

Investigación sobre robustez de edificios de losas de hormigón armado

Research on robustness of concrete flat slab buildings

Manuel Buitrago^{*,a}, Juan Sagaseta^b, Elisa Bertolesi^c, Jose M. Adam^d, Pedro A.

Calderón^f, Juan J. Moragues^g

*a Dr. ICITECH. Postdoctoral Fellow. Universitat Politècnica de València. E-mail: <u>mabuimo1@upv.es</u>

^bDr. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering. Senior Lecturer. University of Surrey. E-mail: <u>j.sagaseta@surrey.ac.uk</u>

^cDr. ICITECH. Postdoctoral Fellow. Universitat Politècnica de València. E-mail: <u>elber4@upv.es</u>

^dDr. ICITECH. Full Professor. Universitat Politècnica de València. E-mail: joadmar@upv.es

^e Dr. ICITECH. Full Professor. Universitat Politècnica de València. E-mail: <u>pcaldero@upv.es</u>

^fDr. ICITECH. Full Professor. Universitat Politècnica de València. E-mail: <u>imorague@upv.es</u>

RESUMEN

El presente artículo presenta el estudio preliminar de los ensayos realizados en el ICITECH de la Universitat Politècnica de València en un edificio probeta a escala real sometido a la retirada repentina de una de las columnas. La estructura estudiada fue diseñada siguiendo las recomendaciones de atado propuestas en los Eurocódigos aunque los resultados obtenidos muestran que los tirantes no actuaron de forma significativa, sino que la losa resistió por mecanismos de flexión con ayuda del comportamiento tipo viga Vierendeel y la activación de caminos alternativos de carga basados en tabiques de fachada.

ABSTRACT

This paper shows the preliminary analysis of the test results of a real scale pilot building test carried out at ICITECH of Universitat Politècnica de València. The results are compared with theoretical predictions and discussed in the context of Eurocode tying requirements. Whilst the structure was compliant with these requirements the results suggest that the structure was able to sustain a sudden corner-column removal due to flexural slab deformations, helped by the Vierendeel behaviour, and without any significant activation of ties in this case and the infill masonry walls as a predominant alternative load path when these panels were considered.

PALABRAS CLAVE: estudio experimental, eventos extremos, colapso progresivo, columna de esquina.

KEYWORDS: experimental study, extreme events, progressive collapse, corner columns.

1. Introduction

Extreme events (i.e. terrorist attacks, vehicle impacts, explosions, etc.) may cause local damage to building structures, and this can be most serious when one or more columns fail, leading to the progressive collapse of the entire structure or a large part of it [1]. Since the beginning of the 21st century there has been growing interest in the risks derived from extreme events, especially after the attacks on the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma in 1995 and on the World Trade Center in New York in 2001. The accent now is on achieving resilient buildings that can arrest progressive collapse after such an event, especially when they form part of critical infrastructures, have a large number of occupants, or are public buildings (e.g. hospitals, shopping centers, theaters, etc.), with the intention of preventing injuries and deaths [2–6].

To date, several studies have been carried out where the failure of interior or end columns have been studied [7–11]. However, the failure of corner columns has hardly been addressed, despite the vulnerability and major probability of an eventual progressive collapse triggered by a corner-column failure:

- In a building structure, corner columns are the most exposed to extreme events, such as those due to terrorist attacks, vehicle impacts, or extreme environmental actions.
- The most advanced current standards consider corner columns as critical elements, whose sudden failure must be evaluated in the design phase of the structure.
- When a corner column fails, it is more difficult to find alternative loading paths.

The greatest advances in this direction come from numerical studies and testing of scaled substructures in the laboratory (e.g. [12,13]). However, some of the alternative load paths can not be evaluated by testing substructures, and results from numerical simulations are not reliable if performed independently from experimental and real results.

The research partially presented in this conference paper [14,15] aims to fill the existing gap. In this study, dynamic and non-linear numerical models were performed to predict

the behaviour of an experimental test. This test consisted of a real 3D building structure designed at the ICITECH of the Universitat Politècnica de València (UPV). In this way, the novelty of the research remains in: i) the introduction of the influence of infill masonry walls in real-scale 3D RC structure subjected to corner-column failure scenarios; ii) the assessment under real conditions of any alternative load path against corner-column failure scenarios, iii) the use of an extensive monitoring system during test, and iv) the performance of the test under the accidental load combination prescribed by the codes as a for assess real method the dynamic performance and the effects under real conditions of load (it is worth noting that dynamic effects depend on the level of damage). This study also includes an analysis of the influence of infill walls to arrest the progressive collapse of RC structures in cornercolumn failure scenarios.

2. A brief description of the building and tests

A real-scale RC building was designed with only research purposes. This building had two floors of 2.8m height, four bays with 5.0m span length, flat-slabs 20cm thick and columns of 30x30cm². Prescriptions of Eurocode 2 [16] were adopted and a category of use corresponding to high occupancy buildings (C1, C2 o C3) [17] was chosen. In addition to the self-weight of the structure, a dead load of 2kN/m² and a uniformly distributed live load of 3kN/m² were considered in the design of the structure.

The building belongs to a consequence class 2a (Lower Risk Group) following Eurocode 1, Part 1-7 [2], but it was categorized as a consequence class 2b (Upper Risk Group) as it is a test which aim is to reproduce the behaviour of high occupancy and taller buildings. At this point, the building was designed using the simplified methodology of the tying forces and elements (horizontal and vertical ties). A discussion about the origins and the validity of the tying simplified methodology is discussed in [6]. As a result, the design of the building was only slightly modified with respect to the design without accidental actions. This is a common trend when considering flat-slabs, as pointed out in [6]. Fig. 2 shows an example of horizontal ties working after an internal-column loss.



Figure 1. 3D view of the design.



Figure 2. Example of horizontal ties working after an internal column loss.

Two experimental tests for two different failure scenarios were considered in this study. In both cases, a corner-column loss was considered, selecting two opposite corners columns to avoid the influence of a damaged structure in the second test. These columns were steel-based (HE-300B profile) prepared with a mechanism to reproduce a sudden failure. Only the structure of the building was tested for the first failure scenario, whereas infill masonry walls were also introduced for the second failure scenario. These masonry walls were only constructed in the first floor and in those modules with more influence in the defined corner-column failure scenario. Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 show the real building prepared for the first and the second failure scenarios, respectively.



Figure 3. Building and definition of the first failure scenario.

Finally, before testing the structures without and with infill masonry walls, the building was verified using the alternative load path method with the notional removal of the selected corner-columns (See Section 3). Experimental and predicted numerical results are presented in Section 4. The latter were used as a reference during tests.



Figure 4. Building and definition of the second failure scenario.

3. Finite element model

A nonlinear dynamic finite element (FE) analysis was carried out in this work using ABAQUS Software [18] and considering material and geometrical non-linearities. The FE model included the RC structure, those steel columns prepared for the failure scenarios and the infill masonry walls (only in the second failure scenario).

RC and steel columns were modelled as BEAM elements (B33) with an elastic behaviour, considering that cracking in the concrete columns should be reduced. SHELL elements (S4R) were used for flat slabs and the infill masonry walls. For the floors, different areas with different amount of reinforcement were considered according to the structure design. A concrete damage plasticity model was adopted to reproduce the non-linear behaviour and damage of the concrete, adopting those expressions given by EC-2 [16]. As a first approach, results for the model with infill masonry walls were not predicted due to the variability of the results according to the unknown mechanical properties and connections with the RC structure. This model will be performed as a future work based on the experimental tested mechanical properties of the materials and the results obtained from the test under the second failure scenario. Table 1 shows the parameters considered in this preliminary study.

 Table 1. Mechanical properties of steel and concrete elements.

	Value*	
Property	Steel	Concrete
Modulus of Elasticity [MPa]	210000	33000
Poisson's Ratio	0.3	0.2
Compressive Strength [MPa]		38
Tensile Strength [MPa]		2.9

* Values should be modified in future Works according to experimental tests.

The lower nodes of the concrete columns of the ground floor had restricted displacements and rotations, whereas those corresponding to the steel columns had restricted displacements and free rotations. Fig. 5 shows a 3D view of the FE model.



Figure 5. 3D view of the FE model without (top) and with infill masonry walls (bottom).

The self-weight was applied automatically with densities of 25kN/m³ and 78.5kN/m³ for concrete and steel, respectively. Dead load (DL) and live load (LL) were applied as a uniformly distributed mass on the slab. The accidental load combination was used in the analysis (i.e. 1.2DL + 0.5LL) in accordance with GSA [3]. This load was also reproduced experimentally.

The gravity acceleration was introduced gradually over time using a ramp function within t=0.0s and t=1.0s, similarly to Buitrago et al [19,20]. This was followed by an interval of stabilization and the introduction of the accidental events at t=1.0s. The response of the structure was computed until t=2.0s. As explained before, local failure scenarios followed the conventional notional member removal approach used traditionally for permanent structures to assess whether the structure can develop alternative load paths after accidental events [3,4,21-24]. Predicted results of the FE model are presented in Section 4 and were used as a reference for the experimental tests.

4. Preliminary results

4.1. Without infill walls

This Section presents the predicted results for the first failure scenario where there is no infill masonry walls in the structure. This is a common trend when considering structures under progressive collapse, in which secondary elements as infill masonry walls are not considered. This aspect could lead to not appropriate results since secondary elements play an important role in arresting progressive collapse (See section 4.2 and 4.3 for more details). Actually, infill masonry walls are considered as an important alternative loading path in accidental scenarios [1].

Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 show the timedependent vertical displacement predicted by the FEM in the center of the bay attached to failed column and in the upper point of this column for the first failure scenario, respectively. As it is shown, the RC structure achieves an important deflection after the accidental event within t = 1.0s and t = 2.0s. This response, as could be seen from the deformed shape (See Section 4.3), is governed by two main alternative load paths: a) bending; and b) Vierendeel action. Other alternative load paths, as membrane or arch action, were not activated in this case. Arch action can be activated when an external or internal column is lost, whereas membrane action is usually activated after the bending action, with high rotations at joints and a stiff horizontal restrain. In addition, Fig. 7 depicts the experimental results which were pretty similar to those predicted by the FEM during the design phase of the test.

Fig. 8 shows the predicted damage (cracking) on the upper and lower part of the RC slabs, respectively. As can be seen, this damage is localized in zones near the slabcolumn joints, where negative bending moments are important after the accidental event. Damage is also localized in the bottom part of the slabs near the failed column due to the flexural stresses introduced by the Vierendeel action. As an example of what occurred in the experimental test, Fig. 9 shows a photography of some cracks produced on the slabs near to the slab-column joint attached to the failed column after the accidental event.







Figure 7. Position and time-history vertical displacements in the upper point of the failed column: predicted by the FE model (top) and registered in the test (bottom) without infill walls.



Figure 8. Predicted tensile damage of the upper (top) and lower (bottom) part of the RC slabs in the first failure scenario at 2.0s (deformed shape magnified 10 times).



Figure 9. Cracks on the slabs near the slab-column joint next to the failed column after its sudden failure.

4.2 With infill masonry walls

The inclusion of the infill masonry walls produced a great influence in the structural response of the building. This can be seen from the vertical displacements in the upper point of the failed column (Fig. 10).



failed column with infill masonry walls.

Results showed that the main alternative load path comprised the activation of the infill masonry walls, as it is represented in Fig. 11.



Figure 11. Activation of an alternative load path based on the infill masonry walls.

4.3 Comparison

Fig. 12 shows a comparison of the vertical displacements (deformed shape) for tests without (Test 1) and with (Test 2) infill masonry walls.



Figure 12. Vertical residual displacement (2D deformed shape) of the first floor between adjacent and failed columns for Test 1 (without infill walls) and Test 2 (with infill masonry walls).

A reduction of 83.8% was found in the maximum vertical displacement. Additionally, the structural response of the building changed, from the flexural and Vierendeel mechanisms (Test 1) to the main contribution of the infill masonry walls (Test 2).

5. Conclusions and future works

A real-scale RC building structure was carried out by ICITECH-UPV to assess its progressive collapse behaviour under corner-column failure

scenarios without and with the consideration of the infill cladding panels. Before testing, as a reference for the experimental tests, a FE model was developed to predict the most important results and the general behaviour of the RC structure. This FE analysis consisted on nonlinear numerical dynamic analysis а performed in ABAQUS. From the experimental and predicted numerical results obtained, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- After a sudden column removal, the RC structure was able to withstand the accidental action with the activation of some alternative load path.
- The accidental event produced some important deflections and damage on the RC structure. However, after the accidental event, the integrity of the structure was maintained and it was able to arrest effectively the possibility of propagating a progressive collapse.
- Bending and Vierendeel actions were the most important alternative load paths under corner-column failure scenarios. As it is confirmed by experimental testing, masonry walls were infill another important alternative load path, highly reducing displacements and damage of the RC structure (83% of reduction). Other alternative load paths, as arch or membrane actions, were not activated. Arch action is not present in cornercolumn losses, whereas membrane action needs high rotations on column-slabs joints and stiff horizontal restrains, which is not applicable in this test.

As future works, experimental research and analyses with dynamic nonlinear numerical simulations fitted to the experimental results without and with infill masonry walls will be developed to precisely analyses the different alternative load paths and the influence of introducing the infill masonry walls on the structural behaviour against progressive collapse. This analysis will be extended to other cases through parametric analysis and other types of RC buildings.

Acknowledgements

This work was carried out with the support of a 2017 Leonardo Grant for Researchers and Cultural Creators from the BBVA Foundation. The authors would also like to express their gratitude to the Levantina, Ingeniería y Construcción S.L. (LIC) company for funding the construction of the building, and to the Valenciana/Fons Social Generalitat Europeu [APOSTD/2019/101] and Universitat Politècnica de València [PAID-10-17] for funding received under different postdoctoral programs.

References

- Adam JM, Parisi F, Sagaseta J, Lu X. Research and practice on progressive collapse and robustness of building structures in the 21st century. Eng Struct 2018;173:122–49. doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2018.06.082.
- [2] EN 1991-1-7. Eurocode 1: Actions on structures - Part 1-7: General actions -Accidental actions; 2006.
- [3] GSA. General Services Administration. Progressive collapse analysis and design guidelines for new federal office buildings and major organization projects; 2013.
- [4] DoD. Department of Defense. Design of buildings to resist progressive collapse (UFC 4-023-03); 2009.
- [5] BS 5975. Code of practice for temporary works procedures and the permissible stress design of falsework 2011.
- [6] Russell JM, Sagaseta J, Cormie D, Jones AEK. Historical review of prescriptive design rules for robustness after the collapse of Ronan Point. Structures 2019;20:365–73. doi:10.1016/j.istruc.2019.04.011.
- [7] Sasani M, Sagiroglu S. Gravity load redistribution and progressive collapse resistance of 20-story reinforced concrete structure following loss of interior column. ACI Struct J

2010;107:636-44.

- [8] Xue H, Gilbert BP, Guan H, Lu X, Li Y, Ma F, et al. Load Transfer and Collapse Resistance of RC Flat Plates under Interior Column Removal Scenario. J Struct Eng (United States) 2018;144:1– 15. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0002090.
- Peng Z, Orton SL, Liu J, Tian Y. [9] Experimental Study of Dynamic Progressive Collapse in Flat-Plate Buildings Subjected to an Interior Removal. Column J Struct Eng 2018;144:1-11. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0001865.
- [10] Bermejo M, Santos AP, Goicolea JM. Development of Practical Finite Element Models for Collapse of Reinforced Concrete Structures and Experimental Validation. Shock Vib 2017:1–9. doi:10.1155/2017/4636381.
- [11] Qian K, Weng YH, Li B. Impact of two columns missing on dynamic response of RC flat slab structures. Eng Struct 2018;177:598–615. doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2018.10.011.
- [12] Ma F, Gilbert BP, Guan H, Xue H, Lu X, Li Y. Experimental study on the progressive collapse behaviour of RC flat plate substructures subjected to corner column removal scenarios. Eng Struct 2019;180:728–41. doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2018.11.043.
- [13] Qian K, Li B. Experimental study of drop panel effects on response of reinforced concrete flat slabs after loss of corner column. ACI Struct J 2013:845–56.
- [14] Adam JM, Buitrago M, Bertolesi E, Sagaseta J, Moragues JJ. Dynamic performance of a real-scale reinforced concrete building test under cornercolumn failure scenario. Eng Struct 2019.
- [15] Buitrago M, Bertolesi E, Sagaseta J, Calderón PA, Adam JM. Robustness of RC building structures with infill

masonry walls: tests on a purpose-built building. Eng Struct 2020.

- [16] EN 1992-1-1. Eurocode 2: Design of concrete structures - Part 1-1: General rules and rules for buildings; 2004.
- [17] EN 1991-1-1. Eurocode 1: Actions on structures. Part 1-1: Densities, selfweight, imposed loads for buildings; 2003.
- [18] ABAQUS v16.4. Abaqus, Theory manual 2016.
- [19] Buitrago M, Sagaseta J, Adam JM. Effects of sudden failure of shoring elements in concrete building structures under construction. Eng Struct 2018;172:508–22. doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2018.06.052.
- [20] Buitrago M, Sagaseta J, Adam JM. Avoiding failures during building construction using structural fuses as load limiters on temporary shoring structures. Eng Struct 2019.
- [21] Olmati P, Sagaseta J, Cormie D, Jones AEK. Simplified reliability analysis of punching in reinforced concrete flat slab buildings under accidental actions. Eng Struct 2017;130:83–98. doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2016.09.061.
- [22] Qian K, Li B. Performance of Three-Dimensional Reinforced Concrete Beam-Column Substructures under Loss of a Corner Column Scenario. J Struct Eng 2013;139:584–94. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0000630.
- [23] Dat PX, Tan KH. Experimental Response of Beam-Slab Substructures Subject to Penultimate-External Column Removal. J Struct Eng 2015;141:1–12. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0001123.
- [24] Sagaseta J, Ulaeto N, Russell J. Structural robustness of concrete flat slab structures. ACI Struct J 2017;315:273– 98.