Theme II: Safety concepts, with particular emphasis on reinforced and prestressed concrets

Objekttyp: **Group**

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

Band (Jahr): **3 (1969)**

PDF erstellt am: **22.05.2024**

Safety concepts, with particular emphasis on reinforced and prestressed concrete

Concepts de sécurité dans le domaine du béton armé et du béton précontraint

Sicherheitsbetrachtungen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Stahl- und Spannbetons

R. E. ROWE
M.A., Sc.D., M.I.C.E., A.M.I.Struct.E.
Director of Research and Development
Cement and Concrete Association, Wexham Springs

INTRODUCTION

The civil and structural engineering professions have always been concerned with the safety of the projects they were creating. Originally, the safety concept was embodied in the experience and intuition of the designer; this was a period in which experimental design was practised and, although many failures occurred, they led to an improved understanding of structural behaviour which, in turn, ensured an increased safety in subsequent projects. Following this period, and with the introduction of the theory of elasticity, the safety concept began to be formally expressed in the, so-called, factor of safety and the associated permissible stresses in materials. This period could, perhaps unkindly, be called the "little learning is a dangerous thing" period since a limited knowledge of material properties and loads was associated with an assumed improvement in the understanding of structural behaviour. It was certainly a productive and creative period and, apparently, gave a satisfactory degree of safety from the structural viewpoint; the only difficulty was that no one knew how much ! Whatever degree of safety was present then began to be reduced by increases in permissible stresses, these being justified by improvements in analysis, quality control and construction processes. At this stage, it began to be appreciated that the ultimate strength of members and structures could be utilized in a somewhat different concept of safety, namely that associated with load factors. This approach to safety was associated with the development of plastic methods of structural analysis and, while obviously a considerable improvement on previous treatments, the central problem of defining the safety concept and expressing it in a rational manner had still not been resolved.

This potted history of the treatment of safety concepts has been given simply as a background to a brief discussion of the activities of many individuals, committees and organizations over the past 15 - 20 years. Freudenthal(1), in his paper to the 8th Congress of the International Association for Bridge and Structural Engineering, has given a critical appraisal of safety criteria and has included an extensive bibliography; this covers the same period of time.

The first notable attempt by an organization to rationalise the treatment of safety concepts was that of the Institution of Structural Engineers in 1955; Professor Sir Alfred Pugsley chaired a committee which produced its report in 1955[2]. This committee's approach was essentially the load factor approach in which the contributory factors had to be assessed by the designer in the light of his knowledge of the loading, control on site, accuracy of calculations, seriousness of failure and economic consequences. Only collapse was treated and the use of statistics in defining loads and material properties was advocated. Following this work, the Comité Européen du Béton (C.E.B.) formulated its proposals in 1963[3]. The International Council for Building Research Studies and Documentation (C.I.B.) set up a committee in 1961 to study the loads assumed for the design of various types of building and the desirable safety margins and general design criteria; Thomas[4] published a paper giving the views of this committee in 1964. The Féderation Internationale de la Précontrainte (F.I.P.) set up a joint committee with the C.E.B. in 1962 which had the aim of treating prestressed concrete in a similar manner to that adopted for reinforced concrete. In 1964, the Construction Industry Research and Information Association (C.I.R.I.A.) set up a committee with Sir Alfred Pugsley as chairman to report on structural safety and the Convention Européen des Associations de la Construction Metallique (C.E.C.M.) also set up a committee in 1966 with the aim of unifying safety concepts. In addition to these, there is an International Standards Organization (.I.S.O.) Committee TC/98 which, obviously, is attempting to draft recommendations on this subject which will be accepted on an international basis. Another notable committee must be included in this catelogue; it is the committee of the American Society of Civil Engineers, under the chairmanship of A. M. Freudenthal which issued its final report in 1966[5].

In the past year, many of the above committees have been finalizing their work and preparing reports and, in addition, two important symposia have been held by the American Concrete Institute [6] and the American Society of Civil Engineers[7]. In England, we have had two occurrences which are very relevant to any consideration of structural safety; the first was the collapse of the cooling towers at Ferrybridge[8] and the second the partial collapse of a block of flats[9]. The latter has certainly resulted in a rather traumatic experience for the structural engineering profession, the repercussions of which are still with us. It is to be hoped that the whole episode will lend more weight to a rational consideration of structural safety rather than result in hasty measures and regulations serving as a palliative and not a remedy and divorced from any rational concepts of safety. We should bear in mind in this connection a statement made by Pugsley[10] in his book on "The Safety of Structures" namely "A profession that never has accidents is unlikely to be serving its country efficiently." !

The object of this paper is to restate the problems of structural safety, particularly with regard to reinforced and prestressed concrete, to indicate some of the suggested treatments of these, and to give views on the future activity and research in this field.

PHENOMENA TO BE CONSIDERED

The four basic phenomena which must be considered by the designer are :

(a) the loads to which the structure is subjected are variable; [11, 12, 13, 14]

(b) the properties of the materials used in construction are variable; [15, 16]

(c) the workmanship and control on site are variable;[15]

and (d) the relevance of the assumptions and the accuracy of design calculations are uncertain to a greater or lesser degree.

All these phenomena are being treated in other themes of this symposium; the references cited merely illustrate the nature and extent of the variability. As a result of these phenomena, it follows that, necessarily, all structural design must be based on a safety concept embodying the probability of failure. This has been stated in somewhat more astringent terms by Freudenthal as "The difference between safe and unsafe design is in the degree of risk considered acceptable, not in the delusion that such a risk can be completely eliminated." However, it must be accepted that the phenomena mentioned above are not necessarily random and hence that a complete probabilistic treatment of safety is not possible, either at the present time or in the immediate future, in the civil and structural fields.

AIMS OF DESIGN

It is becoming generally accepted that the aim of structural design is the achievement of an acceptable probability (which should be uniform for given structural types) that the structure being designed will not become unserviceable during some specified life. At the same time consideration must be given to the aesthetics and economics of the construction. The consideration of economy should ideally be related to the total cost by taking account of the costs of design, construction, normal maintenance, and insurance to cover risk of losses associated with accepted probability of unserviceability.[17, 18]

With our present design procedures, Freudenthal has quoted[1] the order of risks that exist as 10^{-4} to 10^{-6} for steel highway bridges or transmission towers and 10^{-3} to 10^{-5} for concrete structures. Hence it is clear, that the aims of structural design are not being attained, nor can they be, with the so-called treatment of safety which obtains at the present time.

A further point which needs to be emphasised here is that the concept of a useful life for any structure is one which is cardinal to the basic aims of design; not only is it essential for this reason but also because, in a rapidly changing sociological and technological environment, it is totally irrational to think in any other terms. Pugsley[10] has highlighted this aspect and categorised structures as:

(i) Monumental - life 200 - 500 years e.g. large churches, bridges and city halls;

(ii) Permanent - life 75 - 100 years e.g. blocks of flats, university buildings, ordinary road and rail bridges;

(iii) Temporary - life 25 - 50 years e.g. normal industrial buildings.

With the aim of design expressed in terms of probability of unserviceability the immediate question arises as to what constitutes an acceptable risk. Presumably the structures designed in various countries at the present time and in accordance with the existing national codes or regulations might be deemed to have an acceptable risk but, with the lack of uniformity in the probability of failure (as indicated earlier), we have no real basis for deciding what is the minimum acceptable. Hence this is one aspect that needs particular attention by research workers and the national committees, dealing with structural safety. It is pertinent, however, to suggest that, in defining the acceptable probabilities, due account be taken of other risks which the general public accepts, almost without notice. For example, in England the following probabilities were quoted in 1959 by Su[19] for travel by rail and car; 10^{-6} and 10^{-4} per annum for death respectively and, in the case of travel by car 58.4×10^{-4} per annum for injury or death. Other, perhaps more bizarre, examples may be gleaned from the statistics published by the Fire Research Station; such as assessed probability of death in home due to electric blankets 10^{-6} per annum !

TREATMENT OF SAFETY IN DESIGN PROCESS

From the foregoing discussion, it should be clear that the only rational basis for the treatment of safety is in terms of probability and that this basis is not required just for its rationality but because it is the only basis for progress now that our understanding of structural behaviour is improving so rapidly and when, with digital computers, we have tools commensurate with the needs of the required analysis. However, as Freudenthal[1] has pointed out, there are major problems to be resolved namely :

- the non-random phenomena having a bearing on design process and hence not capable of being included in a probabilistic approach;
- the considerable difficulty of obtaining the relevant data for the random phenomena;

and - the inclusion of probabilistic concepts in a simple form for use in design.

Of these, in my view, the last is the major problem and must condition the formulation of the safety concept. Let us now briefly consider the approaches which have been suggested.

1. Probabilistic Approach

The principal protagonist of this approach in recent years is undoubtedly Freudenthal[1, 5]. It would be presumptuous, and indeed totally unnecessary, for me to attempt to paraphrase the critical appraisal of safety criteria and the presentation of the probabilistic approach given in reference 1. However, I believe that this approach will only be used as a means of studying the probability of unserviceability as a function of the many parameters that affect it so that other, more suitable, design approaches can be formulated with a greater assurance of their complying with acceptable probability limits.

Ang[20] has proposed a modification to the classical probability approach which intorduces a factor of ignorance. This approach does offer certain advantages in deriving design procedures which are relatively simple and may therefore be a very useful tool in the codification of safety in design.

2. Limit State Approach (Semi-probabilistic)

This is the approach adopted initially in Russia and then by the C.E.B. and which is now generally accepted by the F.I.P., C.I.B. C.E.C.M., and by I.S.O. The C.E.B. has finalized its revised recommendations on the approach (these are to be formally approved at a plenary session in September) and a summary of them has been given by the author[21]. These have now been endorsed by the other organizations mentioned above and hence could well be recognised internationally. Before giving a brief resume of them it is necessary to state that the C.E.B. was aware of the fundamental need to draft recommendations that could readily be applied in practice and hence departed from the strict probabilistic approach.

The aim, or object, of design is as defined earlier in the paper. In defining unfitness for use, the concept of limit states is introduced; a limit state is defined as being reached when the structure, or part of the structure, ceases to fulfil the function for which it was designed. The limit states are placed in two categories :

(a) Ultimate limit states, which correspond to the maximum load carrying capacity associated with collapse or inelastic deformations of an unacceptable magnitude;

(b) Serviceability limit states, which are related to criteria governing normal use with regard to unacceptable deformations, displacements, vibrations, stresses or other undesirable damage.

It is envisaged that the criteria referred to in (b) will be defined by the various national committees drafting the relevant codes of practice. It is worth noting that the effects of blast loading, explosive pressure, fire and vehicle impact, although not treated as specific limit states, since the above cover them, are referred to as being relevant in the consideration of the structural concept or as being catered for by other appropriate measures.

In the design calculations, it is required that each of the relevant limit states for the structure being considered should be treated and adequate safety, appropriate to the degree of seriousness of the particular limit state, should be provided. Hence the effects of loading, of all types, should be assessed on the basis of a particular limit state for the structure as a whole and the sections designed accordingly.

Since the factors which govern the attainment of a limit state in any structure are in themselves variable, whether random or otherwise, attempts must be made to take account of the variation by the application of probability theory. The main factors to be treated in this way are:

(i) the actual strengths of the construction material in the structure and the actual dimensions and tolerances in the geometry of the structure;

(ii) the actual loadings, arising from any cause, to which the structure may be subjected during its life;

(iii) the degree of approximation adopted in the calculations.

Since all the data necessary for a rigorous probability approach to the treatment of safety are not available, it is convenient at this stage to utilize "characteristic values" of the strength defining the mechanical properties of the materials, and of the loads, which are based upon a fixed probability that the actual values will be either less or greater than the values selected, and to cover the remaining uncertain factors by transforming these "characteristic values" into "design values" by the introduction of certain coefficients, the values of which depend on the limit state being considered, the behaviour of the construction material and the structure itself and the probability of combinations of load occurring. Thus, the material strengths, as given by appropriate tests, are used to define the characteristic strength; for a normal distribution the characteristic strength, σ_k, is given by

$$\sigma_k = \sigma_m - ks \qquad (1)$$

where σ_m = arithmetic mean of different test results;

s = standard deviation;

k = coefficient depending on probability, accepted a priori, of obtaining results less than σ_k.

A similar treatment of the characteristic loads, S_k, is suggested which is essentially the same as that proposed in the earlier Recommendations(3).

In deriving design values the following equations are used.

The design strengths of materials, σ^*, are given by

$$\sigma^* = \frac{\sigma_k}{\gamma_m} \qquad (2)$$

The design loads, S^*, are given by

$$S^* = \gamma_s S_k \qquad (3)$$

The strength reduction coefficient, γ_m, is regarded as the product of two coefficients γ_{m1} and γ_{m2} which take account of the reduction in strength, as compared with the control test specimen, in the structure as a whole and the possible local reductions in stren th due to other causes respectively. The breakdown of the coefficient γ_m in this way is simply to facilitate the derivation of appropriate numerical values for γ_m.

Similarly the coefficient γ_s is regarded as being composed of three coefficients γ_{s_1}, γ_{s2} and γ_{s_3} ; thus

γ_{s_1} allows for abnormal or unforeseen loads other than catered for in the characteristic loads;

γ_{s_2} is intended to cover adverse modifications in the assessed effects of loading i.e. inaccuracies in design assumptions, constructional errors such as dimensions of cross section, position of steel and eccentricities of loading on members;

and γ_{s_3} allows for the reduced probability of combinations of load all at characteristic value.

Again this subdivision of γ_s is simply to facilitate the derivation of appropriate values for γ_s. It is recognised that this approach is not consistent with a probabilistic treatment of safety since the individual factors cannot be treated separately; however for practical purposes, this is the most convenient approach at the present time and, obviously, can be modified as our knowledge improves.

In the approach so far outlined, certain aspects of safety have not been covered specifically and therefore a further coefficient, γ_c, is introduced which is used to modify the design values in appropriate cases.

γ_c is the product of γ_{c_1} and γ_{c_2} where:

γ_{c_1} takes account of the nature of the structure and its behaviour e.g. structures or parts of structures in which partial or complete collapse can occur without warning or where failure of an element can lead to overall collapse;

γ_{c_2} takes account of the seriousness of attaining a limit state from other points of view e.g. economic consequences, danger to community, etc.

Thus the treatment of the safety aspect in structural design is in the definition of three so-called partial factors of safety γ_m, γ_s, and γ_c which are introduced into the design calculations in the treatment of the various limit states. By the assignment of appropriate values to these partial factors of safety for each limit state, it is possible to provide a reasonable and adequate safety against the structure becoming unfit for use during its design life.

It is of interest to note that certain papers[22, 23] presented at the ACI Fall Convention, Memphis, 1968, also discuss rather similar approaches to the formulation of codes on a probabilistic or semi-probabilistic basis. In England, the limit state approach has been used in the drafting of the Unified Code for Structural Concrete. It has also been endorsed by the C.I.R.I.A. committee.[24]

3. Deterministic Approaches

These have long been used as the basis for design but, I believe, have always been regarded with a healthy suspicion by designers. Now it appears they can no longer serve any useful purpose and hence should be discarded.

FUTURE ACTIVITIES IN THE FIELD OF STRUCTURAL SAFETY

As I have indicated, the general principles of the treatment of safety concepts, by way of limit state methods, have now been propounded such that they may be assimilated readily and incorporated in relatively simple design procedures. In addition, the framework provided enables advances in the analytical treatment of safety to be incorporated as well as improved knowledge of loads, materials and structural behaviour. Furthermore, I believe that this framework will give a considerable incentive to designers and contractors since, in the future, by appropriate treatment of the partial safety factors, the more realistic analytical procedures and improved quality control on site can be recognised.

Perhaps of more interest however is the fact that this treatment of safety highlights those areas of ignorance and ensures that the significance of new knowledge on the design process can be assessed. In this respect the major problems now requiring attention are :

(i) the definition of characteristic loads for all types of structure for specific useful lives;

(ii) the significance of combinations of load and the frequency of their occurrence;

(iii) the definition of acceptable probabilities for different limit states;

and (iv) the refinement of the partial safety factors in the light of (i) - (iii).

There is very considerable scope in (iv) for the use of computers in applying probability theory to specific structural forms; Ferry Borges(25) has already indicated the possibilities in this field. The acceptable probability levels in (iii) are being considered by the C.I.B. and it is very appropriate that this body should extend its work in this field; C.I.B. is also attempting to define the loading as mentioned in (i).

Finally, I should like to stress the very considerable improvement in our treatment of structural safety which would be possible with an improved understanding of the variability of the strength of structures as built. This will entail considerable research effort to define the variability of the material properties and then analytical work to assess the significance of this variability.

REFERENCES

1. FREUDENTHAL, A.M. 'Critical appraisal of safety criteria and their basic concepts'. I.A.B.S.E. Proc. 8th Congress New York.

2. Report on Structural Safety. The Structural Engineer. Vol 34 (1955) 141. Discussion on Report Vol 34 (1956) 307.

3. Comité Européen du Béton. Recommendations for an International Code of Practice for Reinforced Concrete. American Concrete Institute and Cement and Concrete Association, London. 1964.

4. THOMAS, F.G. 'Basic parameters and terminology in the consideration of structural safety'. C.I.B. Bulletin No 3, 1964. pp 4-12.

5. FREUDENTHAL, A.M., GARRELTS, J.M. & SHIMOZUKA, M. 'The analysis of structural safety'. Journal of the Structural Division, Proc. Amer. Soc. Civ. Eng. Vol. 92 (1966) No ST1 Proc. Paper 4682.

6. Symposium on Structural Safety. Fall Convention 1968 American Concrete Institute Memphis, November 3-8.

7. Symposium on Structural Safety, A.S.C.E. Annual Meeting and National Meeting on Structural Engineering, Pittsburg September 30 - October 4, 1968.

8. Report of the Committee of Inquiry into collapse of cooling towers at Ferrybridge, Monday 1 November 1965. Published by the Central Electricity Generating Board, pp 90.

9. Report of the Inquiry into the collapse of flats at Ronan Point, Canning Town. H.M.S.O. October 1968. pp 70.

10. PUGSLEY, A.G. 'The Safety of Structures'.
Edward Arnold 1966, p 2.

11. DAVENPORT, A.G. 'The application of statistical concepts to the wind loading of structures'.
Proc. Inst. Civil. Engineers, Vol 19, 1961, pp 449-472.

12. THOM, H.C.S. 'New distribution of extreme winds in the United States'.
Journal Structural Division, ASCE, Vol. 94 No ST7 July 1968.

13. Building Research Station Digest 99 (Second Series)
'Wind loading on Buildings - 1'. November 1968.

14. Building Research Station Digest 101 (Second Series)
'Wind loading on Buildings - 2'. January 1969.

15. JOHNSON, A.I. 'Strength, safety and economical dimensions of structures.' Bulletin, Division of Building Studies and Structural Engineering at the Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, No. 12, 1953.

16. PETERSONS, H. 'Strength of concrete in finished structures'. Transactions of the Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm No. 232 1964.

17. ROWE, R.E., CRANSTON, W.B. & BEST, B.C. 'New concepts in the design of structural concrete.
The Structural Engineer, Vol 43 No 12 December 1965;
Discussion Vol 44 No 4, 1966; Vol 44 No 11, 1966.

18. SAWYER, H.A. Jr. 'The status and potentialities of the non-linear design of concrete frames.'
Proc. International Symposium on the Flexural Mechanics of Reinforced Concrete, Miami, November 1964.

19. SU, H.L. 'Statistical approach to structural design'.
Proc. Inst. of Civil Engineers Vol 13 July 1959 paper No 6365.

20. ANG, H.S.A. & AMIN, M. 'Safety factors and probability in structural design.'
Paper presented at ASCE Annual Meeting and National Meeting on Structural Engineering, Pittsburgh September 30 - October 4, 1968.

21. ROWE, R.E. 'Current European Views on Structural Safety'.
Paper presented at ASCE Annual Meeting and National Meeting on Structural Engineering, Pittsburgh, Sept 30 - Oct 4, 1968.

22. CORNELL, C.A. 'A probability based structural code'.
Paper presented at ACI Fall Convention Memphis Nov 3-8, 1968.

23. SHAH, H.C. 'A rational probabilistic format'.
Paper presented at ACI Fall Convention Memphis Nov 3-8, 1968.

24. CIRIA Study Committee on Structural Safety. Technical Note 2
Guidance for the drafting of codes of practice for structural safety. August 1968.

25. FERRY-BORGES, J. 'Structural Behaviour and safety criteria'. 7th Congress I.A.B.S.E. Rio de Janeiro August 10-16, 1964.

SUMMARY

A brief history of the treatment of structural safety is given followed by a statement of the phenomena relevant to the design process and a definition of the aims of design. The treatment of the phenomena to comply with the aims of design is then discussed in terms of the probabilistic, semi-probabilistic (limit state) and deterministic approaches. The limit state approach is amplified and finally the future work necessary to improve this treatment of structural safety is discussed.

RESUME

L'exposé part de l'historique du traitement des problèmes de sécurité des constructions; il définit ensuite les phénomènes à prendre en considération dans l'établissement des projets ainsi que les objectifs propres à ce processus. L'exposé se poursuit par l'étude du traitement des phénomènes requis en vue d'obtenir une conformité aux objectifs propres de l'établissement de projets, étude des points de vue probabiliste, semi-probabiliste (état limite) et déterministe. On développe la théorie des états-limites, et l'on discute les modifications futures qui seront nécessaire pour améliorer cette théorie de la sécurité des constructions.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Es wird eine kurze Geschichte der Behandlung des Sicherheitsproblems von Tragwerken und eine Aufzählung aller Faktoren, die für den Entwurf wichtig sind, gegeben. Weiterhin wird eine Festlegung der Entwurfsziele getroffen und diesen Faktoren gegenübergestellt, sowie die Behandlung der Faktoren im Hinblick auf Wahrscheinlichkeitsverfahren, exakte und gemischte (Traglastverfahren) Lösungsverfahren diskutiert. Das Traglastverfahren wird ausführlich behandelt, gefolgt von einer abschliessenden Erörterung der notwendigen Forschung, um dieses Verfahren zur Sicherheit von Tragwerken zu verbessern.

Leere Seite
Blank page
Page vide

Safety Concepts, with particular emphasis on Steel

Les concepts de sécurité pour la construction métallique

Sicherheitsbetrachtungen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Stahles

GERARD F. FOX
Partner
Howard, Needles, Tammen & Bergendoff
New York City, New York, USA

INTRODUCTION

In the preceding paper Dr. Rowe has presented an excellent account of present day concepts used in design to insure adequate safety of structures. Emphasis was placed on the Limit State approach and its application to the design of reinforced and prestressed concrete structures. This paper is an extension of Dr. Rowe's and in particular deals with the application of safety concepts to the design of steel structures.

DESIGN GOALS

Engineering design has been defined (1) as a purposeful activity directed toward the goal of fulfilling human needs, particularly those which can be met by the technological factors of our culture. Every design activity that finally leads to a physical embodiment of the designers conception must perforce make some use of technological factors. One of the most significant design activities affecting the design of a structure deals with quantifying the vague concept of factor of safety.

The goal of the structural designer is to provide a structure that will not only be safe but will perform in a manner suitable for its intended use over a given finite period of time. Failure to meet the goal for a steel structure is usually caused by structural inadequacy, fire, corrosion, extreme deflections or vibrations. Structural inadequacy, in terms of strength and deflection, can be avoided by providing ample maximum strength and stiffners to resist the expected static and dynamic loads, fracture and instability.

DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

To adequately design a structure requires repeated iterations to obtain the optimum configuration and size of elements using as a measure the structures intended use, least cost, aesthetics or a combination of these factors. Among the considerations entering into the design process are:

1. Selection of materials and the variation of their properties.

2. Selection of design static and dynamic loads and the variation of the loads expected during the life of the structure.

3. Determining the design life of the structure which is influenced by whether it is to be a permanent or only a temporary structure.

4. Expected quality of workmanship during construction.

5. Expected maintenance and inspection during the life of the structure. This latter item is quite important for a structure subjected to dynamic loads. Visual field inspection is not enough to detect flaws or possible fracture zones in the structure. More sophisticated methods are needed if we are to guard against failure such as the catastrophic bridge failure at Point Pleasant in West Virginia.[2] A few more failures of this type in a short period of time could result in a public demand that no structure be designed that could collapse due to the failure of only one member.

CHARACTERISTIC STRENGTH

The single, most important structural property of a mild steel is its yield point.[3] This applies to both allowable stress design and plastic design. Winter[3] has reported on 3,974 mill tests of ASTM A-7 steel. For this steel the specified yield point is 33 ksi. He reported that the median mill test value was 38.7 ksi with a mean value of 40 ksi, and that less than 2% of the mill tests failed to meet the 33 ksi requirement. Another important steel property, required for the investigation of inelastic buckling of steel members, is the strain-hardening modulus and its variation. There is a great deal of statistical data on material properties available and Dr. Rowe in his paper has indicated that this data can be used to calculate the characteristic strength σ_k by use of the equation:

$$\sigma_k = \sigma_m - k s$$

where σ_m = arithmetic mean of test results

s = standard deviation

k = coefficient depending on probability accepted a priori, of obtaining results less than σ_k.

CHARACTERISTIC LOADS

If statistical data on loadings is available than it is possible to use a similar equation to obtain the characteristic loading. However, little information is available on the variability of loading. In the United States there is a project underway to actually measure the live loads that are present in a large number of buildings throughout the country. For highway bridges variations in the live loads are caused by mixture of trucks and cars, new types of vehicles proposed for the future and the sometimes arbitrary raising of the legal load limits.[4] Wind loads, earthquakes, blast loads, temperature effects, ice load and stream flow add to the complexity of establishing characteristic loadings and their variations.

ALLOWABLE STRESS DESIGN

Design of steel structures has traditionally been governed by allowable stress design. This method requires designing with given loads and an allowable stress taken as a fraction of the yield point stress. With this method it is practically impossible to estimate the actual factor of safety since the collapse load or the possible variation of the design loads is not known. In addition, the method neglects taking into account the full range of load-deformation behavior. Allowable stress design is slowly being replaced by a Maximum Load (Strength) design method.

MAXIMUM STRENGTH DESIGN

Maximum load design of steel structures requires that members be so selected that they reach their maximum strength at a load which is calculated as the product of the characteristic load and a load factor.[5] This method of design is also referred to as Load Factor design. This design approach is semi-probabilistic in that statistical data is used when available to establish appropriate values of the load factors but it is still necessary to draw on past experience to a great degree in establishing some of the load factors. For the forseeable future it is apparant that not enough information will be available to allow the full probabilistic approach developed by Freundenthal[6] to be used in everyday design practices.

MAXIMUM STRENGTH VS. LIMIT STATE

Dr. Rowe in his paper has throughly covered the Limit State method for concrete structures. A steel structure that has failed is said to have reached a limit state.[7] There are many such states, the most important being load limit, fatigue limit, stability limit and deflection limit.

It is appropriate to examine and compare how the safety concepts are developed for the two approaches, namely, the Load Factor design method and the Limit State design method.

The "Tentative Criteria for Load Factor Design of Steel Highway Bridges"(8) proposed for bridges in the United States specifies the following as the load factors to be used:

$$U = 1.25 \left(D + \frac{5}{3} (L+I)\right)$$

where
- D = Dead Load
- L = Live Load
- I = Impact
- U = Maximum Strength

In general: $\Phi \times U = \lambda \left(\alpha D + \beta (L+I) \right)$

where

Φ = factor to allow for uncertainties in the magnitude of characteristic strength due to variations of material properties in the actual structure from that found in test specimens, corrosion, errors in the dimensions of the cross-section and other similar items.

λ = factor to allow for overall effects, such as errors in design assumptions.

α = factor to allow for increases in the dead load of the structure arising either through calculation error or future increases in dead load.

β = factor to allow for overloads.

In the Limit State approach each item is treated separately and partial factors of safety assigned. The partial safety factor for material strength is expressed by the relationship:

$$\sigma^* = \frac{\sigma_k}{\gamma_m}$$

where

σ^* = Maximum Strength U

σ^K = Characteristic Strength

γ_m = Partial Safety Factor

The partial safety factor for loads is expressed by the relationship:

$$S^* = \gamma_S S_K$$

where

S^* = Maximum design load

S_K = Characteristic Load

γ_S = Partial Safety Factor

By comparison it is evident that:

$$\gamma_m = 1/\Phi$$

$$\gamma_s^D = \lambda\alpha$$

$$\gamma_s^L = \lambda\beta$$

where γ_s^D and γ_s^L are the partial factors of safety for dead load and live load respectively. These partial factors of safety are used to reduce the characteristic loads due to overloads, errors in design assumptions and construction errors. They also include the coefficient γ_c referred to by Dr. Rowe as taking into account the type of structure and seriousness of failure of the element of the structure under consideration.

If a value of $\gamma_m = 1.10$ is taken as a reasonable value for a steel structure then for bridges:

$$\gamma_s^D = 1.25 \times 1.0 \div 1.10 = 1.14$$

$$\gamma_s^L = 1.25 \times 1.67 + 1.10 = 1.90$$

The overall safety factor is the product of γ_m and γ_s and is tabulated for various stringer bridges in the following table:

Span	R	γ_m	γ_s^A	$\gamma_m \gamma_s^A$
36'	0.5	1.10	1.65	1.82
70'	1.0	1.10	1.52	1.67
110'	1.5	1.10	1.45	1.60

where R is the ratio of D to L+I

γ_s^A is the average value of γ_s for D+L+I

The criteria for steel bridges was set so as to provide the same section as provided in allowable stress design on the short span range of 30 to 40 feet and lighter sections for longer spans. The ratio of the yield point stress (36 ksi) to allowable stress (20 ksi) for ASTM-A36 steel is 1.80. An examination of the above table shows that for a steel span of 36 feet the factor of safety is 1.82 and reduces as the span length increases.

CONCLUSIONS

There does not appear to be much difference, if any, between the Load Factor or Limit State approaches. There is a significant difference however in the philosophy behind each approach. Limit State is a much more logical and scientific approach to the problem of applying the concept of safety factor. It enables the designer to evaluate separately each item comprising the overall factor of safety and allows him latitude and guidance for setting values for unusual structures.

It seems apparent that concrete design is tending towards using the Limit State concept and it is logical that steel design should likewise be governed by the same concepts. Some of the partial safety factors for the Limit State approach would be the same for both materials. It would serve no useful purpose for steel design to be governed by Load Factors and concrete design by Limit State concepts.

Future research needs to be oriented toward supplying the necessary information to allow further refinements in the setting of the partial factors of safety. The structural behavior of three dimensional framework and three dimensional states of stress should be investigated. Further items needing more clarification are the variation of loads, and the limit states governing deflections, vibrations, wind, fatigue and fracture. The Limit State approach provides a usable everyday design procedures but its success will depend on obtaining the necessary information to assign proper values to the various partial factors of safety.

REFERENCES

1. ASIMOW, M. 'Introduction to Design'.
   Prentice Hall 1962

2. Articles on Collapse of Ohio River Bridge. Engineering-News
   Record, December 21, 1967

3. WINTER, G. 'Properties of Steel and Concrete and the Behavior
   of Structures'.
   Journal of the Structural Division, Proc. Amer. Soc. Civ. Eng.
   Vol. 86, No. ST 2 Proc. Paper 2384

4. ELLIOT, A. L. 'Bigger Bridge Loads Coming'
   Civil Engineering, February 1969

5. BEEDLE, L. S. et al 'Structural Steel Design'
   Ronald Press Co. 1964

6. FREUDENTHAL, A. M. 'Critcial Appraisal of Safety Criteria and
   Their Basic Concepts'.
   I.A.B.S.E. Proc. 8th Congress New York.

7. JOHNSON, R. P. 'Structural Concrete'
   McGraw Hill Co. 1967

8. VINCENT, G. S. 'Tentative Criteria for Load Factor Design of Steel
   Highway Bridges'
   American Iron and Steel Institute, February 1968

SUMMARY

The paper by Dr. Rowe is extended to include a treatment of safety concepts applicable to steel structures. Design and considerations are discussed relative to structural failure, material properties and loadings. The Load Factor approach for steel design is developed and a comparison made between this approach and the Limit State approach. The conclusion reached is that the Limit State approach could well be used for both steel and concrete design. Future research that will be required for the success of the method is commented upon.

RESUME

L'exposé du Dr. Rowe a été développé pour inclure une étude des concepts de sécurité appliqués aux structures métalliques. Le but et l'étude des projets sont examinés quant à la fatigue des structures, aux propriétés du matériau et à la charge. L'auteur a développé pour les constructions métalliques la méthode des charges pondérées et il a comparé cette méthode avec la théorie des états limites. La conclusion est qu'on peut utiliser la théorie des états limites aussi bien pour les constructions métalliques que pour le béton armé. De futures recherches sont nécessaires pour le succès de la méthode commentée ci-dessus.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Der Aufsatz von Dr. Rowe ist erweitert worden, um eine Behandlung von Sicherheitsbegriffen bei Stahlkonstruktionen einzuschliessen. Ziel des Entwurfes und Ueberlegungen werden in bezug auf Bruch, Materialeigenschaften und Belastungen besprochen. Es ist ein Verfahren der gewogenen Lasten (Lastbeiwertverfahren) für den Stahlbau entwickelt und mit dem Traglastverfahren verglichen worden. Die Folgerung daraus ist, dass das Traglastverfahren sowohl im Stahl- als auch im Betonbau angewandt werden kann. Besprochen werden auch die erforderlichen künftigen Untersuchungen für den Erfolg dieser Methode.

Leere Seite
Blank page
Page vide