



University at Buffalo-The State University of New York -2021 EERI Seismic Design Competition-

> Team Captain: Jake C. McCarey Design Manager: Gunnar J. Galuszka **Construction Manager: Ernesto Cruz Martinez** Lead Architect: Delaram Haghdel Design Coordinator: Anthony DeCola







To our sponsors, Thank You!

















Geotechnical & Seismicity Considerations

#### **Objectives** Methodology Assess Regional Geologic Conditions **Identify Future Sources of Ground Motions** • Consult the following Sources: Identify sources of potential future ground motions Washington DNR GIS Assess of subsurface conditions at the proposed site Provide Geotechnical Design Recommendations Interpret Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Data • Identify sources of shaking during design life of the Select and Scale Ground Motions for Structural Design structure Expected Magnitudes \_\_\_\_\_ Recurrence Intervals Methodology **Assess Site Subsurface Conditions Assess Regional Geologic Conditions** Utilize USGS Maps, Historic Geologic Records, • Utilize the provided drill log and P-S log Washington State Dept of Nat Resources GIS • Qualitatively assess the strength of soils to inform: • Purpose: - Foundation Design - Identify depositional method and age of deposits -Liquefaction Potential -Depositional Method: Influences strength, GSD -Ground Improvement Method -Liquefaction Potential: Age & GSD • Determine Seismic Site Classification using ASCE 7-16 - Provide additional confidence in in-situ data - Supplement lack of data/information 1.2

Approximate Site Location and Nearby Faults (Dashed Blue), From: Wash. DNR , ESRI

**University at Buffalo** The State University of New York



- Pacific Northwest Seismic Network(PNSN)
- City of Seattle Office of Emergency Mgmt.

- Obtain parameters for Design Response Spectrum
- -Used ATC Hazard By Locations Tool with site coordinates, risk category (det. using ASCE 7), and seismic site class (found by ASCE 7 and Drill Log)



Design Response Spectrum prepared using ASCE 7-16

### **Interpret Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Data**

- Utilize USGS Unified Hazard Tool to generate probabilistic seismic hazard plots
- Purpose:
  - Identify potential sources of ground motion
  - Used in conjunction with response spectrum to select

and scale ground motions



\_\_\_\_\_

### **Results & Recommendations**

#### **Regional Geologic Conditions**

- Puget Sound Lowland & Seattle Basin
- Influenced by repeated glaciations past 2.5m.y.
  - Clays: Stiff and over-consolidated
- Regrading operations (20th Century)=>Artificial Fill
  - Large deposits near Elliott Bay and Waterfront
  - greatly

#### **Identify Future Sources of Ground Motions**

- Seattle Fault
- South Whidbey Island
- Cascadian Subduction Zone (CSZ)





Composition & Compaction method varies

#### Site Subsurface Conditions

- Liquefaction Potential (Moderate)
  - High Water Table & Loose granular fill
  - Recommended Ground Improvement: Vibroreplacement/Stone Columns
- Foundation Design
  - Gravelly Sand would impede drivability of piles
  - Cast-in-place (CIP) Piles
  - End bearing in dense sand
- Excavation Design
  - Sheet Pile Walls
    - Excavation Wall Stability
    - High Water Table an Issue
  - Drainage ditches along sidewalls in pit

#### **Select & Scale Ground Motions for Structural Design**



Utilize seed motion data to search PEER Database and scale to match response spectrum

#### Results from Seismic Hazard Deaggregation for Proposed Site

ance	Vs30 (m/s)	Rupture Type		
	605	Crustal (Reverse)		
	767	Crustal (Reverse)		

Scaled Pseudo-Spectral Acceleration Response Spectra from GM Selection with the Design Spect



Design Spectrum
 Design Spectrum -15%
 Design Spectrum +15%
 Geomean of Scaled Seed Motions
 Seed Motion #1 (Subduction Interface
 Seed Motion #3 (Reverse Crustal)
 Seed Motion #4 (Reverse Crustal)
 "Seed Motion\*

Existing Structural Assessment and Structural Design of Addition

### **Objectives**

- Model and Assess existing Structure using SAP 2000
- Calculate capacity of structural members using **American Wood Councill NDS**
- Determine whether the existing structure fails given the calculated member capacities and a maximum Interstory Drift Ratio of 5 percent

#### Methodology

Used SAP 2000 to input and perform a linear time history analysis on the effects of ground motions, self weight, and applied dead load

**Purpose:** 

- Determine the peak Interstory Drift Ratios for the structure
- Analyze mode shapes to determine the dominant mode of the structure and how many modes are to be considered for 90 percent mass participation
- Determine peak loadings and accelerations on the structure



Mode Shapes of Existing Structure.

#### Methods

American Wood Council National Design Specification was used to determine overall capacities in shear, flexure and axial loads

**Purpose:** 

- members



**University at Buffalo** The State University of New York



- Find demand: Capacity ratios for the structure to determine whether individual members have reached their failure threshold

Determine whether or not the entire structure would be at risk of failure based on the failure of critical



### Results

-All IDR Ratios Found to be Below the 5% Limit and C9 under Seismic load and self weight

- All members adequate in shear and flexural strength
- Structure has minimal resistance to torsion when subjected to North-South Shaking



#### Conclusion

Based on the failures of Columns A1 and C1, we deemed that the existing structure would experience total failure due to the progressive failure of load bearing members between grids a and c. Our team recommended that the existing building be retrofitted to allow for additional bracing on the central and eastern bays of the structure once the addition is designed and constructed.





- -Demand:Capacity Ratios>1 for Columns A1 and C1 and A9

#### **Design of Structural Addition** Main Considered Alternatives

- Super Braces with atiffened core to draw loading to the main bracing scheme of the lower structure and reduce weight. Tested for 17 and 19 floor configurations
- Added bracing to super braced core to draw loading back to columns on the eastern columns of the building
- Angled bracing with stiffened core to allow for reduction of eccentricity of the building and add stiffness once the lower structure was to be braced

#### **Design Performance**

- All Configurations deemed to fail under axial load. Design #1 sees large amounts of torsion and axial loads on columns A1 and C1
- Design #2 dissipates more force to the columns on the east face of the structure but still overloads all columns and was deemed insufficient in torsion once the structure is retrofitted
- Design #3 deemed to be the most feasible option based on its overall stiffness and inclusion of torsional considerations





Considered Additions



Architectural & Environmental Considerations

### **Objectives**

- Design façade of structure with consideration of Seattle and the surrounding area
- Floor Design with consideration for day-to-day operations and COVID-19 restrictions
- Planning for acquisition of LEED BD+C credentials

\_\_\_\_\_

#### Methodology

Initial research into Seattle history as well as local and international sites which may be used as inspiration for design were prioritized. Furthermore, research into acquisition of LEED credentials was done throughout the time given so that we could best plan to gain the maximum number of credits.



Seattle's F5 Tower pictured above

### Research

Our first task was to research sites locally and internationally which, from our point of view, could inspire our building and the locals. Our main goal was to bring a pristine and lively look to the Seattle skyline so that the hospital not only symbolized a place for healing from illnesses but also an architectural marvel. The below mentioned and pictured sites were used as inspiration for our building.

- Columbia Tower
- F5 Tower
- Deutsche Post Tower







Seattle Public Library

Deutsche Post Tower



Seattle Public Library



Columbia Tower

#### Seattle.gov Mayor Jenny A. Durkar

Seattle Department of Construction &

↔ Home > Codes > Codes We Enforce (A-Z)

አማርኛ, Khmer, 中文, 한국어, ພາສາລາວ, Oromiffa, русский язык, af Soomaali,

#### **Building Code**

See also: Code Interpretations, Electrical Code, Existing Building Code, Mechanical Code, Residential Code

#### What is it?

The Seattle Building Code (SBC) provides minimum requirements for design has adopted the 2018 International Building Code, with amendments spec

#### What It Isn't



### **Floor Design**

The next part of the deliverable was the design of the floor with respect to hospital operations. Our main goal was to not only provide a good floor plan but also to maintain COVID and state guidelines, to accomplish this we asked for help from medical professionals who have been active during the pandemic as well as the Washington State Department of Health where we got guidance for spacing requirements as well as safety and building codes.





Goo	English 🗸 🛛 Q Search 🚍 Menu gle Translate Disclaimer
Inspections	
Español, Tagalog, ภาษาไทย, ԴൗՀรั, Tiếng Việt	Log in to Seattle Services Portal
	What Do You Want To Do?
Elevator Code, Energy Code, Fire Code,	Apply for a Permit Make a Property or Building Complaint
	Pay Permit Fees Online
n and construction of new buildings. Seattle	Check Status
ific to our city.	Enter a <b>record number</b>   <b>Find it on a</b> <b>map</b>
	Example: 6703106-CN
	Z7634 Elevator Shaft
	Staff Lounge and Wash Area
Patier	t Surveillance Area

### LEED BD+C

Our final task for this deliverable was the acquisition of the LEED credentials which was aided by the site provided to the teams by the SLC.

LEED Credit library	Select a Rating System	Select a Version			
	LEED BD+C: Healthcare	✓ v4.1 - LEED v4.1	~		
GETTING STARTED	<ul> <li>Type to search</li> </ul>		۹		
CREDIT CATEGORY	^				
Integrative Process	Category: Integrative process credits $~\times~$				
Location and Transportation     Sustainable Sites     Water Efficiency	2 credits				
Energy and Atmosphere		Internative project planning and d			
Materials and Resources		Integrative project planning and de	esign		
Quality		Integrative process credits			
Innovation		LEED BD+C: Healthcare V4.1 - LEED V4.1			
Regional Priority					
INNOVATION	×				
MINIMUM PROGRAM	v	Integrative Process			
REQUIREMENTS		Integrative process credits			
REGIONAL PRIORITY	1 point				
DOWNLOAD SCORECARD	,	LEED BD+C: Healthcare • V4.1 - LEED V4.1			

### **Final Render**





**Structural Retrofit** 

### **Objectives**

After Finalizing the addition, stiffening of the existing structure in order to provide adequate stiffness and load path to the ground

- Perform iterative analysis to adjust Member sizes and add bracing
- Finalize floor area and

### **Design Considerations/Assumptions**

- Floor width shrinkage of .67 inches per floor according to structural specification
- Weight of wood members deemed to be negligible compared to applied loads. Therefore the center of mass is shifted at .33 inches per floor.
- Eccentricity Created by the difference between the center of mass and center of stiffness Torsional effects considered in our final design



Design Considerations for Structural Addition and Retrofit

### **Considered Retrofit Techniques**

- **Base Isolation** - High upfront cost -Not allowed by the rules of this competition
- **Column Jacketing** 
  - to increase section size and overall capacity in axial forces
  - Common Practice in Reinforced concrete buildings - Added steel reinforcement and outer core to columns

-allows for similar compressive and tensile strengths of each brace through the steel core and tube sections - Decided not to use as it would be too difficult to adjust material properties in SAP



**University at Buffalo** The State University of New York



#### -Viscous Dampers-

- -Considered for the retrofit and addition
- -Not used in final design due to the existing
- structure being a braced frame
- -Would be most effective in a moment frame. Deemed too costly to remove bracing and add in rather than stiffen the structure through added bracing

#### **Polymer Fiber Concrete**

- -Common method to strengthen concrete using a
- polymer concrete composite or steel
- -Difficult to estimate strength increases in wood model

#### **Buckling Restrained Bracing**

*Typical Viscous Damper (Taylor Devices)* 

### **Design Iterations**

- adequate strength
- and a single brace to find adequate capacities
- with lowest eccentricities and torsional effects



Finalized Structural Model

#### **Design Details**

- Tube in tube structure
- ground to draw load to each column equally
- for the inner core and .35 X.35 for outer core to account for increases in axial loading
- capacity and to reduce weight





Column sizes adjusted and capacities recalculated for different section sizes and effective lengths to provide

Built up bracing sections tested as Sections of 4, 2

Center of Stiffness found for all iterations when subjected to North-South Shaking to determine design



Outer Core

• Continued bracing from all bays of the addition to the

Column sections increased from .2X.2 inches to .3X.3

Built up bracing sections removed due to adequate

#### **Analysis Results**

-Main Mode Shapes found to be translational

- Maximum Demand: Capacity Ratios -Axial-.361
  - •-Shear- .00388
  - Torsional-.0949

#### - Interstory Drift Ratios reduced by a factor of 8.43 between addition to final building

#### - Floor area maximized to 2304 sq in



Bouvier, Charlotte A.(2003)- Techniques of Seismic Retrofitting for Concrete Structures. Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Constantinou, Michael C., Taylor, Douglas P (2010). Fluid Dampers for Applications of Seismic Energy Dissipation and Seismic Isolation. Taylor Devices

Hagen, Garrett. (2014). Seismic Assessment and Retrofit of Existing RC Buildings: Case Studies from Degenkolb Engineers.

Sabelli, Rafael. Lopez, Walterio. Buckling Restrained Braced Frames. American Institute of Steel Construction