

THE UNIVERSITY OF
TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY



Faculty of Engineering

**Experimental and Numerical Investigation into
Impact Bending Collapse of
Rectangular Hollow Sections**

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graham Roy Johnson

February, 2001

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP / ORIGINALITY

I certify that this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Candidate

Production Note:

Signature removed prior to publication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The technical competence of the workshop staff at UTS was outstanding. My thanks go to all of the workshop and technical staff for their help at one stage or another. Their contributions were invaluable and most sincerely appreciated. My specific thanks go to Laurence Stonard, Harold Myers, Bill Firth, Stephen Griffith, Scott Graham, John Grove, Lionel Slade, Charles Evans, Graham Bayley, Stewart Gordan and Ian Gibson.

I would also like to especially thank Chris Chapman for his willing and competent assistance with so many aspects of the laboratory procedures and for the friendship that has developed over the years. The assistance of Dr. Jianchun Li in the operation of the Faculty's shake table facility is also acknowledged.

Special thanks to Bruce Johnson of Electroneering Pty. Ltd. for designing and manufacturing the unique instrumentation used in this thesis. His expert assistance was invaluable. Thanks to Lorenz Eberl for the initial inspiration that sparked this research, for our subsequent discussions and his insightful suggestions.

Funding provided by the school of mechanical engineering for the experimental programme, finite element software licenses and my attendance at the Third International Symposium on Structural Crashworthiness held in England, was much appreciated.

My gratitude also extends to the information technology systems department in the Faculty of Engineering for providing excellent computing facilities and maintaining software licenses. My thanks also go to Compumod Pty. Ltd. for support that extended well beyond the bounds of software maintenance.

My special thanks go to my supervisor Dr. Nong Zhang, for many useful discussions, for guidance, and for his encouragement and comradeship.

I extend my sincere thanks to the many staff within the mechanical engineering school/group who have given me support and encouragement throughout my candidature. In particular I would like to thank Associate Professor Stephen Johnston, Dr. Guang Hong, Dr. Austin Mack, Dr. Fred Sticher, Associate Professor Helen McGregor, Professor John Reizes, Professor Rod Belcher, Professor Frank Swinkels

and Lance Reece. Special thanks also to Associate Professor Stephen Johnston for his excellent editorial comment.

My very special thanks go to Terry Brown, Richard Wiltshire and Dr. Bruce Pearson for their collegiality, their support and encouragement during the tough times and for sharing many great curries. I hope the special friendships that we have developed will be lasting. Thanks also to Richard and Terry for their technical proofing of this thesis. Additionally I wish to thank Richard for the very tangible support he gave this research, whilst he was at UTS.

Lastly, sincere thanks to my family for their patience and steadfast support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Certificate.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
List of Tables	xiv
List of Figures	xv
List of Plates	xxi
Glossary and Notation.....	xxiii
Abstract.....	xxvi
CHAPTER 1 Introduction	1
1.1 BUS ROLLOVER	1
1.2 ADR 59/00	1
1.3 PLASTIC HINGE RESPONSE IN RHS.....	4
1.3.1 Performance Parameters.....	7
1.3.2 Response Phases.....	7
1.3.3 Effective Hinge Centre	8
1.4 PLASTIC HINGE RESPONSE UNDER IMPACT LOADING	8
1.5 ASSESSING STRUCTURAL RESPONSE TO IMPACT LOADING	9
1.6 ASSESSING PLASTIC HINGE IMPACT RESPONSE	11
1.7 THESIS AIMS & METHODOLOGY	13
1.8 ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS THESIS	15
1.9 THESIS OUTLINE.....	15
CHAPTER 2 Literature Review	17
2.1 HYBRID MODELLING APPROACH FOR STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS	17
2.2 EXPERIMENTAL COLLAPSE OF THIN WALLED MEMBERS	18
2.2.1 Axially Loaded Columns.....	18
2.2.2 Combined Loading	19
2.2.3 Quasi-Static Bending of RHS	19
2.2.3.1 Initial Elasto-Plastic Post-Buckle Response	19
2.2.3.2 Deep Collapse	20
2.2.3.3 Restricted Collapse	21
2.2.4 Impact Bending Experiments	22
2.2.5 Areas Identified for Investigation.....	23

2.3	DYNAMIC EFFECTS	24
2.3.1	Influence of Inertia	24
2.3.1.1	Influence of Inertia on Bending Collapse of RHS	26
2.3.1.2	Influence of Inertia - Summary	26
2.3.2	Material Strain Rate Sensitivity	27
2.3.2.1	Strain Rate Sensitivity of Mechanical Properties: yield stress, ultimate tensile strength and ductility	27
2.3.2.2	Strain Rate History	30
2.3.2.3	Material Strain Rate Sensitivity - Summary	30
2.3.2.4	Constitutive Models of Strain Rate Sensitivity	31
2.3.3	Areas Identified for Investigation	33
2.4	NUMERICAL MODELLING	33
2.4.1	Bending Collapse of RHS	34
2.4.2	Mesh Density	35
2.4.3	Material Definition	36
2.4.4	Other Applications of FE Modelling	37
2.4.5	Analytical Models	37
2.4.5.1	Axial Crush	37
2.4.5.2	Bending Models	38
2.4.5.3	Empirical Models	40
2.4.6	Specialised Design Tools	40
2.4.7	Areas Identified for Investigation	41
2.5	QUASI-STATIC DESIGN SCHEMES	41
2.5.1	Theoretical Scaling of Flow Stress	42
2.5.1.1	Choice of Material Strain Rate Sensitivity Model	42
2.5.1.2	Choice of Strain Rate	42
2.5.2	Experimental Scaling of Gross Response	44
2.5.3	Areas Identified for Investigation	46
2.6	RELATED AREAS OF LITERATURE REVIEW	47
2.6.1	Special Considerations for Elevated Strain Rate Material Tests	47
2.6.1.1	Low Strain Rates	47
2.6.1.2	Medium Strain Rates	48
2.6.1.3	High Strain Rates	48
2.6.2	Quasi-Static Mechanical Properties of RHS Material	49
2.6.2.1	RHS Manufacture	49

2.6.2.2	Property Variation around the Section.....	49
2.6.2.3	Summary of Quasi-Static Properties.....	53
CHAPTER 3	Pendulum Bend Test Rig Design	54
3.1	INTRODUCTION	54
3.2	SPECIMEN DETAILS.....	54
3.3	RIG DESIGN	57
3.4	IMPACT PENDULUM DETAILS.....	59
3.4.1	General Specifications.....	60
3.4.2	Measurement of Plastic Hinge Response	60
3.4.2.1	Derivation of Hinge Moment from Pendulum Moment	61
3.4.2.2	Calculating Hinge Moment from a Reaction Force	66
3.4.3	Pendulum Acceleration	68
3.4.4	Safety Systems.....	69
3.4.5	Quasi-Static Test Arrangement	71
3.5	INSTRUMENTATION OVERVIEW.....	71
3.5.1	Pendulum Travel/Rotation	72
3.5.2	Pendulum Impact Velocity	73
3.5.3	Reaction Force.....	73
3.5.3.1	Frequency Response of the Strain Amplifier	76
3.5.4	Air Spring Pressure	76
3.5.5	Specimen - Pendulum Contact	76
3.5.6	Hinge Zone Rotation	77
3.5.7	Surface Strains.....	78
3.5.7.1	Strip Gauge Imbalance, Desensitisation and Cross-talk	79
3.5.7.2	Minimising Cross-Talk, Desensitisation and Imbalance	81
3.5.8	Data Acquisition.....	81
3.6	CONCLUSIONS	82
CHAPTER 4	Processing Raw Test Data	83
4.1	INTRODUCTION	83
4.2	CHOICE OF ROTATION AND MOMENT MEASURES	84
4.2.1	Hinge Zone Rotation	84
4.2.1.1	A Comment on Cimpoeru's Finite Mechanism Length.....	86
4.2.2	Hinge Moment.....	87

4.2.2.1	Cimpoeru's Choice of Hinge Moment.....	88
4.2.2.2	Calculating Energy Consistent Hinge Moment	88
4.3	CALCULATING HINGE MOMENT AND HINGE ZONE ROTATION FROM QUASI-STATIC TEST DATA	91
4.3.1	Buckle Forming on the Pendulum Axis	91
4.3.1.1	Post-Buckle Hinge Moment.....	91
4.3.1.2	Pendulum Rotation	92
4.3.1.3	Hinge Zone Rotation.....	92
4.3.2	Buckle Formation "off" the Pendulum Axis	93
4.3.2.1	Post-Buckle Moment Correction	94
4.3.2.2	Pendulum Rotation Correction	96
4.3.2.3	Post-Buckle Hinge Zone Rotation	98
4.3.2.4	Pre-Buckle Hinge Moment	98
4.3.2.5	Impact Test "offset" Buckle Corrections	98
4.4	SPECIMEN ELASTIC STIFFNESS.....	98
4.5	CALCULATING HINGE MOMENT AND HINGE ZONE ROTATION FROM IMPACT TEST DATA	101
4.5.1	Identification of Buckle Initiation	101
4.5.2	Impact Test Hinge Zone Rotation	104
4.5.2.1	A Device to Measure Hinge Zone Rotation Directly.....	104
4.5.3	Impact Test Reaction Force Signal.....	105
4.5.4	Inverse Analysis	106
4.5.4.1	Measurement of the Specimen Mount FRF.....	108
4.5.4.2	The Measured Specimen Mount FRF.....	110
4.5.4.3	FRF Corrected Hinge Moment	111
4.5.5	Low-Pass Filtering	112
4.5.5.1	The Influence of Hinge Vibration on Hinge Moment.....	113
4.5.5.2	Possible Specimen Natural Frequencies	115
4.5.5.3	Assessment of Hinge Unloading due to Specimen Vibration.....	117
4.5.5.4	Low-Pass Filter Cut-off Frequency (f_c) Selection.....	119
4.5.6	Inverse Analysis or Low-Pass Filter.....	121
4.6	SUMMARY OF DATA PROCESSING PROCEDURES.....	123
4.6.1	Quasi-Static Procedures	123
4.6.2	Impact Procedures	125
4.7	CONCLUSIONS	125

4.8	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK.....	126
CHAPTER 5 Bend Test Results		127
5.1	INTRODUCTION.....	127
5.2	TEST PROCEDURE DETAILS.....	128
5.2.1	RHS Specimens.....	128
5.2.2	Loading Rate.....	128
5.2.2.1	Quasi-Static Loading Rate.....	128
5.2.2.2	Pendulum Impact Velocity and Energy.....	128
5.2.3	Data Acquisition.....	130
5.3	GENERAL RESULTS.....	130
5.3.1	Material Failure, Pre-Buckle Plasticity and Collapse.....	130
5.3.2	Effective Hinge Centre.....	132
5.3.3	Longitudinal Surface Strain Signals.....	132
5.4	QUASI-STATIC TEST RESULTS.....	133
5.4.1	Moment Vs Rotation Response Curves.....	133
5.4.1.1	Elastic Hinge Stiffness.....	134
5.4.1.2	Maximum Moment Compared to Fully Plastic Moment.....	135
5.4.1.3	Curvature at the Onset of Buckling.....	135
5.4.1.4	Strain at the Onset of Buckling.....	135
5.4.2	Buckle Mechanism <i>Moment-Rotation</i> Response.....	136
5.4.2.1	Buckle Mechanism Rotation a Relative or Absolute Quantity.....	137
5.4.3	Modelling the Collapse Phase.....	140
5.4.4	Average combined Hinge Zone <i>M-θ</i> Response.....	140
5.4.4.1	Comparison with <i>M-θ</i> Response of Cimpoeru.....	142
5.4.4.2	Comparison with an Analytical Model of Buckle <i>M-θ</i> Response.....	143
5.4.5	Gross Specimen Response.....	144
5.5	IMPACT TEST RESULTS.....	146
5.5.1	Combined Raw Hinge <i>M-θ</i>	146
5.5.2	Filtered Hinge Zone <i>M-θ</i> Response.....	148
5.5.3	Buckle Mechanism <i>M-θ</i> Curves.....	150
5.5.4	Buckle Mechanism Collapse Curve Fits.....	150
5.5.5	Average Combined <i>M-θ</i>	151
5.5.6	Gross Specimen Response.....	151

5.6	COMPARISONS AND DISCUSSION	153
5.6.1	Post-Buckle Hinge Response	153
5.6.1.1	Comparison of Hinge Moment	154
5.6.2	Pre-Buckle Hinge Response	155
5.6.2.1	Strain and Curvature at Peak Moment.....	156
5.6.3	Combined Hinge Zone Response	156
5.6.4	Gross Specimen Response	158
5.7	CONCLUSIONS	161
CHAPTER 6	Strain Rate Sensitivity of RHS Material	163
6.1	INTRODUCTION	163
6.2	EXPERIMENTAL APPARATUS AND PROCEDURES	164
6.2.1	Test Coupon Details	164
6.2.2	Choice of Strain Rates and Testing Machines.....	165
6.2.3	High Strain Rate Tests – Shake Table.....	166
6.2.3.1	Grips.....	166
6.2.3.2	Load Take-up System	168
6.2.3.3	Shake Table Drive Profile.....	168
6.2.4	Low Strain Rate Tests – Shimadzu Universal Testing Machine.....	170
6.2.5	Instrumentation.....	171
6.2.5.1	Strain	171
6.2.5.2	Displacement	171
6.2.5.3	Load	172
6.2.5.4	Data Acquisition	173
6.2.6	High-Elongation Strain Gauging.....	174
6.3	DATA PROCESSING PROCEDURES	175
6.3.1	Engineering Stress and Strain.....	175
6.3.2	Young's Modulus.....	177
6.3.3	Uniform Strain and Total Extension	177
6.3.4	Lower Yield Stress	177
6.3.5	True Stress and Log Strain	177
6.3.6	Plastic Log Strain	178
6.3.7	Plastic Strain Energy Density to UTS	178
6.3.8	Strain Rate and Crosshead Velocity.....	178
6.4	RESULTS.....	178

6.5	DISCUSSION.....	181
6.5.1	Coupon Curvature and Residual Stress.....	181
6.5.2	Variation of Mechanical Properties around the Section.....	182
6.5.3	Variation of Strain Rate with Strain.....	182
6.5.4	Strain Rate Sensitivity.....	184
6.5.4.1	Lower Yield Stress.....	185
6.5.4.2	UTS.....	185
6.5.4.3	Comparison Between C350LO and DuraGal.....	185
6.5.4.4	Strain Energy Density.....	185
6.5.4.5	Young's Modulus.....	186
6.5.4.6	Uniform Strain and Total Extension.....	186
6.5.4.7	Flow Stress.....	186
6.5.4.8	Order of Magnitude Nature of Strain Rate Sensitivity.....	187
6.5.5	Strain Rate Sensitivity Models.....	188
6.5.6	FE Modelling of the Uni-Axial Tensile Test.....	190
6.5.6.1	Strain Distribution along the Coupon Centreline.....	191
6.5.7	Influence of Stress Waves and Imposed Loading Oscillations.....	193
6.6	CONCLUSIONS.....	195
6.7	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK.....	196
CHAPTER 7 Finite Element Modelling		198
7.1	INTRODUCTION.....	198
7.2	BEAM ELEMENT MODEL.....	199
7.2.1	Analyses.....	199
7.2.2	Model Details.....	199
7.2.2.1	Buckle Topology.....	199
7.2.2.2	Restraint.....	200
7.2.2.3	Cantilever Loading and Pendulum Contact.....	200
7.2.2.4	Material and Section Properties.....	200
7.2.3	Results.....	202
7.2.3.1	Static Analysis.....	202
7.2.3.2	Dynamic Analysis.....	202
7.2.3.3	Some Interesting Results.....	207
7.3	SHELL ELEMENT MODEL.....	210
7.3.1	Aim.....	210

7.3.2	Model Details	210
7.3.2.1	Model Topology.....	210
7.3.2.2	Restraint.....	214
7.3.2.3	Loading	214
7.3.2.4	Pseudo-Dynamic Analysis	215
7.3.2.5	Material Properties.....	218
7.3.2.6	“Calibration” of Static Material Properties.....	221
7.3.2.7	Dynamic Properties - Strain Rate Sensitivity	224
7.3.3	Results	225
7.3.3.1	Buckle Mode Shape	225
7.3.3.2	Moment – Rotation Comparisons	228
7.3.3.3	Longitudinal Compression Flange Strain	235
7.3.3.4	Comparison Impact Vs Static	236
7.3.3.5	Full Field Results.....	237
7.4	CONCLUSIONS	243
CHAPTER 8 Estimation and use of Dynamic Scaling Factors		245
8.1	INTRODUCTION	245
8.2	SCALING QUASI-STATIC RESPONSES	246
8.2.1	Theoretical Scaling of Flow Stress.....	246
8.2.1.1	Material Model	247
8.2.1.2	Strain Rate.....	248
8.2.1.3	Scaling Flow Stress – FE Models	250
8.2.2	Experimental Scaling of Gross Response	250
8.3	SCALING THE PLASTIC HINGE RESPONSE OF RHS	253
8.3.1	Kecman's Theoretical Scaling Scheme.....	253
8.3.2	Abramowicz and Jones' Theoretical F_{dyn} Scaling Factor.....	258
8.3.3	Kecman's Experimental F_{dyn}	259
8.3.3.1	Implications of Non-Scaleable Quasi-Static and Impact Responses ..	260
8.3.4	Examples of Predicted RHS Plastic Hinge Impact Response	260
8.3.5	Possible Developments to Predictive Schemes.....	263
8.3.6	Scaling Global Structural Response	263
8.4	A GENERAL COMMENT	264
8.5	USING PLASTIC HINGE PROPERTIES IN A "HYBRID" ANALYSIS	264
8.6	CONCLUSIONS	267

8.7	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK.....	270
CHAPTER 9 Discussion and Conclusions		271
9.1	SPECIFIC AIMS OF THE THESIS	271
9.2	PREDICTING IMPACT RESPONSE.....	273
9.2.1	Detailed Finite Element Modelling	273
9.2.2	Impact Testing.....	274
9.2.2.1	Uninstrumented Impact Testing.....	274
9.2.2.2	Instrumented Impact Testing	275
9.2.3	Scaling a Quasi-Static Response	275
9.2.4	General Comment on Component Impact Responses.....	277
9.3	ADDITIONAL KEY RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS	277
9.3.1	Chapter 3 - Test Rig Design	277
9.3.2	Chapter 4 – Processing Raw Test Data	278
9.3.3	Chapter 5 – Bend Test Results	279
9.3.4	Chapter 6 – RHS Material Strain Rate Sensitivity	279
9.3.5	Chapter 7 – Finite Element Modelling.....	280
REFERENCES		281
APPENDIX A – Kecman’s Analytical Model		291
A.1	INTEGRATION OF ROLLING ENERGY.....	292
A.1.1	Work done by “Rolling”.....	292
A.1.2	Rolling Action in the RHS Buckle.....	294
A.1.2.1	Yield Line GA.....	296
A.1.2.2	Yield Line KA.....	297
A.2	FLATTENING OF THE CORNER MATERIAL.....	297
A.3	THE “COMBINED” EXPRESSION FOR W	298
A.4	SIGNIFICANCE OF THESE CORRECTIONS	299
APPENDIX B - High-Elongation Strain Measurements		301
B.1	STRAIN GAUGE INSTALLATION	301
B.1.1	Surface Preparation	301
B.1.2	Adhesive.....	301
B.1.3	Wiring.....	302

B.2	LARGE STRAIN SIGNAL CORRECTIONS	303
B.2.1	Background Theory	303
B.2.1.1	Bridge Non-linearity (TN- 507)	303
B.2.1.2	Gauge Factor Non-linearity (TT-605).....	303
B.2.1.3	Transverse Sensitivity (TN-509).....	304
B.2.2	Final Working Corrections for Large Strain Measurements	305
B.2.2.1	Transverse Sensitivity Correction.....	305
B.2.2.2	Gauge Factor and Wheatstone Bridge Corrections	306

LIST OF TABLES

3.1	Data acquisition channels	81
4.1	Dominant frequencies in impact tests and FE analysis.....	116
5.1	Summary of key result quantities from quasi-static hinge zone M - θ responses.....	134
5.2	Compression flange strains at depression inception and buckle initiation – quasi-static tests	136
5.3	Summary of key result quantities from impact hinge zone M - θ responses	151
5.4	Compression flange strains at depression inception and buckle initiation – all tests	156
6.1	Shake table drive profile parameters	170
6.2	Sampling rate and filter settings used for material tests	173
6.3a	Mechanical properties for grade C350LO RHS wall material.....	179
6.3b	Mechanical properties for DuraGal RHS wall material.....	179
6.4a	Grade C350LO coupon curvature and residual stress	181
6.4b	DuraGal coupon curvature and residual stress	182
6.5a	Dynamic mechanical properties of grade C350LO RHS wall material	184
6.5b	Dynamic mechanical properties of DuraGal RHS wall material.....	184
6.6a	Variation of flow stress with strain rate and plastic strain - C350LO RHS....	186
6.6b	Variation of flow stress with strain rate and plastic strain - DuraGal RHS....	187
6.7	Order of magnitude sensitivity of C350LO – Face A strain energy density at UTS	187
6.8a	Cowper-Symonds strain rate sensitivity predictions for C350LO RHS	190
6.8b	Cowper-Symonds strain rate sensitivity predictions for DuraGal RHS	190
7.1	Impact : Static plastic strain energy comparisons at peak rotation	237

LIST OF FIGURES

1.1	Three general classes of $M-\theta$ response. Kecman (1979 p. 64)	5
1.2	Typical $M-\theta$ Response of a plastic hinge that has formed in a thin-walled RHS member subjected to a uni-axial bending load	6
1.3	Definition of plastic hinge performance parameters.....	7
1.4	Influence of material strain rate sensitivity on the response of a plastic hinge that has formed in a RHS member under flexural loading	9
2.1	Pure bending test rig of Cimpoeru (1992)	21
2.2	a) Type I and Type II quasi-static load curves, Calladine and English (1984) b) Type I and Type II specimens tested by Tam (1990)	24
2.3	Tensile mechanical properties of EN 2A mild steel, Campbell and Cooper (1966)	28
2.4	Stress-strain curves for 35XF sheet steel, Kassar and Yu (1992).....	29
2.5	Three stages of deformation of a square column subject to pure bending. ABAQUS calculation, Wierzbicki et al. (1994)	35
2.6	Typical deformation of a square column under oblique load. PAMCRASH analysis, Han and Park (1999)	36
2.7	Collapse mechanisms, thin-walled box beam a) Seki and Sunami (1978), b) Kecman (1979)	39
2.8	Variation of tensile properties around a RHS. χ = Yield Stress, σ = UTS Key et al. (1988)	51
2.9	Analytical model for panel removal residual stress, Key and Hancock (1993b)	53
2.10	Analytical model of layering residual stress, Key and Hancock (1993b).....	53
3.1	Pendulum – Specimen energy transfer during the initial stages of an impact test.....	62
3.2a	Hinge moment from FE analysis – true and derived from contact force.....	63
3.2b	Hinge moment from FE analysis – true and derived from filtered contact force	63
3.3	Moment-rotation traces from quasi-static and pendulum impact tests – Kecman (1993a).....	64
3.4	Unscaled pendulum acceleration and reaction force – physical impact test.....	64
3.5	Hinge moment from FE analysis – true and derived from reaction force.....	66
3.6	Schematic of pivoting specimen mount.....	67
3.7	Residual reaction force - Original, after modification #2 and final.....	75

3.8	Frequency Response of Charge Amplifier on 2000 $\mu\epsilon$ range.....	76
3.9	Strip gauge used to measure compression flange longitudinal strain.....	78
3.10	Cross-talk sensitivity with a single excitation supply line.....	80
3.11	Cross-talk sensitivity with two excitation supply lines.....	80
4.1	Plastic hinge characteristic $M-\theta$ response (Fig. 1.3).....	84
4.2	Buckle mechanism as modelled by Kecman (1979).....	85
4.3	Bend test reaction forces and rotations - Plastic hinge formed on specimen mount pivot axis.....	91
4.4	Bend test geometry detailing specimen and pendulum contact - plastic hinge formed on specimen mount pivot axis.....	92
4.5	Bend test reaction forces and rotation - plastic hinge formed "offset" from the specimen mount pivot axis.....	94
4.6	Hinge moment corrected for offset buckle location. Hinge offset (a) = +17 mm.....	96
4.7	Pendulum rotation and specimen geometry - Plastic hinge formed "offset" from the specimen mount pivot axis.....	97
4.8	Specimen elastic stiffness ($\Delta M_H/\Delta\beta'_{elas}$) Vs Hinge zone rotation.....	99
4.9	Compression flange longitudinal strain Vs Hinge zone rotation.....	101
4.10	Strip gauge and hinge moment traces from quasi-static test A5.....	103
4.11	Strip gauge and hinge moment traces from impact test A2.....	103
4.12	Single input - single output system.....	106
4.13	Hinge moment correction factor = 1/(Normalised FRF of the reaction measurement system).....	110
4.14	FRF corrected hinge moment from impact A2.....	112
4.15	Effect of hinge elastic unloading on hinge moment signal a) Hinge $M-\theta$ curve with unloading b) Corresponding moment signal.....	114
4.16	$M-\theta$ signal showing distortion due to; a) Filtered moment signal or filtered rotation signal and b) both moment and rotation signals filtered.....	114
4.17	Hinge $M-\theta$ response from impact FE analysis.....	117
4.18	Hinge moment signal interpolated from impact A2 hinge zone rotation a) raw signal and b) low-pass filtered at 200 Hz.....	118
4.19	Comparison of hinge zone rotation and longitudinal strain from impact test A2 and the dynamic FE analysis of Section 7.2.2.....	119
4.20	Hinge moment Vs hinge zone rotation response a) Impact A2 low-pass filtered at $f_c = 350$ Hz and b) Impact A2 low-pass filtered at $f_c = 200$ Hz.....	120
4.21	Comparison of FRF correction and low-pass filtering of impact $M-\theta$ response.....	122

5.1	ADR 59/00 National Code of Practice – Part B, Profile B a) Allowable roll cage cross section and b) Standard hoop deflection collapse mechanism (National Code of Practice 1992).....	129
5.2	Compression flange buckle profile – Quasi-static test A3	132
5.3	Hinge zone M - θ response - Quasi-static tests A1, A3, A5, C1 and C3	133
5.4	Buckle mechanism M - θ response - Quasi-static tests A1, A3, A5, C1 and C3	137
5.5	FE predicted responses for different loading conditions and initial imperfections Mechanism rotation – a) absolute definition and b) relative definition	139
5.6	Power law fitted buckle mechanism M - θ response curves – Quasi-static tests A1, A3, A5, C1 and C3	140
5.7	Hinge zone M - θ curve from quasi-static test A1	141
5.8	Comparison with experimental M - θ obtained by Cimpoeru and analytical model developed by Kecman	142
5.9	Yield line model of the buckle mechanism, Kecman (1979)	143
5.10	Gross specimen response – pendulum moment Vs pendulum rotation Quasi-static tests A1, A3, A5, C1 and C3	145
5.11	Hinge zone M - θ response - Impact tests A2, A4, A6 and B2.....	146
5.12	Hinge zone M - θ response – Hinge zone rotation derived from rotary potentiometer device and from longitudinal compression flange strains	147
5.13	Filtered hinge zone M - θ response, Impact test A4 – hinge zone rotation derived from the rotary potentiometer device and longitudinal compression flange strains	148
5.14	Filtered hinge zone M - θ response - Impact tests A2, A4, A6 and B2	149
5.15	Filtered buckle mechanism M - θ responses - Impact tests A2, A4, A6 and B2	150
5.16	Pendulum work and specimen strain energy – Impact test A2.....	152
5.17	Pendulum moment Vs pendulum rotation – Impact tests A2, A4, A6 and B2	152
5.18	Quasi-static and impact comparison of buckle mechanism plastic M - θ response	154
5.19	Quasi-static and impact comparison of buckle mechanism energy Vs plastic rotation	155
5.20	Quasi-static and impact comparison of a) hinge moment Vs pre-buckle plastic θ and b) cumulative hinge zone plastic energy Vs pre-buckle plastic θ	155
5.21	Quasi-static and impact comparison of hinge moment Vs hinge zone plastic rotation.....	157

5.22	Quasi-static and impact comparison of hinge zone cumulative plastic energy Vs hinge zone plastic rotation	157
5.23	Quasi-static and impact comparison of pendulum moment Vs normalised pendulum plastic rotation	159
5.24	Quasi-static and impact comparison of cumulative specimen plastic strain energy Vs normalised pendulum plastic rotation	159
6.1	Uni-axial tensile coupons a) geometry and b) coupon locations around the tube section	165
6.2	Shake table specifications	169
6.3	Displacement-time drive profile, Velocity and Acceleration time histories for highest rate shake table tests	170
6.4	Effect of coupon curvature on measured engineering stress Vs engineering strain curve	176
6.5	True stress Vs plastic log strain for RHS wall material a) Grade C350LO RHS, b) DuraGal RHS	180
6.6	Engineering strain rate and equivalent crosshead strain rate Vs engineering strain, C350LO RHS Face A1, Nominal $\dot{\epsilon} = 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$	183
6.7	Plastic log strain rate Vs plastic log strain, logarithmic scale – C350LO RHS	183
6.8	Strain rate sensitivity of RHS wall material a) grade C350LO and b) DuraGal	188
6.9	FE model of the tensile test coupon including initial coupon curvature and grips	191
6.10	Tensile surface stresses after clamping the curved coupon	191
6.11	Profile of longitudinal surface strain along the longitudinal centreline of the coupon at various levels of central strain. a) quasi-static loading and b) nominal strain rate = 10 s^{-1}	192
6.12	Variation of central strain rate Vs central strain. FE predictions and experimental results. Equivalent test strain rates of a) 10^{-4} s^{-1} and b) 10 s^{-1}	193
6.13	Load oscillations in a tensile test at a nominal strain rate = 10 s^{-1}	194
7.1	Modelling the variation in buckle elastic stiffness	201
7.2	Static Pendulum moment Vs Pendulum rotation a) pre-buckle and b) post-buckle	203
7.3	Static Hinge moment Vs Hinge rotation a) pre-buckle and b) post-buckle	204
7.4	Dynamic Pendulum moment Vs Pendulum rotation a) pre-buckle and b) post-buckle	205

7.5	Dynamic Hinge moment Vs Hinge zone rotation a) pre-buckle and b) post-buckle	206
7.6	a) Propagation of a "negative" bending wave in the initial stages of impact b) Corresponding hinge moment Vs time.....	207
7.7	Hinge "negative" response corresponding to pendulum-specimen re-contact	208
7.8	Non-smooth hinge M - θ responses	209
7.9	Detailed model of the RHS specimen using a combination of shell and beam elements.....	210
7.10	Collapse response for $\frac{1}{4}$ buckle model and $\frac{1}{2}$ buckle models	212
7.11	Mesh density in the region of the local buckle	213
7.12	Specimen mounting plate restraint	214
7.13	User routine flow chart	216
7.14	Reverse yielding in the buckle. (PEEQ – PEMAG)	221
7.15	FE moment-rotation responses before and after modification of material stress-strain curves.....	222
7.16a	FE buckle mode shape, $\theta = 37^\circ$	225
7.16b	FE buckle mode shape, $\theta = 37^\circ$	226
7.16c	Experimental buckle mode shape, $\theta \approx 35^\circ$ (Plate 5.1).....	226
7.17	Progressive development of local buckle. Reading L \rightarrow R then Top \rightarrow Bottom; $\theta = 4.18^\circ, 7.79^\circ, 11.9^\circ, 18.7^\circ, 28.4^\circ$ and 35.3°	227
7.18	Buckle asymmetry a) Longitudinal cross-section of buckle at $\theta = 36^\circ$ - FE result and b) Physical buckle	228
7.19	Comparison of FE and experimental gross specimen response a) pre-buckle and b) complete	229
7.20	Comparison of FE and experimental moment – rotation response a) hinge zone and b) buckle mechanism.....	230
7.21	Normalised pendulum moment Vs Normalised pendulum rotation - Comparison FE and experimental	232
7.22	Hinge zone M - θ impact response – Comparison FE and experimental.....	232
7.23	Buckle mechanism M - θ impact response – Comparison FE and experimental	233
7.24	Pendulum work and specimen strain energy – Comparison true and derived.....	234
7.25	Hinge zone M - θ response using Cowper-Symonds material strain rate definition.....	235
7.26a	Pre-buckle longitudinal compression flange strain (40 mm from base plate edge) - Comparison FE and experimental	236

7.26b	Buckle profile – Comparison FE and experimental	236
7.27	Equivalent plastic strain, inner surface at $\theta \approx 36^\circ$	237
7.28	Element plastic strain energy, $\theta \approx 36^\circ$	238
7.29	Equivalent plastic strain rate, outer surface, a) $\theta \approx 7.8^\circ$ and b) $\theta \approx 36^\circ$	240
7.30	Energy-weighted equivalent plastic strain rate, outer surface	241
7.31	Relationship between average buckle strain rate, buckle geometry and hinge rotation rate	242
8.1	Comparison of hinge zone M - θ response from quasi-static and impact tests (Figure 5.21)	251
8.2	Performance of various scaling factors compared to the test results from Chapter 5	261
8.3a	Comparison of true and estimated F_{dyn} for pendulum moment Vs pendulum rotation	262
8.3b	Comparison of true and estimated F_{dyn} for specimen strain energy Vs pendulum rotation	262
A.1	Yield line model of the buckle mechanism, Kecman (1979)	291
A.2	Rolling deformation - general case	292
A.3	General rolling deformation – movement of material over the roller for an infinitesimal displacement of the roller from O to O'	292
A.4	Rolling deformation - simplified case	293
A.5	Increment in buckle collapse	294
A.6	Increment in buckle collapse corresponding to an increment in buckle rotation “mapped” onto the undeformed web	295
A.7	Comparison of buckle moment responses Quasi-static test average, Kecman and Kecman – alternative formulation	299
A.8	Comparison of buckle plastic energy responses Quasi-static test average, Kecman and Kecman – alternative formulation	300
B.1	Corrections to indicated strain for Wheatstone bridge and gauge factor non-linearity	308

LIST OF PLATES

1.1	Sturt Highway, East of Hay N.S.W., 1980	2
1.2	Mount Tamborine, Gold Coast Qld., 25/9/90.....	2
1.3	Mount Tamborine accident under investigation	3
1.4	Paris, 24/4/98	3
1.5	Code of practice bus frame subjected to a simulated rollover according to ADR 59/00.....	4
1.6	Typical local buckle or “plastic hinge” in an isolated RHS member subjected to a uni-axial bending load	6
3.1	Bus ring frame after quasi-static rollover simulation. (Direction and location of quasi-static load shown together with four plastic hinge locations).....	55
3.2	A “Plastic Hinge” at the floor bearer to side pillar joint.....	55
3.3a	RHS cantilever bend test specimen – Before and after testing.....	56
3.3b	Close-up of local buckle in RHS cantilever bend test specimen	56
3.4	Accelerated impact pendulum at the Cranfield Impact Centre, Cranfield, England.....	58
3.5	Accelerated impact pendulum at UTS	59
3.6	Physical specimen mount	68
3.7	Air spring arrangement a) air spring compressed by the pendulum and b) air spring expanded and restrained by straps.....	70
3.8	Geared electric winch and pulley arrangement for quasi-static testing	71
3.9	Details of the optical head, encoder arc and trigger gate	72
3.10	Final load cell and pre-load arrangement with “zero shear” coupling.....	75
3.11a	Hinge zone rotation device attached to a specimen before testing	77
3.11b	Hinge zone rotation device attached to a specimen after testing	78
4.1	Unbent specimen with electromagnetic exciter attached. Note pre-load has not yet been applied.....	109
5.1	Typical buckle forming in quasi-static and impact specimens	130
5.2a	Asymmetrical buckle – effective hinge centre offset from geometric centre.....	131
5.2b	Asymmetrical buckle – Top View	131
6.1a	Tensile test fixtures in place on the shake table Close-up before testing	166

6.1b	Tensile test fixtures in place on the shake table Overview before testing.....	167
6.1c	Overview of tensile test fixtures in place on the shake table after testing.....	167
6.2	Initial curvature in a typical tensile coupon.....	171
6.3	Large strain relief loops on tensile coupons	174
B.1	Tensile coupon - bond curing jig	302
B.2	Large strain relief loops on tensile coupons	302

GLOSSARY AND NOTATION

RHS - Rectangular hollow section. Used in this thesis to cover steel cold-formed thin-walled rectangular and square hollow sections.

Plastic hinge - The localised region of plastic deformation and buckling that developed in the cantilever specimen. See § 1.3.

Effective Hinge Centre - The point about which the length of specimen beyond the hinge zone appeared to rotate following formation of the hinge buckle. The effective hinge centre was typically located within ± 5 mm from the geometric centre of the buckle. See § 1.3.3.

Hinge Zone - The 85 mm length of specimen, from the root of the specimen, over which the potentiometer device described in Section 3.5.6 measured relative rotation. See § 3.5.6 and § 4.2.1.

Energy consistent hinge moment - Hinge moment defined such that the integral *hinge moment Vs hinge zone rotation* was equal to hinge zone energy. See § 4.2.2, Eqn. 4.1.

Normalised pendulum rotation - Approximately the pendulum rotation that would have been measured if the pendulum pivot were at the effective hinge centre. See § 4.3.2.2.

Normalised pendulum moment - The work conjugate to normalised pendulum rotation. See § 4.3.2.2.

Dynamic Factor - For a given quantity or response the dynamic factor is the ratio of the impact value to the corresponding quasi-static value. See § 4.2.1.

FRF - Frequency Response Function. See § 4.5.4.

MPC - Multi-point constraint. See § 7.3.2.1.

UTS - Ultimate tensile strength.

Symbols

θ	Hinge zone rotation.
$M-\theta$	<i>Hinge moment Vs Hinge zone rotation</i> response curve.
β	Pendulum rotation.
β'	Normalised pendulum rotation.
ϕ	Pendulum rotation due to elastic + plastic curvature of the length of specimen beyond the hinge zone.
ϕ'	Normalised pendulum rotation due to elastic + plastic curvature of the length of specimen beyond the hinge zone.
γ	Specimen tip rotation due to elastic + plastic curvature of the length of specimen beyond the hinge zone.
a	Offset of the effective centre from pendulum axis
M_{fp}	Fully plastic moment of the RHS section
f_c	Low-pass filter cut-off frequency [Hz].
D	Cowper-Symonds coefficient defined in Equation 2.1 [s^{-1}]
q	Cowper-Symonds coefficient defined in Equation 2.1
f	Flow stress strain rate sensitivity scaling factor. See § 8.2.
F_{dyn}	“dynamic factor” used to scale a quasi-static gross hinge or quasi-static specimen response quantity. See § 8.2.
δ	General measure of component displacement. See § 8.2.2 Eqn. 8.3.

Superscripts and Subscripts

EC	Energy consistent.
Pre	Pre-buckle phase.
Post	Post-buckle phase.
Trans	Transitional phase between pre-buckle continuous beam response and post-buckle mechanism response.
pb	Response post-buckle formation.
h	Quantity associated with plastic hinge response
elas	Elastic component of the response.
plas	Plastic component of the response.
pend	Quantity associated with pendulum response.
spec	Quantity associated with specimen response.
hinge zone	Quantity associated with hinge zone response.

ABSTRACT

This thesis describes a program of research into the plastic *moment – rotation* ($M-\theta$) response of rectangular hollow section (RHS) steel tubes subjected to impact bending loads. The context for this research was the use of RHS in buses and vehicle rollover protection structures (ROPS) where the “plastic hinges” that form in the RHS members act as energy absorbing “crumple zones”.

In the design of such structures for crashworthiness, there is a need to understand the response of the plastic hinges to impact loading and this research has assessed the following methods used to determine the *moment – rotation* characteristics of plastic hinges under impact bending loads:

- physical impact tests;
- finite element modelling; and
- the use of “dynamic magnifiers” to scale the results of quasi-static tests and analyses.

In dynamic tests, the specimen’s inertia complicates the measurement of plastic hinge properties. These complications were addressed by the design and development of a novel pendulum bend rig and instrumentation and the meticulous processing of test data. The test rig and procedures were successfully used to measure the bending collapse of 50x50x2 grade C350LO RHS specimens to a hinge rotation of 35°. Comparisons between the measured impact and quasi-static responses enabled the influence of the loading rate on plastic hinge response to be quantified.

It is shown that the difference between the impact and static responses is essentially due to the RHS material’s strain rate sensitivity. This influence of strain rate on the mechanical properties of the RHS material was characterised by a programme of uniaxial tensile tests at strain rates ranging from 10^{-4} to 10 s^{-1} .

Detailed finite element analyses of the local buckling response were conducted using HKS ABAQUS–Standard. Excellent agreement between the predicted and measured impact $M-\theta$ responses of the local buckle was obtained using a “pseudo-dynamic” analysis procedure. This procedure correctly accounted for the effect of material strain rate sensitivity within a static analysis by controlling the loading rate.

A critical assessment was made of the quasi-static scaling approach to predicting component impact response. The limitations of predicting impact moment and energy responses using a single scaling factor were demonstrated. It is shown that the most reliable results are obtained using a scaling factor derived experimentally. A theoretical approach proposed in the literature to predict RHS plastic hinge impact response is shown to overestimate the impact response of the RHS tested in this study. An alternative theoretical scaling factor is proposed that gave an improved prediction of RHS impact response.