A Review On Analysis Of An Historical Building Using Pushover Analysis In Analysis Tool SAP2000

Quaid Ansari[1], Hitesh Kodwani[2]
[1]Dept of Civil Engineering
[2]Assistant Professor and Head, Dept of Civil Engineering
[1, 2] Sam College of Engineering and Technology, Bhopal-462021, Madhya Pradesh, India.

Abstract- *The historical background of engineering is inseparably associated with the historical monuments built at that time in a era of development. The modelers' concept of room and shape can't be appeared however through the development of a structure. Improvement of basic ideas, and not the changing of mold in beautifying shapes, is the main impetus of the historical backdrop of engineering.*

Pushover analysis is a non linear static analysis which is capable of determining the maximum limit of displacement of a building under earthquake hazard.

In this paper we are providing literature survey related to non linear static analysis over a historical or existing structure to determine their present strength and stability.

Keywords- Pushover analysis, SAP2000, Seismic force, Structure analysis, Stability, Masonary, historical building, forces, displacement.

I. INTRODUCTION

Pushover analysis is an expected analysis strategy where the structure is subjected to various monotonically expanding parallel powers, with a dispersion which is stature insightful invariant, until the point that the objective removal is contacted. Pushover analysis involves a progression of progressive versatile analysis, superimposed to gauge a power uprooting bend of general structure. The advancement of the constructional idea and points of interest was a moderate, well ordered process - until the point that the cutting edge time of quick specialized advance. In the past ace developers took in their expertise is from their forerunners. As the structures, ranges and auxiliary arrangements changed gradually, they could apply their insight, gained by watching prior structures, to the structures they were really fabricating.

Many studies have already been conducted where authors have analysed existing buildings built without standard criterias. The summary of some of these is given in this section:-

M C Griffith and A V Pinto (2002)have examined the particular subtle elements of a 4-story, 3-straight fortified solid edge test structure with unreinforced block stone work (URM) infill dividers with consideration regarding their shortcomings concerning seismic stacking. The solid edge was appeared to be a "frail segment solid shaft outline" which is probably going to show poor post yield hysteretic conduct. The building was required to have most extreme sidelong misshapening limits comparing to around 2% parallel float. The unreinforced brick work infill dividers were probably going to start splitting at considerably littler sidelong floats, of the request of 0.3%, and totally lost their heap conveying capacity by floats of in the vicinity of 1% and 2%.

ShunsukeOtani(2002)considered the improvement of earthquake safe outline of RCC Buildings (Past and Future). The estimation of ground quickening began in 1930's, and the reaction count was made conceivable in 1940's. Plan reaction spectra were planned in the late 1950's to 1960's. Non-direct reaction was presented in seismic outline in 1960's and the limit plan idea was presented in 1970's for crumple wellbeing. The harm insights of RCC structures in 1995 Kobe catastrophe showed the change of building execution with the improvement of plan system. Structures composed and built utilizing obsolete strategy ought to be overhauled. Execution premise designing ought to be accentuated, particularly for the security of building capacities following continuous earthquakes.

CiroFaellaet. al. (2003)proposed an appraisal methodology as far as relocation limit and request. The example utilization of the proposed strategy to an ordinary building accentuated how simple and brisk can be its application. As a short parametrical examination, the impact of subsoil firmness on the seismic helplessness of the building was broke down pointing out that defenselessness was considerably bigger as subsoil was less solid. An objective plan methodology for picking the retrofitting framework was proposed with the point of deciding the key mechanical attributes of a supporting framework working in parallel with the current structure for agreeing the wellbeing necessity gave by Eurocode 8 – Part 3 completely dedicated to existing structures. In the proposed outline methodology, as indicated

by a dislodging basedapproach, the reinforcing substructure was planned as far as parallel solidness, since removal request is entirely controlled by the uprooting limit of the current structure. Hence, normal power based outline methodology appropriate for new structures, in which relocation limit is just forced by the new structure itself, are not straightforwardly material for propping framework used for retrofitting existing structures.

Oğuz, Sermin(2004) learned the impacts and the precision of invariant parallel load designs used in pushover analysis to anticipate the conduct forced on the structure because of arbitrarily chose singular ground movements causing versatile disfigurement by concentrate different levels of nonlinear reaction. For this reason, pushover examinations utilizing different invariant parallel load examples and Modal Pushover Analysis were performed on strengthened cement and steel minute opposing casings covering an expansive scope of major periods. The exactness of inexact systems used to evaluate target relocation was additionally considered on outline structures. Pushover investigations were performed by both DRAIN-2DX and SAP2000. The essential perceptions from the examination demonstrated that the exactness of the pushover comes about depended firmly on the heap way, the attributes of the ground movement and the properties of the structure.

Durgesh C. Rai (2004)gave the rules for seismic assessment and fortifying of structures. This record was produced as a major aspect of venture entitled ―Review of Building Codes and Preparation of Commentary and Handbooks, granted to Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur by the Gujarat State Disaster Management Authority (GSDMA), Gandhinagar through World Bank accounts. This archive was especially worried about the seismic assessment and fortifying of existing structures and it was expected to be utilized as a guide.

G E Thermou and A S Elnashai (2007)made a worldwide appraisal of the impact of repair techniques on pliability, quality and firmness, the three most vital seismic reaction parameters, to help specialists and professionals in basic leadership to fulfill their particular mediation points. Likewise the term 'recovery' was utilized as a far reaching term to incorporate a wide range of retrofitting, repair and reinforcing that prompts diminished earthquake defenselessness. The term 'repair' was characterized as restoration of the first attributes of a harmed segment or component and was limited to managing the as-manufactured framework. The term 'reinforcing' was characterized as mediation that prompt improvement of at least one seismic reaction parameters (pliability, quality, solidness, and so forth.), contingent upon the coveted execution.

A.Kadid and A. Boumrkik(2007)proposed utilization of Pushover Analysis as a practical technique to survey harm weakness of a building outlined by Algerian code. Pushover analysis was a progression of incremental static analysis did to build up a limit bend for the building. In view of the limit bend, an objective relocation which was a gauge of the uprooting that the plan earthquake would deliver on the building was resolved. The degree of harm experienced by the structure at this objective relocation is viewed as illustrative of the harm experienced by the building when subjected to configuration level ground shaking. Since the conduct of fortified solid structures may be exceedingly inelastic under seismic burdens, the worldwide inelastic execution of RC structures would be overwhelmed by plastic yielding impacts and thusly the precision of the pushover analysis would be affected by the capacity of the diagnostic models to catch these impacts.

R.K. Goel (2009)assessed the nonlinear static strategies indicated in the FEMA-356, ASCE/SEI 41-06, ATC-40, and FEMA-440 reports for seismic analysis and assessment of building structures utilizing solid movement records of RC structures. The greatest rooftop dislodging anticipated from the nonlinear static technique was contrasted and the esteem got straightforwardly from recorded movements for this reason. It was demonstrated that: (I) the nonlinear static systems either overestimates or thinks little of the pinnacle rooftop removal for a few of the structures considered in the examination; (ii) the ASCE/SEI 41-06 Coefficient Method (CM), which depended on late upgrades to the FEMA-356 Coefficient Method proposed in the FEMA440 record, improves gauge of the rooftop relocation; and (iii) the enhanced FEMA-440 Capacity Spectrum Method (CSM) if better gauges of the rooftop uprooting contrasted with the ATC-40 CSM.

Siamaket. al.(2010)measured the impact of the nearness and design of stone work infill dividers on seismic crumple hazard. Infill boards are demonstrated by two nonlinear swagger components, which have compressive quality as it were. Nonlinear models of the edge divider framework were subjected to incremental unique analysis keeping in mind the end goal to survey seismic execution. There was an expansion saw in beginning quality, firmness, and vitality dispersal of the infilled outline, when contrasted with the uncovered casing, even after the divider's fragile disappointment modes. Dynamic analysis comes about showed that completely infilled outline had the least fall chance and the uncovered casings were observed to be the most defenseless against earthquake-prompted crumple. The better crumple execution of completely infilled outlines was

related with the bigger quality and vitality scattering of the framework, related with the additional dividers.

Benyamin Monavariet. al. (2012)utilized nonlinear static analysis and five local people and general yields and disappointment criteria to assess seismic requests of structures. The disappointment is coordinated towards losing structure's execution amid the earthquake or resulting impacts. In light of the subsequent excitations of an earthquake or parallel forced loads on a structure, the firmness of a few components of structure lessened and the structure began to fall flat and lose its execution; in spite of the fact that disappointment happened either in little parts of structure or at the entirety. In this examination thirteen strengthened cement (RC) outline structures with 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16 and 20 stories, having 3 and 4 inlets were composed utilizing seismic power levels got from the Iranian Seismic Code 2005 and proportioned utilizing the ACI318-99 Building Code and after that were displayed by IDARC. Pushover analysis with expanding triangular stacking was utilized.

Huang Li-Jenget. al. (2014)Studied limited component seismic reaction reenactment of a common pinnacle crane outline utilizing SAP2000. Three-dimensional bar components and bar components are mployed for vertical and even edges and in addition the tie poles, separately, to develop the numerical model. At that point numerical case is considered and two sorts of earthquake ground increasing speeds are tried, i.e., 1940 NS segment of the El Centro and 1995 Kobe increasing velocities. The dynamic reactions of uprooting, speed and increasing speeds of a normal hub of the pinnacle crane outline are represented and examined. The numerical reenactment comes about demonstrate that the maximal relocations may be substantial to more than 1 meter and the related maximal speed and quickening can be more noteworthy than 4 m/sand 40 m/s2, individually at the most elevated position of pinnacle crane.

B. S. Taranath (2014) In "Fortified Concrete Design of Tall Buildings" clarifies that modern nonlinear time history analysis is required for every one of the earthquake ground movements, and the aftereffects of the reproductions are contrasted against the execution criteria with guarantee the plan meets the coveted level of security. The analysis instruments used to direct these recreations have turned out to be industrially reasonable just over the most recent quite a while. It is trusted that aftereffect of this modern and thorough approach yields a sheltered and dependable plan.

Liya Mathew & C. Prabha(2014)distributed "Impact of Fluid Viscous Dampers in Multi-Storeyed Buildings" in which they specified that Special defensive frameworks have been created to upgrade security and lessen harm of structures amid earthquakes. Liquid thick damper (FVD) becomes a force to be reckoned with here. That paper additionally manages the investigation of fortified solid structures with and without liquid thick dampers. A parametric report for discovering ideal damper properties for the fortified solid edges was led. Nonlinear time history analysis is done on a symmetrical square building. Pushover Analysis has been completed utilizing softwareand correlations are introduced in graphical organization

Rahul Chaurasiaet. al. (2015) Contemplated the impact of bracings at various position of the structure and contrasted it and unbending stomach structure under powerful stacking, utilizing examination apparatus staad.pro.

Table 1 Max. bending moment in diaphragm system

Structure type	Max Bending Moment			
	Zone II	Zone III	Zone IV	Zone V
Bare Frame	137.728	187.212	253.191	366.537
Rigid Diaphragm	65.779	105.246	157.869	236.803
Semi rigid Diaphragm	135.768	184.114	248.575	358.501

Table 2 Max. Shear force in diaphragm system

Structure type	Max Shear force			
	Zone II	Zone III	Zone IV	Zone V
Bare Frame	115.938	141.473	175.52	226.59
Rigid Diaphragm	83.587	83.587	104.454	156.682
Semi rigid Diaphragm	114.929	139.875	173.137	223.031

He concluded that implementation of slab in structure designing results in economical and stable section compare to bare frame.

K. Venkatarao (2016) contemplated the seismic conduct of customary RC surrounded building, level section with drop and without drop working in every single seismic zone of India. Diverse parameters like parallel float, base shear, day and age and pivotal power are thought about. It was reasoned that parallel dislodging of ordinary RC outline is less when contrasted with level piece without drop building.

DurgeshNeve (2016) Investigation of Flat Slab Resting on Shear Walls by utilizing ETABS-13,In this examination, a building model is thought about in various perspectives, for example, story float, story removal and so on for level piece with segments and level chunk laying on shear dividers. He watched that Flat chunk with shear divider is

profitable idea to be utilized as a part of a tall structure as shear dividers are demonstrate as indicated by arrange for which builds the cover zone, and furthermore horizontal story relocations and story float are diminished by utilized the shear divider.

Pradeepet. al (2016) contemplated the framework to slaughter parallel powers following up on a building format by acquainting unbendable stomach with the structure likewise take a gander at the three conditions of resolute stomach, semi firm stomach and with no locale, to appreciate which one is more profitable and induced that use of tenacious stomach is more ground-breaking than other condition concerning section and fragment controls and dislodging.

II. CONCLUSION

From the literature survey above following points has been concluded are as follows:

- SAP2000 is advance analysis tool working on FEMA standards for structural analysis.
- Researchers determined that pushover analysis as per FEMA 365 provide nonlinear results accurately.
- Researchers observed that monumental buildings without seismic criterias are working well.

REFERENCES

[1] M. R. Arefi, "A study on the damping ratio of the viscous fluid dampers in the braced frames," vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 1223–1235, 2014.

[2] J. Marti, M. Crespo, and F. Martinez, "Seismic Isolation and Protection Systems," *Seism. Isol. Prot. Syst.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 125–140, 2010.

[3] M. K. Muthukumar G, "Analytical modeling of damping," *indianConcr. J.*, vol. 88, no. 4, 2014.

[4] I. López, J. M. Busturia, and H. Nijmeijer, "Energy dissipation of a friction damper," *J. Sound Vib.*, vol. 278, no. 3, pp. 539–561, 2004.

[5] J. A. Inaudi and J. M. Kelly, "Mass Damper Using Friction-Dissipating Devices," *J. od Eng. Mech.*, vol. 121, no. 1, pp. 142–149, 1995.

[6] w. J. William H. Robinson, "Lead Damper for base isolution.pdf." Proceedings of 9th world conference on Earthquake, 1998.

[7] J. Otten, J. Luntz, D. Brei, K. A. Strom, A. L. Browne, and N. L. Johnson, "Proof-of-Concept of the Shape Memory Alloy ReseTtable Dual Chamber Lift Device for Pedestrian Protection With Tailorable Performance," *J. Mech. Des.*, vol. 135, no. 6, p. 61008, Apr. 2013.

[8] D. Demetriou, N. Nikitas, and K. D. Tsavdaridis, "Semi active tuned mass dampers of buildings: A simple control option," *Am. J. Eng. Appl. Sci.*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 620–632, 2015.

[9] E. L. Anderson, "Performance-Based Design of Seismically Isolated Bridges," p. 494, 2003.

[10] S. Infanti, J. Robinson, and R. Smith, "Viscous Dampers For High-Rise Buildings," *14th World Conf. Earthq. Eng.*, 2008.

[11] V. Umachagi, K. Venkataramana, G. R. Reddy, and R. Verma, "Applications of Dampers for Vibration Control of Structures : an Overview," *Int. J. Res. Eng. Technol.*, pp. 6–11, 2013.

[12] J. Marko, D. Thambiratnam, and N. Perera, "Influence of damping systems on building 90 structures subject to seismic effects," *Eng. Struct.*, vol. 26, no. 13, pp. 1939–1956, 2004.

[13] V. S. Balkanlou, M. R. Bagerzadeh, B. B. Azar, and A. Behravesh, "Evaluating Effects of Viscous Dampers on optimizing Seismic Behavior of Structures," no. 2007, 2013.

[14] A. Chopra, "Dynamics of structures," 2012.

[15] K.-H. Chang, *Structural Analysis*, vol. 163. 2009.

[16] Y. G. Zhao and T. Ono, "Moment methods for structural reliability," *Struct. Saf.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 47–75, 2001.

[17] M. Paz, "Structural Dynamics.pdf." Van Nostrand Reinhold Comapany, NYC., p. 574, 1985.

[18] S. Amir and H. Jiaxin, "Optimum Parameter of a Viscous Damper for Seismic and Wind Vibration," vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 192–196, 2014.

[19] Y. Zhou, X. Lu, D. Weng, and R. Zhang, "A practical design method for reinforced concrete structures with viscous dampers," *Eng. Struct.*, vol. 39, pp. 187–198, 2012.

[20] Ö. Atlayan, "Effect of Viscous Fluid Dampers on Steel Moment Frame Designed for Strength and Hybrid Steel Moment Frame Design," *Environ. Eng.*, 2008.

[21] B. S. Taranath, *Reinforced Concrete Design of Tall Buildings*. .

[22] LIYA MATHEW & C. PRABHA, "Effect of Fluid Viscous Dampers in Multi-Storeyed Buildings," *IMPACT Int. J. Res. Eng. Technol. (IMPACT IJRET)*, vol. 2, no. 9, pp. 59–64, 2014.

[23] R. Gettu and M. Santhanam, "Retrofit of non-engineered buildings," *Handb. Seism. retrofit Build.*, no. April, p. 471, 2007.