Design and Modeling Issues Related to Diaphragms of Tall Buildings

**Gian Carlo Piatos**  
Graduate Student  
University of California, Los Angeles

**John Wallace**  
Professor  
University of California, Los Angeles

**Kristijan Kolozvari**  
Assistant Professor  
California State University, Fullerton
Introduction

- Transfer Level Diaphragms experience large demands and complex behavior
- Need for comprehensive approach to analyze demands and design diaphragm components in Performance Based Design
- Various modeling and design approaches used in engineering practice

Objectives
- Investigate sensitivity to modeling configuration (Elastic vs. Inelastic) and effective shear stiffness
- Guidance on use of simplified analysis models to determine demands
Building Description

- 38 – Story Residential building w/ 7 story podium
- Concrete corewall used for main Lateral Force Resisting System (LRFS)
- Designed using Performance Based Design Methodology per LATBSDC Guidelines
Perform 3D Model

Model Elements

- RC core: Nonlinear shear wall
- Podium wall: Nonlinear shear wall
- Basement wall: Elastic shell
- Flexible diaphragms: Elastic shell
- Transfer level: Elastic shell or Nonlinear general wall
Typical Tower Level and Transfer Level

- Tower Level
  - Flexible Diaphragm
  - Fine Mesh with distributed mass

- Transfer Level
  - Semi-Rigid
  - Fine Mesh
Modeling Parameters

- **Elastic Shell Element**
  - Linear Elastic Element used for diaphragms
  - In-plane behavior based on membrane shell, out-of-plane based on elastic beam

- **General Wall Element**
  - Nonlinear Fiber Element typically used to model walls
  - Can Capture vertical axial/bending, horizontal axial/bending, and shear behavior
Typical Diaphragm Demands
Typical Demands

- Demands used in typical engineering design
  - Drag Force
  - Shear Force
  - Chord Force

- Investigate sensitivity of demands to model configuration and effective shear stiffness
Slab Shear Demands

- Use of general wall element reports higher forces
- Effective shear stiffness show varying trends
Drag Force – Compression Demands

- General Wall reports higher forces for tension
- Elastic shell reports higher forces for compression
- Elastic and general wall approximately the same for areas that don’t experience force transfer
Chord Force Demands

- Different trends between positive and negative moments
Comparison of Perform 3D vs. Simplified Calculation Methods
Comparison of Perform 3D vs. Simplified methods

- Compare Perform 3D forces with forces from using Beam analogy
- Use forces from ASCE7 ELF and floor acceleration response from FE analysis
- Investigate effect of including torsion into simplified method
Force Diagrams with Translation Only
Tower Level: East-West Direction

- Beam Analogy underestimates forces from FE analysis
Transfer Level: East-West Direction

- Shear Forces overestimated, bending moment underestimated
Force Diagrams with Translation and Rotation
Tower Level: East-West Direction

- Addition of rotational acceleration closed gap between simplified method and FE analysis

![Graphs showing Shear Force and Bending Moment](image)
Addition of rotational acceleration had small effect
Summary and Conclusions

- Sensitivity of demands to modeling formulation are inconsistent.
  - Comparison between general wall and elastic shell elements as well as shear stiffness sensitivity dependent on cut location and type of force extracted.

- Beam analogy for tower level unable to estimate Perform 3D forces
  - Forces underestimated with only translational response considered
  - Inclusion of rotational response closes gap between envelopes, slightly overestimating FE forces

- Hand calculations for transfer level shear tend to overestimate while bending moment is underestimated with translation only
  - Inclusion or rotational response has little to no effect on the envelopes