

COMPARISON OF SEISMIC BEHAVIOR OF A STRUCTURE WITH COMPOSITE AND CONVENTIONAL COLUMNS

D.MURALI* SHAIK ROFA**

PG SCHOLAR*,ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**

SREE DATTHA INSTITUTE OF ENGINEERING & SCIENCE,AFFILIATED TO JNTUH SHERIGUDA(V),
IBRAHIMPATNAM(M), RANGAREDDY DISTRICT, HYDERABAD, TELANGANA-501510

ABSTRACT: An extensive study has been carried out on the behavior of composite column in a structure. In composite column construction steel and concrete are united in such a manner that the advantages of the materials are employed in a efficient manner. By bonding and friction between steel and composite material these materials will accept the external loading in composite columns. In this study comparison of composite and conventional structure is carried out. Just varying the design of column i.e., by using composite and conventional column and keeping all other structural members same for both the structures. Composite column design is carried out according to Euro code 4 and conventional column design is by IS 456-2000. The buildings are taken to be true to be placed in III seismic zone. Seismic design is followed by IS 1893-2002. There are many different types of composite column from those we have taken concrete encased composite column for our analysis. Concrete encasement would increase the load resistance of steel column. During seismic activity the response of structure is also influenced by the material property which depends on the materials and also its configuration in the structural system. The base of the structure is assumed to be fixed. The building height is 36.8m which comes under low rise building. Modeling and analysis has been carried in ETABS software. The results are obtained of various parameters such as base shear, storey overturning, storey drift etc., thus by obtaining those results graphs have been plotted. And comparison of two different type of structure has been done. Thus, we found that low rise conventional building is more suitable than low rise composite building. Key Words: Composite columns, Seismic behavior, ETABS Software, roof displacement, Storey drift, Overturning moment etc., 1.

INTRODUCTION A column is designed to combine two different materials or two different grades of material to form a structural member. A composite column is a member which is mainly subjected to compression or to compression and bending. Composite construction that seeks to co-action the capabilities of two materials i.e., concrete and light weight steel has been used in both buildings and bridges over a many spans. The buildings in India are constructed

with RCC and the use of steel structures is generally restricted to industrial buildings and of late multi-storey buildings, which have acquired eminence by adopting composite structural elements. However, in recent times, the composite columns are gaining popularity for use in multistorey buildings by excellence of their static and earthquake resistant properties. The earthquake resistance properties such as follows 1. Lower mass & high strength, rigidity and stiffness. 2. High toughness and ductility. 3. High energy dissipation ability. A concrete-steel column is a compression column member. These columns are usually referred as load-carrying members in a composite framed structure.

1.1 History of Composite Columns It is commonly divided into 4 periods

1. Earlier of the 20th century research has been started.
2. In 1930 a first highlight is applied.
3. Oblivion period.
4. Renewal of research and its application has started from 1950 till today.

The premature evolution of composite column was predicated on the dominancy for providing efficacious fire resistance for structural steel in buildings. Generally to wrap steel beams in concrete. The impuissant concrete resulted in very little vigor. Increment in vigor and stiffness due to wrapping of concrete is neglected! In past, albeit it was descried that bucking resistance for the columns was incremented. By early 1960, research showed that concrete encasement or wrapping can increase the load resistance of steel columns. Substantial economy in construction could be gained by using a better quality of concrete and introducing the composite action in design of columns. Both steel section and concrete oppose the exterior loading by collaborating collectively through friction and chemical bond. And also by the use of mechanical shear connectors in some circumstances. Albeit composite columns of steel & concrete were infrequently utilized from the terminus of World War II until the early 1970s, research had commenced a long time afore, at the commencement of the 20thcentury. Cumulating of these materials had shown interest, steel columns were customarily encased in concrete to bulwark them from fire, while concrete columns were coalesced with structural steel as reinforcement.

Now-a-days Euro code 4, the design method of Roik and team was considered developed in the 1970s. This was taken as a substructure for the proposed simplified design method.

1.2 Advantages of Composite Column

- Protection against corrosion in case of concrete encased columns.
- Even smaller dimension gives better strength.
- Fire proof.
- Increased buckling resistance
- Increased stiffness which influences to reduce slenderness of column.
- Economically advantageous over either pure reinforced concrete or structural steel.
- Concrete filled tubular columns formwork is not required.
- High rise building can be erected in an efficient manner.
- By changing steel depth, concrete vigor and reinforcement identical sections can be adopted with different loads and moment resistance. This in turn influence to keep outer dimension of column to be constant and simplifying the construction and architectural detailing.
- Higher stiffness results in less deflection, longer spans and less overall height. There are several other applications of composite construction including multi-storey car parks, industrial and residential buildings, apartments, metro station buildings, etc

BUILDING DESCRIPTION One of the prime objectives of this project is to study the behavior of composite and conventional structure in a particular seismic zone. Investigation is carried out to assess the performance of the framed structure with two alternative column schemes, RCC and Encased. The structures are modeled and analyzed using ETABS software package as per IS 1893: 2002.

Table-1: Common Specifications for RCC and Encased Structures

Seismic zone	III
Zone factor	0.24
Importance factor	1
Response spectra as per IS 1893:2002 (part 1)	3
Damping ratio	5%
Type of soil	Rock or hard soil
Number of storey's	G+10
Base dimension of the building	17.2m x 21.35m
Total height of the building	36.8m
Typical storey height	3.2m
Plinth height	1.5m
Number of Bays along X-direction	3
Number of Bays along Y-direction	10
Live load	2kN/m




Fig :Isometric view of structure

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION After analysis of the conventional and composite column structures located in seismic zone III conforming to IS 1893:2002 by using ETABS, the results

are extracted and compared in terms of critical earthquake response parameters such as base shear, maximum storey drifts, roof displacements and storey overturning moments. Comparative results are listed in tables

STOREY LEVEL	BASE SHEAR (kN)		% increase of base shear
	COMPOSITE	CONVENTIONAL	
LMR TOP	281.616	0	100
LMR BOTTOM	776.5786	0	100
TERRACE	2566.665	349.305	86.39
8F	4777.847	737.262	84.56
7F	6755.505	1047.6	84.49
6F	8499.639	1288.98	84.83
5F	10010.25	1470.04	85.31
4F	11287.33	1599.46	85.82
3F	12330.9	1685.87	86.32
2F	13140.93	1737.93	86.77
FF	13717.45	1764	87.14
GROUND FLOOR	14100.11	1774.75	87.41
PLINTH	14128.06	1774.98	87.43

Table: Comparison of composite and conventional (RC) building for base shear




Fig: Comparison of composite and conventional (RC) building for base shear

CONCLUSIONS Analytical study has been conducted to understand the behavior of concrete encased columns in a structure. ETABS software is used to carry out the analysis. Comparison of conventional and composite design has done. And the following conclusion has been drawn from it. → Both the composite and conventional buildings/structures which are comparatively studied, behave identically for the parameters considered, but more difference in their magnitudes. → It is observed that the base shear is about 80% difference in composite columns structure when compared to the structure with RC columns. Hence, conventional building can be considered superior than the composite building in terms of base shear. → From the comparative study made for a typical low rise building with a height of 36.8 m, the base shear is more in composite structure and so it is more vulnerable to earthquake than the RC building. → Storey drifts and overturning moments are also higher that is 80% and 85% in the case of composite building. → The storey drift is maximum at second floor which may cause more damage to the floors above it, particularly in case of composite structure. But in conventional building, not much drift are observed in between successive floors, which makes it relatively safe. → These results and comparative study observations lead to a conclusion that for low rise buildings composite column design is not suitable.

REFERENCES

1. C.C.Weng, S.I.Yen (2001).,"Comparisons of concreteencased composite column strength provisions of ACI code and AISC^specification", Department of Civil Engineering, National Chiao Tung University, Hsinchu, 30050, Taiwan, ROC. Engineering Structures 24 (2002) 59–72.
2. P. Valach, Š. Gramblička (2007),"Theoretical and experimental analyses of composite steel-reinforced concrete (SRC) columns" Slovak journal of civil engineering 2007/4 PAGES 1 – 9 RECEIVED 15. 5. 2007 ACCEPTED 20. 9. 2007.
3. Cheng-Chih Chen, Jian-Ming Li, C.C. Weng (2005)," Experimental behavior and strength of concrete-encased composite beam–columns with T-shaped steel section under cyclic loading" Journal of Constructional Steel Research 61 (2005) 863–881.
4. N.E. Shanmugam, B.Lakshmi (2001), "State of the art report on steel–concrete composite columns " Journal of Constructional Steel Research 57 (2001) 1041–1080.

5. Mahbuba Begum et al.,(2013),"cost analysis of steel concrete composite structures in Bangladesh" ASIAN JOURNAL OF CIVIL ENGINEERING (BHRC) VOL. 14, NO. 6 (2013) PAGES 935-944.
6. Prof. S. S. Charantimath et al.,(2014), "Comparative Study on Structural Parameter of R.C.C and Composite Building" Civil and Environmental Research ISSN 2224- 5790 (Paper) ISSN 2225-0514 (Online).Vol.6, No.6, 2014.
7. Shweta A. Wagh & Dr. U. P. Waghe(2014), "Comparative Study of R.C.C and Steel Concrete Composite Structures" Journal of Engineering Research and Applications ISSN : 2248-9622, Vol. 4, Issue 4(Version 1), April 2014, pp.369- 376.
8. Zafar Mujawar & Prakarsh Sangave (2015), "Comparative Evaluation Of Reinforced Concrete, Steel And Composite Structures Under The Effect Of Static And Dynamic Loads" Journal of Engineering Research and Applications ISSN : 2248-9622, Vol. 5, Issue 1(Part 5), January 2015, pp.41-44
9. Shashikala. Koppad & Dr. S.V.Itti (2013),"Comparative Study of RCC and Composite Multistoreyed Buildings" International Journal of Engineering and Innovative Technology (IJEIT) Volume 3, Issue 5, November 2013.
10. Holger Eggemann (2003) ,"Development of composite columns. Emperger's effort" Proceedings of the First International Congress on Construction History, Madrid, 20th-24th January 2003, ed. S. Huerta, Madrid: I. Juan de Herrera, SEdHC, ETSAM, A. E. Benvenuto, COAM, F. Dragados, 2003