arise from the fact that in order to represent the actual building in analytical terms, a large number of assumptions and approximations must be admitted; otherwise the problem of modeling the building would be too expensive to be resolved efficiently by current methods of analysis. Therefore, at present we wish to focus upon mathematical models which have been made for specific cases and consider the calculated periods

of the building as an indicator of the model's accuracy. Possibly, by reviewing the set of all existing models, several "state-of-the-art" modeling schemes may be identified. It is expected that each of these selected models would involve various compromise decisions which facilitate computation. Comparison of the various "state-of-the-art" models may give an indication of the potential error implicit in a given modeling technique and suggest areas in which more work need to be done in order to devise more reliable models in the future.

This report summarizes some of the recent models made. The intent is to begin assembling a set of models upon which to base further work along the lines discussed above.

INTRODUCTION

This report reviews recent analytical studies made on actual buildings for which both mathematical models have been developed and experimental measurements have been made to determine the fundamental periods of vibration.

First, three case studies are presented: a concrete shear wall building, a steel moment-resisting frame building, and a concrete momentresisting frame building.

The case studies are followed by a brief review of analytical studies for which the measured period was obtained by ambient vibration tests, man-excited vibration tests, or forced vibration tests only. Each review gives a brief description of the building, the experimental tests performed, the mathematical model used, and a summary of results obtained.

Next, there is a review of studies made where the periods computed by the mathematical model are compared to the periods actually experiences during earthquake excitation.

Finally, two tables are presented to summarize the results of the studies herein reviewed; they present the percentage differences between the computed periods and observed periods for each building.

CASE I. THE CERTIFIED LIFE BUILDING

The <u>Certified Life Building</u> (1) at 14724 Ventura Blvd., Los Angeles, is a 14-story office tower with an adjacent three-story parking structure (separated by a 3-inch seismic joint). The structure is of reinforced concrete shear wall construction with a typical plan of 76' x 156'. The foundation consists of Raymond step-tapered, cast-in-place piles with 12-inch diameter corrugated steel shells. The average length of the piles is 41 feet, providing a design load-carrying capacity of 90 tons per pile. One hundred eighty-five piles are vertical and the remaining 45 are battered at an inclination of 1 to 4. Continuous lateral ties are provided between pile caps by reinforced concrete tie beams.

The vertical load-carrying system consists of lightweight concrete flat slabs supported by columns and bearing walls (which also serve as shear walls). The two exterior spandrel frames in the E-W direction (from the second floor level to the roof and from the third floor to the roof) were designed only to carry vertical loads.

The lateral force resisting system in the tower consists primarily of 12-inch thick reinforced concrete shear walls with some lateral support coming from the exterior spandrel frames and flat slab-column frames. In the first three stories, part of the lateral resistance is provided by 12-inch thich, grouted concrete block walls. The N-S (transverse) shear walls are at the ends of the building and around the elevator core. The E-W (longitudinal) shear walls are entirely around the elevator core.

The moduli of elasticity used were as given in the construction specifications.

Three strong motion accelerographs (MO-2 35 mm film recorders) were mounted to the floor slab at the ground floor level, sixth floor level, and roof. During the 1971 San Fernando earthquake all three instruments recorded the building accelerations. From the time histories, the natural periods of vibration of the building were estimated as the average from the records.

A mathematical model was developed for each of the two principal building axes. Two-dimensional, lumped mass, distributed stiffness models were used. The horizontal translational stiffness of each frame and shear wall in the actual structure was combined to produce the total building stiffness. The masses were taken as the sum of the actual dead weights tributary to each floor level including the structural floor system, columns, partitions, exterior walls, precast spandrels, windows, mechanical equipment, electrical equipment, and code live loads. The base of each model was considered to be rigidly attached to an infinitely stiff ground. Any possible effects of soil-structure interaction in the horizontal directions were assumed to be included in the recorded accelerations at the ground level. Building rocking on the soil was not considered. In stiffness calculations, the gross moment of inertia for all members and gross cross-sectional area for columns and shear walls were used without consideration for the transformed area of steel. Beam stiffness calculations were based on clear spans, and column stiffness calculations were based on full story heights. All joints between beams and columns were considered to be rigid and momentresisting. Floor slabs were assumed to act as rigid horizontal diaphragms

(including the full plan area of the second floor which is actually a mezzanine). The interior N-S shear walls from the ground to second floor levels were treated as equivalent rigid frames. The main vertical shear walls in the N-S direction were represented as single columns possessing the shear and flexural characteristics of the gross concrete section of the wall.

For the core walls, flange action of perpendicular walls was considered in computing the gross moment of inertia; the shear area was based on the gross web area of the wall in the strong direction, neglecting flange areas. The heavily perforated E-W shear walls were modeled as frames with each doorway representing a bay and each shear wall section between doorways as a column.

Because the computer program used in the analysis considered all members in a frame to have the same modulus of elasticity, member sections were adjusted proportionately to account for the variations in the actual moduli. The analysis considered only linear-elastic, horizontal translational response.

The acceleration time-history records indicated that the building went through three distinct phases of response, with lengthening of the building period due to micro-cracking in the concrete shear walls.

In addition, pre-earthquake ambient vibration tests provided data on the natural periods of vibration.

Because the computed periods are shorter than those measured (even the ambient vibration periods), it is believed that soil-structure interaction may have been the main cause (in addition to the errors

		COMPUTED	AMBIENT	MEASURED PERIOD	MEASURED PERIOD	MEASURED PERIOD	
COMPONENT	MODE	PERIOD	PERIOD	0-5 SEC. OF EQ	5-14 SEC. OF EQ	AFTER 14 SEC. OF EQ	
Transverse (N-S)	Ч	0.682	0.81	1	1	1.08	
	2	0.154	I	0.186	0.200	0.215	
	ę	0.073	I	0.076	0.093	0.097	
Longitudinal (E-W)	H	0.784	0.88	I	ī	1.127	
	2	0.195	I	0.218	0.256	0.260	
	ŝ	0.096	I	0.100	I	I	

¥

introduced in making the assumptions), since this is a stiff shear wall building supported on soft soils.

CASE II. BUILDING 180 AT THE JET PROPULSION LAB

<u>Building 180 at the Jet Propulsion Lab</u> (2), Pasadena, California, is a 9-story steel frame structure (plus one basement) with a typical plan of 40' x 220'. The foundation consists of 7-foot wide reinforced concrete spread footings around the periphery of the building. Lateral forces in the transverse direction are resisted by the rigid steel frame action of the partly concrete-encased steel columns and the welded steel trussed floor girders. Lateral forces in the longitudinal direction are resisted by the action of the columns and trussed spandrel girders. Earth retaining walls in the basement and first story add appreciable stiffness to the frames in their lower sections. The 5-inch lightweight concrete floor slabs are supported on E-W directed 12WF27 steel beams and the N-5 trusses. The north and south faces of the building are of glass curtain wall construction. The east and west end walls consist of precast concrete panels supported by the steel frame.

The natural periods of the building were measured during the 1971 San Fernando earthquake as well as by other vibration tests. From the time histories of acceleration recorded during the earthquake, the Fourier amplitude spectra for the roof and basement were computed for the first 40 seconds of shaking. The ratios of roof spectra values to basement spectra values were plotted and a smoothing operation applied. The natural frequencies were obtained from the smoothed ratio of Fourier spectra.

In addition, Nielsen performed man-excited tests and forced vibration tests during the construction of the building in 1963, Teledyne performed ambient vibration tests on the completed building in 1971, and Nielsen and Teledyne performed man-excited tests in 1972.

Two mathematical models were developed for this building. For the "full composite model" the lateral stiffness matrix was derived assuming that the full area of concrete was acting on the columns and that a 15-foot wide section of floor slab was composite with the top chord of the trusses. For the "partial composite model", it was assumed that the concrete in the flexural tension zone of the columns provided no flexural stiffness and that a 7.5-foot wide section of the floor slab acted compositely with the truss top chords. Both models were assumed to be held against horizontal translation at the first floor level, and the columns were assumed to be fully fixed at the foundation pad level. The full composite model was additionally restrained from horizontal translation at the second floor (Values of moduli of elasticity were not presented.) Two-dimensional level. models were thus developed from the stiffness properties of the frame members and the calculated story weights. These refined models were obtained by adjusting the periods of the lower modes obtained from more basic models to agree with the predominant periods found from the earthquake accelerogram investigation.

There was good agreement between the computed periods of the structural models and the values measured by the ambient test after the earthquake. Also the periods computed by the partial composite model were within 10% of the observed earthquake values.

		PEI	RIODS II	N	PEI	RIODS IN	N
		TRA	NSVERSI	Ε	LON	GITUDINA	AL.
		DII	RECTION		DIJ	RECTION	
		^T 1	^T 2	т3	^T 1	^т 2	^т з
I.	Computed Periods from:						
	Full Composite Model	1,16	0.34	0.17	1,09	0,36	0.21
	Partial Composite Model	1.46	0.47	0.26	1.21	0.42	0.26
II.	Measured Periods from:						
	Earthquake Records	1.44	0.44	0.24	1.09	0.36	0.21
	During Construction - Man	0.88	0.29		0.91	0.29	<u> </u>
	Excited (Nielsen, 1963)						
	Forced Vibration Test -	1.03	0.31	0.16	0.99	0.33	0.20
	Const. (Nielsen, 1963)						
	Ambient Tests (Teledyne,	1.11	0.35	0.16	1.05	0.33	0.20
	1971)						
	Man-Excited Tests	1.15	0.31		1.00	0.30	
	(Nielsen & Teledyne, 1972)						

÷

CASE III. THE SHERATON UNIVERSAL HOTEL

The <u>Sheraton Universal Hotel</u> (3) at 3838 Lankershim Blvd., No. Hollywood, California, is a 21-story reinforced concrete frame building with one basement. The typical floor plan is 183'-6" by 57'-10". At the first floor level, there is an adjacent one-story structure separated from the tower at the ground level by expansion joints.

Vertical loads are carried by columns and floor beams in both directions with two-way floor slabs between floor beams. Columns on the north and south sides are not prismatic, but taper from 20" x 18" at the top and bottom of each story to 20" x 15" at the mid-story height.

Lateral forces are resisted by column-girder frames in each direction (the building was designed as a ductile moment-resisting frame). The exterior north and south facades are 4-inch thich precast concrete panels connected to the spandrel beams by strap anchors and having a 3/8-inch gap all around. Slotted bolt holes at the top connections of the precast panels allow lateral movement of the panels in the frames. The exterior east and west facades consist entirely of windows between column lines. Most interior partitions consist of gypsum wallboard on metal studs, while some plaster partitions are used on the ground floor. Twelve-inch reinforced concrete shear walls extend on all four sides of the building in the basement. The foundation consists of reinforced concrete spread footings on soil consisting primarily of sandstones with deposits of salt and clay.

Accelerations during the 1971 San Fernando earthquake were recorded by seismometers located on the 21st floor, 11th floor, and basement level.

Acceleration seismograms were developed from the digitized time histories of acceleration at the different building levels. Estimates of the actual fundamental periods of the structure during the earthquake were made from time-history plots of acceleration at the roof level.

The mathematical model consisted of a cantilevered stem fixed at the base with masses lumped at floor levels. The masses were taken as the sum of the actual tributary dead weights, including estimated weights of furnishings, mechanical and electrical equipment, exterior walls, windows, and partitions. Lateral stiffness characteristics were computed for each element of the lateral load resisting system (apparently using the full section properties), with adjustments made in the moments of inertia and cross-sectional areas of members with different moduli of elasticity in order to express all stiffnesses in terms of only one modulus. The assumed modulus of elasticity for the concrete elements was determined from $E_c = W^{1.5} 33 \sqrt{f'_c}$. The tapered exterior columns were modeled as prismatic members with a cross-section equal to the average of the top and mid-height sections. In the transverse direction alternate frames do not have girders in the center span where there are large openings for ducts and piping. Therefore these frames were modeled to have negligible bending stiffness for the horizontal members in the center The base of the cantilever was assumed fixed at the base and span. soil-structure interaction was assumed negligible. Floors were taken as rigid horizontal diaphragms. The building was assumed to be symmetrical with no eccentricity between the center of mass and center of rigidity.

				MEASURED PERIOD IN	MEASURED PERIOD AFTER
COMPONENT	ц Ц	$^{\mathrm{T}}_{\mathrm{2}}$	$^{\mathrm{T}}_{3}$	1ST 6 SEC. OF EQ	6 SEC. OF EQ
Transverse	2.215	0.790	0.484	1.4	2.1
Longitudinal	2.146	0.748	0.461	2.1	2.1

It is believed that the reason for the computed transverse period being longer than the measured period in the first 6 seconds of response to the earthquake is that the model did not account for the stiffness of the interior partitions located on the transverse column lines, which abut the columns at each end and the beam soffit at the top (these partitions consist of a double layer of gypsum board on each side). However, it is felt that after 6 seconds, enough energy had been generated to overcome the bond between the structural and non-structural elements.

BUILDINGS WHERE ONLY AMBIENT PERIODS HAVE BEEN MEASURED

Jerningham Apartments (4) in New Zealand. The building consists of 14 stories (16 floors) with a typical plan approximately 67' x 74'. The building is supported by reinforced concrete moment-resisting frames symmetrical about the N-S centerline but asymmetrical about all E-W axes. The two lowest stories have much less lateral flexibility than the rest of the framework in both the N-S and E-W directions. The frames on the east and west faces of the building are offset (instead of being contained in a single plane). In the initial design, almost all the lateral resistance was considered to be provided by the external spandrel-beam frames.

"Man-excited" vibration of the building was initiated at the roof level and the induced motions were detected and recorded by "conventional electronic apparatus" to obtain a reliable indication of the resonant frequency.

۱

Because of the symmetry about the N-S centerline, the mathematical models neglected torsional effects for motion in the N-S direction; but because of the asymmetry about the E-W axes, torsional forces were expected to be induced for E-W disturbances, especially in the bottom of the structure where the shear wall in the E-W direction is located to the south of the building's center of mass. Since the structure is practically integral with the ground rock below the second floor level, it was modeled as being supported at this level on a rigid footing. One model assumed that the offset east and west face frames acted independently, while the second model assumed the two sections acted together. Preliminary analyses indicated that these frames should be treated compositely. Using a single bay approximation, the elastic stiffness properties of the elements were combined to form the building lateral stiffness matrix. Using the classical Stodola method, an iterative solution procedure provided the normal frequencies.

	COMPUTED	MEASURED
COMPONENT	PERIOD	PERIOD
N-S	0.54	0.50
E-W n	0.49	0.50

Similar studies were made on three university science buildings: Zoology Building (6 stories), Chemistry Building (8 stories), and Physics Building (8 stories). All three buildings are reinforced concrete, combined moment-resisting frame and shear walls. However, since these buildings are relatively stiff buildings supported on flexible soils,

4

the mathematical model provided for foundation movement (both translational and rotational flexibility). Also, instead of manexcited vibration tests, small amplitude forced vibration tests were used to determine the actual periods of vibration.

	COMPUTED	PERIOD	MEASURED	PERIOD
BUILDING	<u>N-S</u>	<u>E-W</u>	<u>N-S</u>	<u>E-W</u>
ZOOLOGY BUILDING	.24	.33	.24	.33
CHEMISTRY BUILDING	.31	.39	.31	.37
PHYSICS BUILDING	.31	.38	. 32	.38

Office building for the <u>Department of National Health and Welfare</u> (5), at Tunney's Pasture in Ottawa. The building consists of 19 stories (17 floors, ground level, and basement) with a typical plan 140' x 88'. Structural steel columns run the full height of the building; and in the center of the building is a reinforced concrete core housing the elevator shafts and stairways. Floors are 11-inch reinforced concrete slabs. Outside walls consist of heavy precast window sections (each weighing about two tons) bearing on the floor slab at each floor level.

The wind-induced vibration of the building was measured with seven Willmore Mark II seismometers on the 17th, 14th, 11th, 8th, 5th, 2nd, and ground levels. These measurements were fed onto tape recordings, and the Fourier transforms were computed, from which the natural periods of vibration were determined.

Two mathematical models were made concurrently with the experimental program. One model assumed a shear type behavior for the structural frame with equal masses lumped at the floor levels. The second model assumed

	MEAS	JRED PEI	RIODS	COMPUTED	(FRAMI	E ONLY)	COMPUTED	(FRAME	+ CORE)
COMPONENT	\mathbf{T}_{1}	^т 2	^т з	T ₁	^т 2	т _з	T ₁	^т 2	т ₃	
Transverse	1.28	0.30	0.20	1.39	0.65	0.40	0.48	0.162	0.097	
Longitudinal	0.99	0.26	0.19	1.40	0.60	0.36	0.47	0.161	0.097	
Rotational	0.89	0.28	0.18							

that the reinforced concrete core would contribute to the stiffness of the structure by assuming the core acted as a shear structure with lateral displacements equal to those of the surrounding frame (i.e., beams were considered infinitely stiff). In both models, the window sections on each floor forming the outside walls were considered as contributing to the mass but not the stiffness. The lateral stiffness matrix was generated and eigen values for lateral motion about the two principal axes of the building were obtained by digital computation.

Discussion of discrepancies.

If the window sections on each floor forming the outside walls had been considered as contributing to the stiffness as well as to the mass, the building would have been stiffer in the longitudinal direction than in the transverse direction and the periods computed for frame action only would be closer to the measured values. The reason for such low values for the case of frame and core combined is that the stiffness of the core was very large compared to that of the frame. However, if flexure of the beams were allowed (instead of infinitely stiff), the core would not have performed integrally with the frame.

San Diego Gas and Electric Company Building (6) at 101 Ash Street in San Diego, California. The tower of this building consists of 21 floor levels plus a roof above grade and two levels below grade with a typical plan of 180' x 70'. Floor construction is cellular steel decking topped with 2 inches of concrete (5-inch reinforced concrete slabs are used in areas subject to heavier loads). Below the first floor, all steel framing is fireprofed with reinforced concrete; above the first floor,

the frame is fireproofed by metal lath and plaster facing on the columns and a sprayed layer of Zonolite plaster elsewhere. Interior walls are 4-inch and 6-inch metal lath and plaster. Exterior walls are glass and lightweight metal panels. All four sides of the tower are faced with reinforced concrete fins (6" x 18" x 27') attached to the structural frame at each floor level. The tower is structurally independent of the adjacent 2-story U-shaped building and has a foundation consisting of 14- to 22-ft spread footings.

Two eccentric mass vibration generators (developed at C.I.T.) were installed on the 20th floor. Steady-state sinusoidal vibrations were induced. Motions were measured by Statham accelerometers, amplified by Miller C-3 carrier amplifiers, and recorded on a CEC recording oscillograph. A stationary synchro was added for the purpose of measuring the phase between the excitation and the response. Resonant frequencies were determined by applying the half-power method to the response curves of the 90° out-of-phase components. In this manner, the first six modes for E-W, N-S, and torsional components of the response were determined and compared with those frequencies obtained from ambient vibration tests: the two test techniques yielded "substantially the same natural frequencies."

The analytical study of this building was performed in parallel with the testing program. Basic parametric studies were made, first using a program for two-dimensional analysis, and then one for three-dimensional analysis. The mathematical model accounted for the structural frame, floor beams and slabs, fireproofing, and the masses and stiffnesses of non-structural elements (by an approximate technique).

	MEAS	URED PEI	RIODS	COMPI	UTED PE	RIODS
COMPONENT	T ₁	^т 2	т3	r ₁	^т 2	^т з
N-S	2.62	0.91	0.50	2.76	0.93	0.53
E-W	2.54	0.83	0.44	2.60	0.86	0.46
Torsional	2.35	0.81	0.46	2.16	0.73	0.41

The office building for <u>Bethlehem Steel Co.</u>, Pacific Coast Division in San Francisco is a 15-story steel moment-resisting frame structure. Floors are lightweight concrete fill on cellular steel decking. There is exterior marble facing over fireproofed columns and concrete-encased spandrel sections. The rigid frame joints are high-strength bolted connections. There is horizontal steel bracing at the second, third, and fourth floor levels to distribute resulting shear forces at those levels. The foundation consists of driven H-piles in old bay deposits and varied clay and sand strata.

Twenty vibration recordings of wind-induced motions were made during construction using portable seismographs and vibration meters in numerous locations in the building. At times, as high as the fourth natural mode of vibration of the building could be isolated.

The mathematical models for this building assumed shear-beam behavior, concentrating masses at the floor levels. Joint rotations of the columns and girders were included in the analysis, while axial deformations of the columns were neglected. It was decided that nonstructural components (fireproofing and partitions) should be included in the calculations of stiffnesses (since it was found that neglecting them resulted in as much as 39% variation from the measured periods, while including them reduced the variation to as low as 2.2%). The periods were calculated twice: when the steel frame as complete and the concrete slab placing had begun, and when the building was complete except for part of the ceiling, partitions, glass, and similar items. When the period was calculated the second time, the masses were calculated from the total <u>design</u> building weights, and stiffness factors were calculated assuming no composite action of the various materials (e.g., composite action of steel decking welded to the steel girders).

	MEAS	URED PEI	RIODS	COMPU	JTED PE	RIODS
COMPONENT	$^{\mathrm{T}}$ 1	^т 2	т3	т	т2	^т з
Transverse	1.49	0.47	0.27	1.59	0.56	0.33
Longitudinal	1.32	0.42	0.23	1.36	0.50	0.31

Discussion of results.

It was felt that the computed periods were in "general concurrence" with the measured values; that non-structural items should be included in the period calculations; and that assuming shear-beam behavior was valid.

The <u>Sir Alexander Campbell Building</u> (8), Canadian Post Office Department at Ottawa has ten floors above ground level (with a penthouse and one basement). A typical floor plan is 266' x 74'. The frame and floor slabs are of reinforced concrete. Exterior walls are non-loadbearing 4-inch or 8-inch brick walls. Interior partitions are of lightweight metal stud construction or 3-inch block (not designed to provide lateral resistance). Columns are rectangular and have approximately the same section from the foundation to the fifth floor and are halved from the sixth floor to the roof. The foundation consists of 22-inch diameter piles driven 40 feet to solid limestone rock.

Wind-induced vibrations were recorded by six Willmore II seismometers located on floors 9, 8, 7, 6, 4, and 2. A Honeywell-Brown analyzer was used to perform the Fourier analyses of the records and an analog computer was used to determine the phase relation between the vibrations of the different floors.

For the mathematical model, it was assumed that masses were lumped at the floor levels and that all the floor masses were equal. Girders were assumed to be infinitely stiff (shear-beam behavior) and the building was on a rigid base.

	MEASURED	COMPUTED
COMPONENT	PERIOD	PERIOD
Transverse	0.69	0.75
Longitudinal	0,59	0.90

The <u>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce Building</u> (8) in Montreal has 44 stories above ground plus three basement floors. The typical floor plan is 140' x 100'. The building has a structural steel frame with bolted connections. Exterior columns are fireproofed in concrete. The floors consist of corrugated metal deck units supported by purlins and topped by reinforced concrete. The curtain walls are precast concrete faced with slate, and the interior has floating partitions.

The foundation consists of footings on bedrock 48 feet below street level.

Wind-induced vibrations were recorded by six Willmore II seismometers located on different floors of the building. A Honeywell-Brown analyzer was used to perform the Fourier analyses of the records and an analog computer was used to determine the phase relation between the vibrations of the different floors.

For the mathematical model, it was assumed that masses were lumped at the floor levels and that all the floor masses were equal. Girders were assumed infinitely stiff (shear-beam behavior) and the building was on a rigid base.

	MEASURED	COMPUTED
COMPONENT	PERIOD	PERIOD
Transverse	4.65	3.27
Longitudinal	4.65	3.86

Discussion of discrepancies.

It is believed that the large discrepancy in computed and measured building periods indicates that shear-beam behavior is not a realistic assumption for this building.

The <u>CIL House</u> in Montreal (8) has 34 floors above ground level plus 4 basement floors with a typical floor plan of 168' x 112'. It has a structural steel frame with welded connections. Floor construction in the basement, ground level, mechanical floors, and roof are concrete slabs formed in place; elsewhere, floors consist of 3-inch steel

deck-with-concrete fill. In the areas where there are concrete slabs, beams and columns are fireproofed with concrete; elsewhere, asbestos is used for fireproofing. The curtain wall consists of lightweight aluminum. Interior partitions are of lightweight aggregate slag. The building is founded on bedrock.

Wind-induced vibrations were recorded by six Willmore II seismometers at different floor levels of the building. A Honeywell-Brown analyzer was used to perform the Fourier analyses of the records and an analog computer was used to determine the phase relation between the vibrations of the different floors.

For the mathematical model, it was assumed that masses were lumped at the floor levels and that all floor masses were equal. Girders were assumed infinitely stiff (shear-beam behavior) and the building was on a rigid base.

	MEASURED	COMPUTED
COMPONENT	PERIOD	PERIOD
Transverse	4.46	2.58
Longitudinal	3.93	3.01

It is believed that the large discrepancy indicates that shearbuilding behavior is not a realistic assumption.

BUILDINGS WHERE PERIODS HAVE BEEN MEASURED DURING

RESPONSE TO EARTHQUAKE EXCITATION

The Muir Medical Center (9) at 7080 Hollywood Blvd., Hollywood, California, consists of an 11-story tower surrounded by single-story

commercial facilities (separated structurally by a 2-inch seismic joint). There is also a single-story basement garage. The typical floor plan for the tower is 89' x 144'. The structural system consists of 9-inch flat slabs on columns and deep spandrel beams designed to work together as a moment-resisting frame. However, the perimeter basement walls are designed to serve as shear walls to resist seismic forces. The foundation consists of drilled-and-belled caissons and drilled, cast-in-place piles founded on a firm soil layer.

During the February 9, 1971 San Fernando earthquake, accelerations were recorded by AR-240 paper tape recorders (by Teledyne) located in the basement, on the sixth floor, and the roof. The natural periods of vibration of the building were estimated from the acceleration time histories from the sixth floor and roof. Also, past earthquake ambient vibration periods were measured.

Two 2-dimensional, lumped mass, distributed stiffness models were made (one for each principal building axis). The masses included the structural floor system, columns, partitions, exterior walls, windows, mechanical equipment, and electrical equipment. Altogether, 14 lumped masses were used in the model. The base was assumed rigidly attached to the ground, which was assumed infinitely stiff. Possible effects of soil-structure interaction were assumed to be included in the recorded basement accelerations. The influence of building rocking was assumed to be negligible. Stiffness properties were computed using full concrete sections without regard for the transformed area of steel reinforcement. Interior slab stiffnesses were computed to the face of the columns. All

joints between beams and columns were considered to be rigid and momentresisting. The computer program used to calculate the building periods was a modified version of FRMSTC (originally developed at the University of California, Berkeley). Concrete floor slabs were assumed to act as rigid horizontal diaphragms and the building was considered symmetric (i.e., the center of mass and center of rigidity coincide).

	INITI	AL COMP	UTED PE	RIODS	EAT	RTHQUAKE	PERIOD	S	POST-EARTH- OUAKE AMBIEN	т
COMPONENT	T ₁	т2	т _з	T ₄	$^{\mathrm{T}}$ 1	^T 2	т3	T ₄	PERIODS	-
Transverse	1.60	0.536	0.311	0.218	1.60		0.30		1.14	
Longitudinal	1.49	0.493	0.283	0.197	1.43	0.425		0,189	1.02	

The <u>KB Valley Center</u> (10) (<u>Independence Bank Building</u>) at 15910 Ventura Blvd., Los Angeles, California, is a 16-story office tower (plus one basement) structurally separated from the adjacent 4-story parking structure by a 2-inch seismic gap. The typical floor plan is 87' x 165'. The structure is a steel moment-resisting frame. Lightweight concrete slabs are used in composite construction with beams. The four frames which form the perimeter of the tower are designed to resist lateral loads, while all the remaining frames are designed for only vertical loads. All girder-to-column connections are fully welded. The building is founded on firm dense soil layers by means of driven Raymond step-tapered piles interconnected with reinforced concrete tie beams where necessary to provide lateral resistance.

Accelerations in the basement, on the ninth floor and on the roof were recorded by SMA-1 70 mm film recorders (manufactured by Teledyne). The average of periods taken from the accelerograph records at the ninth

floor and roof were considered the actual periods of vibration of the building during the quake.

A 2-dimensional, lumped mass, distributed stiffness mathematical model was developed for each of the two principal building axes. Masses consisted of the structural floor system, columns, partitions, exterior walls, windows, mechanical equipment, and electrical equipment tributary to each floor level. The base of each model was assumed rigidly attached to the ground which was assumed to be infinitely stiff. Any possible effects of soil-structure interaction were assumed to be included in the recorded basement accelerations. Effects of the building rocking on the soil were assumed negligible. In calculating the stiffness properties, the moment of inertia of the girders was based on the full steel section without consideration for the transformed area of the concrete slab which acts compositely. Similarly, moments of inertia and axial area of those columns partially encased in concrete were based on full steel section, neglecting any composite action with the concrete. Girder stiffnesses were calculated to the centerline of the columns, and column stiffnesses were established between clear story heights. All joints between girders and columns were modeled as fully rigid and moment-resisting. The concrete floor slabs were assumed to act as rigid horizontal diaphragms with no eccentricity of stiffness center to mass center. A modified version of FRMSTC (originally developed at the University of California, Berkeley) was used to compute the undamped natural periods of vibration of the building.

	CO	MPUTED	PERIOD	S	EART	HQUAKE	PERIO	DS	POST-EARTHQUAKE
COMPONENT	^T 1	^т 2	т3	T ₄	^т 1	^T 2	^т з	$^{\mathrm{T}}$ 4	AMBIENT PERIOD
Transverse	3.37	1.29	0.801	0.567	3.00	1.11	0.695		2.27
Longitudinal	3.43	1.33	0.816	0.576	3.20	1.20	0.75	0.50	2.37

The <u>Holiday Inn</u> (11) at 1640 Marengo St., Los Angeles, California, is a 7-story reinforced concrete structure with no basements. The typical floor plan is approximately 63' x 160'. Floors are reinforced concrete flat slabs with spandrel beams around each floor perimeter. Lateral forces are resisted by the columns and slabs in the interior of the building and by the columns and spandrel beams around the perimeter of the building on the exterior. The exterior end walls consist of plaster on metal studs. At the west end of the north face, the structure has four bays of brick masonry walls between the ground level and the second floor. However, these brick walls are separated from the exterior columns by 1-inch expansion joints and from the underside of the second floor spandrels by half-inch expansion joints, and are not expected to have a significant effect on the building response. Interior partitions consist of gypsum wallboards on metal studs attached to both the floor and ceiling slabs. The building is supported by concrete piles in mostly silt and silty sand.

Accelerations during the 1971 San Fernando earthquake were recorded on the first floor, fourth floor, and roof. Time history plots of recorded transverse and longitudinal absolute accelerations were obtained from the digitized time histories. Acceleration plots for the fourth floor and roof were reviewed for periodicity and estimates were made of the fundamental period during the earthquake.

For the mathematical model, masses were lumped at floor levels. Masses were calculated as the sum of the actual tributary dead weights (including estimated weights of furnishings, mechanical and electrical equipment, exterior walls, windows, and partitions). The model consisted of a cantilevered stem fixed at the base. Effects of soil-structure interaction were assumed negligible. Member stiffness properties of each slab, girder, and column were determined by accounting for the effects of reinforcement and taking clear spans as effective member lengths. All joints were considered to be rigid and moment-resisting. Floor slabs were assumed to act as rigid horizontal diaphragms. In order to account for varying moduli of elasticity, member sections were adjusted proportionately to express them all in terms of a single modulus of elasticity. The building was assumed symmetrical with no eccentricity between the center of mass and center of rigidity. Thus a linear elastic 2-dimensional analysis was made using the FRMSTC-4 computer program to determine the periods of vibration.

	COMPUTED	MEASURED PERIOD IN	MEASURED PERIOD FOR
ÇOMPONENT	PERIOD	1ST 5 SECS OF EQ	ENTIRE EQ
Transverse	0.88	0.63	1.15
Longitudinal	0.79	0.60	1.10

The computed period was longer than the period measured in the first 5 seconds of earthquake ground motion. It is believed this difference was due to the fact that the mathematical model didn't account for the stiffness contributed by the partitions. The computed period was shorter than the period measured for the duration of the

earthquake. It is believed this difference is due to the fact that yielding of the girders resulted in non-linear behavior with the columns remaining largely elastic.

The <u>Holiday Inn</u> (12) at 8244 Orion Avenue, Van Nuys, California, is the sister building to the Holiday Inn at Marengo. It is a 7-story reinforced concrete structure with no basement. The typical floor plan is approximately 63' x 160'. Floors are reinforced concrete flat slabs with spandrel beams around the perimeter of the floors. Lateral forces are resisted by the frame action of columns and slabs on the interior and by the columns and spandrels on the exterior frames. The exterior end walls consist of cement plaster on metal studs. At the west end of the south (longitudinal) face, the building has cement plaster extending from the ground to the roof; cement plaster extends only to the second floor level along the remaining south face area. Interior partitions are gypsum wallboard on metal studs. The foundation consists of concrete piles on silt and silty-sand with lesser deposits of sand and clay.

The accelerations caused by the 1971 San Fernando Earthquake were recorded by seismometers located at the roof, fourth, and ground floor levels. Time history plots of recorded transverse and longitudinal accelerations were obtained from digitized time histories. Using the plots of accelerations at the roof level, estimates were made of the actual fundamental period of the structure during its response to the earthquake.

The mathematical model assumed cantilevered masses lumped at each floor level, where the masses were obtained by summing the tributary dead weights (including mechanical equipment and partitions). Slabs were assumed to act as rigid horizontal diaphragms. Member section properties were adjusted to account for varying moduli of elasticity. The building was assumed to be symmetrical with no eccentricity between the center of mass and center of rigidity. Non-structural element stiffnesses could not be incorporated into the model directly, so approximations and engineering judgment were used when inputting the idealized structural elements. Soil-structure effects were assumed negligible. A computer analysis was made using the FRMSTC-4 program to determine the natural periods.

	COMP	UTED PE	RIODS	MEASURED PERIOD	IN	MEASURED PERIOD FOR
COMPONENT	T ₁	^т 2	т _з	1ST 7 SECONDS OF	EQ	ENTIRE EQ
Transverse	0.88	0.288	0.164	0.7		1.6
Longitudinal	0.791	0.266	0.156	0.7		1.5

The computed period was for the bare structural frame. If the interior and exterior partitions and walls were included in the model, the computed period would be reduced (toward the measured 0.7 second period). The fact that the measured periods for the entire duration of the earthquake are longer than the computed periods can be explained by attributing the loss of stiffness to the yielding of some members.

The <u>Bank of California</u> (13), at 15250 Ventura Blvd., San Fernando, California is a 12-story reinforced concrete structure (no basement) with a typical floor plan 60' x 161'. A typical floor is a 4 1/2-inch slab on pan joints which span to girders. Lateral forces in each direction

are resisted by reinforced concrete frames consisting of columns and girders: in the transverse direction, exterior frames run from the ground to the roof, while the interior frames run from the ground to the third floor; in the longitudinal direction, exterior frames run from the ground to the roof, while the interior frame is designed to carry only vertical loads. At the second floor level of the west longitudinal frame, the spandrel is set back about two feet from its typical location at other floors. Two 11'6" x 8" thick concrete shear walls on this frame extend from the ground to the third floor. Also a 10-inch thick shear wall runs from the ground level to the second floor approximately 30 feet beyond the east face of the tower. Interior partitions are gypsum board on metal studs. Exterior walls consist of 6'6" glass windows resting on 2'6" high metal stud walls. The foundation consists of concrete piles on moderately firm to firm soils (silt and silty sand).

Accelerations during the 1971 San Fernando earthquake were recorded by seismometers located on the roof, seventh, and ground floor levels. The natural periods of vibration of the building were estimated from the time history plots of acceleration (obtained from digitized time histories).

Two mathematical models were made assuming cantilevered masses lumped at floor levels, where the masses were obtained by summing the tributary dead weights (including mechanical equipment and partitions). Slabs were assumed to act as rigid horizontal diaphragms. Member section properties were adjusted to account for varying moduli of elasticity. The building was assumed to be symmetrical with no eccentricity between

between the center of mass and center of rigidity. Soil-structure effects were assumed negligible. One model (Model A) was made considering all frames as capable of carrying lateral loads (by virtue of their concrete dimensions). A second model (Model B) considered only those frames specifically reinforced for lateral loads as capable of carrying lateral loads. The models were analyzed using the FRMSTC-4 computer program to determine the natural periods of vibration.

	COMPUTED	PERIOD	MEASURED PERIOD FROM	MEASURED PERIOD FROM
COMPONENT	MODEL A	MODEL B	5-15 SEC. OF EQ	15-28 SEC. OF EQ
Transverse	1.335	1.557	2.0	2.5
Longitudinal	L 0.851	0.926	2.5	1.8

It is believed that the measured periods are longer than the computed periods due to the yielding of structural and non-structural elements.

The <u>Bunker Hill Tower</u> (14) at 611 West Sixth St., Los Angeles, California, is a 32-story steel frame structure (no basement) with a typical floor plan 90' x 125'. The floor system consists of 5-inch lightweight concrete slabs on steel beams and girders. Lateral forces are resisted by the perimeter girders and columns. The interior girders and columns are designed for vertical loads only. The exterior walls are glass window walls; interior partitions are gypsum board on metal studs. Structurally-separated concrete block walls are used at the lower floors below the plaza level. Beams and girders are fireproofed

with gypsum board. The building is supported on concrete spread footings and grade beams on caisson foundations on primarily firm shale and sandstone.

Accelerations during the 1971 San Fernando earthquake were recorded by seismometers located on the roof, 16th, and ground floor levels. The natural periods of vibration of the building were estimated from the time history plots of acceleration at the roof level.

The mathematical model consisted of cantilevered masses lumped at each floor level, with the masses also accounting for the weights of mechanical equipment and partitions. The lateral stiffness characteristics were computed for each element of the lateral load resisting system. Twice the moment of inertia of the steel girders was used to approximate the composite action with the concrete slab. Floors were taken as rigid horizontal diaphragms. The building was assumed to be symmetrical with no eccentricity between the center of mass and the center of rigidity. The base of the cantilever was assumed fixed, and the effects of soil-structure interaction were assumed negligible.

	COMP	UTED PE	RIODS	MEASURED PERIOD AFTER				
COMPONENT	$^{\mathrm{T}}$ 1	^т 2	т3	OF EQ SHAKING				
Transverse	3.979	1.440	0.833	4.0				
Longitudinal	3.508	1,274	0.749	3.4				

34

SEC.

Buildings with Periods Determined from Ambient Vibration Tests TABLE 1:

41.4 & 52.5 DIFFERENCE 8.6 & 62.5 PERCENT 8.0 2.0 5.4 5.4 2.4 3.0 3.1 8.1 6.7 0 0 0 0 PERIODS MEASURED 0.99 0.50 0.50 0.33 0.32 0.38 1.28 1.32 0.24 0.37 2.62 2.54 2.35 1.49 0.31 1.39 & 0.48 1.40 & 0.47 COMPUTED PERIODS 0.49 0.38 0.54 0.24 0.33 0.31 0.39 0.31 2.76 2.60 2.16 1.59 **1.**36 STUDY 1965 DATE 1965 1965 1964 1965 1960 1971 OF MAN-EXC VIBRATION FORCED FORCED FORCED FORCED SOURCE **UNIW** MIND OF CMRF/CSW CMRF/CSW CMRF/CSW FRAME CMRF SMRF SMRF SMRF MENTS BASEĩ I 2 ı ÷--I 2 S TORI ES 15 14 9 œ 18 œ 21 San Diego Gas & Electric Co. Bldg. Dept. of Nat'l Health & Welfare Bethlehem Steel Co. Bldg. BUILDING NAME Jerningham Apartments Chemistry Building Zoology Building Physics Building

Table 1 Continued

<u>н</u>
STORIES
TO
44
<u>.</u>
34
11
16
14
6

Buildings with Periods Determined from Earthquake Records TABLE 2:

	PERCENT	DIFFERENCE	37.0		1.4	11.0	58.2 - 5.5	2.2	0	4.2	12.3	7.2	39.8 - 23.5	31.7 - 28.2	25.7 - 45.0	12.9 - 47.3	22.2 - 39.7	48.5 - 63.0
	MEASURED	PERIODS	1.08	<u>.</u>	1.44	1.09	1.4 - 2.1	2.1	1.60	1.43	3.00	3.20	0.63 - 1.15	0.60 - 1.10	0.7 - 1.6	0.7 - 1.5	2.0 - 2.5	1.8 - 2.5
	COMPUTED	PERIODS	0.68		1.46	1.21	2.215	2.146	1.60	1.49	3.37	3.43	0.88	0.79	0.88	0.79	1.557	0.926
DATE	OF	STUDY	1972		1972		1971		1971		1971		1971		1971		1971	
		FRAME	CSW		SMRF		CMRF	- <u>-</u>	CMRF	· · · · ·	SMRF	-	CMRF		CMRF		CMRF	
	BASE-	MENTS	1										1			<u>.</u>	I	
		STORIES	14		6	· · · · · · · · ·	21		11		16		7		7) 12	
		BUILDING NAME	Certified Life Building*	Bldg. 180 at JPL	(Partial Composite Model)*		Sheraton Universal Hotel		Muir Medical Center*		The KB Valley Center*		Holiday Inn (Marengo)		Holiday Inn (Orion)		The Bank of California (Model B	

Table 2 Continued

	PERCENT	DIFFERENCE	0.5	3.2
-	MEASURED	PERIODS	4.0	3.4
	COMPUTED	PERIODS	3.979	3.508
DATE	OF	STUDY	1971	
		FRAME	SMRF	
	BASE-	MENTS	I	
		STORIES	32	
		BUILDING NAME	Bunker Hill Tower	

*、See Table I also.



TYPICAL FLOOR PLAN



EAST-WEST ELEVATION



NORTH-SOUTH ELEVATION

١

40

i.

BLDG. 180 AT JPL



N-S ELEVATION



TYPICAL TRANSVERSE SECTION

References

- "Seismic Study of the Certified Life Builidng, 14724 Ventura Boulevard, Los Angeles, California," William E. Gates, Conrad Associates, Consulting Engineers, Los Angeles, California, February 2, 1972.
- "Analysis of the Earthquake Response of a Nine-Story Steel Frame Building during the San Fernando Earthquake," John H. Wood, Report No. EERL 72-04, California Institute of Technology, Earthquake Engineering Research Laboratory, Pasadena, California, October, 1972.
- 3. "Seismic Study of the Sheraton Universal, 3838 Lankershim Boulevard, North Hollywood, California," John A. Blume and Associates, Engineers, 612 Howard Street, San Francisco, California, September 24, 1971.
- 4. "Dynamic Elastic Analyses in the Design of Typical New Zealand High-Rise Buildings," R. Shepherd, in <u>Proceedings of the Fourth</u> <u>World Conference on Earthquake Engineering</u>, Santiago, Chile, January 13-18, 1969, Vol. II, pp. A-3, 99-112.
- "Determination of the Natural Periods of Buildings," R. Crawford and
 H. S. Ward, in the <u>Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America</u>,
 54, 6, December, 1964.
- "Forced Vibration of a 22-Story Steel Frame Building," Paul C. Jennings,
 R. B. Matthiesen, and J. Brent Hoerner, CIT-EERL and the University
 of California at Los Angeles, Earthquake Engineering and Structures
 Laboratory, EERL 71-01, Pasadena, California, February, 1971.

- 7. "Periods of a Modern Multi-Story Office Building during Construction," John A. Blume and R. W. Binder, in <u>Proceedings of the Second World</u> <u>Conference on Earthquake Engineering</u>, Japan, 1960, pp. 1195-1206.
- "Wind-Induced Vibrations and Building Modes," H. S. Ward and R. Crawford, in the <u>Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America</u>, <u>56</u>, 4, August, 1966.

- 9. "Seismic Study of the Muir Medical Center, 7080 Hollywood Boulevard, Hollywood, California," Conrad Associates, Consulting Engineers, 14656 Oxnard St., Van Nuys, California, November 10, 1971.
- 10. "Seismic Study of the KB Valley Center, 15910 Ventura Boulevard, Los Angeles, California," Conrad Associates, Consulting Engineers, 14656 Oxnard St., Van Nuys, California, November 26, 1971.
- 11. "Seismic Study of the Holiday Inn, 1640 Marengo St., Los Angeles, California," John A. Blume and Associates, Engineers, 612 Howard St., San Francisco, California, October 14, 1971.
- 12. "Seismic Study of the Holiday Inn, 8244 Orion Avenue, Van Nuys, California," John A. Blume and Associates, Engineers, 612 Howard Street, San Francisco, California, October 6, 1971.
- "Seismic Study of the Bank of California, 15250 Ventura Boulevard, San Fernando Valley, California," John A. Blume and Associates, Engineers, 612 Howard St., San Francisco, California, October 7, 1971.
- "Seismic Study of the Bunker Hill Tower, 611 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, California," John A. Blume and Associates, Engineers, 612 Howard St., San Francisco, California, October, 1971.