

ABSTRACT

FIELD PERFORMANCE AND RATING EVALUATION OF A MODULAR PRESS-BRAKE-FORMED STEEL TUB GIRDER WITH A STEEL SANDWICH PLATE DECK

The Short Span Steel Bridge Alliance (SSSBA) is a group of bridge and culvert industry leaders (including steel manufacturers, fabricators, service centers, coaters, researchers, and representatives of related associations and government organizations) who have joined together to provide educational information on the design and construction of short span steel bridges in installations up to 140 feet in length. The SSSBA technical working group has developed a shallow press-brake-formed tub girder, a trapezoidal cold bent girder, to address the demand in the short span steel bridge market for rapid infrastructure replacement solutions.

Following extensive experimental testing and design work at West Virginia University, members of the SSSBA in collaboration with Intelligent Engineering of Ottawa, Canada and County Engineer Douglas Davis, P.E., designed and constructed the Cannelville Road Bridge in Muskingum County, Ohio. The structure is composed of two modular, tub girder and sandwich plate steel (SPS®) deck units that were constructed offsite and erected using accelerated bridge construction (ABC) methods. The structure is the second press-brake-formed steel tub girder bridge to be erected and is the first structure with a composite SPS® deck system. One year after construction, the structure was live load field tested by researchers from West Virginia University and Marshall University to assess its performance.

This study presents the analysis and conclusions of experimental testing and analytical modeling of the Cannelville Road Bridge. The procedure for both experimental and analytical testing is outlined within the content of this study. The results of these analyses were used to generate bottom flange bending stress, live load distribution factors (LLDFs), and interior and exterior girder ratings. These values, experimental and analytical, were then compared with equivalent LLDFs and live load girder ratings computed referencing American Association of Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) LRFD Specifications. The result of this testing evidences that current AASHTO LRFD Specifications for analyzing shallow press-brake-formed tub girders are conservative, with field performance exceeding the performance calculated. In addition to high performance, tub girders are practical in ABC applications and compatible with various deck designs as modular units. With a growing demand and need for rapid infrastructure replacement, shallow press-brake-formed tub girders have been proven to be an effective application in response to the growing industry demand.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	II
TABLE OF CONTENTS	III
LIST OF TABLES	VII
LIST OF FIGURES	VIII
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background / Overview	1
1.2 Project Scope & Objectives	2
1.3 Report Organization.....	2
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1 Introduction.....	4
2.2 Previous Applications of Cold-Bent Steel Girders	4
2.2.1 Prefabricated Press-Formed Steel T-Box Girder Bridge System (Taly & Gangarao, 1979)	4
2.2.2 Composite Girders with Cold Formed Steel U-sections (Nakamura, 2002)	6
2.2.3 Folded Plate Girders (Developed at the University of Nebraska)	7
2.2.4 Texas Department of Transportation Rapid Economical Bridge Replacement.....	8
2.3 Previous Research at WVU on Press-Brake-Formed Steel Tub Girders.....	9
2.3.1 Development and Feasibility Assessment of Shallow Press-Brake-Formed Steel Tub Girders for Short-Span Bridge Applications (Michaelson 2014)	9
2.3.2 Experimental Evaluation of Non-Composite Shallow Press-Brake-Formed Steel Tub Girders (Kelly, 2014)	13
2.3.3 Evaluation of Modular Press-Brake-Formed Tub Girders with UHPC Joints (Kozhokin, 2016)	15

2.3.4 Field Performance Assessment of Press-Brake-Formed Steel Tub Girder Superstructures (Gibbs, 2017)	17
2.3.5 Fatigue Performance of Uncoated and Galvanized Composite Press-Brake-Formed Tub Girders (Tennant, 2018)	18
2.4 Sandwich Plate Steel (SPS®) Deck Applications (Intelligent Engineering).....	20
2.5 FHWA’s Accelerated Innovation Deployment Demonstration Program (AID Demo)....	21
2.6 Current AASHTO Specifications for Tub Girder Design and Application	22
2.6.1 Multiple Presence Factor, Section 3.6.1.1.2 (AASHTO, 2017)	22
2.6.2 Beam-Slab Bridges – Live Load Distribution Factors, Section 4.6.2.2 (AASHTO, 2017)	23
2.6.3 Box-Section Flexural Members, Section 6.11 (AASHTO, 2017)	24
2.7 Current AASHTO Specifications for Superstructure Load Rating (MBE, 2018)	44
CHAPTER 3: DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE CANNELVILLE ROAD BRIDGE.....	47
3.1 Introduction.....	47
3.2 Summary of Design and Construction.....	47
3.2.1 Galvanic Coated Steel Press-Brake Tub Girder.....	48
3.2.2 Sandwich Plate Steel Deck System.....	49
3.2.3 Accelerated Bridge Construction Methods.....	49
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODS	51
4.1 Introduction.....	51
4.2 Experimental Testing Equipment	51
4.2.1 BDI Strain Transducers.....	51
4.2.2 STS-WiFi Data Acquisition System	53
4.2.3 Load Truck and Wheel Scales	56
4.3 Finite Element Modeling	57

4.3.1 Material Definitions	57
4.3.2 Element Selection	58
4.3.3 Mesh Discretization	58
4.3.4 Multiple Point Constraints and Boundary Conditions	59
4.3.5 Application of Live Loading.....	60
4.4 Data Reduction Methods.....	61
4.4.1 Computation of Midspan Bending Stresses	62
4.4.2 Computation of Live Load Distribution Factors.....	63
4.4.3 Girder Load Rating	66
CHAPTER 5: FIELD TESTING OF THE CANNELVILLE ROAD BRIDGE.....	70
5.1 Introduction.....	70
5.2 Live Load Field Test Assessment	70
5.2.1 Structure Instrumentation.....	70
5.2.2 Live Load Path Delineation	75
5.2.3 Live Load Testing.....	77
CHAPTER 6: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	79
6.1 Introduction.....	79
6.2 Comparison of results	79
6.2.1 Finite Element Modeling Results.....	79
6.2.2 Live Load Field Test Results	85
6.2.3 Comparison of Analytical and Experimental Results	89
6.3 Comparison of Live Load Distribution Factors with AASHTO Specifications	97
6.3.1 Live Load Distribution Factors	97
6.3.2 Live Load Girder Rating.....	99

6.4 Conclusions.....	102
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	103
7.1 Project Summary and Conclusions	103
7.2 Recommendations for Continued Work	104
REFERENCES	105
APPENDIX A: RESULTS FOR ALL TRUCK RUNS.....	108
A.1 Average Midspan Bending Stress	109
A.1.1 Live Load Field Test Results	109
A.1.2 Finite Element Analysis Results	113
A.1.3 Results Comparison: Live Load Field Test vs. Finite Element Analysis	117
A.2 Live Load Distribution Factors	131
A.2.1 Live Load Field Test Results	131
A.2.2 Finite Element Analysis Results	135
A.2.3 Results Comparison: Live Load Field Test vs. Finite Element Analysis	139
A.2.4 Results Comparison: Live Load Field Test , Finite Element Analysis, AASHTO Calculations.....	146
APPENDIX B: LARS BRIDGE CONNECT LOAD RATING OUTPUT	150
APPENDIX C: CANNELVILLE ROAD BRIDGE DESIGN PLANS	168