

FLEXURAL MECHANICS OF REINFORCED CONCRETE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM
MIAMI, FLA. / NOV. 10-12, 1964



ASCE—1965-50
ACI SP-12

Price \$10

FLEXURAL MECHANICS OF REINFORCED CONCRETE

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM
MIAMI, FLA. / NOV. 10-12, 1964**

Jointly Sponsored By:

American Society of Civil Engineers

American Concrete Institute

College of Engineering, University of Florida

National Science Foundation

**Copyright by the American Society of Civil Engineers
1965**

SYMPOSIUM STEERING COMMITTEE

A. L. L. Baker	Newlin D. Morgan, Jr.
Vitelmo V. Bertero	Alfred L. Parme
Richard R. Bradshaw	Emilio Rosenblueth
M. Z. Cohn	Mete Sozen
Edward R. Estes, Jr.	Edward E. Walters
Richard W. Furlong	George Winter
Edward B. Laing	D. T. Wright
Alan H. Mattock	Hans Gesund, Secretary
	Herbert A. Sawyer, Jr. Chairman

CONTENTS

Papers

	Page
Introduction and Acknowledgments	5
Status and Potentialities of Nonlinear Design of Concrete Frames by Herbert A. Sawyer, Jr.	7
Discussion by Milík Tichý and Miloš Vorlíček, and Herbert A. Sawyer, Jr.	
Reinforced Concrete Linear Structures at Ultimate Load by E. F. P. Burnett and C. W. Yu	29
Discussion by Edward G. Nawy, H. A. Sawyer, M. Z. Cohn, and E. F. P. Burnett and C. W. Yu	
Safety of Reinforced Concrete Framed Structures by Milík Tichý and Miloš Vorlíček	53
Discussion by Theodore Zsutty, Jack R. Benjamin, C. Allen Cornell, and Milík Tichý and Miloš Vorlíček	
Inelastic Hyperstatic Frames Analysis by A. L. L. Baker and A. M. N. Amarakone	85
Discussion by E. Burnett, D. B. Beal, R. H. Wood, and A. L. L. Baker	
Rotational Capacity of Hinging Regions in Reinforced Concrete Beams by Alan H. Mattock	143
Discussion by Chan W. Yu and M. T. Soliman, and Alan H. Mattock	
Moment-Curvature Characteristics of Reinforced Concrete Members Subjected to Axial Load and Reversal of Bending by Hiroyuki Aoyama	183
Discussion by Kurt H. Gerstle and Leonard G. Tulin, and Hiroyuki Aoyama	
Ductility of Concrete by H. E. H. Roy and Mete A. Sozen	213
Discussion by P. R. Barnard, S. Stöckl, Vitelmo Bertero and C. Felippa, and H. E. H. Roy and Mete A. Sozen	
Elastic Distribution of Moments on Continuous Beams by Giorgio Macchi	237
Discussion by Milík Tichý	

	Page
Behavior of Continuous Prestressed Concrete Beams by Neil M. Hawkins, Mete A. Sozen, and Chester P. Siess	259
Discussion by Milík Tichý	
Recent British Advances in Yield Line Analysis by the Equilibrium Method	295
by Leonard L. Jones	
Discussion by Manuel Xanthakis and Leonard L. Jones	
Plastic Design of Slabs Using Equilibrium Methods by R. H. Wood	319
Discussion by D. H. Clyde, M. P. Nielsen, and R. H. Wood	
Membrane Action in Flexure of Rectangular Plates with Restrained Edges	347
by Antoni Sawczuk	
Rotation Compatibility in the Limit Design of Reinforced Concrete Continuous Slabs	359
by M. Z. Cohn	
Conservatism in Reinforced Concrete Frame Theory by D. H. Clyde	383
Discussion by M. Z. Cohn and D. H. Clyde	
Design of Concrete Frames for Two Failure Stages by Herbert A. Sawyer, Jr.	405
Discussion by M. Z. Cohn, Milík Tichý and Miloš Vorlíček, and Herbert A. Sawyer, Jr.	
Instability Considerations in Limit Design of Concrete Frames by Emilio Rosenblueth and Roger Díaz de Cossío	439
Discussion by Peter R. Barnard, Herbert A. Sawyer, M. Z. Cohn, and Emilio Rosenblueth and Roger Díaz de Cossío	
Statically Determinate or Indeterminate Reinforced or Pre- stressed Concrete Beams	465
by A. A. Gvozdev	
Microcracking and Inelastic Behavior of Concrete by Gerald M. Sturman, Surendra P. Shah, and George Winter	473
Discussion by Peter R. Barnard, George Pincus, Charles A. Rich, and Gerald Sturman, Surendra P. Shah, and George Winter	
The Collapse of Reinforced Concrete Beams by Peter R. Barnard	501
Discussion by Leonard G. Tulin and Kurt H. Gerstle, Ralph M. Richard and Stanley D. Hansen and Peter R. Barnard	

Critical Length of Long Hinged and Restrained Concrete Columns by Wen F. Chang	521
Computer Use in Studies of Frames with Long Columns by John E. Breen	535
Stochastic Model of Creep Deflection of Reinforced Concrete Beams by Jack R. Benjamin, C. Allen Cornell, and Bernard L. Gabrielsen	557
Whither Inelastic Concrete Design? by George Winter with floor discussion and Committee closure	581
Why Nonlinear Analysis and Design? by M. Z. Cohn	591
Review of Experimental Investigations in Session II by Vitelmo V. Bertero	595

INTRODUCTION

All agree that reinforced concrete deviates from elastic behavior appreciably at low load and radically at high load. Present American design practice, as defined by ACI Building Code 318-63, specifies a non-elastic analytical determination of the ultimate strength of members at cross sections while specifying an elastic analytical determination of the moments and forces applied to the cross sections. This basic contradiction is somewhat characteristic of most current codes, and its elimination awaits the development of new methods of inelastic, nonlinear analysis appropriate to reinforced concrete. This development has proved to be slow and difficult, because reinforced concrete is no more ideally plastic than it is ideally elastic, and the new methods must approximate the non-ideal, extremely complex behavior of reinforced concrete and also be tractable. The purpose of this Symposium is the presentation of results of recent work directed specifically toward this goal and generally toward a more basic understanding of the flexural behavior of reinforced concrete.

Acknowledgments.—The success of the Symposium was made possible by the support of its sponsors. The financial support of the National Science Foundation made possible the participation of many authors, the publication of preprints, the relatively low price of these Proceedings, and certain secretarial help and necessary expenditures. For organizing and administering the Symposium, the College of Engineering of the University of Florida willingly provided the necessary man-hours of the steering committee chairman and many others, not to mention the use of its physical facilities and certain specialized and secretarial help. The American Concrete Institute superbly publicized the Symposium and made most of the arrangements for facilities at Miami. And last, but not least, the result of the efforts of the technical editorial staff of the American Society of Civil Engineers is now in your hands.

Cooperating individuals, besides the steering committee and the staffs of the sponsoring organizations, are too numerous to mention. However, exceptions must be made of Raymond C. Reese (an instigator of the Symposium), Ralph W. Kluge, Hans Gesund, and Lynn S. Beedle. Also R. C. Reese, A. L. L. Baker, C. P. Siess, R. W. Kluge, and Eivind Hognestad did masterful jobs of chairing sessions, and V. V. Bertero, D. T. Wright, R. W. Furlong, and George Pincus prepared valuable session reports.

H. A. S.

STATUS AND POTENTIALITIES OF NONLINEAR DESIGN OF CONCRETE FRAMES

Herbert A. Sawyer, Jr.,¹

With discussion by Milík Tichý and Miloš Vorlíček;
and Herbert A. Sawyer, Jr.

SYNOPSIS

Because structural failure generally occurs in successively more severe stages at successively less probable loads, design should ideally account for all stages and be based on comprehensive analysis utilizing a comprehensive, non-linear, force-strain relationship. The criterion for optimum design, using the failure-stage-versus-load profile, is derived. For frames, a method of comprehensive analysis based on a multilinear moment-curvature relationship, using critical moments and "plasticity factors," is presented. Procedures and the relative economics of comprehensive design and its special cases, elastic, plastic, and ultimate strength designs, are compared. A bilinear design procedure for concrete frames, based on two failure stages, is presented.

THE STAGES OF FAILURE AND COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN

Notation.—The symbols adopted for use in this paper are defined where they first appear and are listed alphabetically in Appendix II.

Although asked by the program committee to present a keynote survey paper to the Symposium, it is hardly necessary to state that the views to be presented may not coincide with those of committee members. Rather, what follows will be an effort to establish some basic concepts (flavored by personal biases) by which some of our differences may be clarified, if not reconciled.

As the loads increase on a structure, structural failure may be considered to occur in stages, each more severe than the preceding stage, and each representing a higher relative loss, L , to the owner and users of the structure. However, the probability, p , that the load corresponding to any failure stage will occur in the life of the structure decreases with increase in load. Thus,

¹ Chrm., Symposium Steering Committee; and Prof. of Civ. Engrg., Univ. of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.

a low probability tends to compensate for the high loss of a severe failure stage, and any failure stage may be the most critical in the design of the structure (1).²

Therefore, in the ideal, design is a comprehensive procedure by which the resistances of a structure to the various failure stages are correlated to the probabilities of the corresponding loads so that the total cost, including the first cost and the expected losses from all failure stages, is minimized. This comprehensive design procedure necessarily requires a knowledge or determination of the failure-stage-versus-load relationship for any structure assumed by the designer. This relationship must be obtained by some sort of comprehensive analysis—based on a model by which the designer may predict the behavior of the structure with respect to all possible critical failure stages.

Thus, the ultimate concern of the designer is comprehensive design. Elastic design, limit design, or ultimate strength design are but limited aspects of this concern, and so these terms have been purposely eliminated from the title of this symposium.

THE FAILURE-STAGE VERSUS LOAD RELATIONSHIP

Each load on a structure has its own characteristic failure-stage-versus-load relationship. Also, these relationships vary from structure to structure; such relationships for reinforced concrete structures generally differ from those for steel structures, and characteristic differences exist for statically determinate and indeterminate structures.

Fig. 1 shows the writer's concept of this relationship for a possibly typical load on a typical statically indeterminate reinforced concrete building, including an attempted approximation of the losses corresponding to the failure stages, and a plot of these losses versus the probability of the load in the life of the structure on logarithmic scales.

For this case, the first failure stage shown is that caused by the small creep deflections and minor tensile cracking which always occurs and which causes very small loss (i.e., slight loss in corrosion or weathering resistance). With higher load, the yield point of the reinforcement is exceeded at more and progressively longer regions, leading to wide cracking, objectionable deflections, loss of user-confidence, and need for repairs. Then, with further increase in load, the concrete strains begin to exceed the value, approximately 0.004, at which spalling will occur, and deflections become excessive, soon leading to abandonment of the building. The loss at this point will include not only the cost of the building, but the cost of wrecking and the losses from interruption of the affected businesses.

The final stages are the actual collapse of portions of the frame, followed by the limit stage of collapse of the entire frame. Both of these stages usually occur at appreciably higher loads than spalling because of: The redistribution of forces that continues after spalling, the increase of resistance of some sections after spalling, and the resistance to collapse of those elements of the building usually neglected in the frame design such as walls, floors and roofs. The loss at total collapse has been estimated so as to include

² Numerals in parenthesis refer to corresponding items in the Appendix.




FIG. 1




FIG. 2

the losses from destruction of the tools and records of the businesses and the loss from a 0.5 probability of loss of life of the occupants of the building. Evaluating the loss of a life is difficult and even controversial, and the loss has here been assumed at twice the total future earnings of the occupant, with one occupant assumed for each 250 sq ft of an average-cost building.

A comparable and somewhat typical relationship for a building with continuous steel framing is shown in Fig. 2. Here, the successive failure stages for successively higher loads involve very small, and then larger, amounts of permanent set and deflection, with abandonment of the building following soon after the formation of sufficient hinges for the theoretical collapse mechanism, and with actual collapse occurring at an appreciably higher load because of the strength reserves from strain hardening, the moment gradients at the hinges, and the elements of the building neglected in the frame design.

A significant feature of relationships similar to those of Figs. 1 and 2 is that the relative total expected loss in the life of the building from all failure stages for the particular loading is closely given by the area under the curve:

$$\frac{\text{Total Expected Loss}}{\text{Cost of Building}} = \int_{p=0}^{p=1} L dp = \int_{L=0}^{L=L_c} p dL \dots (1)$$

in which L_c is the value of L at collapse. Mathematically, the error in this relationship becomes negligible for low probabilities, and this error may be neglected for probabilities of magnitude corresponding to the failure stages shown.

Because both scales of Figs. 1 and 2 are logarithmic, the areas of these plots are of variable density. The parallel lines inclined at 45° shown on these figures are contours of constant density, with each successive line indicating a change in density by a factor of ten. Thus, the expected loss is very sensitive to horizontal displacement of any "hump" on the curve representing a failure stage on the curve, and the horizontal placement of these humps is the prerogative of the structural designer.

Two goals of comprehensive design, as distinguished from design for one failure stage, may now be stated in terms of the loss-failure-load relationship. The major objective is the optimum horizontal placement of the failure-stage profile. A minor objective is the adjustment of this profile within the rather severe limitations imposed by statics and other design requirements, toward the optimum shape, for which the failure stages are located close to a common 45° -inclined line.

OPTIMUM PLACEMENT OF FAILURE-STAGE PROFILE

The optimum horizontal placement of the failure-stage profile will be considered first. For an infinitesimal increase in strength or load factor of the structure all failure stages will occur at an infinitesimally higher load with corresponding decreases in probability of occurrence in the life of the structure, dp . That is, each point of the curves of Figs. 1 or 2 will move to the right a distance dp . (The scale of load relative to true collapse load will move likewise.) The corresponding change in expected loss will be the change in area under the curve of the figure plus the changes in areas of all other

similar curves representing all other modes of failure and loading:

$$\frac{d(\text{expected loss})}{C_T} = \sum_{\text{All Modes}} \int_{L_1}^{L_c} (dp) dL$$

in which C_T is total cost of the building, and L_1 is the L-axis intercept (a more significant value of L_1 will be established later). Because, mathematically

$$dp = p d(\log_e p)$$

the change in expected loss becomes:

$$\frac{d(\text{expected loss})}{C_T} = \sum_{\text{All Modes}} \int_{L_1}^L d(\log_e p) p dL \dots (2)$$

The optimum or most economical horizontal position will occur when the sum of the change in expected loss and the change in the cost of the building is zero. The change in the cost of the building may be obtained from the curve of frame cost versus collapse load of which Fig. 3 is an example. Obviously,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d(\text{cost frame})}{C_T} &= \frac{\partial \left(\frac{C_F}{C_T} \right)}{\partial (\log_{10} p_c)} d(\log_{10} p_c) \\ &= 0.434 \frac{\partial \left(\frac{C_F}{C_T} \right)}{\partial (\log_{10} p_c)} d(\log_e p_e) \dots \dots \dots (3) \end{aligned}$$

Adding Eqs. 2 and 3 and equating to zero

$$\begin{aligned} &0.434 \frac{\partial \left(\frac{C_F}{C_T} \right)}{\partial (\log_{10} p_c)} d(\log_e p_c) \\ &+ \sum_{\text{All Modes}} \int_{L_1}^L d(\log_e p) p dL = 0 \dots \dots \dots (4) \end{aligned}$$

In general, the horizontal movements dp , actually $d(\ln p)$, of the points on a curve such as Figs. 1 or 2 will not be equal. Instead, the increase in load for any given failure condition will tend to be proportional to the load. Furthermore, the load scale corresponding to the logarithmic probability scale will likely be somewhat irregular and nonlinear, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2. The value of load corresponding to a probability of unity will usually be the dead

load; the value of load corresponding to a probability of 10^{-1} will usually be greater than the service load; and the collapse load probability is usually not less than 10^{-6} . Therefore, the load-scale tends to expand from left to right.

Both of these factors cause the values of $d(\ln p)$ for $1 > p > 10^{-1}$ or even $1 > p > 10^{-2}$ to be much smaller than the values for the remainder of the scale. Therefore, a good approximation of the integral of Eq. 4 may be obtained by ignoring values of L equal to or less than those for the lowest plateaus of Figs. 1 and 2, and the limit L_1 may then be redefined as the value of L at the top of this lowest plateau, roughly corresponding to the theoretical elastic limit for either steel or reinforced concrete.

A second approximation, involving more error than the one considered above, but nevertheless potentially useful, now becomes apparent. Between L_c and the redefined L_1 , corresponding to values of p on Figs. 1 and 2 between approximately 10^{-7} and 10^{-3} , the load scale is almost linear. If it is assumed that for this range the value of $d(\log_e p)$ is constant, Eq. 4 becomes

$$-0.434 \frac{\partial \left(\frac{C_F}{C_T} \right)}{\partial (\log_{10} p_c)} = \sum_{\text{All Modes}} \int_{L_1}^{L_c} p \, dL \quad \dots \dots (5)$$

This basic relationship may be written thus: For optimum placement of the failure-stage profile, Fig. 1, the slope of the frame-cost versus collapse-load-probability curve, Fig. 3, is numerically equal to the expected loss from all modes of failure for L exceeding the redefined L_1 .

Eq. 5 has more potential significance in the quantitative, rational determination of load factors than is indicated by the rigor of some of its assumptions because of the extremely large changes in probability corresponding to small changes in load.

VARIATION IN SHAPE OF PROFILE

The shape of the failure stage profile is subject to great variation from causes that may or may not be controllable by the designer. At one extreme there is the practically vertical line profile corresponding to an elastic-range instability, fortunately rare, and at the other extreme, there is the structure with broad steps for successive failure stages representing great reserves of strength beyond the elastic limit.

Factors in this variation over which the designer has some control are: (a) The configuration of the cross section of members—for reinforced concrete the choice of tee-beam, flat slab, or folded plate is significant; (b) the ductility of the materials in the members, even considering only reinforced concrete, the choice is first whether or not to prestress; the designer then knows that ductility varies inversely with the net reinforcing index, $q - q'$, over a wide range; and (c) finally, the interaction with flexure of "secondary" effects, often critical, including shear, bond, and the participation of floors, walls, and roofs in flexural action, over which the designer may exert limited control.

However, the designer has very little control over other important causes of variation, most important of which are the configuration of the loads and




FIG. 3.—FRAME COST VS. COLLAPSE LOAD




FIG. 4.—VARIATION IN FAILURE-STAGE LOADS WITH DUCTILITY AND STRUCTURE-LOAD CONFIGURATION

related configuration of the axes of members placed to support these loads. An example of variation from these causes is shown in Fig. 4, which illustrates the theoretical relative load levels for the two statically indeterminate structure-load configurations shown over a range of ductility indicated by the "plasticity factors," k_{lp} , characteristic of bilinear moment-curvature relationships for reinforced concrete (defined in Fig. 8). The load levels are those given by an elastic distribution of moments, P_e , an inelastic distribution of moments limited by an ultimate compressive concrete strain of 0.0038, P_{ep} , and a complete rigid-plastic redistribution distribution of moments, P_u . These levels represent approximately a wide-cracking, a crushing-spalling, and a collapse failure stage, respectively (the last neglecting the restrictions of limited ductility on a full redistribution of moments). Variations in maximum moment at a section for these failure stages have been neglected; therefore, the variations in strength shown are only those caused by differing redistributions of moment. Obviously, the three curves for any statically determinate structure would all coincide on the straight line, $P/P_{ep} = 1$.

Thus, Fig. 4 shows, for only three parameters (configuration of structure and load and ductility) of the several mentioned: First, a wide variation in horizontal spread in failure stage profile (vertical spread on Fig. 4), and second, a wide variation in relative position of the failure stages with respect to each other.

TRADITIONAL VERSUS COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN

Whereas Eq. 5 determines the optimum horizontal placement of any failure-stage profile regardless of its shape or spread, the traditional design procedure of the past has been based on a single failure stage, and placement of the entire profile has depended on a fixed (constant load factor) placement of one hump of the profile. The results for elastic moment design are shown in Fig. 5. In order to assure a permissible horizontal position for the collapse hump for any possible structure (here the statically-determinate structure profile is usually critical), the design loads or load factor for the elastic analysis must be set very high, resulting in overly safe and uneconomical designs for those structures and loadings with the highest reserves of strength from redistribution of moments.

As Fig. 6 shows, a similar situation exists for the plastic design of steel, except that control of an intermediate hump probably provides slightly better control over the humps at either extreme. Here, to insure proper position of permanent-set and over-all collapse humps, the loads for mechanism collapse (probably closest to actual local collapse loads) must be set uneconomically high.

Thus, the primary advantage of comprehensive design is that it leads to the use of lower, more economical, load factors.

COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

Of course, the prerequisite to the optimum placement of the load-failure-load profile is the determination of this profile through a comprehensive analysis, and the solution to this problem will now be considered.