

Aerodynamic databases and electronic standards for wind loads: A pilot application

by

Timothy Whalen^{1,2}, Emil Simiu¹, Gilliam Harris³, Jason Lin⁴, and David Surry⁴

ABSTRACT

As part of ongoing National Institute of Standards and Technology research on the development of a new generation of standard provisions for wind loads, we present results of a pilot project on the use of large aerodynamic databases for the improved estimation of wind-induced bending moments and shear forces in low-rise building frames. We use records of wind pressure time histories measured at a large number of taps on the building surface in the Boundary Layer Wind Tunnel of the University of Western Ontario. Time histories of moments and shear forces in a frame are obtained by adding pressures at all taps tributary to that frame multiplied by the respective tributary areas and influence coefficients. The latter were obtained from frame designs provided by CECO Building Systems. We compare results obtained by using the pressure time history records with results based on ASCE 7 standard provisions. The comparison shows clearly that provisions which use aerodynamic databases containing the type of data described in this work can result in designs that are significantly more risk-consistent as well as both safer and more economical than designs based on conventional standard provisions. We outline future research on improved design methodologies made possible by our proposed approach to wind loading standardization. Finally, the proposed methodologies may be used for damage assessment for insurance purposes.

KEYWORDS: Building technology; aerodynamics; codes and standards; databases; risk; structural engineering; wind engineering.

1. INTRODUCTION

Conventional standard provisions for wind loads

reflect two conflicting needs: (1) to assure that they are risk-consistent, the provisions should reflect the information on which they are based as completely and realistically as possible; and (2) conventional standards have limitations that impose reductive formats and simplifications, with consequent loss of information and risk-consistency.

Owing to current information storage and computational capabilities standard provisions need no longer be based on reductive -- and distorting -- tables and plots. It is now practical to develop user-friendly standard provisions that incorporate large amounts of useful information [1,2]. In this paper we present results that illustrate aspects of the development and advantages of such provisions in the specific case of low-rise building frames.

In Section 2 we describe (1) the geometry of the buildings chosen as our test cases, (2) the design criteria for the frames, and (3) basic information on the frames, which were designed by CECO Building Systems. In Section 3 we briefly describe the wind tunnel tests performed at the Boundary Layer Wind Tunnel Laboratory of the University of Western Ontario (BLWTL) [3]. In Section 4 we describe the procedure used to calculate wind-induced internal forces (i.e., bending moments, shear forces and axial forces),

¹Building and Fire Research Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899

²Present address: School of Civil Engineering, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907

³CECO Building Systems, Columbus, MS 39703

⁴Boundary Layer Wind Tunnel Laboratory, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont., Canada N6A 5B9

using: (1) the ASCE 7-93 Standard provisions on wind loads [4], and (2) time-dependent loads based on the wind tunnel measurements. In Section 5 we present and discuss our results. In Section 6 we discuss the vast potential for improving both the safety and economy of structural designs offered by the approach described in this paper, and future research aimed at realizing that potential.

2. BUILDING GEOMETRIES, DESIGN CRITERIA, AND FRAMES

The buildings studied in this pilot project are rectangular in plan with dimensions 61 m (200 ft) $\times$ 30.5 m (100 ft), and have gable roofs with 1/24 slopes and ridge parallel to the long dimension. For the first set the eave height is $H=6.1$ m (20 ft); for the second set it is $H=9.75$ m (32 ft). Each set consists of four buildings with identical geometry. Two of the four buildings are located near Miami, Florida. The other two are located near Charleston, S.C. For each of these locations one building is in open terrain and one is in suburban terrain. All buildings are located at 13 km (8 miles) inland from the coastline and are assumed to be Category 1 [4].

The frames were designed by CECO Building Systems in accordance with Metal Buildings Manufacturers Association (MBMA) current practices, which are based on the the ASCE 7-93 Standard and the 1989 AISC Design Manual (Allowable Stress Design). The configuration of the frames is shown in Fig. 1. For the direction normal to the ridge, the main wind load resisting systems consist of 2 end frames and 7 interior frames. The distance between interior frames is 7.62 m (25 ft) center to center. The end frames are equally spaced from the respective neighboring interior frame. The frame dimensions and the cross-sectional dimensions of the webs and flanges are identical for all frames of a given building. We refer to the Miami (M) building with $H=6.1$ m (20 ft) in suburban (S) terrain as MS20. The other buildings are designated MS32, CS20, CS32, and MO20, MO32, CO20, CO32 (C designates Charleston;

O designates open terrain).

3. WIND TUNNEL TESTS

Building models were tested at 1:200 and 1:100 scales for suburban terrain and 1:200 scale for open terrain. Pressure taps were installed at about 500 locations for the buildings with $H=9.75$ m and 440 locations for the buildings with $H=6.1$ m. The tap locations are shown in Fig. 2. Pressure time histories were measured for each of 37 wind directions between 0° and 180° at 5° intervals. Pressure coefficients C_p obtained from the pressure measurements were referenced to the experimental dynamic pressures at the eave height H . The approximate wind tunnel mean flow speeds $V_h(H)$ at the model eave height H correspond to the full-scale hourly speeds listed in Table 1.

In this paper we consider only the 1:200 model tests. The characteristics of the wind tunnel flows conform to standard representations of atmospheric boundary-layer flows over open and suburban terrain -- see [3] for details.

The time series were sampled at 400 Hz for 60 s. The processed time series were corrected for residual non-simultaneity, and digitally low-pass filtered at 150 Hz. The resolution for the pressure coefficients is about 0.01. The data were archived onto 8 mm cassette tapes. Each tape contains two directories. Each directory contains all the data for one building with specified eave height in one type of terrain. The size of a directory is about 2 GigaBytes when uncompressed and about 600 MegaBytes when compressed. For details on the data file structure and on restoring data from tapes see [3].

4. WIND-INDUCED INTERNAL FORCES

Wind-induced internal forces were obtained for two types of wind loadings: (1) the wind loading specified by the ASCE 7-93 Standard and (2) the wind loading obtained from the wind tunnel data. The ASCE loading is based on wind speeds estimated without regard for direction. For

consistency our estimates of the wind loading obtained from wind tunnel tests are based on similar estimates of the wind speeds. The pressures are

$$p(t) = 0.613 C_p(t) V_h^2(H) \quad (\text{N/m}^2) \quad (1)$$

$$V_h(H) = 1.046 (K_z)^{1/2} V c, \quad (2)$$

where C_p is the pressure coefficient as determined from the wind tunnel tests, 1.046 is the importance factor for Category 1 buildings located at 13 km (8 miles) from the coastline (Table 5 of [4]), H is the eave height in meters, $V_h(H)$ is the mean hourly speed at elevation H , V is the basic wind speed in m/s ($V=42.5$ m/s (95 mph) for Charleston and 49.6 m/s (111 mph) for Miami -- see Fig. 1 of [4]), K_z is an exposure coefficient whose square root transforms the fastest-mile wind speed at 10 m elevation over open terrain into the fastest-mile wind speed at elevation H over the specified type of terrain (for $H=6.1$ m (20 ft), $K_z=0.87$ for open terrain and $K_z=0.42$ for suburban terrain; for $H=9.75$ m (32 ft), $K_z=0.996$ for open terrain and $K_z=0.514$ for suburban terrain -- see Table 6 of [4]), and c is a coefficient that transforms fastest-mile wind speeds to mean hourly speeds ($c \approx 1/1.30$ for Charleston and $c \approx 1/1.31$ for Miami -- see Sect. 6.5.2.2 and Fig. C5 of the Commentary in [4]).

The internal forces were obtained by summing up the pressures at all taps contributing to the loading of a frame times the respective tributary area and influence coefficient. The influence coefficients were calculated using standard linear analysis techniques, and accounted for the position of the tap with respect to the frame. It was assumed that the load associated with any given tap is transmitted to the frame by simply supported girts or purlins, and that there is no load redistribution among the frames. For the loading based on wind-tunnel results this procedure yielded time histories of the internal forces being sought, from which r.m.s. values of the internal forces were obtained. The internal force corresponding to a nominal one-hour loading is defined as the mean value plus the

r.m.s. value times the peak factor

$$k_{pk} = (2 \ln 3600 v_p)^{1/2} + 0.577 / (2 \ln 3600 v_p)^{1/2} \quad (3)$$

[5], where v_p is the mean zero upcrossing rate of the fluctuating part (excluding the mean) of the internal force for the prototype. The rate v_p is obtained from its model counterpart by equating reduced frequencies for the model and prototype. This yields $v_m/v_p = \{[V_h(H)]_m/[V_h(H)]_p\}(D_p/D_m)$, where the subscripts p and m indicate model and prototype, respectively, and D_p/D_m is the reciprocal of the model scale. The speed $V_h(H)$ for the model is taken from Table 1. It is assumed that the wind speed specified by the ASCE 7-93 Standard can blow from any direction.

5. RESULTS

For 6 cross-sections shown in Fig. 1, Table 2 lists the ratio between the worst case bending moments induced by the time-dependent load modeled on the basis of the wind tunnel tests (for brevity, we will refer to this load as the actual loading) and their counterpart worst case bending moments induced by ASCE Standard 7-93 loads. In both cases the respective most unfavorable wind loading conditions were assumed. If the loading specified by the Standard were "on target", i.e., if it reflected consistently the actual loading, then all entries in Table 2 would be unity. Such consistency is impossible owing to the constraints imposed on the volume of information that can be conveyed in conventional standard provisions. Given those constraints the ASCE 7-93 Standard writers attempted to specify information as consistently as possible. However, we note that for any given frame the ratios of Table 2, instead of being unity, differ significantly and nonuniformly from unity in most cases. For example, for the frames of building CS20, the ratios vary from a minimum of 0.5 to a maximum of 0.82. This means that some cross-sections will be more over-designed than others. The sections that are the most over-designed contribute little to the overall safety of the frame. The statement can

therefore be made -- conditional on the strength having a given value -- that the least over-designed cross-section would fail if a sufficiently powerful storm occurred, with the additional strength reserve of the more over-designed cross-sections being wasted. The ratio between the maximum and the minimum entry for a given type of frame is denoted by r_f , and is a measure of the inconsistency of the design over the cross-sections listed in Table 2 for that type of frame. We also list in Table 2 the ratio, denoted by r_{inf} , between the maximum to the minimum entry across types of frames for cross-sections #2, #4, and # 6 (these sections are the section at the frame knee, girder pinch, and ridge line, where comparisons between frame types are meaningful). The ratio r_{inf} is a measure of the extent to which the influence lines of the frames affect the capability of the conventional standard provisions to reflect the actual moments occurring in the frames. This capability is affected by the fact that the standard provisions were based on one specific type of influence lines. Inconsistencies between effects of loads in conventional standard provisions and effects of actual loads inevitably arise should the design of the frames deviate from the design assumed in development of the conventional standard provisions. It can be seen in Table 2 that r_{inf} can be as large as 1.52. (We also note that the ASCE standard does not differentiate between loads on two-hinged and three-hinged frames, even though the respective influence lines are significantly different. Nor does the ASCE 7 standard make allowance for the distance between frames, even though owing to the fluctuating nature of the loads this distance can affect significantly the magnitude of the internal forces.)

The adoption of standard provisions that use large aerodynamic databases would result in moment and shear diagrams allowing the designs would be risk-consistent both within a frame and across different frames. The waste inherent in non-uniformities within a frame would therefore be eliminated. For example, for frame CS32, the design would be safer if instead of the ratio 1.00 (for cross-section #6), the ratio 0.9 were used,

and it would also be more economical if the ratios 0.65, 0.67, 0.74, 0.58, and 0.87 were to be changed to the ratio 0.9.

Design technology has progressed to the point where designers can achieve designs with stresses that are within a few percentage points of the stresses induced by the standard loads. However, this close match provides only the illusion of good design, since the designer is deprived by conventional standard provisions of the knowledge of the actual loads and the associated actual stresses. A standard using large aerodynamic databases would allow the designer to design for the best available loading information that can be produced in the present state of the art, without the significant artificial distortions due to the conventional standards' antiquated way of conveying loading information.

Since the present investigation is exploratory, we considered only wind directions 0° , 30° , 60° , 90° , and 120° . In a forthcoming report all 37 wind directions will be considered. Preliminary searches have indicated that consideration of the results for all 37 directions will leave Table 2 essentially unchanged.

6. FUTURE RESEARCH

As already indicated, the aim of this paper is to present a pilot study. An exhaustive investigation along the lines presented in this paper is planned, however, which will include consideration of all wind directions. It will also consider the effects of wind directionality, which we assumed here to be characterized by a circular extreme wind rosette. This assumption is used in the ASCE 7-93 Standard, but it is fact not necessarily warranted, as shown by the example of the wind rosette of Fig. 3 (milepost 1950, near Charleston, see [6]). We plan to investigate the effect of modeling scale using the results obtained in the wind tunnel for 1:100 models. Instead of estimating moments for a few selected sections, we plan to produce full moment and shear force diagrams for the entire frames. It is conceivable that automated production will render desirable in

the future designs that may be somewhat different for the various frames of a given building. Moment and shear force diagrams corresponding to various mean recurrence intervals can be produced for each of those individual frames, giving the designer the option of considering the possibility of reducing the amount of material for some frames, if this is warranted by the moment and shear force diagrams.

We also plan to study the possibility of automated iterative designs, starting with a design based, for example, on conventional standard provisions, refining the design on the basis of moment and shear diagrams based on actual wind loads, recalculating the moments and shears based on the influence lines of the new frame, until a satisfactory convergence is achieved. Only then will designs accommodating calculated stresses to within a few percentage points make sense, that is, offer the substance rather than the illusion of good engineering design. We note that anticipated progress in Computational Fluid Dynamics might allow the entire load definition process to be computerized in the future, at least for certain applications. Finally, we note that the power of the computer and the availability of databases for time histories of wind pressures make it possible for researchers and designers to study the plastic behavior of frames in the time domain on the basis of realistic fluctuating wind loads. Plastic designs are currently viewed by the industry as uneconomical, and allowable stress designs are used instead, but further research made possible by the availability of appropriate databases containing aerodynamic pressure time histories will enable research to be conducted that might lead to a change of current design philosophy.

7. REFERENCES

1. Simiu, E. and Stathopoulos, T. (1997), "Codification of wind loads on buildings using bluff body aerodynamics and climatological data bases," *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* (in press).
2. Simiu, E., Garrett, J.H., and Reed, K.A. (1993), "Development of Computer-based Models of Standards and Attendant Knowledge-base and Procedural Systems," in *Struct. Eng. In Natural Hazards Mitigation, Structures Congress*, Irvine, Calif., American Society of Civil Engineers, New York.
3. Lin, J. and Surry, D. (1997), *Simultaneous Time Series of Pressures on the Envelope of Two Large Low-rise Buildings*, BLWT-SS7-1997, Boundary-Layer Wind Tunnel Laboratory, The Univ. of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada.
4. *ASCE Standard 7-93* (1993), American Society of Civil Engineers, New York.
5. Davenport, A.G. (1964), "Note on the Distribution of the Largest Values of a Random Function with Application to Gust Loading," *J. Inst. Civ. Eng.* **24**, 187-196.
6. Simiu, E. and Scanlan, R.H. (1996), *Wind Effects on Structures: Fundamentals and Applications to Design*, 3rd Ed., Wiley-Interscience, New York.

Table 1. Wind tunnel mean flow speeds $V_h(H)$

1:200 model, open terrain, H=6.10 m:	10.15 m/s
1:200 model, open terrain, H=9.75 m:	10.95 m/s
1:200 model, suburban terrain, H=6.10 m:	8.30 m/s
1:200 model, suburban terrain, H=9.75 m:	8.95 m/s
1:100 model, suburban terrain, H=6.10 m:	9.35 m/s
1:100 model, suburban terrain, H=9.75 m:	10.05 m/s

Table 2. Ratios of maximum moments due to loads modeled by wind tunnel data to moments induced by ASCE 7-93 Standard provisions, for six frame cross-sections

Frame for building type	CS20	CO20	CS32	CO32	MS20	MO20	MS32	MO32	r_{inf}
Cross-section (see Fig. 1)									
#1	0.60	0.61	0.75	0.65	0.60	0.61	0.74	0.62	
#2	0.66	0.66	0.78	0.66	0.65	0.66	0.78	0.67	1.20
#3	0.75	0.76	0.89	0.74	0.75	0.75	0.87	0.73	
#4	0.50	0.46	0.68	0.58	0.51	0.52	0.70	0.67	1.52
#5	0.79	0.76	0.90	0.87	0.78	0.75	0.89	0.86	
#6	0.82	0.79	1.00	0.96	0.81	0.78	0.98	0.85	1.28
$r_f = r_{max}/r_{min}$	1.64	1.72	1.47	1.66	1.59	1.50	1.40	1.39	




Fig. 1. Schematic of typical frame taken from construction drawing.



1603	1602	1709	1708	1615	1614	1605	1604	1510	1509	1416	1415	1406	1405
1604	1601	1710	1707	1616	1613	1606	1603	1511	1508	1501	1414	1407	1404
1605	1716	1711	1706	1701	1612	1607	1602	1512	1507	1502	1413	1408	1403
1606	1715	1712	1705	1702	1611	1608	1516	1513	1506	1503	1412	1409	1402
1607	1714	1713	1704	1703	1610	1609	1515	1514	1505	1504	1411	1410	1401

105	104	103	102	101
106	107	108	109	110
115	114	113	112	111
116	200	202	203	204
209	208	207	206	205
210	211	212	213	214
303	302	301	216	215
304	305	306	307	308
313	312	311	310	309
314	315	316	401	402
407	406	405	404	403
408	409	410	411	412
501	416	415	414	413
502	503	504	505	506
501	508	509	508	507

2/15/2012

1901	2001	2101	2201	2301	2401	2501	2601	2701	2801	2901	3001	3101	3201
1902	2002	2102	2202	2302	2402	2502	2602	2702	2802	2902	3002	3102	3202
1903	2003	2103	2203	2303	2403	2503	2603	2703	2803	2903	3003	3103	3203
1904	2004	2104	2204	2304	2404	2504	2604	2704	2804	2904	3004	3104	3204
1905	2005	2105	2205	2305	2405	2505	2605	2705	2805	2905	3005	3105	3205
1906	2006	2106	2206	2306	2406	2506	2606	2706	2806	2906	3006	3106	3206
1907	2007	2107	2207	2307	2407	2507	2607	2707	2807	2907	3007	3107	3207
1908	2008	2108	2208	2308	2408	2508	2608	2708	2808	2908	3008	3108	3208
1909	2009	2109	2209	2309	2409	2509	2609	2709	2809	2909	3009	3109	3209
1910	2010	2110	2210	2310	2410	2510	2610	2710	2810	2910	3010	3110	3210
1911	2011	2111	2211	2311	2411	2511	2611	2711	2811	2911	3011	3111	3211
1912	2012	2112	2212	2312	2412	2512	2612	2712	2812	2912	3012	3112	3212
1913	2013	2113	2213	2313	2413	2513	2613	2713	2813	2913	3013	3113	3213
1914	2014	2114	2214	2314	2414	2514	2614	2714	2814	2914	3014	3114	3214
1915	2015	2115	2215	2315	2415	2515	2615	1010	2015	2915	3015	3115	3215

NUMBER OF TAPS
ROOF 14x15 = 210
SIDEWALLS 14x13x2 = 140
ENDWALLS 15x3x2 = 150

TOTAL 500

506	506	506	506	506	506	506	506	506	506	506	506	506	506
512	603	604	611	612	703	704	711	712	803	804	811	812	904
513	602	605	610	613	702	705	710	713	802	805	810	813	903
514	601	606	609	614	701	706	709	714	801	806	809	814	902
515	516	607	608	615	616	707	708	715	716	807	808	815	901

Fig. 2. Schematic showing arrangement of pressure taps.




Fig. 3. Maximum and mean hurricane winds for 16 azimuths near Charleston, S.C. Largest directional speeds are 50 m/s (WSW and NW directions.)