





Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety

Presented by

Asst. Prof. Panya Kansuwan, Ph.D.

panya.ka@kmitl.ac.th (080-441-2995)

Department of mechanical engineering, School of Engineering, King Mongkut's Institute of technology Ladkrabang

on November 22nd, 2023

Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Major types of trains in consideration







Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Vehicle acceptance analysis





Running safety, Track loading, Ride characteristics					
EN14363:2005 - Railway applications - Testing for the	Association of American Railroads – Safety and Operations.				
acceptance of running characteristics of railway vehicles -	MSCP-C-II: Manual of Standards and Recommended				
Testing of running behaviour and stationary tests.	Practices – Section C – Part II. Design, Fabrication and				
	Construction of Freight Cars. Chapter 11 – Service				
	worthiness tests and analyses for new freight cars. Issue of				
	2007				

Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Main objectives – Increase load capacity with safety issues intact





- Wheel/Rail contact pairs
 - Wheel/Rail profiles
 - Remaining life and damage mechanism wear and rolling contact fatigue
 - Wheel and rail materials
- Vehicle design
 - Car body strength and natural frequency
 - Bogie frame strength and natural frequency
 - Primary and Secondary suspension configuration and parameters
- Track design
 - Gauge system
 - Track quality
 - Foundation construction
- Loading Axle load

Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Vehicle acceptance analysis – Suspension parameters



Parameter	K_{wy}	K _{wx}	K _{ty}	C _{ty}
SRC (β_x)	0.06311	0.60140	0.01177	0.06703
Parameter	5	λ	K_{tx}	C_{tx}
SRC (β_{γ})	- 0.7	6400	0.03967	0.21501





Thanaporn Talingthaisong, Sedthawatt Sucharitpwatskul, Anchalee Manonukul, Panya Kansuwan, Sensitivity Analysis of Suspension Parameters of the Critical Velocity of a Railway Bogie on a Tangent Track Using Standardized Regression Coefficients, Journal of Engineering and Digital Technology, 2023. 11(1).

 $V = 40 \ m/s$





Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Vehicle acceptance analysis – Wheel/Contact pair geo-comparison







	Standard Gauge	Meter Gauge	
Gauge width (mm)	1435	1000	
Flange back distance (mm)	1360	927	
Tape circular distance	1500	1067	
Radius (mm)	460	425.5	
Rail inclination	0.025	0.025	
Wheel profile	S1002/h28.5/e30/70	Vidura/h28.5/e30/70	
Rail profile	54E1	54E1	





Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Vehicle acceptance analysis – Wheel/Contact pair geo-comparison





54E1-S1002/h28.5/e30/0.067/70

54E1-Vidura/h28.5/e30/0.05/70



Panya Kansuwan

Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Vehicle acceptance analysis – Wheel/Contact pair geo-comparison





a member of NSTD

Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Vehicle acceptance analysis – Model parameters







|--|



-	Parameter	Symbol	Measure	Unit
	Half of the track gauge	а	0.5	m
	Wheel radius	r_o	0.4255	m
	Wheelset mass*	m_w	932.09	kg
	Moment of inertia of the wheelset – roll component*	I_{wx}	272.20	kg m²
	Moment of inertia of the wheelset – pitch component*	Iwy	73.15	kg m ²
	Moment of inertia of the wheelset – yaw component *	I_{wz}	272.20	kg m²
	Axle load	W_A	1.01E+05	Ν
	Mass of bogie frame	m_t	1212	kg
	Moment of inertia of bogie frame in yaw	I_{tz}	1722	kg m²
	Primary suspension - Lateral stiffness	K_{wy}	6.17E+05	N/m
	Primary suspension – Longitudinal yaw spring stiffness	K_{wx}	9.95E+05	N/m
	Secondary suspension - Lateral stiffness	K_{ty}	1.60E+05	N/m
	Secondary suspension - Lateral damping coefficient	C_{ty}	2.50E+04	N s/m
	Secondary suspension - Longitudinal yaw spring stiffness	K_{tx}	1.60E+05	N/m
	Secondary suspension - Longitudinal yaw damping coefficient	C_{tx}	2.50E+05	N s/m
(all	Half of the primary longitudinal yaw spring arm	b	0.7875	m
A	Half of the primary longitudinal yaw damper arm	b_1	0.7875	m
	Half of the secondary longitudinal yaw spring arm	b_2	0.7875	m
1	Half of the secondary longitudinal yaw damper arm	b_3	1.095	m
	Half of longitudinal distance of the lateral secondary spring	l_1	1.15	m
	Half of longitudinal distance of the lateral secondary dampers	l_2	1.15	m
	Creep force coefficient – Lateral component	f_{11}	6.73E+06	Ν
	Creep force coefficient – Spin component	f_{22}	1000	N m ²
Panya Kans	Creep force coefficient – Lateral spin component	f_{12}	1.20E+03	Nm
1	Creep force coefficient – Longitudinal component	f_{33}	6.73E+06	Ν

Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Vehicle acceptance analysis – Model parameters and validation





Title	Technical specification	Acceptance program
Party	Owner/Operator	Supplier
Responsibility	 Classification of the bogie type All necessary documentation for design approval Planning of activity to indicate that the design conform to the technical requirement and related norms. Delivery of quality control process 	 Design the bogie following the customer's specification Activity to indicate that the design conform to the technical requirement and related norms. Structural calculations for static assessment (bogie frame and attachment) Structural calculations for fatigue assessment (bogie frame and attachment) Static tests Fatigue tests On-track tests

category B-I bogies for main line and inter-city passenger carrying rolling stock including high speed and very high speed vehicles, powered and un-powered;

category B-II bogies for inner and outer suburban passenger carrying vehicles, powered and un-powered;

category B-III bogies for metro and rapid transit rolling stock, powered and un-powered;

category B-IV bogies for light rail vehicles and trams;

category B-V bogies for freight rolling stock with single-stage suspensions;

category B-VI bogies for freight rolling stock with two-stage suspensions;

category B-VII bogies for locomotives.

Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Vehicle acceptance analysis – Model parameters and validation









Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Vehicle acceptance analysis – Model parameters and validation







Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety

Vehicle acceptance analysis – Stationary test – Safety against derailment on twisted track







13

Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety

Vehicle acceptance analysis – Stationary test – Safety against derailment on twisted track







Ai	Lower	Higher
$A_{V}(m rad)$	4.032×10^{-7}	1.080×10^{-6}
$A_A(m rad)$	2.119×10^{-7}	6.124×10^{-7}

Panya Kansuwan, Sedthawat Sucharitpwatskul, A. Manonukul, "Application of Fast Fourier Transform to the Synthesis of Track Irregularities," in *the 8th International Conference on Engineering, Applied Sciences and Technology (ICEAST 2022)*. 2022: Online.













	1	2	3	4	
Test Zone	Straight Track and curves	Large-radius	Small-radius	Very small-radius	
	with very large radius	curves	curve		
Radius of circular curves (m)	$R \ge 8000$	$600 \leq R \leq 3000$	$400 \leq R \leq 600$	$250 \leq R \leq 400$	
Track length (m)	615477	68066	22975	44905	
Length fraction (%)	81.91	9.06	3.06	5.98	
Number of Curves	15	195	72	178	
Number fraction (%)	3.26	42.39	15.65	38.70	

Length of curve radius (m)

Searching for safe operation range

	Test	Test Speed Speed		Curve radius	
loadcase	zone	zone	(km/h)	(m/s)	(m)
1		44	40	11.11	250
2	л	43	40	11.11	300
3	4	42	40	11.11	350
4		41	40	11.11	400
5		35	60	16.67	450
6		34	60	16.67	500
7	3	33	60	16.67	550
8		32	60	16.67	600
9		31	60	16.67	700
10	-	30	80	22.22	800
11		29	80	22.22	900
12		28	90	25.00	1000
13		27	90	25.00	1100
14	2	26	90	25.00	1200
15	Z	25	90	25.00	1300
16		24	90	25.00	1400
17		23	100	27.78	1500
18		22	120	33.33	2000
19		21	120	33.33	4000
20		13	120	33.30	8000
21	1	12	120	33.30	10000
22		11	120	33.33	infinity





EN14363:2005 - On-Track Test - Running Safety Filtered Derailment Quotient - Leading axle



Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Vehicle acceptance analysis – Estimation of critical velocity (On-track test)

Panya Kansuwan

Computational simulation for understanding rail dynamics safety Vehicle acceptance analysis – Estimation of critical velocity (On-track test) Target rolling radius difference (TRRD)



รัศมีโค้ง (m)	RRD	จำนวนโค้ง	รัศมีโค้ง (m)	RRD	จำนวนโค้ง
190	3.63	130	1500	0.46	2
292	2.36	99	1600	0.43	2
390	1.77	79	1800	0.38	4
494	1.40	23	2000	0.35	9
597	1.16	49	2500	0.28	2
687	1.00	4	2600	0.27	2
798	0.86	30	3000	0.23	6
892	0.77	7	3500	0.20	1
994	0.69	120	4400	0.16	2
1100	0.63	2	5000	0.14	2
1200	0.58	9	6000	0.12	1
1250	0.55	1	7000	0.10	3
1380	0.50	1	15000	0.46	2

$$\Delta r = \frac{2br}{R}$$





Acknowledgment

Ekkarut Viyanit, Ph.D., Anchalee Manonukul, D.Phil. (Oxon), Sedthawatt Sucharitpwatskul, Ph.D., NSTDA, Thailand NSTDA, Thailand NSTDA, Thailand

