

# Free discussion

Autor(en): **Weinberg, B.E.**

Objekttyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **IABSE reports of the working commissions = Rapports des commissions de travail AIPC = IVBH Berichte der Arbeitskommissionen**

Band (Jahr): **4 (1969)**

PDF erstellt am: **15.05.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-5932>

## Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

each of the two rather arbitrarily defined design levels ("maximum probable" and "maximum credible"), both of which had been previously, independently selected by rather arbitrary means, a surprising degree of consistency was found.<sup>3</sup> The former level usually corresponded to a return period of about 10<sup>5</sup> years and the second to 10<sup>6</sup> or 10<sup>6</sup> years.

## III

## Free Discussion / Discussion libre / Freie Diskussion

B.E. WEINBERG  
U.S.A.

I would like to add the following comments to Mr. Newberry's fine paper:

1. I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Newberry's plea that wind-load requirements should not be lowered until more research in this area has been completed. In the past, buildings have been far stronger in resisting wind pressures than those for which they were designed; primarily, on account of the existence of non-load bearing partitions. However, the tendency today, at least in the United States, is for office buildings to be built with moveable partitions. Many partitions that are not moveable do not extend all the way from floor to ceiling. Therefore, we no longer are guaranteed the built-in added safety factor so frequently present in the past.

2. In ACI Committee 348 (Structural Safety), we consider serviceability to be one aspect of structural safety. Therefore, it is not enough to design a building to withstand wind pressure so that the building will not collapse. The building must also be comfortable for those inside it. This gets to be important as more of our tall buildings are apartment buildings, not only office buildings as in the past. Wind deflections which might be acceptable to workers in an office building, may be totally unacceptable to tenants living in an apartment building.

Concerning Mr. Mitchell's paper, I would like to add the following comments:

1. There is usually very little control of construction loads by the designing engineer and sometimes not even by the contractor. This is a problem which engineers should consider during their design and contractors in planning their construction sequence. Many more buildings collapse during construction than after they are completed. This is especially true of concrete buildings where frequently construction loads far in excess of the design live load are imposed on parts of the structure which have not yet attained their design strength and are not intended to for twenty-eight days.

2. For snow loads, the duration of the load must be considered together with the intensity of the load.

3. In addition to those mentioned there are two other load surveys being conducted in the United States; one by the Post Office Department of its facilities and the other by the National Bureau of Standards, the latter being confined to office buildings.