DESIGNING COLD-FORMED STEEL USING THE DIRECT STRENGTH METHOD

Note: this document was originally published as G100-09, Corrected to G102-09 in April, 2011.

Summary: The Direct Strength Method is an entirely new design method for cold-formed steel. The Direct Strength Method requires no effective width calculations, eliminates tedious iterations to determine section properties, properly includes interaction effects between elements of the cross-section such as the flange and the web, and opens up the potential to create new sections as it is applicable to nearly any shape that can be formed from cold-formed steel, as opposed to just C, Z, and hat shapes. The Direct Strength Method was first adopted in 2004 as Appendix 1 to the North American Specification for the Design of Cold-Formed Steel Structural Members, and the most recent version can be found in the recently published AISI-S100-07. This CFSEI Technical Note introduces the Direct Strength Method and details some of the features of a recently published AISI Design Guide for this Method. The intent of this Tech Note and the Guide is to provide engineers with practical guidance in the application of this new design method.

Disclaimer: Designs cited herein are not intended to preclude the use of other materials, assemblies, structures or designs when these other designs and materials demonstrate equivalent performance for the intended use; CFSEI documents are not intended to exclude the use and implementation of any other design or construction technique.

INTRODUCTION

The key documents and tools necessary for the application of the Direct Strength Method are summarized in Figure 1, they include: (a) The North American Specification for the Design of Cold-Formed Steel Structural Members (AISI-S100-07) also known as the main Specification, (b) the Direct Strength Method (DSM) Design Guide (AISI 2006), and (c) the finite strip software CUFSM (Schafer 2006).

The Direct Strength Method provisions are straightforward. For example, column design was excerpted from AISI-S100-07 and is provided in Figure 2. Complete column design takes only one page. The engineer must provide the elastic buckling loads in global (P_{cr}), local (P_{cl}), and distortional (P_{cd}) buckling, these, along with the squash load (P_y) are the only inputs. The method checks limit states of global, local, and distortional buckling and provides the column load carrying capacity. Beam design is similar.

The only complication for the engineer is finding the elastic buckling loads, but this is simplified by freely available, open source, software, CUFSM, (www.ce.jhu.edu/~bschafer/cufsm, Schafer and Ádány 2006). However, even CUFSM is not required for the Direct Strength Method as closed-formed solutions are provided for standard shapes in the DSM Design Guide, and other software packages are available that provide the same solution.

FIGURE 1: KEY DOCUMENTS AND TOOLS NEEDED FOR THE DIRECT STRENGTH METHOD
### 1.2.1 Column Design

The nominal axial strength, $P_{nv}$, is the minimum of $P_{nve}$, $P_{nle}$, and $P_{nd}$ as given below. For columns meeting the geometric and material criteria of Section 1.1.1.1, $\Omega_c$ and $\phi_c$ are as follows:

For all other columns, $\Omega$ and $\phi$ of Section A1.1(b) apply.

#### 1.2.1.1 Flexural, Torsional, or Torsional-Flexural Buckling

The nominal axial strength, $P_{nve}$, for flexural, … or torsional-flexural buckling is

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{for } \lambda_c \leq 1.5 & \quad P_{nve} = \left(0.658 \frac{P_y}{\lambda_c^2}\right) P_y \\
\text{for } \lambda_c > 1.5 & \quad P_{nve} = \left(0.877 \frac{P_y}{\lambda_c}\right) P_y
\end{align*}
$$

(Eq. 1.2.1-1)

(Eq. 1.2.1-2)

where $\lambda_c = \sqrt{\frac{P_{y}}{P_{cre}}}$

$P_y = A_g F_y$ (Eq. 1.2.1-3)

$P_{cre}$ = Minimum of the critical elastic column buckling load in flexural, torsional, or torsional-flexural buckling …

#### 1.2.1.2 Local Buckling

The nominal axial strength, $P_{nle}$, for local buckling is

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{for } \lambda_l \leq 0.776 & \quad P_{nle} = P_{nve} \\
\text{for } \lambda_l > 0.776 & \quad P_{nle} = P_{nve} \left(1 - 0.15 \left(1 - \left(\frac{P_{cre}}{P_{nve}}\right)^{0.4}\right) \left(\frac{P_{cre}}{P_{nve}}\right)^{0.4}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

(Eq. 1.2.1-5)

(Eq. 1.2.1-6)

where $\lambda_l = \sqrt{\frac{P_{nve}}{P_{cre}}}$

$P_{cre}$ = Critical elastic local column buckling load …

$P_{nve}$ is defined in Section 1.2.1.1.

#### 1.2.1.3 Distortional Buckling

The nominal axial strength, $P_{nd}$, for distortional buckling is

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{for } \lambda_d \leq 0.561 & \quad P_{nd} = P_y \\
\text{for } \lambda_d > 0.561 & \quad P_{nd} = P_y \left(1 - 0.25 \left(\frac{P_{crd}}{P_y}\right)^{0.6}\right) \left(\frac{P_{crd}}{P_y}\right)^{0.6}
\end{align*}
$$

(Eq. 1.2.1-8)

(Eq. 1.2.1-9)

where $\lambda_d = \sqrt{\frac{P_y}{P_{crd}}}$

$P_{crd}$ = Critical elastic distortional column buckling load …

$P_y$ is given in Eq. 1.2.1-4.

### FIGURE 2: DIRECT STRENGTH METHOD FOR COLUMNS (EXCERPT FROM AISI 2004)

Why use DSM (Appendix 1 AISI-S100-07) instead of the main Specification?

The Direct Strength Method encourages innovative cross-sections. As Figure 3 indicates, DSM provides a design method for complex shapes that requires no more effort than for normal shapes, while the main Specification can be difficult, or even worse, simply inapplicable in such situations.

A number of practical advantages exists for the use of DSM:

- no effective width calculations,
- no iterations required, and
- use gross cross-sectional properties.

On the more theoretical/philosophical side DSM includes proper consideration of the interaction of elements (i.e., equilibrium and compatibility between the flange and web is maintained in the elastic buckling prediction), and explores and includes all stability limit states. Further, DSM encourages cross-section optimization, provides a solid basis for rational analysis extensions to new sections and situations, and has a potential for much wider applicability and scope than the main Specification which is essentially tied to C, Z, and simple hat shapes. Finally DSM focuses the engineering effort on correct determination of elastic buckling behavior, instead of on correct determination of empirical effective widths, and change that leads to more insight for the engineer with regard to the expected behavior.
**DSM DESIGN GUIDE**

In an effort to expand the use of the Direct Strength Method a Design Guide (AISI 2006) was recently completed. The subsequent sections of this Note focus on this DSM Guide and provide the interested engineer with further information on the application of DSM. The Guide covers the following areas: elastic buckling, overcoming difficulties with elastic buckling determination in the finite strip method, beam design, column design, beam-column design, product development and nearly 100 pages of design examples.

**MEMBER ELASTIC BUCKLING**

**Solution Methods**

To use DSM the engineer needs to know the elastic buckling loads or moment of the member. The Guide discusses and provides references to a variety of solution methods for elastic buckling of cold-formed steel members including the finite element method, the finite strip method, and closed-form hand solutions, but the focus is on the finite strip method. Typical results from a finite strip analysis are shown in Figure 5. From finite strip analyses local, distortional, and global buckling of a beam and/or column may be identified.

**Finite Strip Method Examples**

A number of examples are presented in the Guide, including those of the AISI (2002) Design Manual plus additional examples selected to highlight the use of the Direct Strength Method for more complicated and optimized cross-sections. For each example the following is provided: (1) references to the AISI (2002) Design Manual example problems (as appropriate), (2) basic cross-section information and confirmation of finite strip model geometry (see e.g., Figure 4), and (3) elastic buckling analysis by the finite strip method (CUFSM) and notes on analysis. Models of the following cross-sections were generated:

- C-section with lips,
- C-section with lips modified,
- C-section without lips (track section),
- C-section without lips (track section) modified,
- Z-section with lips,
- Z-section with lips modified,
- Equal leg angle with lips,
- Equal leg angle,
- Hat section,
- Wall panel section,
- Rack post section, and a
- Sigma section.

**Figure 3: Design of Cold-Formed Steel Shapes Main Specification and DSM**

(a) conventional shapes

Design effort

Main Specification: Medium

DSM (Appendix 1): Medium

(b) optimized shapes

Design effort

Main Specification: High or NA*

DSM (Appendix 1): Medium

*NA = not applicable or no design rules

**Figure 4: Example of C-section used for elastic buckling and design analysis**

(FIGURE 4 IN THE DSM DESIGN GUIDE AISI 2006)

---

**C-section with lips (9CS2.5x059)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>FSM model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A = 0.881</td>
<td>0.880 in.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iₓ = 10.3</td>
<td>10.285 in.⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x₀ = 0.612</td>
<td>0.610 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iᵧ = 0.698</td>
<td>0.695 in.⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m = 1.048</td>
<td>1.036 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x₀ = -1.660</td>
<td>-1.646 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J = 0.00102</td>
<td>0.00102 in.⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cₓ = 11.9</td>
<td>11.1 in.³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* given in the AISI Design Manual (2002)
FIGURE 5: UNDERSTANDING FINITE STRIP ANALYSIS RESULTS (FIGURE 2 DSM DESIGN GUIDE AISI 2006)

DESIGN EXAMPLES

The heart of the DSM Design Guide is a series of example problems. A typical page from the design examples is annotated, and provided in Figure 6. Each set of example problems is focused on a particular cross-section. For example, for a C-section with lips (a stud section) the following examples are provided:

C-section with lips
- Flexural strength for a fully braced member (AISI 2002 Example I-8)
- Flexural strength for L=56.2 in. (AISI 2002 Example II-1)
- Effective moment of inertia (AISI 2002 Example I-8)
- Compressive strength for a continuously braced column (AISI 2002, I-8)
- Compressive strength at $F_n=37.25$ ksi (AISI 2002 Example III-1)
- Beam-column design strength (AISI 2002 Example III-1)

The flexural strength for a fully braced member is similar in concept to determining the effective section for a member at yield. The examples cover strength as well as serviceability (deflection) determinations using the Direct Strength Method. Application of the Direct Strength Method to beam-columns is also illustrated. In addition, reference is provided to the AISI (2002) Design Manual (noted in parentheses in the above list) where similar calculations are performed using the conventional effective width methods of the main Specification.

The design examples in the Guide span nearly 100 pages and cover a variety of cross-sections and situations, including:
- a C-section with web stiffeners added, including strong axis flexural strength and compressive strength with different bracing conditions,
- an SSMA track section, including strong and weak-axis flexural strength, compressive strength, and beam-column strength,
- a track section with flange stiffeners added, including flexural strength and compressive strength,
- a Z-section purlin, including flexural and compressive strength for different bracing conditions,
- an equal leg angle with lips, including flexural strength, compressive strength, and compressive strength explicitly including eccentricity,
an equal leg angle, including flexural and compressive strength,
a hat section, including flexural strength, compressive strength for different bracing conditions, and beam-column allowable strength,
a wall panel section, including flexural strength for intermediate and end panels with the top flange in compression and flexural strength for bottom flange in compression,
a rack post section, including flexural and compressive strength, and
a sigma section, including flexural and compressive strength.

FIGURE 6: ANNOTATED EXAMPLE OF DSM DESIGN GUIDE EXAMPLE PROBLEMS

Typical example from the DSM Design Guide

Problem Assumptions

Provided examples
For each cross-section a number of different beam, column, and beam-column examples are provided.

Elastic Buckling
Elastic buckling results are the key to DSM. For this bending example, $M_{eq} \text{ and } M_{ed}$ are found from the finite strip analysis which is shown in thumbnail to the right, the same analysis is also fully examined in Chapter 3 of the Guide.

Global buckling check
The beam is assumed to be fully laterally braced, thus the global buckling strength is simply the moment at first yield, $M_Y$.

Local buckling check
The Direct Strength expressions are used to provide the strength in local buckling ($M_{eq}$) including interaction with global buckling strength ($M_{ed}$) as shown at right.

Distortional buckling check
The Direct Strength expressions for distortional buckling are given to the right. Note that interaction with global buckling ($M_{ed}$) is not included for distortional buckling.

Nominal strength
$M_n$ is the minimum of three individual strength checks. Conversion of nominal strength to allowable design strength (ASD) or design strength (LRFD) requires application of the appropriate safety and resistance factors which are discussed in the examples.

8.1 C-section with lips

Given:
- Steel: $F_y = 55$ ksi
- Section 9CS2.5x059 as shown to the right
- Finite strip analysis results (Section 3.2.1)

Required:
1. Bending capacity for fully braced member
2. Bending capacity at $L=56.2$ in. (AISI 2002 Example II-1)
3. Effective moment of inertia
4. Compression capacity for a fully braced member
5. Compression capacity at a uniform compressive stress of 37.25 ksi (AISI 2002 Example II-1)
6. Beam-column design (AISI 2002 Example II-1)

Equation numbers refer to the relevant parts of DSM (Appendix I AISI 2004)

Inputs from the finite strip analysis include:

- $M_{ed} = 126$ kip-in
- $M_{eq} = 85$ kip-in
- $M_{ed} = 108$ kip-in

per DSM 1.2.2, $M_n$ is the minimum of $M_{eq}$, $M_{ed}$, $M_{uq}$. For a fully braced member lateral-torsional buckling will not occur and thus $M_n = M_{eq}$, $M_{ed}$ and $M_{uq}$ must still be checked.

Local buckling check per DSM 1.2.2.2

$$
\lambda_l = \sqrt{\frac{M_{ed}}{M_{eq}}} \quad (\text{subscript } f = \lambda_l)
$$

$$
M_{ed} = M_{eq} \text{ if } \lambda_l \leq 0.776
$$

$$
M_{ed} = 94 \text{ kip-in}
$$

Distortional buckling check per DSM 1.2.2.3

$$
\lambda_d = \sqrt{\frac{M_{ed}}{M_{eq}}} \quad (\text{subscript } f = \lambda_d)
$$

$$
M_{ed} = M_{eq} \text{ if } \lambda_d \leq 0.673
$$

$$
M_{ed} = 93 \text{ kip-in}
$$

Predicted bending capacity per 1.3

$$
M_n = \min \left( \frac{M_{ed}}{M_{eq}} \right) \quad (\text{subscript } f = M_n)
$$

The geometry of this section falls within the "pre-qualified" beams of DSM 1.1.1.2 and the higher $g$ and lower $\gamma$ of DSM Section 1.2.2 may therefore be used.

LRFD:
- $\theta > 0.9 \quad \theta_b M_n = 84 \text{ kip-in}$

ASD:
- $\Omega_b = 1.67 \quad M_n = 56 \text{ kip-in}$
The DSM Design Guide provides complete details for development of beam span tables or charts and column height tables or charts using the Direct Strength Method. An example beam chart is provided in Figure 7. In this example one can see how the local buckling strength, \( M_{nl} \), is a reduction below the global buckling strength, \( M_{ne} \). The point where \( M_{nl} \) and \( M_{ne} \) merge (approximately 9 ft) indicates that local buckling no longer provides a reduction in the strength of this beam - in the main Specification this occurs when the stress used to determine the effective section \( (F_n) \) is low enough that the section is fully effective at that stress. Further, the impact of distortional buckling on intermediate length beams is clearly shown.

**BEAM AND COLUMN CHARTS**

The DSM Design Guide provides complete details for development of beam span tables or charts and column height tables or charts using the Direct Strength Method. An example beam chart is provided in Figure 7. In this example one can see how the local buckling strength, \( M_{nl} \), is a reduction below the global buckling strength, \( M_{ne} \). The point where \( M_{nl} \) and \( M_{ne} \) merge (approximately 9 ft) indicates that local buckling no longer provides a reduction in the strength of this beam - in the main Specification this occurs when the stress used to determine the effective section \( (F_n) \) is low enough that the section is fully effective at that stress. Further, the impact of distortional buckling on intermediate length beams is clearly shown.

**BEAM-COLUMN DESIGN**

Main Specification Methodology

As described in the Guide conventional beam-column design follows the basic methodology of the main Specification, and is a simple extension of the Direct Strength Method. The basic interaction equation, in ASD format, is as follows:

\[
\frac{\Omega_n P}{P_n} + \frac{\Omega_x C_m \alpha_x M_x}{M_{ax} \alpha_x} + \frac{\Omega_y C_m \alpha_y M_y}{M_{ay} \alpha_y} \leq 1.0
\]

where: \( P_n \) and \( M_n \) are determined from the Direct Strength Method. The first-order required strengths (demands) are \( P, M_x \) and \( M_y \), as determined from conventional linear elastic analysis. \( C_m \) is the moment gradient factor, of which, the method for determination is addressed in the main Specification and is unchanged. Finally, \( \alpha \), the moment amplification factor is \( 1 - \frac{\Omega_n P}{P} \), where \( P \) is the elastic buckling load of the cross-section about the same axis as the primary bending moment, i.e., for strong axis moment \( M_y \), global buckling load \( P_e \) is \( P_{ey} \). Global buckling loads may be determined from main Specification equations or directly from a finite strip analysis.

**Future methods for beam-column design**

The advantage of the Direct Strength Method is that the stability of the entire cross-section under a given axial load \( (P) \) or bending moment \( (M) \) is investigated. Local, distortional, and global buckling of the column or beam is explored. It is natural to extend this idea to the stability of the cross-section under any given \( P \) and \( M \) combination. Where, now, the three buckling modes: local, distortional, and global buckling are explored under the actual \( P \) and \( M \) combination of interest, instead of separately for \( P \) and separately for \( M \). Such an analysis can lead to far different behavior than typically assumed in the interaction equation approach used in the main Specification.

The fundamental difference between the interaction equations and a more thorough stability analysis can be understood by answering a simple question: *for all cross-sections does the maximum axial capacity exist when the load is concentric?* The interaction equation approach says, yes, any additional moment caused by a load away from the centroid will reduce the nominal strength of the cross-section. While a conservative answer, it is not always correct. If moving the axial load causes the relative compressive demand on a weak part of the cross-section (say the lip) to be relieved the cross-section strength will benefit from this. Interaction diagrams make some sense for determining when a simple cross-section yields, but stability, this is another matter. A design example previewing this new approach to beam-column design is provided in the Guide.

**PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT**

Cold-formed steel is a versatile, easily formed material - it is one objective of DSM and the DSM Guide to help manufacturers take advantage of the potential in cold-formed steel for creating optimal cross-section shapes. Final optimization and bringing a product to market has as much, if not more, to do with manufacturing, constructability, and other practical matters as strength; however, DSM provides a way to quantitatively focus on the strength improvements available to cold-formed steel designers/manufacturers.

One particularly important matter with regard to strength is the application of resistance or safety factors for newly developed members. For a newly developed cross-section, not covered by the main Specification provisions,
two basic avenues exist for strength prediction, as outlined in the 2007 edition of the main Specification Section A1.2(b): (a) determine the strength by testing and find $\phi$ via Chapter F of the Spec., or (b) determine the strength by rational analysis and use the blanket $\phi = 0.80$ ($\Omega = 2.0$) provided in A1.2(b). As Figure 8 shows although $\phi = 0.8$ may be a rather low resistance factor it may take a large number of tests (and relatively low scatter) to do better than this value.

Beyond using the blanket rational analysis resistance or safety factors, formal methods for pre-qualifying a new cross-section and using improved resistance factors have not yet been formalized. However, the DSM Guide provides specific guidance on how to take advantage of the testing that has already been performed in approximating the reliability of a new product.

**LIMITATIONS OF DSM: PRACTICAL AND THEORETICAL**

Of course, limitations of DSM (as implemented in AISI-S100-07) exist as well, not the least of which is that the method has only been formally developed for the determination of axial ($P_0$) and bending ($M_0$) strengths to date. Existing main Specification provisions may be used to supplement the strength prediction in other limit states (for example, shear or web crippling); otherwise, rational analysis or testing are a possible recourse. In addition, rational analysis may be a rather low resistance factor it may take a large number of tests (and relatively low scatter) to do better than this value.

One additional difficulty that is discussed in the DSM Design Guide is some of the complications that can arise in determining the elastic buckling load in global, distortional, and local buckling via the finite strip method. Topics covered in the Guide include the following:

- Indistinct local mode
- Indistinct distortional mode
- Multiple local or distortional modes (stiffeners)
- Global modes at short unbraced lengths
- Global modes with different bracing conditions
- Influence of moment gradient
- Partially restrained modes
- Boundary conditions for repeated members
- Members with holes
- Boundary conditions at the supports not pinned
- Built-up cross-sections

Each of the above listed topics is covered thoroughly with the Guide and includes narrative, figures, and practical advice for engineers modeling cold-formed steel members in a variety of design and development applications.

An example of interest is the change in the elastic buckling behavior when external restraining elements are included in the model. For example, if rotational restraint is modeled as attached to the compression flange of a Z-section in bending the distortional buckling mode is retarded greatly, as shown in Figure 9. Given the recently adopted main Specification procedures for distortional buckling (see CFSEI TN G100-08) the ability to directly add restraint into a model is in some sense a complication, but in reality a definite advantage of the Direct Strength Method approach to strength. Even for those not using the Direct Strength Method, $M_{n_{ai}}$ is now required in the main Specification and finite strip method solutions are allowed.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The Direct Strength Method (DSM) is a new method for the design of cold-formed steel members. The method provides a rational analysis approach for designing a cold-formed member even with a highly unconventional cross-section. The approach employs member elastic buckling solutions to directly provide the member strength in global,
local (with global interaction), and distortional buckling. DSM does not employ effective width, and instead uses gross properties, also DSM requires no iteration in determination of the strength. The method was formally adopted for beams and columns in 2004 as Appendix 1 of the North American Specification for the Design of Cold-Formed Steel Structural Members.

Recently a DSM Design Guide has been completed. The objective of the Guide is to aid engineers interested in applying DSM to their own designs, or in developing new products that take advantage of the flexibility of DSM. Key aspects of the new Guide are reviewed here, including: detailed explanation of member elastic buckling solutions using the finite strip method, a brief summary of the topics covered in the design examples, a review of methods for developing beam and column charts, as well as beam-column design, and how to use DSM in product development.
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