San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge Self Anchored Suspension Span (SFOBB SAS)

SEISMIC EVALUATION OF SAS AT E2 PIER PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF SHEAR KEYS S1 & S2 July 15, 2013

Appendices A-E

Appendix A - Pier E2 Shear Key and Bearing Design Plans



































Appendix B – Bearing Upper Housing FEM

ANALYSIS OF BEARING UPPER HOUSING FOR SEISMIC LOADS

Self-Anchored Suspension Bridge

San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project

Caltrans Project No. 04-0120F4

T.Y. Lin International / Moffatt & Nichol Joint Venture

July 15, 2013

INTRODUCTION

This study investigates the scenario of using only the permanent bearings to resist the seismic safety evaluation earthquake (SEE) load (without shear keys engaged – Load Path B and C).

MODEL

The behavior of the bearing upper housing was evaluated using a finite element model. This model was created using ADINA.

As shown in the figure below, the model includes the following structural components:

- 1. Bearing upper housing (Pink)
- 2. OBG base plate (Orange)
- 3. Bearing anchor bolts (Red vertical lines)
- 4. Anchor blocks for the bearing anchor bolts (Green)
- 5. Rigid Shell at the outer boundary of bearing shaft (Blue and Brown)

Page 2 of 7

CONNECTIVITY AND BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

In order to apply the designated loading, the surface of the bearing shaft is modeled with shell elements. The loading To ensure stability of the analysis model, the shell is fully connected to one side (left in the above figure) of the bearing upper housing, through rigid links between the shell and inner face of the bearing housing arm. It is noteworthy that this rigid linked connection is expected to distort the results in the vicinity of the connection locations as an artifact of the modeling that should be discounted. Therefore, the results from the other arm (right) of the bearing housing should be used when applicable. Part of the shell body between the two arms of the bearing upper housing is rigidly connected to the loading point defined per plan, at the CG of the bearing shaft. A coupled contact surface is established between the shell body and the inner face of the other bearing housing arm. The contact surface assumes zero friction to simulate a lubricated interface.

The bearing upper housing is in contact with the bottom face of the OBG base plate. The contact friction coefficient is set to be 0.5, for the designated Class B finish. The upper housing is held to the OBG by A354BD anchor bolts of 3 inch diameter. The anchor bolts are constrained to the bolt holes on both the bearing upper housing and the anchor blocks. The anchor bolts are pretensioned to 0.7fpu under the dead load condition.

For simplicity, the OBG base plate is fully fixed, providing a rigid contact surface for the bearing upper housing. The anchor blocks are also rigidly supported, as they are welded to the OBG frame, which is not fully modeled in this analysis.

LOADS

Bearing forces were extracted from a seismic (time history) analysis of the self-anchored suspension bridge including the bearings and shear keys. The total longitudinal, transverse, and vertical loads transferred from the westbound and eastbound box girders to Pier E2 were extracted from the analysis and distributed to the bearings and shear keys in accordance with the plans. The bearing loads are shown in Table 1.

Normal functioning of the bearing corresponds to the case "Shear Key Engaged". The bearing is only required to carry vertical loads. These are either downwards—case C—or upwards—case U. Upwards loads are of greatest concern and are addressed in this report. A "safety factor" of 1.4 is applied to the calculated loads from the seismic analysis.

The bearing is also intended to function as a secondary mechanism to resist longitudinal and transverse loads should the shear keys fail. The three cases of greatest interest are those corresponding to the peak uplift on the bearing (case U), the peak transverse load (case T), and the peak longitudinal load (case L). In each case the orthogonal loads occurring simultaneously with the peak loads are also tabulated (and analyzed). These loads are applied with a "safety factor" of 1.0, since they are based on the conservative assumption that the shear key has failed.

Bea	aring Forces	(SF=1.4)			_	
Case	Case	Trans.	Long.	Vert.	_	
Shear Key Engaged	С	0	310	81104		
(Load Path A)	U	0	108	-13355		

Bearir	ng Forces	(SF=1.0)		
Case	Case	Trans.	Long.	Vert.
Shear Key Failed (Load Path B & C – See Note)	С	10799	4770	57932
	U	25287	1628	-9539
	Т	30496	8186	16441
	L	1340	13232	19255

Note: The same seismic demands are conservatively assumed for Load Path C.

Table 1, Bearing Loads

As mentioned previously, the loading on the model is assigned at the CG of the bearing shaft, which transfers the force from the bearing upper housing to the bearing lower housing.

The load is modeled as pressure loading applied at relevant surfaces, with some simplifications.

Page 5 of 7

ASSUMPTIONS

Assumptions are made in this analysis model, due to various constraints. The assumptions might be implied in the model description above, but are summarized as follows:

1. The load transfer mechanism within the bearing might be more complicated than the simplified single node loading. But the current loading scheme is considered to capture the behavior with sufficient accuracy.

Page 6 of 7

- 2. The stiffness of the supporting OBG structure, and the bearing shaft and lower housing, will affect the stress distribution of the upper housing. But it is considered to have minor effect and therefore is not included in this analysis.
- 3. No shearing and bearing action is considered for the bolt model, only axial tension with the corresponding friction that holds the various components of the model together.

CONCLUSIONS

A series of finite element analyses were performed to determine the response of the bearing upper housing to seismic loads. Of particular interest are the stresses induced by peak uplift and peak transverse and longitudinal loads (with orthogonal loads occurring simultaneously). In all cases, the effective stresses in the housing are less than the yield strength of the material (not counting stresses concentrations related to simplified load application and boundary conditions – these superficial concentrated stresses are of no concern).

Page ${\bf 7}$ of ${\bf 7}$










SAS_E2_BrgUp_201-204_Brg_Upper_Bolt_MaxUplift_WithoutSK_ISOVIEW2_AXIAL_STRESS



SAS_E2_BrgUp_201-204_Brg_Upper_MaxLongiShear_WithoutSK_ISO_PosiY_EFFECTIVE_STRESS



SAS_E2_BrgUp_201-204_Brg_Upper_Bolt_MaxLongiShear_WithoutSK_ISOVIEW2_AXIAL_STRESS

E2 Bearings - Upper Housing Package_2013.07.15.pdf

Page 6 of 10



SAS_E2_BrgUp_201-204_Brg_Upper_MaxTransShear_WithoutSK_ISO_PosiY_EFFECTIVE_STRESS



SAS_E2_BrgUp_201-204_Brg_Upper_Bolt_MaxTransShear_WithoutSK_ISOVIEW2_AXIAL_STRESS

E2 Bearings - Upper Housing Package_2013.07.15.pdf

Page 8 of 10



SAS_E2_BrgUp_201-204_Brg_Upper_MaxUplift_WithSK_ISO_PosiY_EFFECTIVE_STRESS



SAS_E2_BrgUp_201-204_Brg_Upper_Bolt_MaxUplift_WithSK_ISOVIEW2_AXIAL_STRESS

Appendix C – Bearing Lower Housing FEM

ANALYSIS OF BEARING BOTTOM HOUSING FOR SEISMIC LOADS

Self-Anchored Suspension Bridge

San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project

Caltrans Project No. 04-0120F4



T.Y. Lin International / Moffatt & Nichol Joint Venture

July 13, 2013

INTRODUCTION

The bearing bottom housing surrounds the spherical bushing assembly and transfers bearing loads to the bearing hold down assembly, see Figure 1.



Figure 1, Bearing assembly showing the bearing bottom housing.

This report summarizes a series of analyses demonstrating the response of the bearing bottom housing to seismic loads.

LOADS

Bearing forces were extracted from a seismic (time history) analysis of the self-anchored suspension bridge including the bearings and shear keys. The total longitudinal, transverse, and vertical loads transferred from the westbound and eastbound box girders to Pier E2 were extracted from the analysis and distributed to the bearings and shear keys in accordance with the plans. The bearing loads are shown in Table 1.

Normal functioning of the bearing corresponds to the case "Shear Key Engaged". The bearing is only required to carry vertical loads. These are either downwards—case C—or upwards—case U. Upwards loads are of greatest concern and are addressed in this report. A "safety factor" of 1.4 is applied to the calculated loads from the seismic analysis.

The bearing is also intended to function as a secondary mechanism to resist longitudinal and transverse loads should the shear keys fail. The three cases of greatest interest are those corresponding to the peak uplift on the bearing (case U), the peak transverse load (case T), and the

peak longitudinal load (case L). In each case the orthogonal loads occurring simultaneously with the peak loads are also tabulated (and analyzed). These loads are applied with a "safety factor" of 1.0, since they are based on the conservative assumption that the shear key has failed.

Bearing Forces (SF=1.4)					
Case	Case	Trans.	Long.	Vert.	
Shear Key Engaged	С	0	310	81104	
(Load Path A)	U	0	108	-13355	
Bearing Forces (SF=1.0)					
â					
Case	Case	Trans.	Long.	Vert.	
Case	Case C	Trans. 10799	Long. 4770	Vert. 57932	
Case Shear Key Failed	Case C U	Trans. 10799 25287	Long. 4770 1628	Vert. 57932 -9539	

Note: The same seismic demands are conservatively assumed for Load Path C.

1340

13232

19255

Table 1, Bearing Loads

L

MODEL

Finite Element Model

The behavior of the bearing bottom housing was evaluated using the finite element model shown in Figure 2. This model was created using ADINA.



Figure 2, ADINA model of bottom bearing housing

The body of the bottom bearing housing is colored green in Figure 2. The spherical bushing assembly is colored red. The interface between the housing and the bushing was modeled with a contact surface able to transfer compression only.

Loads

For simplicity, longitudinal and vertical loads were distributed over the vertical faces of the spherical bushing assembly, as shown in Figure 3.



Figure 3, Application of vertical and longitudinal loads

Transverse loads are transferred to the bearing bottom housing through contact with the bearing upper housing on the side faces of both housings. This contact is complex. For simplicity, transverse loads were applied to the bearing bottom housing on the bottom half of the perimeter of the opening in the housing, as shown in Figure 4.



Figure 4, Application of transverse loads

Boundary Conditions

The bearing bottom housing is restrained through contact with the bearing hold down assembly. In lieu of modeling this contact, the restraint was modeled by fixed boundaries applied to the edges of the bearing bottom housing. The restrained edges were chosen to reflect the direction of the applied loads. The restrained boundaries used to resist uplift on the housing are shown in Figure 5.



Figure 5, Boundary conditions used to analyze uplift

RESULTS

Maximum Uplift (Safety Factor = 1.4)

Assuming the shear key is functional, the loads on the bearing bottom housing are vertical. For the critical case of uplift on the bearing, the computed effective (von Mises) stresses in the housing are shown in Figure 6.



Figure 6, Effective stresses for maximum uplift (safety factor = 1.4)

The peak stresses in the body of the housing are about 175 MPa, which is well below the yield strength of the material of 550 MPa. Stresses on the restrained edges are also high. These overes-

timate the actual stresses because the contact of the housing with the hold down assembly will occur over some area rather than on an edge.

Maximum Uplift (Safety Factor = 1.0)

Assuming that the shear keys have failed, the bearings will resist longitudinal and transverse loads in addition to vertical loads. These loads are considered with a "safety factor" of 1.0. For the case of maximum uplift, the effective stresses are shown in Figure 7.



Figure 7, Effective stresses for maximum uplift (safety factor = 1.0)

There are high stresses around the bottom perimeter of the opening in the housing (where the spherical bushing assembly fits into the housing). This is due to the application of the transverse loads to the housing along this line. The stresses along this line overestimate the actual stresses in the housing because transverse loads will be applied over some contact area with the bearing top housing.

Aside from the aforementioned stress concentrations and those occurring along the restrained edges, the peak stresses in the housing are about 280 MPa.

Maximum Transverse Load (Safety Factor = 1.0)

Also assuming that the shear keys have failed, the effective stresses for the case of maximum transverse load are shown in Figure 8. Aside from stresses concentrations related to the (simplified) application of the loads and the boundary conditions, the peak stress in the housing is about 200 MPa.

Maximum Longitudinal Load (Safety Factor = 1.0)

Also assuming that the shear keys have failed, the effective stresses for the case of maximum longitudinal load are shown in Figure 9. Aside from stresses concentrations related to the (simplified) application of the loads and the boundary conditions, the peak stress in the housing is about 200 MPa.



Figure 8, Effective stresses for maximum transverse load (safety factor = 1.0)



Figure 9, Effective stresses for maximum longitudinal load (safety factor = 1.0)

CONCLUSIONS

A series of finite element analyses were performed to determine the response of the bearing bottom housing to seismic loads. Of particular interest are the stresses induced by peak uplift and peak transverse and longitudinal loads (with orthogonal loads occurring simultaneously). In all cases, the effective stresses in the housing are less than the yield strength of the material (not counting stresses concentrations related to simplified load application and boundary conditions – these superficial concentrated stresses are of no concern).

Appendix D – Bearing Hold Down Assembly FEM

ANALYSIS OF BEARING LOWER HOUSING HOLD DOWN ASSEMBLY FOR SEISMIC LOADS

Self-Anchored Suspension Bridge

San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project

Caltrans Project No. 04-0120F4



T.Y. Lin International / Moffatt & Nichol Joint Venture

July 15, 2013

INTRODUCTION

This study investigates the scenario of using only the permanent bearings to resist the seismic safety evaluation earthquake (SEE) load (without shear keys engaged – Load Path B and C).

MODEL

The study is conducted with an analysis model developed in Adina. As shown in the figure below, the model includes the bearing hold down assembly and supporting concrete frame. Both are modeled as solid elements. A total of 24-A354BD of 3-inch diameter anchor bolts are modeled as truss elements, with both ends fixed to the concrete and the hold down assembly. The anchor bolts are assigned with initial tension strain that simulates installed pre-tension and are modeled with an initial tension equivalent to 0.7fpu per the plans.

The hold down assembly includes three pieces: one base plate and two top pieces which are held down by the anchor bolts. The two top pieces have a split interface at the transverse CL of the pier. The hold down assembly is modeled based on the as-built condition, which includes larger chamfer in each individual anchor bolt hole.

To ensure analysis efficiency and accuracy, only a portion of the concrete pier is modeled. The bottom of the concrete model is fixed.

The resistance at interface of all model components is only static friction based on the contact pressure. Bolt shear capacity is not considered across the interface and is conservative. The contact surface between the faces of the hold down assembly pieces uses a coefficient of 0.5 which corresponds to a Class B surface. The contact surface between the hold down assembly and the concrete pier uses a coefficient of friction of 0.67 for the as-built condition.



Page 2 of 5

LOADS

Bearing forces were extracted from a seismic (time history) analysis of the self-anchored suspension bridge including the bearings and shear keys. The total longitudinal, transverse, and vertical loads transferred from the westbound and eastbound box girders to Pier E2 were extracted from the analysis and distributed to the bearings and shear keys in accordance with the plans. The bearing loads are shown in Table 1.

Normal functioning of the bearing corresponds to the case "Shear Key Engaged". The bearing is only required to carry vertical loads. These are either downwards—case C—or upwards—case U. Upwards loads are of greatest concern and are addressed in this report. A "safety factor" of 1.4 is applied to the calculated loads from the seismic analysis.

The bearing is also intended to function as a secondary mechanism to resist longitudinal and transverse loads should the shear keys fail. The three cases of greatest interest are those corresponding to the peak uplift on the bearing (case U), the peak transverse load (case T), and the peak longitudinal load (case L). In each case the orthogonal loads occurring simultaneously with the peak loads are also tabulated (and analyzed). These loads are applied with a "safety factor" of 1.0, since they are based on the conservative assumption that the shear key has failed.

Bearing Forces (SF=1.4)				
Case	Case	Trans.	Long.	Vert.
Shear Key Engaged	С	0	310	81104
(Load Path A)	U	0	108	-13355
Bearing Forces (SF=1.0)				
Case	Case	Trans.	Long.	Vert.
	С	10799	4770	57932
Shear Key Failed	U	25287	1628	-9539
(Load Path B – See Not	ie) T	30496	8186	16441
	L	1340	13232	19255

Note: The same seismic demands are conservatively assumed for Load Path C.

Table 1, Bearing Loads

The load is modeled as pressure loading applied at relevant surfaces, with some simplifications.







Page 4 of 5

	SAS_E2_B4_111	n 8:9:2, 12 July 2013' Licensed from ADBNA R&D, Inc. 114_Brg_HoldDown_MaxUpHL_WithSK_Loading_Unit_	MNumirad		
	, ↓_×			PRESCRIBED PRESSURE 11/4E 7.000	TIPHE 7.000
				z	

CONCLUSIONS

A series of finite element analyses were performed to determine the response of the bearing lower housing hold down assembly to seismic loads. Of particular interest are the stresses induced by peak uplift and peak transverse and longitudinal loads (with orthogonal loads occurring simultaneously). The analysis results are presented graphically for the four most critical load cases in Appendix A. The following can be concluded:

- Load Path A:
 - Case U: The effective stresses are less than yield.
- Load Path B:
 - Case L: The effective stresses are less than yield.
 - Case T: Localized yielding is expected at the edges where contact between the lower housing and the hold down assembly occurs. Note that the magnitude of the effective stresses are magnified by the simplified load application and boundary conditions.
 - Case U: Localized yielding may be expected at the corners where contact between the lower housing and the hold down assembly occurs. Note that the magnitude of the effective stresses are magnified by the simplified load application and boundary conditions.

For Load Path B (Case T and Case U), minor damage to the bearing lower housing hold down assembly is expected under the extreme event of SEE if all the shear keys failed. However, it is important to note that for Load Path C, the Transverse Shear at the Pier E2 Bent is shared among the four bearings (B1, B2, B3 and B4) and Shear Keys (S3 and S4) thereby reducing the demand by about a factor of 4/6, thereby reducing the stresses close to yield.





E2 Bearings - Hold Down Assembly Package_2013.07.15.pdf

Page 2 of 9



Page 3 of 9

E2 Bearings - Hold Down Assembly Package_2013.07.15.pdf

SFOBB-SAS

Shear Key Retrofit Analysis Summary

TYLIN International



E2 Bearings - Hold Down Assembly Package_2013.07.15.pdf

SAS_E2_B4_111-114_Brg_HoldDown_MaxLongiShear_WithoutSK_ISOVIEW2_EFFECTIVE_STRESS

07/15/13

Page 4 of 9



Page 5 of 9

SFOBB-SAS

Shear Key Retrofit Analysis Summary

TYLIN International



E2 Bearings - Hold Down Assembly Package_2013.07.15.pdf

SAS_E2_B4_111-114_Brg_HoldDown_MaxTransShear_WithoutSK_ISOVIEW2_EFFECTIVE_STRESS

07/15/13

Page 6 of 9



Page 7 of 9

E2 Bearings - Hold Down Assembly Package_2013.07.15.pdf



E2 Bearings - Hold Down Assembly Package_2013.07.15.pdf

Page 8 of 9



E2 Bearings - Hold Down Assembly Package_2013.07.15.pdf

Page 9 of 9

Appendix E – Pier E2 Push-Over Analysis

The superstructure supports at Pier E2 were developed with four (4) shear keys resisting the horizontal forces and four (4) bearings carrying the vertical loads. This design is based on the 1998 recommendation of the Seismic Safety Peer Review Panel (SSPRP) to have horizontal load carrying members separate and independent from the vertical load carrying members.

The shear keys were designed for the larger of:

- 1.4 times the Safety Evaluation Earthquake (from Time History Analysis)
- 1.15 times pushover strength of Pier E2 using maximum feasible material overstrength properties (f'ce = 1.7f'c for concrete and fye = 1.3fy for rebar)

The 100% design considered prestressing the shear key stub down to the crossbeam and utilized shear friction to resist design horizontal force. The large prestressing force is required to provide adequate friction force as well as preventing any uplift, and this necessitated the use of large diameter, high-strength anchor rods.

Seismic Demand			Design Shear (Max of 1.4 SEE or 1.15 Pushover)		
Total Shear at Bent E2	Time History (Max of 6 SEE)	Pushover (PO) (1.7f'c, 1.3fy)	1.4 SEE	1.15 PO	Governing Load Case
Longitudinal Shear	50 MN	48 MN	70 MN	55 MN	70 MN
Transverse Shear	120 MN	110 MN	168 MN	127 MN	168 MN

Pier E2: Transverse Push-Over (Base Shear)



225

EAST SPAN SEISMIC SAFETY PROJECT
Pier E2: Longitudinal Push-Over (Base Shear)



EAST SPAN SEISMIC SAFETY PROJECT

227