Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express his sincere acknowledgement to his advisors **Prof. Dr. Hamed M. Salem, Prof. Dr. Ahmed M. Saleh,** and **Dr. Mohamed A.Zaki** for continuous guidance, professional suggestions, encouragement through the study program, and for their time and effort spent in discussion of the results and reviewing the manuscript. The author also wishes to thank his professors and his friends at **Concrete Structures Research Institute (CSRI)**, especially **Prof. Dr. Hadad said.**

Warm thanks are also for the staff of Concrete Construction Testing Laboratory in Housing and Building National Research Center for their help during the period of my experimental work.

Finally, hot gratitude must go to my family for their sacrifices and support without which completion of this study would have not been possible.

Table of Contents

Cha	apter 1 :Introduction	1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Historical events of building progressive collapse	1
1.3	Objectives and scope of study	4
1.4	Research arrangement	5
Cha	apter 2 : Literature Review	7
2.1	General	7
2.2	Definition of progressive collapse	7
2.3	Introduction to reinforced concrete flat slab structures	8
2.4	Types of progressive collapse	9
	2.4.1 Pancake-type collapse	9
	2.4.2 Zipper-type collapse	10
	2.4.3 Domino-type collapse	11
	2.4.4 Section-type collapse	12
	2.4.5 Instability-type collapse	12
	2.4.6 Mixed-type collapse	13
2.5	Progressive collapse analysis and design procedures	13
	2.5.1 Indirect design method	
	2.5.2 Direct design method	14
2.6	Previous research on progressive collapse in flat slab structures	20
2.7	Catenary and membrane actions in solid and flat slab structures	25
2.8	Applied element method (AEM)	26
	2.8.1 Reinforced concrete model	27
	2.8.2 Analysis concept	31
	2.8.3 Extreme Loading for Structures (ELS) software procedure	31
Cha	apter 3: Experimental Program	32
3.1	General	32
3.2	Structural prototype	32
3.3	Similitude requirements for the prototype modelling	34
	3.3.1 Concrete modeling	34
	3.3.2 Reinforcement Modeling	35
	3.3.3 Geometry and loading modeling	36
3.4	Description of the structural model	37

3.5	Mate	erial properties	.41
	3.5.1	Concrete	.41
	3.5.2	Reinforcement	.41
3.6	Prep	aration and construction of the tested model	.42
3.7	Test	set-up	.42
3.8	Instr	umentation	.42
	3.8.1	Displacement transducers (LVDTs)	.43
	3.8.2	Strain gauges	.43
	3.8.3	Accelerometer	.43
3.9	Colu	mns removals tests procedures	.45
Cha	apter 4	: Presentation of Experimental Results	.59
4.1	Gene	eral	.59
4.2	Expe	erimental estimation of the model frequencies	.59
	4.2.1	Test set-up and instrumentation	.59
	4.2.2	Test procedure	.59
	4.2.3	Signal data processes	. 62
4.3	First	column removal test (dead load only)	.71
	4.3.1	Loading calculations	.71
	4.3.2	Displacements and cracks observations	.72
	4.3.3	Reinforcement strains	.72
	4.3.4	Acceleration response during column removal	.72
	4.3.5	Estimation of column removal time	.73
	4.3.6	Displacements with time using accelerations data	.73
4.4	First	column removal test (dead load + live load)	.81
	4.4.1	Loading calculations	.81
	4.4.2	Displacements and cracks observations	. 82
	4.4.3	Reinforcement strains	. 82
	4.4.4	Displacements with time using accelerations data	.85
4.5	Seco	nd column removal test (dead load + live load)	.86
	4.5.1	Global displacements	.86
	4.5.2	Cracks observations	.87
	4.5.3	Reinforcement strains	.87
	4.5.4	Displacement with time using acceleration data	.87
4.6	Thir	d column removal test	.95
	461	Global displacements	95

Ref	erences	160
7.4	Recommendations for Future Research	168
7.3	General recommendations to mitigate the progressive collapse of r concrete flat slab structures	
7.2	Conclusions	
7.1	Challenges of the research	
Cha	apter 7: Conclusions and Recommendations	
6.9		
6.8	Effects of column removal duration	158
6.7	Effects of top reinforcement ratio	154
6.6	Effects of bottom reinforcement ratio	150
6.5	Effects of number of floors	147
6.4	Effects of slab continuity	144
6.3	Effects of depth column section	141
6.2	Effects of slab thickness	136
6.1	General	
Cha	apter 6 : Analytical Parametric Studies	
	5.3.5 Fourth column removal analysis	
	5.3.4 Third column removal analysis (Dead load + Live load)	
	5.3.3 Second column removal analysis (Dead load + Live load)	
	5.3.2 First column removal analysis (Dead load + Live load)	
5.5	5.3.1 First column removal analysis (Dead load only)	
5.3	Computational model columns removal results	
	5.2.1 Material properties of the analytical model5.2.2 Analytical estimation of the model fundamental period	
5.2	Analytical Model for the Tested Flat Slab Structure	
5.1	General Analytical Model for the Tosted Flet Slab Structure	
	apter 5: Computational Modeling and Analysis of Results	
Cl.	4.7.1 Cracks observations	
4.7	Partially fourth column removal test	
	4.6.2 Cracks observations	

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Ronan Point building after the May 1968 partial c	ollapse [<mark>9</mark>]2
Figure 1.2 Alfred P. Murrah building collapse - terrorist attac	
Figure 1.3 Harbour Cay Condominium collapse [46]	
Figure 2.1. Classification of flat slab construction	
Figure 2.2 Stages of the pancake-type progressive collapse	
Figure 2.3. Tacoma Narrows bridge after collapse [48]	
Figure 2.4. Stages of the domino-type collapse	
Figure 2.5. Stages of instability-type progressive collapse	
Figure 2.6 Applicability flow chart (GSA-2013)	
Figure 2.7 Loads and load locations for external and internal	
and nonlinear static models (left side demonstrates ex	
right side shows internal column removal) (GSA-201	
Figure 2.8. Reinforcement detailing a) gravity load only b) p	/ L -
	19
Figure 2.9 Different types of ties incorporated to provide stru	
Figure 2.10 Post punching behavior of top and bottom reinfo	
Figure 2.11. Destruction of the first central column (Kokot 2	
Figure 2.12. Overview of typical specimen in position ready	
Figure 2.13. Comparison of vertical load and horizontal reac	.
deflection (ND series and corresponding WD series s	pecimens) [16]23
Figure 2.14 Elevation view for the tested flat slab structure [4]	
Figure 2.15. Schematic view of test model [41]	-
Figure 2.16. Load transfer by catenary action in reinforced co	
Figure 2.17. Membrane actions f simply supported slab. (a) I	n a simply supported slab.
(b), (c) Associated with inner and external column los	
Figure 2.18 Modeling of structure to AEM [5]	
Figure 2.19 Stresses in springs due to relative displacement [
Figure 2.20 Stress-Strain curves for concrete	28
Figure 2.21 Stress-Strain curves for reinforcement	28
Figure 2.22 Cracking criterion of concrete	29
Figure 2.23 Behavior of concrete elements after cracking	29
Figure 2.24 Separation strain	30
Figure 2.25. Elements separate and re-contact again	30
Figure 3.1 Prototype floor top reinforcement details and cond	erete dimensions33
Figure 3.2 Prototype floor bottom reinforcement detail and c	
Figure 3.3 Prototype Section 1-1	
Figure 3.4 Reinforcement and concrete similitude requirement	nts36
Figure 3.5 Model floor top reinforcement details and concre	te dimensions38
Figure 3.6 Model floor bottom reinforcement details and con	crete dimensions38
Figure 3.7 Plan at footing level of the model	39
Figure 3.8. Section 1-1 in the Model building	40
Figure 3.9. Pin-hinge steel column mechanism	
Figure 3.10 Reinforcing cage and concrete form work for tw	
Figure 3.11 Casting of first floor columns	47

Figure 3.12 Locating of the base plate immediately after casting of the footing	.48
Figure 3.13 Reinforcing cage and form work of the first floor slab	.48
Figure 3.14 Casting of the first floor slab	.49
Figure 3.15 Casting of the second floor columns	.49
Figure 3.16 Casting of the second floor slab	.50
Figure 3.17 Structural model after complete of construction	.50
Figure 3.18 Exterior column pin-hinge mechanism	.51
Figure 3.19 Loading of the model using sand bags	.51
Figure 3.20 Locations of completely removed columns	. 52
Figure 3.21 Circled columns of the building were removed during the experiment	. 52
Figure 3.22 Floor plan showing LVDTs and accelerometer locations and direction of	•
measurement	. 53
Figure 3.23 Model instrumentation and loading arrangement	. 53
Figure 3.24 Floor plan showing strain gauge locations	
Figure 3.25 Piezoelectric accelerometers functions	. 54
Figure 3.26 Signal conditioner QTC-350 type	. 55
Figure 3.27 Functional description of signal conditioning system	. 55
Figure 3.28 Data acquisition system and signal processing	.56
Figure 3.29 Steel column after removal	.56
Figure 3.30 Removing of concrete covers and supporting floor using heavy timber	.57
Figure 3.31 Demolishing of reinforced concrete column using electrical hammer	.57
Figure 3.32 Third column after removing test	. 58
Figure 4.1 Modal test set-up and instrumentation	.60
Figure 4.2 Locations and measurement directions of the used accelerometers	.60
Figure 4.3 First accelerometer location	
Figure 4.4 Second accelerometer location	
Figure 4.5 Part of signal time domain for channel 1	.65
Figure 4.6 Part of signal time domain for channel 2	. 65
Figure 4.7 Signal processing prior FFT extraction	.65
Figure 4.8 Signal processing prior FFT extraction	
Figure 4.9 Part of channel (1) signal before and after linear trending	.66
Figure 4.10 Channel 1 decay at first point	
Figure 4.11 Channel 1 decay at second point	.68
Figure 4.12 Channel 1 decay at third point	
Figure 4.13 Channel 1 FFT at first point	. 69
Figure 4.14 Channel 1 FFT at second point	. 69
Figure 4.15 Channel 1 FFT at third point	
Figure 4.16 Channel 2 FFT at first point	
Figure 4.17 Channel 2 FFT at second point	
Figure 4.18 Locations of the removed columns and points of measurements	.74
Figure 4.19 Circled columns of the model that were completely removed during the	
experiments.	
Figure 4.20 Loading of model (dead loads only) before first column removal	
Figure 4.21 Vertical displacement response at points A & B after 1st column removal	.76
Figure 4.22 Reinforcement strain at points A, I after first column removal test (dead	
loads only)	.76

Figure 4.23 Vertical acceleration at point (A) during and just after the first column
removal77
Figure 4.24 FFT of the vertical response at point (A) during 1 st column removal77
Figure 4.25 FFT of the horizontal response at point (H) during 1 st column removal 78
Figure 4.26. Impact model, F = dynamic interaction force (EN 1991-1-7) [47]78
Figure 4.27. Vertical acceleration at point A (the impulsive part)79
Figure 4.28 Complete rotation of the steel column after 1.418 second79
Figure 4.29 Procedure of the displacement calculating from the acceleration data80
Figure 4.30 Vertical displacement at point A after 1 st column removal81
Figure 4.31 Loading of the model (DL+ L.L) before the first column removal
Figure 4.32 Vertical displacement response after 1 st column removal (DL+L.L)83
Figure 4.33 Bottom slab surface of the first floor level after first column removal test
(<i>DL</i> + <i>L</i> . <i>L</i>)
Figure 4.34 First floor slab reinforcement strain after 1 st column removal test (DL+L.L)84
Figure 4.35 Vertical acceleration at point (A) at first column removal time85
Figure 4.36 Vertical displacement history at point A after first column removal test
(D.L+L.L)86
Figure 4.37 Structural model second column removal
Figure 4.38 Vertical displacement of point A after 1 st & 2 nd column removal
Figure 4.39 Vertical displacement of point C after 1 st & 2 nd column removal
Figure 4.40 Vertical displacement of point G after 1 st & 2 nd column removal90
Figure 4.41 Vertical displacement of point K after 1 st & 2 nd column removal90
Figure 4.42 Bottom slab cracks at second floor (second column removal)91
Figure 4.43 Top slab cracks at second floor (second column removal)
Figure 4.44 Top slab cracks at first floor (second column removal)
Figure 4.45 Final slab Top and Bottom cracks (second column removal)92
Figure 4.46 Strain of first floor slab bottom reinforcement after first & second column
removals93
Figure 4.47 Strain of first floor slab top reinforcement after first & second column
removals93
Figure 4.48 Vertical displacement of point A after 1 st & 2 nd column removal94
Figure 4.49 Vertical displacement of point C after 1 st & 2 nd column removal94
Figure 4.50. Structural model after third column removal
Figure 4.51 Vertical displacement of point A after 1 st & 2 nd and 3 rd column removal 96
Figure 4.52 Vertical displacement of point C after 1 st , 2 nd and 3 rd column removal97
Figure 4.53 Vertical displacement of point E after 1 st , 2 nd and 3 rd column removal97
Figure 4.54 Vertical displacement of point G after 1 st , 2 nd and 3 rd column removal 98
Figure 4.55 Bottom and top slab cracks after third column removal
Figure 4.56 Bottom slab cracks at first floor (third column removal)
Figure 4.57 Top slab crack at first floor (third column removal)
Figure 4.58 Top slab crack width (third column removal)
Figure 4.59 Final slab top and bottom cracks (Third column removal)
Figure 4.60 Tensile transversal cracks at second floor edge columns after third column
removal test
Figure 4.61 Partially removal of fourth column and using heavy timber as vertical
support
54PF-1102

Figure	4.62 Fourth column after partially removal	02
Figure	4.63 Estimation of slab defection after 4 th column partially removed	03
Figure	4.64 Estimation of slab defection after 4 th column partially removed	03
Figure	4.65 Bottom slab cracks at first floor (4 th column removal)	04
	4.66 Maximum bottom slab cracks width at second floor (4 th column removal)	
	4.67 Top slab flexural cracking failure at second floor exterior column	
_	4.68 Top slab flexural cracking failure at second floor exterior column	
_	4.69 Top slab flexural cracking failure at first floor exterior column	
_	4.70 Final cracking pattern for top slab surface	
_	4.71 Final cracking pattern for bottom slab surface	
_	5.1 Overview of ELS Model for the tested structure	
_	5.2 The first four modes with corresponding frequencies	
_	5.3 ninth and tenth modes with corresponding frequencies	
_	5.4 Locations of the removed columns and points of measurements	
_	5.5 Deflection contours due to central column removal (unites in mm)	
_	5.6 Experimental displacement at points A & B after 1st column removal 1	
_	5.7 Analytical displacement at points A & B after 1st column removal	
_	5.8 Experimental and analytical vertical displacements versus time of point A	
Ü	first floor level after 1 st column removal (D.L only)	
Figure	5.9 Final strain contours in the X-direction at top slab surface due to the central	
	column removal (D.L loading only)	
Figure	5.10 Final strain contours in the X-direction at bottom slab surface due to the	
_	central column removal (D.L loading only)1	17
Figure	5.11 Experimental reinforcement strain at points A, I after 1 st column removal	
	(D.L only)	18
Figure	5.12 Analytical reiforcement strain at points A, I after 1st column removal (D.D.	<u></u>
	<i>only</i>)1	18
Figure	5.13 Deflection contours due to the central column removal (unites in mm) 1	20
Figure	5.14 Experimental displacement at points A & K and G after 1st column	
	removal1	
Figure	5.15 Analytical displacement at points A & K and G after 1st column removal	121
Figure	5.16 Experimental and analytical vertical displacements versus time of point A	
	in first floor after 1 st column removal (D.L + L.L)	
Figure	5.17 Final strain contours in the Y-direction at top slab surface due to the cent	ral
	column removal (D.L + L.L)	22
Figure	5.18 Final strain contours in the Y-direction at bottom slab surface due to the	
	central column removal (D.L + L.L)	23
Figure	5.19 Experimental RFT strain at first floor slab after first column removal	
	(DL+L.L)	
_	5.20 Analytical RFT strain at 1^{st} floor slab after 1^{st} column removal ($DL+L.L$)	124
Figure	5.21 Final analytical deflection contours due to the first and second column	
	removal (unites in mm)	
Figure	5.22 Experimental and analytical vertical displacements versus time for point.	
	at first floor after 1^{st} and 2^{nd} column removal (D.L + L.L)	
Figure	5.23 Experimental and analytical vertical displacements versus time of point C	
	at first floor after 1 st and 2 nd column removal (D.L + L.L)	26

Figure	5.24 Final strain contours in the Y-direction after second column removal
	analysis for top and bottom first floor slab surface with the experimental
	observed cracks pattern
Figure	5.25 Experimental with analytical bottom reinforcement strain at first floor level
	after 1 st and 2 nd column removal (D.L + L.L)
Figure	5.26 Experimental with analytical top reinforcement strain at first floor level
υ	after 1 st and 2 nd column removal (D.L + L.L)
Figure	5.27 Final analytical deflection contours after third column removal analysis
8	(unites in mm)
Figure	5.28 Experimental and analytical vertical displacements of point (A) at first
8	floor after 1^{st} & 2^{nd} and 3^{rd} columns removal (D.L + L.L)
Figure	5.29 Final strain contours in the Y-direction after 3 rd column removal for top and
8	bottom first floor slab surface with the experimental observed cracks
Figure	5.30 Building collapse after the fourth column removal analysis
_	5.31 Strain contours in Y-direction after the fourth column removal with the
1 18011	experimental observed cracks pattern at top slab surface
Figure	5.32 Strain contours in Y-direction after the fourth column removal with the
1 18410	experimental observed cracks at second floor corner column
Figure	6.1 Locations of the removed columns and points of measurements
_	6.2 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (A) for models with
1 iguit	different slabs thickness after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.3 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (C) for models with
1 iguic	different slabs thickness after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.4 Analytical maximum permanent vertical displacements for models with
1 iguic	different slabs thickness for different columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.5 Analytical bending moment history at point (A) for models with different
1 iguit	slabs thickness after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.6 Analytical bending moment history at point (I) for models with different
1 iguit	slabs thickness after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.7 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (A) for models with
1 iguit	different depthes of column sections after columns removal scenarios142
Figure	6.8 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (C) for models with
1 18410	different depthes of column sections after columns removal scenarios142
Figure	6.9 Analytical maximum permanent vertical displacements for models with
1 iguit	different depthes of column section for different columns removal scenarios 143
Figure	6.10 Analytical bending moment history at point (A) for models with different
1 iguic	depthes of column sections after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.11 Analytical bending moment history at point (I) for models with different
1 iguic	depthes of column sections after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.12 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (A) for models with and
1 iguic	without edge slab cantilever after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.13 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (C) for models with and
ı ığuıc	without edge slab cantilever after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.14 Analytical bending moment history at point (A) for models with and
1 iguic	without edge slab cantilever after columns removal scenarios
	winiout bage stab cantilevel after columns femoval scenarios

Figure	6.15 Analytical bending moment history at point (I) for models with and without
	edge slab cantilever after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.16 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (A) for models with
	different number of floors after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.17 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (C) for models with
	different number of floors after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.18 Analytical bending moment history at point (A) for models with different
	number of floors after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.19 Analytical bending moment history at point (I) for models with different
	number of floors after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.20 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (A) for models with
	different slab bottom reinforcement ratios after columns removal scenarios 152
Figure	6.21 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (C) for models with
	different slab bottom reinforcement ratios after columns removal scenarios 152
Figure	6.22 Analytical maximum permanent slab deflection for models with different
	slab bottom reinforcement ratios for different columns removal scenarios 153
Figure	6.23 Analytical bending moment history at point (A) for models with different
	slab bottom reinforcement ratios after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.24 Analytical bending moment history at point (I) for models with different
	slab bottom reinforcement ratios after columns removal scenarios154
Figure	6.25 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (A) for models with
	different slab top additional reinforcement ratios after columns removal
	scenarios
Figure	6.26 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (C) for models with
	different slab top additional reinforcement ratios after columns removal
	scenarios
Figure	6.27 Analytical maximum permanent slab deflection for models with different
	slab top reinforcement ratios for different columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.28 Analytical bending moment history at point (A) for models with different
	slab top additional reinforcement ratios after columns removal scenarios 157
Figure	6.29 Analytical bending moment history at point (I) for models with different
	slab top additional reinforcement ratios after columns removal scenarios 157
Figure	6.30 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (A) for models with
	different column removal duration after columns removal scenarios159
Figure	6.31 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (C) for models with
	different column removal duration after columns removal scenarios159
Figure	6.32 Analytical bending moment history at point (A) for models with different
	column removal duration after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.33 Analytical bending moment history at point (I) for models with different
	column removal duration after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.34 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (A) for models with
	different structural system after columns removal scenarios
Figure	6.35 Analytical vertical displacements history at point (C) for models with
	different structural system after columns removal scenarios

List of Tables

Table 3.1 Summary of scale factor for geometry and loading modeling [19]	37
Table 3.2 Concrete Mix Design	41
Table 3.3 Concrete strength (mean values)	41
Table 3.4. Mechanical Properties of Reinforcing Steel	41
Table 3.5. Summary of instrumentation	46
Table 5.1 Concrete properties for the model structural element	109
Table 5.2 Mechanical Properties of Reinforcing Steel	110
Table 5.3 First ten modes frequencies	111
Table 6.1 Reinforcement details and concrete dimensions for the flat slab and	beams-
slab analytical models	161

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A_s	Area of the reinforcing steel;
a	Element length;
a(t)	acceleration at time t
b	Element height, or beam width;
(<i>C</i>)	The damping matrix;
d	The distance between each spring, the diameter of the circle that fits
	into the element, or beam depth;
D	Dead load including façade loads
E	Young's modules;
E_c	Young's modulus of concrete;
E_s	Young's modulus of steel;
E_{sp}	The post-yield stiffness;
E_t	The post-yield tangent modulus;
E_{y}	The initial elastic stiffness;
{f}	The applied load vector;
F_i^*	The modified load vector value of degree of freedom "i";
F_{ult}	The ultimate stress capacity of the material;
F_{cu}	Concrete compressive strength;
f_{y}	Steel yield stress;
G	Shear modules;
G_{LD}	Increased gravity loads for Linear Static analysis
h	Beam total depth;
K	stiffness
(<i>K</i>)	The stiffness matrix;
L	Live load
(M)	Mass matrix;
m	mass
Q_{i}	Load effect
(<i>R</i>)	Transformation matrix;

R_n Nominal strength

S Snow load

s(*t*) displacement at time t

 S_L geometric scale factor

T Element thickness;

t Time in second

 v_0 initial velocity

 U_u total bond force

[X] The displacement vector;

 Δ_i The assumed displacement of degree of freedom number "j";

 $\Delta f(t)$ The incremental applied load vector;

 δ_o The yield displacement;

 ε_{ult} The ultimate strain capacity of the material;

 ε_u The ultimate strain of the concrete;

 ω The natural circular frequency of a structure;

 ω_1 The first natural frequency;

 ζ The damping ratio;

 Φ Strength reduction factor

 θ_{pra} plastic rotation angle

 $\theta_{\rm y}$ yield rotation angle

 Ω_{LD} Load increase factor used for linear static analysis

μ Poisson's ratio

 σ stress

ρ density of concrete

ABSTRACT

The progressive collapse of buildings is initiated when one or more vertical load carrying members (typically columns) is removed or collapsed. After losing of the original load path due to column removal, the load may be transferred to an alternate path. For flat slab buildings, when a supporting column is instantaneously removed, the likelihood of disproportionate collapse depends on the strength and deformation capacity of the neighboring slab column connections as well as the forces and deformations demands caused by the dynamic loading effects.

Numerous tests have been conducted on isolated slab-column connections with lack of in-plane restraints and dynamic load applied to the specimens. The Non-existence of these tested specimens in an actual flat-slab system makes tests data questionable to be used for accurately defining of the strength and stiffness properties of slab-column connections. Additionally, only a few flat-slab specimens with multiple slab panels have been tested and static rather than dynamic loading was applied to these specimens. The combination of lack of knowledge about the dynamic disproportionate collapse performance and extensive use of flat-plate structures makes this research important to be carried out to protect the occupants of flat-plate buildings. The research presented herein is motivated by the existing gap in knowledge regarding to the vulnerability of the associated risk of progressive collapse in flat plate structures.

The research proposed herein seeks to fill in the gap in existing knowledge for the dynamic disproportionate collapse potential of the flat slab buildings by providing analytical and experimental modeling approaches. To achieve this objective, a three dimensional, ¼-scale flat slab model building was constructed for progressive collapse testing. The flat-slab model was tested by subjecting it to a sudden loss of its supporting columns. Three columns were completely removed from the structural model one each time. As each column was removed, the reinforcement strains, displacements and accelerations were measured to be analyzed and compared with the analytical results extracted from analysis using the Applied Element Method. By adopting agreement between the analytical and experimental results, a numerical study for the effects of the design parameters considered in assessing the progressive collapse potential of flat slab structures was conducted. The analytical results showed that, flat slab structure systems have greater vulnerability to progressive collapse compared to beam-column-slab structures. The analytical results also showed that, the increase of column size enhance flat slab building resistance to progressive collapse and that, the modification of continuity of flat slab model by only 0.25m cantilever indicate significant effects on the flat slab structure resistance to progressive collapse.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background

The topic of progressive collapse has taken the attention of many researchers in recent years due to many structural collapse associated with accidents or terrorist attacks or failure of structural elements. The progressive collapse of buildings is initiated when one or more vertical load carrying members (typically columns) is removed or collapsed. After losing the original load path due to column removal, the load may be transfer to an alternate path. The loads from the upper floors will be redistributed quickly within a few milliseconds. As a result, all floors above the first floor will deflect identically and dynamically under uniform gravity loads to seek a new equilibrium path. The building will not collapse immediately due to spatial action of structure and catenary action of the frame beams or slabs.

The term of progressive collapse has been used to describe the propagate of an initial local failure in a style like a chain reaction that causes to partial or total collapse of the structure. The basic characteristic of the progressive collapse that the end state of the destructions is disproportionately greater than the failure that initiate the collapse. The design guidelines (ASCE 7-10, DoD 2009, ACI 318-11) guarding against disproportionate collapse are based mainly on engineering experience as well as limited numerical and experimental studies. The research proposed herein seeks to fill in the gap in existing knowledge for the dynamic disproportionate collapse potential of flat-slab structures by providing experimental and numerical modeling approaches.

1.2 Historical events of building progressive collapse

In this section, attempt has made to provide brief information on some of the significant structural failures in past which have presented the worldwide opportunities to evaluate the validity of engineering approaches and design procedures. The research regarding progressive collapse was initiated by the well-known collapse of Ronan Point apartment tower on May 16, 1968 as shown in Figure 1.1, due to an internal gas explosion at the 18th floor, which knocked out load bearing precast concrete panels near one corner of the building [30].

Another recent event takes the attention of civil engineers in 1995 after the collapse of the Alfred P. Murrah federal building in Oklahoma, USA. A bomb explosion occurred at the ground level next to the nine-story reinforced concrete office building. The side facing the blast had corner columns and four other perimeter columns. The blast shock wave disintegrated one of the 0.50×0.92 meter perimeter columns and caused brittle failures of two others [9]. The transfer girder at the third level above these columns failed, and the upper-story floors collapsed in a progressive fashion. Approximately 70 percent of the building experienced dramatic collapse. One hundred sixty-eight people died, many of them as a direct result of progressive collapse. Damage might have been less if this structure not relied on transfer girders for support of upper floors, if there had been better detailing for ductility and greater redundancy [Figure 1.2].