

# SEISMIC RETROFITTING OF RC STRUCTURES WITH EXTERIOR SHEAR WALLS AND BRACING

<sup>1</sup>BHARAT DILIPRAO DASPUTE, <sup>2</sup>L.G.KALURKAR

<sup>1</sup>PG Student (Structural Engineering), MGM's JNEC, Aurangabad, 431002, Maharashtra, India.

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, MGM's JNEC, Aurangabad, 431002, Maharashtra, India.

**Abstract**-Many existing reinforced concrete framework in world that is present are insufficient for earthquakes. Recent earthquakes that occurred during last ten years have suggested that significant damage happened wasn't specifically on account of methods of earthquakes but on account of bad performance of construction during earthquake. The current building system, that were design and constructed according to first codal provisions, don't satisfy needs of present seismic design and code methods. It's realized that the best technique of lowering the danger of harmful structure is seismic retrofitting. In the recent past, there's a tremendous enhancement of retrofitting techniques. This analysis highlights the concepts of evaluating and also retrofitting of structure against seismic events. A 3 dimensional R.C. frame fashioned with linear elastic compelling analysis. The computer software program ETab is utilized for dynamics analysis strategy is applied to look at the functionality of a reinforced concrete building. The various retrofitting techniques including steel and concrete application and jacketing of fiber reinforced polymer (FRP) composites that happened to be utilized to enhance the load bearing capacity of specific structure elements are highlighted and techniques including shear wall space plus shear cores that enables you to improve general balance of buildings. Most retrofitting techniques are going to result a rise in stiffness as well as somewhat enhance in mass that causes in return a shorter period. Shortening in period of vibration quite often results an increased ductility and strength of retrofitted structure. Consequently, a proposed retrofit program could be believed to achieve success in case it results an increased strength and also ductility capability of the structure that is higher compared to the requirements required by earthquakes.

**Keywords:** Retrofitting, Seismic Events, FRP, Jacketing, Stiffness

## I. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 GENERAL

Seismic Retrofitting Techniques are required for concrete constructions which are vulnerable to damage and failures by seismic forces. In the past thirty years, moderate to severe earthquakes occurs around the world every year. Such events lead to damage to the concrete structures as well as failures.

### 1.2 EARTHQUAKE DESIGN PHILOSOPHY

The engineering intention behind earthquake resistant design is not to make earthquake-proof buildings that will not get damaged even during the rare but strong earthquake; such

buildings will be too robust and also too expensive. Instead, the engineers make buildings to resist the effects of ground shaking, although they may get damaged severely but would not collapse during the strong earthquake.

### 1.3 SEISMIC RETROFITTING TECHNIQUES

1. Earthquake creates great devastation in terms of life, money and failures of structures.
2. Upgrading of certain building systems (existing structures) to make them more resistant to seismic activity (earthquake resistance) is really of more importance.
3. Structures can be (a) Earthquake damaged, (b) Earthquake vulnerable

### 1.4 .SEISMIC RETROFITTING OF CONCRETE STRUCTURES:

Definition:

It is the modification of existing structures to make them more resistant to seismic activity, ground motion, or soil failure due to earthquakes. The retrofit techniques are also applicable for other natural hazards such as tropical cyclones, tornadoes, and severe winds from thunderstorms.

### 1.5 NEED FOR SEISMIC RETROFITTING:

1. To ensure the safety and security of a building, employees, structure functionality, machinery and inventory
2. Essential to reduce hazard and losses from non-structural elements.
3. Important buildings must be strengthened whose services are assumed to be essential just after an earthquake like hospitals.

### 1.6 PROBLEMS FACED BY STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS ARE:

Lack of standards for retrofitting methods – Effectiveness of each methods varies a lot depending upon parameters like type of structures, material condition, amount of damage etc.,

### 1.7 BASIC CONCEPT OF RETROFITTING

1. Up gradation of lateral strength of structure
2. Increase in ductility of structure
3. Increase in strength and ductility

### 1.8 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The main reason for this particular study is increasing proficiency and knowledge in earthquake resistant design plus

seismic rehabilitation of existing buildings and also in order to increase familiarity with modeling & analyzing buildings against seismic loads by utilizing computer software

### 1.9 OBJECTIVE

The objectives of this particular analysis are:

- (i) To explore the consequences of earthquake forces on structures and literature search on earthquake resistant design
- (ii) To assess the feasibility of seismic evaluation of advantages and buildings of using the retrofit measures designed for strengthening
- (iii) To evaluate performance based design and compare various seismic analysis method

## II. METHODOLOGY

To gather various types of work on seismic analysis of high-rise structures and increasing lateral stiffness of the system various papers, thesis and research articles were studied thoroughly and referred. The idea behind doing literature review was to collect data and have understanding on different methods and approaches that can be used, to clear understand the software requirement of the project. Literature review was done to have thorough guidelines during the entire project work.

### 2.1 Data Collection

The data's were obtained from the college. The earthquakes considered in this work are time history of ground motion as per IS 1893:2002 (Part-I), at particular location.

### 2.2 Methodology Adopted

As discussed in the scope of the work, the entire work is divided into three parts:

1. Analysis of bare frame
2. Analysis of the braced frames.
3. Analysis of the frame with shear wall

For analysis a 12 stories high building is modeled in Etab as a space frame. The building is does not represent any real existing building. The building is unsymmetrical with the span more along Z direction than along X direction. The building rises up to 42m along Y direction and spans 15m along X direction and 20 m along Z direction .The building is analyzed by Response Spectrum Analysis, which is a linear dynamic analysis. Dynamic Analysis is adopted since it gives better results than static analysis. The specifications of the frame are given in Table 3.1. and the plan and the model of the building is shown in Fig. 4and Fig.5 respectively. In the entire course work X and Z are taken as the horizontal axes and Y as the vertical axes.

**Table.2.1. Specifications of the building**

Specifications	Data
Storey Height	3.5m
No. of bays along X direction	3
No. of bays along Z direction	4
Bay Length along X direction	5m
Bay Length along Z direction	5m
Concrete grade used	M 30
Columns	0.45m X 0.25m
Longitudinal Beams	0.40m X 0.25m
Transverse Beams	0.35m X 0.25m
Slab Thickness	0.1m
Unit Weight of Concrete	25 kN/m <sup>3</sup>
Live Load	3.5 kN/m <sup>2</sup>
Zone	IV
Soil Conditions	Hard Soil
Damping Ratio	5%



Fig 2.1 Plan of the building

In E tab, Modeling and Analysis is done as follows:

1. After preparing the bare model, seismic definition for IS 1893-2002 was created by giving the required input of time period, zone factor, R factor, etc. Then under seismic definition self-weight and floor weights of 2.5kN/m<sup>2</sup> and 3.5 kN/m<sup>2</sup> were given.
2. Under Load Definition Earthquake load, Dead load, Live load and various load combinations were created.
3. Under Earthquake load, after assigning self-weight, floor load and live load in X, Y and Z directions,. For Indian Code compatible earthquake already defined IS 1893-2002 is chosen.
4. The load combinations that were considered were according to IS 1893-2002 (Part-1) and are as follows:
  - 1.5(DL+LL)
  - 1.2 (DL+ LL+EL)
  - 1.2 (DL+ LL-EL)
  - 1.5 (DL+EL)

1.5 (DL-EL) 0.9DL + 1.5 EL 0.9DL -1.5 EL

### Modelling of Braced Frame


For braces angle section ISA 60 X 40 X 6 is used. There are four trial locations in the building where braces are placed and analyzed for their effect on lateral stiffness. Braces are modeled as axial force members having pinned end connections. Bracings are of X-type modeled throughout the height of the building. The four locations are as follows:

Location 1: Bracing A- at the exterior side of the frame along X-direction.

Location 2: Bracing B- at the exterior side of the frame along Y-direction.

Location 3: Bracing AB- at the exterior side of the frame along X and Y-direction. Location 4: Bracing C- at the exterior side of the frame around the corners.

The figures of the models with different locations of braces are given in the tables below:



3D Model of the building with braces at location 1

## III. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

### 3.1 Introduction

In recent years, devastating earthquakes worldwide confirmed the deficiencies of building structures. The experience gained from field observations and back-analysis led to improvement of the level of knowledge and the evolution of seismic codes. The interest of the research community is focused on buildings that do not comply with current seismic codes and exhibit deficiencies such as poor detailing, discontinuous load paths and lack of capacity design provisions.

### 3.2 Framework of seismic rehabilitation

Performance objectives are set depending on the structural type, the importance of the building, its role in post-earthquake emergencies, the economic consequences of business interruption, its historical or cultural significance, the construction material and socio-economic factors.

### 3.3 Injection of cracks

Crack injection is a versatile and economical method of repairing reinforced concrete (RC) structures. The effectiveness of the repair process depends on the ability of the adhesive material (usually epoxies) to penetrate, under appropriate pressure, into the fine cracks of the damaged concrete. Flexural cracks and shear cracks are mainly continuous and therefore provide unobstructed passages for the epoxy.




Figure 3.1 Application of the: (a) epoxy resin; (b) cement grout injection in beam-column joints

#### IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The result is based on the responses of the bare frame model and the changes in the responses after using bracings and shear wall. The results include changes in base shear, inter-storey drifts and top-storey deflections for ground motions along X and Z direction considered individually. The results of, base shear, inter-storey drifts and top-storey deflection for bare frame, braced frame and shear wall frame were then compared with each other and a conclusion was then drawn.

##### 4.1 Comparison of Base Shear for ground motion in X-direction

Table 4.1. Base shear for ground motion in X-direction

Cases	Base Shear (kN)
Bare Frame	558.65
Case A	678.48
Case B	562.32
Case AB	681.95
Case C	740.62
Shear Wall A	895.7
Shear Wall B	658.36
Shear Wall AB	990.91
Shear Wall C	1227.99




Fig 4.1. Variation of base shear for ground motion in X- direction

##### 5.2 Comparison of Base Shear for ground motion in Z-direction

The base shear was found to be increasing from bare frame to braced frame and is even more for frame with shear wall. In case of braced frame highest base shear is found in case of


The base shear was found to be increasing from bare frame to braced frame and is even more for frame with shear wall. In case of braced frame highest base shear is found in case of Bracing C in X-direction. In case of shear wall base shear is highest in case of Shear wall C in X-direction. Shear wall B shows the least base shear among all the shear wall cases because in case of Shear Wall B the frame is stiffened only along Y- direction and not along Z.

Table 4.1 shows the base shear for ground motion in X-direction for all the cases. Fig 5.1. Shows the variation of the base shear

Bracing C in Z-direction. In case of shear wall base shear is highest in case of Shear wall C in Z-direction. Shear wall A shows the least base shear among all the shear wall cases because in case of Shear Wall A the frame is stiffened only along X- direction and not along Z.

**Table 4.2. Base shear for ground motion in Z-direction**

Cases	Base Shear (kN)
Bare Frame	519.54
Case A	519.36
Case B	514.35
Case AB	511.25
Case C	518.58
Shear Wall A	563.52
Shear Wall B	1145.63
Shear Wall AB	1221.58
Shear Wall C	1310.55

**Fig 4.2. Variation of base shear for ground motion in Z- direction**

#### 4.3 Comparison of Inter-Storey Drift for ground motion in X- direction

As per IS 1893-2002 (Part-I) storey drift should be within 0.4% of storey height. For the building considered in this study the safe limit for storey drift is 14mm. Inter- storey drifts in bare frame was found to exceed this limit of 14mm. By using bracings and shear wall in the building the drift is found to be reduced. Inter storey drift decreases remarkably in case of shear walls. Fig 4.3. Shows the variation of inter-storey drift

**Table4.3. Inter-Storey Drift for ground motion in X- direction**

Storey	Bare Frame	Bracing A	Bracing B	Bracing AB	Bracing C	Shear Wall A	Shear Wall B	Shear Wall AB	Shear Wall C
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	7.923	6.51	7.946	6.498	5.667	3.288	7.882	3.079	2.576
3	13.611	10.441	13.65	10.424	8.938	5.344	14.066	5.912	4.63
4	14.317	10.828	14.361	10.815	9.321	5.716	14.88	6.757	5.099
5	13.722	10.468	13.771	10.465	9.085	5.975	14.34	7.054	5.319
6	12.716	9.862	12.763	9.861	8.653	6.462	13.728	7.291	5.707
7	11.583	9.182	11.626	9.182	8.172	6.697	12.62	7.418	5.892
8	10.424	8.492	10.462	8.49	7.698	6.847	11.309	7.481	6.056
9	9.236	7.774	9.269	7.771	7.205	6.985	9.883	7.46	6.212
10	7.95	6.958	7.977	6.954	6.611	6.915	8.412	7.212	6.168
11	6.484	5.96	6.506	5.965	5.824	6.53	6.681	6.684	5.884
12	4.812	4.739	4.828	4.735	4.791	5.976	5.08	6.054	5.379
13	3.251	3.222	3.522	3.254	3.256	5.214	3.256	5.321	4.256




Fig 4.3. Variation of Inter-Storey Drift for ground motion in X direction

#### 4.4 Comparison of Inter-Storey Drift for ground motion in Z- direction

Inter- storey drifts in bare frame was found to exceed this limit of 14mm. By using bracings it was found that there was no reduction in drift in Z direction but frame with shear wall showed remarkable reduction in the drift. Inter storey drift decreases remarkably in case of shear walls. For ground motion in Z-direction inter-storey drift is minimum in case Shear Wall C. Shear Wall B shows the least inter-storey drift in Z- direction than Shear Wall A, because Shear Wall A is along Z direction only whereas Shear Wall A is along X direction only. Table 5.4 shows the inter-storey drift for ground motion in Z-direction for all the cases. Fig 5.4. Shows the variation of inter-storey drift.

Table 4.4. Inter-Storey Drift for ground motion in Z- direction

Storey	Bare Frame	Bracing A	Bracing B	Bracing AB	Bracing C	Shear Wall A	Shear Wall B	Shear Wall AB	Shear Wall C
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	12.527	12.483	12.45	12.306	12.484	11.848	4.011	2.695	2.759
3	16.015	15.963	16.021	15.841	15.963	15.675	4.762	4.227	4.213
4	15.531	15.476	16.03	16.393	15.476	15.935	3.82	4.555	4.543
5	14.536	14.485	15.052	15.45	14.485	15.115	3.624	4.784	4.844
6	13.354	13.307	13.392	13.283	13.306	13.935	4.457	5.107	5.308
7	12.114	12.071	12.085	11.962	12.07	12.692	5.341	5.48	5.757
8	10.868	10.828	10.855	10.715	10.828	11.341	5.25	5.814	6.141
9	9.55	9.555	9.573	9.447	9.553	9.933	5.735	6.063	6.462
10	8.2	8.165	8.182	8.068	8.168	8.401	5.752	6.124	6.589
11	6.605	6.584	6.592	6.497	6.583	6.728	5.96	5.913	6.467
12	4.767	4.745	4.755	4.685	4.747	4.955	5.738	5.544	6.132
13	2.756	2.745	2.751	2.713	2.743	3.054	5.135	4.845	5.39




Fig 4.4. Variation of Inter-Storey Drift for ground motion in Z direction

**4.5 Comparison of Top-Storey Deflection for ground motion in X- direction**

There is reduction in top-storey deflection in the frame due to bracing and shear wall. Reduction is more in case of Bracing C and Shear Wall C. For ground motion in X- direction Shear Wall B is ineffective since in Shear Wall B case shear wall is present in Z-direction not in X-direction.

Table 5.5 below shows the top-storey deflection for each case, Fig 5.5. shows the variation in top-storey deflection in X direction and Fig.5.6 shows the Etab results for top-storey deflection.

**Table 4.5. Top-Storey Drift for ground motion in X- direction**

Cases	Top- Storey Deflection (mm)
Bare Frame	105.876
Bracing A	80.129
Bracing B	84.483
Bracing AB	75.551
Bracing C	54.88
Shear Wall A	108.349
Shear Wall B	56.836
Shear Wall AB	42.696
Shear Wall C	105.876





Fig 4.5. Variation of Top-Storey Deflection for ground motion in X direction




#### 4.6 Comparison of Top-Storey Deflection for ground motion in Z- direction

Bracings were found to be ineffective in reducing top-storey deflection in Z direction in the frame. But there is remarkable reduction in top-storey deflection in Z direction due to shear wall. Reduction is more in case of Shear Wall C. For ground motion in Z-direction Shear Wall A is ineffective since in Shear Wall A case shear wall is present in X-direction not in Z-direction.

Table 5.6 below shows the top-storey deflection for each case, Fig 5.7 shows the variation in top-storey deflection in Z direction and Fig 5.7. shows the Etab results for top-storey deflection.

**Table 4.6. Top-Storey Drift for ground motion in Z- direction**

Cases	Top- Storey Deflection (mm)
Bare Frame	116.355
Bracing A	116.385
Bracing B	132.365
Bracing AB	131.377
Bracing C	150.214
Shear Wall A	108.366
Shear Wall B	59.63
Shear Wall AB	49.365
Shear Wall C	58.939



**Fig 4.7. Variation of Top-Storey Deflection for ground motion in Z direction**



## V. CONCLUSION

This project work was a small effort towards perceiving the how introducing bracing or a shear wall in a building can make in difference in protecting the building in earthquakes. Almost all the buildings in India are RC frame, and earthquake tremors are felt every now a then in some or the other part of the country. Hence through this project it was tried to appreciate the effectiveness and role of this small extra structural elements that can save both life and property, at least for most of the earthquakes.

The following conclusions were drawn at the end of the study:

- Base Shear produced in the Bare Frame is maximum for Shear wall at C.
- In case of bracing system, Bracing System C (with braces at the corners) are the most effective one than other bracing systems, effectively reducing top-storey drift and inter storey drifts in both X- and Z- directions.
- There is hardly any reduction in drift along Z- direction due to Bracing B, for all the ground motions.
- Shear Wall A is effective in reducing drifts along X- direction only, and Shear Wall B is effective in reducing drifts along Z- direction only, for all the ground motions.
- Above all Shear Wall C is the best in all the stiffening cases considered.
- Shear wall elements are very much efficient in reducing lateral displacement of frame as drift and horizontal deflection induced in shear wall frame are much less than that induced in braced frame and plane frame
- The location of shear-wall and brace member has significant effect on the seismic response than the plane frame
- Shear wall construction will provide large stiffness to the building by reducing the damage to the structure.

## VI. REFERENCES

- [1] Chandurkar P. P, Dr. Pajgade P. S. (2013). "Seismic Analysis of RCC Building with and Without Shear Wall." , International Journal of Modern Engineering Research (IJMER) (2249-6645).
- [2] Chavan Krishnaraj R. ,Jadhav H.S. (2014). "Seismic Response of RC Building With Different Arrangement of Steel Bracing System.", International Journal of engineering Research and Applications (2248-9622).
- [3] Esmaili O. et al. (2008). "Study of Structural RC Shear Wall System in a 56- Storey RC Tall Building.", The 14th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering October 12-17, 2008 , Beijing, China.
- [4] Akbari R.et al. (2014). "Seismic Fragility Assessment of Steel X-Braced and Chevron- Braced RC Frames.", Asian Journal of Civil Engineering (BHRC), VOL- 16 No.1 .
- [5] Kappos Andreas J., Manafpour Alireza (2000). "Seismic Design of R/C Buildings with the aid of advanced analytical techniques." Engineering Structures 23 (2001) 319-332.
- [6] Yamada M. et al. " Multistorey Bracing Systems of Reinforced Concrete and Steel – Rigid Frames Subjected To Horizontal Loads- Proposition of Total Evaluation on the Aseismic Capacity for Design."
- [7] Viswanath K.G. et al.(2010). "Seismic Analysis of Steel Braced Reinforced Concrete Frames." International Journal of Civil & Structural Engineering (0976-4399).
- [8] A.E Hassaball, "Seismic analysis of a RC building by RSM", IOSR journal of engineering, volume 3, Issue 9, ISSN:2250-3021, September 2013.
- [9] Sagar R. Padol, "Review paper on seismic response of multistoried RCC building with mass irregularity" International journal of research in engineering and technology. ISSN: 2321-7308. [10]Girum mindaye, "Seismic analysis of multistory RC frame building in different seismic zone", International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology, vol.-05, issue-09, sep.2016.
- [11]Patil A.S, Kumbhar P.D, "Time history analysis of multistoried RRC building for different seismic intensities", International Journal of Structural and Civil Engineering Research, vol.-02, issue-03, Aug 2013.
- [12]Bhagwat Mayuri D, "Comparative study of Performance of multistoried building for Koyna and Bhuj earthquake by THM and RSM", International Journal of Advanced Technology in Engineering and Science, vol.no.-02, issue- 07, ISSN:2348-7550, July 2014.
- [13]Dubey S.K, Sangamnerka Prakash, Agrawal Ankit, "Dynamic analysis of structures subjected to earthquake load", International Journal of Advance Engineering and Research Development, vol.-02, issue-09, ISSN:2348-4470, Sep.2015.
- [14] Rampure Aarti baburao, "Comparison between Response Spectrum Method and Time History Method of dynamic analysis of concrete gravity dam", Open Journal of Civil Engineering, June 2016.
- [15] Hawaldar Jyothi C, "Earthquake analysis of G+12storey building with and without infill for Bhuj and Koyna earthquake function", International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology(IRJET), vol.-2, issue-05,ISSN:2395-0056, august 2015.
- [16]Bahador Bagheri, "Comparative study of the static and dynamic analysis of multistorey irregular building", International Journal Civil, Environmental Structural Construction and Architectural Engineering, vol-6.
- [17]Harshita, "seismic Analysis of symmetric RC frame using RSM and THM", International Journal of Scientific Research and Education, vol-02,issue03,march 2014.
- [18] Amit A Sathawane and R. S. Deotale (2012), "Analysis of Flat Slab and Grid Slab and Their Cost Comparison", International Journal of Advanced Technology in Civil Engineering, ISSN: 2231-5721, Vol. 01, Issue 02, pp.122-126.