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#### Abstract

The main objective of this research is to evaluate the seismic performance of elevated rectangular RCC water tanks having different $L / B$ ratios with constant depth. In this investigation different Length/width ratios considered are (1.0, 1.2, $1.4,1.6,1.8,2.0,2.5,3.0$ and 4.0 ). The water tank is designed for 10000 liters capacity for 2.5 m depth for all the $L / B$ ratios. The height of RCC elevated water tank is 18 m . Using Staad pro software the analysis of RCC water tank has been carried out for different seismic zone ( Zone III, Zone IV \& Zone V). Result parameters compare from this analysis are lateral displacement, base shear \& Axial Force.
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## I.INTRODUCTION

A large amount of water storage capacity is said to be an elevated water tank which is constructed for supply the water at definite height for the water distribution system. There are various types of storage of water such as underground, ground supported and overhead used broadly by municipalities and industries. So water tanks are mainly necessary requirement for public usefulness and for industrial structures.In various researches it is observed that earthquakes damaged some of the liquid storage container. Some unnecessarymeasures are caused such as lack of drinking water as well as utilizing water, uncontrolled fires and spillage of dangerous fluids which are due to damage or collapse of these structures.

## II. OBJECTIVE

The objectives of the present research works are:

1. Evaluatedisplacement \& base shear of seismic performance of elevated RCC water tanks having different L/Bratios.
2. To evaluate the outcomeparameter of different rectangular RCC water tanks having different L/B ratios with steady depth and capacity

## MODELLING APPROACH

## Modeling Approach

The analysis of rectangular water tank for different models \& analysis has been carried out for different seismic zones.
Table 1: Details of various building models

| Model | L/B Ratio |
| :--- | :--- |
| Model 1 | 1.0 |
| Model 2 | 1.2 |
| Model 3 | 1.4 |
| Model 4 | 1.6 |
| Model 5 | 1.8 |
| Model 6 | 2.0 |
| Model 7 | 2.5 |
| Model 8 | 3.0 |
| Model 9 | 4.0 |



Fig:1Plan of water tank L/B 1.0


Fig:2Plan of water tank L/B 1.2


Fig:3Plan of water tank L/B 1.4

Fig:6 Plan of water tank L/B 2.0


Fig:4Plan of water tank L/B 1.6 Fig:5Plan of water tank L/B 1.8




Fig:7Plan of water tank L/B 2.5 Fig:8Plan of water tank L/B 3.0


Fig:9 Plan of water tank L/B 4.0

## IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results obtained from analysis are given in various tables and figures are as follows
IV (A) Results of Displacements:
Table 2 Displacements for Zone III

| Displacement (mm), Zone III |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| L/B ratio | Height (m) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 | 18 |
| 1 | 4.39 | 8.39 | 12.52 | 16.59 | 20.38 | 23.09 |
| 1.2 | 4.18 | 7.97 | 11.89 | 15.79 | 19.44 | 22.14 |
| 1.4 | 4.12 | 7.85 | 11.73 | 15.59 | 19.25 | 22 |
| 1.6 | 4.1 | 7.81 | 11.68 | 15.55 | 19.22 | 22.04 |
| 1.8 | 4.01 | 7.65 | 11.46 | 15.28 | 18.94 | 21.8 |
| 2 | 3.89 | 7.42 | 11.14 | 14.89 | 18.54 | 21.88 |
| 2.5 | 3.96 | 7.59 | 11.44 | 15.36 | 19.16 | 22.28 |
| 3 | 7.19 | 14.03 | 21.24 | 28.43 | 35.16 | 40.47 |
| 4 | 8.44 | 16.55 | 25.19 | 33.81 | 41.84 | 47.72 |



Fig. 10 Displacements for Zone III
Table 3 Displacements for Zone IV

| Displacement (mm), Zone IV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L/B ratio | Height (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 12 | 15 | 18 |
|  | 3 | 6 | 9 | 18.78 | 24.89 | 30.58 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 6.59 | 12.59 | 34.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 | 6.27 | 11.95 | 17.84 | 23.68 | 29.16 | 33.21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.4 | 6.18 | 11.78 | 17.6 | 23.39 | 28.87 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.6 | 6.15 | 11.72 | 17.52 | 23.32 | 28.83 | 33.05 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.8 | 6.01 | 11.48 | 17.19 | 22.92 | 28.4 | 32.69 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 5.83 | 11.13 | 16.71 | 22.34 | 27.81 | 32.82 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.5 | 5.94 | 11.38 | 17.16 | 23.03 | 28.74 | 33.43 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 10.78 | 21.05 | 31.87 | 42.64 | 52.73 | 60.71 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 12.66 | 24.83 | 37.78 | 50.72 | 62.76 | 71.58 |  |  |  |  |  |



Fig. 11 Displacements for Zone IV
Table 4 Displacements for Zone V

| Displacement (mm), Zone V |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| L/B ratio | Height (m) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 | 18 |
| 1 | 9.88 | 18.88 | 28.16 | 37.34 | 45.87 | 51.95 |
| 1.2 | 9.4 | 17.93 | 26.76 | 35.52 | 43.75 | 49.82 |
| 1.4 | 9.27 | 17.67 | 26.4 | 35.09 | 43.31 | 49.5 |
| 1.6 | 9.22 | 17.58 | 26.28 | 34.98 | 43.24 | 49.58 |
| 1.8 | 9.02 | 17.21 | 25.78 | 34.38 | 42.61 | 49.04 |
| 2 | 8.74 | 16.7 | 25.07 | 33.5 | 41.71 | 49.23 |
| 2.5 | 8.9 | 17.07 | 25.74 | 34.55 | 43.11 | 50.14 |
| 3 | 16.18 | 31.57 | 47.8 | 63.96 | 79.1 | 91.07 |
| 4 | 18.99 | 37.24 | 56.67 | 76.08 | 94.14 | 107.36 |



Fig. 12 Displacements for Zone V
Discussion: From the above graph it is very clear thatin zone III, Zone IV \& Zone V the value of displacement decreases in L/B ratio 1.0 to 2.0 then in L/B ration 2.5 it slightly increases. But in Length/width ratios 3.0 and 4.0 value of displacement rapidly increases
(B) Results of Base Shear:

Table 5 Base Shear

| L/B Ratio | Base Shear (KN) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Zone III | Zone IV | Zone V |
| 1 | 144 | 215 | 323 |
| 1.2 | 141 | 212 | 318 |
| 1.4 | 142 | 214 | 321 |
| 1.6 | 145 | 216 | 323 |
| 1.8 | 143 | 215 | 322 |
| 2 | 145 | 210 | 315 |
| 2.5 | 125 | 183 | 245 |
| 3 | 4 | 148 | 367 |



Fig. 13 L/B Ratio Vs. Base Shear
From the graph it is clear that In zone III, Zone IV \& Zone V the value of base shearmaximum in L/B ratio 1.0 to 2.5 . When L/B ration 3.0 the minimum value of base shear is achieved.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusion of this research is as follows:

1. After analysis all the models of water tank the value of displacement \& base shear decreases for lower seismic zone \& increases for higher seismic zone.
2. When length by width ration increases the value of displacement decreases up to length by width ratio is 2.5 in Zone II, Zone III \& Zone IV.
3. When Length by width ratio 3.0 and 4.0 forZone II, Zone III, Zone IVwater tanks the maximum value of displacement achieved.
4. When Length by width ratio 3.0 the minimum base shear is value is achieved and for Length by width ratio 4.0 maximum value of base shear is achieved for Zone II, Zone III, Zone IV.
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