

**DEVELOPMENT OF A METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING
STRESSES IN TRACK COMPONENTS**

FRANCOIS PAULUS NAUDÉ

Submitted in fulfilment of part of the requirements, for the degree of

MASTER OF ENGINEERING (MECHANICAL)

in the

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

October 2004



DEVELOPMENT OF A METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING STRESSES IN TRACK COMPONENTS

FRANCOIS PAULUS NAUDÉ

SUMMARY

Supervisor: Professor NJ Theron
Co-Supervisor: Doctor RD Fröhling
Department: Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering
University: University of Pretoria
Degree: Master of Engineering (Mech)

An existing analytical model, in use by Spoornet for the past two decades for calculating rail stresses on railway track, was revisited and improved. The model provided engineers with an easy-to-use program for evaluating track capacity and authorizing heavier loads on track. The model was modified to calculate rail and track component stresses more accurately. These modifications include the incorporation of current best practices and presentation of guidelines for the engineer on how to determine some input parameters which are normally difficult to obtain.

Firstly it was determined which input parameters the model was the most sensitive to. Thereafter it was determined whether or not the correct information would generally be readily available for those sensitive parameters. The most sensitive parameters were further investigated and test results, as well as best practice analytical methods, were used to establish nominal input values and guidelines for determining such values.

This research was necessary to establish whether or not the currently used analytical model still provided railway engineers with a useful tool and whether or not more modern and popular tools could validate or replace it.

After some modifications to the analytical model, it was proved that it provides engineers with a suitably accurate tool for calculating rail and track component stresses, without the need to build time-consuming models of the track under investigation. It showed that the model, after some modifications, is current with calculational methods in recent publications and provides an immediate answer to "what-if" questions without the need to run lengthy analyses.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank and acknowledge contributions by the following persons:

- All my former Spoornet colleagues for their invaluable assistance and support during this research.
- Mr Hannes Maree for supporting this project and for providing valuable information and guidelines.
- Mr Mike Tomas for sharing his expertise and unlimited supply of test data.
- Professor Nico Theron for his support, enthusiasm and guidance.
- Dr Robert Fröhling for his consistent vision, technical contributions and for his driving force without which this project may not have been completed!
- Spoornet and Land Mobility Technologies (Pty) Ltd for making this research possible.
- I wish to thank my wife for all the hours I spent in seclusion and for her everlasting understanding, support and love, and my daughter, Andrea, whose birthdate marked a D-date for the delivery of this dissertation and forced many a late night's work!

Lastly, I want to echo my wife and thank my Lord and Saviour, in heaven, here and everywhere, for the opportunity to have an occupation that keeps me busy (Ecclesiastes 3:10).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	VI
LIST OF TABLES	IX
NOMENCLATURE.....	X
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Problem statement.....	2
1.3. Objectives and scope of research	3
1.4. Conclusion.....	4
2 LITERATURE STUDY.....	5
2.1. History of the railways	5
2.2. Track design philosophy	6
2.3. Engineering Modelling of track	6
2.4. Available approaches relevant to this project	8
2.4.1. Finite element modelling.....	9
2.4.2. Dynamic modelling	10
2.4.3. Analytical methods.....	11
2.4.4. Combination of methods	11
2.5. Conclusion.....	12
3 THE ANALYTICAL METHOD	13
3.1. Input parameters.....	13
3.1.1. Dynamic factor	14
3.1.2. Support condition	16
3.1.3. Rail stresses	18
3.1.3.1. Comparison of rail stress calculations from the analytical method to those of Finite Element Analysis results	24
3.1.3.2. Rail stress results from field measurements	32
3.1.4. Sleeper reaction force:.....	34
3.2. Limitations of the analytical method.....	35
3.3. Sensitivity analyses	37
3.3.1. Quantitative sensitivity analysis.....	37
3.3.2. Qualitative sensitivity analysis.....	39
3.4. Conclusion.....	43

4	IMPROVEMENTS TO THE ANALYTICAL METHOD	44
4.1.	Investigations into the improvements of the analytical method.....	44
4.1.1.	Dynamic Factor	44
4.1.1.1.	Empirical Formulas	49
4.1.1.2.	Empirical Tests	51
4.1.1.3.	Calculating the dynamic factor	63
4.1.1.4.	Worked out example on Sweden test data (dynamic factor)	65
4.1.1.5.	Dynamic factor overview	68
4.1.2.	Lateral Force.....	70
4.1.2.1.	Empirical test results	71
4.1.2.2.	Lateral force analysis	85
4.1.3.	Eccentricity of vertical wheel load	85
4.1.3.1.	Eccentricity analysis	86
4.1.3.2.	Summary of the methodology to determine eccentricity vs. lateral load values	90
4.1.4.	Rail stresses calculation improvement	90
4.2.	Sensitivity study on modified analytical method	94
4.3.	Conclusion.....	95
5	METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING TRACK COMPONENT STRESSES.....	97
5.1.	Methodology	97
5.1.1.	Dynamic factor	97
5.1.2.	Support condition	100
5.1.3.	Material.....	101
5.1.4.	Rail section properties	102
5.1.5.	Vertical load eccentricity.....	102
5.1.6.	Bogie setup	104
5.1.7.	Rail seat stress	105
5.1.8.	Railhead and flange stresses	106
5.2.	Conclusion.....	107
6	CONCLUSION.....	108
6.1.	Summary of contributions	108
6.2.	Recommendations for future work.....	109
6.3.	Conclusion.....	110
	REFERENCES.....	111

APPENDIX A	113
Stochastic rail stress distributions (Different iterations with the same model)	
APPENDIX B	115
Histograms of Leandra test data	
APPENDIX C	117
Lateral force graphs of Iron Ore Export line data	
APPENDIX D	123
Summary of dynamic factors	

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3-1: Typical train speed distribution	16
Figure 3-2: Load decomposition for calculation of rail stresses	20
Figure 3-3: Position of shear centre / rotational axis	22
Figure 3-4: Finite element model – combination of 3D 8-node elements and 1D beam elements	25
Figure 3-5: Deflection curve of FEA models and analytical methods	26
Figure 3-6: Centred and off-centred load cases	28
Figure 3-7: Axial stress results from analytical and FEM model with centred vertical load and different support stiffnesses	28
Figure 3-8: Axial stress results from FEM model with 100kN off-centre load and 50kN lateral load on different support stiffnesses of 20, 50 and 100MPa/m (right side of rail)	29
Figure 3-9: Axial stress results from FEM model with 100kN off-centre load and 50kN lateral load on different support stiffnesses of 20, 50 and 100MPa/m (left side of rail)	29
Figure 3-10: Graphical representation of typical stress results from a FEM model with an off-centre load with a simultaneous lateral load (left) and a centre load only (right)	30
Figure 3-11: Strain gauge positions as pasted onto rail for field tests (23)	33
Figure 3-12: Rail stresses under different vertical and lateral loads (eccentricities unknown) (23)	34
Figure 3-13: Sensitivity analysis of parameters in component stress calculation spreadsheet	39
Figure 3-14: Stochastic distribution of rail stresses from the analytical method	40
Figure 3-15: Stochastic distribution of rail stresses with a number of parameters held constant	41
Figure 3-16: Stochastic distribution of rail stresses with a number of parameters held constant	42
Figure 4-1: Skid mark on rail running surface	46
Figure 4-2: Skid mark on wheel tread (“flat wheel”)	46
Figure 4-3: The presence of water and excessive track deformation pump mud to the surface	47
Figure 4-4: Measuring the depth of a dip joint (soft flash butt weld)	47
Figure 4-5: Dip joint identified by two wider patches on the contact band	48
Figure 4-6: Track geometry vertical alignment vs. dynamic loads	48
Figure 4-7: Comparison of dynamic factors from different empirical formulas	50
Figure 4-8: A complete unmanned weigh-in-motion weighbridge.	52
Figure 4-9: Calibration curves for weighbridge on No1. line at Saaiwater	53
Figure 4-10: Calibration curves for weighbridge on No2. line at Saaiwater	53
Figure 4-11: Calibration curves for weighbridge on No3. line at Saaiwater	53
Figure 4-12: Wheel impact load presentation	54
Figure 4-13: Dynamic impact loading distribution (number of wheels) – Line 1	55
Figure 4-14: Dynamic impact loading distribution (number of wheels) – Line 2	56
Figure 4-15: Dynamic impact loading distribution (number of wheels) – Line 3	56
Figure 4-16: Spoornet mobile laboratory for measuring strains, deflections and accelerations.	57

Figure 4-17: Instrumented wheelset installed in 30t per axle iron ore wagon	58
Figure 4-18: Leandra test site track layout	59
Figure 4-19: Leandra test site track geometry (curve radius)	60
Figure 4-20: Instrumented wheelset with “red eye”	60
Figure 4-21: Vertical forces measured at 20km/h with instrumented wheelset and 15t axle load	62
Figure 4-22: Vertical forces measured at 60km/h with instrumented wheelset and 15t axle load	62
Figure 4-23: Sweden test track geometry (curvature)	66
Figure 4-24: Sweden wheel-rail vertical forces @ 40km/h.	67
Figure 4-25: Dynamic factors from tests at Leandra and Sweden with different methods	67
Figure 4-26: Summary of all dynamic factors from this study	69
Figure 4-27: Track geometry lateral alignment vs. dynamic loads	71
Figure 4-28: Lateral left wheelset force at different speeds [km/h]	72
Figure 4-29: Lateral right wheelset force at different speeds [km/h]	73
Figure 4-30: Lateral left wheelset force of 1 st 100m at different speeds [km/h]	73
Figure 4-31: Lateral right wheelset force of 1 st 100m at different speeds [km/h]	74
Figure 4-32: Statistical summary of lateral left forces at Leandra test site	75
Figure 4-33: Statistical summary of lateral right forces at Leandra test site	76
Figure 4-34: Leandra test data: Vertical vs. Lateral Forces	77
Figure 4-35: Test train setup with three instrumented wheelsets at Iron Ore Export line tests	79
Figure 4-36: Statistical summary of lateral left forces at different speeds and axle loads	80
Figure 4-37: Statistical summary of lateral right forces at different speeds and axle loads	80
Figure 4-38: 30km/h test results of vertical and lateral loads (Iron Ore Export line tests)	81
Figure 4-39: 60km/h test results of vertical and lateral loads (Iron Ore Export line tests)	81
Figure 4-40: Iron Ore Export line vertical rail-wheel forces vs. lateral rail-wheel forces for 15t/axle tests	82
Figure 4-41: Iron Ore Export line vertical rail-wheel forces vs. lateral rail-wheel forces for 30t/axle tests	83
Figure 4-42: Statistical summary of lateral left forces at different speeds	84
Figure 4-43: Track layout for Medyna analysis	87
Figure 4-44: Eccentricity and lateral force sign convention of Medyna results	88
Figure 4-45: Vertical force eccentricity vs. lateral load	88
Figure 4-46: Profile properties of a 57kg/m rail	91
Figure 4-47: Rail stress comparison with railhead depth chosen at 47.5mm (100kN off-centred vertical load and 50kN lateral load)	92
Figure 4-48: Rail stress comparison with railhead depth chosen at 43.17mm vs. 47.5mm (100kN off-centred vertical load and 50kN lateral load)	93
Figure 4-49: Rail stress comparison with railhead depth chosen at 43.17mm (full profile scale)	94

Figure 4-50: Sensitivity analysis of parameters in component stress calculation spreadsheet	96
Figure 5-1: Dynamic factor parameters	98
Figure 5-2: Support condition parameters	101
Figure 5-3: Material parameters	101
Figure 5-4: Rail section properties and load position input	103
Figure 5-5: Rail section property list	104
Figure 5-6: Bogie setup	104
Figure 5-7: Rail deflection due to wheel spacing	105
Figure 5-8: Track setup	105
Figure 5-9: Rail axial stresses (without temperature stresses)	106
Figure 5-10: Rail axial stresses (with temperature stresses)	107

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1:	Input parameters of the analytical method	14
Table 3-2:	Conversion of foundation modulus values to support stiffness	27
Table 3-3:	Stress comparison between FEM and analytical model	31
Table 3-4:	Input parameter sensitivity analysis	38
Table 3-5:	Order of sensitive parameters	39
Table 3-6:	List of parameters modified in stochastic simulation results of Figure 3-15 and Figure 3-16	42
Table 3-7:	Most sensitive input parameters of the analytical method	43
Table 4-1:	List of empirical formulas for the calculation of a dynamic factor	49
Table 4-2:	Comparison of dynamic factors from different empirical formulas	50
Table 4-3:	Track setup at Saaiwater weighbridges	53
Table 4-4:	Test section lengths for statistical analysis	65
Table 4-5:	Dynamic factors as calculated with different methods	68
Table 4-6:	Statistical results from lateral left forces [kN] of Leandra test data	74
Table 4-7:	Statistical results from lateral right forces [kN] of Leandra test data	75
Table 4-8:	Correlation between vertical and lateral force data	77
Table 4-9:	Statistical results from lateral left forces [kN] of Iron Ore Export line test data	79
Table 4-10:	Statistical results from lateral right forces [kN] of Iron Ore Export line test data	79
Table 4-11:	Correlation between vertical and lateral force data	83
Table 4-12:	Statistical results from lateral left forces of Sweden test data	84
Table 4-13:	Possible worst-case scenarios for eccentricity and lateral load pairs (rail stress model coordinate system: positive eccentricity <i>opposing</i> positive lateral force)	89
Table 4-14:	New proposed railhead depths for different rail sections	94
Table 4-15:	Input parameter sensitivity analysis	95
Table 4-16:	Order of sensitive parameters	96
Table 5-1:	Test section lengths for statistical analysis	99
Table 5-2:	Foundation modulus values	100

NOMENCLATURE

A	Section area
A_e	Effective area
A_{rs}	Baseplate area
a	Sleeper spacing
a_0	Coefficient of locomotive maintenance
a_1	Railhead depth
a_2	Top of rail to top of flange
α	Coefficient of thermal expansion
b_1	Width of railhead
b_2	Width of rail flange
β	Inverse of the characteristic length
b_0	Coefficient of track maintenance
C	Foundation modulus
C_1	Torsion stiffness
c	Actual super elevation
D	Wheel diameter [m]
d	Section height
δ	Running top condition
E	Elasticity modulus
e	Eccentricity of vertical forces
F_0	Pretension force of fastening system
f	Flange thickness
fL	Factor of static load
g	Gravitational acceleration
h	Head NA to flange NA
h	Track cant
h_1	Distance from head NA to section rotation point
h_2	Distance from flange NA to section rotation point
η	Influence factor of adjoining wheels

NOMENCLATURE

I	Second moment of area
I_{yy}	Second moment of area yy
I_{zz}	Second moment of area zz
$I_{yy} \text{ Head}$	Second moment of area yy head
$I_1 \text{ or } I_{zh}$	Second moment of area zz head
$I_2 \text{ or } I_{zf}$	Second moment of area zz flange
ϕ	Dynamic factor
k	Equivalent spring stiffness (MN/m)
κ	Characteristic value
λ	Characteristic length
L	Lateral load
NA	Neutral Axis
n	Position of lateral force below rail top
P	Static wheel load
p_c	Vehicle centre of gravity height
Q	Dynamic wheel load
q'	Reaction force per unit area
R	Curve radius
R'	Sleeper reaction force
s	Track width (gauge)
σ	Stress
σ_{rs}	Mean contact pressure between rail and sleeper
T	Torsion
ΔT	Temperature change
t	Web thickness
t'	Statistical confidence level
ΔT	Max temp change
UTS	Ultimate Tensile Strength
U	Track modulus

NOMENCLATURE

ν	Poisson
V	Speed (<i>km/h</i>)
ν	Type of sleeper
x	Distance from wheel
x_1	Distance from wheel in front
x_2	Distance from wheel behind
x_3	Distance from third wheel
Y	Lateral load
yk	Top to section NA
z	Deflection of beam