

ANALYSIS AND DESIGN OF STEEL DECK – CONCRETE COMPOSITE SLABS

Budi Ryanto Widjaja

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Civil Engineering

W. S. Easterling, Chairman

R. M. Barker

E. G. Henneke

S. M. Holzer

T. M. Murray

October, 1997

Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: composite slabs, direct method, iterative method, finite element model, long span, resistance factor

ANALYSIS AND DESIGN OF STEEL DECK – CONCRETE COMPOSITE SLABS

by

Budi R. Widjaja

Dr. W. S. Easterling, Chairman

Department of Civil Engineering

(ABSTRACT)

As cold-formed steel decks are used in virtually every steel-framed structure for composite slab systems, efforts to develop more efficient composite floor systems continues. Efficient composite floor systems can be obtained by optimally utilizing the materials, which includes the possibility of developing long span composite slab systems. For this purpose, new deck profiles that can have a longer span and better interaction with the concrete slab are investigated.

Two new mechanical based methods for predicting composite slab strength and behavior are introduced. They are referred to as the iterative and direct methods. These methods, which accurately account for the contribution of parameters affecting the composite action, are used to predict the strength and behavior of composite slabs. Application of the methods in the analytical and experimental study of strength and behavior of composite slabs in general reveals that more accurate predictions are obtained by these methods compared to those of a modified version of the Steel Deck Institute method (SDI-M). A nonlinear finite element model is also developed to provide additional reference. These methods, which are supported by elemental tests of shear bond and end anchorages, offer an alternative solution to performing a large number of full-scale tests as required for the traditional m-k method. Results from 27 composite slab tests are compared with the analytical methods.

Four long span composite slab specimens of 20 ft span length, using two different types of deck profiles, were built and tested experimentally. Without significantly increasing the slab depth and weight compared to those of composite slabs with typical span, it was found that these long span slabs showed good performance under the load tests. Some problems with the

vibration behavior were encountered, which are thought to be due to the relatively thin layer of concrete cover above the deck rib. Further study on the use of deeper concrete cover to improve the vibrational behavior is suggested.

Finally, resistance factors based on the AISI-LRFD approach were established. The resistance factors for flexural design of composite slab systems were found to be $\phi=0.90$ for the SDI-M method and $\phi=0.85$ for the direct method.

*In Memory of my Father
and
In Love of my Mother*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am most grateful to Dr. W. Samuel Easterling for his continuous support, guidance and friendship throughout my graduate study at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech). I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to the members of the research committee, Dr. R. M. Barker, Dr. E. G. Henneke, Dr. S. M. Holzer and Dr. T. M. Murray. Special thanks goes to Dr. R. M. Barker for his valuable discussion on the resistance factors and to Dr. T. M. Murray for his valuable discussion on floor vibrations.

I gratefully acknowledge financial support from the National Science Foundation, under research grant no. MSS-9222064, the American Institute of Steel Construction, the American Iron and Steel Institute, Vulcraft and Consolidated System Incorporated. Further, material for test specimens was supplied by BHP of America, TRW Nelson Stud Welding Division and United Steel Deck. My sincere thanks is also for the Steel Deck Institute for the Scholarship Award that I received for my research and very special thanks to Mr. and Mrs. R. B. Heagler for their very warm hospitality during my visit at the SDI annual meeting in Florida. Mr. Heagler also keeps me updated with new technical issues and developments in the SDI.

I would also like to thank to Dr. M. Crisinel and Dr. B. J. Daniels for the access to use the COMPCAL program at the Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne, Switzerland. They also allowed me to use the drawings for the elemental tests.

To all my friends in the Civil Engineering Department and especially those at the Structures and Materials Laboratory of Virginia Tech, I extend my appreciation for their support, discussion and friendship. I am particularly indebted to Joseph N. Howard for his immeasurable help in performing the vibration tests on the long span slabs. Special thanks goes to Dennis W. Huffman and Brett N. Farmer for their constant help and cheerful support during my research work at the Structures Lab.

Last but certainly not the least, I am thankful to my wife, Surjani, for being a constant source of inspiration and encouragement. She is a wonderful wife and friend.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATIONS.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF NOTATIONS.....	xii
Chapter 1. Introduction	
1.1. Motivation and Scope of the Research.....	1
1.2. Organization of this Report.....	3
Chapter 2. Elemental Tests	
2.1. General.....	4
2.2. Review of Research on Elemental Tests for Shear Bond and End Anchorages.....	4
2.3. Shear Bond Elemental Tests.....	6
2.3.1. Specimen Description and Test Set Up.....	6
2.3.2. Test Procedure.....	10
2.3.3. Test Results.....	10
2.4. End Anchorage Elemental Tests.....	13
2.4.1. Specimen Description and Test Set Up.....	13
2.4.2. Test Procedure.....	15
2.4.3. Test Results.....	15
2.5. Concluding Remarks.....	17
Chapter 3. Strength and Stiffness Prediction of Composite Slabs by Simple Mechanical Model	
3.1. General.....	18

3.2. Review of Methods of Prediction of Composite Slab Strength by Means of Semi-Empirical Formulations and Simple Mechanical Models	19
3.3. SDI-M Method.....	27
3.4. Iterative Method.....	27
3.5. Direct Method.....	34
3.6. Comparison of Calculated and Test Results.....	35
3.7 Concluding Remarks.....	40

**Chapter 4. Strength and Stiffness Prediction of Composite Slab by Finite
Element Model**

4.1. General.....	41
4.2. Review of Finite Element Method for Composite Slabs	42
4.3. Finite Element Model	43
4.3.1. Structure Model.....	43
4.3.2. Material Model.....	45
4.4. Method of Analysis.....	48
4.5. Results of Analysis and Discussion.....	49
4.6 Concluding Remarks.....	52

Chapter 5. Long Span Composite Slab Systems

5.1. General.....	53
5.2. Construction Phase	57
5.3. Service Phase	60
5.4. Specimen Description and Instrumentation.....	60
5.5. Load Test Procedure	64
5.6. Test vs. Analysis Results	65
5.7. Evaluation of the Floor Vibrations	67
5.8. Proposed Detailed Connection	69
5.9. Concluding Remarks.....	70

Chapter 6. Reduction Factor, ϕ	
6.1. General.....	71
6.2. Review of Probabilistic Concepts of Load and Resistance Factor Design	71
6.2.1. Reliability Index	72
6.2.2. AISC LRFD Approach for the Resistance Factor	74
6.2.3. AISI LRFD Approach for the Resistance Factor	75
6.3. Statistical Data.....	76
6.3.1. Material Factor, M	77
6.3.2. Fabrication Factor F	78
6.3.3. Professional Factor, P.....	79
6.3.4. Load Statistic.....	79
6.4. The Resistance Factor.....	80
6.5. Concluding Remarks.....	82
Chapter 7. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	83
References.....	85
VITA	96

LIST OF FIGURES

2-1. Profile shapes	8
2-2. Embossment types.....	8
2-3. Shear bond test.....	9
2-4. Shear bond specimen with frames for lateral force	9
2-5. Shear stress vs. slip of specimen SB2-2-A.....	12
2-6. Shear stress vs. slip of specimen SB6-1-B.....	12
2-7. Details of the end anchorage specimens	13
2-8. End anchorage test	14
2-9. Load vs. deck to concrete slip of specimen EA1-1-B.....	16
2-10. Load vs. deck to concrete slip of specimen EA2-1-A.....	16
3-1. m and k shear bond regression line	20
3-2. Partial interaction theory (Stark and Brekelmans 1990).....	22
3-3. Simplified relation between M_p' and N_b (Stark and Brekelmans 1990)	22
3-4. Boundary curve based on the partial interaction theory	24
3-5. Free body diagram of the forces action in the composite slab section (Patrick 1990, Patrick and Bridge 1994).....	25
3-6. Plot of M_u vs. T (Patrick 1990, Patrick and Bridge 1994).....	26
3-7. Boundary curve for the ultimate bending moment capacity (Patrick 1990, Patrick and Bridge 1994)	26
3-8. Reinforcing effects of some devices	27
3-9. Forces acting on the cross section.....	28
3-10. Shear bond interaction	29
3-11. Concrete bottom fiber elongation, dL , and slip diagrams.....	31
3-12. Additional load carrying capacity from the deck.....	32
3-13. Forces acting on the cross section for the direct method.....	34
3-14. Test setup	37
3-15. Test vs. predicted strength	38
3-16. Load vs. mid-span deflection: (a) slab-4, (b) slab-15, (c) slab-21	39
4-1. Schematic model of steel deck to concrete slip	44
4-2. Typical finite element model	44
4-3. Von Mises yield surface in the principal stress space	45
4-4. Concrete failure surface in principal stress space.....	46
4-5. Concrete uniaxial compressive stress-strain relation.....	47
4-6. Typical shear bond shear stress vs. slip	47
4-7. (a) Shear stud to steel deck interaction, and (b) puddle weld to steel deck interaction.....	48
4-8. General arc-length method.....	49
4-9. Slab-4: (a) Load vs. mid-span deflection. (b) Load vs. end-slip.....	50

4-10. Slab-15: (a) Load vs. mid-span deflection. (b) Load vs. end-slip.....	50
4-11. Slab-21: (a) Load vs. mid-span deflection. (b) Load vs. end-slip.....	51
4-12. Composite slab strength: FEM vs. experimental	51
5-1. Prototype 1 and prototype 2 of Ramsden (1987) deck profiles	54
5-2. Innovative light weight and long-span composite floor (Hillman 1990, Hillman and Murray 1994).....	54
5-3. Slimflor system (British Steel, Steel Construction Institute 1997).....	55
5-4. 6 in, 4.5 in and 3 in deep profiles.....	56
5-5. Yield strength and deflection limit states of the construction (non-composite) phase	58
5-6. Steel deck weight vs. span length of single span systems.....	59
5-7. Steel deck weight vs. span length of double span systems	59
5-8. System configuration of LSS1 and LSS2.....	61
5-9. Strain gage and shear stud schedules of LSS1	62
5-10. Strain gage and shear stud schedules of LSS2	63
5-11. Test set-up	64
5-12. Map of cracks in LSS1	65
5-13. Map of cracks in LSS2.....	65
5-14. Load vs. mid-span deflection of LSS1	66
5-15. Load vs. mid-span deflection of LSS2.....	66
5-16. Normalized relative power vs. frequency of LSS1	68
5-17. Normalized relative power vs. frequency of LSS2	68
5-18. Proposed beam to girder connection to reduce slab-beam height.....	70

LIST OF TABLES

2-1. Test parameters	7
2-2. Summary of shear bond test results	11
2-3. Test parameters	14
2-4. Summary of the end anchorage test results.....	15
3-1. Test parameters	36
3-2. Prediction vs. test results.....	37
4-1. Finite element vs. test results	49
5-1. Ratios of actual load capacities and permissible load based on allowable deflection to 50 and 150 psf design live loads	57
5-2. Section properties of profiles 1, 2 and 3	58
5-3. Summary of ultimate load capacity and permissible load based on allowable deflection.....	67
6-1. β vs. p_f	73
6-2. Statistical data of f_c' , f_y , $f_{s,max}$ and $f_{s,min}$	77
6-3. Statistical data of t	78
6-4. Statistical data of P	79
6-5. Statistical data of dead and live loads.....	79
6-6. Calculated ϕ factors for SDI-M method (AISI-LRFD Approach)	81
6-7. Calculated ϕ factors for direct method (AISI-LRFD Approach)	81
6-8. Calculated ϕ factors for SDI-M method (AISC-LRFD Approach).....	81
6-9. Calculated ϕ factors for direct method (AISC-LRFD Approach).....	81

LIST OF NOTATIONS

A_{bf}	= area of steel deck bottom flange / unit width of slab
A_s	= steel deck cross sectional area
A_{webs}	= area of steel deck webs / unit width of slab
a	= depth of concrete stress block $= \frac{A_s f_y}{0.85 f_c' b} \text{ (Eqn.(3-6))}$ $= \frac{F_s + F_{st}}{0.85 f_c' b} \text{ (Eqn.(3-24))}$
b	= section width
C	= resultant of concrete compressive force
c	= depth of the neutral axis of composite section
D_n	= nominal value of dead load
d	= distance of the steel deck centroid to the top surface of the slab (effective depth) = length of each segment
dL, dL_i	= elongation of the bottom fiber of concrete slab of segment i
dL_c	= elongation of the segment at the mid-span
d_c	= deflection of the partially composite section
d_s	= deflection of the steel deck
E_s	= elastic modulus of steel deck
E_o, E_{sc}	= initial and secant modulus of concrete
e_1, e_2, e_3	= moment arms of T_1, T_2, T_3 (Eqn.(3-9))
F	= minimum anchorage force (Chapter 3) = $f_y \left(A_s - \frac{A_{webs}}{2} - A_{bf} \right)$, (Eqn.(3-8)) = fabrication factor (Chapter 6)
F_m	= mean of fabrication factor

F_s, F_{St}	= tensile force in the steel deck resulted from the effect of shear bond and end anchorages respectively
$F_{s,limit}$	= upper limit of F_s
$f_{anchorage}$	= stress in the steel deck induced by end anchorages
f_{bond}	= stress in the steel deck induced by shear bond force, f_b
f_c'	= concrete compressive strength
$f_{c',m}$	= mean of concrete compressive strength = $\mu_{f_c'}$
f_{cast}	= stress in the steel deck induced by concrete casting
f_s	= shear bond force per unit length
f_{shore}	= stress in the steel deck induced by shore removal
$f_{s,max}, f_{s,min}$	= maximum and minimum of f_s
f_t	= concrete tensile strength
f_w	= stress in the steel deck induced by puddle welds
f_y	= steel deck yield stress
f_{yc}	= corrected steel deck yield stress due to concrete casting and shoring
f_y^*	= remaining strength of the steel deck
$f_{y,m}$	= mean of steel deck yield stress = μ_{f_y}
f_1, f_2	= elastic concrete compressive and tensile stress at the extreme fiber
h_b	= concrete depth above steel deck rib
h_1	= depth of the concrete flange (concrete above steel deck rib)
I_{eff}	= effective cross sectional inertia of the slab
I_i	= effective cross sectional inertia of a segment
i	= sequence number of a segment
L	= span length of the slab
L'	= shear span length
L_c	= cantilever length

L_n	= nominal value of live load
L_s	= shear bond length
M	= bending moment, general (Chapter 3) = material factor (Chapter 6)
M_{et}	= first yield bending moment
M_m	= mean of material factor
$M_{m,SDI}, M_{m,Direct}$	= means of material factor with regard to the SDI and Direct method, respectively
M_{nc}, M_{nd}	= nominal moment capacity: phase-1 and phase-2, respectively
M_p	= steel deck plastic moment capacity
M_u, M_n	= nominal bending moment
m	= bending moment caused by a unit load
N_b	= $k f_c' h_b b$ (Eqn.(3-3))
N_r	= number of shear studs / unit width of slab
n	= number of segment from the support to the mid-span
P	= professional factor
P_m	= mean of professional factor
p_f	= probability of failure
Q_i, Q_m	= load effect, mean of load effect
Q_n	= nominal strength of single shear stud
q, q_c, q_d	= load carrying capacity: total, phase-1, phase-2, respectively
R	= reduction factor due to insufficient number of shear studs to provide anchorage = $\frac{N_r Q_n}{F}$ = support reaction
R_n, R_m	= nominal resistance, mean of resistance
S	= steel deck section modulus
s_i	= total slip at a section
T	= resultant of tensile force in steel deck

T_1, T_2, T_3	= forces acting in top flange, web and bottom flange of steel deck
t	= steel deck thickness
t_m	= mean of steel deck thickness = μ_t
u_1^d	= nodal displacement of steel deck beam element in d.o.f.-1 direction (horizontal)
u_1^c	= nodal displacement of concrete beam element in d.o.f.-1 direction (horizontal)
V, V_R, V_Q	= coefficients of variation: general, resistance, load effect
$V_M, V_F, V_P, V_{f_c'}, V_{f_y}, V_t$	= coefficients of variation of: material, fabrication, professional factors, concrete compressive strength, steel deck yield stress, steel deck thickness
$V_{M,SDI}, V_{M,Direct}$	= coefficients of variation of material factor with regard to the SDI and Direct method, respectively
V_u	= ultimate shear capacity
x, x_i	= distance from the support to the section being investigated
y_c	= horizontal projection of y_d
y_d	= depth of deck c.g. from concrete c.g.
y_s	= horizontal slip of steel deck relative to the concrete
y_1, y_2	= moment arm of F_s and F_{st} , respectively
β	= reliability index
ϵ, ϵ_{cu}	= concrete strain, concrete strain at the peak compressive stress
ϵ_s	= steel deck strain
Φ	= standard normal probability function
ϕ	= design resistance factor
γ_D, γ_L	= dead and live load factors
γ_i	= design load factor
γ_D	= correction due to diagonal shear cracking
κ	= fraction of the support reaction, R in Eqn.(3-11)

$\lambda, \lambda_R, \lambda_Q$ = log-normal mean: general, resistance, load effect

μ = coefficient of friction between the deck and concrete

μ_{f_c} = mean of concrete compressive strength = $f_{c',m}$

μ_{f_y} = mean of steel deck yield stress = $f_{y,m}$

μ_t = mean of steel deck thickness = t_m

θ = rotation of cross sectional plane (Chapter 4)

= central safety factor (Chapter 6)

ρ = reinforcement ratio = A_s / bd

$\sigma, \sigma_P, \sigma_t$ = standard deviations: general, professional factor, steel deck thickness

$\tau_{\text{shear bond}}$ = shear bond strength

$$\Psi = \left(\gamma_D \frac{D_n}{L_n} + \gamma_L \right) / \left(1.05 \frac{D_n}{L_n} + 1 \right), \text{ (Eqn.(6-18))}$$

ζ, ζ_R, ζ_Q = log-normal standard of deviation: general, resistance, load effect

$$\Omega_i = \frac{\int M m ds}{\int M m ds} \text{ (Eqn.(3-22))}$$

L