**SSC-382** 

# REEXAMINATION OF DESIGN CRITERIA FOR STIFFENED PLATE PANELS



This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited

SHIP STRUCTURE COMMITTEE 1995

.

Ship Structure Committee 1995

SSC-382 **Reexamination of Design Criteria for Stiffened Plate Panels** 

.

### SHIP STRUCTURE COMMITTEE

The SHIP STRUCTURE COMMITTEE is constituted to prosecute a research program to improve the hull structures of ships and other marine structures by an extension of knowledge pertaining to design, materials, and methods of construction.

> RADM J. C. Card, USCG (Chairman) Chief, Office of Marine Safety, Security and Environmental Protection U. S. Coast Guard

Mr. Thomas H. Peirce Marine Research and Development Coordinator Transportation Development Center Transport Canada

Mr. Edward Comstock Director, Naval Architecture Group (SEA O3H) Naval Sea Systems Command

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR** 

Mr. Edwin B. Schimler Associate Administrator for Shipbuilding and Technology Development Maritime Administration

Mr. Thomas W. Allen Engineering Officer (N7) Military Sealift Command

CONTRACTING OFFICER TECHNICAL REPRESENTATIVE

Defence Research Establishment-Atlantic

Naval Sea Systems Command

Mr. William J. Siekierka

Dr. Donald Liu

Senior Vice President

Mr. Warren Nethercote Head, Hydronautics Section

American Bureau of Shipping

CDR Stephen E. Sharpe, USCG U. S. Coast Guard

# SHIP STRUCTURE SUBCOMMITTEE

The SHIP STRUCTURE SUBCOMMITTEE acts for the Ship Structure Committee on technical matters by providing technical coordination for determinating the goals and objectives of the program and by evaluating and interpreting the results in terms of structural design, construction, and operation.

MILITARY SEALIFT COMMAND

Mr. Robert E. Van Jones (Chairman) Mr. Rickard A. Anderson Mr. Michael W. Touma Mr. Jeffrey E. Beach

#### AMERICAN BUREAU OF SHIPPING

Mr. Stephen G. Arntson Mr. John F. Conlon Mr. Phillip G. Rynn

Mr. William Hanzelek

### MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Frederick Seibold Mr. Richard P. Voelker Mr. Chao H. Lin Dr. Walter M. Maclean

NAVAL SEA SYSTEMS COMMAND

Mr. W. Thomas Packard Mr. Charles L. Null Mr. Edward Kadala Mr. Allen H. Engle

U.S. COAST GUARD

CAPT G. D. Marsh CAPT W. E. Colburn, Jr. Mr. Rubin Scheinberg Mr. H. Paul Cojeen

۰.

#### TRANSPORT CANADA

Mr. John Grinstead Mr. Ian Bayly Mr. David L. Stocks Mr. Peter Timonin

#### DEFENCE RESEARCH ESTABLISHMENT ATLANTIC

Dr. Neil Pegg LCDR Stephen Gibson Dr. Roger Hollingshead Mr. John Porter

### SHIP STRUCTURE SUBCOMMITTEE LIAISON MEMBERS

### U. S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

LCDR Bruce R. Mustain

U. S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Dr. C. B. Kim

U. S. NAVAL ACADEMY

Dr. Ramswar Bhattacharyya

CANADA CENTRE FOR MINERALS AND ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES Dr. William R. Tyson

SOCIETY OF NAVAL ARCHITECTS AND MARINE ENGINEERS Dr. William Sandberg

U. S. TECHNICAL ADIVSOBY GROUP TO THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS ORGANIZATION CAPT Charles Piersall

<u>NATIONAL\_ACADEMY\_OF\_SCIENCE</u>S -<u>MARINE\_BOARD</u> Dr. Robert Sielski

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES -COMMITTEE ON MARINE STRUCTURES Mr. Peter M. Palermo

WELDING RESEARCH COUNCIL

Dr. Martin Prager

AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE

Mr. Alexander D. Wilson

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Dr. Yapa D. S. Rajapaske

STUDENT MEMBER

Mr. Trevor Butler Memorial University of Newfoundland

an Ci

# COMMITTEE ON MARINE STRUCTURES

## **Commission on Engineering and Technical Systems**

### National Academy of Sciences – National Research Council

The COMMITTEE ON MARINE STRUCTURES has technical cognizance over the interagency Ship Structure Committee's research program.

Peter M. Palermo Chairman, Alexandria, VA Subrata K. Chakrabarti, Chicago Bridge and Iron, Plainfield, IL John Landes, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN Bruce G. Collipp, Marine Engineering Consultant, Houston, TX Robert G. Kline, Marine Engineering Consultant, Winona, MN Robert G. Loewy, NAE, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, NY Robert Sielski, National Research Council, Washington, DC Stephen E. Sharpe, Ship Structure Committee, Washington, DC

# LOADS WORK GROUP

Subrata K. Chakrabarti Chairman, Chicago Bridge and Iron Company, Plainfield, IL Howard M. Bunch, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI Peter A. Gale, John J. McMullen Associates, Arlington, VA Hsien Yun Jan, Martech Incorporated, Neshanic Station, NJ John Niedzwecki, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX Solomon C. S. Yim, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR Maria Celia Ximenes, Chevron Shipping Co., San Francisco, CA

### MATERIALS WORK GROUP

J. C. C

John Landes, Chairman, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN William H Hartt, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL Horold S. Reemsnyder, Bethlehem Steel Corp., Bethlehem, PA Barbara A. Shaw, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA James M. Sawhill, Jr., Newport News Shipbuilding, Newport News, VA Bruce R. Somers, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA Jerry G. Williams, Conoco, Inc., Ponca City, OK

### **RECENT SHIP STRUCTURE COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS**

- SSC-363 <u>Uncertainties in Stress Analysis on Marine Structures</u> by E. Nikolaidis and P. Kaplan 1991
- SSC-364 <u>Inelastic Deformation of Plate Panels</u> by Eric Jennings, Kim Grubbs, Charles Zanis, and Louis Raymond 1991
- SSC-365 Marine Structural Integrity Programs (MSIP) by Robert G. Bea 1992
- SSC-366 <u>Threshold Corrosion Fatigue of Welded Shipbuilding Steels</u> by G. H. Reynolds and J. A. Todd 1992
- SSC-367 <u>Fatigue Technology Assessment and Strategies for Fatigue Avoidance</u> in Marine Structures by C. C. Capanoglu 1993
- SSC-368 <u>Probability Based Ship Design Procedures: A Demonstration</u> by A. Mansour, M. Lin, L. Hovem, A. Thayamballi 1993
- SSC-369 <u>Reduction of S-N Curves for Ship Structural Details</u> by K. Stambaugh, D. Lesson, F. Lawrence, C-Y. Hou, and G. Banas 1993
- SSC-370 <u>Underwater Repair Procedures for Ship Hulls (Fatigue and Ductility of</u> <u>Underwater Wet Welds)</u> by K. Grubbs and C. Zanis 1993
- SSC-371 <u>Establishment of a Uniform Format for Data Reporting of Structural</u> <u>Material Properties for Reliability Analysis</u> by N. Pussegoda, L. Malik, and A. Dinovitzer 1993
- SSC-372 <u>Maintenance of Marine Structures: A State of the Art Summary</u> by S. Hutchinson and R. Bea 1993
- SSC-373 Loads and Load Combinations by A. Mansour and A. Thayamballi 1994
- SSC-374 Effect of High Strength Steels on Strength Consdierations of Design and Construction Details of Ships by R. Heyburn and D. Riker 1994
- SSC-375 <u>Uncertainty in Strength Models for Marine Structures</u> by O. Hughes, E. Nikolaidis, B. Ayyub, G. White, P. Hess 1994
- SSC-377 <u>Hull Structural Concepts For Improved Producibility</u> by J. Daidola, J. Parente, and W. Robinson 1994
- SSC-378 The Role of Human Error in Design, Construction and Reliability of Marine Structures by R. Bea 1994
- SSC-379 Improved Ship Hull Structural Details Relative to Fatigue by K. Stambaugh, F. Lawrence and S. Dimitriakis 1994
- SSC-380 <u>Ship Structural Integrity Information System</u> by R. Schulte-Strathaus, B. Bea 1995
- SSC-381 <u>Residual Stregth of Damaged Marine Structures</u> by C. Wiernicki, D. Ghose, N. Nappi 1995

Ship Structure Committee Publications – A Special Bibliography

de la C

Member Agencies:

American Bureau of Shipping Defence Research Establishment Atlantic Maritime Administration Military Sealift Command Naval Sea Systems Command Transport Canada United States Coast Guard



Address Correspondence to:

Executive Director Ship Structure Committee U.S. Coast Guard (G-MI/SSC) 2100 Second Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20593-0001 Ph:(202) 267-0003 Fax:(202) 267-4677

An Interagency Advisory Committee

March 24, 1995

SSC-382 SR-1350

### REEXAMINATION OF DESIGN CRITERIA FOR STIFFENED PLATE PANELS

The emphasis on reducing vessel weight in the recent generation of ships has lead to increased usage of high strength steels to allow for thinner scantlings. These designs provided panels of equivalent overall strength but with less inherent rigidity. This, in turn, has resulted in unanticipated failures at the intersections of transverse and longitudinal stiffeners with the plating. These failures demonstrated the need to rethink some of the assumptions currently used in the design process.

This project analyzed the total stresses at the panel to stiffening system interface. After using conventional design procedures for a panel section, finite element models of the panel were subjected to various anticipated panel loads and the resulting stresses were analyzed. The report concludes with a discussion of the effect of the less stiff panel structures on failures and adjustments which should be considered in the design procedures. Recommendations for future research are given.

C. CARD

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard Chairman, Ship Structure Committee

### Technical Report Documentation Page

SSC-382     PB95-188181       1. Tite and Samine     June 1994       "Re-Examination of Design Criteria for Stiffened     June 1994       Plate Fanels"     June 1994       The and Samine     June 1994       The analysis     Second Science       June 1994     Second Science       June 1995     Second Science       June 1996     Second Science       June 1996     Second Science       June 1996     Second Science       June 1996	1. Report No.	2. Government Acces	sion No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.				
1. Trite and Subinie       S. Report Dete         "Re-Examination of Design Criteria for Stiffened       J. Menory Dete         Pittube J. Chose and Natale S. Nappi       Performing Organization Report Ne.         1. Authory Direction Name and Address       Design Criteria for Stiffened         Designers & Flammers, Inc.       10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)         2120 Washington Blud, Suite 200       Natlington, VA 22204         11. Contract or Grant Name and Address       Design Criteria Report Ne.         Designers & Flammers, Inc.       11. Contract or Grant Na.         2120 Washington, D. C. 20593       11. Contract or Grant Na.         2100 Second Street, S.W.       Washington, D. C. 20593         13. Supplementer Nee:       G-M         Sponsoried by the Ship Structure Committee using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate gamel) stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel'         Matrix Supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffenese stress. Grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. Stress, Normal Stress, Normal Stress, Normal Stress, Normal Stress, N	SSC382	PB95-1881	.81					
"Re-Examination of Design Criteria for Stiffened Plate Panels"       June 1994         * Performing Organization Report No.         * Performing Organization Report No.         * Sector of Committee Committee Stiffened Distington Formation Report No.         * Sector of Committee Commits Committee Committee Committee Committee Committee Committee Com	4. Title and Subtitle	<u> </u>		5. Report Date				
Plate Panels"       9. Performing Organization Reserv Ne.         7. Author J       5. Performing Organization Reserv Ne.         9. Performing Organization Name and Address.       5. Performing Organization Reserv Ne.         9. Performing Organization Name and Address.       5. Performing Organization Reserv Ne.         12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address.       10. Wask Unit Ne. (TRAIS)         12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address.       11. Centrest of Unit Ne.         12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address.       11. Centrest of Unit Ne.         13. Supplementery Nets.       5. Coast Guard         14. Sponsoring Agency Code       G-M         15. Soparation Agency Nets.       Sponsored by the Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.         14. Astron       G-M         15. Astron       G-M         16. Astron       G-M         17. Key Wards       G-M         18. Supplementery Nets.       Sponsored by the Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.         16. Astron       Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength naterials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach uselects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have reautor stresthick of the supporting infite element techniques to ta	"Re-Examination of Design	Criteria for S	Stiffened .	June 1994				
7. Author'd Dhruba J. Ghose and Natale S. Nappi       1. Performing Organizations Report Ne. "SR-1350"         9. Performing Organizations Report Net Designers & Planners, Inc. 2120 Washington Blvd., Suite 200 Arlington, VA 22204       10. Work Unit Ne. (TRAIS)         12. Someonic Aperty Net and Addies: U.S. Coast Guard 2100 Second Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20593       10. Work Unit Ne. Difference Organization Report Net Difference Organization Report Net Difference Organization Report Net Difference Organization Report Net Sponsored by the Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.         13. Supplementary Net: Sponsored by the Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.         14. Attract Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scaling were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using first element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffener; and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.         17. Key Words Finite Elements, Stiffened Plates, Structure       18. Seconty C	Plate Panels"			6. Performing Organization Code				
7. Autorid Dhruba J. Ghose and Natale S. Nappi       "SR-1350"         9. Performing Constitution News and Address Designers & Planners, Inc.       10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)         12.120 Washington Blvd., Suite 200 Arlington, VA 22204       11. Centret of Gent No. DTCG23-92-R-ED1030         12. Separating Agnery News and Address Ship Structure Committee U.S. Coast Guard       11. Centret of Gent No. DTCG23-92-R-ED1030         13. Supplementery News and Address Ship Structure Committee U.S. Coast Guard       11. Centret of Gent No. DTCG23-92-R-ED1030         13. Supplementery News and Address Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.       FINAL         14. Separating Agnery Cast Washington, D.C. 20593       14. Separating Agnery Cast Gent         15. Supplementery News       2.000 second Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20593       14. Separating Agnery Cast Gent         15. Advited       Current ship structural design criteris for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (notmal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the affect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scantlings vere developed us				8. Performing Organization	Report No.			
<ul> <li>Performing Orgenization Name and Address Designers &amp; Planners, Inc.</li> <li>2120 Washington Blvd., Suite 200 Arlington, VA 22204</li> <li>Schartington, VA 22204</li> <li>Contract of Grant Na. DTGG23-92-R-DD1030</li> <li>Type of Remon and Period Covered Ship Structure Committee U.S. Coast Guard</li> <li>Septimentery Netse</li> <li>Septimentery Netse</li> <li>Septimentery Netse</li> <li>Support of the Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.</li> <li>Abstract</li> <li>Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using finite element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffeners and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.</li> <li>Securit Cleasif (d his report) Unclassified</li> <li>Securit Cleasif (d his report)</li>     &lt;</ul>	7. Author(s) Dhruba J. Ghose and Natale	e S. Nappi		"SR-1350"				
2120 Washington Blvd., Suite 200       II. Converter Grant Ne. DTCG23-92-R-E01030         11. Seconcering Agency Name and Address Ship Structure Committee       II. Type of Report and Beined Covered         12. Seconcering Agency Name and Address Ship Structure Committee       II. Type of Report and Beined Covered         12. Seconcering Agency Name and Address Ship Structure Committee       II. Seconcering Agency Name and Address         13. Seconcering Agency Name and Address       II. Seconcering Agency Name and Address         14. Abstract       G-M         Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scantlings were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using finite element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffener: and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.         17. Key Wode Finite Elements, Stiffened Plates, Stiffeners, Orillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull Unclassified       11. No.	<ol> <li>Performing Organization Name and Address Designers &amp; Planners, Inc.</li> </ol>	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	<u></u>					
Arlington, VA 22204       DTCC23-92-R-RD1030         12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Ship Structure Committee       13. Type of Report and Pariod Coursed         13. Supplementary Name and Address       FINAL         2100 Second Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20593       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         13. Supplementary News       G-M         Sponsored by the Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.         14. Aburcet       Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Crillage scantlings were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using finite element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffener and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.         17. Key Woods       14. Distribution Statement Available from: Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull Unclassified       14. No. of Pagent Stiffeners         12       52. Price Stiffeners <th>2120 Washington Blvd., Sui</th> <td>lte 200</td> <td></td> <td>11. Contract or Grant No.</td> <th></th>	2120 Washington Blvd., Sui	lte 200		11. Contract or Grant No.				
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Ship Structure Committee       13. Type of Report and Penied Covered         Ship Structure Committee       FINAL         2100 Second Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20593       14. Sponsoring Agency Cade G-M         15. Supplementery News         Sponsored by the Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.         16. Abstract         Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scantlings were developed using first principals based approach and the analyzed using finite element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffener and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.         17. Key Wods Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull Unclassified       14. Distributes Statement Available from: National Technical Information Service Springfield, VA 22161         19. Security Cleasified       21. Ne. of Peer       22. Price S12.50 Mic	Arlington, VA 22204			DTCG23-92-R-E01	L030 ·			
12. Security Gamma Marked Additional Structure Committee       FINAL         Ship Structure Committee       II. Spennering Agency Cole         2100 Second Street, S.W.       II. Spennering Agency Cole         3. Supplementary Netes       G-M         Sponsored by the Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.       II. Second Street, S.W.         14. Abarreet       Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scantlings were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using first element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffener: and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.         17. Key Words       II. Dissibutes Statement         7. Key Words       III. Dissibutes Statement         8. Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull       III. Dissibutes Statement         9. Secority Clessif. (of this report)       <				13. Type of Report and Peri	iod Covered			
U.S. Coast Guard       11.1111         2100 Second Street, S.W.       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         Washington, D.C. 20593       G-M         15. Supplementation Notes       G-M         Sponsored by the Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.         16. Abureat       Guard committee and its member agencies.         17. Key Wards       Guard committee and its member agencies.         18. Abureat       Guard committee and its member agencies.         19. Abureat       Guard committee and its member agencies.         10. Abureat       G-M         11. Supporting structureal design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using structures. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scantlings were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using finite element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffener and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.         17. Key Wards       It. Distributes Sterment         Prince Stress, Normal Stress, Hull       Available from: National stress components.         17. Key Wards	12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Ship Structure Committee			FTNAT.				
2100 Second Street, S.W.       14. Sponsoring Agency Code G-M         15. Supplementary Netro         Sponsored by the Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.         16. Abstract         Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scantlings were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using finite element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffener and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.         17. Key Words       18. Distributen Sterement Available from: Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull Structure         19. Security Cleasif. (of this report Unclassified       21. Ne. of Poet S12. 700 Pape S12. 50 Mic	U.S. Coast Guard							
Washington, D.C. 20593       G-M         13. Supplementary Notes       Sponsored by the Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.         14. Abstract       Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scantlings were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using finite element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffener: and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.         17. Key Words       It. Dismbution Statement         Finite Elements, Stiffened Plates, Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull Structure       It. Dismbution Statement         19. Security Cleasified       20. Security Cleasified       12. Price Stressent         112       Stressent       Stressent       22. Price Stressent         112       Stressent       Stressent       Stressent       Stresstice	2100 Second Street, S.W.			14. Sponsoring Agency Code	•			
15. Supplementary Notes         Sponsored by the Ship Structure Committee and its member agencies.         16. Astrost         Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scantlings were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using finite element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffener and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.         17. Key Words       18. Dismibution Statement         Finite Elements, Stiffened Plates, Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull Structure       18. Dismibution Statement         19. Security Clessified       20. Security Clessified       21. No. of Pages         21. No. of Pages       22. Price S7.00 Page	Washington, D.C. 20593			G-M				
16. Abuve:         14. Abuve:         Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scantlings were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using finite element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffener and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.         17. Key Words       Ite Distributies Stotement         Finite Elements, Stiffened Plates, Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull Structure       Ite Distributies Stotement         19. Security Cleasif. (of this page)       Zt. Security Cleasif. (of this page)       21. No. of Paget St. St. 70.0 Page         11.2       St.7.00 Page         12.2       St.7.00 Page	15. Supplementary Notes		<u> </u>					
16. Abstract by the shap structure committee and its member agencies.         16. Abstract         Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scantlings were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using finite element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffener and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         Finite Elements, Stiffened Plates, Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull Structure       18. Distribution Statement         19. Security Cleasif. (of this page)       21. No. of Pages       22. Price         11.2       \$27.00 Papp         11.2       \$27.00 Papp         11.2       \$27.00 Papp         11.2       \$27.00 Papp	Snoneored by the Ship Star	atura Carrita						
16. Abstract         Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel' supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scantlings were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using finite element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage striess.         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         Finite Elements, Stiffened Plates, Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull Structure       18. Distribution Statement         19. Security Clessif. (of this report)       20. Security Clessif. (of this page)       21. No. of Page       22. Price         11.2       \$27.00 Papp         12. Size Stress       52.00 Pape	sponsored by the ship stru	cture committe	e and its mem	ber agencies.				
10. Astrony         Current ship structural design criteria for stiffened plate panels is based upon strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. This approach neglects the effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate surface), membrane and torsional stress components induced by the flexibility of the panel'. Supporting structure. Recent trends towards the use of higher strength materials have resulted in the design of grillage structures which are more flexible and therefore increase the vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components in the plate panel. This report presents the results of a study undertaken to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members of the grillage structure on the plate panel stress. Grillage scantlings were developed using first principals based approach and then analyzed using finite element techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffener and to quantify the effects of vertical shear, membrane and torsional stress components.         17. Key Wards       18. Dismission Statement         Finite Elements, Stiffened Plates, Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull Structure       18. Dismission Statement         19. Security Clessif. (of Mis report)       22. Security Clessif. (of Mis report)       21. Ne. of Peger       22. Price         19. Security Clessified       11.2       \$27.000 Pap       512.50 Mic				······································				
17. Key Words Finite Elements, Stiffened Plates, Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull18. Distribution Statement Available from: National Technical Information Service Springfield, VA 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified21. No. of Pages \$27.00 Pap \$12. 50 Mic	membrane and torsional str supporting structure. Rec have resulted in the design therefore increase the ver in the plate panel. This determine the effect of th of the grillage structure developed using first prin element techniques to take and to quantify the effect components.	ess components ent trends tow of grillage s tical shear, m report present e stiffness ch on the plate p cipals based a into account s of vertical	induced by the ards the use of tructures which membrane and to s the results aracteristics anel stress. approach and the the flexibilities shear, membran	he flexibility of t of higher strength ch are more flexibl orsional stress com of a study underta of the supporting Grillage scantling hen analyzed using ty of the grillage ne and torsional st	the panel's materials and ponents then to members then to swere finite stiffeners ress			
17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         Finite Elements, Stiffened Plates,       Available from:         Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria,       National Technical Information Service         Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull       Springfield, VA 22161         Structure       20. Security Classif. (of this report)       20. Security Classif. (of this page)         Unclassified       Unclassified       112								
Stiffeners, Grillage, Design Criteria, Shear Stress, Normal Stress, HullNational Technical Information Service Springfield, VA 2216119. Security Classif, (of this report) Unclassified20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified21. No. of Pages \$27.00 Pap \$12.50 Mic	17. Key Words Finite Elements. Stiffened	Plates	18. Distribution Stat Available	emen: from:				
Shear Stress, Normal Stress, Hull       Springfield, VA       22161         Structure       19. Security Classif. (of this report)       20. Security Classif. (of this page)       21. No. of Pages       22. Price         Unclassified       Unclassified       112       \$27.00 Pap         \$12.50 Mic	Stiffeners, Grillage, Desi	.gn Criteria,	National To	= ≘chnical Informatio	on Service			
Structure19. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. PriceUnclassifiedUnclassified112\$27.00 Pap\$12.50 Mic	Shear Stress, Normal Stres	s, Hull	Springfield	d, VA 22161				
19. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. PriceUnclassifiedUnclassified112\$27.00 Pap\$12.50 Mic	Structure	i	-					
19. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. PriceUnclassifiedUnclassified112\$27.00 Pap\$12.50 Mic								
Unclassified Unclassified 112 \$27.00 Pap \$12.50 Mic	19. Security Classif, (of this report)	20. Security Class	sif. (of this page)	21- No. of Pages	22. Price			
	Unclassified	Unclassif	ied		12.50 Micro			

•

Reproduction of completed page authorized

.

.

.

.



United States Department of Commerce Technology Administration National Institute of Standards and Technology Metric Program, Galthersburg, MD 20899

2

# **METRIC CONVERSION CARD**

静静とす

1

j

	Approximate Co	onversions to	o Metric Measures		L
Symbol	When You Know	Multiply by	y To Find S	Symbol	nch
		LENGTI	I		s —
in	inches	2,5	centimeters	cm	
ft	feet	30	centimeters	cm	
yđ	yards	0.9	meters	m	
mi	miles	1.6	kilometers	km	
		AREA			
in <sup>2</sup>	square inches	6.5	square centimeters	cm <sup>2</sup>	
ft²	square feet	0.09	square meters	m <sup>2</sup>	
yd2	square yards	0.8	square meters	m <sup>2</sup>	
mi <sup>2</sup>	square miles	2.6	square kilometers	km²	N —
	acres	0.4	hectares	ha	·
		MASS	(weight)		
oz	ounces	28	grams	g	
lb	pounds	0.45	kilograms	kg	
	short tons	0.9	metric ton	t	
	(2000 lb)			-	$\omega =$
		VOLUMI	E		
tsp	teaspoons	5	milliliters	mL	
Tbsp	tablespoons	15	milliliters	mL	
in <sup>3°</sup>	cubic inches	16	milliliters	mL	
fl oz	fluid ounces	30	milliliters	mL	
с	cups	0.24	liters	L	4
pt	pints	0.47	liters	L	
qt	quarts	0.95	liters	L	
gal	gallons	3.8	liters	L	
ft <sup>3</sup>	cubic feet	0.03	cubic meters	m <sup>3</sup>	
yđ3	cubic yards	0.76	cubic meters	m <sup>3</sup>	
	TEN	MPERAT	URE (exact)		ທ_ <u></u>
°F	degrees	subtract 32	, degrees	°C	
	Fahrenheit m	ultiply by f	5/9 Celsius		
					<u>ه</u> =
					<b>—</b>

	0		Approximate Conv	ersions in	om Mei
	B	Symbol	When You Know	Multinlv h	v
		5,11001	Ι	LENGT	, H
<u> </u>	ì	mm	millimeters	0.04	inche
		cm	centimeters	0.4	inche
<u> </u>		m	meters	3.3	feet
	ω	m	meters	1.1	yards
	-	km	kilometers	0.6	miles
	4			AREA	
	-	cm <sup>2</sup>	square centimeter	rs 0.16	squar
	4 <b></b>	$m^2$	square meters	1.2	squar
	-	km²	square kilometers	s 0.4	squar
		ha	hectares	2.5	acres
	ດ		$(10,000 \text{ m}^2)$		
	-			MASS	(weig
	7	g	grams	0.035	ounce
	-	kg	kilograms	2.2	pound
		t	metric ton	1.1	short
=	<u></u>		(1,000 kg)		
			V	<u>'OLUM</u>	E
<u>=</u>	9	mL	milliliters	0.03	fluid
		mL	milliliters	0.06	cubic
	3	L	liters	2.1	pints
==	-	L	liters	1.06	quarts
<u> </u>	<b></b>	L	liters	0.26	gallor
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	m	cubic meters	35	cubic
<u> </u>		m3	cubic meters	1.3	cubic
	2		TEM	PERAT	URE
		°C	degrees mu	ltiply by t	9/5, d
$\equiv$	5		Celsius	add 32	F
=	_				
=	<u> </u>	40	30 0	20 27	
≡-	4	<u>'C ''</u>	-20 0		
<u> </u>	-	*F	 0 32	80 98 6	1
	σı	-10	unter free-or	المراجع	. tomas
			water meezes	DOG	y tempe
	6				
	<u> </u>				

# Table of Contents

•

1.0	INTRODUCTION
	1.1       Background       . <t< td=""></t<>
2.0	DESIGN OF STIFFENED PLATE STRUCTURE 5
3.0	FINITE ELEMENT MODELS OF STIFFENED PLATE STRUCTURE 12
	3.1 Introduction
4.0	<b>RESULTS</b>
	<ul> <li>4.1 Comparison of Stresses using Plate Elements</li></ul>
5.0	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK 78
6.0	REFERENCES
APPE	NDIX 1

 $\leq$ 

# List of Tables

,

\_\_\_\_

2.1	DIMENSIONS AND SCANTLINGS OF OSS GRILLAGE	_	10
2.2	DIMENSIONS AND SCANTLINGS OF HSS GRILLAGE	•	11
3.1	OPTIMUM MESH SIZE DETERMINATION USING PLATE	•	<b>T T</b>
	ELEMENTS	_	15
3.2	COMPARISON OF STIFFENER MODELS USING PLATES	-	
	AND OFFSET BEAMS	_	18
3.3	SECTIONAL PROPERTIES OF LONGITUDINALS AND	•	10
	TRANSVERSES (OSS)	_	20
3.4	SECTIONAL PROPERTIES OF LONGITUDINALS AND	•	20
	TRANSVERSES (HSS)	_	21
4.1	MAXIMUM DISPLACEMENT AND STRESSES OF OSS	•	
	MODELS (USING PLATE ELEMENTS)		28
4.2	MAXIMUM DISPLACEMENT AND STRESSES OF HSS	•	20
	MODELS (USING PLATE ELEMENTS)		28
4.3	MAXIMUM DISPLACEMENT AND STRESSES OF OSS MODELS	•	20
	(USING BRICK ELEMENTS)		A A
4.4	MAXIMUM DISPLACEMENT AND STRESSES OF HSS MODELS	•	17
	USING BRICK ELEMENTS)		45
4.5	MAXIMUM STRESSES IN MODEL 3 WITH INITIAL DEFORMATION	•	45
	(OSS AND HSS)		74
4.6	EFFECT OF VARYING ELEMENT SIZE ON THE RESULTS OF	•	17
	BRICK MODEL 3 (OSS MATERIAL)		76

# List of Figures

•

3.1 3.2	Mesh Size Determination using Plate Elements . Schematic of Ouarter Grillage Model for	•	•	•	٠	16
3.3	F.E. Analysis	•	•	٠	•	23
	(Using Plate Elements)	•	•	•		24
4.1	Plot of Von Mises Stress for OSS Model 1 (Plate Elements)	_		_		29
4.2	Plot of Normal Stress, $\sigma_{yy}$ for OSS Model 1	-	•	·	-	
4.3	Plate Elements)	•	•	•	•	30
4.4	(Plate Elements)	•	•	٠	•	31
	(Plate Elements)	•		•	•	32
4.5	Plot of Von Mises Stress for OSS Model 2 (Plate Elements)	_	_			<b>२</b> २
4.6	Plot of Normal Stress, $\sigma_{yy}$ for OSS Model 2	•	•	•	·	55
4.7	(Plate Elements)	•	٠	•	•	34
	(Plate Elements)	٠	•	•	•	35
4.8	Plot of Normal Stress, $\sigma_{yy}$ for HSS Model 2 (Plate Elements)					26
4.9	Plot of Von Mises Stress for OSS Model 3	•	•	•	•	20
4.10	(Plate Elements)	•	•	•	•	37
	(Plate Elements)	•	-	•	•	38
4.11	Plot of Von Mises Stress for HSS Model 3 (Plate Elements)		_			39
4.12	Plot of Normal Stress, $\sigma_{yy}$ for HSS Model 3	•	•	•	•	55
4.13	(Plate Elements)	•	•	٠	•	40
	Single Panel	•			٠	42
4.14	Comparison of Stresses in HSS Plate Model with Single Panel	_	_			43
4.15	Plot of Von Mises Stress for OSS Model 1	•	•	•	•	
4.16	(Brick Elements)	•	•	•	•	47
	(Brick Elements)	•	•	•	•	48
4.17	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $\tau_{y_2}$ for OSS Model (Brick Elements)	1				4.0
4.18	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $\tau_{xz}$ for OSS Model	1	•	•	•	49
4.19	(Brick Elements)	•	•	•	•	50
7 • I J	(Brick Elements)					51
4.20	Plot of Normal Stress, $\sigma_{yy}$ for HSS Model 1 (Brick Flements)					
4.21	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $\tau_{v}$ , for HSS Model	1	•	•	•	52
	(Brick Elements)					53

4.22	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $ au_{ m xz}$ for HSS Model (	L			
	(Brick Elements)				54
4.23	Plot of Von Mises Stress for OSS Model 2				
	(Brick Elements)				55
4.24	Plot of Normal Stress, $\sigma_{yy}$ for OSS Model 2				
	(Brick Elements)				56
4.25	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $ au_{ m yz}$ for				
	OSS Model 2 (Brick Elements)			-	57
4.26	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $\tau_{xx}$ for	-	•	·	
	OSS Model 2 (Brick Elements)				58
4.27	Plot of Von Mises Stress for HSS Model 2	•	•	•	50
	(Brick Elements)			_	59
4.28	Plot of Normal Stress, $\sigma_{vv}$ for HSS Model 2	-	•	•	
	(Brick Elements)				60
4.29	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $\tau_{-}$ for	•	•	•	00
	HSS Model 2 (Brick Elements)				61
4.30	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $\tau_{\rm m}$ for	•	•	•	ΟT
	HSS Model 2 (Brick Elements)				62
4.31	Plot of Von Mises Stress for OSS Model 3	•	•	•	02
	(Brick Elements)				63
4.32	Plot of Normal Stress, g., for OSS Model 3	•	•	•	00
	(Brick Elements)				61
4.33	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $\tau_{-}$ for	•	•	•	04
	OSS Model 3 (Brick Elements)				65
4.34	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $\tau$ for	•	•	•	05
	OSS Model 3 (Brick Elements)				66
4.35	Plot of Von Mises Stress for HSS Model 3	•	•	•	00
	(Brick Elements)				67
4.36	Plot of Normal Stress, $\sigma_{w}$ for HSS Model 3	•	•	•	07
	(Brick Elements)				68
4.37	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $\tau_{\rm m}$ for HSS Model 3	•	•	•	00
	(Brick Elements)				69
4.38	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, T., for HSS Model 3	•	•	•	05
	(Brick Elements)				70
4.39	Comparison of Stresses in OSS Brick Model with	•	•	•	/0
	OSS plate model				71
4.40	Comparison of Stresses in HSS Brick Model with	•	•	•	1
	HSS plate model				72
5.1	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $\tau_{vr}$ in Brick Model	-	-	-	
	of Single Panel	_	_	_	81
5.2	Plot of Vertical Shear Stress, $\tau_{\rm m}$ in Brick Model	•	•	•	<u>ст</u>
	of Single Panel				82
		•	•	•	02

•••

iv .

### Nomenclature

b = breadth of the panel, m

 $b_e = effective width of plating, m$ 

t = thickness of the panel, mm

- C = Constant depending on the plate material and location on the ship
- H = Head of sea water, feet
- K = Factor depending on the aspect ratio of the panel
- $E = Young's Modulus, N/mm^2$
- $\sigma_{\rm Y} = {\rm Yield \ Stress, \ N/mm^2}$
- A = Total cross-sectional area of the beam,  $cm^2$

 $A_{SH} = Shear area, cm^2$ 

- $A_y$  = Shear area along 'y' axis, cm<sup>2</sup>
- $A_z$  = Shear area along 'z' axis,  $cm^2$
- $I = Moment of Inertia, cm^4$
- $I_y$  = Moment of Inertia about 'y' axis, cm<sup>4</sup>
- $I_z$  = Moment of Inertia about 'z' axis, cm<sup>4</sup>
- $y_{\scriptscriptstyle P}$  = distance of neutral axis from plating, cm
- $y_f$  = distance of neutral axis from stiffener flange, cm
- $SM_{\rm p}$  = Sectional Modulus to the plating,  ${\rm cm}^3$

 $SM_{\rm f}$  = Sectional Modulus to the stiffener flange,  ${\rm cm}^3$ 

J = St. Venant's Torsional Constant, cm<sup>4</sup>

r = radius of gyration, cm

 $F_{\text{ULT}}=$  Ultimate Strength of the plating,  $N/\text{mm}^2$ 

 $F_{\text{CR}}=$  Critical Buckling stress due to axial compression,  $N/\text{mm}^2$ 

 $F_{BCR}$  = Critical Buckling stress due to bending, N/mm<sup>2</sup>

 $F_{\text{SCR}}=$  Critical Buckling stress due to shear,  $N/\text{mm}^2$ 

 $\sigma_{xx}$  = Normal Stress in longitudinal direction, N/mm2

 $\sigma_{yy}$  = Normal Stress in transverse direction,  $\textrm{N/mm}^2$ 

 $\sigma_{zz}$  = Normal Stress in vertical direction, N/mm<sup>2</sup>

 $\sigma_{xy}$  = In-plane shear Stress, N/mm<sup>2</sup>

v

 $\sigma_{xz}$  = Vertical shear Stress, N/mm<sup>2</sup>

 $\sigma_{yz}$  = Vertical shear Stress, N/mm<sup>2</sup>

vm = Von Mises Stress, N/mm<sup>2</sup>

 $\Delta_{\rm (x,y)}$  = Initial Deformation at x and y, mm

L = Length of Beam, m

s = stiffener spacing, m

- $d_w$  = web depth, mm
- $t_w = web thickness, mm$
- b<sub>f</sub> = flange width, mm

 $t_f = flange thickness, mm$ 

p = normal pressure, N/mm<sup>2</sup>

- IT = moment of inertia of the stiffened plate in the transverse direction

iL = moment of inertia of the stiffened plate per longitudinal iT = moment of inertia of the stiffened plate per transverse  $(A/B) (iT/iL)^{0.25} = Virtual Aspect Ratio.$  (Measure of stiffness of cross stiffened panels)

1200 - 95 1000

1-2-6720

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

Due to the emphasis on increasing ship lengths and reducing structural weight to increase cargo capacity, there has been an increase in the use of high strength steels on commercial vessels, especially tankers. Recently, tankers constructed of high strength steel have experienced damage to their side shell and bottom structures. This damage is characterized by the initiation of cracks in plating at the intersection of transverses and longitudinal stiffeners.

The use of high strength materials has resulted in the design of grillage structures that are lighter and more flexible. But, even though the material's strength is greater, its stiffness is the same. Therefore, reducing the area of the stiffener increases its flexibility. The result of this increased flexibility is an increase in secondary stresses due to the increased deflection of supporting structure.

The stiffened plate panel, which is intended to provide watertightness and contribute to a major portion of hull girder longitudinal and transverse strength, must be designed to withstand primary stresses due to hull girder bending, secondary stresses due to bending from local loading of the plate-stiffener combination and tertiary stresses due to bending of the plate panel itself from local lateral loads. Current design criteria for plate panels of grillage structure are based upon a strength of materials approach using either linear plate or beam theory. Acceptance is based upon comparing calculated stresses with allowable stress levels (yielding or buckling). For high strength steel,

(1/

certification bodies (i.e. regulatory bodies and U.S. Navy) have allowed higher levels for both primary and secondary design stresses, which in turn means larger values of actual cyclic as well as static stresses. Vertical shear (normal to the plate panel), membrane and torsional stress components are not accounted for in the selection of the plate panel scantlings when using a strength of materials approach.

Based upon this, it is assumed that the damage found in stiffened plate panels is due to stress levels which either exceed the yield stress of the material or induce fatigue failure. In practice, fatigue failure is avoided through quality control of welds, careful design of connection details and limiting the allowable stress levels. The design of plates based upon first principals approach does not take into consideration the stresses induced by the flexibility of its supporting structure. Therefore, the emphasis of this study will be on determining the added stresses in plate panels due to increased flexibility of grillage structure.

### 1.2 Objective

The objective of this task was to evaluate the combined effects of vertical shear (normal to the plate panel), membrane stress and torsion on the total stress of a stiffened plate panel as a result of the effects of the overall grillage response. Specifically, the impact of the error introduced by ignoring grillage behavior, such as the effects of vertical shear and membrane stresses, was determined. In order to quantify the additional stresses induced by grillage behavior on stiffened plate panels, a series of finite element model were developed and parametric studies performed varying key

design parameters for a typical grillage structure designed to current industry recognized practice. For this task, the U.S. Navy design practice was chosen since it is based upon a first principals approach versus emprically based design equations.

### 1.3 Approach

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of the stiffness characteristics of the supporting members. of grillage structures on the plate panel stress. The first step of this process was to design a grillage using strength of materials - first principals based approach. Grillage scantlings designed were then analyzed using FEM techniques to take into account the flexibility of the grillage stiffeners and to quantify stress componenets.

Six grillage designs were developed, three of Ordinary Strength Steel and three of High Strength Steel. The designs represent the bottom structure between transverse bulkheads fore and aft and longitudinal girders on either side. The overall length of the grillage and the plate panel aspect ratios were kept constant, and the breadth of the grillage was varied to modify the stiffness characteristics.

Finite element analysis of the grillages were performed to determine the stress components and variation of stress through out the grillage structure. Two sensitivity studies were performed to determine simplifications that would allow for results that are within the acceptable level of accuracy and the hardware resources and computational time available. First the optimum mesh size was determined. Second, a comparison of the results of a grillage model using plate elements to represent both plates and stiffeners to a grillage

3.

model using plate elements to represent plates and beam elements to represent stiffeners was accomplished. Finite element models of the six grillages developed made use of the results of these simplifications. In order to quantify the stress components, the following types of models were developed:

Plate Models - used as the base model for comparison.

Brick Models - used to quantify the vertical shear stress component

Plate Model with initial deflection - used to quantify the membrane effect.

# 2.0 DESIGN OF STIFFENED-PLATE STRUCTURE

Current U.S. Navy structural design practices  $[1,2,3]^1$  were used to calculate the scantlings for six (6) stiffened panel structures. These stiffened panels are comprised of 3 OSS and 3 HSS systems. The overall length, A, of the grillage was maintained at 15.24 m (50 ft), while the overall breadth, B, was varied, e.g. 10.06 m (33 ft), 6.4 m (21 ft), and 2.74 m (9 ft). The resulting geometrical grillage aspect ratio are 1.52, 2.38, and 5.56. The plate panel aspect ratio remained the same, namely 3.05 m x 0.9 m (10' x 3'), for all six systems.

The panel was loaded with an uniform lateral pressure of 0.107  $N/mm^2$  (15.56 lb/in<sup>2</sup>), which is equivalent to a head of sea water of 9.14 m (30 ft). The plate panel thickness was selected using Navy formula [2] of:

$$\frac{b}{t} \leq \frac{C}{K \cdot \sqrt{H}}$$

Where H is the head of sea water, in feet. C is a constant which is a function of plate material and its location on the ship. The C values takes into account the acceptable deformation of the structure. C values have been established for the following locations:

- a. Topside Plating
- b. Lower shell and tank boundaries
- c. Boundaries for the control of flooding.

<sup>1</sup> References in section 6.0

And K is a factor that takes into consideration the aspect ratio of the panel, b/a>0.5 (i.e., short panels).

For these studies, C was taken as 350 for OSS plating and 400 for HSS plating which corresponds to topside structure where the minimum amount of deformation (no permanent set) is allowed for and hence would result in a conservative design. The resulting plate thicknesses were 15.88 mm (0.6250") and 14.29 mm (0.5625") for OSS and HSS respectively.

The longitudinal beam stiffeners were designed as continuous beams over non-deflecting supports, while the transverse girders were designed as clamped beams. The following steps were used to develop these designs:

- Calculate plating thickness, t, for normal loads due to a uniform pressure from a head of sea water using the equation above.
- Determine the effective width of plating, b<sub>e</sub>, based on shear lag approach (post-buckling response),

$$b_e = 2t \sqrt{\frac{E}{\sigma_y}}$$

3. Select a beam size (i.e., a tee beam attached to the plate).

- 4. Determine plate/beam section properties, including the cross sectional area, A; shear area,  $A_{SH}$ ; moment of inertia, I; distance of the neutral axis from the plating,  $y_P$ ; distance of the neutral axis from the stiffener flange,  $y_f$ ; sectional modulus to the plating, SM<sub>P</sub>; sectional modulus to the stiffener flange, SM<sub>f</sub>; and radius of gyration, r.
- 5. Determine the secondary bending moments and shear forces.
- 6. Determine the shear stress at the supports and the secondary bending stresses at two locations; one at the support and the other at the mid span of the beam. At each location, compute bending stresses at the plate and at the flange of the stiffener.
- 7. Check plating for ultimate strength  $(F_{ULT})$ .
- 8. Check plating for buckling under in-plane compression, bending and shear,  $(F_{CR}, F_{BCR}, F_{SCR})$ .
- 9. Check composite plate-tee beam for yielding in tension/compression due to bending.
- 10.Check composite plate-tee beam for maximum web shear stress.

11. Check tee stiffener for Tripping.

12. Check tee stiffener flange for local buckling.

13. Check tee stiffener web for local buckling.

The results of the above design procedures have been summarized in Tables 2.1 and 2.2 for OSS and HSS grillage designs respectively. These scantlings were used to develop the FEM models described in section 3.0. The symbols used in the first column of tables 2.1 and 2.2 are listed below:

- 'B' = dimension of the stiffened panel in the short direction
- 'a' = dimension of the unsupported span of plating in the long direction

'p' = uniform lateral pressure

't' = plate thickness

'IL' = moment of inertia of the stiffened plate in the longitudinal direction

'IT' = moment of inertia of the stiffened plate in the transverse direction

- 'iL' = moment of inertia of the stiffened plate per longitudinal
- 'iT' = moment of inertia of the stiffened plate per transverse

'(A/B)(iT/iL)^0.25' = Virtual Aspect Ratio. (Measure of stiffness of cross stiffened panels)

The virtual aspect ratio,  $(A/B)(i_T/i_L)^{0.25}$ , is derived from the fact that the stiffness of an unstiffened gross panel, of constant thickness, is usually a function of the length to breadth ratio (i.e A/B). This ratio is commonly referred to as

the panel aspect ratio. Therefore A/B would represent the ratio of the stiffness in one direction to the other direction. If the panel is supported by mutually perpendicular intersecting beams, whose stiffnesses are different, then the ratio of the gross panel stiffness would have to be modified to account for the stiffness provided by the moment of inertia of those beams. When this is accomplished the quantity called "virtual aspect ratio" is used. Hence, the virtual aspect ratio is equal to  $(A/B)(i_T/i_L)^{0.25}$ , assuming that the Young's Modulus, E, is the same in both directions.

Detail calculations for one grillage, are provided in Appendix 1.0 to illustrate the process used. It should be noted that the original calculations were performed using the English system, therefore the plate thickness selected in the appendix is not a standard metric plate size.

	m= <u></u>		
Model No.	1	2	3
A (m)	15.24	15.24	15.24
B (m)	10.06	6.40	2.74
a (m)	3.05	3.05	3.05
b (m)	0.91	0.91	0.91
t (mm)	15.88	15.88	15.88
Long'l Size	WT 205x140x23	WT 205x140x23	WT 205x140x23
Trans Size	914x457x15.9/28.6 T	W-T 690x250x123.5	W-T 410X180X5
$p (N/mm^2)$	0.107	0.107	0.107
IL (cm <sup>4</sup> )	6984.36	6984.36	6984.36
IT $(cm^4)$	717,041.14	255,524.21	48,157.93
ASL $(cm^2)$	14.06	14.06	14.06
AST $(cm^2)$	149.68	100.65	39.87
$iL=IL/b(cm^4/cm)$	76.36	76.36	76.36
iT=IT/a(cm <sup>4</sup> /cm)	2,352.53	838.36	157.97
A/B	1.52	2.38	5.56
(A/B)(iT/iL)^1/4	3.57	4.33	6.66

TABLE 2.1 - DIMENSIONS AND SCANTLINGS OF OSS GRILLAGE

.

10

)

TABLE 2.2 - DIMENSIONS AND SCANTLINGS OF HSS GRILLAGE

.

.

.

.,'

I

Model No	1	2	
A (m)	15.24	15.24	15.24
B (m)	10.06	6.40	2.74
a (m)	3.05	3.05	3.05
b (m)	0.91	0.91	0.91
t (mm)	14.3	14.3	14.3
Long'l Size	WT 180x130x19.5	WT 180x130x19.5	WT 180x130x19.
Trans Size	W-T 920x305x167.5	W-T 610x230x101	W-T 410x175x3
$p (N/mm^2)$	0.107	0.107	0.107
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
IL $(cm^4)$	4,578.55	4,578.55	4,578.55
IT $(cm^4)$	444,701.66	156,461.39	34,630.45
ASL $(cm^2)$	11.48	11.48	11.48
AST $(cm^2)$	144.58	80.77	30.19
iL=IL/b(cm <sup>4</sup> /cm)	49.98	49.98	49.98
iT=IT/a(cm <sup>4</sup> /cm)	1,458.94	513.41	113.56
A/B	1.52	2.38	5.56
(A/B)(iT/iL)^1/4	3.52	4.26	6.82
•	·	T C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	1

11

;

# 3.0 FINITE ELEMENT MODELS OF STIFFENED PLATE STRUCTURE

### 3.1 Introduction

This section discusses the finite element analysis of the stiffened-plate structures designed in section 2.0. The P.C. based finite element software ALGOR was used to analyze the plate and brick models using linear elastic theory. The VAX based NASTRAN software was used to analyze the brick model with an initial deformation. All analyses in this study were originally performed using english units. The final results presented in this document are in metric units, therefore standard metric sizes were not selected. For each of the six configurations designed in section 2.0, two models were developed, one using plate elements and the other using brick elements. Additional models were developed to; determine optimum mesh size, study the effect of using offset beams, study the response of single panels under uniform load with clamped boundary conditions and study the effect of initial deformation of the plating. The procedures adopted for each of these studies are described in detail below.

# 3.2 Determination of Mesh Size.

It is a well known fact that the results of a finite element analysis are predicated by the mesh size adopted in the analysis. For accurate results finer mesh sizes are desirable. But at times the price to be paid in terms of hardware resources and computational time is too enormous to justify such refinements. Therefore, to ascertain mesh sizes which would yield results within established limits of

accuracy without straining available computer resources, a study was undertaken to determine the optimum mesh size.

The usual procedure is to study the convergence of finite element results obtained using various mesh sizes to available theoretical results. For a single unstiffened panel that is part of a grillage, the edge fixity will depend upon its location within the grillage and the stiffness of its supporting structure. Currently, theoretical solutions of stiffened-plate structures under normal pressure loads with various edge fixities are not available. Hence, the convergence study was performed using one single unsupported panel with fully fixed end conditions for which theoretical results exist.

Performing a convergence study on a single panel has two advantages. First, the results of a finite element analysis of a panel under uniform pressure could be compared to available theoretical solutions of rectangular plates with all edges fixed under uniform pressure. Second, using a single panel of unsupported plating for the mesh size determination, enormously reduces the size of the model.

The single panel chosen for the mesh size determination was the unsupported span of plating,  $3.05m \times 0.91m (10'x3')$ , from the stiffened-plate structure designed in section 2.0. The plating thickness used was as determined in section 2.0 for OSS steel panels, which is 15.88mm (0.625"). The plating was subjected to the same lateral pressure of  $0.107 \text{ N/mm}^2$  (15.56 psi) as used in section 2.0 and clamped on all sides. For this configuration, five models using plate elements were developed having uniform square meshes. The element sizes for the models were as follows: 304.8mm (12"), 152.4mm (6"),

76.2mm (3"), 38.1mm (1.5"), and 19.05mm (0.75"). The displacement and the two normal stresses,  $\sigma_{xx}$  and  $\sigma_{vv}$  , were compared with theoretical results given in Reference [4] based on elastic small deflection theory. These results are summarised in Table 3.1 which also contains the in-plane shear,  $\tau_{xy}$ , Von-Mises and the maximum principal stresses. For illustrative purpose, the time and the memory required to run each model are also included in the table. In Figure 3.1, results from Table 3.1 are plotted as percentage differences between the finite element analysis and theory. As expected, with a finer mesh, the results converge to the theoretical values. For element sizes less than 152.4mm (6"), displacement converge exactly to the theoretical value while for element

sizes less than 76.2mm (3"), stresses are within 10% of the theoretical values. Each refinement produces results closer to theory, but the amount of time and storage space (memory) required increases. While model 5, with a mesh size of 19.05mm (0.75") produces results which are almost within 2.5% of the theoretical result, it takes 75 times longer and about 70 times more memory than model 3 having a mesh size of 76.2mm (3"). Hence, for the present study models having element sizes of 76.2mm (3") square were chosen.

3.3 Modeling of Longitudinals and Transverses.

Full 3-dimensional models of cross stiffened panels using plate elements to model the plating as well as the longitudinals and transverses are complex. As mentioned in section 2.0, when designing stiffened-plate structure, the longitudinals and transverses have been checked explicitly for their various modes of failure. Therefore for the

TABLE 3.1. OPTIMUM MESH SIZE DETERMINATION USING PLATE ELEMENTS

Model	1	2	3	4	5	Elas. Small Defl.
Element Size (mm x mm)	304.8 x 304.8	152.4 x 152.4	76.2 76.2 ×	38.1 x 38.1	19.05 x 19.05	
Displ.(mm) (% Diff)	2.04 · -20.82	2.59 0.45	2.59	2.59 0.45	2.59	2.57
$\sigma_{xx} (N/mm^2)$ (% Diff)	51 -58.13	97 -19.86	109 -10.29	115 -5.12	118	121
$\sigma_{yy}(N/mm^2)$ (% Diff)	119 -33.17	149 -16.40	164 -7.99	171 -3.78	175 -1.68	178
$\tau_{xy}(N/mm^2)$	18	24	22	23	23	
∨m (N/mm^2)	119	149	164	171	175	
max. prin. (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	119	149	164	171	175	
time(min)	0.23	0.42	1.51	11.03	117.28	
memory (Mb)	0.024	0.095	1.001	8.8	71.3	

s<sub>xx</sub> = Normal Stress in 'x' direction s<sub>yy</sub> = Normal Stress in 'y' direction t<sub>xy</sub> = In-plane Shear Stress vm = von mises Stress max.prin. = maximum principal Stress Note : % Differences are with respect to Elastic Small Deflection Theory



FIGURE 3.1 Mesh Size Determination using Plate Elements

Y.

present study, the area of interest was the behavior of the plating in a cross stiffened structure under normal loads. To economise on the size of the models and still maintain accuracy, the longitudinal and transverse stiffeners were modeled using beam elements. Since FEM grids combine elements at their neutral axis, the beam elements were offset from the plating by an amount equal to the distance of their neutral axis from the plating. Sectional properties used to represent the stiffeners include total cross-sectional area (A), the shear areas  $(A_y \text{ and } A_z)$ , moment of inertias about the strong and weak axes of bending  $(I_v \text{ and } I_z)$  and the St. Venant's torsional constant (J). The properties were obtained by treating the longitudinals and transverses as stand alone beams with no effective plating.

validate the use of offset beams to represent То the longitudinal and transverse stiffeners, two finite element models were developed. In one, the stiffeners were modeled using discrete plate elements, in the other offset beam elements were used. For this comparative study, the second ordinary strength steel (OSS) stiffened-plate model, 15.24m x 6.4m (50' X 21'), designed in section 2.0 was used. For the model in which the stiffeners were represented by discrete plate elements, the webs of the longitudinals were two elements deep and those of the transverses were four elements deep. The flanges of both the longitudinals and transverses In both models, the plating was were two elements wide. represented by 152.4mm (6") square elements. Due to symmetry in loading and boundary conditions, only a quarter of the structure was modeled. Results of the comparison are shown in Table 3.2. In addition to displacement, Table 3.2 also contains the computational time taken and the memory required for analyzing each of the models. Table 3.2 indicates that

TABLE 3.2. COMPARISON OF STIFFENER MODELS USING PLATES AND OFFSET BEAMS. (PLATING MODELED USING PLATE ELEMENTS)

MODEL	STIFFENERS AS PLATES	STIFFENERS AS BEAMS	8 DIFFERENCE
Displacement(mm)	9.73	9.99	2.69
$\sigma_{xx}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	140.53	139.85	-0.48
$\sigma_{yy}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	190.34	192.92	1.36
$ au_{xy}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	54.28	55.55	2.34
v.mises (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	169.31	171.87	1.51
Time (min)	21	4	-81.00
Memory (Mb)	25	6	-76.00

 $\sigma_{xx}$  = Normal Stress in 'x' direction

 $\sigma_{yy}$  = Normal Stress in 'y' direction

 $\tau_{xy}$  = In-plane Shear Stress

,

v.mises = von mises Stress

Note : % Differences are with respect to the model in which the stiffeners are modeled using plates.

while the differences in the displacements and stresses between the two models are less than 3%, the saving in time and storage (memory) is as high as 75%.

### 3.4 Modeling of Plating using Plate Elements

Six stiffened-plate structures, three made of ordinary strength steel (OSS) and three of high strength steel (HSS) were designed in section 2.0. To study the effect of deflection of the supports (longitudinals and transverses) on the plate panels of a stiffened-plate structure, linear elastic finite element models were developed for each of the above six structures using 76.2mm (3") square plate elements to model the plating and offset beams to represent the longitudinals and the transverses. The beam elements used to model the stiffeners were offset at the connection points to the plating by an amount equal to the distance of the neutral axis of the stiffeners from the bottom of the plate surface.

The thicknesses of the plating used were 15.88mm (0.625") for the OSS models and 14.29mm (0.563") for the HSS. The sectional area properties for the longitudinals and transverses used for the six models are summarised in Table 3.3 and 3.4. For all six models, Young's modulus, E, of 206,850  $N/mm^2$  (30 X 10<sup>6</sup> psi) and Poisson's ratio of 0.3 were used as material constants, an uniform pressure load of 0.107  $N/mm^2$  (15.56 psi) was applied normal to the plane of the plating, in the direction of the stiffeners. Due to symmetry of the structure and the load, only a quarter of the structure was modeled. These stiffened-plate models represent bottom structures between transverse bulkheads on the forward and aft ends and longitudinal girders on either

	MODEL 1		MOD	EL 2	MODEL 3		
	LONGL.	TRANSV.	LONGL.	TRANSV.	LONGL.	TRANSV.	
A (cm <sup>2</sup> )	29.006	271.270	29.006	157.322	29.006	67.058	
$A_{y}(cm^{2})$	14.090	145.161	14.090	100.322	14.090	39.864	
$A_z (cm^2)$	14.916	126.109	14.916	57.000	14.916	27.193	
I <sub>Y</sub> (cm <sup>4</sup> )	258.65	22,787.01	258.65	3,310.95	258.65	775.23	
$I_z(cm^4)$	1,136.35	233,612.22	1,136.35	80,869.90	1,136.35	12,041.53	
J(cm <sup>4</sup> )	8.70	473.71	8.70	180.10	8.70	36.42	
Y <sub>na</sub> (cm)	14.983	66.309	14.983	46.772	14.983	28.699	

TABLE 3.3. SECTIONAL PROPERTIES OF LONGITUDINALS AND TRANSVERSES (OSS)

A = Total Area

 $A_y$  = Area along 'y' axis

 $A_z$  = Area along 'z' axis

 $I_y$  = Moment of Inertia about 'y' axis

 $I_z$  = Moment of Inertia about 'z' axis

J = St.Venant's Torsional Constant .

 $Y_{na} = \mbox{Distance}$  of the neutral axis from the plating

	MODEL 1		MODEL 2		MODEL 3	
-	LONGL.	TRANSV.	LONGL.	TRANSV.	LONGL.	TRANSV.
A (cm <sup>2</sup> )	24.387	214.445	24.387	129.387	24.387	48.761
$A_y(cm^2)$	11.452	145.671	11.452	81.458	11.452	30.187
$A_z(cm^2)$	12.935	68.774	12.935	47.929	12.935	18.574
I <sub>Y</sub> (cm <sup>4</sup> )	185.76	5,622.25	185.76	2,255.60	185.76	510.76
I <sub>z</sub> (cm <sup>4</sup> )	718.50	192,408.89	718.50	52,509.55	718.50	8,499.36
J(cm <sup>4</sup> )	6.66 -	259.02	6.66	• 128.45	6.66	13.19
Y <sub>na</sub> (cm)	13.246	59.731	13.246	41.849	13.246	27.607

TABLE 3.4. SECTIONAL PROPERTIES OF LONGITUDINALS AND TRANSVERSES (HSS)

A = Total Area

Ay = Area along 'y' axis

 $A_z$  = Area along 'z' axis

 $I_y$  = Moment of Inertia about 'y' axis

 $I_z$  = Moment of Inertia about 'z' axis

J = St.Venant's Torsional Constant

 $Y_{na} =$  Distance of neutral axis from plating

side. For the quarter models, two of the edges are fully fixed representing fixities at the transverse bulkhead and longitudinal girder. On the other two edges, symmetry boundary conditions are applied. A schematic of the structure is shown in Figure 3.2.

Figure 3.3, shows the actual finite element model of the first OSS plate-stiffened structure, 15.24m X 10.06m (50' X 33') designed in section 2.0. The other five models are similar except for their overall dimensions and scantlings.

3.5 Modeling of Plating using Brick Elements

To study the effect of vertical shear on the plate panels of a stiffened-plate structure, linear elastic finite element models were developed by substituting the plate elements used in the previous sub-section with 76.2mm (3") square brick elements to model the plating. One layer of brick elements was used through the thickness, therefore the thickness of the brick elements was the same as the thickness of the plating. The thicknesses of the plating used were 15.88mm (0.625") for the OSS models and 14.29mm (0.563") for the HSS model. As in the previous subsection, offset beams were used to represent the longitudinal and the transverse stiffeners. The sectional area properties for the stiffeners, material properties, load and boundary conditions were the same as those used in the plate models, see Table 3.3 and 3.4.

3.6 Modeling of Plating with Initial Deformation

It has been observed that in stiffened-plate structures, due to the shrinkage of welds at the attachment of the




stiffeners to the plating, the unsupported span of the plating bounded by the stiffeners develops an initial deformation. As mentioned in [4] depending on the amount of initial deformation present in the plating and the degree to which the edges are restrained from pulling in, the plating under normal (lateral) loads, develops membrane tension. This membrane effect which, is absent when the plate is perfectly flat, produces a normal (or lateral) component of membrane tension which can carry a portion of the normal pressure load and hence can be beneficial. То study such membrane effects on stiffened-plate structure with deflecting supports (longitudinals and transverses), two finite element models of the third stiffened-plate structure 15.24m x 2.74m (50' X 9') designed in section 2.0 were developed. For both, the OSS and HSS models, brick elements were used to model the plating and as before offset beam elements were used to represent the stiffeners.

The initial deformation in the unsupported span of the plating between the stiffeners was defined by a double sine function as given below :

$$\Delta_{(x,y)} = t \sin\left(\frac{\pi x}{a}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\pi y}{b}\right)$$

where :

 $\Delta_{(x,y)}$  = Initial deformation t = thickness of the plating a,b = length and breadth of the unsupported span of plating

Using this expression the maximum deflection always occurs at the middle of the panel. The deflection value was chosen to be equal to one plate thickness. For this study, 38.1mm (1.5") square brick elements were used and as before their

thicknesses were the same as that of the plate. The same material constants, loading and boundary conditions were used as in sub-section 3.4 and 3.5.

## 4.0 RESULTS OF FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS

## 4.1 Comparison of Stresses using Plate Elements

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 summarize the results of the analysis performed using plate elements to represent plate panels of the six stiffened-plate models designed in section 2.0. The output includes maximum displacement, normal stresses  $\sigma_{\scriptscriptstyle XX}$  and  $\sigma_{yy}$ , in-plane shear stress  $\tau_{xy}$ , and Von-Mises stress for the OSS and HSS models respectively. The normal stress,  $\sigma_{xx}$ , is in the longitudinal direction or the long direction of the structure while  $\sigma_{yy}$  is the normal stress in the transverse direction. The Von-Mises stress represents the Hecky - Von-Mises failure criteria and takes into account all the normal stress components as well as the the shear stresses. In the tables, locations of the maximum values of displacements and stresses are given in parenthesis below each quantity.

For comparison, the last column of Tables 4.1 and 4.2 (with the heading 'SP') contains results of a single panel with fully fixed edges. This single panel is the same as an unsupported panel of plating of models 1, 2, and 3. This panel has the same thickness as that of the stiffened-panel (15.88mm) (0.625") for OSS structures and 14.3mm (0.563") for HSS structures). This single panel represents a case where the longitudinals and transverses are excessively stiff and hence are undeflecting.

Figures 4.1 to 4.12 show the stress patterns of the normal,  $\sigma_{yy}$ , and the Von-Mises stresses for models 1, 2 and 3. Stress

TABLE 4.1. MAXIMUM DISPLACEMENT AND STRESSES AT THE BOTTOM SURFACE OF OSS MODELS (USING PLATE ELEMENTS; t = 15.88 mm;  $\sigma_{y}$  = 235 N/mm<sup>2</sup>)

	MODEL 1	MODEL 2	MODEL 3	S.P.
	(15.24x10.06)	(15.24x6.40)	(15.24x2.74)	(3.05x0.91)
Disp. (mm)	14.45	10.42	7.44	2.59
(cm, cm)	(457,503)	(457,320)	(457,137)	(152,46)
σ <sub>xx</sub> (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	157.28	151.97	151.94	108.57
(cm, cm)	(0,137)	(0,137)	(610,137)	
$\sigma_{yy} (N/mm^2)$	241.70	209.13	195.92	163.76
	(610,0.0)	(518,0.0)	(457,0.0)	(122,0.0)
$\tau_{xy} (N/mm^2)$	60.99 (587,107)	53.26 (587,99)	37.54	22.48
v.mises (N/mm <sup>2</sup> ) (cm,cm)	230.64 (610,0.0)	189.87 (610,0.0)	184.05	145.55

TABLE 4.2. MAXIMUM DISPLACEMENT AND STRESSES AT THE BOTTOM SURFACE OF HSS MODELS (USING PLATE ELEMENTS; t = 14.29 mm;  $\sigma_{y}$  = 350 N/mm<sup>2</sup>)

	MODEL 1	MODEL 2	MODEL 3	S.P.
	(15.24x10.06)	(15.24x6.40)	(15.24x2.74)	(3.05x0.91)
Disp. (mm)	18.68	14.46	10.32	3.55
(cm, cm)	(457,503)	(457,320)	(457,137)	(152,46)
$\sigma_{xx}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	192.31	187.65	188.01	134.03
(cm, cm)	(0,137)	(0,137)	(610,137)	(0,46)
$\sigma_{yy} (N/mm^2)$	281.23	258.09	241.85	202.18
	(610,0.0)	(518,0.0)	(457,0.0)	(122,0.0)
$\tau_{xy}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	73.54	67.07	46.51	27.76
(cm, cm)	(587,107)	(587,99)	(587,99)	(23,15)
v.mises (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	250.50	232.66	227.43	179.70
(cm,cm)	(610,0.0)	(610,0.0)	(457,0.0)	



psi N/mm<sup>2</sup>





FIGURE 4.2 OSS PLATE MODEL 1;  $\sigma_{\rm \, YY}$  stress (VIEW from the bottom)

psi N/mm<sup>2</sup>





FIGURE 4.3 HSS PLATE MODEL 1; VON-MISES STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)

psi N/mm<sup>2</sup>





FIGURE 4.4 HSS PLATE MODEL 1;  $\sigma_{\,yy}$  stress (view from the bottom)









FIGURE 4.6 OSS PLATE MODEL 2;  $\sigma_{\rm yy}$  stress (view from the bottom)



 $N/mm^2$ 

psi

m





FIGURE 4.8 HSS PLATE MODEL 2;  $\sigma_{\,\rm YY}$  stress (view from the bottom)

36

.



---



-

 $N/mm^2$ 196 95 -106 -207 psi ГЦ 2841





- 1







FIGURE 4.12 HSS PLATE MODEL 3;  $\sigma_{\,\rm YY}$  stress (view from the bottom)



patterns of the other two components,  $\sigma_{xx}$  and  $\tau_{xy}$ , are not included since in all cases the magnitude of  $\sigma_{xx}$  is less than  $\sigma_{yy}$  and  $\tau_{xy}$  is very small. As the figures indicate, the maximum stresses occur at the two fixed edges and along the intersection of the stiffeners with the plate. The two fixed edges are those which are closer to the right and top edges of the paper respectively. In each of the figures, the stress distribution has been represented by five ranges, values of which are shown at the top. The OSS and HSS models have the same stress patterns although their magnitudes are different due to the difference in plate thicknesses and grillage beam sizes.

Figures 4.13 and 4.14 provide a direct comparison of the stress components. The maximum values of four stress components, two normal stress components  $\sigma_{xx}$  and  $\sigma_{yy}$ , in-plane shear  $\tau_{xy}$  and von-mises, are plotted with respect to the virtual aspect ratio defined in section 2.0. For comparison, the values of these stresses for the single panel model described above have also been plotted. For each value of virtual aspect ratio, the percentage differences in the stresses of the stiffened-plate and the single panel model are shown in the plots.

## 4.2 Comparison of Stresses using Brick Elements

Tables 4.3 and 4.4 provide maximum values of the normal stress  $\sigma_{22}$  and vertical shear stresses  $\tau$   $\tau$  in addition to









COMPARISION OF STRESSES IN HSS PLATE MODEL WITH SINGLE PANEL

43

I

TABLE 4.3. MAXIMUM DISPLACEMENT AND STRESSES OF OSS MODELS

(USING BRICK ELEMENTS; t = 15.88 mm;  $\sigma_{y_{--}}$ =\_235 N/mm<sup>2</sup>)

.

1	MODEL 1	MODEL 2	MODEL 3
	(15.24x10.06)	(15.24×6.40)	(15.24x2.74)
		····	
Disp. (mm)	14 12	10 14	
	(437,303,0.000)	(457,320,0.000)	(457,137,0.000)
$\sigma_{xx}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	140.44	130.32	130.15
(Cm, cm, cm)	(0,457,0.000)	(0,274,0.000)	(610,137,0.000)
		······································	(
$\pi$ (NI/mm <sup>2</sup> )	255 51	204 55	164 11
$O_{YY}$ (147 IIIIII )	2,00,01	204.55	104.11
(Cm, Cm, Cm)	(610,0,0.000)	(610,0,0.000)	(457,0,0.000)
$\sigma_{77}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	87.45	68.94	39.26
	(610 0 1 588)	(610 0 1 588)	(610 0 1 588)
	(010,0,1.300)	(010,0,1.500)	(010,0,1.588)
2.	<b>C2 02</b>	54 50	
$\tau_{xy}$ (N/mm <sup>-</sup> )	63.03	54.50	36.70
(cm, cm, cm)	(594,99,1.588)	(594,99,1.588)	(587,99,1.588)
$\tau_{\rm up}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	29.31	23.59	15.71
		(810,0,0.000)	(610,0,0.000)
. 3			
$\tau_{xz}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	16.58	14.96	13.11
(cm, cm, cm)	(0,457,0.000)	(0, 274, 0.000)	(0,91,0,000)
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	(-,-,-,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
$x = (N/mm^2)$	202 55	162 17	152 96
		102.47	T32.00
(Cm, Cm, Cm)	(610,8,0.000)	(610,8,0.000)	(457,0,1.588)

•

.

## TABLE 4.4. MAXIMUM DISPLACEMENT AND STRESSES OF HSS MODELS

(USING PLATE ELEMENTS; t = 14.29 mm;  $\sigma_{y}$  = 350 N/mm<sup>2</sup>)

. -

	MODEL 1	MODEL 2	MODEL 3
	$(15.24 \times 10.06)$	$(15, 24 \times 6, 40)$	$(15 24 \times 2 74)$
	(2012 11201 00)	(10.24/01.10)	(13.2422.74)
		1	
Disp. (mm)	18.20	14.02	10.02
(cm, cm, cm)	(457,503,0,000)	(457, 320, 0, 000)	(457, 137, 0, 000)
			(10//10//0.000)
$\sigma_{xx}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	] 167.47	159.07	159.81
(cm, cm, cm)	(0.457.0.000)	(0 274 0 000)	(610 137 0 000)
	(3) 10/ 0000/	(0,2,4,0:000)	(010,137,0.0007
$\sigma_{vv}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	279.77	253.56	202.67
(cm. cm. cm)	(610 0 0 000)	(610 0 0 000)	(457 0 0 000)
(Chi) Chi, Chi)	(010,0,0.000)	(010,0,0.000)	(457,0,0.000)
$\sigma_{\pi\pi}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	100.04	86.80	46.34
	1610 0 1 420	(610 0 1 120)	1070 0 7 1000
	(010,0,1.430)	(610,0,1.430)	(610,0,1.430)
$\tau_{\rm mr}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	74.99	67.98	44.98
	(504 00 7 400)	(504 00 1 400)	(507 00 1 100)
(Cm, Cm, Cm)	(594,99,1.430)	(594,99,1.430)	(587,99,1.430)
[			
$\tau_{\rm m} (\rm N/mm^2)$	25.48	26.16	18.04
			10001
(cm, cm, cm)	(610,0,0.000)	(610, 0, 0.000)	(610,0,0.000)
$\tau (N/mm^2)$	17.20	15 76	13 73
	1,,20	13.70	10.15
(cm, cm, cm)	(0,457,0.000)	(0,274,0.000)	(0,91,0.000)
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
$M = micos (M/mm^2)$	228 19	202 02	100 14
v.mises (iv/mun)	220.43	203.92	190.14
(cm, cm, cm)	(610,8,0.000)	(610,8,0.000)	(457,0.0,1.430)

.

.

stress  $\tau_{xy},$  and Von-Mises stress for the OSS and HSS models respectively. The normal stresses  $\sigma_{xx}$  and  $\sigma_{yy}$  are in the same direction as described in sub-section 4.1. The normal stress  $\sigma_{zz}$  acts vertically upwards. The two additional shear stresses  $\tau_{xz}$  and  $\tau_{yz}$  act vertically on the two faces perpendicular to the longitudinal and transverse directions of the panel. The Von-Mises stress represents the Hecky - Von- mises failure criteria and takes into account all the normal stress components as well as the shear stresses. As in the previous sub-section in the tables, locations of the maximum values of displacements and stresses are given in parenthesis below each quantity. Figures 4.15 to 4.38 show the stress patterns of the normal stress  $\sigma_{\scriptscriptstyle yy},$  von-mises stress and the vertical shear stresses  $\tau_{xz}$  and  $\tau_{yz}$  for models 1, 2 and 3. As before, only  $\sigma_{yy}$ , whose magnitude is greater than the other two normal stresses, are shown. For all the models, maximum  $\sigma_{vv}$  and von mises occur at the two fixed edges and along the intersection of the plate with the stiffeners. The two fixed edges are those which are closer to the right and top edges of the paper respectively. Maximum vertical shear stress  $\tau_{vz}$  occurs along the transverses while the maximum  $\tau_{xz}$  occurs along the longitudinals. In each of the figures, the total stress distribution has been divided into five ranges, values of which are shown at the top. The OSS and HSS models have the same stress patterns although their magnitudes are different because of the difference in plate thicknesses and grillage beam sizes.

In Figures 4.39 and 4.40, the maximum values of four stress components, two normal stress components  $\sigma_{xx}$  and  $\sigma_{yy}$ , in-plane shear  $\tau_{xy}$  and von-mises, are plotted with respect to the













X



48

FIGURE 4.16 OSS BRICK MODEL 1;  $\sigma_{\,\rm yy}$  STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)







FIGURE 4.18 OSS BRICK MODEL 1;  $\tau_{\rm XZ}$  STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)

psi N/mm<sup>2</sup> 32000 221 24162.5 167 16325 113 59 650 4



FIGURE 4.19 HSS BRICK MODEL 1; VON-MISES STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)

psi N/mm<sup>2</sup>





FIGURE 4.20 HSS BRICK MODEL 1;  $\sigma_{\,\rm yy}$  STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)





FIGURE 4.21 HSS BRICK MODEL 1;  $\tau_{\rm YZ}$  STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)

ы С







FIGURE 4.22 HSS BRICK MODEL 1;  $\tau_{\rm XZ}$  STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)



- -



•

슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻
ᄽᇾᇴᇃᇛᅆᅸᆤᄹᆑᅾᅌᇦᇦᆸᆸᆸᆸᇳᄡᆣᆮᆣᇑᇤᆖᅆᅀᄽᄽᅾᇴᇢᆸᅜᇆᄭᅆᆃᆃᇹᇤᆋᆂᄽᄔᆃᆕ ᄽᇾᇴᇃᇛᅇᅸᆤᆤᆒᅾᅌᇦᇦᆸᆸᆸᇳᇳᆖᄡᆣᆮᆣᇑᇤᆖᅆᅀᄽᄽᅾᅋᇤᇤᅊᅸᅸᅆᆧᇦᇦᇤᇤᆖᄱᄽᄔᆃᆕ
슻슻놰슻쇖슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻
기록 방법은 문을 가장을 해외했다. 전문 이 전문 이 전문 비행을 가장을 통해서 귀해 이 문화를 가지 않는 것이다. 이 전문 이 전문 이 전문 이 전문 이 전문 비행이다. 이 전문 이 전문 비행이다. 이 전문 비행
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
二、2019年51、《建國等型》集集集集集)、1919年5日、2019年5月、2019
《学学学教》 这些那些无法没有的问题, 这里里的"大大大学学校",这些是是一个情绪的问题。 《教育教》 计分析的分子,并且是我们一个问题的一个分析的形式,这些是我是任何的问题。
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
一口收载的, 化化物化合金 化物化物 计存储数 古古的复数形式 化甲酸化物医甲酸化物
《教授》:"如果我们去了你是我的,你就能们这个时候都能能了你的你能去了这些我们。
二、物理学生、1四回日常会计可的时,可以要求自己可能要求学习中国的学习。
。"杨国王,《杨林斯斯·汉利国王斯 计算例的表示计算例的第三人称单数形式目标的名词
2.5 金星等时,这些要说说不可是希望的。 机管理机合适应器用导动,和管理器与可能会要做。 2.2 整整新门(如图整路分达过是新图像), 机管理机合适应器用导动, 化管理器与可能会要用
고 안 속 물 등 가격을 통한 고 것 가 물 것 같 것 같 것 같 것 같 것 같 것 같 것 같 것 같 것 같 것
·····································
三、金属有主义和基础的运行已有新教训,加强自己在行时回答题。 网络美国美国美国美国 王文教圣教士《教学教师院院记》王教教教、《法国美国大学学习主义》。 网络美国美国美国美国
별로 등 문 전 역 등 전 등 위 등 분들 수 있는 전 등 전 등 전 등 전 등 위 등 분 등 위 등 등 등 등 등 등 등 등 등 등 등 등 등 등
슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻
슻꺡붱끹닅놰뼺닅쏊빝뮾슻녎끹닅끹긆故붱욯끹슻놰븮볞욭랦슻쌉놰븮붱붱닅끹끹붱 슻걙뭱뀀距슻놰븮닅닅탒듁깇끹븮끹븮녆귿퀂걙슻셵슻뫋슻놂닅닅슻깇꿗볞닅닅끹닅
ə 제도 김 바늘 자두 아프 모르 프로 후 재정 프로 승규가 방문지 문문은 환경가 잘 해 말 받으는 것
슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻
과 부명 김 김 부분은 또 같은 것 것 같은 것 이유 한 것 같은 것 같은 것 이가 있는 것 같은 것 같은 것 같이 있다. 그 가 밖 방 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 이 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은
신문 문제 방법 같은 문제 문제 관람이 많은 것은 문제 같은 것을 만들었다. 이 가 나 나 나 나 나 나 나 나 나 나 나 나 나 나 나 나 나 나
?????????????????????????????????????
옥감옥해학에 가족은 중점 전전도 유용한 '대로 비타고 감각은 특별' '대로 문화해학 문화적' 중 가족은 한 사람은 관계 것으로 같은 해외 전 전 전 문화 전 가격은 문화 '대로 문화해학 문화적'
사가 문화물로 가져놓는 사실을 주셨는 그들은 유가 있는 것은 문화로 가장을 받았는 것을 만들었다. 가 것을 통해서 시계를 통하고 있는 것을 통해서 가지 않는 것을 통해 있는 것을 통해 있 같이 것을 통해 있는 것을 통해 있
·····································
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
(4)《中学院》(如今年2日回归》》21日前期,一次学校和学校的学校的学校的学校的学校的学校的学校的学校的学校的学校的学校的学校的学校。
중장도로 알아내가 가장된 강전 경험 우리는 것 것은 가장은 것을 모두 한 나라 바람이 있는 것을 가장을 하는 것 같아. 것 것 같은 것 같아. 아이들 것 같아.
그는 해요즘 전 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이
고는것같이다. (개봉원감감감학합문문, 개봉문한(김규가분문문), (개봉원원문문원) 2012년 동일, (개봉원감감감학합문문, 개봉문한(김규가분문문원, (개봉원원문문문문문문원),
근무은별부분에 가장을 맞구 것 것 같은 것 ~ 가용을 하지 않아 아들 않아 (Vienes and States). 것 것 문화물리 수관물 문경에 관련 방문도(), 개들은 환성 것 이 아들 문화 문화로 문화되었다.
고장부분들은 이유민 방송가에서 비용되는 이민들은 말이가 가운동되는 이민들은 방송을 통해 있다. 이 아파
그는 모두 바람은 모두 바람이 나라 모두 아이지 않는 것을 다 나라 나라 나라 나라 다 나라 다 나라 다 나라 다 나라 다 나라
슻슻슻휶슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻슻
ᅳᆟ쀼븮붱탒륗끹끹끹탒쇖껕븮닅끹빝겯숺볞븮붱놣노끹똜쁚휭棍놂깇깇끹쀼붱닅붱읰닅닅닅 껵꺡윩쎾닅탒닅끹끹뽜教꿗슻끹끹끹걙巧퀑븮닅끹슻끹닅닅닅닅닅슻깆끹닅끹닅닅닅닅
옥부모 문문문문문문분은 모든 문문문문분은 여자가 가 문을 위한 것이 가 같은 것을 모두 모두 모두 다. 것같은 것은
·····································
:
he contained with a set a s
글 ····································
사실 문제 전 전 문제 전 전 전 문제 바 가 이 방 방 문 전 전 관 방 방 나 나 가 방 방 문 이 가 있다.
김정은 모두 김 모양이 아이지 않는 것 같은 바람이 가지 않는 것 같은 바람이 있는 것 같은 것 같
그쪽은 문화에 135은 정확의 전원을 받아 '생활을 한 그것은 문화에 가지로 문화해 있는 문화가 것은 분류는 13일은 전에 관계하는 것이 관계하는 것이 가지로 문화하는 것이다. 그것은 문화에 관심을 받아 주
그것 방법은 가격을 다양한 것을 받는 것 같은 다양한 것이 방송을 다 가격을 통해 주 있었다. 이 아파 아파 가격을 다 가 있는 것을 다 가 있다. 것을 다 가 있는 것을 다 같이
그것으로 또한 1월 등 전망가입을 위한 1일 사용을 당당감정을 통해 하는 1일 문화로 운동되었다. 같으로 또한 1월 등 문화되었다. 특별 방상 1일 특별 위에실 것을 통하는 1일 문화로 운동되는 것이다.
김정도도 비행 1000년 현명한 2000년 1000년 100 

FIGURE 4.23 OSS BRICK MODEL 2; VON-MISES STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)





FIGURE 4.24 OSS BRICK MODEL 2;  $\sigma_{\,\rm yy}$  stress (view from the bottom)

Ŋ







FIGURE 4.25 OSS BRICK MODEL 2;  $\tau_{\rm YZ}$  STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)







FIGURE 4.26 OSS BRICK MODEL 2;  $\tau_{\rm XZ}$  STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)




······································
ᅸᅸᇼᇾᇂᅳᆢᇮᇰᆭᅶᅶᅸᆤᅸᅸᅸᅸᆣᅳᅳᇈᇈᅸᅸᆣᆣᇾᆤᅆᇆᇈᅊᅋᆋᇾᇾᄮᆋᇴᇎᇔᆂ ᇃᅍᅆᅍᆧᇤᆍᄪᇊᇤᄪᇤᇠᇵᄻᇄᅑᇏᆍᅒᆍᇤᆋᆍᇃᅒᄻᇥᅒᄢᇊᅋᇎᆕᆂᆂᆂ
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Q 앱 은 해 면 수 있는 것 은 위 하 은 문 분 약을 보 두 방 중 단 은 생 은 바 듣 일 등 만 한 만 한 바 있 수 한 안 이 수 한 바 있 수 한 바 있 수 한 바 있 수 한 m 있 수 한 바 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h 있 수 한 h N D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D
"我们有意义,这些是有些有些没有的意思。"这些是是是没有意思的。
· 프로젝아() · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
- 부분명하는 사망하다 고려 있다. 이 가슴에도 소전 귀매하다 관계 가슴을 다 가려 있다. - 사람들은 - 가방을 만들고 있게 많다. 이 가슴에도 그 가려 들고 다 가슴을 다 가려.
·····································
"我你怎么?"这些我们没有这些事实,你是你是你不能是我的?"他是你的人,我们能能能。
大行会教授() 没有意味在二种种教教 《教室》二十八种教师后,正是那种希达出口语言。 《外国教》:"我自己,我这些我们,我们是我们没有问题,我们是我们没有问题,我们是你们的是不能。"
· 가족되는, 유바우리그 가족되는, 가족되는 가족되는 가족되는 것을 다 있는 것을 것을 수 있는 것을 다 있는 것을 것을 것을 것을 수 있는 것을 다 있는 것을 다 있는 것을 다 있는 것을 수 있는 것을 것을 수 있는 것을 것을 수 있는 것을 다 있는 것을 다 있는 것을 다 있는 것을 것을 것을 것을 수 있는 것을 것을 것을 것을 수 있는 것을 것을 것을 것을 것을 것을 것을 것을 것을 수 있는 것을
二(三译号)(····································
그 김 정원들은 것 같아요 다고고 가 집에서 이 가 집에 다고 관광 가 귀에 가 집에 다 가 귀 나는 것 같아.
김 가족유럽은 '김 속도 바라는 것 같아요'는 그것 같은 것 것 같아요. 김 가족유럽은 것 같아요. 이 가 나는 것 않아요. 이 가 나는 것 같아요. 이 가 나는 것 같아요. 이 가 아요. 이 가 나는 것 같아요. 이 가 나는 것 같아요. 이 가 나는 것 않아요. 이 가 나는 것 않아요. 이 가 나는 것 않아요. 이 가 나는 것 같아요. 이 가 나는 것 않아요. 이 가 나는 것 같아요. 이 가 나는 것 않아요. 이 아요. 이 이 이 아요.
· 近天的天台,如果是你不知道了我的来说。""你想要是你的,你不是我的吗?""你不是我的吗?" "你们我们的你,你们就是你们不是你的?""你是你们你们的你们,你们就是你们不是你的吗?"
·····································
二二甲基苯基 化苯甲基乙基乙基甲基化 计非常可能分子 计中学表示 计分子字母 网络罗马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马马
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
그가족 방법은 사장은 바라고 우 아이들은 바람은 바람을 다 가지 않는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이다. 그 가족 방법은 사장은 바람은 아이들은 바람은 바람을 다 가지 않는 것이 같이 많이 있는 것이다.
작품건물록경 참 참 같은 것을 모두 같은 것을 가는 사람에 가는 모두 가고 있었다. 또 한 것을 것을 가 가 가 다. 
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
퀑락 7년 2월 전원리크 국민적류에 2월 선생은 모면의 장관 콜륨 2월 문문문 공부를 걸렸다.
ᆕᅸᆕᆤᆤᆤᆤᆊᅖᅖᅖᇆᅸᆕᆕᅖᇽᄚᅘᆣᅏᇑᄪᇤᄪᇳᄹᆤᆤᅋᆊᆤᆤᇉᆙᅸᆤᅸᄪᄪᄪᄪ
·····································
xx = ㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋ
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
这些事件事件,我们是是这些我们有问题。"我们们也是这些是要是?"我们们的中国是是在一些。 你们们们的,我们就是是这些我们的问题。"我们们们也是这些是是我们的是是你们的,我们们们不是不是这
그는 동물 문화 (1888년) 김 동물 전 동물 방법 전 문문 문제 가격은 동물 문문 문문 문제 전 전 전 문문
공장은 도착에 대해 문화가 관려 가 있는 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같이
생물로 도망 : (이 문 이 생님 그는 도망) : 이 문 당신 사람은 문 방 가 있는 문 문 문 문 문 문 문 한 () : 이 문 문 한 () : 이 문 문 한 () : 이 문 문 문 문 문 문 문 문 문 문 문 문 문 문 문 문 문 문
그는 모르 1월 모님의 방상 모르 1 같은 바람을 위해 모르는 1월 8월
型性型量量和 1.3 CB (1.5) 对 CG (1.1) CB (1.5) (
역는 이 이 위에 가장을 통해 다 가장을 하는 것을 해야 하는 것을 가 있다. 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이
사건물 병원의 정도록 유산수 다 관등 병원 ( 1 부분병 후 바닐 개별 목부) ( 가운동 부분은 문문 문원 것 2 명 문문 것 2 문문 유산 것 2 문문 원 ( 1 부분명 후 바닐 개별 문문 문문 문원 용)
김 승규는 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이 이
3일문문법성유용문법성정권은백력상 2월 문어권전북북동동4 (7월 문북북북동동국 고도문문문(고양북북동동국권) 2월 문어권 전북북동동국 (7월 문북북북동동국
h 문 가 바 한 국 모두 성상 및 위에 타 문 도 관 관 관 관 관 관 관 관 관 관 관 관 관 관 관 관 관 관
·····································
·····································
사업은 비행이 가지 않는 것이 같이 아이들 것이 아이들 것이 아이들 것이 아이들 것이 아이들 것이 같이 가지?
구는 모든 김 교육은 해외에서 있는 것은 것은 것은 것은 것은 모두 두 두 두 가장은 모르고 다음을 받았는 것은 모두 두 두 가 있었다. 이 것은 모두 두 두 두 두 두 두 두 두 두 두 두 두 두 두 두 두 두 두
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
같은 모든 것 같은 모님 요금을 마려하는 '김 모프 모음을 해야 한다. [김 모르 유민 모르
생활은 특별한 100 분위한 명이 있는 것은 특별한 것이 있는 것은 가지 않는 것은 가지 않는 것이다. 고등 문화문화 100 분위한 연습이었는 것은 특별한 것이 있는 것은 것은 분위한 분위한 것이다.
이 같은 것 같은
금근 문문을 위해 해당된 문제로 문란이는 '면 분분은 감정 문문을 위해 가운 분분을 받았다. 사실은 분홍은 이번 분위는 전체 문문을 위해 관계하는 것이 문문을 위해 있다.



THE



7



ì

FIGURE 4.28 HSS BRICK MODEL 2;  $\sigma_{\,\rm yy}$  stress (VIEW from the bottom)







FIGURE 4.29 HSS BRICK MODEL 2;  $\tau_{\mathrm{YZ}}$  STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)







FIGURE 4.30 HSS BRICK MODEL 2;  $\tau_{\rm XZ}$  STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)

psi N/mm<sup>2</sup>





1

X 7

FIGURE 4.31 OSS BRICK MODEL 3; VON-MISES STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)

2





FIGURE 4.32 OSS BRICK MODEL 3;  $\sigma_{\,\rm YY}$  STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)

10 -15 -10  $N/mm^2$ <u>þ</u>si 



FIGURE 4.33 OSS BRICK MODEL 3;  $\tau_{\rm YZ}$  STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)

N

 $psi N/mm^2$ 1 10 10 10 10

. ---



FIGURE 4.34 OSS BRICK MODEL 3;  $\tau_{\rm XZ}$  STRESS (VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM)

N







FIGURE 4.36 HSS BRICK MODEL 3;  $\sigma_{yy}$  stress (View from the bottom)











N

(VIEW FROM THE BOTTOM) STRESS  $\tau_{\rm XZ}$ ω. HSS BRICK MODEL





ì

COMPARISION OF STRESSES IN HSS BRICK MODEL WITH HSS PLATE MODEL

virtual aspect ratio defined in section 2.0. For comparison, the values of these stresses obtained using plate elements have also been plotted. For each value of the virtual aspect ratio, the percentage differences in the stresses of the stiffenedplate structures using brick elements and plate elements are shown.

4.3 Comparison of Stresses with Initial Deflection in the Plating

Results of the finite element analyses of the third model, 15.24m x 2.74m (50'x9'), with initial deflection, are presented in Table 4.5. The same six stress components,  $\sigma_{xx}$ ,  $\sigma_{yy}$ ,  $\sigma_{zz}$ ,  $\tau_{xy}$ ,  $\tau_{xz}$ ,  $\tau_{yz}$  and von-mises have been considered. For comparison, another model without any initial deflection and having the same mesh size was also analysed for both the OSS and HSS materials. Results of which are also presented in the Table 4.5. In the table, the location of these maximum stress values are presented in parenthesis.

4.4 Discussion of Results

The results of the FEM analyses of the cross-stiffened plate panels, using plate elements, are shown in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 for OSS and HSS material respectively. It can be observed from Figures 4.13 and 4.14, that the plate bending, shear stresses and deflections are much higher in a grillage panel than in a single plate panel. The bending stresses, which are usually used to select plate thicknesses, can be as much as 50% higher. However, the difference decreases as the virtual aspect ratio,

TABLE 4.5. MAXIMUM STRESSES IN MODEL 3 WITH INITIAL DEFORMATION (OSS AND HSS)

STRESS	OSS	OSS	HSS	HSS	
	(UNDEFORMED)	(DEFORMED)	(UNDEFORMED)	(DEFORMED)	
$\sigma_{xx} (N/mm^2)$	148.04	155.83	181.89	191.75	
(cm, cm, cm)	(0,91,0.000)	(0,91,0.000)	(0,91,0.000)	(0,91,0.000)	
$\sigma_{yy} (N/mm^2)$	185.75	160.86	229,40	196.65	
(cm, cm, cm)	(457,0,0.000)	(610,0,0.000)	(457,0,0.000)	(610,0,0.000)	
$\sigma_{zz}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	45.22	46.86	54.08	56.15	
(cm, cm, cm)	(610,0,0.000)	(610,0,0.000)	(610,0,0.000)	(610,0,0.000)	
$\tau_{xy}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	37.40	33.74	45.98	41.34	
(cm, cm, cm)	(587,103,1.588)	(591,95,1.628)	(587,103,1.430)	(591,95,1.466)	
$\tau_{yz}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	39.44	39.41	47.23	47.20	
(cm, cm, cm)	(610,0,0.000)	(610,0,0.000)	(610,0,0.000)	(610,0,0.000)	
$\tau_{xz}$ (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	34.41	34.08	39.58	39.16	
(cm, cm, cm)	(0,91,0.000)	(0,91,0.000)	(0,91,0.000)	(0,91,0.000)	
$vm (N/mm^2)$	173.13	176.31	213.88	216.09	
(cm, cm, cm)	(457,0,1.588)	(610,91,0.0)	(457,0,1.430)	(610,91,0.0)	

( 15.24 m.X 2.24 m)

(A/B)  $(i_T/i_L)^{1/4}$ , decreases. Even at the higher virtual aspect ratios the significant bending stress is 17% and 19% higher than the single plate panel for the OSS and HSS gillages respectively. It can also be observed that the plate bending stress is greater than the yield stress for the OSS system and is approaching the yield stress for the HSS system as the virtual aspect ratio is approximately equal to 3. Hence, it is possible that ship structures will experience higher stresses than calculated using a first principals approach, resulting in failure and/or fractures. Therefore the stiffness of grillage supporting structure should be accounted for in the plate selection process. The results of the FEM analyses using brick elements are shown in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 for the OSS and HSS system respectively. Comparison of stress distributions ( $\sigma_{yy}$  and Von-Mises) produced by the plate element models and the brick element models reveal similarity in the location of the high stress regions although comparisons of the maximum values of the stresses in Figures 4.39 and Figure 4.40 show that the bending stresses from the brick models are lower than those of the plate by about 16% and the shear stresses are about 2%. This discrepancy can be attributed to the mesh size chosen for brick Table 4.6 presents results of two additional finite models. element analysis done on the smallest OSS model 15.24m x 2.74m (50'x9'), designed in section 2.0 with brick elements. These two models had mesh sizes of 50.8 mm (2") and 38.1 mm (1.5") square. Comparison of the results show that as the mesh size is made smaller, results of the brick model approaches those of the plate model.

A comparison of the through the thickness shear stresses shows that the critical locations are at the intersection of the

Model	1	2	3	PLATE MODEL
Element Size (mm x mm)	76.2 x 76.2	50.8 x 50.8	38.1 x 38.1	76.2 x 76.2
Displ. (mm)	7.06	7.09	7.11	7.30
(% Diff)	-3.24	-2.78	-2.61	
σ <sub>xx</sub> (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	130.15	142.38	148.63	151.94
(% Diff)	-14.34	-6.29	-2.18	
σ <sub>yy</sub> (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	164.11	178.39	185.77	195.92
(% Diff)	-16.24	-8.95	-5.18	
τ <sub>xy</sub> (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	36.70	37.30	37.72	37.54
(% Diff)	-2.24	-0.64	0.46	
vm (N/mm <sup>2</sup> )	153.86	166.55	173.10	184.05
(% Diff)	-16.40	~9.51	-5.95	
time (min)	0.225	0.422	. 1.51	
memory (Mb)	0.024	0.095	1.001	

## TABLE 4.6. EFFECT OF VARYING ELEMENT SIZE ON THE RESULTS OF BRICK MODEL 3 (OSS MATERIAL)

-

.

.

$\sigma_{xx}$		Ξ	Normal Stress in	'x'	direction				
σγγ		=	Normal Stress in	'y'	direction				
$\tau_{xy}$	•	=	In-plane Shear S	tres	5				
v.mises		=	von mises Stres	S					
Note	:	ક	Differences	are	e with	respect	to	plate	model.

76

longitudinal and transverse stiffeners. However, these shear stresses are only 10% of the plate bending stresses. The use of sophisticated FEM analyses, using multi-noded elements, is not warranted because they will not significantly change the results for selecting the required plating thicknesses for ship structure subjected to normal loads.

The results of FEM analyses with initial deflection in the plating, using brick elements, are shown in Table 4.5 for both the OSS and HSS material systems. It is observed that the plate bending stresses in the x-x direction are only 5% higher than comparable stresses of the FEM analysis with no initial deflection in the plating, and that the plate bending stresses in the y-y direction are 13% less. Hence, the use of initial deflections, of the order of one plate thickness, in the analysis of plate bending stresses will not change the requirements for selecting plate thicknesses needed to resist normal loads.

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORKS

The primary objective of this task was to evaluate the effect of overall grillage behavior on the total stress of a stiffenedplate panel. Overall grillage behavior is defined as the deflection of the supporting structure (transverses and longitudinals) due to an applied loading. This deflection induces additional stresses on the plate panel which are not accounted for in the selection of the plating thickness. In order to quantify the impact of these additional stresses in a stiffened plate structure, finite element models were developed representing typical grillage structures designed to current industry recognized practice. The results of these finite element analyses are presented in section 4.0 and the following conclusions are based on those results.

1. As evident from Figure 4.13 and Figure 4.14, stresses induced in the plating of a stiffened panel due to the deflection of the stiffeners are significantly higher than those where the stiffeners are assumed to be fairly rigid and hence unyielding. The differences are as high as 50%. The differences in stresses depend on the virtual aspect ratio of the panel. The differences seem to attain a maximum at virtual aspect ratio of three. They then tend to decrease and become constant at higher values of virtual aspect ratio.

2. From Table 4.3 and 4.4, a comparison of the maximum values of the normal stresses  $\sigma_{xx}$  and  $\sigma_{yy}$  with the vertical shear stresses,  $\tau_{xz}$  and  $\tau_{yz}$  show that the vertical shear stresses are about 10% of the normal stresses and hence would not play a

significant part in selection of plating thicknesses based on static stress design.

3. Figures 5.1 and 5.2 show the vertical shear stress distributions,  $\tau_{xz}$  and  $\tau_{yz}$  of a rectangular panel 3.05m x 0.91m (10'x3') fully fixed on all sides and under normal pressure load of 0.107 N/mm<sup>2</sup> (15.56 psi). While these figures indicate that the maximum tends to occur at the middle of the boundaries of the panel, Tables 4.3 and 4.4 indicates that for a stiffened-plate structure, the location of maximum vertical shear stresses are at the intersection of the transverses and longitudinals. Therefore these regions in a stiffened-plate structure may be more prone to cracking.

4. From the limited data produced in this study, it appears that initial plate deflection does not significantly affect the behavior of stiffened plate structures. This could be due to the flexibility of the stiffening members (longitudinals and transverses) since they do not restrain the edges of the unsupported panel.

Based on the above conclusions, the following recommendations are being provided for future work:

1. Figures 4.13 and 4.14 indicate that for virtual aspect ratio greater than 6.5, the maximum values of the normal and Von-Mises stresses seem to become constant. But, for virtual aspect ratios less than 3.5, these values seem to increase. Therefore it is suggested that further finite element analysis be performed on models of aspect ratios less than 3.5 to ascertain the trend.

- 2. The design of a stiffened-plate panel is influenced by a number of factors including the loading, the overall dimensions of the panel, the scantlings of the plating and the stiffeners and the spacing of the stiffeners. Interaction of all these factors result in complex stress patterns for which there are no closed-form solutions. Hence, parametric studies should be performed taking into account these variables to develop methods to calculate stresses in terms of these variables.
- 3. Methods for selection of plate thickness subject to normal loads should be modified to take into account the deflection of the stiffeners and the orthotropic stiffeness of the grillage, i.e. (A/B) (iT/iL)<sup>1/4</sup>. ABS rules in "Safe Hull" are currently doing this for in-plane loads.
- 4. The use of non-linear finite element methods should be persued as well as large scale testing of grillage structure to aid in verification of panel stress calculation methods described above. The analysis should account for geometrical and material non-linearity. Existing test data of structural grillages should be gathered and re-evaluated.





BRICK MODEL OF SINGLE PANEL; VERTICAL SHEAR STRESS,  $\tau_{_{Yz}}$ FIGURE 5.1

N







N

## 6.0 REFERENCES

1. Navy Sea Systems Command, "General Specifications for Ships of the United States Navy," Department of the Navy, NAVSEA S9AA0-AA-SPN-010/Gen. Spec. (1992 Edition).

2. Naval Ship Engineering Center, "Structural Design Manual foar Naval Surface Ships," NAVSEA 0900-LP-097-4010 (Dec. 1976).

3. Naval Ship Systems Command, "Design Data Book - Design Data Sheet, DDS100-4, 'Strength of Structural Members'," NAVSEA 09020LP-006-000 (Feb. 1983).

4. Hughes, O.F., "Ship Structural Design", SNAME, 1988.

## APPENDIX 1

Following calculations illustrate the procedure used to design the OSS grillage having an overall dimension of 15.24m X 2.74m. The formulae and criterion used are those available in Structural Design Manual [2] and DDS-100-4 [3]. The same procedure is followed for the remaining five grillage structures designed in section 2.0.

(a) Determination of Plate thickness:

The minimum plate thickness required is determined using the following equation :

$$\frac{b}{t} \leq \frac{C}{K \cdot \sqrt{H}}$$

where for this study, C = 350 and the head of water, H = 35 ft. The panel dimensions are, a = 10' and b = 3'. Therefore K = 1. Substituting these values of C, H and K in the above equation, we get,

$$\frac{b}{t} \leq 59.16$$

or  $t \ge 0.608$ 

The nearest available plate size is 0.625". Since the constants C and K and the variables b, t and H are in english units, therefore the thickness is derived in english units and converted to metric units to yield a thickness of 15.88mm.

(b) Determination of Transverse Girder:

The procedure mentioned in section 2.0 has been followed to determine the scantlings required for the transverse girder.

<u>Given:</u> Length of beam, L = 2.74 m (9.0') Spacing of beam, s = 3050.0 mm (10.0') Uniform Pressure, p = 0.107 N/mm<sup>2</sup> (15.56 psi) Thickness of Plate, t = 15.88 mm (0.625")

> Beam Size: W-T 410 x 53.0 (16 x 7 1/8 x 50# I-T) Web depth,  $d_w = 397 \text{ mm} (15.63'')$ Web thickness,  $t_w = 9.65 \text{ mm} (0.38'')$ Flange width,  $b_f = 180.0 \text{ mm} (7.07'')$ Flange thickness  $t_f = 16.0 \text{ mm} (0.63'')$

Yield stress,  $\sigma_y = 235 \text{ N/mm}^2$  (34,000 psi) Allowable stress,  $\sigma_b = 195 \text{ N/mm}^2$  (28,000 psi) Proportional Limit,  $\sigma_{p1} = 176 \text{ N/mm}^2$  (25,000 psi) Young's Modulus,  $E = 206,850 \text{ N/mm}^2$  (30 x 10<sup>6</sup> psi) Poissons' ratio, v = 0.3

Section Properties of Combined Plate-Beam Section:



Effective Width of Plating, be:

Shear lag approach:  $b_e = L/4 = 2740/4 = 685 \text{ mm} (27'')$ 

Post-buckling approach:  $b_e = 60t = 60x15.88 = 953 \text{ mm}$  (37.5")

Spacing of beam, s = 3050 mm (120'')

The effective width of plating is the lesser of the above 3 values. Therefore,

 $b_e = 685 \text{ mm} (27'')$ 

٩.

Computation of section properties:

Flowert	7		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		·
Frement	Area	IУ	A.V	A.v.	To~o
Plate	10,878	7.94	86,371	685,788	228,596
Web	3,831	214.38	842727	180,663,982	50.316.673
Flange	2,880	420.88	1,212,134	510,163,126	61,440
Σ	17,589	•	2,141,232	691,512,896	50,606,709

 $\Sigma A = 17,589 \text{ mm}^2$ 

 $\Sigma A.y = 2,141,232 \text{ mm}^3$  $y_{P} = \Sigma A.Y/\Sigma A = 2,141,232/17,589 = 121.74 \text{ mm}$  $y_f = t_p + d_w + t_f - y_p = 15.88 + 397 + 16 - 121.74 = 307.14 \text{ mm}$  $Ix-x = \Sigma A.y2 + \Sigma Io-o = 691,512,896 + 50,606,709$  $= 742, 119, 605 \text{ mm}^4$  $CORR = y_p \cdot \Sigma A \cdot y = 121.74 \times 2,141,232=260,673,584 mm^4$ Moment of Inertia,  $I_{NA} = Ix-x - CORR$ = 742,119,605 - 260,673,584 = 481,446,021 mm<sup>4</sup> Section Modulus, Plate,  $SM_p = I_{NA}/\gamma_p$ = 481,446,021/121.74 = 3,954,707 mm<sup>3</sup> Section Modulus, Flange,  $SM_f = I_{NA}/Y_f$ = 481,446,021/307.14  $= 1,567,513 \text{ mmm}^3$ Shear Area,  $A_{SH} = (t_p + d_w + t_f) t_w$ = (15.88+397+16)9.65 = 4,139 mm<sup>2</sup> Radius of Gyration,  $r = \sqrt{(I_{NA}/A)}$ =√481,446,021/17,589=165.4 mm Secondary Bending Moments and Shear (Assuming Fixed Supports) Bending Moment at middle span,  $BM_m = wL^2/24$ Bending Moment at Support,  $BM_s = wL^2/12$ where w = b.p = (3050)(0.107) = 326.25 N-mm Therefore,  $BM_m = (326.25)(2740)^{-}/24 = 102,087,719$  N-mm  $BM_s = (326.25)(2740)^2/12 = 204,175,438$  N-mm

Shear Force, V = wL/2 = (326.25)(2740)/2 = 447,099 NSecondary Bending and Shear Stresses Bending Stresses; Middle: Flange of Stiffener,  $f_{BMS} = BM_m/SM_f$ = 102,087,719/1,567,513  $= 65.1 \text{ N/mm}^2$ At the Plating,  $f_{BMP} = BM_m / SM_p$ = 102,087,719/3,954,707  $= 25.8 \text{ N/mm}^2$ Support: Flange of Stiffener,  $f_{BES} = BM_s/SM_f$ = 204,175,438/1,567,513  $= 130.3 \text{ N/mm}^2$ At the Plating,  $f_{BEP} = BM_s/SM_p$ = 204,175,438/3,954,707  $= 51.6 \text{ N/mm}^2$ Shear Stresses;  $f_s = V/A_{SH} = 447,099/4,139$  $= 108.0 \text{ N/mm}^2$ Column Buckling Strength; F.  $F_c = \sigma_v;$  $C \leq 1.4$  $F_c = \sigma_y (1.235 - 0.168C); 1.4 < C \le 4.8$  $F_c = \sigma_y (9.87/C^2);$  C > 4.8 where C =L/r $\sqrt{(\sigma_y / E)}$  = 2740/162.5 $\sqrt{(235/206850)}$ = 0.57Since C is less than 1.4, Therefore,  $F_c = \sigma_y = 235 \text{ N/mm}^2$ 88

Ultimate Strength of Plating; Fu

$$\begin{split} F_u &= \sigma_y & \beta \le 1.25 \\ F_u &= \sigma_y [ 2.25/\beta - 1.25/\beta^2 ] & \beta > 1.25 \\ \text{where, } \beta &= b/t \sqrt{(\sigma_y/E)} . \\ \text{Since } b &= s = 3050 \text{ mm, } t = 15.88 \text{ mm, therefore} \\ \beta &= b/t \sqrt{(\sigma_y/E)} = (3050/15.88) \sqrt{(235/206850)} = 6.47 \\ \text{Since } \beta > 1.25, F_u &= 235[ 2.25/6.47 - 1.25/6.47^2 ] \\ &= 74.71 \text{ N/mm}^2 \end{split}$$

Critrical Buckling Strength; Fp

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}_{cr} &= K \frac{\pi^{2} E}{12 (1 - \mu^{2})} \frac{1}{(a/t)^{2}} \\ \text{where, } K &= [1 + (a/b)^{2}]^{2} . \\ \text{Since } a &= L/3 = 913.33 \text{ mm and } b = s = 3050 \text{ mm, therefore} \\ \text{K} &= [1 + (913/3050)^{2}]^{2} = 1.2. \\ \text{F}_{p} &= F_{cr} \qquad F_{cr} \leq \sigma_{PL} \\ \\ \mathbf{F}_{p} &= \frac{\sigma_{Y}}{1 + 0.1824 \left(\frac{\sigma_{Y}}{F_{cR}}\right)^{2}} \qquad F_{CR} > \sigma_{PL} \end{aligned}$$

Now a/t = 913/15.88 = 57.49. Therefore,

$$F_{CR} = 1.090 \frac{\pi^2 (206850)}{12 (1 - 0.3^2)} \frac{1}{(57.49)^2} = 61.6 \text{N/mm}^2$$

Maximum Tripping Length, L<sub>T</sub>

$$L_{T} = \frac{1.283b_{f}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{V}}{E}} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{d}{b_{f}} \right)^{\frac{1}{t_{f}}} - 0.128 \left( \frac{t_{f}}{d} \right)^{2} \frac{E}{\sigma_{v}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ d = d_{w} + t_{f} = 397 + 16 = 413 \text{ mm}} \\ d/b_{f} = 413/180 = 2.2944 \\ t_{w}/t_{f} = 9.65/16 = 0.6031 \\ t_{f}/d = 16/413 = 0.0387 \\ E/\sigma_{Y} = 206850/235 = 880.21 \\ L_{T} = \frac{(1.283)(180)}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{880.21}} \left[ 1 + .333(2.2944)(0.6031) - (0.128)(0.0387)^{2}(880.21) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ = 6027.42 \text{ mm} ; L_{T} \ge L ; 6027.4 > 3050 \text{ O.K.} \\ \frac{Local Buckling of Flange and Web}{b_{f}/t_{f}} = 180/16 = 11.25 \le 29.0 \qquad \text{O.K.} \\ d_{w}/t_{w} = 397/9.65 = 41.14 \le 64.0 \qquad \text{O.K.} \\ \frac{Strength Assessment}{s} = \frac{1.283b_{f}}{1.283} + \frac{1.283b_{f}}{1.283} + \frac{1.28b_{f}}{1.283} + \frac{1.28b_{f}}{1.28} + \frac{1.28b_{f}$$

Tension:

Stiffener Flange;  $f_{\text{BMS}}/\sigma_{\text{b}}$  = 65.1/195 = 0.33  $\leq$  1.0 O.K.

Plate ;  $f_{\text{BEP}}/_{\sigma_b} = 51.6/195 = 0.26 \le 1.0$  O.K.

Compression:

٠.

Ultimate Strength of Panel;  $f_{BMP} \leq (0.8)(F_U) \frac{F_C}{F_Y}$ 

 $25.8 \le 0.8(74.7)(235)/(235)$ 

90

S 6.

or  $25.8 \le 59.76$  O.K.

Buckling Strength of Panel;  $f_{BMP} \leq F_{cr}$ 

25.8≤ 67.9 O.K.

Stiffener;  $f_{BES} \leq \sigma_b$ 

130.3≤ 195 O.K.

(c) Determination of Longitudinal Stiffeners:

The procedure mentioned in section 2.0 has been followed to determine the scantlings required for the longitudinal stiffeners.

<u>Given:</u> Length of beam, L = 3.05 m (10.0') Spacing of beam, s = 914.4 mm (3.0') Uniform Pressure,p = 0.107 N/mm<sup>2</sup> (15.56 psi) Thickness of Plate, t = 15.88 mm (0.625")

> Beam Size: WT 205 x 23.0 (8 x 5 1/2 x 15.5# I-T) Web depth,  $d_w = 190.5 \text{ mm} (7.5'')$ Web thickness,  $t_w = 7.0 \text{ mm} (0.275'')$ Flange width,  $b_f = 140.5 \text{ mm} (5.53'')$ Flange thickness  $t_f = 11.2 \text{ mm} (0.44'')$

Yield stress,  $\sigma_y = 235 \text{ N/mm}^2$  (34,000 psi) Allowable stress,  $\sigma_b = 195 \text{ N/mm}^2$  (28,000 psi) Proportional Limit,  $\sigma_{p1} = 176 \text{ N/mm}^2$  (25,000 psi) Young's Modulus,  $E = 206,850 \text{ N/mm}^2$  (30 x 10<sup>6</sup> psi) Poissons' ratio, v = 0.3 Section Properties of Combined Plate-Beam Section:



Effective Width of Plating, be:

Shear lag approach:  $b_e = L/4 = 3050/4 = 762.5 \text{ mm}$ (30")

Post-buckling approach:  $b_e = 60t = 60x15.88 = 953$  mm (37.5")

Spacing of beam, s = 914 mm (36'')

The effective width of plating is the lesser of the above 3 values. Therefore,

 $b_e = 762.5 \text{ mm} (30'')$ 

Computation of section properties:

Element	Area		7		······································
<u>H</u> = Childric	<u></u>	<u> </u>	A.y	A.y <sup>2</sup>	Io-o
Plate	12,109	7.94	96,146	763,399	254,454
Web	1,334	111.13	148,247	16,474,689	4,032,754
Flange	1,574	211.98	333,657	70,728,611	16,449
Σ	15,017		578,050	87,966,700	4,303,657

 $\Sigma A = 15,017 \text{ mm}^2$ 

 $\Sigma A.y = 578,050 \text{ mm}^3$ 

 $y_{p} = \Sigma A.Y/\Sigma A = 578,050/15,017 = 38.49 \text{ mm}$  $y_f = t_p + d_w + t_f - y_p = 15.88 + 190.5 + 11.2 - 38.49 = 179.09 \text{ mm}$  $Ix-x = \Sigma A.y2 + \Sigma Io-o = 87,966,700 + 4,303,657$ = 92,270,357 mm<sup>4</sup>  $CORR = y_p \cdot \Sigma A \cdot y = 38.49 \times 578,050 = 22,249,145 \text{ mm}^4$ Moment of Inertia,  $I_{NA} = Ix-x - CORR$ = 92,270,357 - 22,249,145 = 70,021,212 mm<sup>4</sup> Section Modulus, Plate,  $SM_p = I_{NA}/y_p$ = 70,021,212/38.49  $= 1,819,205 \text{ mm}^3$ Section Modulus, Flange,  $SM_f = I_{NA}/y_f$ = 70,021,212/179.09 $= 390,983 \text{ mm}^3$ Shear Area,  $A_{SH} = (t_p+d_w+t_f)t_w$ =  $(15.88+190.5+11.2)7.0 = 1,523 \text{ mm}^2$ Radius of Gyration,  $r = \sqrt{(I_{NA}/A)}$  $=\sqrt{70,021,212/15,017}$ = 68.3 mmSecondary Bending Moments and Shear (Assuming Fixed Supports) Bending Moment at middle span,  $BM_m = wL^2/24$ . Bending Moment at Support,  $BM_s = wL^-/12$ where w = s.p = (914)(0.107) = 97.8 N-mm Therefore,  $BM_m = (97.8)(3050)^2/24 = 37,906,912$  N-mm  $BM_s = (97.8)(3050)^2/12 = 75,813,824$  N-mm 93

Shear Force, V = wL/2 = (97.8)(3050)/2 = 149,145 NSecondary Bending and Shear Stresses Bending Stresses; Middle: Flange of Stiffener,  $f_{BMS} = BM_m/SM_f$ = 37,906,912/390,983  $= 96.95 \text{ N/mm}^2$ ·At the Plating,  $f_{BMP} = BM_m / SM_p$ = 37,906,912/1,819,205  $= 20.84 \text{ N/mm}^2$ Support: Flange of Stiffener,  $f_{BES} = BM_s/SM_f$ = 75,813,824/390,983  $= 193.91 \text{ N/mm}^2$ At the Plating,  $f_{BEP} = BM_s/SM_p$ . = 75,813.824/1,819,205  $= 41.67 \text{ N/mm}^2$ Shear Stresses;  $f_s = V/A_{SH} = 149,145/1,523$ = 97.93 N/mm

Column Buckling Strength; F.

 $\begin{aligned} F_c &= \sigma_Y; & C \leq 1.4 \\ F_c &= \sigma_Y (1.235 - 0.168C); & 1.4 < C \leq 4.8 \\ F_c &= \sigma_Y (9.87/C^2); & C > 4.8 \\ \end{aligned}$ where  $C &= L/r \sqrt{(\sigma_Y/E)} = 3050/68.3 \sqrt{(235/206850)} \\ &= 1.51 \end{aligned}$ 

Since C is greater than 1.4 but less than 4.8,
Therefore, 
$$F_c = (1.235-0.168 \times 1.51)235$$
  
= 230.6 N/mm<sup>2</sup>

Ultimate Strength of Plating; Fu

$$\begin{split} F_u &= \sigma_y & \beta \leq 1.25 \\ F_u &= \sigma_y [ 2.25/\beta - 1.25/\beta^2 ] & \beta > 1.25 \\ \text{where, } \beta &= b/t \sqrt{(\sigma_y/E)} . \\ \text{Since b} &= s = 914 \text{ mm, } t = 15.88 \text{ mm, therefore} \\ \beta &= b/t \sqrt{(\sigma_y/E)} = (914/15.88) \sqrt{(235/206850)} = 1.94 \\ \text{Since } \beta > 1.25, F_u &= 235[ 2.25/1.94 - 1.25/1.96^2] \\ &= 194.5 \text{ N/mm}^2 \end{split}$$

Critical Buckling Strength; Fp

 $\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}_{cr} &= K \frac{\pi^{2}E}{12(1-\mu^{2})(a/t)^{2}} \\ \text{where, } K &= [1 + (a/b)^{2}]^{2} \\ \text{Since } a &= 3050 \text{ mm and } b = s = 914 \text{ mm, therefore} \\ a/b &= 3050/914 = 3.34, \text{ then} \\ K &= 4.0. \\ F_{p} &= F_{cr} \\ F_{p} &= \frac{\sigma_{r}}{1+0.1824 \left(\frac{\sigma_{r}}{F_{cR}}\right)^{2}} \\ F_{cR} &> \sigma_{PL} \end{aligned}$ 

Now a/t = 914/15.88 = 57.56. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{F}_{CR} = 4 \frac{\pi^2 (206850)}{12 (1 - 0.3^2)} \frac{1}{(57.56)^2} = 225.7 \text{ N/mm}^2$$

Since 225.7 > 176, therefore 95

$$\mathbf{F}_{CR1} = \frac{235}{1+0.1824 \left(\frac{235}{225.7}\right)^2} = 196.2 \,\mathrm{N/mm^2}$$

Maximum Tripping Length,  $L_T$ 

$$L_{T} = \frac{1.283b_{f}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{Y}}{E}} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{d}{b_{f}} \right) \left( \frac{t_{w}}{t_{f}} \right) - 0.128 \left( \frac{t_{f}}{d} \right)^{2} \frac{E}{\sigma_{y}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

$$d = d_{w} + t_{f} = 190.5 + 11.2 = 201.7 \text{ mm}$$

$$d/b_{f} = 201.7/140.5 = 1.44$$

$$t_{w}/t_{f} = 7.0/11.2 = 0.625$$

$$t_{f}/d = 11.2/201.7 = 0.0555$$

$$E/\sigma_{Y} = 206850/235 = 880.21$$

$$L_{T} = \frac{(1.283)(140.5)}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{880.21}} \left[ 1 + .333(1.44)(0.625) - (0.128)(0.0555)^{2}(880.21) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

$$= 5479.33 \text{ mm}; L_T \ge L; 5479.3 > 3050 \text{ O.K}.$$

Local Buckling of Flange and Web

$$b_f/t_f = 140.5/11.2 = 12.55 \le 29.0$$
 O.K.

$$d_w/t_w = 190.5/7.0 = 27.21 \le 64.0$$
 O.K.

## Srength Assessment

Tension:

Stiffener Flange;  $f_{\text{BMS}}/\sigma_{\text{b}}$  = 96.95/195 = 0.50  $\leq$  1.0 O.K.

÷ .

.

Plate ;  $f_{\text{BEP}}/_{\sigma_b} = 41.67/195 = 0.21 \le 1.0$  O.K.

Compression:

Ultimate Strength of Panel;  $f_{BMP} \leq (0.8)(\sigma_U) \frac{F_c}{\sigma_V}$ 

 $20.84 \le 0.8(194.5)(235)/(235)$ 

or 20.84 ≤ 147.6 O.K.

Buckling Strength of Panel;  $f_{BMP} \leq F_{cr}$ 

20.84 ≤ 196.2 O.K.

Stiffener;  $f_{\text{BES}} \leq \sigma_{b}$ 

193.91≤ 195 O.K.

## **Project Technical Committee Members**

The following persons were members of the committee that represented the Ship Structure Committee to the Contractor as resident subject matter experts. As such they performed technical review of the initial proposals to select the contractor, advised the contractor in cognizant matters pertaining to the contract of which the agencies were aware, and performed technical review of the work in progress and edited the final report.

Chairmen	
Todd Ripley/Gary North	Maritime Administtio
Tom Ingram	American Bureau of Shipping
Stephen Yang	Director Ship Engineering, Canada
Alasdair Stirling	Director Ship Engineering, Canada
Thomas Hu	Defence Research Establishment Atlantic, Canada
Key Chang	U.S. Coast Guard
Hsien Y. Jan	MARTECH Inc.
William Siekierka	Naval Sea Systems Command, Contracting Officer's Technical Representative
Robert Sielski Alexander Stavovy	National Academy of Science, Marine Board Liaison
Steve Sharpe	U.S. Coast Guard, Executive Director Ship Structure Committee

acc