

7. Design for Fatigue Resistance

7.1. General

Designing for adequate resistance to fatigue is the most important consideration in design of crane runways. Fatigue driven cracks in or around welded joints are known to occur in many Class S4 to S9 crane runway girders, at some time in service and before reaching their design life. Below Class S4 the number of load oscillations is too low for fatigue damage to start. Fatigue cracking has been widely reported (references 31, 40, 42, 50, 57, 59, 66, 74, 78). However not all problems are reported in the literature because the owners carry out repairs at shutdown times and make no reports.

Invariably, the causes of fatigue damage include the following:

- excessive stress range between the maximum and minimum stress
- underestimated number of load applications
- poor workmanship in carrying out the welding
- biaxial stresses (detail design)

Unlike in the design for strength, it is not possible to improve fatigue life by choosing a higher grade steel. The stress range concept is only concerned with stress concentrations and discontinuities associated with welding and notches. Because welding is used in the girder construction there is no point in using higher strength steel.

7.2. Stress analysis

The usual design practice is to first attend to the strength design and then check the design for fatigue. This is not the best order of events for more fatigue-prone structural Classes, S5 to S8 where it is best to start with fatigue assessment then choose the appropriate girder section and recheck fatigue. The strength verification of overload condition can then follow.

A separate elastic stress analysis must be carried out for fatigue verification. Plastic analysis is inappropriate for this purpose.

The possibility of fatigue damage occurring before the design life of the runway has been reached should be reduced to a minimum by carrying out a fatigue cognisant welded detail design and by carrying out welding inspections for Detail Class SP. to ascertain that the girders are initially free of cracks. This should be followed up with periodical welding inspections.

The main attention should be given to structural and non-structural details and in particular to welded joints involved. The highest fatigue resistance is obtained where no welding and notches are present. Welded joints in general contain numerous imperfections that originate

from stress concentrations such as undercut, over reinforcement, porosity, slag inclusions, lack of fusion, to mention just the more common ones. These imperfections may not be large enough to result in fracture under predominantly static loads. Quality assurance must effectively eliminate any imperfections larger than the limit given in the welding code. The designer's task is to avoid as far as possible the welded details that reduce the fatigue resistance such as, for example, welding across tensile flanges.

7.3. Number of stress cycles

The load combinations for which the fatigue resistance must be verified are those involving frequently applied loads, given in AS 4118, Table 5 as load combinations LC1 to LC3. Since the fatigue resistance depends on the stress range and detail category, the upper and the lower limits of cyclic loads should be carefully examined.

Crane runways in steel mills, alumina smelters, warehouses and many other applications are subject to millions of stress fluctuations in their service life while workshop cranes may not reach 100,000. The stress fluctuations vary in intensity and frequency. The purpose of the Structural Classification in AS 1418.1 is to arrive at the number of 'normative' stress cycles of uniform amplitude rather than using variable amplitudes as in real life. Then again local areas may be subject to higher class, as for example, in the top flange region where two or more wheels in the end carriage produce several stress cycles each time the crane passes.

In practice cranes may be subject to a heavier duty than that obtained by application of the code rules, as has been repeatedly found in investigations of fatigue cracking. To ascertain, in more important installations the most reliable estimate of fatigue parameters it is necessary to carry out time-and-motion analysis such that the upper limit of stress cycles can be established.

The number of cycles for fatigue verification of the runway structures depends on the 'structural class' as can be seen from Table 3.

Table 3. Number of normative stress cycles for fatigue design

Crane structure Class	No. of cycles for design
S1 to S3	0
S4 and S5	100 000
S6 and S7	500 000
S8	2 000 000
S9	5 000 000

The number of load cycles relevant for fatigue assessment is given in AS 1418 Part 1 and in Table 2 herein. It should be noted that fatigue assessment is concerned with stress ranges, not maximum stresses. The loads not included in the stress range calculation are the dead loads of the runway, rails, power conductors, the crane itself and all those loads that occur less than 20000 times over the service life. AS 4100 specifies that all loads are to be applied at their serviceability level, that is with load factor $\phi=1.0$ but the dynamic factor has to be included. Only the load combinations 1, 2 and 3 need normally be considered except in high-risk applications (Heavy Duty) where load combinations 1 to 6 may need to be included.



Crane Runway Girders

Limit States Design

Second Edition 2003



AUSTRALIAN STEEL INSTITUTE
(ABN)/ACN (94) 000 973 839

Branko Gorenc

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Runway & Crane System	2
2.1. Crane types	3
2.2. Crane runway girders	5
2.3. Monorail beams	7
2.4. Building columns and frames	8
3. Classification of Cranes and Runways	9
3.1. Reason for crane classification	9
3.2. Utilisation Class – Global design	9
3.3. Local Utilization class	10
3.4. Multiple Cranes	10
3.5. Structural Class v/s Group Class	11
3.6. Duty Classification	11
4. Crane Loads	12
4.1. Load determination	12
4.2. Load combinations	12
4.3. Dynamic factors	14
4.4. Long travel acceleration forces	14
4.5. Wind on crane and hoisted load	15
4.6. Buffer impact	16
4.7. Oblique travelling	16
4.8. Approximate load determination	17
5. Structural Analysis	19
5.1. Global load effects	19
5.2. Analysis for global loads	19
5.3. Curved monorail beams	22
5.4. Girder cross section	22
6. Design Procedure	24
6.1. Design for strength	24
6.2. Torsion	25
6.3. Torsion Capacity by rigorous method	25
6.4. Lateral stability of the runway girder	26
6.5. Box Sections	26
6.6. Design for fatigue resistance	27
6.7. Local load effects in the top flange region	27
6.8. Web stiffeners	33
6.9. Lateral restraints at columns	34
6.10. End stops	35
6.11. Monorail beams	36

7. Design for Fatigue Resistance	40
7.1. General	40
7.2. Stress analysis	40
7.3. Number of stress cycles	41
7.4. Fatigue Verification by AS 4100	42
8. Deflection Limits	43
9. Detail Design	45
9.1. Detailing practices	45
9.2. Bolted connections	45
9.3. Welded joints	45
9.4. Splices in simply supported runways	46
9.5. Avoidance of lamellar tearing	46
9.6. Web stiffeners	47
9.7. End bearing stiffeners and bearing details	48
9.8. Crane columns and corbels	50
9.9. Longitudinal Bracing	51
10. Rails and Accessories	52
10.1. Rail splices and expansion joints	52
10.2. Rail fixings	53
10.3. Resilient bedding strips	54
10.4. Painting	54
11. Materials, Fabrication, Workmanship and Tolerances	55
11.1. Materials	55
11.2. Workmanship	55
11.3. Welding top hat sections	56
11.4. Tolerances	56
12. Inspection and Maintenance	57
13. Numerical Example	58
14. Glossary	67
15. References	69

List of Figures

Fig 1.	Types of overhead running cranes	3
Fig 2.	Types of crane drives	4
Fig 3.	Runway Static System	6
Fig 4.	Monorail beam and cranes	7
Fig 5.	Relation between building frame and the runway	8
Fig 6.	Inertial forces	15
Fig 7.	Buffers and Buffer impact	16
Fig 8.	Oblique travel forces	17
Fig 9.	Crane wheel loads	18
Fig 10.	Frame / runway relation	19
Fig 11.	Bending moment envelope and influence lines	20
Fig 12.	Global analysis for vertical and torsional loads	21
Fig 13.	Curved monorail beam	22
Fig 14.	Types of cross section	23
Fig 15.	'Top Hat' (a) and lipped sections (b)	23
Fig 16.	Localized effects in the top flange area	27
Fig 17.	Web crushing (AS4100 method)	29
Fig 18.	Buckling of the web panel due to patch load acting in the plane of the web (AS 4100 method)	30
Fig 19.	Transverse bending of web due to torque	31
Fig 20.	Transverse bending of top flange	32
Fig 21.	Elastomeric strips reduce transverse bending of flange	33
Fig 22.	Web stiffeners	34
Fig 23.	Lateral movement and rotation at girder bearing	35
Fig 24.	Forces on end stops	36
Fig 25.	Monorail bottom flange stresses	37
Fig 26.	Comparison of Becker(15) vs BHP plots for C_z under the wheel load	38
Fig 27.	Stress range vs number of stress cycles for normal stress and shear stresses (excerpt from AS4100)	42
Fig 28.	Deflection limits	44
Fig 29.	Rail meandering in practice	44
Fig 30.	Bolted intermediate web stiffeners	45
Fig 31.	Welded girder splices	46
Fig 32.	Web stiffener details	47
Fig 33.	End bearing stiffeners	48
Fig 34.	Bearings	49
Fig 35.	Unsatisfactory bearing details	49
Fig 36.	Types of supporting columns	50
Fig 37.	Longitudinal Expansion due to temperature and bracing of crane columns.	51
Fig 38.	More bearings and crane rail splice details	53
Fig 39.	Common rail fixings	54
Fig 40.	Soft bedding of rails	54
Fig 41.	Welding access to 'top hat' welds	56
Fig 42.	Applied Loads	58
Fig 43.	Section and Girder Dimensions	58
Fig 44.	Forces from trolley acceleration	59