

QUASI-STATIC STOCHASTIC MODELLING OF TRACK RESPONSE

Milan MORAVČÍK

Department of Mechanics
Faculty of Civil Engineering
University of Transport and Communications
Žilina, Slovak Republic

Abstract

The field test revealed that the vertical rail deflection under various environments has a random character. The quasi-static linear rail response under vertical wheel load $P = 1 \text{ kN}$ — the rail deflection and the bending moments of the rail with constant spacing discrete supports is presented. The stiffness of fasteners, sleepers and subgrade are included by a set of discrete springs. The linear finite element procedure is applied, using the IDA computer program. The parametric studies are carried out to examine the effect of randomly variable stiffness of supports and modelled reduction in stiffness of some supports. The deterministic response results and random ones are compared.

Keywords: track stiffness, track model, response, linear analysis.

1. Introduction

During the lifetime of the track its components operate under conditions of repeated variable loading, variability of the foundation, irregularities of the rail, etc., which introduce stochastic components in the problem and the response of the track structure is of a random character. The quasi-static response of the track for these conditions can be described in terms of the deflection of the rail loaded by the concentrated force P , in the form of equation

$$L[v(x)] = \delta(x) \cdot P, \quad (1)$$

where $v(x)$ is the vertical deflection of the rail at point x , L is a linear differential operator, $\delta(x)$ is the Dirac delta function.

The formulation of the problem and the boundary conditions of Eq. (1) require the deflection, its slope, the bending moment and shear force at infinite distance to right as well as to the left of the force P to be zero, see Fig. 1. Under these assumptions the beam is in a so-called quasi-stationary state, i.e., its behaviour depends on the distance from the moving point of application of the force, and the origin is moving together with the moving force P . In this paper the static case of the problem is analysed, i.e.,




Fig. 1. Linear track models: a) Beam on deterministic Winkler foundation; b) Beam on a randomly variable Winkler foundation

without the dynamic effect. For more than one load, a solution may be obtained by superposition of the various wheel loads P . In a standard lin-




Fig. 2. Linear track model of a finite long beam on discrete elastic supports

ear analysis, the deterministic quasi-static response was tackled by several authors [2], while the stochastic character was investigated in a few cases only.

In order to develop a rational method taking into account the variability of the input parameters, it is necessary to formulate the problem in a stochastic framework. Such stochastic formulation consists of two main elements:

- (a) Characterisation of the uncertainty of the input parameters;
- (b) Development of the relationship between the statistical characteristics of the output.

The aim of the paper is to present the quasi-static rail response for various support stiffness conditions. The rail response analysis is concerned

REPLACED LINEAR SPRING CHARACTERISTICS




Fig. 3. Idealised linear spring characteristic \$k_r\$ of discrete rail supports

with the determination of the vertical displacement \$v(x)\$, bending moments \$M(x)\$ and support reactions \$R_j\$. Stiffness of the foundation is a random variable and other input parameters of the problem are considered as deterministic data. In this analysis, the track components such as fasteners, sleepers, ballast and subgrade are modelled by a set of vertical springs. The finite element method is used to find the response. Using the IDA computer program [3], the analysis has been conducted to investigate the effect of the variability of the support stiffness on the response. Practically, we could take into account other random factors of the problem, such as irregularities of the rail or the load of the rail. We suppose these sets are stochastically independent and we can investigate their effect in detail.

2. Linear Track Model

In a standard linear analysis the railway track structure consisting of rails, pads, sleepers, and subgrade is modelled as an infinitely long beam resting on a deterministic continuous Winkler foundation (Fig. 1a). The model just mentioned has been widely accepted for the calculation of the rail response and it may be generally extended to a stochastic case, see Fig. 1b.

For a static case of the Bernoulli-Euler beam on elastic foundation, the operator \$L\$ takes a form

$$L[v(x)] = \frac{d^4 v(x)}{dx^4} + c(x) \cdot v(x), \tag{2}$$




Fig. 4. Nonstationary modelled reduction in stiffness of some supports

and the model in Fig. 1b is described by the stochastic differential equation

$$EI \frac{d^4 v(x)}{dx^4} + \tilde{c}(x) \cdot v(x) = P, \quad (3)$$

where $v(x)$ is the vertical deflection of point x on the rail axis, EI is the constant bending stiffness of the rail, P is vertical wheel loads and $\tilde{c}(x)$ is the stiffness of the foundation that varies randomly along its length coordinate x .




Fig. 5. Stationary randomly variable stiffness of the discrete supports

In Eq. (3) the coefficient is of a random character and the equation belongs to the class of differential equations with random coefficients. The solution of Eq. (3) is cumbersome, and one of possible approximation techniques is the perturbation approach. FRÝBA in [5] has applied this method to a similar dynamic problem. Because of difficulties connected with the solution of the stochastic differential equation (3) a finite element model of the rail, a finite beam resting on discrete elastic supports with constant spacing (Fig. 2), was introduced and solved. The spring stiffness of discrete rail supports include the stiffnesses of fasteners, sleepers and of the subgrade. The spring supports are attached to the rail at the sleepers, see Fig. 2.

The stochastic finite element method [7], the direct Monte Carlo simulation or direct finite element method (FEM) simulation are suitable methods of solving the problem. Because of the cost of the Monte Carlo simulation, the simple direct FEM was applied to estimate the track response. In the FEM, the structure is approximated by a set of discrete elements interconnected at nodal points, see Fig. 2. By using the virtual displacement theorem, the equilibrium equation of the set has the form

$$\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{P}, \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{K} is the stiffness matrix, \mathbf{P} is the force vector, \mathbf{v} is the vector of nodal displacements.

The elements of \mathbf{K} are given in terms of the geometry variables \mathbf{L} , elasticity variables \mathbf{E} and spring stiffness k . Nodal displacements \mathbf{v} are solved from Eq. (4) directly

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{K}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{P}. \quad (5)$$




Fig. 6. Results of the standard deterministic analysis for the four stiffness levels




Fig. 7. Response analysis for the nonstationary modelled reduction in stiffness of some supports corresponding to Fig. 4e

The set of load effects $S = f(L, E, P, k)$ is correspondingly related to the nodal displacements v by

$$S = D \cdot v, \tag{6}$$

where the elements of D are given in terms of L and E as well.

Inserting Eq. (5) in Eq. (6) yields

$$S = D \cdot K^{-1} \cdot P = C \cdot P, \tag{7}$$

where $C = P \cdot K^{-1}$ is a matrix binding the load effects and external loads.

This linear finite element procedure was applied using the IDA computer program [3].




Fig. 8. Response analysis for the nonstationary modelled reduction in stiffness of some supports corresponding to Fig. 4g

3. Modelling of the Input Parameters

The track stiffness, $k \text{ (Nm}^{-1}\text{)}$, is defined as

$$k = \frac{P}{v}, \tag{8}$$

where P is the concentrated wheel force applied to the rail, v is the rail deflection under the force.

The track foundation modulus, $c \text{ (Nm}^{-2}\text{)}$, is a widely used parameter to represent the vertical stiffness of the rail foundation, and it is defined as a force per length squared

$$c = \frac{p}{v}, \tag{9}$$




Fig. 9. Response analysis for stationary randomly variable stiffness of supports

where p is the vertical rail foundation supporting force per unit length, and v is the vertical rail deflection. The relationship between the track modulus c and the track stiffness k is as follows

$$c = \frac{k^{4/3}}{(64EI)^{1/3}} \quad (10)$$

The spring stiffness of discrete rail supports k_r should include the stiffness of fasteners, sleepers and of the subgrade. The conditions of the track stiffness are modelled by the four characteristic levels of the spring stiffness of the discrete supports with the mean $\overline{k^{(i)}} = \mu_k^{(i)}$; $i = 1 \div 4$, see *Table 1*.

Table 1
Characteristic stiffness levels of rail supports

Level of stiffness	Spring const.	Spring charact. of subgrade	Modulus compressibility of subgrade
i	$\mu_k^{(i)} = \overline{k^{(i)}}$ [Nm ⁻¹]	$k_s^{(i)}$ [Nm ⁻¹]	$K_s^{(i)}$ [Nm ⁻³]
1	$0.9 \cdot 10^7$	$1.2 \cdot 10^7$	$5 \cdot 10^7$
2	$1.5 \cdot 10^7$	$2.4 \cdot 10^7$	$10 \cdot 10^7$
3	$2.5 \cdot 10^7$	$6.7 \cdot 10^7$	$30 \cdot 10^7$
4	$3.2 \cdot 10^7$	$16.0 \cdot 10^7$	$70 \cdot 10^7$

Idealised linear spring characteristics $k_r^{(i)}$ of discrete rail supports are expressed by the spring constant of the elastic joint k_f , and the spring constant of the subgrade $k_s^{(i)}$. *Fig. 3*.

$$k_r^{(i)} = \frac{k_f \cdot k_s^{(i)}}{k_f + k_s^{(i)}}; \quad i = 1 \div 4. \tag{11}$$

The spring constant k_f was taken as the mean value $k_f = 4 \cdot 10^7$ Nm⁻¹. Four characteristic levels for the mean value of $k_s^{(i)}$ were chosen to model the foundation of the track, see *Table 1*.

Two basic models in the stiffness reduction of support were investigated :

- (a) Nonstationary reduction stiffness of some supports, see *Fig. 4*,
- (b) Stationary random stiffness of the discrete supports, see *Fig. 5*.

4. Parametric Study

Using the computer program IDA [3], the parametric studies were conducted to investigate the effect of reduction of the support stiffness. Two-dimensional finite element model with 57 beam elements supported by springs was used to represent the rail. The rail of type R65 was used

for the studies, with the flexural stiffness $EI = 7.875 \cdot 10^6 \text{ Nm}^2$, and spacing of the sleepers $l = 0.6 \text{ m}$. The rail response analysis consists in the determination of the vertical displacements $v(x)$, bending moments $M(x)$, and support reaction R_j .

- a) Results of the standard linear analysis for constant stiffnesses of supports, $k_j^{(i)} = \text{const.}$, for the four characteristic deterministic stiffness levels of the rail supports $i = 1 \div 4$ (Table 1) are shown in Fig. 6. The vertical force $P = 1 \text{ kN}$ is applied to the support.

Table 2
Comparison of the rail response for modelled reduction of the support stiffness on Fig. 4e, g, b

Charact. level	Support stiffness	Rail response for $P_w = 1 \text{ kN}$					
		constant stiffness of supports			Modelled reduction of the support stiffness Fig. 4e		
(i)	$k^{(i)}$ [Nm ⁻¹]	$v(x=0)$ [mm]	$M(x=0)$ [kNm]	$R(x=0)$ [kN]	$v(x=0)$ [mm]	$M(x=0)$ [kNm]	$R(x=0)$ [kN]
1	$0.9 \cdot 10^7$	0.0284	0.285	0.251	0.0396 (139%)	0.338 (118%)	0.174 (69%)
2	$1.5 \cdot 10^7$	0.0193	0.249	0.284	—	—	—
3	$2.5 \cdot 10^7$	0.0129	0.212	0.325	0.0185 (143%)	0.257 (121%)	0.232 (71%)
4	$3.2 \cdot 10^7$	0.0108	0.198	0.345	—	—	—

Charact. level	Support stiffness	Rail response for $P_w = 1 \text{ kN}$					
		Modelled reduction of the support stiffness Fig. 4g			Modelled reduction of the support stiffness Fig. 4b		
(i)	$k^{(i)}$ [Nm ⁻¹]	$v(x=0)$ [mm]	$M(x=0)$ [kNm]	$R(x=0)$ [kN]	$v(x=0)$ [mm]	$M(x=0)$ [kNm]	$R(x=0)$ [kN]
1	$0.9 \cdot 10^7$	0.0345 (121%)	0.321 (112%)	0.213 (84%)	0.03 (105%)	0.278 (97%)	0.265 (105%)
2	$1.5 \cdot 10^7$	—	—	—	—	—	—
3	$2.5 \cdot 10^7$	0.163 (126%)	0.241 (113%)	0.286 (88%)	0.013 (100%)	0.208 (98%)	0.334 (102%)
4	$3.2 \cdot 10^7$	0.0138 (127%)	0.226 (114%)	0.304 (88%)	—	—	—

- b) Nonstationary reduction in the stiffness of some supports. Such modelling provides the basis for predicting the track performance with relatively poor ballast, or dipped rail joints. Typical result of the

response analysis for the cases from *Figs. 4e* and *4g* are shown in *Figs. 7* and *8*.

The elastic deflection curves illustrated in *Figs. 6, 7* and *8* are, at the same time, the influence lines for deflection of the rail, because the unit force $P = 1$ kN was applied. For the wheel force having a specific magnitude P acting on the rail at the point $x = 0$ the deflection $v(x = 0)$ can be found by multiplying the influence line ordinate by the magnitude of the force P . A comparison is made between the results of nonstationary response and the deterministic response for the characteristic levels of the support stiffness in *Table 2*.

- c) Linear analysis of the stationary random stiffness of supports. For a chosen mean value $\mu_k^{(i)}$ and coefficient of variation $V_k (V_k = 0.1 \div 0.3)$, the random variables stiffness $k_j^{(i)}$ was generated by means of the random number generator having a rectangular density function. Typical results of the response analysis for randomly variable stiffness of supports are shown in *Figs. 9* and *10*, and for the characteristic stiffness levels $i = 2$ and 4 are displayed in *Table 3*.

The rail with a stationary randomly variable stiffness of discrete supports was successively static loaded by the force $P = 1$ kN in positions $j = 1 \div 19$ and corresponding amplitudes v_j, M_j in positions j were computed. As an example two elastic deflection curves of the rail for the input parameters $\mu_k = 1.5 \cdot 10^7 \text{ Nm}^{-1}$ and $V_k = 0.1 \div 0.3$, are shown in *Fig. 11*. They represent the static rail deformation that is successively loaded by the force $P = 1$ kN in position $j = 1 \div 19$.

5. Conclusions

In the presented parametric studies of the quasi-static rail response, the effect of the reduction of rail support stiffness is examined. The rail response analysis is concerned with the determination of the vertical displacement $v(x)$ bending moments $M(x)$ and discrete support reactions R_j . The stiffness of discrete supports is a variable quantity and other input parameters of the problem are considered as deterministic ones. The reduction in stiffness of supports models some important practice cases. The finite element method was used to find the response. Two types of reduction of the support stiffness modelled: the nonstationary reduction in the stiffness of some supports and the stationary random reduction in stiffness of supports. The

Table 3
The results of parametric study of the rail response for random stiffness of supports

charact. level	input parameters			Response for $P_w = 1$ kN				
	support stiffness $\mu_k^{(i)}$ [Nm ⁻¹]	coeff. of variation V_k	mean value μ_v [mm]	standard deviat σ_v [mm]	deflection $v(x=0)$ max. $v(x=0)$ [mm]	bending moment $M(x)$ mean value μ_M [kNm]	standard deviat σ_M [kNm]	max. $M(x=0)$ [kNm]
2	$1.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$	0.1	$1.96 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$0.22 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.0205 (106%)	0.248	$2.66 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.256 (103%)
		0.2		$0.45 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.0204 (105%)		$4.19 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.255 (103%)
		0.3		$0.65 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.0205 (106%)		$6.83 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.258 (104%)
4	$3.2 \cdot 10^{-7}$	0.1	$1.1 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$0.13 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.0113 (104%)	0.199	$2.51 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.203 (102%)
		0.2		$0.27 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.0114 (105%)		$3.62 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.207 (104%)
		0.3		$0.42 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.0118 (109%)		$5.01 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.209 (103%)




Fig. 10. Response analysis for stationary randomly variable stiffness of supports

first type enables the qualitative predicting rail performance with relatively poor ballast or dipped rail joints while the second type of reduction enables to assess the effect of random variation in sleeper stiffness. Numeric studies showed that the simulation is adequate method for response analysis of the track structure. The response results for the stationary random reduction in stiffness of support, show that the response is not so unfavourable as for a nonstationary reduction in support stiffness. Thus, the stiffness of vertical springs can considerable influence the response of the track. The knowledge of the rail variable response is important both for determination of the force transfer from the rail to the sleepers and for assessing the serviceability of the railway track.

Acknowledgement

The work reported in this paper is a part of the research project supported by Slovak Grant Agency for Science, Grant No.1882/94. The support from the GAV is greatly appreciated.




Fig. 11. Elastic rail deflection curves for quasi-stationary wheel force $P = 1\text{ kN}$ in position $j = 1 \div 19$

References

1. ARBABI, F. – LOH, C. U. (1991): Reliability Analysis of Railroad Tracks, *Journal of Structural Engineering*, Vol. 117, No. 5/1991, pp. 1435–1447.
2. KERR, A. D. (1976): On the Stress Analysis of Rails and Ties, *Bulletin 659-ARE Association*, Vol. 78, 1976, pp. 19–43.
3. IDA manual (in Slovak), VŠDS Žilina, 1990 pp. 1–90.
4. FRÝBA, L. (1968a): Random Vibration of a Beam on Elastic Foundation under Moving Force, *Studies in applied mechanics 14*, Elsevier 1986, pp. 206–230.
5. FRÝBA, L. (1993b): Stochastic Finite Elements for a Beam on a Random Foundation with Uncertain Damping under a Moving Force, *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 1993, 163 (1, pp. 31–45).
6. MORAVČÍK, M. (1992): Stress Analysis of Sleepers (in Slovak), *Studies of University of Transport and Communications, Civil Eng., serie 15, Žilina 1992*, pp. 19–47.
7. MAHADEVAN, S. – HALDAR, A. (1991): Stochastic FEM — Based Validation of LRFD, *Journal of Structural Engineering*, Vol. 117, No. 5/1991, pp. 527–547.