

## D3.1

# Conceptual design of the GFRP deck elements and its connections





D3.1

## Conceptual design of the GFRP deck elements and its connections

### Colophon

Copyright © 2015-2018. All rights reserved.

This publication is produced by SUREBRIDGE work group:

The main author is: R. Grefhorst

Co-authors are: T. Gheorghe

The authors intended not to use any copyrighted material for the publication or, if not possible, to indicate the copyright of the respective object. The copyright for any material created by the authors is reserved. Any duplication or use of objects such as diagrams, sounds or texts in other electronic or printed publications is not permitted without the author's agreement.

The authors are not responsible for the topicality, correctness, completeness or quality of the information provided. Liability claims regarding damage caused by the use of any information provided, including any kind of information which is incomplete or incorrect, will therefore be rejected. If you notice information in this publication that you believe should be corrected or updated, please contact us. We shall try to remedy the problem.



The information in this publication does not necessarily represent the view of the Infravation.

*This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement No. 31109806.0009.*

*SUREBRIDGE project is co-funded by Funding Partners of The ERA-NET Plus Infravation and the European Commission. The Funding Partners of the Infravation 2014 Call are:*

*MINISTERIE VAN INFRASTRUCTUUR EN MILIEU, RIJKSWATERSTAAT*

*BUNDESMINISTERIUM FÜR VERKEHR, BAU UND STADTENTWICKLUNG,*

*DANISH ROAD DIRECTORATE,*

*STATENS VEGVESEN VEGDIREKTORATET,*

*TRAFIKVERKET – TRV,*

*VEGAGERDIN,*

*MINISTERE DE L'ECOLOGIE, DU DEVELOPPEMENT DURABLE ET DE L'ENERGIE,*

*CENTRO PARA EL DESARROLLO TECNOLOGICO INDUSTRIAL,*

*ANAS S.p.A.,*

*NETIVEI, ISRAEL - NATIONAL TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE COMPANY LTD,*

*FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION USDOT*



## Table of contents

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	9
2	INTRODUCTION .....	11
2.1	The FRP deck as part of the SUREBridge solution .....	11
2.2	Scope of the deliverable .....	11
2.3	Outline .....	11
3	DESIGN ASSUMPTIONS, REQUIREMENTS AND CRITERIA .....	13
3.1	Assumptions .....	13
3.2	Requirements .....	13
3.3	Criteria .....	13
4	CONCEPT GENERATION AND SELECTION OF THE DECK ELEMENTS .....	17
4.1	Requirements .....	17
4.2	Concepts .....	17
4.3	Selection .....	18
4.4	Preliminary design of the deck .....	20
5	CONCEPT GENERATION AND SELECTION OF THE DECK-DECK CONNECTION .....	21
5.1	Connection requirements .....	21
5.2	Concepts .....	22
5.3	Selection .....	24
5.4	Preliminary design .....	24
5.4.1	Transfer of bending moment .....	24
5.4.2	Transfer of shear .....	27
5.4.3	Location and distribution along the edge of the panel .....	27
5.5	Preliminary test .....	28
5.5.1	Bending tests .....	28
5.5.2	Shear tests .....	31
5.5.3	Simulating the influence of adhesive bond failure .....	33
5.5.4	Test overview and measured properties .....	33
5.5.5	Preliminary test specimen layup .....	33
6	CONCEPT GENERATION AND SELECTION OF THE FRP-CONCRETE CONNECTION .....	35
6.1	Connection requirements between FRP panel and concrete deck .....	35
6.2	Conceptual design of connections .....	36
6.2.1	Connection concept derived from conventional technique .....	36
6.2.2	Connection strategy developed in SUREBridge .....	37
6.3	Literature review for SUREBridge connect concept .....	38
6.3.1	FRP-concrete composite bridge deck .....	38
6.3.2	Bond mechanism between FRP and cast-in-place concrete .....	39
6.3.3	Bond performance between FRP and cast-in-place concrete .....	41



- 6.3.4 Innovative bond methods from literature ..... 43
- 6.4 Preliminary design of FRP-concrete connection ..... 45
  - 6.4.1 Design derived from the state-of-art literature review ..... 45
  - 6.4.2 Design developed in SUREBridge project..... 48
  - 6.4.3 Select the promising connection proposals ..... 51
  - 6.4.4 Select the proper mortar material for bond layer..... 52
- 6.5 Preliminary experimental test ..... 53
- 7 MODULARITY, LAYOUT AND ORIENTATION OF THE FRP DECKING ELEMENTS ..... 55
  - 7.1 Cantilever widening..... 55
  - 7.2 Shear web orientation ..... 55
  - 7.3 Layout options ..... 55
  - 7.4 Design adaptation ..... 58
  - 7.5 Auxiliary elements and function integration..... 59
    - 7.5.1 Wear surface..... 59
    - 7.5.2 Gutters and water drainage..... 59
    - 7.5.3 Pipes, cables, lighting;..... 60
    - 7.5.4 Railings ..... 60
    - 7.5.5 Crash barriers ..... 60
- 8 CONCLUSIONS FOR THE SAN MINIATO DESIGN CASE..... 61
- 9 REFERENCES ..... 62
- APPENDIX A. BACKGROUND AND STATE OF THE ART OF INFRACORE® DECK PANELS ..... 65
  - A.1. Basics of InfraCore® ..... 65
  - A.2. Mechanical Principles of the structure..... 66
  - A.3. Stiffness driven design and utilization..... 69
  - A.4. Advantages of InfraCore Inside®, common failure in FRP bridges; robustness ..... 69
  - A.5. Added value of robustness..... 70
  - A.6. Production..... 71
- APPENDIX B. INFRACORE CASE STUDIES..... 73
  - B.1. All FRP traffic bridges ..... 73
    - B.1.1. Hoofdbrug Oosterwolde..... 73
    - B.1.2. Kruisvaartbrug Utrecht ..... 74
    - B.1.3. Lelkowo, Poland ..... 76
  - B.2. Composite deck on steel substructure..... 77
    - B.2.1. Friese brug Alkmaar ..... 77
    - B.2.2. Klaffbron Malmö ..... 78
  - B.3. Steel composite hybrid traffic bridges ..... 79
    - B.3.1. A27 Lunetten ..... 79
    - B.3.2. Pijlebrug Meppel..... 81
    - B.3.3. Spieringbrug Muiden ..... 82
  - B.4. Lock doors ..... 83





B.4.1.	Erica-Ter Apelkanaal .....	83
B.4.2.	Wilhelminakanaal Tilburg .....	84
B.5.	Full composite pedestrian bridges .....	85
B.5.1.	Rotterdam series ‘Terug naar de Kleine Maat’ .....	85
B.5.2.	Excercisesingelbrug Rotterdam .....	86
APPENDIX C.	STATE OF THE ART, VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION OF DESIGN .....	87
C.1.	Material tests .....	87
C.1.1.	Tensile, vf, Tg, ILSS tests, WMC .....	87
C.1.2.	Fatigue testing – Tension-tension loading lengthwise (span direction) .....	89
C.1.3.	Fatigue testing – Tension-tension loading crosswise .....	90
C.2.	Component tests .....	92
C.2.1.	Tests Erica-Ter Appel lock doors .....	92
C.2.2.	Fatigue test Gent .....	92
C.3.	Full scale fatigue tests .....	93
C.4.	Impact test .....	95
C.5.	Fire tests .....	96
C.6.	Performance monitoring and assessment of a lock door .....	97
C.7.	References .....	98
APPENDIX D.	RESULTS OF THE PRELIMINARY FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS .....	99
D.1.	Basic hypotheses .....	99
D.2.	Models .....	99
D.3.	Results .....	100
APPENDIX E.	PRINCIPAL LAMINATE LAYUP OF THE INFRACORE DECK AND MATERIAL DATA FOR FE ANALYSIS	105
E.1.	Principal laminate layup .....	105
E.2.	Typical material data and deck geometry used for Finite Element Analysis .....	105



# 1 Executive summary

The SUREBridge solution aims to be a full refurbishment solution for existing concrete bridges, offering both an increase in load bearing capacity and the possibility to change the functionality of the bridge.

The SUREBridge solution does this by offering a flexible strengthening solution that is a combination of externally bonded prestressed CFRP strengthening strips (at the bottom and sides) and a GFRP deck at the top of the bridge. The FRP deck is constructed from modular, easily transportable and installable deck elements and is connected to the substructure in such a way that there is composite action between the existing concrete structure and the FRP deck.

This deliverable outlines the rationale behind the concept development of the GFRP deck elements and its connections to the existing concrete substructure and neighbouring deck elements. As this deliverable focuses on the concept design, a simplified deck is assumed, with perfect connections with its surroundings. This assumption will be tested at a later stage using experimental testing and more elaborate modelling in the detailed design phase.

Based on a number of top-level requirements regarding the offered increase in load bearing capacity, lifespan increase and acceptability – both financially and technically – a structural concept for the deck itself is selected out of a number of candidates. The proposed solution, InfraCore provides a high level of structural integrity (robustness, damage tolerance), has a proven track-record for heavy traffic applications and is proven economical. A first design is proposed, based on the experience of the manufacturer. As the structure is ‘sandwich-like’, it provides a bending stiffness of itself and is effective in spreading highly localized loads to the supporting structure. As such, it relieves the (possible damaged) substructure.

Based on the geometry of the proposed InfraCore deck, a number of options for the FRP-FRP and FRP-concrete connections was investigated. The selected FRP-FRP connection is capable of transferring most internal forces between deck elements. As such, the connection allows assembling a complete deck out of smaller elements, without reducing the load bearing capacity. A practical geometry for the connection is proposed, the capacity is estimated. Test specimens are produced to be tested.

To complete the SUREBridge solution, a number of possible concepts for the FRP-concrete connections have been developed from experience and literature study. As all concepts promise a similar performance level, a test is setup to determine the capacity and practicality of all concepts.

All elements combined form the SUREBridge solution. To assess the effectiveness of the solution and determine first order geometry and mechanical requirements for the design, a finite element analysis on a simplified plate bridge has been performed.

Strengthening the concrete deck using CFRP prestressed strengthening and GFRP InfraCore decking, increases live load capacity with a factor  $> 2,5$ . Shear stress on the bonded joint between concrete and deck is  $< 0,5\text{MPa}$ , which is expected to be well-achievable by all proposed FRP-deck connection options.

The expected live load increase shows a possible upgrade of the San Miniato bridge to modern Eurocode standards if no widening option is selected. For the San Miniato bridge, option A1 was determined to be achievable as a limited widening is required to provide more comfort to passing traffic.