# **OPTI 2005**

## Simulated annealing optimization of walls, portal and box reinforced concrete road structures

by

Vidosa, Yepes, Alcalá, Carrera and Perea



UNIVERSIDAD Politecnica De valencia Technical University of Valencia Department of Construction Engineering Spain



## 1. Structures object of the study.

A) Cantilever RC earth retaining walls (Internal Report CST/GPRC-01, Alcalá)



B) Portal RC road frames (Internal Report CST/GPRC-02, Carrera)



C) Box RC road frames (Internal Report CST/GPRC-03, Perea)



traffic loading

### 2. Variables and parameters.

- 2.1. Walls: 26 continuous and discrete variables:
- 4 geometrical
- 4 concrete and steel grades
- 18 variables of steel reinforcement setup



### 2. Variables and parameters.

2.2. Variables for the RC portal road frames: 28 variables; 5 geometrical, 3 concrete grades and 20 types of steel reinforcement.



## 2. Variables and parameters.

2.3. Variables for the box frame road structures: 44 variables: 2 geometrical, 2 concrete grades and 40 types of steel reinforcement.



## 3. Feasibility of solutions.

- Loads according to national IAP prescriptions for road bridges.
- ULS:
  - sliding and overturning (only walls)
  - flexure
  - shear
- SLS:
  - flexure (cracking control)
  - deflections:
    - 1/150 in walls
    - 1/250 for quasipermanent loading in frames
- Fatigue of concrete (box frames only)

### 4. Optimization procedure method.



#### **Methodology**

- step 1 Generation of random solutions (random walk)
- step 2 Study of best moves by descent local search
- step 3 Calibration of simulated annealing / threshold accepting methods
- (9 runs per analysis: minimum, mean and standard deviation)

### 5. Results

#### 5.1. Wall of 7.0 m height.

Variable	Permissible stress = $0.3 \text{ N/mm}^2$		
	Reference	Deflections unrestricted	Deflections limited
b	0.25-0.70 m	0.265 m	0.607 m
р	0.75 m	0.833 m	0.770 m
t	1.70 m	1.248 m	0.900 m
с	0.70 m	0.568 m	0.605 m
$f_{ck,ste}$	25	35	30
${ m f}_{ m ck,foo}$	25	25	25
f <sub>yk,ste</sub>	500	500	500
${ m f}_{ m yk,foo}$	500	500	500
A <sub>1</sub>	$7.70 \text{ cm}^2$	6.946 cm <sup>2</sup>	11.442 cm <sup>2</sup>
A <sub>2</sub>	$7.70 \text{ cm}^2$	<b>29.602</b> cm <sup>2</sup>	1.431 cm <sup>2</sup>
A <sub>3</sub>	0	26.730 cm <sup>2</sup>	10.332 cm <sup>2</sup>
A <sub>4</sub>	4.35 cm <sup>2</sup>	1.000 cm <sup>2</sup>	1.149 cm <sup>2</sup>
A <sub>5</sub>	3.74 cm <sup>2</sup>	3.400 cm <sup>2</sup>	$6.552 \text{ cm}^2$
A <sub>6</sub>	7.73 cm <sup>2</sup>	5.661 cm <sup>2</sup>	13.120 cm <sup>2</sup>
A <sub>7</sub>	0	0	0
A <sub>8</sub>	13.40 cm <sup>2</sup>	16.837 cm <sup>2</sup>	16.958 cm <sup>2</sup>
A <sub>9</sub>	$10.05 \text{ cm}^2$	1.000 cm <sup>2</sup>	17.013 cm <sup>2</sup>
A <sub>10</sub>	0	19.549 cm <sup>2</sup>	1.000 cm <sup>2</sup>
A <sub>11</sub>	0	1.447 cm <sup>2</sup>	1.000 cm <sup>2</sup>
A <sub>12</sub>	3.74-1.67 cm <sup>2</sup> (low-up)	3.955 cm <sup>2</sup>	8.776 cm <sup>2</sup>
A <sub>13</sub>	0	0	0
L <sub>1</sub>	2.18 m	2.954 m	0.849 m
L <sub>2</sub>	0	0.852 m	0.834 m
L <sub>3</sub>	0	0	0
$L_4$	0	1.248 m	0.745 m
$L_5$	0	0.568 m	0.689 m



#### Simulated annealing data:

- Markov chains of 1000 iterations
- Cooling coefficient of 0.80
- Best move 16 in 26 variables
- Running time 21 minutes in Visual Basic 6.3 with an Excel I/O interface

#### **Conclusion:**

Importance of limitation of the deflection of the stem

### 5. Results

#### 5.2. Portal frame case study B.

Geometric variables			
h	0.375 m		
b	0.400 m		
с	0.400 m		
р	0.950 m		
t	0.750 m		
Concrete grades			
upper slab	HA-25		
wall	HA-25		
foundation	HA-25		
Reinforcement			
A <sub>1</sub>	15ø12/m		
A <sub>2</sub>	10ø20/m		
A <sub>6</sub>	12.06 cm <sup>2</sup> /m		
A <sub>7</sub>	15ø12/m		
A <sub>8</sub>	8ø16/m		
A <sub>9</sub>	12ø8/m		
A <sub>15</sub>	10ø16/m		
A <sub>16</sub>	12ø10/m		
A <sub>20</sub>	9.05 cm <sup>2</sup> /m		

#### Simulated annealing data:

- Markov chains of 375 iterations
- Cooling coefficient of 0.70
- Best move 4 in 28 variables
- Running time 10.75 hours in an AMD 1.49 GHz in Visual Basic 6.3



Conclusion: Importance of including fatigue of concrete.

SIMULATED ANNEALING OPTIMIZATION OF WALLS, PORTAL AND BOX REINFORCED CONCRETE ROAD STRUCUTRES

### 5. Results

#### 5.3. Box frame case study C.

#### Simulated annealing data:

- Markov chains of 500 iterations
- Cooling coefficient of 0.90
- Best move 9 in 44 variables
- Running time 47 minutes in an Pentium IV 2.40 GHz in Fortran



Conclusion: Importance of including fatigue of concrete and deflections.

## 7. Conclusions.

- Simulated annealing feasibility as an optimization procedure for RC road structures.
- Importance of limitting the deflections in wall analysis.
- Importance of deflections and fatigue of concrete in analysis of frame road structures.

## 8. Current and future work.

- Building frames
- Vaults
- Abutments of bridges
- Bridge hollow piers
- Prestressed concrete slab-decks for flyovers
- Composite decks for flyovers



# **OPTI 2005**

## Simulated annealing optimization of walls, portal and box reinforced concrete road structures

by

Vidosa, Yepes, Alcalá, Carrera and Perea



UNIVERSIDAD Politecnica De valencia Technical University of Valencia Department of Construction Engineering Spain

