

**DEVELOPMENT AND EXPERIMENTAL TESTING OF PRESS-BRAKE-FORMED STEEL TUB GIRDERS FOR SHORT SPAN BRIDGE APPLICATIONS**

Karl E. Barth, Ph.D.

Gregory K. Michaelson, Ph.D.

Adam D. Roh

Robert M. Tennant, E.I.

**VOLUME VII: FIELD EVALUATION OF A MODULAR PRESS-BRAKE-FORMED STEEL TUB GIRDER IN AN APPLICATION THAT INCLUDES SKEW AND SUPERELEVATION**

Submitted to the AISI Steel Market

Development Institute Short Span

Steel Bridge Alliance

## **ABSTRACT**

### **FIELD EVALUATION OF A MODULAR PRESS-BRAKE-FORMED STEEL TUB GIRDER IN AN APPLICATION THAT INCLUDES SKEW AND SUPERELEVATION**

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'-0" in length. A technical working group from within the SSSBA developed the notion for the modular shallow press-brake-formed steel tub girder as a solution for the short span steel bridge market.

After extensive testing at West Virginia University and multiple successful field demonstrations, members of the SSSBA collaborated with the West Virginia Division of Highways to arrange implementation of this system. The Fourteen Mile Bridge located in Lincoln County, West Virginia, was chosen as a prime candidate to demonstrate the system due to the significant superelevation and skew present. Upon completion of the Fourteen Mile Bridge, researchers from Marshall University and West Virginia University traveled to the bridge site to perform a live load field test.

This study presents the results and evaluation from experimental and analytical testing of the Fourteen Mile Bridge. Additionally, the research methods for both the experimental and analytical testing are outlined. Live load distribution factors were computed from the experimental and analytical data and compared to those computed following the AASHTO LRFD specifications. The results of this comparison reflect that the AASHTO LRFD specifications are conservative in the analysis of press-brake-formed tub girders. This report also includes an initial qualitative examination of bracing configurations for non-composite press-brake-formed tub girders. The results provide the basis for extending the work towards a closer investigation to determine the best practices of bracing.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>II</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>VIII</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	<b>IX</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 BACKGROUND / OVERVIEW</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 PROJECT SCOPE &amp; OBJECTIVES</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1.3 REPORT ORGANIZATION</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2.1 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2.2 PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS OF COLD-BENT STEEL GIRDERS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<i>2.2.1 Prefabricated Press-Formed Steel T-Box Girder Bridge System (Taly &amp; Gangarao, 1979)</i> .....	<b>4</b>
<i>2.2.2 Composite Girders with Cold Formed Steel U-sections (Nakamura, 2002)</i> .....	<b>5</b>
<i>2.2.3 Folded Plate Girders (Developed at the University of Nebraska)</i> .....	<b>6</b>
<i>2.2.4 Texas Department of Transportation Rapid Economical Bridge Replacement</i> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>2.3 PREVIOUS RESEARCH AT WVU ON PRESS-BRAKE-FORMED STEEL TUB GIRDERS</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<i>2.3.1 Development and Feasibility Assessment of Shallow Press-Brake-Formed Steel Tub Girders for Short-Span Bridge Applications (Michaelson 2014)</i> .....	<b>8</b>
<i>2.3.2 Experimental Evaluation of Non-Composite Shallow Press-Brake-Formed Steel Tub Girders (Kelly, 2014)</i> .....	<b>13</b>
<i>2.3.3 Evaluation of Modular Press-Brake-Formed Tub Girders with UHPC Joints (Kozhokin, 2016)</i> .....	<b>14</b>

2.3.4 <i>Field Performance Assessment of Press-Brake-Formed Steel Tub Girder Superstructures (Gibbs, 2017)</i> .....	16
2.3.5 <i>Fatigue Performance of Uncoated and Galvanized Composite Press-Brake-Formed Tub Girders (Tennant, 2018)</i> .....	18
2.3.6 <i>Field Performance and Rating Evaluation of a Modular Press-Brake-Formed Steel Tub Girder with a Steel Sandwich Plate Deck (Underwood, 2019)</i> .....	20
<b>2.4 CURRENT AASHTO SPECIFICATIONS FOR TUB GIRDER DESIGN AND APPLICATION ..</b>	<b>22</b>
2.4.1 <i>Multiple Presence Factors</i> .....	22
2.4.2 <i>Beam-Slab Bridges – Live Load Distribution Factors</i> .....	23
2.4.3 <i>Box-Section Flexural Members</i> .....	24
<u>2.4.3.1 Cross Section Proportion Limits</u> .....	<u>24</u>
<u>2.4.3.2 Constructability</u> .....	<u>25</u>
<u>2.4.3.3 Service Limit State</u> .....	<u>28</u>
<u>2.4.3.4 Fatigue and Fracture Limit State</u> .....	<u>30</u>
<u>2.4.3.5 Strength Limit State</u> .....	<u>31</u>
2.4.3.5.1 <i>General Flexure Requirements</i> .....	32
2.4.3.5.2 <i>Flexural Capacity of Composite Sections, Positive Flexure</i> .....	33
2.4.3.5.3 <i>Flexural Capacity of Non-composite Sections</i> .....	36
2.4.3.5.4 <i>Shear Capacity</i> .....	40
<u>2.4.3.6 AASHTO Equation References</u> .....	<u>42</u>
<b>CHAPTER 3: DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE FOURTEEN MILE BRIDGE</b> .....	<b>46</b>
<b>3.1 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>46</b>
<b>3.2 SUMMARY OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</b> .....	<b>46</b>
3.2.1 <i>Fabrication of Modular Components</i> .....	47
3.2.2 <i>Installation of Modular Components</i> .....	52

3.2.3 Accelerated Bridge Construction Strategies.....	55
<b>CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODS .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>4.1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>4.2 EXPERIMENTAL TESTING EQUIPMENT .....</b>	<b>56</b>
4.2.1 BDI Strain Transducers .....	56
4.2.2 STS-WiFi Data Acquisition System.....	57
4.2.3 Load Truck and Wheel Scales.....	59
<b>4.3 FINITE ELEMENT MODELING.....</b>	<b>60</b>
4.3.1 Material Definitions.....	60
4.3.2 Element Selection.....	61
4.3.3 Mesh Discretization .....	61
4.3.4 Boundary Conditions and Multiple Point Constraints .....	63
4.3.5 Application of Live Loading.....	63
<b>4.4 DATA REDUCTION METHODS.....</b>	<b>64</b>
4.4.1 Computation of Quarter Span Bending Stresses .....	64
4.4.2 Computation of Live Load Distribution Factors .....	65
<b>CHAPTER 5: FIELD TESTING OF THE FOURTEEN MILE BRIDGE .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>5.1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>5.2 LIVE LOAD FIELD TEST ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>69</b>
5.2.1 Structure Instrumentation .....	69
5.2.2 Live Load Path Delineation.....	75
5.2.3 Live Load Testing.....	79
<b>CHAPTER 6: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>6.1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>81</b>

<b>6.2 COMPARISON OF RESULTS .....</b>	<b>81</b>
6.2.1 <i>Live Load Field Test Results.....</i>	81
<u>6.2.1.1 <i>Live Load Distribution Factors.....</i></u>	<u>82</u>
6.2.2 <i>Comparison of Analytical and Experimental Results .....</i>	83
<b>6.3 COMPARISON OF LIVE LOAD DISTRIBUTION FACTORS WITH AASHTO LRFD SPECIFICATIONS .....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>6.4 CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>CHAPTER 7: QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF BRACING EFFECTIVENESS AND TORSIONAL RESPONSE FOR NON-COMPOSITE TUB GIRDERS .....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>7.1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>7.2 VERIFICATION WITH KELLY’S MODEL .....</b>	<b>89</b>
7.2.1 <i>Geometric Imperfections.....</i>	89
7.2.2 <i>Material Modeling .....</i>	92
7.2.3 <i>Element Selection.....</i>	94
7.2.4 <i>Riks Loading Algorithm.....</i>	94
7.2.5 <i>Comparison with Kelly’s Model .....</i>	95
<b>7.3 BRACING SCENARIOS .....</b>	<b>96</b>
7.3.1 <i>Internal Bracing Scenarios.....</i>	96
7.3.2 <i>External Bracing Scenarios .....</i>	97
<b>7.4 RESULTS OF FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>98</b>
7.4.1 <i>Comparison of Internal Bracing Scenarios .....</i>	99
7.4.2 <i>Comparison of External Bracing Scenarios .....</i>	100
<b>7.5 CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>8.1 PROJECT SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>103</b>

<b>8.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUED WORK .....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: RESULTS FOR ALL TRUCK RUNS.....</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>A.1 LIVE LOAD DISTRIBUTION FACTORS.....</b>	<b>107</b>
<i>A.1.1 Live Load Field Test Results .....</i>	<i>107</i>
<i>A.1.2 Finite Element Analysis Results .....</i>	<i>111</i>
<i>A.1.3 Results Comparison: Live Load Field Test vs. Finite Element Analysis.....</i>	<i>111</i>
<i>A.1.4 Results Comparison: Live Load Field Test, Finite Element Analysis, AASHTO Calculations .....</i>	<i>116</i>
<b>APPENDIX B: FINITE ELEMENT MODELING PROGRAM.....</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: FOURTEEN MILE BRIDGE DESIGN PLANS.....</b>	<b>174</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table 2.1: Summary of Distribution Factors (Kozhokin, 2016)</i> .....	16
<i>Table 2.2: Multiple Presence Factors (AASHTO, 2017)</i> .....	22
<i>Table 2.3: Chapter 2 Equation Legend (AASHTO, 2017)</i> .....	43
<i>Table 4.1: Typical Aspect Ratio for Girder Elements</i> .....	62
<i>Table 4.2: Strain Values, Quarter Span Bending Stress</i> .....	65
<i>Table 4.3: Strain Values, Single Lane Loaded LLDF Sample Calculation</i> .....	66
<i>Table 4.4: Strain Values, Two Lanes Loaded LLDF Sample Calculation</i> .....	67
<i>Table 6.1: Measured Strain from Truck Run 1, Experimental</i> .....	82
<i>Table 6.2: Computed Live Load Distribution Factors from Truck Run 1, Experimental</i> .....	83
<i>Table 6.3: Comparison of Field and FEA Live Load Distribution Factors, One Lane Loaded</i> ... 84	
<i>Table 6.4: Comparison of Field and FEA Live Load Distribution Factors, Two Lanes Loaded</i> . 84	
<i>Table 6.5: Comparison of Field, FEA and AASHTO Live Load Distribution Factors, One Lane Loaded Truck Run 1</i> .....	86
<i>Table 6.6: Comparison of Field, FEA, and AASHTO Live Load Distribution Factors, Two Lanes Loaded Truck Run 1 and 4</i> .....	87
<i>Table 7.1: Expressions for Computing Steel Stress-Strain Behavior (Galindez, 2009)</i> .....	93

## LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Figure 2:1: T-Box Girder System, Typical Girder Section with 5” Pre-cast, Prestressed Concrete Slab (Taly &amp; Gangarao, 1979)</i> .....	5
<i>Figure 2:2: Nakamura’s Proposed Bridge System (Nakamura, 2002)</i> .....	6
<i>Figure 2:3: Folded Plate Girder and Composite Deck Cross Section (Burner, 2010)</i> .....	7
<i>Figure 2:4: Cross Section of Box Girder from Bridge FM 3267 (Chandar et al., 2010)</i> .....	8
<i>Figure 2:5: Design Comparison of 84” Wide Standard Mill Plate (Michaelson, 2014)</i> .....	9
<i>Figure 2:6: Typical Section, Composite Test Specimen (Michaelson, 2014)</i> .....	10
<i>Figure 2:7: Typical Ductile Failure of Composite Girder Section (Michaelson, 2014)</i> .....	11
<i>Figure 2:8: Typical Lateral Failure of Non-Composite Girder Section (Michaelson, 2014)</i> .....	11
<i>Figure 2:9: Comparison of Analytical and Experimental Results (Michaelson, 2014)</i> .....	12
<i>Figure 2:10: Initial Twist of Specimen #2 (Kelly, 2014)</i> .....	13
<i>Figure 2:11: Deflection at Quarter Points (Kelly, 2014)</i> .....	14
<i>Figure 2:12: Exposed Aggregate Finish of Shear Key Detail (Kozhokin, 2016)</i> .....	15
<i>Figure 2:13: New Amish Sawmill Bridge (Gibbs, 2017)</i> .....	17
<i>Figure 2:14: FEA v. Experimental v. AASHTO LLDFs (Gibbs, 2017)</i> .....	18
<i>Figure 2:15: Uncoated Steel Girder Under Fatigue Loading (Tennant, 2018)</i> .....	19
<i>Figure 2:16: Galvanized Steel Girder (Tennant, 2018)</i> .....	19
<i>Figure 2:17: Cannelville Road Bridge Modular Unit (Underwood, 2019)</i> .....	20
<i>Figure 2:18: Field v. FEA v. AASHTO LLDFs (Underwood, 2019)</i> .....	21
<i>Figure 2:19: Center-to-Center Flange Distance (AASHTO, 2017)</i> .....	23
<i>Figure 2:20 Live Load Deflection Limits (AASHTO, 2017)</i> .....	28
<i>Figure 3:1: Aerial View of Bridge Under Construction</i> .....	47
<i>Figure 3:2: Galvanized Tub Girder, Prior to Formwork Construction</i> .....	48
<i>Figure 3:3: Tub Girder with Completed Internal Formwork</i> .....	49
<i>Figure 3:4: Isometric View of Reusable External Formwork</i> .....	50
<i>Figure 3:5: Close View of Rebar Placement at Semi-Integral Abutment End</i> .....	50
<i>Figure 3:6: Casting of Fresh Concrete</i> .....	51
<i>Figure 3:7: Finished Concrete Deck</i> .....	51
<i>Figure 3:8: Test Fit of Two Precast Modules at Fabrication Yard</i> .....	52
<i>Figure 3:9: Composite Module Delivered to Site</i> .....	53

<i>Figure 3:10: Placement of First Composite Module On-Site</i> .....	53
<i>Figure 3:11: Verification of Fit of Adjacent Modules on Site</i> .....	54
<i>Figure 3:12: Pouring of UHPC Along Longitudinal Joint</i> .....	54
<i>Figure 3:13: Diamond Grinder Used to Finish Deck On-Site</i> .....	55
<i>Figure 4:1: BDI Strain Transducer, Typical Application to Girder</i> .....	57
<i>Figure 4:2: BDI STS-WiFi Wireless 4-Channel Node</i> .....	58
<i>Figure 4:3: BDI STS-WiFi Mobile Base Station</i> .....	58
<i>Figure 4:4: Tandem Axle Dump Truck used for Live Load Test</i> .....	59
<i>Figure 4:5: Haenni Wheel Load Weigher Scale</i> .....	60
<i>Figure 4:6: Typical Mesh Discretization for Each Tub Girder</i> .....	62
<i>Figure 4:7: Nodal Distribution of Point Loads (Michaelson, 2010)</i> .....	63
<i>Figure 5:1: Gage Locations on Girders, Looking Upstation</i> .....	70
<i>Figure 5:2: Aerial Lift Supplied by Contractor</i> .....	70
<i>Figure 5:3: Centerline of Gages at Quarter Span, Looking Upstream</i> .....	71
<i>Figure 5:4: Typical Bottom Flange Gage Mounting Points, Looking Upstream</i> .....	72
<i>Figure 5:5: Typical Web Gage Mounting Points, Looking Downstream</i> .....	72
<i>Figure 5:6: Typical Tab Mounting to Steel Surface</i> .....	73
<i>Figure 5:7: Typical View of Gages Installed on Bottom Flange, Looking Downstream</i> .....	74
<i>Figure 5:8: Overview of Instrumentation, Looking Backstation</i> .....	74
<i>Figure 5:9: Nail placement in Foam Joint with Construction String Line Wrapped Taut</i> .....	75
<i>Figure 5:10: Parallel Longitudinal Delineations on Deck with Construction String Line</i> .....	76
<i>Figure 5:11: Transverse Mark Completed with Blue Crayon</i> .....	76
<i>Figure 5:12: Plan View of Panel Point Grid</i> .....	77
<i>Figure 5:13: Live Load Truck Placement, Looking Upstation</i> .....	78
<i>Figure 5:14: Typical Truck Pass Location</i> .....	79
<i>Figure 5:15: Truck Dimensions and Field Weight Measurements</i> .....	80
<i>Figure 6:1: Deflected Shape of Finite Element Model, Truck Run 1, Panel Point 5</i> .....	84
<i>Figure 6:2: Comparison Between Analytical and Experimental Live Load Distribution Factors for Single and Two Lane Loaded Conditions</i> .....	85
<i>Figure 6:3: Comparison of Field, FEA and AASHTO Live Load Distribution Factors, One Lane Loaded Truck Run 1</i> .....	87

<i>Figure 6:4: Comparison of Field, FEA, and AASHTO Live Load Distribution Factors, Two Lanes Loaded Truck Run 1 and 4.....</i>	<i>88</i>
<i>Figure 7:1: Flange Inclinations (Kelly, 2014) .....</i>	<i>90</i>
<i>Figure 7:2: Web Inclinations (Kelly, 2014).....</i>	<i>90</i>
<i>Figure 7:3: Tub Girder Modeled with Flange Tilt.....</i>	<i>91</i>
<i>Figure 7:4: Tub Girder Modeled with Girder Twist .....</i>	<i>91</i>
<i>Figure 7:5: Tub Girder Modeled with Web Out of Flatness .....</i>	<i>92</i>
<i>Figure 7:6: Multi-linear Stress-Strain Curve.....</i>	<i>93</i>
<i>Figure 7:7: Vertical Deflection at Midspan for Unbraced Girder and Kelly (2014).....</i>	<i>96</i>
<i>Figure 7:8: Internal Bracing Scenarios .....</i>	<i>97</i>
<i>Figure 7:9: External Bracing Scenarios.....</i>	<i>98</i>
<i>Figure 7:10: Lateral Displacement Comparison for Internal Bracing Scenarios .....</i>	<i>99</i>
<i>Figure 7:11: Lateral Displacement Comparison for Internal Bracing Scenarios .....</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Figure 7:12: Lateral Displacement Comparison for External Bracing Scenarios .....</i>	<i>101</i>
<i>Figure 7:13: Vertical Displacement Comparison for External Bracing Scenarios .....</i>	<i>101</i>