Composites in Constructions, Figueiras et al (eds), © 2001 Swets & Zeitlinger, Lisse, ISBN 90 2651 858 7

Energy dissipation in sections prestressed with FRP tendons

Miguel Morais & Chris Burgoyne
Engineering Department, Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK

ABSTRACT: The main problem in the use of Fibre Reinforced Plastics (FRP) materials for prestressing beams is their linear elastic behaviour; this results in a brittle structural failure. By enhancing the plastic capacity of concrete and by making use of it, we can increase the ductility of our structures. An analytical study is presented that shows that the same values of energy dissipation can be achieved using steel and FRP prestressed concrete sections, provided we use over-reinforced beams with confined concrete.

1 INTRODUCTION

Interest in the use of FRP as a reinforcement material started in the early 1980's due to corrosion problems with steel, particularly in hot and wet or saline environments.

The main advantages in the use of FRP prestressing reinforcement are high resistance to corrosion, high strength-to-weight ratio, good fatigue resistance and low relaxation. The main disadvantages are high cost in comparison to steel; lack of design codes, brittle behaviour resulting in reduced structural ductility and lack of understanding of the behaviour of FRP reinforced continuous structures.

FRP reinforcements exhibit elastic behaviour up to failure, without the typical yield plateau of steel (Figure 1). Therefore, the ductility of FRP prestressed structures has been questioned.

This study focuses on the determination of the ductility capacity of steel and FRP prestressed concrete beams. The use of Aramid FRP (AFRP) spirally-confined concrete and steel fibre reinforced concrete will be studied in order to enhance the ductility of FRP prestressed concrete beams.



Figure 1 - Stress-Strain Curves for steel and aramid FRP rods (FiBRA and Technora)

The ductility of reinforced concrete members is a basic requirement of various design approaches and is fundamental to traditional approaches to reinforced concrete design with steel. According to the CEB-FIP (1998), the plastic deformation capacity of reinforced members is indispensable for:

- Warning before failure of statically determinate and indeterminate structures by large deflections;
- Allowing the use of linear elastic analysis *without* moment redistribution, based on the stiffness of the uncracked section, which implicitly assumes a certain rotational capacity in plastic areas;
- Allowing the use of linear analysis *with* moment redistribution, which requires rotation capacity in the plastic areas to allow for the assumed degree of redistribution;
- Allowing the use of elasto-plastic analysis, which is based on the assumption of indefinite plasticity of the member;
- Permitting equilibrium methods which are valid only if compatibility of displacements can be achieved by plastic deformation (e.g. truss models, strut and tie models);
- Providing an ability to withstand unforeseen local impact and accidental loading without collapse (robustness);
- Dissipating energy under cyclic (e.g. seismic) loading;

The most conventional way of defining ductility is the ability of a material, section, structural element, or structural system to sustain inelastic deformation prior to collapse, without significant loss in resistance. In the past, ductility measures have been expressed in the form of a ratio called the ductility index or ductility factor. This index is commonly based on stresses and is the ratio between the curvature, rotation or deflection at the ultimate stage and the same quantity at the yielding of the reinforcement. Since the FRP tendons do not yield, the conventional definition of ductility index cannot be used (Naaman & Jeong 1995).

To overcome the difficulties caused by stress-based definitions, several authors have expressed the ductility capacity in terms of rotation capacity and hence deformability. However, due to the small Young's Modulus and large strain capacity of FRP prestressing tendons, it is possible to achieve the same values of deflection in beams prestressed with steel and FRP. Lees (1997, 1999) reported that using partially bonded tendons, large rotation capacity and high ultimate load capacity could be achieved. Abdelrahman & Rizkalla (1997) tested partially prestressed beams reporting that, provided the failure is controlled by crushing of the concrete in the compression zone, the deflection of beams prestressed by CFRP is equivalent to the deflection of beams prestressed by steel.

However, large deflections prior to failure do not necessarily imply good ductility. When a beam prestressed with FRP fails by rupture of the tendons horizontal splitting cracks appear. These fractures are the result of the release of a large quantity of elastic energy stored in the tendon. The release of such energy at failure could be devastating to the structure and its users. The elastic energy accumulated in the FRP tendon beams can be two to three times larger than in steel tendon beams and the inelastic energy consumed prior to failure can be several times smaller. Naaman & Jeong (1995) proposed a new definition of ductility expressed by the ratio of the elastic and total energies stored in a beam. This definition is also applicable to steel reinforcement and hence provides a common basis for comparison. By applying this index, they concluded that beams prestressed with FRP tendons have substantially lower ductility than beams prestressed with steel tendons.

1.1 *How can ductility be enhanced?*

Macchi (CEB-FIP 1998) pointed out that structural concrete has its beginning in the lucky coincidence of the following facts:

- Complementary properties of steel and concrete
- Intuition of an engineer in exploiting these properties
- Successful application of these intuitive techniques in design and execution

For FRPs to be successful, it is necessary to identify the complementarity of these materials with concrete, rather than to try to make them look like replacement steel. Since FRPs have different properties from steel, it might be necessary to find concrete with different properties. The lack of plasticity of FRP tendons could be supplemented by increasing the plasticity of concrete.



Figure 2 - Experimental Results of Concrete Confined with an AFRP spirals (HY Leung)

Thus, ductility of FRP prestressed structures might be achieved by forcing the structure to fail by compressive crushing of the concrete. In this way the plasticity of concrete can be used to make up for the lack of plasticity of the tendons. One approach to the enhancement of the limited ductility of concrete is to use concrete confined with aramid FRP spirals (Leung 2000), which does not significantly improve the concrete strength but the strain capacity achieved is two to three times higher (Figure 2). By using these spirals to confine the concrete in the compression flange of FRP prestressed beams, it should be possible to considerably improve the ductility index. Alternatively, adding steel fibres to the mix can enhance the strain capacity of concrete. Wafa & Ashour (1992), reported that the addition of 1.5% of steel fibres results in a much more ductile failure mode with a higher post-cracking strain capacity.

2 DUCTILITY ANALYSIS OF A PRESTRESSED CONCRETE SECTION

The ideal method of determining the ductility capacity of a method of construction would be based on the ratio of the total to elastic energy in the section immediately before failure, and would be measured in tests. But this would require that the specimen be unloaded immediately before failure, which is the only way to determine the stored elastic energy, and is both expensive and difficult to carry out since the moment of failure is not easy to predict. There are also size effects associated with the length of the failure zone which would make comparison difficult. A better approach, at least for comparing alternative forms of construction, is to carry out a computer analysis, in which unloading from any point on the load deflection curve is possible.

A computer program was thus developed that determines the total and elastic/inelastic energy of a re-



Figure 5 - Moment-Curvature Relationships for Under-Reinforced Steel Tendon Beam with Ordinary Concrete (Energy in KN.m*m)

plastic capacity of the concrete and steel is used so a large part of the total energy stored in the section is plastic.

When the prestressing tendon is with FRP, there is no yielding of the reinforcement, and in an under-reinforced beam the tendon reaches its capacity before the concrete so failure occurs by snapping of the reinforcement, without any descending branch in the moment-curvature relationship. Only a small part of the plastic capacity of the concrete is used so the plastic energy ratio is small (Figure 6).

In over-reinforced prestressed beams with ordinary concrete, the behaviour is not very different for steel and FRP tendons. In both cases, the failure is by crushing of the concrete and both steel and FRP behave linear elastically up to failure. The main difference is the lower Young's modulus of FRP resulting in a slightly higher curvature. In both cases, most of the concrete plastic capacity is used. However, ordinary concrete has a limited plastic capacity (Figure 7).

For over-reinforced sections with AFRP spirally-confined concrete (Figure 8) most of the plastic capacity of the concrete is used, and since the concrete has a much higher plastic capacity, most of the total energy stored in the section is plastic. These curves are similar to the under-reinforced steel-prestressed concrete section.

Figure 9 shows the energy dissipation, expressed as the ratio between the plastic and the total energies, for different mechanical reinforcement ratios. There are two sets of lines, the lower lines represents the energy ratio when unloading from the maximum moment in the moment-curvature curve (Max). The upper lines represent the energy ratio when unloading from final moment - half the maximum moment in the post-peak region (Post). Each set has 3 lines corresponding to different material properties; steel tendons with unconfined concrete (StUc), FiBRA with unconfined concrete (FiUc) and FiBRA with Confined concrete (FiCc).

For the two lines corresponding to steel, the



Figure 6 - Moment-Curvature Relationships for Under-Reinforced FiBRA Tendon Beam with Ordinary Concrete



Figure 7 - Moment-Curvature Relationships for Over-Reinforced FiBRA Tendon Beam with Ordinary Concrete

lowest values on each curve correspond to a balanced section; the concrete and steel reach their peak capacities at the same time, so they behave elastically, and therefore the energy dissipation is a minimum. On the left of the balanced section, for under-reinforced sections, the energy is mainly dissipated in the steel. On the right of the balanced section, for over-reinforced sections, the energy is only dissipated in the concrete. It is worth noting that many designers regard balanced sections as being the "best" use of the materials, but in ductility terms they are the worst.

For beams with FRP reinforcement, at the lower values of the mechanical reinforcement ratio, failure occurs by snapping of the reinforcement so there is no post peak behaviour. For the confined concrete, since the concrete has a much higher strain capacity, it is necessary to have much larger mechanical reinforcement ratio for the tendon not to snap.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Figure 9 clearly shows that the energy absorption of sections with FRP reinforcement matches that of balanced sections with steel, provided that the sections are over-reinforced, and that by the use of spirally confined concrete the energy absorption can match that of the best under-reinforced sections with steel.

However, these curves also show that the design philosophy which allows these materials to work efficiently with concrete is significantly different from the philosophy that is conventionally used for sections with steel tendons.

These results have been produced by assuming that the cracking load is significant, rather than the maximum load, and a number of rather arbitrary assumptions have been made to reduce the problem to a simple form. Nevertheless, it is believed that the methods presented here form a rational



Figure 8 - Moment-Curvature Relationships for Over-Reinforced FiBRA Tendon Beam with AFRP Spirally Confined Concrete



Figure 9 - Variation of Energy Dissipation Ratios with the Mechanical Reinforcement Ratios and Material Properties

means of comparing sections of different types, and they also show clearly the changes in principle that need to be applied when using different materials.

5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The first author would like to thank the "Fundação da Ciência e Tecnologia" for supporting his research.

6 REFERENCES

Abdelrahman, A. A. and Rizkalla, S. H. (1997). Serviceability of Concrete Beams Prestressed by Carbon-Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic Bars, in *ACI Structural Journal*, V. **94**, N° 4, pp. 447-457.

CEB-FIP (1998) Ductility of Reinforced Concrete Structures – Synthesis Report and Individual Contributions, Bulletin d' Information n. 242

Lees, J. M. (1997). *Flexure of Concrete Beams Pre-Tensioned With Aramid FRPs*, PhD thesis, Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, UK.

Lees, J. M. and Burgoyne, C. J.(1999). Experimental Study of Influence of Bond on Flexural Behaviour of Concrete Beams Pretensioned with Aramid Fibre Reinforced Plastics, in *ACI Structural Journal*, V. **96**, N° 3, pp 377-385

Leung, H. Y. (2000). *Aramid Fibre Spirals to Confine Concrete in Compression*, PhD thesis, Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, UK.

Naaman, A. E. and Jeong, S. M. (1995). Structural ductility of concrete beams prestressed with FRP tendons, in Taerwe, L. (ed.), *Non-Metallic (FRP) Reinforcement for Concrete Structures – Proceedings of the Second International RILEM Symposium (FRPRCS-2)*, Rilem Proceedings 29, E & FN Spon, pp. 379-386.

Wafa, F. F. and Ashour, S. A. (1992). Mechanical Properties of High-Strength Fibre Reinforced Concrete, in *ACI Materials Journal*, V. **89**, N° 5, pp. 449-455.

7 NOMENCLATURE

A_s – Area of tensile reinforcement (mm^2)
b – Section width (mm)
d – Section depth (mm)
ε_b – Bottom strain
f_{cu} – Mean compressive strength of concrete (MPa)
f_y – Ultimate tensile strength of Steel or FiBRA (MPa)
K – Curvature
M – Bending Moment (KN.m)
s – Spiral pitch (mm)
v_f – Fibre volume (%)