# Challenges for the Design of Connections and Joints in All-FRP Construction

1

Dr J. Toby Mottram MIStrutE CEng School of Engineering

Costruzioni in Materiale Composito – ALL-FRP CONSTRUCTIONS Università luav di Venezia 18<sup>th</sup> September 2007

































## **Joints and Connections Chapter**

17

Provide design formulae and design guidance for both serviceability and strength limit states.

Determine professional factors for the formulae proposed for the different failure modes based on available test data.

Provide detailing guidelines for end/edge distances and spacing as a function of fastener diameter. Recommendations will be given on bolt torque, clearance hole size, washer type and sizes, etc. Detailing guidelines will be provided for joints and connections that are "bearing" failure controlled since slip-critical load transfer is not practical.

Adhesive bonding will not be considered

WARWICK



# Joints and Connections Chapter

19

To scope design currently found in three types of structures:

#### Trusses

### **Lattice frames**

#### **Braced frames (no sway)**

For braced frame structures the scope of Chapter 8 will be for the design of:

Primary beam-to-column simple connections (slide 16).

Continuous beam over column top connections.

Secondary beam to primary beam connections.

Continuous beam bearing on continuous beam connections.

Vertical and horizontal bracing members to primary members (to

involve gusset plates or other connecting elements).

Splice connections for column and beam members.

WARWICK

| eometry ra                               | itios (at R                  | T and no  | environr                                      | nental ag                                     | geing)   |                                |  |  |
|--|------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Source                                   | Plate<br>thickness<br>t (mm) | Bolt<br>diameter<br>/ Plate<br>thickness<br>D/t | Edge<br>distance<br>/ Bolt<br>diameter<br>E/D | Side<br>distance<br>/ Bolt<br>diameter<br>S/D | Width<br>distance<br>/ Bolt<br>diameter<br>W/D | Clearance<br>hole size<br>(mm) | Washer<br>diameter<br>/ Bolt<br>diameter |  |
| Strongwell<br>(1989)                     | 6.35 to<br>19.05             | 1.0 to 3.0                                      | 2.0 to 4.5<br>(3) <sup>1</sup>                | 1.5 to 3.5<br>(2) <sup>1</sup>                | 4 to 5<br>(5) <sup>1</sup>                     | 1.6                            | -  |  |
| Fiberline<br>(1995)                      | 3 to 20                      | 0.5 to 16.0                                     | 2.5 & 3.5                                     | 2.0   | 4  | 1.0                            | 2  |  |
| EUROCOMP <sup>2</sup><br>(1996)          | Unspeci-<br>fied             | 1.0 to 1.5                                      | ≥3  | ≥ 0.5W/D                                      | ≥3   | ≤ 0.05D                        | >2                                       |  |
| Creative<br>Pultrusions<br>(1999)        | 6.35 to 12.7                 | Unspeci-<br>fied                                | 2.0 to 4.5<br>(3.0) <sup>1</sup>              | 1.5 to 3.5<br>(2.0) <sup>1</sup>              | 4 to 5<br>(5.0) <sup>1</sup>                   | 1.6                            | 2.5                                      |  |
| Rosner &<br>Rizkalla (1995)              | 9.53 to<br>19.05             | 0.5 to 1.0                                      | 5 <sup>3</sup>                                | Single-<br>bolt                               | 5 <sup>3</sup>                                 | 1.6                            | -  |  |
| Cooper and<br>Turvey <sup>4</sup> (1995) | 6.35                         | 1.6   | 3   | Single-<br>bolt                               | 4  | Close fit<br>(0.1 to .3)       | -  |  |













## **Joints and Connections**

27

### Design Approaches -STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY LEVEL

Accounts for progressive damage growth and a higher resistance than given by initial damage load (see slide 21). Approaches are semiempirical and require a lot of information! Reduces Factors of Safety.

From 1970s – Hart-Smith – Concentric loading only – Correlation coefficient to convert isotropic stress concentration factors to fit test data for bolted connections with orthotropic plates – Curve fitting. Requires FEA for by-pass load distribution.

From 1990s – EUROCOMP Rigorous Design Method<sup>1</sup> - Characteristic distance concept to characterise additional resistance due to damage tolerance – Requires FEA for source (load distribution to bolts) and target (local stress distributions around bolt-hole).

 $\overline{WA} RWICK$  Note: 1. Complex and not shown to be practical.







## **Concluding Remarks**

- UK has seen a steady progress in the execution of novel and innovative structures of FRP structural materials, and this progress can be expected to grow as technologies mature and we seek sustainable solutions for buildings and bridges.
- Knowing how to design safe and reliable connections and joints remains the biggest challenge for those wanting to exploit FRPs in construction.
- For pultruded shapes bolting is the primary connection method (it provides flexibility and is familiar).
- There is a need for standard connection details giving easy to assemble structures that are safe, reliable and cost-effective.

## WARWICK



