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Background

- **Light rail** is a commonly used mode of public transit in North America for in-city transportation.
- **Ballasted track** is the most frequent superstructure system used in railroads worldwide - *simple and efficient*.
- **Concrete** is 2nd most used material for crossties in the US (~5% of total) after timber – provides higher *system resiliency* and longer expected *life cycle*.
- Current design methodologies are based on practical experience.
- **Rail transit load** environment has not been *studied* in depth.
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Problem Statement

- Crossties behave as beams – flexural behavior governs
- **Mechanistic design approach of concrete crossties** is proposed by researchers at the University of Illinois
- Consider in service loads, real **field loading conditions** using field data collection as fundamental tool
- **Flexural performance** of crosstie largely dependent on support conditions (ballast reaction)
- Traditional design approach to limit crack opening in critical cross sections (C- and RS+)

![Diagram of rail seat and center with load application](image)
Objectives and Approach

- **Objectives:**
  - Understand the flexural behavior of crossties under rail transit loading conditions using field data collected under revenue service
  - Study the variability of moments as a function of rolling stock wheel loads
  - Use the bending moment characterization of transit systems for crosstie redesign
Light Rail Tangent Data

Trains in Dataset: 2,245
From 18 March 2016
to 26 April 2016

(Tangent Site)
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Track Geometry
St. Louis MetroLink Tangent Site

• Light rail system
• Tangent site
• Located in East St. Louis, IL
• Automated data collection
  (~154 trains/day (Red & Blue lines))
• Prestressed concrete crosstie: LB Foster CXT 100-06
  – Design capacity: C- 147 kip-in; RS+ 221 kip-in
• Measured speeds range from 26 mph to 52 mph
  (track speed 55 mph)
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• Metrics to quantify:
  – **Crosstie bending strain** (crosstie moment design)
  – Rail displacements (fastening system design)
  – Vertical and lateral input loads (crosstie and fastening system design, and load environment characterization)
  – Crosstie temperature gradient

Typical Field Instrumentation Map

- Crosstie Bending Strain
- Vertical and Lateral Load (Wheel Loads)
- Rail Displacement (Base Vertical, Base Lateral)
- Rail Displacement (Base Vertical)
- Thermocouple
- Laser Trigger

(Ambient Temperature)
Data Processing Overview
Crosstie Bending

- **Desired data:**
  - Crosstie bending strains due to transit loads

- **Data collection and objective of data analysis:**
  - Surface strain gauges mounted along the chamfer of the crosstie
  - Understand revenue service bending moments and determine the support conditions for crossties
  - Assess the capacity and design of the manufacturer and the specifications given by rail transit agencies

Center and intermediate gauges
Rail seat gauge
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Center Negative Bending
St. Louis MetroLink
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Rail Seat Bending
St. Louis MetroLink – Gauge A
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Rail Seat Bending
St. Louis MetroLink – Gauge A
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Rail Seat Bending
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### Crosstie Reserve Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile Bending Moment</th>
<th>Reserve Design Capacity = Design Capacity</th>
<th>Measured Bending Moment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center Negative</td>
<td>Rail Seat Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>82.48</td>
<td>43.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99%</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Max recorded center bending moment (25 kip-inches) could be increased by a factor of **5.6** without reaching the design moment for the crosstie or the agency specifications.
- Max recorded rail seat positive bending moment (62 kip-inches) defines a potential reserve capacity of **2.2**.
Comparison with Design Standards

- Large amount of field data collected
  - 2245 train passes
  - 12 axles per train
  - 5 different ties
  - Dynamic input loads
- Field results compared with capacity required by design standards to understand current design procedures’ accuracy
- Current design standards use different assumptions: support conditions, rail seat load considerations
- Analyzed standards:
  - AREMA
  - Euronorm (EN) / International Union of Railways (UIC)
  - Australian Standard (AS)
## Comparison with Design Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREMA*</th>
<th>Rail Seat Positive (RS+)</th>
<th>Center Negative (C-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **(a)**: w
- **(b)**: w, 0.61w, w
- **(c)**: w
- **(d)**: w
- **(e)**: w
- **(f)**: w

*Methodology used until 2016*
Comparison with Design Standards
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![Graph showing comparison of bending moments with design standards.](image-url)
Comparison with Design Standards

Rail Seat Positive Bending Moment
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Comparison with Design Standards
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![Graph showing comparison between different bending moment standards.]

- **Field Rail Seat A**
- **Field Rail Seat E**
- **AREMA**
- **EN/UIC**
- **AS**
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Bending Moments Conclusions

- Flexural reserve capacity was quantified for a light rail transit system (only revenue service, equipment not accounted)
- For current in-service design, excessive potential reserve capacity is found when compared to design capacity
- Minor variability in support conditions was observed between consecutive crossties
- Potential reserve capacity for center negative bending moment (5.6) is generally higher than for rail seat positive bending moment (2.2)
- Using field measured dynamic loads, analytical design approach used by standards do not match the on-site measured bending moments:
  - Overdesign for C-
  - Lack of capacity for RS+
Future Work

• Observe seasonal and environmental variations in track behavior (automated data collection)
• Bound support condition variability of the system
• Derive new analytical models that match better field results – propose new design assumptions
• Develop track monitoring tools to assess need for maintenance (resurfacing due to deteriorated support)
• Calibrate FE model with real field data
• Use this information to develop prototype
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