

Load Combinations Lead to Efficiencies

LRFD versus ASD for Wood Design

By John "Buddy" Showalter, P.E. and Dr. Robert J. Taylor, P.Eng.

Several case studies have been conducted to compare the load and resistance factor design (LRFD) methodology to the allowable stress design (ASD) methodology for wood. These case studies indicate that load combinations, as permitted by LRFD, can lead to greater efficiencies in wood design. For multi-story structures, where components such as load bearing studs and headers are designed for multiple transient live loads, this could be significant.

LRFD for wood was recently incorporated in the American Forest & Paper Association's (AF&PA) 2005 National Design Specification® (NDS®) for Wood Construction. Appendix N of the NDS refers to the American Society of Civil Engineer's (ASCE) Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures, ASCE 7-02 for LRFD load combinations.

Case Studies

Case studies comparing designs using LRFD methodology to those using ASD procedures as prescribed in the NDS indicate similar results for beams and connections with live to dead load ratios of 3:1. In a paper presented to the ASAE Annual International Meeting in 1998 (LRFD versus ASD for Wood Design), the authors indicated that efficiencies could be achieved for certain designs using LRFD versus ASD, due primarily to load factoring per ASCE 7-98. Those same case studies evaluated per ASCE 7-02 show that those efficiencies are also possible with the new standard.

Load Combinations

Table 1 outlines ASD and LRFD loads and load reductions from ASCE 7-02. For ASD, applicable load duration factors are taken from NDS Table 2.3.2. Note that ASCE 7-02 allows a 25% reduction in transient loads used in ASD combinations. The 25% reduction as shown in column 6 of Table 1 was accounted for in this load combination comparison.

For LRFD loads and load factors, the 2005 NDS Appendix N (Table N3) outlines load combinations and time effect factors consistent with ASCE 7-02. For comparison purposes, load combinations most common to multi-story structures are shown in Table 1.

Only gravity loads including dead (D), occupancy live (L), snow (S), and roof live or construction (L_r) are evaluated in this table. Due to the varied treatment of seismic loads in combination with other loads in the various building codes, they have been omitted from this comparison. With respect to wind loads, (Consideration in Wind Design of Wood Structures, Douglas and Weeks, 2001) showed that components and assemblies that receive wind directly and as part of the main wind force resisting system (MWFRS) should be checked for MWFRS and components and cladding wind loads independently. For components that must be designed for wind loads, the load case of wind acting alone will often control. Due to the multiple checks required for wind load analysis, combinations regard-

ing wind loads were also omitted. Less common loads like ice, fluid pressure, flood, earth pressure, rain, and self-straining forces were also not incorporated here.

Note that ASCE 7-02 contains an exception permitting a load factor on L in combinations shown in this article to be 0.5 for all occupancies in which L is less than or equal to 100 psf, with the exception of garages or areas occupied as places of public assembly.

Eight load combinations are shown in Table 1 combining dead, floor live, construction, and snow loads. Load magnitudes commonly specified in building codes are used to calculate a total load, which is adjusted by applicable reduction factors for ASD or load factors for LRFD. Note that results provided in Table 1 would differ for other load magnitudes. The load duration factor, C_D, for ASD and time effect factor, λ, for LRFD are divided out of

the total load to determine a comparable strength limit state. The second column from the right shows the ratio of LRFD/ASD adjusted total loads. This ratio is then divided by the format conversion factor, K_p, (see NDS Appendix N, Table N1) of 2.16 to allow relative comparison of these two methodologies (see ASTM D5457 (2004) for details). A ratio less than one indicates that LRFD should provide a more efficient design should that load combination control. Conversely, a ratio greater than unity indicates a benefit using ASD loads.

Note that a deflection controlled member should be identical with ASD versus LRFD, since unfactored loads are used for deflection calculations. Note also that compression perpendicular to grain uses a different K_p factor, so this analysis would show different results for bearing controlled applications.




Figure 1

Table 1: LRFD/ASD Load Combination Comparisons

	Allowable Stress Design							Load and Resistance Factor Design					LRFD Load/ ASD Load	LRFD/ (2.16*ASD)	
	Load Types				ASCE 7 Load Factor	C _D	Load/C _D	Load Types				Load/ λ			
	D	L	L _r	S				D	L	L _r	S				λ
1	1				1	0.9	2.22	1.4				0.6	46.67	2.10	0.97
2	1	1			1	1	60.00	1.2	1.6			0.8	110.00	1.83	0.85
3	1		1		1	1.25	32.00	1.2		1.6		0.8	70.00	2.19	1.01
4	1			1	1	1.15	43.48	1.2			1.6	0.8	90.00	2.07	0.96
5	1	1		1	0.75	1.15	63.04	1.2	1.6		0.5	0.8	128.75	2.04	0.95
6	1	1		1	0.75	1.15	63.04	1.2	0.5		1.6	0.8	115.00	1.82	0.84
7	1	1	1		0.75	1.25	52.00	1.2	1.6	0.5		0.8	122.50	2.36	1.09
8	1	1	1		0.75	1.25	52.00	1.2	0.5	1.6		0.8	95.00	1.83	0.85

D = dead, L = floor live, L_r = roof live, S = snow, D=20 psf, L=40 psf, L_r=20 psf, S=30 psf

	Roof Live Load (psf)	Ground Snow Load (psf)		
	20	30	50	70
Roof Only	1.01	0.96	0.99	1.01
Roof and One Floor	1.06	0.93	0.93	0.99
Roof and Two Floor	1.17	1.04	0.97	0.92

Table 2: LRFD/ASD Load Combination Comparisons for Multiple Stories

Column buckling and beam buckling are not explicitly addressed in Table 1, since in those cases it is not appropriate to divide loads directly by C_D or λ . By extension, many cases of combined loading are not completely addressed by the simplified treatment in Table 1 (since most combined loading scenarios involve column buckling and/or beam buckling).

Results

As noted in the discussion of case studies above, efficiencies for structural members carrying multiple transient loads (roof live and occupancy) are possible using LRFD versus ASD. As shown in Table 1, row 5 would show a 5% benefit using LRFD versus ASD. Note that rows 5 and 6 compare dead, occupancy live, and snow load combinations. Row 5 controls for this combination. Examples of this would be headers and studs on the first floor of multi-story buildings (Figure 1). These members will typically carry snow and occupancy live loads.

Table 2 further compares load combinations using the same approach used to develop Table 1. However, dead, occupancy live, and snow loads are varied to correspond to multi-story structures. Note that with a few exceptions, LRFD will provide efficiencies due to load factoring.

ASD or LRFD?

The question is often asked, "Why switch to LRFD?" The answer really lies with the de-

signer. The wood industry now has provided a dual format NDS to give the user the option of using either methodology as transparently as possible. Universities have predominately been teaching LRFD for the last decade to engineering students, so young designers may have a certain comfort level with LRFD.

One benefit of LRFD is the convenient use of common load sets regardless of the structural materials used. When designing hybrid structures involving wood

and other materials, the designer now can use one set of loads for LRFD strength design, instead of switching load sets part way through the structure as required by a structural material change that might have an LRFD or ASD design basis. Most structural materials now have the availability of resistance values and design processes on an LRFD basis. However, with LRFD, since deflection analysis still requires unfactored loads, both factored and unfactored load sets will be required to provide both factored and unfactored load paths through the entire structure. The bottom line is that the designer can choose the methodology that best suits his or her needs. LRFD makes the design of structures using multiple materials more convenient.

Summary

Load factors can contribute significantly to differences in design results using LRFD versus ASD. In many cases, more economical designs result using LRFD procedures. The underlying premise of load factoring is to move more of the safety factor, or reliability, to the loads side, since more information is available on loads today. It is reasonable to expect that more efficiency in the design process results from this knowledge.

Designers of multi-story wood frame buildings might consider the LRFD approach where multiple transient live loads could result in significant efficiencies. For applications with numerous structural elements, such as headers, this could result in substantial savings. ■

John "Buddy" Showalter, P.E. serves as Director of Technical Media for the American Wood Council (AWC) of the American Forest and Paper Association. Responsibilities at AWC include development of design tools like the Wood Design Package, which includes the National Design Specification® for Wood Construction (NDS®), and other technical media.

Dr. Robert J. Taylor, P.Eng., Assoc. AIA, serves as AWC's Director, Technology Transfer. He has accumulated over 30 years of experience in Canada and the US in academia, industry, and government. Robert is an award-winning speaker, educator, and presenter of wood design education topics to varied audiences, and appears at many seminars, conferences, and Wood Solutions Fairs nationally every year.

References

American Forest & Paper Association (2005), *National Design Specification (NDS) for Wood Construction*, Washington, DC.

American Society of Civil Engineers (2002), *Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures*, ASCE 7-02, ASCE, Reston, VA.

American Society of Civil Engineers (1998), *Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures*, ASCE 7-98, ASCE, Reston, VA.

ASTM (2004), *Standard Specification for Computing Reference Resistance of Wood-Based Materials and Structural Connections for Load and Resistance Factor Design*, D5457-04, ASTM, West Conshohocken, PA.

Douglas, B. K., and B. R. Weeks, *Considerations in Wind Design of Wood Structures*, www.awc.org.

Line, P.; Showalter, J.H.; Taylor, R.J. (2004), 2005 *National Design Specification® (NDS®) for Wood Construction*, Wood Design Focus, Winter 2004, Forest products Society, Madison, WI, 14(4)3-6.

Showalter, J. H., H. B. Manbeck, and D. G. Pollock, (1998), *LRFD versus ASD for Wood Design*, Presented at the July 12-16, 1998 ASAE Annual International Meeting. Paper No. 984006. ASAE, 2950 Niles Rd., St. Joseph, MI 49085-9659 USA.

Taylor, R.J. (2001), *Design Case Studies using LRFD for Wood – And Other Issues*, Proceedings Structures 2001, ASCE New York Metropolitan Section Spring Seminar, American Society of Civil Engineers, 135-147.

Taylor, R.J. (2002), *Designing with LRFD for Wood*, Structural Engineer, Mercer Media Inc., Alpharetta, GA, July 2001, 2(6):42-47.