**APPENDICES** 

**APPENDIX A-1: SPECIMEN B.IT.NC.ES** 









**B.IT.NC.ES** North End



**B.IT.NC.ES South End** 

## **B.IT.NC.ES**









**APPENDIX A-2: SPECIMEN B.IT.C.ES** 





A-2-2





**B.IT.C.ES** North End



**B.IT.C.ES** South End





**B.IT.C.IS** Flexural Strain at South Cutoff Location





A-2-7





**APPENDIX A-3: SPECIMEN B.T.NC.ES** 



## T Beam Typical Section







**B.T.NC.ES North End** 



**B.T.NC.ES South End** 



Note: Flexural strain data not available for this specimen, as all strain gages failed during initial test A failure.



A-3-6





A-3-8

**APPENDIX A-4: SPECIMEN B.IT.NC.IS**




Internal Stirrup Repair: Typical Section





**B.IT.NC.IS North End** 



**B.IT.NC.IS South End** 









**APPENDIX A-5: SPECIMEN B.IT.C.IS** 





Internal Stirrup Repair: Typical Section





**B.IT.C.IS North End** 



**B.IT.C.IS South End** 





**B.IT.C.IS** Flexural Strain at South Cutoff Location









**APPENDIX A-6: SPECIMEN B.T.NC.IS** 



**T Beam Typical Section** 



Internal Stirrup Repair: Typical Section





**B.T.NC.IS North End** 



**B.T.NC.IS South End** 





## **B.T.NC.IS** Tension Diagonal Displacement Data offset by 1 in.





**B.T.NC.IS** Supplemental Stirrup Strain

**APPENDIX A-7: SPECIMEN B.IT.NC.CF** 





<u>CFRP Strip Repair:</u> <u>Typical Section</u>





**B.IT.NC.CF** North End



**B.IT.NC.CF South End**








**APPENDIX A-8: SPECIMEN B.IT.NC.NS** 









**B.IT.NC.NS North End** 



**B.IT.NC.NS South End** 









**APPENDIX A-9: SPECIMEN D.T.C.PT** 



## Typical Section at Mid Span











**D.T.C.PT** North End



**D.T.C.PT** South End







D.T.C.PT







D.T.C.PT South Integrally Cast Stirrup 1-4 Strain Data Offset by 8000 με





**APPENDIX A-10: SPECIMEN D.T.C.CF** 



## Typical Section at Mid Span









**D.T.C.CF** North End



**D.T.C.CF South End** 




A-10-7







D.T.C.CF







A-10-13

# APPENDIX B: DESIGN WITH ALTERNATIVE SHEAR STRENGTHENING METHODS

## **APPENDIX B Design with Alternative Shear Strengthening Methods**

The basic steps for shear strengthening include:

- 1) Perform structural analysis of rating and permit trucks to find demands at locations on the bridge. The factored shear and moments should be taken as those that are coincident and the separate peaks should not be combined.
- 2) Determine current capacity of the section according to AASHTO-MCFT.
- 3) Identify critical moment-shear interactions that need to be addressed (where demands exceed capacity).
- 4) Develop shear stress-stirrup quantity interaction plots for these critical M/V ratios.
- 5) Identify the amount of shear pressure required to meet design objective at the critical M/V ratios.
- 6) Proportion the supplemental reinforcing according to the method chosen.
- 7) Detail the repair.
- 8) Check strengthening design with the demands from 1) to ensure design is adequate.
- 9) Check flexural steel for additional demands to ensure adequate anchorage.

The first step is to conduct an analysis of the bridge under the desired legal/permit/inventory/ operating rating level. Structural analysis under the load cases should consider coincident moment and shear effects rather than lumping the maximums that do not occur simultaneously.

Consider a three-span continuous RCDG bridge with 50 ft spans. Structural analysis shows the inventory load rating is controlled by a coincident factored shear of 99 kips and factored moment of 900 kip-ft at the negative moment region (the corresponding M/V ratio is 9.09 ft).

The available strength of the section should be computed and compared with the load demands. The capacity of the section can be estimated using the sectional analysis procedure in AASHTO-LRFD which takes into account shear-moment interaction. The cross section to be evaluated is shown in Figure B1. The effective depth for shear ( $d_v$ ) is 40.2 in. The design concrete strength is 3300 psi. There are 5#11 bars of Intermediate Grade (Grade 40) fully developed at the section. The stirrups are #4 bars of Intermediate Grade (Grade 40). It is desired to upgrade the bridge to an inventory rating level of 1.0 (beta =3.5 for HL93). The AASHTO-MCFT interaction strength curve and factored moment and shear are shown in Figure B2. As seen in this figure, the section requires additional shear strength to achieve the desired rating.



Figure B1: Existing cross section (shown inverted)



Figure B2: Current M,V resistance and demands that produce inventory rating below 1.0

The ability to increase the shear capacity of a section can best be visualized by considering the average shear strength vs stirrup quantity for the given M/V ratio that controls the rating (9.09 ft for the current case). For the given section and M/V ratio the shear stress (V/  $bd_v$ ) vs stirrup quantity ( $A_v f_v / bs$ ) is shown in Figure B3. To achieve the required 99 kips of factored shear the

nominal average shear stress required is  $V_u/\phi bd_v=99/(0.9(14/40.2)=195$  psi. This is shown as the reference line in Figure B3. The current  $V_n$ ,  $M_n$  for the 18 in. stirrup spacing is shown as a vertical line at 63.5 psi on the abscissa. The ACI 318 approach of superposition with additional transverse stele is shown in the figure as the dashed line. If this approach were considered, it would falsely require very little additional transverse steel to achieve the required strength (approximately 81-63=18 psi of transverse reinforcing stress). However, as revealed by the MCFT interaction curve due to nonlinear response of the flexural steel, a much larger amount of transverse reinforcing pressure is required to achieve the strengthening goal (228-63=165 psi). If significantly more shear strength were required, it would be very difficult to increase the strength of the section further without also increasing the flexural strength.



Figure B3: Average shear stress and stirrup quantity for M/V=9.09 ft (the critical load effect demand from Figure B2) on the current cross section. In situ condition to be strengthened is for internal cast-in-place stirrup spacing of s=18 in.

To achieve the goal of 165 psi of additional transverse reinforcing pressure, several options are possible. Using the present research results, these include internal stirrups, external stirrups, or surface bonded CFRP which follows a separate approach. Each of these approaches is described subsequently.

### External stirrups

Consider an option that uses 1/2 in. diameter threaded bars with nominal yield of 70 ksi. The bar area is taken as  $0.2 \text{ in}^2$ . The unbonded length of the bars will be 48 in. The stiffness of the stirrup will be AE/L = 0.2(29000)/48 = 120.8 kip/in. Stirrups should be as close to the web as possible to minimize the moment arm on the supporting steel section. Nominally the bars could be placed within 1 in. from the face of the web, but due to tolerances required to avoid drilling through flexural bars, the permissible offset can be this amount plus the diameter of the flexural bars in the deck (#11 bars in the present example). For the present case the total maximum offset is 1+11/8 = 23/8 in. To provide a section such that only 2/100 of the deformation occurs in the steel support sections, an idealized four-point bending setup is considered with the bars loading the section and reactions occurring on the face of the edge of the chamfer on the stem. Computing the deflection at the rod location, the required moment of inertia for a steel section to provide the requisite stiffness is  $13 \text{ in}^4$ . (use W6x20, I=13.3 in<sup>4</sup> and the efficiency is 98%). This enables the threaded rod to be 98% efficient. To achieve higher levels of efficiency requires much stiffer sections (for example 99% requires  $I=30 \text{ in}^4$ ). For the given service dead load shear (considered here as 30 kips), then the estimated dead load stirrup stress is taken as  $(V_{DL}/V_n)f_v$ =(30/110)40=10.9 ksi (taking V<sub>n</sub> as V<sub>n</sub>/ $\phi$ ). To ensure that the external stirrups yield at approximately the same time as the external stirrups (assuming internal stirrups have already vielded at cracked locations and thus will behave almost elastically until ultimate taken as 60 ksi) as well as ensure strain compatibility, the external stirrups will be post-tensioned to 20 ksi. To determine the spacing of stirrups required, the required stirrup quantity is rearranged as:

$$s_{\rm sup} = \frac{\lambda A_{\nu \rm sup} f_{\nu \nu \rm sup}}{SQb} = (0.98 \times 2 \times 0.2 \times 70000) / (165 \times 14) = 11.8 \text{ in. use } 11 \text{ in.spacing}$$
[B.1]

In this equation,  $\lambda$  is the efficiency of the stirrups considering the flexibility of the supporting steel sections. The effective spacing used in computing the repaired section is taken as:

$$s_{eff} = \frac{A_{vCIP} f_{yvCIP} d_{v}}{\frac{A_{vCIP} f_{yvCIP} d_{v}}{S_{CIP}} + \frac{\lambda A_{vsup} f_{yvsup} d_{v}}{s_{sup}}} = 4.73 \text{ in. spacing of #4 Grade 60 stirrups}$$
[B.2]

The trial design is checked with AASHTO-MCFT and the M,V interaction curve is shown in Figure B4 indicating adequate shear strength.

Finally, due to the increased capacity of the section, the flexural demands must also be checked to ensure anchorage demands will not be exceeded per AASHTO-LRFD section 5.8.3.5.



Figure B4: M,V resistance provided by supplemental external stirrups that will achieve inventory rating for section (internal stirrup option and external stirrup options shown)

#### Internal stirrups

Consider #6 Grade 60 reinforcing steel as the supplemental internal transverse reinforcing. One could use higher strength bars, but the bar stress should be limited to a design maximum of 80 ksi. The bars will be placed at a 45 degree angle. Thus, the supplemental bars contribution to shear strength can be computed as:

$$V_{S \sup} = \frac{A_{v \sup} f_{y v \sup} d_v (\sin \alpha + \cos \alpha \tan \theta)}{s_{\sup}}$$
[B.3]

For the initial design the crack angle  $\theta$  is also assumed to be 45 degrees. Given the required additional stirrup pressure to achieve the desired rating (SQ=165 psi), the above equation can be recast as:

$$s_{\text{sup}} = \frac{A_{\text{vsup}} f_{\text{yvsup}}(\sin \alpha + \cos \alpha)}{SQb} = (0.44(60000)(\cos 45 + \sin 45))/(165*14)) = 16.2 \text{ in. say 16 in.}$$
[B.4]

The effective spacing used in computing the repaired section for equivalent #4 Grade 60 stirrups is taken from Eqn 2. as 4.96 in. The trial design is checked with AASHTO-MCFT and the M,V interaction curve is shown in Figure B4 indicating adequate shear strength

Finally, due to the increased capacity of the section, the flexural demands must also be checked to ensure anchorage demands will not be exceeded per AASHTO-LRFD section 5.8.3.5.

### Surface Bonded CFRP

CFRP strengthening should follow ACI 440 procedures and be combined with ACI 318 base strengths. This approach is described subsequently. In the present approach, the d term is replaced with  $d_v$  which results in slightly smaller strength predictions. The ACI average shear strength vs stirrup quantity is shown in Figure B3. As seen in this figure the section requires a nominal transverse reinforcing quantity of  $(99/\phi)/bd_v = (99/0.75)/(14*40.2)=234.5$  psi. To achieve this average shear stress, the supplemental transverse reinforcing must be able to provide 121 psi of transverse pressure. The current cross section provides 63.5 psi, thus an additional 57.5 psi is need from supplemental transverse reinforcing. Using a single layer of CF130 material with 10 in. wide strips and following ACI 440 guidelines, the spacing of strips can be determined. To do so, the reduced effective CFRP stress for vertical strips is calculated as:

$$\psi V_f(lb) = \frac{\psi A_{fv} f_{fe} d_{fv}}{s_f}$$
[B.5]

where  $d_{fv}(in) =$  height of the web above the flexural steel,  $s_f(in) =$  CFRP strip spacing, and  $\psi$  is a reduction coefficient for the wrap configuration (0.85 for the 3 sided U wrap) and A<sub>fv</sub> is the area of the CFRP strips as:

$$A_{fv} = 2nt_f w_f = 2(1)0.0065*10=0.13 \text{ in}^2$$
 (10-4) [B.6]

and f<sub>fe</sub> is the effective CFRP strain for debonding failure as:

$$f_{fe} = \varepsilon_{fe} E_f \tag{10-5} [B.7]$$

ACI 440.2R-02 limits the ultimate strain of the FRP,  $\varepsilon_{fu}$ , to an effective strain,  $\varepsilon_{fe}$ , using a bondreduction coefficient,  $\kappa_{\nu}$ , which is based on the development length,  $L_e$ , and other FRP properties:

$$L_e = \frac{2500}{(n t_f E_f)^{0.58}} = 2500/((1*0.0065*33,000,000)^{0.58}) = 2.0 \text{ in}$$
(10-7) [B.8]

$$k_1 = \left(\frac{f_c'}{4000}\right)^{2/3} = (3.3/4)^{(2/3)} = 0.88$$
(10-8) [9]

$$k_2 = \left(\frac{d_f - L_e}{d_f}\right) = (33.5 - 2.0)/33.5 = 0.94$$
(10-9) [B.10]

$$\kappa_{\nu} = \frac{k_1 k_2 L_e}{468 \varepsilon_{fu}} \le 0.75 = 0.88 \times 0.94 \times 2.0/(468 \times 0.017) = 0.208 < 0.75 \tag{10-10} \text{ [B.11]}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{fe} = \kappa_v \mathcal{E}_{fu} \le 0.004 = 0.208*0.017=0.0035$$
 (10-6b) [B.12]

where n = number of FRP layers,  $t_f =$  FRP thickness,  $E_f =$  FRP elastic modulus,  $f_c' =$  concrete compression strength and  $d_f =$  depth of FRP reinforcement. Note that the environmental exposure factor (0.85 for bridges) is applied to the effective CFRP strain at the very end based on previous research (Higgins et al. 2009).

$$C_E \varepsilon_{fe} = 0.85*0.0035 = 0.0030 < 0.004$$
 (10-6b) [B.13]

The effective stress,  $f_{fe}$ , is finally calculated from Eqn. 7 as 33,000\*0.003=99 ksi.

For the negative moment region,  $d_{fv}$  is not well defined and was taken as the clear web distance (36 in for the present case) minus the distance to the compression steel (approximately 2.5 in.) =33.5 in. For the selected trial material, the effective stress was computed as 99 ksi. Rearranging the equation in terms of the stirrup quantity required of the CFRP the required, the strip spacing is computed as:

$$s_f = \frac{\psi A_{f_b} f_{f_e}}{SQb} = (0.85*0.13*99000)/(57.5*14) = 13.5 \text{ in. use } 13 \text{ in.spacing}$$
[B.14]

The required strip spacing was computed as 13 in. A check of the bond demand for the large expected demand on the CFRP due to flexural steel yielding (consider Figure B3). The shear stress expected on the CFRP is likely to be significantly larger than that predicted by ACI 440 given the nonlinear response of the section as the flexural steel begins to yield. In fact, for the present section, MCFT results indicate that the section cannot achieve the ACI 440 capacity as seen in Figure B6. This repair method may not be the most suitable for this section.



Figure B5: Graphical definition of  $d_f$  from ACI-440



Figure B6: Repair design approach with ACI-440

ACI-440 limits the FRP strip spacing to the limits set forth in ACI-318 for the internal shear steel reinforcing. However, because of the typical debonding failures, additional detailing should be considered. A spacing that is based on CFRP strip width, the crack angle, and the web height is recommended that will ensure *at least* one strip crosses the diagonal crack with an anchorage length of *at least* one-half the height of the web. The maximum gap spacing between strips to ensure this condition is:

$$g = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{h_w}{\tan \theta} - 3w_f \right) = 0.5((42/\tan 45) - 3*10) = 6 \text{ in.}$$
 [B.15]

As the crack angle becomes smaller, the wider the gap is permitted to be between strips. For a  $45^{\circ}$  crack angle, the FRP strip spacing becomes:

$$s = \frac{1}{2} (h_w - w_f) = 0.5(42-10) = 16$$
 in. [B.16]

where g (in) = gap spacing between FRP strips,  $h_w$  (in) = height of the web,  $\theta$  = crack angle, and  $w_f$  (in) = FRP strip width. The 13 in. spacing will provide a gap of 3 in., thus the above details are satisfied.

Finally, due to the increased capacity of the section, the flexural demands must also be checked to ensure anchorage demands will not be exceeded per AASHTO-LRFD section 5.8.3.5.