

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

PREVIEW

COMPOSITE ACTION IN BRIDGE I-GIRDER SYSTEMS

by

Hussam F. Kakish

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**Major: Interdepartmental Area of Engineering
(Civil Engineering)**

Under the Supervision of Professor Maher K. Tadros

Lincoln, Nebraska

August, 1997

UMI Number: 9736937

UMI Microform 9736937
Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

DISSERTATION TITLE

Composite Action in Bridge I-Girder Systems

BY

Hussam F. Kakish

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

APPROVED

DATE

Maher K. Tadros
Signature 7/31/97
DATE

Dr. Maher Tadros
Typed Name
Atorod Azizinamini
Signature 7/25/97
DATE

Dr. Atorod Azizinamini
Typed Name
Gary I Krause
Signature 7-25-97
DATE

Dr. Gary Krause
Typed Name
Jack Heidel by MKT
Signature 7-25-97
DATE

Dr. Jack Heidel
Typed Name
Massoum Moussavi
Signature 7/25/97
DATE

Dr. Massoum Moussavi
Typed Name
Chris Tuan
Signature 7-25-97
DATE

Dr. Chris Tuan
Typed Name



GRADUATE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

COMPOSITE ACTION IN BRIDGE I-GIRDER SYSTEMS

Hussam F. Kakish, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska, 1997

Advisor: Maher K. Tadros

This thesis investigate the development of new connection systems for composite action in both concrete and steel girder bridges. The new systems will enhance and accelerate the replacement process of concrete bridge decks, and provide sufficient composite action to resist the horizontal shear at the girder-to-deck interface. The new systems include a debonded interface with formed shear key protruding from the precast girders and steel connectors for concrete girders; 1- $\frac{1}{4}$ in. diameter steel shear studs and a new “dovetail” shaped connector plate for steel girder construction.

Test program consisting of horizontal shear push-off specimens, lab size beams, and full scale girders was conducted on all proposed connection schemes. Test results show that the debonded shear key system with a steel connectors spaced at 24 in. along the length of the girder provides sufficient horizontal shear resistance utilizing the shear friction theory. The 1- $\frac{1}{4}$ in. diameter steel shear studs appears to have high fatigue resistance and higher α values as compared to both AASHTO Standard and AASHTO LRFD Specifications. The ultimate strength capacity of the 1- $\frac{1}{4}$ in. studs found to be twice the

capacity of the conventional 7/8 in. diameter studs. The testing conducted so far on the steel dovetail plate connector has demonstrated the viability of the new system. Its strength was found to depend upon the amount of reinforcement transverse to the plate connector. The dovetail connector does show a merit as a possible standard composite connection method for all sizes of steel girder bridges. Design criteria and procedures for the new connection systems are presented.

PREVIEW

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deep and sincere appreciation to my advisor Dr. Maher K. Tadros for his guidance, professionalism, and encouragement throughout my Ph.D. program. I wish to thank my supervisory committee, Dr. Atorod Azizinamini, Dr. Jack Heidel, Dr. Gary Krause, Dr. Massoum Moussavi, and Dr. Chris Tuan, for their cooperation and support. I also thank Dr. Mantu Baishya for his technical advice and assistance during the experimental testing program and on many other occasions.

Special thanks to Project members, Bill Dowd, Phil Rossbach, Hussein Khalil of HDR Engineering, Inc; Dr. Sharad Mote, Gary Pietrock, Frank Watt, and Jerry Thoendel of Kiewit Construction Company. Thanks also goes to all the other faculty, staff, and graduate students in the Civil Engineering Department and the Center for Infrastructure Research.

Last but not least, my deepest appreciation to my family and friends for their moral support during my college career.

Table of Contents

List of Figures	i
List of Tables	vi
List of Notations	vii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Concrete Girder-to-Deck Connection System	4
2.1 Introduction	4
2.2 Literature Review	5
2.2.1 Introduction	5
2.2.2 Linear Shear Friction Equation	6
2.2.3 Horizontal Shear Failure and Critical Slip Limit	8
2.2.4 Precracked vs. Uncracked Interfaces	9
2.2.5 Push-off Tests vs. Beam Tests	11
2.2.6 Horizontal Shear Strength Design Equations	12
2.2.7 Code Equations for Horizontal Shear Design	16
2.3 Overview of the Debonded Interface Shear Key System	21
2.4 Theoretical Analysis of the Debonded Shear Key System	27
2.5 Computation of Horizontal Shear Stresses	33
2.6 Analytical Derivation of the Elastic Horizontal Shear Equation	36
2.7 Composite Loads	38

2.8 Configuration of Shear Keys	40
2.8.1 Bearing Strength	40
2.8.2 Shear Strength at Base of Shear Key	41
2.8.3 Configuration of Shear Keys and Connectors for NU Girders	42
2.8.3.1 Height of the Shear Key	42
2.8.3.2 Area at Base of the Shear Key	42
2.8.3.3 Connectors Spacing	44
2.9 Testing Program	48
2.9.1 Introduction	48
2.9.2 Push-off Tests	49
2.9.3 Beam Tests	53
2.9.4 Full Scale Tests	61
2.9.4.1 Introduction	61
2.9.4.2 Fabrication of Test Specimen	62
2.9.4.3 Experimental Program and Test Procedures	65
2.9.4.4 Analysis of Test Results	68
2.9.5 Deck Removal	74
2.10 Proposed Changes to Horizontal Shear Code Provisions	75
2.10.1 Proposed Changes to AASHTO LRFD	75
2.10.1.1 Additions and Revisions	75
2.10.1.2 Background	76
2.10.1.3 Advantages of the Proposed Changes	78
2.10.2 Proposed Changes to ACI Code	80
2.10.2.1 Additions and Revisions	80
2.10.2.2 Background	80

2.10.2.3 Advantages of the Proposed Changes	81
2.11 Conclusions	84
Chapter 3 Use of Large Studs for Steel Girder Bridge Composite Action	85
3.1 Introduction	85
3.2 Literature Review	86
3.2.1 Introduction	86
3.2.2 Pushout Tests vs. Beam Tests	87
3.2.3 Configuration of the pushout Specimens	88
3.2.4 Schemes of Loading for Ultimate Strength Test	91
3.2.5 Critical Slip	91
3.2.6 Shear Strength of the Welded Shear Stud	92
3.2.7 Splitting Induced by Shear Connectors in Composite Beams	94
3.2.8 Fatigue Strength of the Welded Shear Stud	95
3.3 Development of Larger Diameter Stud and Welding Equipment	98
3.3.1 Introduction	98
3.3.2 Stud Material and Welding Process	98
3.3.3 Inspection of Welded Studs	101
3.4 Overview of the Experimental Program	104
3.5 Fabrication of Test Specimen	112
3.6 Description of Tests and Test Set-up	112
3.6.1 Fatigue Tests	112
3.6.2 Ultimate Tests	115
3.7 Observations During Testing	116
3.7.1 Fatigue Tests	116

3.7.2 Ultimate Tests	116
3.8 Analysis of Test Results	120
3.8.1 Fatigue Tests	120
3.8.2 Ultimate Tests	125
3.9 Full Scale Test	130
3.9.1 Introduction	130
3.9.2 Purpose of Test	130
3.9.3 Fabrication of Test Specimens	131
3.9.4 Experimental Program and Test Procedures	133
3.9.5 Analysis of Test Results	139
3.9.5.1 Slippage	139
3.9.5.2 Strains and Stresses Distribution	140
3.9.5.3 Deck Removal	143
3.10 Design Criteria	149
3.10.1 Fatigue Design	149
3.10.2 Strength Design	153
3.10.3 Studs Spacing	157
3.11 Design Example	159
3.11.1 Problem Statment	159
3.11.2 Fatigue Design	160
3.11.3 Strength Design	161
3.12 Cost Analysis of 1- ¹ / ₄ in. and 7/8 in. Shear Studs	166
3.11 Conclusions	169

Chapter 4 Steel Girder-to-Deck Connection	171
4.1 Introduction	171
4.2 Literature Review	171
4.3 Overview of the Steel Dovetail Plate Connector	174
4.4 Overview of the Test Program	175
4.5 Test Setup and Procedure	179
4.6 Test Results	180
4.7 Design Crieteria	184
4.8 Conclusions	187
References	188
Appendix A Design Calculations of Concrete Full Scale Girder	A-1
Appendix B Design Calculations of Steel Full Scale Girder	B-1
Appendix C Analysis of Composite Loads	C-1

List of Figures

Figure 2.1	Shear Friction Analogy	6
Figure 2.2	Hofbeck, Ibrahim, and Mattock Equation	10
Figure 2.3	Loov and Patniaks Equation	17
Figure 2.4	Horizontal Shear Capacity According to Various Codes	20
Figure 2.5	Overview of the New Composite System	21
Figure 2.6	Shear Key's Form Details	22
Figure 2.7	Details of Proposed Steel Shear Connectors	24
Figure 2.8	Proposed Composite System for NU Girder	25
Figure 2.9	Shear Keys on Full Scale NU Girder	26
Figure 2.10	Shear Keys on Full Scale NU Girder	26
Figure 2.11	Mechanism of Proposed Composite Debonded Shear Key Connection	27
Figure 2.12	Analytical Prediction of Coefficients of Friction for Debonded System with Shear Keys	32
Figure 2.13	Deflected Noncomposite and Composite Beams	34
Figure 2.14	Development of Horizontal Shear Stress Expression	37
Figure 2.15	Composite Loads	39
Figure 2.16	Upper and Lower Bound of Shear Key Height	46
Figure 2.17	Upper and Lower Bound of Shear Key Area.....	46
Figure 2.18	Upper and Lower Bound of Steel Connector (b1) Spacing.....	47
Figure 2.19	Push-off Specimen Details	49
Figure 2.20	Ultimate Test Setup for Push-off Specimens	50
Figure 2.21	Ultimate Test Setup for Push-off Specimens	51
Figure 2.22	Load-Slip Curves of Ultimate Tests	52

Figure 2.23	Details of B1 and B2	54
Figure 2.24	Details of B1 and B2	55
Figure 2.25	Test Setup of Beam Tests	57
Figure 2.26	Results of Beam 1 and 2	58
Figure 2.27	Results of Beam 3 and 4	59
Figure 2.28	Beam 2 at Failure	60
Figure 2.29	Beam 4 at Failure	60
Figure 2.30	Assembling Shear Key's Forms	62
Figure 2.31	Assembling Steel Connectors	63
Figure 2.32	Pouring Concrete Girder	63
Figure 2.33	Applying Debonding Agent	64
Figure 2.34	Pouring Concrete Deck	64
Figure 2.35	Test Setup of Concrete Full Scale Girder	66
Figure 2.36	Setup for Flexural Test	67
Figure 2.37	Setup for Shear Test	67
Figure 2.38	Experimental Midspan Strain and Stress Distribution	69
Figure 2.39	Load Vs. Deflection Test Results for Bonded Composite Member ...	70
Figure 2.40	Load Vs. Deflection Test Results for Debonded Composite Member	70
Figure 2.41	Load Vs. Slip Test Results for Debonded Composite Member	71
Figure 2.42	Load Vs. Slip Test Results for Shear Test of the Debonded Composite Member	72
Figure 2.43	First Girder at Failure	73
Figure 2.44	Second Girder at Failure	73
Figure 2.45	Proposed AASHTO LRFD Horizontal Shear Equations Compared to its' Current Equation	79

Figure 2.46	Proposed ACI Horizontal Shear Equation Compared to Various Methods	82
Figure 2.47	Proposed ACI Horizontal Shear Equation Compared to test Results	83
Figure 3.1	Slutter and Fisher Pushout Specimens	89
Figure 3.2	Viest Pushout Specimens	89
Figure 3.3	Naithani, Gupta and Gahd Pushout Specimens	90
Figure 3.4	Tensile Cracking Induced by Concentrated Load	95
Figure 3.5	Details of the Proposed 1- $\frac{1}{4}$ in. Studs	99
Figure 3.6	Arc Welding Process for Steel Studs	100
Figure 3.7	Modifed Stud Gun for 1- $\frac{1}{4}$ in. Stud	101
Figure 3.8	Quality Control Inspection Device	103
Figure 3.9	Quality Control Inspection Device	104
Figure 3.10	Steel Stud Push-off Specimen, Series (I,TT)	108
Figure 3.11	Steel Stud Push-off Specimen, Series (II&IV, TTTT&RTTTT)	109
Figure 3.12	Steel Stud Push-off Specimen, Series (II,TITI)	109
Figure 3.13	Steel Stud Push-off Specimen, Series (II,TIIT)	110
Figure 3.14	Steel Stud Push-off Specimen, Series (III,tttt)	110
Figure 3.15	Steel Stud Push-off Specimen, Series (V,STITI)	111
Figure 3.16	Steel Stud Push-off Specimen, Series (V,ATITI)	111
Figure 3.17	Fatigue Tests	114
Figure 3.18	Ultimate Strength Test for Series I, II, III, and IV	115
Figure 3.19	Ultimate Strength Test for SeriesV	115
Figure 3.20	Ultimate Failure of 1- $\frac{1}{4}$ in. Steel Studs	117
Figure 3.21	Ultimate Failure of 1- $\frac{1}{4}$ in. Steel Studs	118
Figure 3.22	Crack in the concrete for 1- $\frac{1}{4}$ in. Steel Studs Specimens	118

Figure 3.23	Ultimate Strength of 7/8 in. Steel Studs	119
Figure 3.24	Ultimate Strength of 7/8 in. Steel Studs	119
Figure 3.25	Stud Fatigue Results Compared to Slutter and Fisher's	121
Figure 3.26	Ultimate Tests of 1-1/4 in. Steel Studs	128
Figure 3.27	Ultimate Tests of 7/8 in and 1-1/4 in. Steel Studs	128
Figure 3.28	Ultimate Tests of 1-1/4 in. Steel Studs after Fatigue was Applied	129
Figure 3.29	Ultimate Tests of 1-1/4 in. Steel Studs for Group V	129
Figure 3.30	Stage I of Construction	131
Figure 3.31	Stage II of Construction	132
Figure 3.32	Stage III of Construction	132
Figure 3.33	Setup for Fatigue Loading	135
Figure 3.34	Setup for monotonic Loading at Endspan	136
Figure 3.35	Setup for Fatigue Loading	137
Figure 3.36	Setup for monotonic Loading at Endspan	137
Figure 3.37	Strain Gages Locations at Full Scale Test for Steel Girder	138
Figure 3.38	Setup for monotonic Loading at Midspan	138
Figure 3.39	Stress Distribution at 4 ft from End Support	141
Figure 3.40	Stress Distribution at midspan	142
Figure 3.41	Saw Cutting Lines of the Slab	144
Figure 3.42	Cutting along the Longitudinal Direction	145
Figure 3.43	Cutting along the Transverse Direction	145
Figure 3.44	Removing Section 1a	146
Figure 3.45	Jack Hammering around the Studs	146
Figure 3.46	Removing Remaining Sections of the Slab	147
Figure 3.47	Breaking Concrete from around the Studs	147

Figure 3.48	Studs after Complete Deck Removal	148
Figure 3.49	Stud Deformation in Concrete.....	155
Figure 3.50	Lower and Upper Bound of Stud Spacing	158
Figure 3.51	Bridge Cross Section	159
Figure 3.52	Shear Connector Pitch	165
Figure 4.1	Perfobond Strip Connector by Leonhardt	173
Figure 4.2	Dovetail Shear Connector Details	174
Figure 4.3	Photo of Steel Dovetail Shear Connector	177
Figure 4.4	Applying Stresses to reinforcing Bars	178
Figure 4.5	Dovetail Plate Shear Connector Specimens Details	178
Figure 4.6	Ultimate Strength Test Setup	179
Figure 4.7	Ultimate Tests of Dovetail Shear Connector (Group I)	181
Figure 4.8	Ultimate Tests of Dovetail Shear Connector (Group II)	182
Figure 4.9	Ultimate Tests of Dovetail Shear Connector (Group II)	182
Figure 4.10	Dovetail Push-off Specimens at Failure	183
Figure 4.11	Dovetail Push-off Specimens at Failure	183
Figure 4.12	Dovetail Connector Test Results Vs. Linear Shear Friction and Loov's Equations	185

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Parametric Study of NU Girders	45
Table 2.2	Push-off Specimens Test results Designation and Description of Push-off Specimens	106
Table 3.2	Steel Stud Fatigue Specimen	113
Table 3.3	Fatigue Test Results of 1- $\frac{1}{4}$ in. Diameter Shear Studs	120
Table 3.4	Capacity of 1- $\frac{1}{4}$ in. Welded Shear Studs	127
Table 3.5	Slippage Measurements	139
Table 3.6	Parametric Study of Stud Shear Connector Spacing	151
Table 3.7	Summary of the Fatigue Design	161
Table 3.8	Summary of Elastic Theory Approach	164
Table 4.1	Designation of Dovetail Shear Connector Specimens	176
Table 4.2	Capacity of the Steel Dovetail Shear Connector	181

List of Notation

a	=	depth of equivalent compression zone at nominal strength
A_{bs}	=	area of concrete dowel in shear
A_{cc}	=	area of concrete in the plane of the connector
A_{DT}	=	area of one dovetail connector
A_{sc}	=	cross-sectional area of a stud shear connector
A_{sk}	=	area of shear key at its' base
A_{st}	=	area of steel
A_{hole}	=	cross-sectional area of hole
A_{vf}	=	area of vertical steel reinforcement crossing the interface
b	=	width of section
b_v	=	width of interface
c	=	cohesion coefficient
C	=	total compression force acting in the section
d	=	distance from extreme compression fiber to centroid of steel
d_s	=	diameter of stud
DL	=	bridge dead load
E_c	=	concrete modulus of elasticity
f_u	=	ultimate stress
f_y	=	yield strength of non-prestressed steel
f'_c	=	concrete compressive strength
f_{cl}	=	clamping stress
f_{max}	=	maximum applied stress
f_{min}	=	minimum applied stress

G	=	shear modulus
h	=	overall depth of the member
I	=	moment of inertia of the section
I_{cr}	=	cracked moment of inertia
l_s	=	effective bar length in shear
l_t	=	effective bar length in tension
LL	=	bridge live load
M_{cr}	=	cracking moment
M_n	=	nominal midspan moment
M_u	=	ultimate midspan moment
N	=	number of fatigue cycles
P	=	applied force
P_c	=	net compressive force normal to shear interface
P_y	=	tensile force in the connector
P_{xy}	=	shear force in the connector
Q	=	first moment of area
Q_{cr}	=	shear stud critical ultimate load
Q_n	=	shear stud nominal horizontal shear stress (AASHTO LRFD)
q_u	=	ultimate strength
t	=	height of shear key
s	=	steel spacing
S_c	=	spacing of shear connectors
S_{sk}	=	spacing of shear keys
SF	=	ultimate shear force per hole in Perfobond Strip or per one Dovetail connector
S_r	=	applied stress range

S_u	=	shear stud ultimate horizontal shear strength (AASHTO 15th Ed.)
V_n	=	nominal vertical shear force
V_u	=	ultimate vertical shear force
v	=	horizontal shear stress
v_{nh}	=	nominal horizontal shear stress
v_{uh}	=	ultimate horizontal shear stress
w	=	width of dovetail at its' base
Z_r	=	shear stud allowable range of shear force
Δ	=	displacement
α	=	fatigue coefficient for shear studs
δ	=	local coefficient of friction
ϵ_x	=	tensile strain in the x direction
ϵ_y	=	tensile strain in the y direction
ϕ	=	reduction factor
γ_{xy}	=	shear strain
λ	=	constant used for the effect of concrete density
μ	=	friction coefficient between the two surfaces
μ_e	=	effective coefficient of friction
ν	=	poisson's ratio of steel reinforcement
ρ_v	=	area of reinforcement crossing the surface per unit area
σ_y	=	tensile stress
τ_{xy}	=	shear stress
ω	=	$\frac{\rho_v f_y}{f'_c}$

Chapter 1

Introduction

The objective of this research is to develop new connection systems for both concrete and steel girder bridges which facilitate future bridge deck replacement and provide full composite action. Composite action in structures may be considered as the interaction of different structural elements and may be developed using either different or similar structural materials, in which these materials act together as a single unit under superimposed load. The most common composite construction in bridges consists of cast-in-place (CIP) reinforced concrete slab on either a precast concrete or steel beam.

The composite construction is smaller, shallower, and lighter than non-composite construction and thus leads to overall cost savings. The most common connection between the slab and the steel beams are welded studs and C channels. For concrete girders, extended steel shear reinforcing, and the natural bond between the concrete deck and the concrete girder are the most common connections.

The increasing traffic demand on bridges in the United States during the last 20 years and the use of deicing salts have caused increased bridge deck deterioration which, in turn, raises the need for deck replacement. In areas of heavy traffic volume, deck replacement

often must be performed in a short period of time. A girder-to-deck connection which facilitates rapid deck replacement is, therefore, a high priority.

Extra effort and care is needed to remove the deteriorated concrete from around the connectors used to provide the composite action and from the girder top flange. This is especially evident in concrete girder bridges where the concrete girder surface is bonded to the concrete deck. Deck removal could be enhanced if the bond between the concrete girder top flange and the concrete deck could be eliminated by a debonded mechanical system, such as debonded shear key interface with steel ties crossing the interface.

Steel studs are the most common method for providing composite action between the concrete deck and steel girders. The studs are welded to the top flange through an efficient stud-gun welding process. The relatively small spacing between the studs along the length of the girder or the number of studs per row can sometimes slow deck removal. If the spacing between studs is increased to the Specification limitations or the number of studs per row is decreased, through the use of larger diameter studs, the removal process could be enhanced.

The connection systems developed in this study include those for both steel and concrete girders. The objective of these connections is to speed up deck removal without damaging the connectors or the girder top flange, and to provide the full composite action and the horizontal shear strength needed in the girder-to-deck connection.

A test program was developed to evaluate the horizontal shear strength of the proposed connections through the use of push-off specimens, lab size beam specimens, and full