

# Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division

West Bethesda, MD 20817-5700

---

---

**NSWCCD-TR-65-97/18 April 1997**

Survivability, Structures, and Materials Directorate  
Technical Report

## **An Experimental Investigation of the Ultimate Strength of Stiffened Panels**

### **- Volume 2, Test Data**

by

Gregory J. White (USNA),  
ENS Robert H. Vroman (USNR),  
David P. Kihl (NSWCCD), and  
Sara E. Mourning (USNA)

100% QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19971015 021



---

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

---



## DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER, CARDEROCK DIVISION  
9500 MACARTHUR BOULEVARD  
WEST BETHESDA MD 20817-5700

9100  
Ser 65-43  
12 May 97

From: Commander, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division  
To: Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command (SEA 03R)  
Subj: RELIABILITY BASED STRUCTURAL DESIGN PROGRAM  
Ref: (a) Program Element PE063564N, Project S2036-01, Milestone H5, Subtask IIC  
Encl: (1) NSWCCD-TR-65-97/18, *An Experimental Investigation of the Ultimate Strength of Stiffened Panels - Volume 1, Results and Analyses*  
(2) NSWCCD-TR-65-97/18, *An Experimental Investigation of the Ultimate Strength of Stiffened Panels - Volume 2, Test Data*

1. Reference (a) directed the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division (NSWCCD) and the U.S. Naval Academy to investigate the failure mode and ultimate strength of longitudinally-stiffened plate commonly used in ship structures such as decks, bottoms, bulkheads and side shells. Enclosure (1) presents results for six grillages which were tested to collapse in the Grillage Test Fixture at the U.S. Naval Academy. Each grillage consisted of three stiffened panels (bays). They were nominally identical and represented approximately a 1/3rd scale model of typical warship deck structure. The grillages were made of longitudinal and transverse T-shaped stiffeners welded to flat plate; all pieces were made of mild steel. Three of the six specimens were tested under in-plane axial load only; the remaining three were tested under a combination of axial in-plane load and initial lateral pressure. The test specimens were fully instrumented with strain gages and displacement transducers to quantify the structural behavior up to and beyond ultimate collapse. Although representative plots of structural behavior are illustrated in Enclosure (1), a much more comprehensive series of test results is provided, for each test, in Enclosure (2).
2. The report compares test results from these panels with theoretical predictions of failure mode and stress. Data obtained from a literature search of similar tests performed at other facilities were also used for comparison. In so doing, we have evaluated the accuracy of theoretical predictions over a wide range of test conditions. A finite element model of the grillage specimen subjected to compressive axial was also constructed and compared to the test results.
3. The in-plane axial load test results were found to be between 4% and 8% higher than the theoretical prediction. The predictions are considered to be quite good and slightly conservative. The test results with lateral load were found to be 4% higher for the 5 psi case and about 20%

Subj: RELIABILITY BASED STRUCTURAL DESIGN PROGRAM

higher for the 10 psi and 20 psi loadings. The poorer agreement at higher pressures, although conservative, is attributed to a shortcoming in the way lateral deformations are assumed to magnify the axial in-plane stresses. The finite element results were found to accurately predict the ultimate strength of the grillage specimen, but did not produce good estimates of the overall deformations. Better agreement may be possible by modeling the stiffener attachments to the plating and including initial geometric imperfections. Results of the literature search revealed very few tests have been conducted on multi-bay specimens, and even fewer with combine in-plane and axial loads.

4. Comments or questions may be referred to the principal investigator, Dr. David P. Kihl, Code 653; telephone (301) 227-1956; e-mail, kihl@oasys.dt.navy.mil.



J. E. BEACH  
By direction

Copy to:

COMNAVSEASYSCOM WASHINGTON DC

SEA 03H (w/o encl (2))  
SEA 03H3 (w/o encl (2))  
SEA 03H3 (Engle) (w/o encl (2))  
SEA 03P (w/o encl (2))  
SEA 03P1  
SEA 03P1 (Bourne) (w/o encl (2))  
SEA 03P1 (Kadala) (w/o encl (2))  
SEA 03P1 (Nappi) (w/o encl (2))  
SEA 03P1 (Waldman) (w/o encl (2))  
SEA 03P1 (Walz) (w/o encl (2))  
SEA 03P4 (Kurzweil) (w/o encl (2))  
SEA 03P4 (Snyder) (w/o encl (2))  
SEA 03R3 (Hough) (w/o encl (2))  
SEA 03R1 (Webster) (w/o encl (2))

USNA ANNAPOLIS MD

Dept. of Naval Architecture, Ocean, and Marine  
Engineering  
(White)  
(Mouring)

DTIC FORT BELVOIR VA

NAVSURFWARCENT CADEROCKDIV

BETHESDA MD  
Codes 3442 (TIC)  
60 (w/o encl)  
601 (w/o encl)  
602/6091 (w/o encl)  
65  
65R (2 copies, encl (1)) (1 copy, encl (2))  
65 (files, w/o encl)  
651 (w/o encl (2))  
651 (Adamchak)  
653 (4 copies, encl (1)) (4 copies, encl (2))  
653 (Kihl)  
654 (w/o encl (2))  
654 (Melton) (w/o encl (2))

**Naval Surface Warfare Center  
Carderock Division**  
West Bethesda, MD 20817-5700

---

---

**NSWCCD-TR-65-97/18 April 1997**

Survivability, Structures, and Materials Directorate  
Technical Report

**An Experimental Investigation of the Ultimate  
Strength of Stiffened Panels**

**- Volume 2, Test Data**

by  
Gregory J. White (USNA),  
ENS Robert H. Vroman (USNR),  
David P. Kihl (NSWCCD), and  
Sara E. Mourning (USNA)

---

---

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

---

---

## **REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE April 1997	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE An Experimental Investigation of the Ultimate Strength of Stiffened Panels - Volume 2, Test Data		5. FUNDING NUMBERS PE063564N S203601	
6. AUTHOR(S) Gregory J. White, Robert H. Vroman, David P. Kihl, Sara E. Mourning			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division 9500 MacArthur Boulevard West Bethesda, MD 20817-5700		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NSWCCD-TR-65-97/18	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Sea Systems Command (SEA 03R) 2531 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 22242-5160		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)  A series of multi-bay steel grillages were tested to collapse in the Grillage Test Fixture at the U.S. Naval Academy. The grillages were nominally 1/3-scale models of typical warship deck structures. The tests were part of a student research project investigating reliability-based design methods for stiffened panels. The six nominally identical grillage specimens were made from ordinary steel and consisted of three panels (bays) stiffened longitudinally and transversely with T-shaped stiffeners. Three specimens were tested under in-plane loads only, and three were tested with a combination of in-plane loads and initial lateral pressure. During testing, data were collected from strain gages and displacement transducers to quantify the structural behavior of the specimens under load. Theoretical predictions of failure mode and stress level are compared to observed values. The test results are also compared to results from similar tests conducted at other facilities. A finite element method analysis of the grillages subjected to compressive axial load was conducted using ABAQUS and the results compared to the test results. The data from past tests and these tests are used to evaluate the accuracy of theoretical predictions over a wide range of test conditions.			
14. SUBJECT TERMS steel grillage ABAQUS reliability-based design methods		T-shaped stiffeners	15. NUMBER OF PAGES 176
			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR

## Table of Contents

	Page
Background .....	2
Introduction .....	2
Data Presentation Format .....	4
Test Results .....	5
References.....	14
Appendix - Grillage Data.....	A-1

## Figures

1a. Dimensions of the Grillage Specimens .....	8
1b. Web-Stiffener Connection Details .....	8
2. Schematic of the USNA Grillage Test Fixture .....	9
3. Strain Gage Locations for Test Series .....	10
4. Geometry of the Stiffener-Plate Cross-Section Showing Elastic Neutral Axis .....	11
5. Geometry of the Stiffener-Plate Cross-Section Showing Plastic Neutral Axis .....	12
6. Typical Grillage Specimen Before Testing .....	13

## Tables

1. Loads applied to Test Specimens .....	7
--	---

## Administrative Information

The work described herein was performed by the Department of Naval Architecture, Ocean, and Marine Engineering at the U.S. Naval Academy and the Structures and Composite Department, Code 65, of the Survivability, Structures, and Materials Directorate at the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division under the sponsorship of the Naval Sea Systems Command (SEA 03R3). This report is submitted in partial fulfillment of Milestone H5, Sub task IIC of the Reliability Based Structural Design Program PE063564N, Project S2036-01.

## Background

A series of six scaled grillage tests were conducted at the United States Naval Academy (USNA), Annapolis, Maryland during calendar years 1994 and 1995. Results of these efforts are documented in two other reports.<sup>1,2</sup> These reports contained only enough pertinent data to show representative behavior and support conclusions. Since other data had been collected during these tests, but not specifically included in the preceding report, it was decided that a basic data archival report would be of value as the experimental study of grillage behavior progressed.

This report therefore contains a brief introductory section which defines the overall series of tests and measurements. The data collected during each test are provided in the appendices. Most of the data are presented in graphical form and grouped by test. To facilitate comparison of data between one test and another, each section of data is organized in the same format with similar data plots presented in the same order.

## Introduction

The test specimens consisted of orthogonally stiffened plate representative of ship hull girder structure. Each test specimen contained four longitudinal tee stiffeners which ran the full length of the test specimens. At the third points, the longitudinal stiffeners passed through deeper transverse stiffeners, forming a three bay test specimen. Plating in the outer two bays was slightly thicker to reduce the applied stress in the outer bays and allow a uniform load transition into the center test section. Figure 1 shows the basic test specimen which was used in each of the six tests.

The test specimens were mounted in a testing fixture capable of applying in-plane axial

compressive load, up to 360,000 pounds, into the end of the test specimen and lateral pressure load, up to 40 psi, over the plate (as opposed to stiffener) side of the test specimen. The test fixture is shown in Figure 2.

The test specimens were instrumented with sensors to monitor the structural behavior during the initial loading and ultimate collapse of the specimen. Sixty strain gages were placed on each test specimen at points of interest to measure induced strain. The strain gages were typically laid out in pairs to sense local and/or overall modes of structural instability. Strain gage locations are shown in Figure 3. Dial gages and potentiometers were also placed at various locations over each test specimen to measure deformation of the specimen as it collapsed. The axial deformation measurements were initially made using string potentiometers positioned along either longitudinal side of test specimen. Later, these axial deformation measurements were supplemented with other types of displacement transducers (dial gages and linearly variable displacement transducers (LVDTs)) when it was discovered that the string potentiometers exhibited hysteresis as the specimen was unloaded. In some cases, longitudinal displacement was also measured by the actuator positioning LVDT. The actuator LVDT measurement, however, would also contain the elongation of the fixture itself, in addition to the compression of the test specimen. Applied load and axial deformation measurements were considered most important, since they would eventually be used to generate load shortening curves. Load shortening curves serve as the basic input for some ultimate strength prediction computer programs. Data from the dial gages, which were positioned above the center bay of the grillage, were visually monitored during the first few tests. However, the limitations of visually recording measurements, especially during a destructive test, rendered much of this data suspect. These data were therefore not included in this document.

The test specimens were positioned in the fixture such that the center of the load head

coincided with the average distance between the calculated elastic and plastic neutral axis locations shown in Figures 4 and 5. Figure 6 shows a typical test specimen mounted in the test fixture.

The series of six tests were all conducted in the same fixture on nominally identical specimens. The first three specimens, #0494, #0894 and #1094, were all tested under in-plane axial compressive load to estimate the scatter in the ultimate collapse load and overall response. The next three specimens, #0595, #0695 and #0995, were subjected to various amounts of lateral pressure before the axial in-plane compressive load was applied. Table 1 is provided to show the different load conditions considered and the ultimate load carried by each of the six test specimens.

#### Data Presentation Format

Test data are provided in the appendix of this report. The appendix contains data from the specimens subjected to in-plane axial load only, i.e. tests #0494, 0894 and 1094, and data from specimens subjected to a combination of in-plane axial load and initial lateral pressure, i.e. #0595, 0695 and 0995.

The data obtained from each test were similar and are therefore arranged in the same order and in the same format for each test specimen. At the beginning of each section, the first plot shows a time history of the compressive load applied to the test specimen, where "time" is measured as data records acquired. This plot shows how the specimen was loaded in increments, periodically unloaded and reloaded up to and beyond failure.

The next plot is one of end shortening versus compressive load applied. As discussed earlier, the plots may vary somewhat from specimen to specimen, depending on how the end

shortening measurement was made (string pots, actuator LVDT, or dial gages).

The next four pages illustrate the condition of the specimen before and after the test. Before load was applied, measurements were made on each test specimen to quantify the out-of-plane imperfections in the flat plate. Results are shown in both a contour plot and a topographical "relief" type plot. The same types of measurements were made again after the test was completed and are provided in the same forms for comparison.

The remainder of the figures in each group of data show plots of measured strain versus applied compressive load. The gages shown on each plot are grouped conveniently to show strain profiles across a section of the grillage, across the flange of a stiffener, or on sections of plating between stiffeners.

### Test Results

All of the grillages were tested to collapse and well into the post buckling range. As shown in the time history plots of the loading sequence, several loading and unloadings of the grillage were performed. It is apparent from the time histories that each of the grillages continued to carry a significant portion of the ultimate load (on the order of 60%) after surpassing the ultimate load.

By periodically unloading the grillage and reapplying the load, the linearity of the grillage response and the magnitude of permanent deformations can be determined. After the first loading, all subsequent unloadings show an offset loading line with nominally the same slope.

The grillages collapsed in a mode triggered by a compression failure of the plating. This determination was made by an evaluation of the stress/strain relationships in the center bay of each grillage specimen. By examining the strain gage readings at each load increment, it was

determined that the plating was the first element to reach the yield stress of the material. A characteristic out-of-plane bending of the grillage was typically observed. Also apparent was the rotation of the stiffeners into an "S" shaped pattern. This observation indicates stiffener instability was ultimately the cause of the panel collapse. The ultimate collapse occurred between the transverse frames in the center bay.

When lateral pressure was present, the ultimate strength in-plane load carrying capacity of the grillages was reduced. In all cases, the lateral pressure was applied first while the ends of the grillage were held in a constant position. As the in-plane load was applied, the lateral pressure was monitored and manually adjusted to try and maintain a constant pressure on the test specimen. The lateral pressure was applied to the plate side of the grillage, forcing the grillage to bend and deflect upwards. The lateral pressure applied to the second series of grillage tests was varied from 5 psi for the first grillage, to 10 psi for the second grillage, and finally to 20 psi for the last specimen.

The failure mechanism observed in each case when lateral pressure was applied, was the same as that observed under axial load only. The uniform lateral pressure caused an initial deflection at the midspan of the stiffeners and an initial deflection of the midspan of the center plate. The collapse started in the center panel of the center bay and proceeded outward to the stiffeners. The local buckling of the plate between the stiffeners appeared to initiate bending of the stiffener web, causing it to bulge away from the upward deflection of the plate. This, in turn, causes the stiffener flange to rotate towards the center of the panel.

The three tests conducted with only in-plane loads show some scatter in ultimate load carrying capacity. Though nominally the same grillage, there were some differences in the "as tested" dimensions as well as differences in the initial deformations of the stiffeners.

When lateral pressure is present, there is a decrease in the experimental collapse stress.

A greater decrease in collapse strength is observed as the lateral pressure is increased. The plate bending caused by the lateral load usually induces a simple half-wave pattern as one would expect. Depending on the aspect ratio of the plate, this pattern will not likely match the critical buckling mode shape for the plate and therefore may actually increase the plate critical buckling stress. The lateral pressure does, however, cause the stiffeners to deflect in a sinusoidal half wave, which induces another component of stress in the panel; one which magnifies the effect of the axial stress. If the failure mode for the panel is plate-induced, moderate levels of lateral pressure may have almost no overall effect on strength, since the increase in the plate critical buckling stress may more than offset the magnified axial stress due to the deformation.

Surprisingly, the initial deflection of the plating has little to do with the ultimate strength of the panel. This is due to the fact that the usual form of initial deflection of plating is a single longitudinal and transverse wave. This mode shape is actually much stronger in axial compression than the preferred mode shape. The net result is that there can be an increase in axial strength of the plating with initial deflection. This idea ties in with the effect of lateral pressure, which also tends to induce an initial deflection of the plate in a one half-wave pattern. However, initial deflections of the stiffener appear to be more important than plating deformations in determining both the failure mode as well as the failure load. Typically, any initial deflection tends to push the stiffener in a direction which corresponds to a primary failure mode shape. The relationship between stiffener geometry and the tolerance allowed on initial deflections is an area which needs further investigation.

Table 1 - Loads applied to Test Specimens

Test	Ultimate Load (kips)	Ultimate Stress (ksi)	Lateral Pressure (psi)
0494	325.857	37.225	0
0894	300.812	34.781	0
1094	312.914	35.772	0
0595	315.663	36.104	5
0695	305.994	34.835	10
0995	296.356	34.020	20




Figure 1a - Dimensions of the Grillage Specimens




Figure 1b - Web-Stiffener Connection Details






Figure 2 - Schematic of the USNA Grillage Test Fixture

## Forward Bay



## Center Bay



## Aft Bay




Figure 3 - Strain Gage Locations for Test Series

### Calculation of the Height of the Elastic Neutral Axis




Figure 4 - Geometry of the Stiffener-Plate Cross-Section Showing Elastic Neutral Axis

All dimensions in inches

## Calculation of the Height of the Plastic Neutral Axis




Figure 5 - Geometry of the Stiffener-Plate Cross-Section Showing Plastic Neutral Axis

All dimensions in inches




Figure 6 - Typical Grillage Specimen Before Testing

## References

1. White, G.J., R.H. Vroman, D.P. Kihl, and S.E. Mouring, An Experimental Investigation of the Ultimate Strength of Stiffened Panels - Volume 1, Results and Analysis, NSWCCD-TR-65-97/18, April 1997.
2. Vroman, Robert H., An Analysis into the Uncertainty of Stiffened Panel Ultimate Strength, Trident Scholar Research Report No. 234, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD., May, 1995.

## Appendix


### Grillage Data


The following table provides an index to the grillage data.

Load	Specimen	Data	Pages
Axial	0494	Load History	A-2
		Load vs. End Shortening	A-3
		Pre-Test Survey	A-4 thru A-5
		Post-Test Survey	A-6 thru A-7
		Strain vs. Applied Load	A-8 thru A-23
Axial	0894	Load History	A-24
		Load vs. End Shortening	A-25
		Pre-Test Survey	A-26 thru A-27
		Post-Test Survey	A-28 thru A-29
		Strain vs. Applied Load	A-30 thru A-48
Axial	1094	Load History	A-49
		Load vs. End Shortening	A-50
		Pre-Test Survey	A-51 thru A-52
		Post-Test Survey	A-53 thru A-54
		Strain vs. Applied Load	A-55 thru A-73
Axial and Lateral	0595	Load History	A-74
		Load vs. End Shortening	A-75
		Pre-Test Survey	A-76 thru A-77
		Post-Test Survey	A-78 thru A-79
		Strain vs. Applied Load	A-80 thru A-98
Axial and Lateral	0695	Load History	A-99
		Load vs. End Shortening	A-100
		Pre-Test Survey	A-101 thru A-102
		Post-Test Survey	A-103 thru A-104
		Strain vs. Applied Load	A-105 thru A-123
Axial and Lateral	0995	Load History	A-124
		Load vs. End Shortening	A-125
		Pre-Test Survey	A-126 thru A-127
		Post-Test Survey	A-128 thru A-129
		Strain vs. Applied Load	A-130 thru A-148


**Specimen 0494 Axial Load**

## Load History




**Load vs. End Shortening**

## Pre-Test Survey




All measurements are in inches


**Pre-Test Survey**





## Post-Test Survey




**Post-Test Survey**





**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**





**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


## Strain vs. Applied Load




**Strain vs. Applied Load**


## Strain vs. Applied Load




**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Specimen 0894 Axial Load**

**Load History**

**Load vs. End-Shortening**

## Pre-Test Survey




All measurements in inches

**Pre-Test Survey**





## Post-Test Survey





All measurements in inches


**Post-Test Survey**




**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


## Strain vs. Applied Load





### Strain vs. Applied Load





**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


### Strain vs. Applied Load





### Strain vs. Applied Load





## Strain vs. Applied Load




**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Specimen 1094 Axial Load**

**Load History**

Load vs. End Shortening




## Pre-Test Survey




All measurements are in inches

**Pre-Test Survey**





Post-Test Survey





All measurements are in inches

**Post-Test Survey**





**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**

### Strain vs. Applied Load




**Strain vs. Applied Load**


### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




**Strain vs. Applied Load**


### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




**Strain vs. Applied Load**

### Strain vs. Applied Load





### Strain vs. Applied Load




**Specimen 0595 Axial and Lateral Load**

### Load History



**Load vs End Shortening**

Pre-Test Survey




All measurements are in inches


**Pre-Test Survey**





## Post-Test Survey




**Post-Test Survey**




**Strain vs. Load**


**Strain vs. Load**

### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




**Strain vs. Applied Load**


### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load





### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




**Specimen 0695      Axial and Lateral Load**

**Load History**

## Load vs. End Shortening




## Pre-Test Survey




**Pre-Test Survey**





## Post-Test Survey





**Post-Test Survey**





**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Specimen 0995 Axial and Lateral Load**


## Load History




## Load vs. End Shortening




## Pre-Test Survey




**Pre-Test Survey**




## Post-Test Survey





**Post-Test Survey**




### Strain vs. Applied Load




**Strain vs. Applied Load**


**Strain vs. Applied Load**

**Strain vs. Applied Load**


### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




**Strain vs. Applied Load**


### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load




### Strain vs. Applied Load



### Strain vs. Applied Load



### Strain vs. Applied Load



### Strain vs. Applied Load

