Post exam
Post EX3
$$\rightarrow b6$$
; Dynamics in Girl Engineering
($M \rightarrow M$
 $mo = EL, m$
 $mo = M(x) = (\frac{m}{2})^2$. Given $M(x) = M(x) (1-\frac{\pi}{2}) = MB(x) \cdot B(1-\frac{\pi}{2})$
 $M_{eq} = \int_{m}^{L} m \overline{u}^2 du = \int_{m}^{L} M_{eq}(1-\frac{\pi}{2}), \frac{\pi}{2^4} dx + \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}} M(\overline{u}(x-\frac{\pi}{2}))^2$
 $= M_{eq} (\frac{L^5}{6} - \frac{L^5}{6}) + \frac{92M}{31} = \frac{M_{eL}}{30} + \frac{12M}{31}$
 $= \frac{M_{eq}}{2^4} (\frac{L^5}{6} - \frac{L^5}{6}) + \frac{92M}{31} = \frac{M_{eL}}{30} + \frac{12M}{31}$
 $M_{eq} = \int_{0}^{L} ET(\frac{M_{eq}}{2\pi^3})^2 dx = \int_{0}^{L} B_0(1-\frac{\pi}{2})(\frac{2\pi}{2})^2 dx = \frac{4\pi E_0}{24}(1-\frac{L}{2}) = \frac{2\pi}{2^3}$
b). $M_0 = 2.5 \times 10^6 M_{eq}/m$, $M = 11 \times 10^3 \Rightarrow M_{eq} = \frac{2.5 \times 10^5 V 240}{240^3} - \frac{95 \times 10^{16} N/m}{81}$
 $L = 240 m$
 $M_{eq} = \frac{2.5 \times 10^6 M_{eq}}{2.40^3} = \frac{1}{72.5 \times 10^6} = 0.030 Hz$
 C
 $F_{eq} = \int_{0}^{L} F \overline{u} dx = \int_{0}^{L} F \overline{u}(\frac{\pi}{2})^2 dx = \frac{F_{eq}}{4}$
 $= \frac{100 \times 10^3 \times 1290}{72.5 \times 10^6} = 6 \times 10^6 M$
 $H_{eq} = \frac{100 \times 10^3 \times 1290}{12.5 \times 10^6} = 0.073 m$

O cont.

$$T = \frac{1}{0.3} = 3.35$$
 $i \cdot \frac{t_R}{T} = \frac{1}{3.3} = 0.3 \implies DAF = 1.6$ (detashedt)
 $i \cdot M_{max} = 1.6 \times 0.083 = 0.13 \text{ M}$
d) Resonance of the hundrmental mode may best be controlled
by the addition of one or more tweed-mass dampers, tweed
to the 0.3HZ frequency of the mode.

Q1 Dynamics of a tower block

A straightforward question about the dynamical characteristics of a tall building (which just happened to have a passing resemblance to the Bahrain World Trade Center on the front of the 2009 Databook). Most attempts were reasonable and most errors were algebraic during the various integrations.

a) When soils are shaken cyclishear stresses cause soils lo tend to contract, especially for loose soils. If pores are saturated and water cannot escape due to low permeability, the high bulk modulus of water will mean the soil cannot compress and the tendency to contract will be exhibited as an increase in pore pressure. High pore pressures reduce effective stresses. Low effective stresses give low strength r sliftness cett, hence liquefaction.

We hence need - SAND SATURATED LOOSE

b) Densitication is most popular method, either drop weights on surface or force in probe to compact soil. Strone columns can improve drainage reducing e.p.p. or other kechniques such as MICP.

c) i)
4

$$G_{max} = 100 (3-e)^2 \sqrt{p^2}$$

 $I + e = 0.8$
 $\sigma_v = 24 \times 31 + 18.5 \times 0.5$
 $p' = \sigma_v'(1+2K_0)/3 = 18.25(1+2(0.42))/3 = 11.2kPa$
 $K_0 = \frac{0.3}{0.7} = 0.42$
 $\gamma = 0.3$
 $V = 0.3$
 $V = 0.3$

$$G_{max} = 100 \times \frac{22^2}{1.8} \sqrt{\frac{11.2}{1000}}$$

from databook $l:b:2m = \frac{L}{b} = 1 = \frac{e}{b} = \frac{1}{2}$ $K_{hx} = \frac{Gb}{2-\nu} \left[6.8 \left(\frac{L}{b}\right)^{0.65} + 2.4 \right] \left[1 + \left\{ 0.33 + \frac{1.34}{1+\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \left(\frac{e}{b}\right)^{0.8} \right]$ = 1 $= \frac{Gb}{1.7} \left[9.2 \right] \left[1.574 \right] = 17.0 \text{ G}$

$$K_{ry} = \frac{Gb^{3}}{1-\nu} \left[3.73 \left(\frac{L}{b}\right) + 0.27 \right] \left[1 + \frac{e}{b} + \frac{1.6}{0.35 + (\frac{b}{b})^{4}} \left(\frac{e}{b}\right)^{2} \right]$$

$$= \frac{Gb^{3}}{1-\nu} \left[4.0 \right] \left[1.796 \right] = 82.16$$

$$= 2337 \qquad MN m m m rad$$

$$(C)(i) Concrete block weights 16 \times 24: 384 kN = 38,400 kg$$

$$= 38,400 kg$$

$$Matchine mas 5,000 kg$$

$$H mode w_{n} = \sqrt{\frac{K_{h}}{m_{T}}} = \sqrt{\frac{485 \times 10^{6}}{43,400}} = 106 rads/s = 16.8Hz$$

$$R mode w_{n} = \sqrt{\frac{K_{r}}{T}} = \sqrt{\frac{2337 \times 10^{6}}{38400 \times 1^{2}} + 5000 \times 35^{2}} = \frac{153.1 rads/s}{=24.4 Hz}$$

Q2 Liquefaction and foundation vibration

Most scored highly on the first parts, describing liquefaction and its possible remedies. On the numerical part, there were quite a few errors in the effective stress calculation. A common error was thinking the pore water had only half a meter (rather than 1.5m) of hydrostatic pressure beneath the slab. There were, of course, quite a few arithmetic errors when evaluating those long Wolff formulae.

For the final part, a few people actually ignored the mass and rotational inertia of the foundation, and considered the machine alone.

476° Q3, 2021. a) In Response Spectrum Analysis, as used in earthquake engineering, the response spectrum is defined as the response of a set of s.d.o.f. oscillators of various frequencies to given input, such as the grand motions of a porticular earthquake, ar an idealised, averaged earthquake. Spectral analysis in wind engineering theory of buffetting is when random vibration theory is applied to determine the response of a structure to buffetting by incident turbulence. Unlike in earthquake engineering this takes account of spatial as well as temporal variations in the applied pressures. It involves many "spectra" each being the Fourier transforms of some signal, (one of which night be the displacement at some point on the structure, i.e. "the "response"). Background calculations (NOT REQUIRED FROM THE STUDENTS) ki mi ka ma -M-D-MM-D R,= Contilever 36×103 24×103 kg ks 5=W13 BET W=/BEI)5 $k = 3(2000 \text{ kNm}^2) \left(\frac{1}{5^3} + \frac{1}{3^3} \right) = 3(2000)(0.045)$ 123/ALR MELLES $M = 6EI \quad SL = 2M, \quad S = (12EI)S$ $12 \quad I = 1 \quad K = k$ k, = 4-5 $k_1 = 2(12EI) = 24(2000) = 750 \text{ km}$ 206 them 13 13 4^3 $M = \begin{bmatrix} 700 \\ 24000 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 750 \\ -750 \\ -750 \end{bmatrix} \times 10^{3} \text{ N/m},$ = $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 36000 \\ -750 \\ -750 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -750 \\ -750 \\ -750 \end{bmatrix} \times 10^{3} \text{ N/m},$ BOT Matlab, $\omega^2 = oig [inv(M) * K] \rightarrow f = 0.3275H_2, 1.1841H_2.$ $evers = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0.865 \end{bmatrix}_{9} \begin{bmatrix} -0.7712 \end{bmatrix}$

4D6 Q3, 2021 (i) $\alpha = 0.3g$, d = 8inches = 203mmFig. 3. b) ii) $f_1 = 0.33 H_2$ $W_1 = 2.07 \text{ rads/s}$ $T_1 = 1/f_1 = 3.03 \text{ secs}$ $S_a = 0.19$ $f_2 = 1.18 H_2$ $W_2 = 7.41 \text{ rads/s}$ $T_2 = 1/f_2 = 0.85 \text{ secs}$ $S_a = 0.59$ from Fig 3, $M_{eq1} = \left[\frac{24(1)^2 + 36(0.86)^2}{1000}\right] \text{ tonne} = 50.6 \text{ tonne}}$ $M_{eq2} = \left[\frac{24(1)^2 + 36(0.77)^2}{1000}\right] \text{ tonne} = 45.4 \text{ tonne}}$ $\frac{1}{1} = M_{i}u_{i} + M_{i}u_{2} = 24 + (0.86)_{36} = 55.0 - 1.086$ $M_{eq} = 50.6 = 50.6$ 50.6 50.6 = 24 + (-0.77)36 = -3.72 = -0.082F. = 45.4 45-4 $\frac{\text{Model: } S_{d_{1}} = S_{a_{1}} = (0.1)(9.81) = 0.23 \text{ m} (n.9 \text{ modes})}{\omega_{1}^{2}}$ $\frac{1}{(2.07)^{2}}$ > Fig3/ Model: $Sd_2 = Sa_2 = (0.5)(9-81) = 0.09 m (n 3.5 middles)$ $W_2^2 = (7-41)^2$ $u_1 = \Gamma_1 S_{d_1} d_{d_1} = (1.086)(0.23m) I = 0.25 m$ 0.86 = 0.21 $u_{2} = \Gamma_{2} S_{d_{2}} d_{2} = (0.082)(0.09m)[1] = [0.01]m (finy)$ [-0.77] [-0.01]m (finy)Bottom floor: SRSS = (0.21)2+ (0.01)2 = 0.21m Shear $S = (3EI)S = 3(2000) \text{ kNm}^2(0.21\text{ m}) = 46.7 \text{ kN}$ $(13)^{-33} \text{ m}^3$ on 3 m column. (Top storey interstorey drift is clearly less critical) Alternatively: Base shear = $\Gamma^2 M_{eq} S_a = (1086)^2 (50.6 \times 10^3) (0.1 \times 9.81 \text{ m/s}^2) = 58.5 \text{ kN}$ by (for mode 1 - ignore mode 2) Pro rate by stiffness . $\frac{1}{3^3} = 0.037 = 0.821 \rightarrow (0.821)(58.56N)$ To get fraction on 3 mleg $\frac{1}{3^3} \frac{1}{3^3} = 0.0870.037 = 48 LN$ for 3m column

4D6 2021, Q3. c). First mode T,= 3.03 seconds. Column shear capacity = 20 kN but from 6) we need 46.7 kN if elastic, based on a deflection of 0.21 of first floor. So we only want 1st floor to have an elastic deflection of $0.21 \text{ m x} \left(\frac{20 \text{ kN}}{46.7 \text{ kN}} \right) = 0.09 \text{ m}$
$$\begin{split} \mathcal{S}_{1} &= \prod \mathcal{S}_{1} \underbrace{\mathcal{I}}_{1st} = \prod \mathcal{S}_{1} \underbrace{\mathcal{I}}_{1st} = \prod \mathcal{S}_{2} \underbrace{\mathcal{I}}_{1st} = 0.09 \, \mathrm{m} \\ floor & \left(\frac{\omega^{2}}{\omega^{2}} \right) \underbrace{\mathcal{I}}_{st} = 0.09 \, \mathrm{m} \end{split}$$
1 7 $\frac{S_{a}}{\Gamma_{i}} = \frac{S_{i}}{\Psi_{i}} = \frac{(0.09 \text{ m})(2.07)^{2}}{(1.086)} = \frac{0.41 \text{ m/s}^{2}}{1.042 \text{ g}}$ $\frac{\Gamma_{i}}{\Psi_{i}} = \frac{\Gamma_{i}}{\Gamma_{i}} = \frac{(1.086)}{(1.086)} = \frac{0.042 \text{ g}}{1.042 \text{ g}}$ -5 2 The PGA at the site = 0.45g. So require S_a in Fig 4 plot = 0.042g = 0.09g (which is for PGA=lg) 0.45 $\left(\frac{12}{12}, \frac{0.099}{19} = \frac{0.0429}{0.459} \right)$ From Fig. 4., T=3.03 secs, Sa=0.09g -7 M=6 regid.



Most students could explain the difference between response spectrum analysis in earthquake engineering and the spectral analysis used in wind engineering. Many students did not read the correct PGA and PGD from the graph. Estimates of the peak column shear were generally reasonable. A common error was omitting the floor masses from the modal participation factor (which is only possible if all floor masses are equal, and thus cance. Another error was to assume that both base columns carried the same shear. A few students managed to obtain the correct ductility factor from the inelastic response spectra, and many followed the method through correctly, but with earlier numerical errors (which were not penalised twice).

476 Q4 2021. $Force = \frac{1}{2}\rho V^{2}GD = \frac{1}{2}(1.25)(60)^{2}(1.2)2$ $\frac{\log m^{2}}{\log m^{2}}$ $\frac{\log m^{2}}{\log m^{2}} = 5.4 \text{ kN/m}.$ -> ' a) 8 VW, tWZ Nor4-5m, say. B #4m 1 - B #4m 1 + 2m Moments = (5.4 kN/m × 8m) × 4m about A = 173 KNm (= 195 KNm) For 4.5 m) AF Restoring moment required = 2.5× (195 kNm) = 488 kNm F.o.S.

~

.

.

.

Tark verybs 4 bone = 40hN (assume empty - worth case)
Slab = (4×4×t) m³ × 24 hal/m² = 384t kd
Moneat equilibrium: (40+384t)×2m = 488 kbNm.

$$\therefore$$
 t = (428 - 40) /384 = 0.53m slab three heres
 $(\frac{2}{2})$ /380m slab three

4D6 Q4 2021 (fibii) Strouhal number of cylinder = 0.2 for high Re. $St = f.b^{n} diamoter$ $St = f.b^{n} \cdot u = f.b = (2\cdot3H_{2})(2\cdot5m)$ $SL = 0\cdot2$ (data sheet) = 29 m/s Scruton number Sc = 2 Sm pb2 Ĭli \ $5_{5} = \log decrement$ = 277 g fraction of critical. Need to assume a value for damping. A steel structure could be as low as $\frac{9}{2} = 0.5\%$ citical, but Bundation may push this up significantly. In lien of further info, assume $\frac{9}{2} = 0.5\%$. $i. Sc = 4TT_{gm} = 4TT(0.005)(617 kg/m)$ $p 52 (1.25 kg/m^3)(2.5^2)m^2$ = 516 $y_{max} \approx 1.5 D = 1.5(2.5) \approx 0.7 m (large!)$ Sc 5.2(at 2-3HZ, for 29m/s windspeed). Helical strakes disruptithe heightwise wherence of the shed vertices creating a more disordered, highly

3-divensional wake, Forces are therefore not in synchrony up the height of the structure, thus amplitudes are greatly reduced. (here is a consequent increase in static drag). There were only a few attempts, and these were generally good. Estimating the frequency of the cantilever proved the greatest difficulty as no method was suggested: almost every student tried a different method, with the two thirds mass at two thirds height being perhaps the simplest reasonable approximation. Similarly, students needed to assume the damping for the Scruton number calculation: most picked 5% of critical but without any justification. The damping for a steel structure like this could be almost an order of magnitude smaller, but perhaps soil damping could push this figure up, all of which could have been mentioned.