

ANALYSE AND DESIGN OF A PSC BOX GIRDER BRIDGE.

NANCHARI KANCHALA¹, SHAIK MUKTHAR², MOHAMMED FARKHANDA ALI KHAN³, MOHAMMED **IBRAHIM**⁴

¹Assistant Professor, Dept of CIVIL ENGINEERING, ISL ENGG COLLEGE, HYDERABAD. ^{2,3&4}Students, Dept of CIVIL ENGINEERING, ISL ENGG COLLEGE.

ABSTRACT - Most of the bridges still under construction at this time were delayed for investigation of basic design principle. Some were abandoned and rebuilt as a different form of bridge altogether. Box girder are rarely used in the buildings, but they may be used in special circumstances, such as when loads are carried eccentrically to the beam axis. Box girders can be universally applied from the point of view of load carrying, to their indifference as to whether the bending moments are negative or positive and to their torsional Stiffness; from the point of view of economy.

- Pre-Stressed Concrete Box Girder bridges are extensively use in highway and railway construction.
- Pre-Stressed Concrete Box Girder are used to achieve deflection control and to restore bearing capacity of bridges.

INTRODUCTION

Planning and designing of bridges is part art and part compromise, the most significant aspect of structural engineering. It is the manifestation of the creative capability of designers and demonstrates their imagination, innovation , and exploration. The first question designers have to answer is what kind of structural marvel bridge design are they going to create? The importance of conceptual analysis in bridge-designing problems cannot be emphasized strongly enough. The designer must first visualize and imagine the bridge in order to determine its fundamental function and performance. Without question, the factors of safety and economy shape the bridge designer"s thought in a very significant way. The values of technical and economic analysis and indisputable, but they do cover the whole design process Bridge is a complex engineering problem. The design process includes consideration of other important factors, such as choice of bridge system, material, dimension, foundation, aesthetics, and local landscape and environment.

METHODOLOGY

Material definition

iterial Data				
General				
Material ID 2		Name	M50	
Electricity Data				
Type of Design Cor	crete v	Steel	_	
_		Standard		
6		80		
		Concrete		
		Standard	IS(RC)	v
Type of Material			Code	
(e) Isoarobic	Ormotrope	00	M50	
Steel				
Modulus of Elasticity :	0.0000e+000	ktijm^2		
Poisson's Ratio :	0			
Themal Coefficient :	0.0000e+000	1/[C]		
Weight Density :	0	W/m^3		
Use Mass Density	0	idijin^3jg		
Concrete				
Modulus of Elasticity :	3.5355e+007	ktijm^2		
Poisson's Ratio 1	0.2			
Thermal Coefficient 1	1.0000e-005	1/[C]		
Weight Density :	23.6	klijim^3		
Use Mass Density:	2.407	Wijm^3/g		
Plasticity Data				
Plastic Material Name	NONE	v		
Inelastic Material Proper	ties for Fiber Model			
Concrete None	v	Rebar	None	¥
Thermal Transfer				
Specific Heat t	0	Btu/MN*[C]		
Heat Conduction :	0	Btu/m#v*(C)		
Damping Ratio :	0.05	1		
Webster (CI)				





Volume: 08 Issue: 04 | Apr 2021

www.irjet.net

e-ISSN: 2395-0056 p-ISSN: 2395-0072

1.86e+006

1.581e+006

0.17

0

0.002

Bond Type

OK

Bonded

OUnbonded

kN/m^2

kN/m^2

1/m

Cancel Apply

kN/m^2

Section definition

(Add

OReplace ODelete

Ry Dy -Y

CRX DX

Dy 🗹 Dz

Rz Rz

Apply Close

*×

P

Support Type (Local Direction)

Ry

Z

RZC

DZ

D-ALL

Dx 🗌

R-ALL

Rx 🔲

Rw

• Defining load cases



Name

Ultimate Strength

Wobble Friction Factor

Anchorage Slip(Draw in)

External Cable Moment Magnifier

: 0.005

: 0.006

m

m

Yield Strength **Curvature Friction Factor**

Begin

End



• Defining Tendon profile

-	-	Dame	-	Conces Default	123 17
endos	Property		Tendon	ville	
	d Elements	10 I	10:43	(1) (Mer.)	
Input O 24	t Type D	30	1	Straight Length of Tend	on
Osp	e Type Ane	Round		End: 0	m
Typic	al Tendon		Ne	of Tendons : 1	
User	defined Le	ngth	😔 Begin	1 0 End: 0	
Refere	ence Axis	4	OStraig	ht Ocurve 🛞 E	lement
8	8.03249				
	.0326923				
		a (#)	io is i	0 28 20 28 40	45 _X
	8.03269	<u></u>			
0	.0326923	-			
- 2	-4.94733	0 8	10 18 1	0 25 30 38 40	40
	x(m)	v(m)	z(m)	B(m)	1 ^
	0.0000	2 6660	-1.0000	0.000	
2	2.0000	2.6660	-1.2590	0.000	0
3	4.0000	2.6660	-1.5352	0.000	0
4	6.0000	2,6660	-1.7722	0.000	5
5	8.0000	2.6660	-1.9613	0.000	0
6	10.000	2.6660	-2.1028	0.000	0
7	12.000	2.6660	-2.1970	0.000	0
8	14.000	2.6660	-2.2441	0.000	0
9	16.000	2.6660	-2.2500	0.000	- 10
Point	of Sym.:	OFest	@ Last	Make Symmetric Ter	ndon
Profile	Insertion	Point :	@End-t	O End-J of Elem.	1
Axis	Direction		(c-1)	OJ-> I of Elem.	1
	Rot. Angle	67	-11.2 0	(deg) Protectio	m
x Axis		1.	1000		
x Axis Offset	t yr.	0	m	- R. 1.	

• Load definition of vehicle

RC:6-	2000 Standard Loa	d								
ehicula	ar Load Properties									
/ehicul	ar Load Name	Class 70R	Class 70R Class 70R							
ehicul	ar Load Type	Class 70R								
fin. No	se to Tail Distance	30			m					
Wa	veled Vehicles			**	+					
Tra	veled vehicles dD1 cked vehicles	D1 D2	Do Da Bogie Cars	Pb It D5	De dD2 Pb					
Tra	veeled vehicles dD1 ched vehicles Load(M())	D1 D2 D D D Spacing(n)	Do D	D5 P5 14 D1	De dD2 Pb					
Wa Tra No 1	kveled dD1 cheed (dD1 cheed Lood((d4)) 78.4532	D1 D2 P D H Spacing(m) 3.96	Do Do Begie Cars dD1 dD2	Ds Pb 14 D 0.61 0.91	De dD2 Pb					
No 1 2	Load(44) 78.4532 117.68	D1 D2 P D Spacing(m) 3.96 1.52	dD1 dD2 p	Pb Pb ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓	De dDz Pb b m m kN					
No 1 2 3	Load(44) 78,4532 117,68 117,68	D1 D2 D D Spacing(m) 3.96 1.52 2.13 1.12	Do Du Bogie Caro dD1 dD2 P D	Ds Pb 0.61 0.91 686.4655 4.57	→ De 6D2 P6 → 1 m 1 m 1 m 1 m 1 m 1 m					
No 1 2 3 4 5	Load(44) 78,4532 117,68 117,68 117,68 117,68 117,68	D1 D2 D D Spading(m) 3.96 1.52 2.13 1.37 3.05	Di Di Begia Care dD1 dD2 P D	Ds Pb Pb 0.61 0.91 686.4655 4.57 98.0665						
Wa Tra No 1 2 3 4 5 6	Lood(04) 78,4532 117,68 117,68 117,68 117,68 117,68 117,68 117,68 117,68 117,68	D1 D2 P D Specing(m) 3.96 1.52 2.13 1.37 3.05 1.37	Do Do Bogie Caro dD1 dD2 P D Pb	Ds Pb Ds Pb Ds Ds Ds Ds Ds Ds Ds Ds Ds Ds	b dD2 Pb b +1 m m NN NN					

• Assigning reinforcement

ction Manager											
rlode Reinforcements v		Bill ord:	. 0.1 m	🗹 Snap		Longitude	al Reinfo Reber D	rcement ata at i 8	Shear Renfi	vcenent	I
Renforcements v Target Section & Benent Section : 11 Section : 11 Se			2+	ſ		Coordin Guid I Type O Por O Ore Ref. Y Ref. 2 Num Space Dia Fijet	ate J nt de Cent Top	 Cent Une O Pol d A v 	oid O Le 0 Cline 2 Inout Meth 7 0 2 0 0 0 83	h eottor	
						Refere Ref. (As	nce for T Left	apered S M	ection (Fal. 1) (0.1393540 (dfy	6 m Delet	^2
						H	Type	Num	t Add CTC (m)	Dia]^
						2	Line	11		#18	J.
Copy Reinforcements to	MID SECTION	G:-262.00, 1	151.00	_	SELECT						

• Assigning load combination

LIST OF LOAD COMBINATIONS

NUM NAME ACTIVE TYPE

LOADCASE(FACTOR) + LOADCASE(FACTOR) +

LOADCASE(FACTOR)

1. cLCB1 Strength/Stress Add

70R(1.500) + Dead Load(1.350) + SIDL-WC(1.350)

+ SIDL-CB(1.350) + Creep Secondary(1.000) + Shrinkage Secondary(1.000)

+ Tendon Secondary(1.000)

International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET) IRJET Volume: 08 Issue: 04 | Apr 2021

www.irjet.net

2. cLCB2 Strength/Stress Add	+ Shrinkage Secondary(1.000) + Tendon Secondary(
Cl.A(1.500) + Dead Load(1.350) + SIDL-WC(1.350)	1.000)
+ SIDL-CB(1.350) + Creep Secondary(1.000) + Shrinkage Secondary(1.000)	
+ Tendon Secondary(1.000)	6. cLCB6 Strength/Stress Add
	Temperature Rise(0.900) + Temperature-fall(0.900) + Positive Temp. Grad(0.900)
3. cLCB3 Strength/Stress Add	+ Negative Temp. Grad(0.900) + 70R(1.500) + Dead Load(1.350)
Temperature Rise(0.900) + Temperature-fall(0.900) + Positive Temp. Grad(0.900)	+ SIDL-WC(1.350) + SIDL-CB(1.350) + Creep Secondary(1.000)
+ Negative Temp. Grad(0.900) + 70R(1.500) + Dead Load(1.350)	+ Shrinkage Secondary(1.000) + Tendon Secondary(1.000)
+ SIDL-WC(1.350) + SIDL-CB(1.350) + Creep Secondary(1.000)	
+ Shrinkage Secondary(1.000) + Tendon Secondary(7. cLCB7 Strength/Stress Add
	Temperature Rise(0.900) + Temperature-fall(0.900) + Positive Temp. Grad(0.900)
4. cLCB4 Strength/Stress Add	+ Negative Temp. Grad(0.900) + Cl.A(1.500) + Dead Load(1.350)
Temperature Rise(0.900) + Temperature-fall(0.900) + Positive Temp. Grad(0.900)	+ SIDL-WC(1.350) + SIDL-CB(1.350) + Creep Secondary(1.000)
+ Negative Temp. Grad(0.900) + Cl.A(1.500) + Dead Load(1.350) + SIDL-WC(+ Shrinkage Secondary(1.000) + Tendon Secondary(1.000)
1.350) + SIDL-CB(1.350) + Creep Secondary(
1.000)	
+ Shrinkage Secondary(1.000) + Tendon Secondary(8. cLCB8 Strength/Stress Add
1.000)	Temperature Rise(-0.900) + Temperature-fall(-0.900) + Positive Temp. Grad(-0.900)
	+ Negative Temp. Grad(-0.900) + 70R(1.500) + Dead Load(1.350)
Temperature Rise(-0.900) + Temperature-fall(-0.900) + Positive Temp. Grad(-0.900)	+ SIDL-WC(1.350) + SIDL-CB(1.350) + Creep Secondary(1.000)
+ Negative Temp. Grad(-0.900) + 70R(1.500) + Dead Load(1.350)	+ Shrinkage Secondary(1.000) + Tendon Secondary(1.000)
+ SIDL-WC(1.350) + SIDL-CB(1.350) + Creep Secondary(1.000)	

IRJET

9. cLCB9 Strength/Stress Add

70R(1.500) + Dead Load(1.350) + SIDL-WC(1.350)

+ SIDL-CB(1.350) + Creep Secondary(1.000) + Shrinkage Secondary(1.000)

+ Tendon Secondary(1.000)

10. cLCB10 Strength/Stress Add

Cl.A(1.500) + Dead Load(1.350) + SIDL-WC(1.350)

+ SIDL-CB(1.350) + Creep Secondary(1.000) + Shrinkage Secondary(1.000)

- + Tendon Secondary(1.000)
- PSC design material

	ust						
D	Name	fc fck R	Chk	Larr	bda	Main-ba	r Sub-bar
2	M50	50000	x		1	Fe500	Fe500
3	M40	40000	x		1		
oncrete ode :	Material Selecti IS(RC)	on V	Grade		MSC)	~
peofied	Compressive Str	rength (fc fck)	9. 	1	500	000	kN/m^2
Light	Weight Concrete	Factor (Lamb	da) :		1		
	ection						
tebar Se	DOM: NO	~					
tebar Se lode :	IS(RC)					KAAAAA	
tebar Se tode : rade of	IS(RC) Main Rebar :	Fe500	~	Fy		300000	kN/m^2

• Performing design and generating report

0000	Gia zura - (Prichil Brichebennis Books Priceter Bannis Books Priceter Bannis Books Priceter Bannis Carl (Mous Gan										
ど Ven Str	uture Node,Benerit Properties	Boundary Load	Analysis	Results	K.	Pushover	Design	ktrç	Quey		
IRC:112-2011 · GB Parameters	FSC Design Material Design Output Position *	Short Long tem Loa Deposure Class E	d Case	Reform Design 1		Result Table Design Fri PSC Result	oles * oces E Diagram				
Design Parameter	PK 0	nga Data		PSCDe	işt.	KCOesign	Reals				
@1	TRECIENCES	1	1		i II	12=D	1 /2	¤48	F.	AA BOO	

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The various analysis results for the PSC box girder such as support reactions, displacements, bending moments, torsional moments, shear forces, prestresses along with the design results have been discussed.

*Maximum Reaction :- Left support = 7093.8 kN Right Support = 6717.3 kN



*Displacements:- Maximum Displacement 23mm.



*Bending Moment:-Maximum B.M= 36 kNm



*Shear Force Maximum S.F = 42 kN



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are thankful to **Dr. Mohammed Masood**, Principal, ISLEC, for his encouragement throughout the project. We would also like to express our heartfelt thanks to **Ms. K. Nanchari**, Head of Civil Engineering Department, ISLEC for her help and unending cooperation with us during completion of this work.

REFRENCES

1. Khaled M.Sennah & John B.Kenndy performed elastic analysis and experimental studies on the elastic response of Box Girder Bridges. in elastic analysis they represent the orthotropic plate theory method, grillage analogy method, folded plate method, finite element method, thin-walled curved beam theory etc The curvilinear nature of box girder bridges along with their complex deformation patterns and stress fields have led designers to adopt approximate and conservative methods for their analysis and design. Recent literature on straight and curved box girder bridges has dealt with analytical formulations to better understand the behavior of these complex structural systems. Few authors have undertaken experimental studies to investigate the accuracy of existing method.

2. Kenneth W. Shushkewich performed approximate Analysis of Concrete Box Girder Bridges. The actual threedimensional behaviour of a box girder bridges as predicted by a folded plate, finite strip or finite element analysis can be approximated by using some simple membrane equations in conjunction with plane frame analysis.

3. Y. K. Cheung et al discussed on curved Box Girder bridges based on the curvilinear coordinate system, the spline finite strip method is extended to elasto-static analysis. As the curvature effect cannot be ignored, the webs of the bridges have to be treated as thin shells and the flanges as flat curved plates. The shape functions for the description of displacement field (radial, tangential, and vertical) are given as product of B-3 spline functions in the longitudinal direction and piece-wise polynomials in the other directions. The stress-strain matrices can then be formed as in the standard finite element method. Compared to the finite element method, this method yields considerable saving in both computer time and effort, since only a small number of unknowns are generally required in the analysis. This paper represents three examples box girder bridges of different geometrical shapes to demonstrate the accuracy and versatility of the method. This method was recently devised by Cheung et al. (1982) for the analysis of right straight plates and box girders. It was then subsequently extended to cover skew plates (Tham et al. 1986) and the plates of arbitrary shape (Li et al. 1986).

4. Ricardo Gaspar & Fernando Reboucas Stucchi presented Web Design of Box Girder Concrete Bridges. An experimental investigation was undertaken with the purpose verifying the validity of the newly developed approach. The following failure modes considered: excessive plastic deformation of stirrups, crushing of the compressed struts and failure of the stirrups due to fatigue. The experimental results showed good agreement with the results of the proposed approach. Furthermore, the tests revealed new aspects of the fatigue behavior, the failure of the stirrups due to fatigue occurred in stages, one at a time in gradual manner. In all cases, failure took place near the connection between the web and the bottom flange.



5. Avman M. Okeil & Sherif El Tawil carried out detailed investigation of warping-related stresses in 18 composite steel-concrete box girder bridges. The bridge designs were adapted from blueprints of existing bridges in the state of Florida and encompass a wide range of parameters including horizontal curvature, cross-sectional properties, and number of spans. The bridges after which the analysis prototypes are modeled were designed by different firms and constructed at different times and are considered to be representative of current design practice. Forces are evaluated from analyses that account for the construction sequence and the effect of warping. Loading is considered following the 1998 AASHTO-LRFD provisions. Differences between stresses obtained taking warping into account and those calculated by ignoring warping are used to evaluate the effect of warping. Analysis results show that warping has little effect on both shear and normal stresses in all bridges.

6. Alok Bhowmick presented Detailing Provisions of IRC: 112-2011 Compared with Previous Codes (IRC: 21 & IRC: 18) Part-2: Detailing Requirement for Structural Member & Ductile

Detailing for Seismic Resistance (Section 16 & 17 of IRC: 112). The unified concrete code (IRC: 112) published by the Indian Road Congress (IRC) in November 2011 combining the code for reinforced concrete and prestressed concrete structures. The new unified concrete code (IRC: 112) represents a significant difference from the previous Indian practice followed through IRC: 21 & IRC: 18. The code is less prescriptive and offer greater choice of design and detailing methods with scientific reasoning. This new generation code, when used with full understanding, will bring benefits to all sectors of our society as it will eventually lead to safer construction make a tangible contribution towards a sustainable society. The present situation in the industry is that most of the consulting officers are struggling to understand this code, which is not so user friendly. Since the designer is hard to pressed for time, majority of the consultants are unfortunately spending their valuable time only in fulfilling the prescribed rules of the code, acting as a technical lawyer, with very little understanding of the subject

BIOGRAPHIES



NANCHARI KANCHALA, M. TECH STRUCTURES Assistant professor, Dept of CIVIL ENGINEERING, ISLEC, HYDERABAD, INDIA.



SHAIK MUKTHAR,

Student, Dept of CIVIL ENGINEERING, ISLEC, HYDERABAD, INDIA.



MOHAMMED FARKHANDA ALI KHAN, Student, Dept of CIVIL

ENGINEERING, HYDERABAD, INDIA. CIVIL ISLEC,



MOHAMMED IBRAHIM,

Student, Dept of CIVIL ENGINEERING, ISLEC, HYDERABAD, INDIA.