Effects of Material Changes on the Performance of Industrial Trusses: A Simulation Approach

Rahul Sharma¹, Sumit Pahwa²

¹PG Research Scholar; Department of Civil Engineering, Alpine Institute of Technology, Ujjain (M.P), India
²Professor and Head, Department of Civil Engineering, Alpine Institute of Technology, Ujjain (M.P), India

Abstract: For many years, trusses have served as one of the excellent load carrying members for domestic and industrial buildings, and are becoming more-and-more useful day-by-day. Considering these facts Present research work is devoted to the investigations on the performance evaluation of trusses under different materials. For this purpose, three industrial trusses, namely, Howe truss, Pratt truss and Warren truss are designed, and performance parameters, maximum compressive force, maximum tensile force, maximum shear, maximum bending moment under compression and node displacement for each alternative under two different materials, hot rolled steel and cold forged steel, are investigated. In next step, in order to get common ranking, a well known statistical technique, coefficient of variance is used. Results of the research work show the suitability of cold forged steel for truss making applications. Results also show that cold forged Warren truss shows the best performance out of the available alternatives.
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1. Introduction

A truss is a structure where each element, typically a bar, only supports tension or compression forces because it is connected to other bars through what are assumed to be multiple spherical joints, although in some cases the joints may be separated in the actual construction. Truss structures and space frames have long been preferred solutions to the problem of maximizing structural efficiency, as they allow for very large increases in the flexural rigidity and load carrying capacity achievable from a given amount of material. The primary advantage of a truss over a monolithic or tubular structure is that grouping the material available into discrete local beam members allows for the overall size of a structure built from a given amount of material to be increased to take advantage of the highly non-linear scaling laws governing bending stiffness and strength (as determined by equivalent flexural rigidity) without being overly restricted by the strength limitations inherent in trying to make large, thin walled tubular structures. Another key advantage of truss structures is that they divide the large structure into a number of local members which due to their slenderness, straightness, and attachment methods are able to act in a manner which approaches an ideal two-force member. A two force member, unlike a beam, experiences only tensile and compressive forces. Structures are considerably stiffer and stronger under axial loading then they are under bending loading, and so the use of trusses allows the material to experience lower stress levels and to be used more efficiently. In present research work, investigations on the effect of material changes on industrial trusses are made. In the research work, three types of trusses, Pratt, Warren and Howe, are considered and their performance under two materials, hot rolled steel and cold formed steel, is evaluated. For the purpose of evaluation well known structural analysis software STADD.Pro V8i SS6 is used.

1.1 Objectives of the Research Work

Following are the objectives of research work;
1) Analyze the effects of material changes on the performance of different industrial trusses; and
2) Ranking of different combinations of materials and trusses.

2. Literature Review

Present section tells about the academic aspects of the research carried out in the field of trusses, and presents a summary of research contributions in the field of trusses, the details of which are presented in upcoming sections.

2.1 Research contributions in the field of Trusses

Table 2.1 shows the summary of research contributions made by different researchers in the field of trusses.
2.2 Gaps in the Existing Research

On the basis of survey of above literature, following research gaps are being identified:
1) There is very limited research which compares different industrial trusses; and
2) There is almost none research available which analyses the effects of material changes on the performance of trusses.
3. Solution Methodology

Present chapter tells about the details of parameters investigated and software used for the research work, the details of which are presented in upcoming sections.

3.1 Investigated Parameters in the Research

Following parameters are being investigated in the research work.

1) **Maximum Tensile Force**  
It is defined as the maximum value of force due to tension effects in the member or assembly of members of truss;

2) **Maximum Compressive Force**  
It is defined as the maximum value of force due to compression effects in the member or assembly of members of truss;

3) **Maximum Shear**  
It is defined as the maximum value of force due to shear effects in the member or assembly of members of truss;

4) **Bending Moment in Compression**  
It is defined as the summation of all bending moments from one end to the other end, in the beam when compressive load is applied on it; and

5) **Node Displacement**  
It represents the maximum displacement of the member from designed location.

3.2 Software used in Research Work

The software used in the research work is STADD.Pro. STAAD or (STADD.Pro) is a structural analysis and design computer program originally developed by Research Engineers International at Yorba Linda, CA in 1997. In late 2005, Research Engineers International was bought by Bentley Systems. An older version called Staad-III for Windows is used by Iowa State University for educational purposes for civil and structural engineers. The commercial version, STADD.Pro, is one of the most widely used structural analysis and design software products worldwide. It supports several steel, concrete and timber design codes.

It can make use of various forms of analysis from the traditional 1st order static analysis, 2nd order p-delta analysis, geometric non-linear analysis, Pushover analysis (Static-Non Linear Analysis) or a buckling analysis. It can also make use of various forms of dynamic analysis from modal extraction to time history and response spectrum analysis.

In recent years it has become part of integrated structural analysis and design solutions mainly using an exposed API called OpenSTAAD to access and drive the program using a Visual Basic macro system included in the application or by including Open STAAD functionality in applications that themselves include suitable programmable macro systems. Additionally, STAAD.Pro has added direct links to applications such as RAM Connection and STAAD. Foundation to provide engineers working with those applications which handle design post processing not handled by STAAD.Pro itself. Another form of integration supported by the STAAD.Pro is the analysis schema of the CIMsteel Integration Standard, version 2 commonly known as CIS/2 and used by a number modeling and analysis applications.

4. Problem Formulation and Solution

Present section tells about the details of implementation of research tools on the case problem, the details of which are presented in upcoming sections.

4.1 Problem Formulation

In order to solve any problem, the first step need is a systematically designed problem. Problem formulation is defined as a first step of a solution. The research problem was the comparison of Howe, Pratt and Warren trusses using different materials. For this purpose, first of all models of different trusses were designed in a modeling software, STADD.Pro V8i SS6, the details of which are presented as follows.
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(a) Howe Truss
Details of properties and reports obtained are presented in Appendix I.

Following are the details of properties of materials used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Hot Rolled Steel</th>
<th>Cold Rolled Steel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Young’s Modulus</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poisson’s Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>gm/cm³</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thermal Coefficient</td>
<td>/°C</td>
<td>1.20E-05</td>
<td>1.20E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Critical Damping coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shear Modulus</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Solution of the Problem

In next step, with the help of expert’s opinion, different load combinations were applied to the models, the details of which are presented as follows.

**Types of loads:**
- a) Live load
- b) Dead Load
- c) Wind Load

**Load Combinations:**
- a) 1.5 (DL + LL)
- b) 1.2 (DL + LL + WL)
- c) 1.2 DL + 1.2 LL + (-1.2 WL)
- d) 1.2 (DL + LL)
- e) 1.5 (DL + WL)
- f) 1.5 DL + (-1.5 WL)
- g) 1.5 DL
- h) 0.9 DL

After application of loads, results were analyzed.

5. Results and Discussion

The section tells about the results yielded out of the analysis as well as discussion, the details of which are presented in upcoming sections.

5.1 Results

Table 5.1 tells about the summary of results obtained.
Table 5.1: Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Type of Truss</th>
<th>Maximum Axial Force</th>
<th>Maximum Shear</th>
<th>Maximum Bending Moment in compression</th>
<th>Maximum Torsion</th>
<th>Node Displacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>CFS-Howe</td>
<td>143.092</td>
<td>39.004</td>
<td>83.428</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>18.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>CFS-Pratt</td>
<td>183.589</td>
<td>25.578</td>
<td>114.449</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>18.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>CFS-Warren</td>
<td>143.902</td>
<td>39.004</td>
<td>83.428</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>15.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>HRS-Howe</td>
<td>144.015</td>
<td>39.319</td>
<td>82.800</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>3.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>HRS-Pratt</td>
<td>185.503</td>
<td>25.833</td>
<td>113.196</td>
<td>1.908</td>
<td>15.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>HRS-Warren</td>
<td>169.632</td>
<td>40.037</td>
<td>77.835</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>13.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graphical representation above results is presented as follows.

Figure 5.1: Graphical Representation of Results for Different Forces

Figure 5.2: Graphical Representation of Results for Maximum Bending Moments in Compression

Figure 5.3: Graphical Representation of Results for Maximum Node Displacement

5.2 Discussion

From results obtained from Table 5.1 and Table 5.1, rankings to the trusses made of two materials can be assigned, as follows.

Table 5.2: Ranking of Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Type of Truss</th>
<th>Maximum Axial Force</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Maximum Shear</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Maximum Bending Moment in compression</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Maximum Torsion</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Node Displacement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CFS-Howe</td>
<td>143.902</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83.428</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.305</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CFS-Pratt</td>
<td>183.589</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.578</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114.449</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.703</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CFS-Warren</td>
<td>143.902</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83.428</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.455</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HRS-Howe</td>
<td>144.015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.319</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82.800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.418</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HRS-Pratt</td>
<td>185.503</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.833</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113.196</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.908</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.781</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HRS-Warren</td>
<td>169.632</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.037</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77.835</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.406</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 shows the absence of common ranking scored by different trusses. For rank 1 CFS-Howe and CFS-Warren truss show their suitability for criteria maximum axial force and maximum torsion. For the same ranking CFS Pratt truss shows its suitability for the criteria maximum shear. In the similar manner HRS-Howe truss earns the same rank for criteria node displacement, and HRS-Warren gets the rank for criteria maximum bending moment.

For rank 2, HRS-Howe truss acquires the rank for criteria maximum axial force and maximum bending moment, HRS-Pratt truss gets the rank for criteria maximum shear force.
whereas HRS-Warren truss earns the rank for criteria maximum torsion and node displacement.

For rank 3 CFS-Howe truss and CFS-Warren truss show their suitability for criteria maximum shear force and maximum bending moment, while CFS-Pratt truss scores for this rank on maximum torsion. Similarly, HRS-Warren earns the rank for criteria maximum axial force. CFS-Warren truss also shows its suitability for the same rank on criteria node displacement.

For rank 4, HRS-Howe truss shows its suitability on maximum shear and maximum torsion. Similarly, CFS-Pratt truss earns the rank for maximum axial force, and HRS-Pratt truss for maximum bending moment and node displacement.

For rank 5, CFS-Pratt scores for the criteria maximum bending moment, whereas for criteria maximum torsion and axial force, HRS-Pratt truss seems to be appropriate. On criteria Maximum shear, HRS-Warren truss also appears for rank 5, whereas for criteria node displacement CFS-Howe truss is appropriate. On criteria node displacement CFS-Pratt truss appears for rank 6.

From Table 5.2, following points can be noted.
• There is the absence of common ranking of different trusses on different criteria; and
• There is absence in common rankings based on truss materials.

Therefore, in order to get a common ranking, a statistical tool, coefficient of variance was calculated for different criteria were calculated. Coefficient of variance is defined as the ratio of standard deviation to the average for scores in percentage. While dealing with parameter, the ranking procedure for the criteria is selected for which value of coefficient of variance is minimum. Table 5.3 shows the details of coefficient of variance for different criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Maximum Axial Force</th>
<th>Maximum Shear</th>
<th>Maximum Bending Moment</th>
<th>Maximum Torsion</th>
<th>Node Displacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>20.27267</td>
<td>7.051908</td>
<td>16.63631</td>
<td>0.604653</td>
<td>5.62284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>161.7572</td>
<td>34.79583</td>
<td>92.5267</td>
<td>7.022</td>
<td>14.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coefficient of Variance</td>
<td>0.125328</td>
<td>0.202665</td>
<td>0.179808</td>
<td>0.837469</td>
<td>0.7028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>%Coefficient of Variance</td>
<td>12.53278</td>
<td>20.26653</td>
<td>17.9808</td>
<td>83.7469</td>
<td>70.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 5.3 ranking of trusses should be done on the basis of maximum compressive force, based on which overall rankings are presented as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Truss</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CFS-Howe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CFS-Pratt</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CFS-Warren</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HRS-Howe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HRS-Pratt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HRS-Warren</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Conclusion, Limitations and Future Scope of the Research

Present section tells about the conclusion, limitations and future scope of the research, the details of which are presented in upcoming sections.

6.1 Conclusion

In present research work, comparison of two well known truss building materials, hot rolled steel and cold forged steel is made for industrial truss applications. For this purpose, three types, namely, Howe truss, Pratt truss, and Warren truss, were designed in STADD.Pro software and five parameters, maximum axial force, maximum shear, maximum bending moment and maximum node displacement were investigated for all the alternatives made up of hot rolled steel and cold forged steel. Due to unavailability of common rankings, coefficients of variance of alternatives were calculated, which give the rankings of trusses as well as suitability of materials. Following points represent the conclusion drawn from the research work.

1) Out of the available options, best material for industrial truss application is cold forged steel;
2) Out the three alternatives, best truss designs are Howe and Warran trusses; and
3) Second best truss design is HRS-Howe truss.

6.2 Limitations and Future Scope of the Research

Following points represent the limitations of present research work.

1) The research work is limited to a particular set of truss materials;
2) The research is also limited to limited designs of trusses; and
3) The research is also limited to the investigations of limited properties of trusses.

Based on above limitations, following points indicate the future scope of the research work.

1) A detailed research work, including a broader set of truss materials can be initialized;
2) An extensive research work consisting of a detailed set of truss designs can is still awaited; and
3) A detailed research work considering investigations on a broader set of truss properties is can be initiated.
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