

## Analysis of a Curved Steel Plate Girder Bridge with BrR

2015 AASHTOWare Bridge Design and Rating Software User Group Meeting Albany, NY, August 4th and 5th

George Huang, PhD, PE

California Department of Transportation



# Introduction

# Introduction



- The function of the curved steel plate girder rating analysis was introduced in V6.5 including diaphragms.
- Lateral bracing members were added in V6.6.
- Many issues in LFR analysis engine have been resolved since then.
- Only main girders are rated.



# Structure Description



#### Structure Description

- Built in1962, connecting highway 110 to I-5.
- Curved Steel Plate Girders for Span 8 10
- Spans 8 9 are 2-span (92.5'-92.5') continuous structure with curved alignment
- Span 10 is a simple span (97.5') with curved and tangent alignment
- The RC deck with four steel girders spacing at 9'-3".
- 400 ft radius is used for the curved alignment line.
- Maximum super elevation is 12%



#### Bridge Location





#### Structure Plan





#### Steel Layout





### Top View





#### Side View





#### Bottom View





#### **Girder End Details Lateral Bracing Connection (6" above bottom flange)**





#### Girder Details

- Span 8-9: Web: 68" x 7/16"; Flanges: 16" x 1-1/2" Equal shear stiffener spacing: 53.1" to 56.9" Non-composite section near Bent 9 Fixed bearings at all supports
- Span 10: Web: 68 x 7/16, Stiffener Space: 47.5" to 51" Top Flange: 14 x 1 Bottom Flange: 18 x 1-1/2 and 18 x 1 Composite Section Expansion and fixed bearings used



# Bridge Modeling



#### Superstructure Definition

- Curved alignment
- Radius
- Superelevation
- Design speed: 50 mph





### Structure Framing (Span 8-9)





# Diaphragms (Span 8-9)





#### Diaphragms (cont.)





 $\vert$ 3

Girder Bay:

× Copy Bay To... Diaphragm<br>Wizard...





## Lateral Bracing (Span 8-9)







#### Framing Details: Span 8-9





#### Framing Details: Span 10





#### Typical Section





# **Shear Capacity**



### **Shear Capacity**

#### **LFD (2003 Guide Spec) LRFD (7th Ed. 2014)**

- At simple support (end panel) At end panel:  $d_0 \leq 0.5D$
- At interior panel:

 $d_0 \leq D$ 

• Shear capacity at all location:

$$
\mathbf{V}_{\text{cr}} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{V}_{\text{p}}
$$

where:

- $V_p = 0.58 F_v Dt_w$
- ratio of the elastic-shear-buckling  $C =$ strength to the shear-yield strength
- - $d_0 \le 1.5D$  $V = V = CV$

$$
\mathbf{v}_n - \mathbf{v}_{cr} - \mathbf{v}_{p}
$$
   
At interior panel:

 $d_0 \leq 3D$  (no LS)

$$
V_n = V_p \left[ C + \frac{0.87(1-C)}{\left( \sqrt{1 + \left( \frac{d_o}{D} \right)^2 + \frac{d_o}{D} \right)} \right]
$$



### Shear Capacity in BrR (LFR)

- With LFR, shear stiffener is ignored in BrR when  $d_0$ >0.5D at end support.
- For this bridge,  $d_0$  is constant along the girder and the ranges from 0.7D to 0.84D.
- For this analysis, the shear capacity override is used at span ends.
- The override capacity is calculated ignoring 0.5D limit, or the capacity at internal panel.



#### **Shear Capacity Comparison**





# Boundary Conditions



#### Fixed(Pinned) Bearing (Span 8-9)





## Moments (Span 8-9, G1)





### Moments with Different Supports (Span 8-9, G1)





#### Moments Comparison (Span 8-9)





## Ratings: Pinned Supports Lathans (Span 8-9)





## Ratings: Rollers at Ends (Span 8-9)





# End Support Choice

- With rollers at ends, there is some reduction for negative moments, but very large increase for positive moments (up to 53% for DL and 98% for LL).
- If slot holes are used in the flanges, there would be no horizontal force due to the steel weight.
- Considering actual pin location, 6" from bottom flange, will reduce horizontal force (up to 36% for DL) based on FEM analysis.
- Bearing anchor bolts may bend due to larger horizontal forces.



# End Support Choice (Cont.)

- The actual end support conditions are between rollers and pinned.
- For this bridge with constant girder section and same top and bottom flanges, it would be conservative to use pinned supports.
- Considering the 1.3 load factor used and the possible slower speed of heavy permit trucks, it would be reasonable to allow all permit trucks on this structure, or simply use the results with rollers at ends.



#### Rating w/o Shear Override (rollers at ends)



AASHTO LFR 3D Engine Version 6.7.0.3001

Analysis Preference Setting: None



#### Permit Load Setting

**Vehicle Properties** 

∸





Adjacent vehicle live load factor:

 $|1,3\rangle$ 



# Rating for Striped Lane



# One Lane Striping

- Left ETW: 1 ft from the barrier
- Traffic lane width: 12 ft
- Used 15 ft travel way width
- Do not used striped travel way function when edge stripe is less than 2 ft from barrier.





### Rating with Pinned Supports





# Design Speed and Centrifugal Force



#### Slope and Centrifugal Force

#### **Vehicle Self Weight Vehicle Centrifugal Force**





### Centrifugal Force

#### 3.10 **CENTRIFUGAL FORCES**

**3.10.1** Structures on curves shall be designed for a horizontal radial force equal to the following percentage of the live load, without impact, in all traffic lanes:

$$
C = 0.00117S^{2}D = \frac{6.68S^{2}}{R}
$$
 (3-2)

where,

- $C =$  the centrifugal force in percent of the live load, without impact;
- $S =$  the design speed in miles per hour;

 $D =$  the degree of curve;

 $R =$  the radius of the curve in feet.

#### **LFD LRFD**

#### 3.6.3-Centrifugal Forces: CE

For the purpose of computing the radial force or the overturning effect on wheel loads, the centrifugal effect on live load shall be taken as the product of the axle weights of the design truck or tandem and the factor  $C$ , taken as:

$$
C = f \frac{v^2}{gR} \tag{3.6.3-1}
$$

where:

 $\overline{R}$ 

- highway design speed (ft/s)  $=$  $\mathbf{v}$ 
	- 4/3 for load combinations other than fatigue and  $=$ 1.0 for fatigue

gravitational acceleration:  $32.2 \text{ (ft/s}^2)$  $=$ g

radius of curvature of traffic lane (ft)  $=$ 



## Centrifugal Force (cont.)

- Ratio of centrifugal forces with the same speed:  $C_{LRFD}/C_{LFT}=1.33$
- Maximum design speed:  $S_{max, LRFD}/S_{max, LFD}=0.867$
- This bridge:  $S_{\text{max,LRFD}} = 52.5 \text{ mph}$  $S_{\text{max,LFD}} = 60.9 \text{ mph}$
- A design speed that works with LFR, may not work with LRFR.



# LRFR and Refined Analysis



#### Permit Checks

6A.4.5.4.2c—Permit Checks Using Refined Analysis

When routine permit checks are evaluated using a refined analysis, the load factors as given in Table  $6A.4.5.4.2a-1$  shall be increased (by adding)  $0.10$ and applied on the two permit trucks placed in adjacent lanes.

When escorted special permits with no other vehicles on the bridge are evaluated using a refined analysis,  $\gamma_{L} = 1.1$  should be applied to the escorted vehicle.



#### Permit Checks (cont.)

When special permits mixed with traffic are evaluated using a refined analysis, a live load factor 1.0 shall be applied on the permit truck while a  $= 1.10$  shall be applied on the governing AASHTO legal truck placed in the adjacent lane.



# LRFR 3D with Single Permit





# Results Missing Vehicles





## **Conclusion**



# **Conclusion**

- LFR Engine produces all required rating results
- Ready to be used for rating production
- Will be more efficient after other issues resolved
- Would also be more efficient:
- (1) Extend  $d_0/D$  limit for shear capacity
	- (2) Extend the 300 foot span length limit
	- (3) Consider the bearing pin location
	- (4) List lateral force at support
- LRFR Engine needs more testing



# Questions?