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## 1 Motivation

Wood is a natural material with orthotropic properties. The strength and stiffness properties of solid wood or glulam in grain direction are much higher than the strength and stiffness properties perpendicular to the grain direction. The characteristic tensile strength in grain direction for European spruce and pine according to [1] is between 8 and $30 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. Against it, the characteristic tensile strength perpendicular to the grain direction is merely $0.4 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. Even the characteristic compression strength perpendicular to the grain with a value between 2 and $3.2 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ depending on the strength class is much smaller than the corresponding value in grain direction $\left(16-29 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}\right)$. Finally, the ratio between the modulus of elasticity in grain direction and the corresponding value perpendicular to the grain is about 30 . Due to the low strength and stiffness properties for timber, loads perpendicular to the grain direction should be avoided in timber constructions.
Another disadvantage of solid wood or even glulam is the poor dimensional stability. With changing moisture timber is prone to shrinking and swelling. Most of the softwoods shrink and swell in grain direction with a characteristic value of $0.01 \%$ related to their length and per $1 \%$ moisture changing. Against it, perpendicular to grain, softwoods shrink and swell with a characteristic value of $0.24 \%$ related to their length and per $1 \%$ moisture changing. On site, usually "wet" timber with an average moisture content of $18 \%$ is used. In heated rooms this timber changes the moisture content to around $12 \%$. A changing of $6 \%$ in moisture leads to a shrinking and swelling ratio of $1.44 \%$ per length unit perpendicular to the grain direction. Hence, a 400 mm high timber beam shrinks about 6 mm while drying from $18 \%$ to $12 \%$ moisture content. Suchlike huge changing in dimension perpendicular to the grain direction leads the timber to splitting. Although most of the strength properties were determined under consideration of cracks, splitting should be prevented. Cracks in the area of connections or where single loads occur are very dangerous and degreases the performance of a construction.
The poor properties of timber perpendicular to the grain direction can be counterbalanced using reinforcements. Perpendicular to the grain direction loaded timber beams can be reinforced using timber screws, glued-in rods, nail plates or glued-on timber products. These reinforcing methods are efficient for local problems, but they are quite inefficient when nearly the whole timber member needs to be reinforced. In this case, solid wood or glulam should be replaced by a building material with better properties perpendicular to the grain direction.
Timber products with nearly isotropic material properties are for example plywood, solid wood panels and cross laminated timber (CLT). These products are characterised by nearly equal strength and stiffness properties in the main axis direction and perpendicular to the main axis direction. CLT is a plate-like multi layer element made using crosswise orientated laths, planks or boards which are glued together over the wide surfaces only. At present, CLT can be produced with three up to nine layers and
with a total thickness of 500 mm . The maximum plate dimensions a limited to 30 m in length and 4.8 m in width. These maximum dimensions are only limited by the dimensions of the press and manufacturing tools. Fig. 1 shows the typical assembly of a CLT element with five layers. Three layers are orientated in the main axis direction while two inner layers are orientated perpendicular to the main axis direction.


Fig. 1 From raw material to cross laminated timber (CLT) panel
In Fig. 2 a typical CLT panel manufactured by a European manufacturer is displayed. As displayed right in Fig. 2 the layers are bonded together only over the wide surfaces. The gaps between neighboured boards are used to prevent stresses between the crosswise orientated layers due to disabled shrinkage or swelling. Additional grooves (right in Fig. 2) can even reduce these stresses, in particular in thicker CLT elements. Furthermore, the missing of bonding between neighboured boards reduces the production effort significantly.


Fig. 2 CLT panel with gaps and grooves
CLT panels with large dimensions provide the opportunity to use this massive wood product even in large buildings. In Europe, multi-storey cellular structures are typical applications for CLT products where CLT can be used for wall, roof and floor elements. An example for a building which was made solely using CLT panels is displayed in Fig. 3. To connect the elements together, traditional dowel-type fasteners
(nails, bolts, dowels and screws) were used. Hence tension, compression as well as bending can be transferred between the CLT elements.


Fig. 3 Massive timber building made using CLT panels
A further advantage of CLT panels is the prefabrication. Openings for windows and doors as well as the final shape of a wall or floor system can be prefabricated in a factory. Just the final assembling is to be done on construction site. Compared to systems, which are produced on construction site, prefabricated elements are more accurate and economical.
The dimensional stability is one more advantage of CLT elements compared to solid wood. Due to the crosswise orientation of the raw material, CLT shrinks and swells equal in the main axis direction and perpendicular to the main axis direction. According to [1], the swelling and shrinkage parameter for CLT panels is $0.02 \%$ per length unit and per $1 \%$ moisture changing. Hence, the dimensionally stability of CLT is 12 times higher than those of solid wood or glulam perpendicular to the grain direction. For this reason, solid wood and glulam are prone to splitting while CLT is not. Compared to solid wood and glulam with orthotropic strength and stiffness properties, the strength and stiffness values for CLT panels are nearly similar in the main axis direction and perpendicular to the main axis direction.

Currently, CLT elements are commonly used in the massive wood building systems as elements loaded in the out-of-plane and in the in-plane direction. Due to the previously mentioned advantages, CLT could be used as well for beams loaded in bending. In particular, beams loaded by tensile stresses perpendicular to grain or by high shear stresses are prone to splitting. Reinforcing using timber screws, glued-in rods, etc. is only efficient in local areas. For beams, where tensile stresses perpendicular to grain or/and high shear stresses occur along the biggest part of the beam (see Fig. 4), traditional reinforcing methods are inefficient.


Fig. 4 Glulam beam loaded by tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain and by shear stresses

For those problematic beams, which are prone to splitting, CLT instead of solid wood or glulam could be used. Therefore CLT must be orientated on edge (Fig. 5). In this case, axial loads are transferred by the parallel orientated layers, while the perpendicular orientated layers are used to transfer loads perpendicular to the beam axis direction. Hence, additional reinforcements wouldn't be necessary any more. Using CLT elements instead of solid wood and glulem would increase the dimensional stability, too.


Fig. 5 Beam loaded by tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain made using CLT elements

Within the scope of the DAAD founded research project, the possible field of application for CLT beams was determined. It is shown, that CLT provides an opportunity for beams loaded in bending and by tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction. Due to some disadvantages, the field of application for CLT in beams is strongly reduced. For this reason, a new product, diagonal orientated timber (DLT), was developed. Tests were done on self-made CLT and DLT beams. The test results confirm the accuracy of the finite element analysis, which was done to investigate the loaddisplacement behaviour of CLT and DLT beams.
The investigations were performed at the Department of Wood Science, University of British Columbia in Vancouver/Canada and kindly supported by Prof. Frank Lam.

## 2 Preliminary considerations

Compared to solid wood and glulam, CLT used in beams loaded in bending is characterised by one significant disadvantage: Due to the crosswise orientation of the layers, the bending stiffness of CLT beams is usually smaller than the bending stiffness of solid wood or glulam beams with identical dimensions. Particularly for wide spanned beams, the performance of beams loaded in bending is controlled by the deflections and hence by the bending stiffness. Therefore, for long beams CLT is not suitable.
Theoretical, the bending stiffness of CLT beams is controlled only by the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers. At best, the bending stiffness of CLT beams can be calculated considering the parallel orientated layers as a full shear plane. In fact, even the parallel orientated layers cannot be assumed as a full shear plane because the neighboured boards in the same layer are not glued together. Therefore, traditional CLT as used for panels may not be usable for beams loaded in bending.
To counterbalance this disadvantage of CLT, following modifications could be done:

- The bending stiffness of edgewise orientated CLT elements loaded in bending increases with increasing ration between the parallel and the perpendicular to the beam axis orientated layers. However, with increasing ratio between the parallel and the perpendicular to the beam axis orientated layers the reinforcement performance degreases. The thinner the perpendicular orientated layers are the lower loads perpendicular to the beam axis can be transferred.
- The bending stiffness of edgewise orientated CLT elements loaded in bending could be increased by additional gluing of boards along the narrow surfaces. Then the parallel orientated layers could be considered as a full shear plane.
- Another opportunity to increase the bending stiffness of edgewise orientated CLT beams loaded in bending could be given by optimizing of the reinforcing layers. Usually, CLT is made with crosswise orientated layers, where the layers are orientated perpendicular to each other. By an orientation of the inner layers in diagonal direction, like displayed in Fig. 6, the bending stiffness could be increased.


Fig. 6 Modified CLT element with diagonal orientated inner layers
To estimate the relationship between the local modulus of elasticity in the beam axis direction and the inclination angle, numerical calculations were done. Therefore, a beam with two planes loaded in bending was investigated, where the planes were orientated in the opposite direction to each other (Fig. 8). Both planes were glued together using contact elements and both planes considered the orthotropic material properties for the timber. The modulus of elasticity in grain direction was assumed as $E_{0}=12800 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ while the corresponding value perpendicular to the grain direction was assumed as $\mathrm{E}_{90}=275 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. The angle between the beam axis and the grain direction for the front side plane is $\alpha$. In contrast, the inclination for the back side plane is $\left(180^{\circ}-\alpha\right)$.


Fig. 7 Model to determine the relationship between the local MOE and inclination
The relationship between the local MOE in the beam axis direction and the inclination $\alpha$ is displayed in Fig. 8.


Fig. 8 Relationship between inclination and local MOE in the beam axis direction
This relationship can be described as well using equation (1). This equation fits the numerical results very good for $\mathrm{n}=2.6$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{e f}=\frac{E_{0}}{\frac{E_{0}}{E_{90}} \cdot \sin ^{n} \alpha+\cos ^{n} \alpha} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

According to the results (Fig. 8 and equation (1)) the local MOE degrease very fast with increasing inclination. Already at an inclination of $\alpha=13^{\circ}$, the local MOE in the beam axis direction degreases to the half of the MOE in grain direction. For an inclination of $\alpha=45^{\circ}$ the local MOE in the beam axis direction can be calculated to $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{ef}, 45^{\circ}}$ $=663 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. This value is about 2.4 times higher than the assumed $E_{90}=275 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ but unfortunately much smaller than the assumed MOE in grain direction ( $E_{0}=12800 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ).
This result shows that even diagonal ( $\alpha=45^{\circ}$ ) orientated reinforcing layers are not able to increase the bending stiffness of a CLT beam loaded in bending significantly. Nevertheless, this new product with diagonal orientated layers (DLT) can provide other opportunities: CLT with perpendicular orientated layers is suitable for beams which are loaded both in bending and by tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis. The modified product with diagonal orientated reinforcing layers (DLT) could be suitable for beams which are loaded both by tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis and by shear stresses simultaneously. High tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction and high shear stresses occur for example in local areas of beams. Therefore, the modified product with diagonal reinforcing layers was investigated as well within this project.

## 3 Practical part of the work

### 3.1 Preliminary remark

To determine the performance of cross (CLT) and diagonal (DLT) laminated timber elements used in beams loaded in bending tests on short and long beams were done. Short beams were planned to evoke shear failure. Against it, long beams were used to evoke bending failure. Tests were done on common beams with rectangular cross-section and without any singularities. To determine the reinforcing effect, additional tests on beams with singularities like holes and notched supports were done. Finally, the tests were done taking into account different cross-section types. Therefore, CLT and DLT beams with five layers and DLT with four layers were tested.
In the framework of this research project, all specimens were produced in the former "CANFOR" research lab in New Westminster, British Columbia where a heated press is located. The press is able to glue panels with 4 m in the length, 2 m in the width with a total thickness of 14 cm . The press is equipped with a heater and with vertical and horizontal hydraulic jacks. Unfortunately, the hydraulic jacks, which were orientated perpendicular to the plane surface, are limited to a total load of 850 kN . Considering the maximum press dimensions $\left(4 \times 2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\right)$ and the maximum loading ( 850 kN ), a total pressure of $0.11 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ can be applied on the elements.
Most of the glue manufacturers recommend a pressure of about $1 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ to obtain an adequate bonding between the timber members. With lower pressure the bonding performance degreases. Due to the limited pressure, it was not able to produce beams with large dimensions.

### 3.2 Timber selection

A CLT panel is a high quality product which is usually made using low quality raw material. Even low damaged raw material can be used for CLT. Damages, like smaller cracks or bigger knots in the boards don't affect the load-carrying capacity of CLT elements significantly. For this reason, not damaged raw material but as well raw material which was previously damaged by the mountain pine beetle (MPB) were used for the specimens.
Following material was provided by the Department of Wood Science for the test specimens:
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Series 1: } \quad 1512 \text { boards with a length of } 244 \mathrm{~cm} & H \times B=89 \mathrm{~mm} \times 38 \mathrm{~mm} \\ \text { Series 2: } & 756 \text { boards with a length of } 244 \mathrm{~cm} & H \times B=94 \mathrm{~mm} \times 21 \mathrm{~mm}\end{array}$

The standardised "2-by-4" boards with a total length of 8' (244 cm) were 1.5 " $(38 \mathrm{~mm})$ thick and $3.5^{\prime \prime}(89 \mathrm{~mm})$ height. This raw material (series 1 ) was taken from woods, where the mostly trees were destroyed by the mountain pine beetle (MPB). 756 pieces were taken from trees, which were cut down after a period of three years by being affected by the mountain pine beetle. The remaining 756 pieces were taken
from trees which were cut down after a period of one year by being affected by the mountain pine beetle. Boards from series 2 were not attached by the mountain pine beetle.

For all 2268 boards the timber density, the moisture content and the dynamic modulus of elasticity were determined. Each timber member was numbered and hence all determined parameters could be used to allocate the properties of CLT and DLT beams. Finally, the results were used as well to determine the relationship between the damage due to the MPB and the stiffness properties.
The frequency distribution for the dry timber density is displayed in Fig. 9. The dry timber density for timber damaged by the MPB and for the non-attacked timber is quite similar. The frequency distribution for the moisture content considering all 2268 boards is displayed in Fig. 10. The moisture content for timber which was affected by the MPB for three years is smaller than the moisture content for timber which was affected by the mountain pine beetle for one year. Thereby, both timber packages were stored for around one year at the University of British Columbia. Timber from series 2 was previously dries in an oven.


Fig. $9 \quad$ Frequency distribution for the dry timber density


Fig. 10 Frequency distribution for the moisture content
In Fig. 11 the relationship between the dynamic modulus of elasticity and the dry timber density is given. Obviously, the MOE is not influenced by the strength of the MPB attack. The MOE for timber which was attacked by the MPB timber for one year is quite equal to the MOE for timber which was attacked by the MPB for three years. The MOE for the non attacked timber is smaller than for the timber attacked by the MPB. The low value of the MOE can be explained by the low grade of this timber. The frequency distribution of the MOE is displayed in Fig. 12. Considering all results, the main results are summarized in Table 1.


Fig. 11 Relation between the dynamic MOE and the dry timber density


Fig. 12 Frequency distribution for the MOE

Table 1 Main parameters considering the pre-grading

| Series | Dimensions | Timber | $\mathbf{n}$ <br> $[-]$ | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{5 \%}}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{5 0 \%}}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\mathbf{5 \%} \%}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{k g} / \mathbf{m}^{\mathbf{3}}\right]$ | $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{5 0 \%}}$ <br> $[\mathbf{\%}]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{8 9} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{3 8} \mathbf{~ m m}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ year MPB attack | 756 | 8,39 | 12,1 | 387 | 15,7 |
|  |  | 8,97 | 11,8 | 402 | 10,9 |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{9 4} \times \mathbf{2 1} \mathbf{~ m m}$ | non attacked timber | 756 | 6,48 | 9,89 | 388 | 13,9 |

Taking into account the German grading classes for soft wood, timber from series 1 can be classified into the German grading class C27/C30. Against it, timber from series 2 can be classified into the German grading class C20/C22. Both grading classes are usually used for European cross laminated timber panels.
The determination of the timber properties took place in the laboratories of the Department of Wood Science at the University of British Columbia. Afterwards, the timber was transported to the former "CANFOR" research laboratories in New Westminster, British Columbia, Canada, where the specimens were manufactured.
Because not all raw materials were used for the CLT and DLT beams, an additional end-grading at the laboratories in New-Westminster was done. The first results from the pre-grading demonstrate that the duration of the MPB attack does not affect the MOE and the density of the timber. Hence, the end-selection was reduced to only two grading types, considering attacked timber in general (species 1) and nonattacked timber (species 2).
The CLT and DLT beams were produced using 800 timber beams from species 1 and 694 timber beams from species 2 . The properties of the finally used timber are summarized in the following figures. Fig. 13 shows the frequency distribution for the dry timber density for beams with $89 \times 38 \mathrm{~mm}$ (series 1) and for beams with $94 \times 21 \mathrm{~mm}$ (series 2). The relation between the dynamic modulus of elasticity and the dry timber density for both timber series is displayed in Fig. 14. In Fig. 15 the frequency distribution for the modulus of elasticity is displayed. Comparing the results from the end-grading with those from the pre-grading no significant differences can be noticed. For this reason the main parameters from the end-grading (Table 2) are quite similar to those from the pre-grading (Table 1).


Fig. 13 Frequency distribution for the dry timber density


Fig. 14 Relation between the dynamic MOE and the dry timber density


Fig. 15 Frequency distribution for the MOE
Table 2 Main parameters for the end-grading

| Series | Dimensions | Timber | $\mathbf{n}$ <br> $[-]$ | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{5 \%}}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{5 0 \%}}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\mathbf{5 \%}}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{k g} / \mathbf{m}^{\mathbf{3}}\right]$ | $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{5 0 \%}}$ <br> $[\mathbf{\%}]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{8 9} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{3 8} \mathbf{~ m m}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ year MPB attack <br> $\mathbf{3}$ year MPB attack | 518 <br> 282 | 8,79 | 11,9 | 390 | 13,9 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{9 4} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{2 1} \mathbf{~ m m}$ | non attacked timber | 694 | 6,49 | 9,97 | 388 | 13,6 |

### 3.3 Production of CLT beams

Using the end-graded timber, 60 CLT and DLT beams were produced. As previously mentioned, the maximum press load is limited to 850 kN . Considering the maximum dimensions of the press $\left(4 \times 2 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\right)$ and the maximum load, only a total pressure of $0.11 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ can be applied on full elements. However, most of the glue manufacturers recommend a pressure of $1 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ for their glue to assure an adequate bonding between the timber members. Therefore, it was not possible to produce whole panels with maximum dimensions and afterwards to cut them to the necessary geometry of the beams. Unfortunately, only two beams were produced in one run, which was pretty inefficient. In practice, the beams can be cut out of whole panels which are previously manufactured in one run.
Following 60 CLT and DLT beams were produced in 30 runs using the end-graded raw material:

Species 1.1: 12 short beams with $L \times H \times B=244 \times 37 \times 14 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}, 90^{\circ}$, 5-ply (Fig. 47)
Species 1.2: 12 long beams with $L \times H \times B=427 \times 27 \times 14 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}, 90^{\circ}, 5$-ply (Fig. 48)
Species 2.1: 8 short beams with $L \times H \times B=244 \times 37 \times 14 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}, 45^{\circ}, 5-\mathrm{ply}$ (Fig. 49)
Species 2.2: 10 short beams with $L \times H \times B=244 \times 37 \times 11 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}, 45^{\circ}$, 4-ply (Fig. 50)
Species 2.3: 8 long beams with $L \times H \times B=427 \times 27 \times 14 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}, 45^{\circ}, 5$-ply (Fig. 51)
Species 2.4: 10 long beams with $L \times H \times B=427 \times 27 \times 11 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}, 45^{\circ}$, 4-ply (Fig. 52)

To enforce shear failure, short beams (species 1.1, 2.1, and 2.2) were produced. To enforce bending failure, long beams (species 1.2, 2.3 and 2.4) were produced. Species 1.1 and 1.2 were made using crosswise orientated boards. Thereby, three layers were orientated in the beam axis direction while two layers were orientated perpendicular to the beam axis direction. Species 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 were made using diagonal orientated layers. Either specimens with five layers (2.1 and 2.3) or specimens with four layers (2.2 and 2.4) were manufactured. Those DLT beams with five layers were made using three parallel and two diagonal layers. Thereby, in between the two diagonal layers, which were orientated in the opposite direction to each other, a parallel layer was placed. DLT beams with four layers were made with two outer parallel and two inner diagonal layers. Thereby, the diagonal layers were orientated in the opposite direction and side by side.
For all specimens, timber from series $1\left(89 \times 38 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}\right)$ was used for the parallel layers. All perpendicular and diagonal orientated layers were made using timber from series $2\left(94 \times 21 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}\right)$. Due to the limited length of $8^{\prime}(2.44 \mathrm{~m})$ of the raw material, the boards for the parallel layers in longer beams were connected together using finger joints to increase the length to $14^{\prime}(4,27 \mathrm{~m})$. Therefore, totally 480 boards from series 1 were finger jointed together to 240 boards with a total length of 14' ( 4.27 m ). The location of the finger joints in long CLT and DLT beams is marked in Fig. 48, Fig. 51 and Fig. 52 using a red line. Within the next manufacturing step, all timber beams were planed over their wide surfaces. The narrow surfaces weren't planed. Timber from series 1 was planed to a new thickness of 35 mm while timber from series 2 was planed to a new thickness of 17.5 mm . Due to the reduced pressure of the press simply beams instead of panels were produced. Therefore, it was necessary to chop all the beams from series 2 used for the perpendicular and diagonal layers to their final length. The geometry and number of pieces which is necessary for any beam can be taken from Fig. 47 to Fig. 52. All beams were glued using a Phenol-Resorcinol-Formaldehyde-glue provided by HEXION. Thereby, CASCOPHEN AG5635Q was mixed together with CASCOSET FM-6310L in a proportion of 2.33. The processing time for the glue is given by the manufacturer to 25 to 30 minutes. Two beams remained for about $45-90$ minutes at the same time in the heated press. The oil temperature was $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Considering the maximum hydraulic jack load of 850 kN and the geometry of the beams, long beams were pressed with $0.4 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$, while short beams were pressed with $0.5 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. Although this pressure is definitely
lower than the recommended pressure by the glue manufacturer, almost no glue failure was noticed in the tests.
The manufacturing process is documented in Fig. 53 to Fig. 66. The assembling time for two beams was limited to 25 to 30 minutes due to the processing time for the glue. To accelerate the production process, a self-made frame was used for the beams. This frame was used as well to hold the beam members together during the pressing and hardening process. The beams were assembled together layer by layer. Between each layer glue was applied only on one surface using a commercial painter roller.
During the pre-grading all single timber members were numbered. Those numbers consists information about the dynamic modulus of elasticity and the dry timber density for each timber member. The modulus of elasticity and the dry timber density for the single timber members are listed in Table 14 to Table 19. To locate the single timber members in the corresponding beam use Fig. 47 to Fig. 52.

### 3.4 Testing and test results

The final cutting and testing of the manufactured 60 beams took place at the University of British Columbia. First, 30 beams were tested in bending without any changing. The remaining 30 beams were used to demonstrate the effect of the diagonal and perpendicular layers. Therefore, rectangular holes and end notches were cut into the remaining 30 beams. Those singularities affect the load-carrying capacity of beams due to tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction. Geometrical identical solid wood and glulam beams would split at lower load-carrying capacities. Against it, for CLT and DLT beams with holes and notches higher load-carrying capacities were expected.

### 3.4.1 Short beams without singularities

15 short CLT and DLT beams were tested in bending according to the test set-up in Fig. 16 to determine the bending stiffness and the load-carrying capacity. Thereby two single loads were applied on the single supported beam. Thereby, the load, the displacement of the hydraulic jacks, the total and the local vertical displacements were measured. The specimens were loaded until failure. The testing speed was determined to get the first failure in between $5 \pm 1$ minute. The total and local displacements were measured using displacement transducers. Those were removed at approximately $70 \%$ of the estimated load-carrying capacity and short before the beams failed to avoid transducer damage.


Fig. 16 Test set-up for short beams
Following dimensions were used for the test set-up:
$\mathrm{L}=2100 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=800 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{T}}=600 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{T}}=10 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{S}}=300 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{S}}=20 \mathrm{~mm}$.
All tested short beams were $\mathrm{H}=360 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the height. Beams with five layers from series 1-1 and 2-1 were $B=140 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the width while beams with four layers from series 2-2 were $B=105 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the width. As previously mentioned, parallel orientated boards were $B_{\text {par }}=35 \mathrm{~mm}$ thick while perpendicular or diagonal orientated boards were $B_{\text {perp }}=17.5 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the thickness.

Table 3 contents the main results for short beams without singularities. In the first row the specimen number is displayed, where the first two numbers represent the species according to Fig. 47 to Fig. 52. In the upper third of the table, test results for short CLT beams with five plies and with perpendicular to the beam axis orientated layers (species 1-1) are given. Results for short DLT beams with fife plies and with diagonal orientated layers (species 2-1) are given in the middle third of the table. Finally, in the lower third of the table the results for short DLT beams with four plies and with diagonal orientated layers (species 2-2) are displayed. The ultimate load $F_{\text {total }}$ for both hydraulic jacks is given in the second row. In row three to five the bending stresses $\sigma_{m}$, shear stresses $\tau_{v}$ and the local modulus of elasticity $\mathrm{E}_{0}$ are given. These values were calculated according to the beam theory at the ultimate load considering the total beam thickness, which includes the parallel and perpendicular layers. In row six to eight the corresponding net values are given. These values were calculated using the ultimate load and only the thickness of the parallel layers. Thereby, perpendicular to the beam axis orientated layers were not taken into account.

Table 3 Main results for short beams without singularities

| specimen | $F_{\text {total }}$ | $\sigma_{m}$ | $\tau_{v}$ | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $\sigma_{m, n e t}$ | $\tau_{\mathrm{v}, \text { net }}$ | $\mathbf{E}_{0, \text { net }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $[\mathbf{k N}]$ | $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ |
| $\mathbf{1 - 1 - 1}$ | 303 | 32,5 | 4,51 | 8191 | 43,4 | 6,01 | 10921 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 1 - 2}$ | 292 | 31,4 | 4,35 | 8427 | 41,9 | 5,80 | 11236 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 1 - 5}$ | 248 | 26,7 | 3,69 | 7246 | 35,5 | 4,92 | 9662 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 1 - 6}$ | 242 | 26,0 | 3,60 | 7872 | 34,6 | 4,80 | 10497 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 1 - 8}$ | 263 | 28,2 | 3,91 | 7176 | 37,7 | 5,22 | 9568 |
| mean | $\mathbf{2 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 , 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 3 7 6}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 1}$ | 291 | 31,2 | 4,33 | 8087 | 41,7 | 5,77 | 10782 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 2}$ | 287 | 30,8 | 4,27 | 6810 | 41,1 | 5,70 | 9080 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 4}$ | 320 | 34,3 | 4,76 | 8471 | 45,8 | 6,34 | 11295 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 5}$ | 305 | 32,8 | 4,54 | 7802 | 43,7 | 6,05 | 10402 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 7}$ | 301 | 32,3 | 4,48 | 7678 | 43,1 | 5,97 | 10237 |
| mean | $\mathbf{3 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 , 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 , 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 3 5 9}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 1}$ | 248 | 35,5 | 4,92 | 6008 | 53,3 | 7,38 | 9012 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 2}$ | 191 | 27,4 | 3,79 | 7500 | 41,1 | 5,69 | 11250 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 3}$ | 272 | 38,9 | 5,39 | 7897 | 58,4 | 8,08 | 11845 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 4}$ | 229 | 32,9 | 4,55 | 7785 | 49,3 | 6,82 | 11678 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 5}$ | 207 | 29,6 | 4,10 | 6659 | 44,4 | 6,15 | 9989 |
| mean | $\mathbf{2 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 , 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 , 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7 5 5}$ |

The load-displacement behaviour for all short beams is displayed in Fig. 67 to Fig. 69. Fig. 67 shows the relationship between the total load considering both hydraulic jacks and the displacement of the hydraulic jacks. The relationship between the total load considering both hydraulic jacks and the total and local beam deflection is given in Fig. 68 and Fig. 69. The total deflection was determined considering the beam span. In contrast, the local deflection was determined between the two single loads on a length $L_{T}$. The modulus of elasticity was calculated according to equation (2) using the local deflection. Between the single loads, no shear occurs. Therefore, the local modulus of elasticity doesn't consider the shear component.

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{0,(\text { net })}=\frac{\left(L-L_{A}\right) \cdot L_{A}^{2} \cdot F_{\text {total }}}{32 \cdot I_{(\text {net })} \cdot \Delta u_{T}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

With
$\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}} \quad$ Length between single loads
$\Delta u_{T} \quad$ Relative displacement in local area

## $\mathrm{F}_{\text {total }}$ Total load considering both hydraulic jacks <br> $I_{\text {(net) }} \quad$ (Net) moment of inertia

Short beams were tested to enforce shear failure. In contrast to the expectation, some beams failed in bending (left in Fig. 70) while other beams failed in shear (Fig. 70 to Fig. 72). Bending failure is characterised by tensile failure of one of the bottom and in the beam axis orientated boards. Against it, shear failure is characterised by delaminating of one of the outer and in the beam axis orientated boards. The shear failure occurred at the beam ends while bending failure occurred between the single loads. Some beams failed due to a combined failure due to shear and bending. The reason for the combined failure was that the bending and shear stresses, which were calculated according to the beam theory, were very close to their strength properties (Table 3). Although the failure was different, a difference between the different beam types can be showed taking into account the results in Table 3.
First, the local net modulus of elasticity is nearly similar for CLT and DLT beams. Hence, the beam type does not affect the bending stiffness significantly. However, the test results show differences for the net stresses and hence for the load-carrying capacities. The lowest average bending and shear stresses were reached for CLT beams with five plies and with perpendicular to the beam axis orientated layers (species 1-1). For DLT beams with diagonal layers and five plies (species 2-1) the average stresses were about $12 \%$ higher. Finally, the best result was reached for DLT beams with diagonal layers and with four plies. Considering only the parallel layers and the net cross-section, the increase in strength compared to CLT beams was $28 \%$. But even in case of taking into account the total cross-section including parallel and diagonal layers, the stresses for DLT beams with four plies were about 14\% higher compared to the CLT beams. Thereby, for DLT beams with four plies the ratio between the thickness of the parallel layers and the total beam thickness is only 0.67. Against it, the same ratio for CLT beams is 0.75 . Obviously, DLT beams with two diagonal layers, which are orientated in the opposite direction to each other and side by side are much better than CLT beams. Assuming approximately equal strength properties for the single timber members and taking into account the test results, the stresses for DLT beams should be smaller than those calculated according to the beam theory. This assumption will be investigated using the finite element analysis.

### 3.4.2 Long beams without singularities

Bending tests on 15 long CLT and DLT beams according to the test set-up in Fig. 17 were done to determine the bending stiffness and the load-carrying capacity. The test set-up used for long beams is similar to those used for short beams.


Fig. 17 Test set-up for long beams
For long beams following dimensions were used:
$\mathrm{L}=3800 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=1300 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{T}}=1000 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{T}}=0 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{S}}=300 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{S}}=85 \mathrm{~mm}$ All tested long beams were $\mathrm{H}=270 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the height. The thickness for specimens from test series 1-2 and 2-3 with five plies was $B=140 \mathrm{~mm}$ while the thickness for specimens from test series 2-4 with four plies was $B=105 \mathrm{~mm}$. As already mentioned, parallel to the beam axis orientated boards were $B_{p a r}=35 \mathrm{~mm}$ thick. The thickness of the boards used for the diagonal or perpendicular layers was $\mathrm{B}_{\text {perp }}=$ 17.5 mm .

Table 4 consider the main results for long beams without singularities. The layout in Table 4 is similar to those for short beams. In the first row the specimen number is displayed. The first numbers represent the species as displayed in Fig. 47 to Fig. 52. The upper third of the table deals with results for long CLT beams with five plies and with perpendicular to the beam axis orientated layers (species 1-2). Results for long DLT beams with five plies and with diagonal to the beam axis orientated layers (species 2-3) are given in the middle third of the table. Finally, in the lower third of the table, results for long DLT beams with four plies and with two side by side diagonal orientated layers (species 2-4) are displayed. The ultimate load $\mathrm{F}_{\text {total }}$ considering both hydraulic jacks is given in the second row. In row three to five the bending stresses $\sigma_{m}$, shear stresses $\tau_{v}$ and the local modulus of elasticity $E_{0}$ are given. These values were calculated at the ultimate load using the total beam thickness including the parallel and perpendicular layers. The bending and shear stresses were calculated using the beam theory. The local modulus of elasticity was calculated according to equation (2). In row six to eight, net values are given. These values were calculated using only the thickness of the parallel to the beams axis orientated layers.

Table 4 Main results for long beams without singularities

| specimen | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {total }}$ | $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\tau_{\mathrm{v}}$ | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}, \text { net }}$ | $\tau_{\mathrm{v}, \text { net }}$ | $\mathrm{E}_{0, \text { net }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $[\mathrm{kN}]$ | $\left[\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}\right]$ | $\left[\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}\right]$ | $\left[\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}\right]$ | $\left[\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}\right]$ | $\left[\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}\right]$ | $\left[\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}\right]$ |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 8}$ | 92,1 | 33,8 | 1,83 | 9026 | 45,1 | 2,44 | 12034 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 9}$ | 105 | 38,6 | 2,08 | 10007 | 51,4 | 2,78 | 13343 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 1 0}$ | 93,8 | 34,5 | 1,86 | 10352 | 46,0 | 2,48 | 13803 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 1 1}$ | 80,2 | 29,5 | 1,59 | 7045 | 39,3 | 2,12 | 9393 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 1 2}$ | 87,8 | 32,3 | 1,74 | 9603 | 43,0 | 2,32 | 12804 |
| mean | $\mathbf{9 1 , 8}$ | $33, \mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 , 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 2 7 5}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 3}$ | 79,7 | 29,3 | 1,58 | 9408 | 39,0 | 2,11 | 12544 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 4}$ | 81,4 | 29,9 | 1,62 | 9128 | 39,9 | 2,15 | 12171 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 5}$ | 91,5 | 33,6 | 1,82 | 8400 | 44,8 | 2,42 | 11201 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 7}$ | 95,4 | 35,1 | 1,89 | 9217 | 46,7 | 2,52 | 12289 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 8}$ | 87,2 | 32,0 | 1,73 | 9221 | 42,7 | 2,31 | 12294 |
| mean | $\mathbf{8 7 , 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 , 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 1 0 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 2}$ | 68,6 | 33,6 | 1,82 | 9249 | 50,4 | 2,72 | 13874 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 4}$ | 52,6 | 25,8 | 1,39 | 8223 | 38,6 | 2,09 | 12334 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 8}$ | 56,4 | 27,6 | 1,49 | 8693 | 41,4 | 2,24 | 13039 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 9}$ | 57,4 | 28,1 | 1,52 | 8390 | 42,1 | 2,28 | 12585 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 1 0}$ | 56,5 | 27,7 | 1,49 | 8804 | 41,5 | 2,24 | 13206 |
| mean | $\mathbf{5 8 , 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 6 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 , 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 0 0 8}$ |

The corresponding load-displacement behaviours for all long beams are displayed in Fig. 73 to Fig. 75. The first diagram represents the relationship between the hydraulic jack displacement and the total load. The other both diagrams represent the relationship between the total load and the total or local deflection of the single supported beam. Like for short beams, to protect the displacement transducers, they were removed shortly before the failure occurred.
Long beams were tested to enforce bending failure. As expected, all long beams failed in bending (Fig. 76 to Fig. 78). Bending failure is characterised by tensile failure of at least one of the bottom and in the beam axis orientated boards.
Compared to the test results for short beams, the local modulus of elasticity for all beams was much higher. However, like for the short beams, no significant increase in bending stiffness was reached using DLT beams instead of CLT beams. Obviously, the beam type does not affect the bending stiffness significantly. In contrast to the test results for short beams, no significant difference in load-carrying capacity and hence in bending strength was observed. It seems that the beam type does not affect the load-displacement behaviour for long beams. Strictly speaking, the average net
stresses for DLT beams were even $5 \%$ smaller than the average net stresses for CLT beams. For better qualification numerical investigations using the finite element analysis are necessary.

### 3.4.3 Short beams with notches

Due to the reinforcing layers, CLT and DLT are more efficient in beams with singularities than in common beams loaded in bending. Those singularities can be notched ends and round or rectangular holes. For this reason, tests on beams with notched ends and holes were done. It was expected, that the performance of CLT and DLT beams with notched ends and holes is much better than those of geometrical identical solid wood or glulam beams with similar singularities.
Short beams were used to demonstrate the effect for notches while long beams were used for beams with holes. At first, 15 short CLT and DLT beams were prepared using the HUNDEGGER K2 CNC machine and afterwards, they were tested in bending to determine the bending stiffness and the load-carrying capacity. Using the HUNDEGGER K2 CNC machine, notches for short beams were cut out. The beams were tested in bending according to the test set-up in Fig. 18.


Fig. 18 Test set-up for short beams with notches
The dimensions for short beams with notches were similar to those for short beams without singularities:
$\mathrm{L}=2100 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=800 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{T}}=600 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{T}}=-10 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{S}}=300 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{S}}=0 \mathrm{~mm}$
The short and end notched beams were $\mathrm{H}=360 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the height. Beams from test series 1-1 and 2-1 with five plies were $B=140 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the width while beams from test series 2-2 were $B=105 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the width. Thereby, parallel to the beam axis orientated boards were $B_{\text {par }}=35 \mathrm{~mm}$ thick. The thickness of the perpendicular or diagonal to the beam axis orientated layers was $B_{\text {perp }}=17.5 \mathrm{~mm}$.
The spacing between the edge of the beam support and the edge of the notch was chosen to $\mathrm{c}=50 \mathrm{~mm}$. The remaining beam height at the beam support was chosen
to $h_{A}=0.5 \cdot H=180 \mathrm{~mm}$. Hence, the ratio between the remaining beam height $h_{A}$ and the total beam height H was $\alpha=0.5$. This is the maximum permitted ratio according to [1]. With increasing ratio $\alpha$ the load-carrying capacity degreases. Therefore, for $\alpha=0.5$ the lowest load-carrying capacity is expected.
According to [1] the shear stress at a notched beam support can be calculated using equation (3) to (5). Equation (3) calculates the shear stress around the notched beam support taking into account the remaining beam height $h_{A}$ and a reduction factor $k_{v}$. As long as the reduction factor $k_{v}$ equals 1 , no splitting and hence no failure around the notched edge occurs. It is expected, that for notched beam supports made using CLT or DLT those kind of failure does not occur.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau_{v}=1,5 \cdot \frac{V}{B \cdot h_{A}} \cdot \frac{1}{k_{v}} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

With

$$
k_{v}=\min \left\{\begin{array}{c}
1  \tag{4}\\
k_{90} \cdot k_{\varepsilon}
\end{array}\right\} \quad \text { with } \quad k_{\varepsilon}=1 \text { for } \varepsilon=90^{\circ}
$$

And with

$$
\begin{equation*}
k_{90}=\frac{k_{n}}{\sqrt{H} \cdot\left(\sqrt{\alpha \cdot(1-\alpha)}+0,8 \cdot \frac{c}{H} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{\alpha}-\alpha^{2}}\right)} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

For beams with an equal geometry but made in glulam instead of CLT or DLT, the factor $k_{v}$ can be calculated to $k_{v}=0.53$ (using $\alpha=0.5, \mathrm{c}=50 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{H}=360 \mathrm{~mm}$ and $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{n}}=6.5$ for glulam). For this reason, splitting around the notched edge should occur at a calculated shear stress which is about half of the shear strength for timber. However, the calculated shear stresses for the investigated CLT and DLT beams were much higher than the half of the shear strength and splitting likewise observed for common glulam beams didn't occur. Table 5 contains the mentioned shear stresses in row seven. These shear stresses were calculated considering the remaining beam height $h_{A}$ which was assumed as $50 \%$ of the total beam height. The average shear stress for CLT beams is $\tau_{v, n e t}=6.14 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. For DLT beams with five plies the average shear stress is $\tau_{\mathrm{v}, \text { net }}=5.45 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$, while for the DLT beams with four plies the average shear stress was calculated to $\tau_{\mathrm{v}, \text { net }}=6.87 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. Those values are quite similar to the shear strength for the used timber. As expected, for the investigated CLT and DLT beams with notched ends no splitting failure occurred. These results show that the performance of CLT and DLT beams with notched ends is much better that those for similar beams made using solid wood or glulam.
Table 5 contains more results. In row three to five the bending stresses $\sigma_{m}$, shear stresses $\tau_{v}$ and the local modulus of elasticity $\mathrm{E}_{0}$ are given. These values were determined using the beam theory considering the total beam thickness including the parallel, perpendicular and diagonal to the beam axis orientated layers. Row six to
eight contains values for the bending stresses, the shear stresses and the local modulus of elasticity. These values were calculated considering only the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers. Both values, the local modulus of elasticity in row six and eight, were calculated using equation (2). Likewise for short and long beams without singularities, the bending stresses and the modulus of elasticity were calculated taking into account the total height of the beams. Against it, the shear stresses were calculated considering the remaining beam height $h_{A}$ which was assumed as $50 \%$ of the total beam height. Thereby the shear stresses in Table 5 were not reduced as ruled in [1] using the factor $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{v}}$. It was assumed, that splitting at the notched ends doesn't occur due to sufficient reinforcing by the perpendicular or diagonal layers. The full diagrams considering the load-displacement behaviour are displayed in Fig. 79 to Fig. 81.

Table 5 Main results for short beams with notches

| specimen | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {total }}$ | $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\tau_{\mathrm{v}}$ | $\mathrm{E}_{0}$ | $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}, \text { net }}$ | $\tau_{\mathrm{v}, \text { net }}$ | $\mathrm{E}_{0, \text { net }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | [kN] | [ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ] | [ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ] | [ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ] | [ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ] | [ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ] | [ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ] |
| 1-1-3 | 153 | 16,5 | 4,56 | 8779 | 22,0 | 6,08 | 11705 |
| 1-1-4 | 178 | 19,1 | 5,30 | 7940 | 25,5 | 7,07 | 10587 |
| 1-1-7 | 124 | 13,3 | 3,69 | 7361 | 17,8 | 4,93 | 9815 |
| 1-1-9 | 125 | 13,5 | 3,73 | 8956 | 18,0 | 4,97 | 11942 |
| 1-1-10 | 163 | 17,5 | 4,85 | 7361 | 23,3 | 6,46 | 9815 |
| 1-1-11 | 182 | 19,5 | 5,41 | 8888 | 26,0 | 7,21 | 11851 |
| 1-1-12 | 158 | 17,0 | 4,71 | 7929 | 22,7 | 6,28 | 10573 |
| mean | 155 | 16,6 | 4,61 | 8174 | 22,2 | 6,14 | 10898 |
| 2-1-3 | 104 | 11,2 | 3,09 | 9711 | 14,9 | 4,13 | 12948 |
| 2-1-6 | 134 | 14,4 | 3,99 | 8811 | 19,2 | 5,32 | 11748 |
| 2-1-8 | 174 | 18,7 | 5,18 | 8979 | 25,0 | 6,91 | 11971 |
| mean | 137 | 14,8 | 4,09 | 9167 | 19,7 | 5,45 | 12223 |
| 2-2-6 | 113 | 16,2 | 4,48 | 7365 | 24,3 | 6,72 | 11048 |
| 2-2-7 | 130 | 18,7 | 5,18 | 8432 | 28,1 | 7,77 | 12648 |
| 2-2-8 | 109 | 15,7 | 4,34 | 8097 | 23,5 | 6,51 | 12146 |
| 2-2-9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2-2-10 | 109 | 15,6 | 4,31 | 7801 | 23,4 | 6,47 | 11702 |
| mean | 115 | 16,5 | 4,58 | 7924 | 24,8 | 6,87 | 11886 |

Although the results in Table 5 are difficult to understand, the observed failures can help to qualify the different beam types. Two failures were observed for this test series. Thereby, some beams failed in pure shear which occurred at the beam end above the notched area. This failure was characterised by delaminating of at least
one of the outer boards, which are orientated in the beam axis direction. Thereby, no failure in the notched edge was observed. For this reason, the calculated shear stresses in row seven in Table 5 according to the beam theory are nearly similar to the shear strength of the single timber members. Against it, for some beams the failure occurred in the area of the notched edges. Thereby, either the reinforcing inner layers failed in tensile or pure glue failure between the parallel orientated and the reinforcing layers occurred. This kind of failure is documented in Fig. 82 to Fig. 84.
This second failure occurs, when the tensile load perpendicular to the grain direction at the notched edge is smaller than the load-carrying capacity of the reinforcing layer. This tensile load perpendicular to the grain direction can be calculated according to [1] using following equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{t, 90}=1,3 \cdot V \cdot\left[3 \cdot(1-\alpha)^{2}-2 \cdot(1-\alpha)^{3}\right] \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thereby the tensile load depends on the ratio $\alpha$ and on the shear load. Considering the average total loads for CLT and DLT beams, the tensile load can be calculated to $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}, 90}=50.4 \mathrm{kN}$ for CLT beams, to $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}, 90}=44.5 \mathrm{kN}$ for DLT beams with five plies and to $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}, 90}=37.4 \mathrm{kN}$ for DLT beams with four plies. Taking into account these results, perpendicular to the beam axis orientated reinforcing layers provide obviously the best reinforcing method. Tensile loads in the notched area occur only locally and close to the notched end. For this reason only the first board, which is located close to the notched edge, is loaded by $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}, 90}$. Considering two perpendicular layers and a crosssection of $94 \times 17.5 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}$ for each perpendicular to the beam axis orientated board, the first boards in each layer were loaded by a tensile stress which is $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{0}}=15.3$ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. Tensile failure occurred, because the maximum tensile stress in grain direction $\mathrm{f}_{t, 0}=15.3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ was nearly similar to the characteristic tensile strength in grain direction. As previously mentioned, the perpendicular to the beam axis orientated boards can be graded into the class C20/C22 according to [1]. The tensile strength in grain direction for $\mathrm{C} 20 / \mathrm{C} 22$ is $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{0}, \mathrm{k}}=12-13 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$.
As long as the load-carrying capacity of a beam with notched ends is governed by the load-carrying capacity of the notched beam supports, CLT should be preferred to DLT. The reinforcing layers in CLT are orientated perpendicular to the beam axis direction and hence in the direction of the tensile stresses, which occur at the notched beam support. Against it, the reinforcing layers in DLT are orientated in diagonal direction and hence they aren't orientated in the direction of the tensile stresses. The load transfer between the diagonal layers and the tensile load perpendicular to the beam axis direction can be regarded as a truss system. Therefore, with degreasing inclination of the diagonal layers, the reinforcing effect degreases.

### 3.4.4 Long beams with holes

Finally, 15 long CLT and DLT beams with holes were first cut using the HUNDEGGER K2 machine and afterwards they were tested in bending to determine the bending stiffness and the load-carrying capacity. The holes geometry was determined according to [1]. Thereby the height of a hole is limited to $40 \%$ of the total height of the beam while the length of the hole is limited to the total beam height. For the specimens almost the maximum holes dimensions were chosen because with increasing dimensions the load-carrying capacity degreases. The beams were tested in bending according to the test set-up in Fig. 19.


Fig. 19 Test set-up for long beams with holes
The outer dimensions for long beams with rectangular holes were similar to those for long beams without singularities:
$L=3800 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=1300 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{T}}=1000 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{T}}=0 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{S}}=300 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{S}}=50 \mathrm{~mm}$
The tested long beams with holes were $\mathrm{H}=270 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the height. Beams from test series 1-2 and 2-3 were $B=140 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the width. Against it, beams from test series 2-4 were $B=105 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the width. The thickness of the parallel orientated boards was $B_{\text {par }}=35 \mathrm{~mm}$ while the perpendicular or diagonal to the beam axis orientated boards were $B_{\text {perp }}=17.5 \mathrm{~mm}$ thick.
The hole edge distance to the beam end was $a_{D}=690 \mathrm{~mm}$. The holes were placed in the middle between the beam support and the neighbouring single load to avoid an influence of the stresses which occur around the loading area. The length of the holes was chosen to $L_{D}=H=270 \mathrm{~mm}$. The holes were $h_{D}=100 \mathrm{~mm}$ in the height, which is about $37 \%$ of the beam height. The beams were designed in that way, that similar solid wood or glulam beams should fail due to tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction around the holes. Thereby, the loads should be significantly smaller than those for similar beams without holes. However, it was expected, that CLT and DLT beams don't behave like solid wood or glulam. Hence, no splitting failure around the holes for CLT and DLT beams was expected.

In Table 6 the main results for long beams with holes are given. In row two the total load for both hydraulic jacks is given. The corresponding bending and shear stresses as well as the modulus of elasticity were calculated using the beam theory. Row three to five contains the values which consider the total beam thickness. In row six to eight values are given, which consider only the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers. The maximum bending stresses occur in between the single loads while maximum shear stresses occur at the holes. Hence, bending stresses were calculated considering the total beam height while for the maximum shear stresses only the net height at the beam holes was considered. Diagrams with the loaddisplacement behaviour for long beams with holes loaded in bending are displayed in Fig. 85 to Fig. 87.

Table $6 \quad$ Main results for long beams with holes

| specimen | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {total }}$ | $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\tau_{\mathrm{v}}$ | $\mathrm{E}_{0}$ | $\sigma_{\text {m,net }}$ | $\tau_{\mathrm{v}, \text { net }}$ | $\mathrm{E}_{0 \text {,net }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | [kN] | [ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ] | [ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ] | [ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ] | [ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ] | [ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ] | [ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ] |
| 1-2-1 | 87,8 | 32,3 | 2,77 | 8642 | 43,0 | 3,69 | 11523 |
| 1-2-2 | 74,5 | 27,4 | 2,35 | 8851 | 36,5 | 3,13 | 11802 |
| 1-2-3 | 92,5 | 34,0 | 2,92 | 9514 | 45,3 | 3,89 | 12686 |
| 1-2-4 | 98,9 | 36,4 | 3,12 | 10629 | 48,5 | 4,16 | 14171 |
| 1-2-5 | 83,3 | 30,6 | 2,63 | 8674 | 40,8 | 3,50 | 11565 |
| 1-2-6 | 82,7 | 30,4 | 2,61 | 9588 | 40,5 | 3,48 | 12784 |
| 1-2-7 | 65,7 | 24,1 | 2,07 | 8223 | 32,2 | 2,76 | 10964 |
| mean | 83,7 | 30,7 | 2,64 | 9160 | 41,0 | 3,51 | 12214 |
| 2-3-1 | 78,3 | 28,8 | 2,47 | 8636 | 38,4 | 3,29 | 11514 |
| 2-3-2 | 94,2 | 34,6 | 2,97 | 9610 | 46,1 | 3,96 | 12814 |
| 2-3-6 | 85,7 | 31,5 | 2,70 | 8856 | 42,0 | 3,60 | 11808 |
| mean | 86,0 | 31,6 | 2,71 | 9034 | 42,2 | 3,62 | 12045 |
| 2-4-1 | 52,6 | 25,8 | 2,21 | 7592 | 38,7 | 3,32 | 11388 |
| 2-4-3 | 58,0 | 28,4 | 2,44 | 7902 | 42,6 | 3,65 | 11854 |
| 2-4-5 | 50,9 | 24,9 | 2,14 | 8313 | 37,4 | 3,21 | 12469 |
| 2-4-6 | 62,3 | 30,5 | 2,62 | 9321 | 45,8 | 3,92 | 13982 |
| 2-4-7 | 41,3 | 20,2 | 1,73 | 8199 | 30,3 | 2,60 | 12299 |
| mean | 53,0 | 26,0 | 2,23 | 8266 | 39,0 | 3,34 | 12399 |

Usually, the load-carrying capacity for beams with holes is governed by the loadcarrying capacity around the hole. Thereby, high tensile and compression stresses perpendicular to the beam axis direction and high shear stresses occur around the holes. Similar beams with holes however made in solid wood or glulam would fail at lower loads. Against it, the load-carrying capacities for the investigated CLT and DLT
beams were similar to those for CLT and DLT beams without holes and hence higher than the assumed load-carrying capacities for solid wood or glulam beams with holes.
The investigated CLT and DLT beams failed in bending. Neither tensile nor shear failure was observed around the holes. Thereby, the perpendicular or diagonal orientated reinforcing layers were able to prevent splitting and hence a brittle failure at lower load-carrying capacities. The typical observed failure in bending is displayed in Fig. 88 and Fig. 89.
According to [1] the load component perpendicular to the beam axis direction next to the holes edges can be calculated (see (7)).

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{t, 90}=\frac{V \cdot h_{D}}{4 \cdot H} \cdot\left[3-\frac{h_{D}^{2}}{H^{2}}\right]+0,008 \cdot \frac{M}{h_{r}} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

With

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{r}=\frac{\left(H-h_{D}\right)}{2} \quad \text { for rectangular holes located in the middle of the cross-section } \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The tensile load occurs locally. With increasing distance to the holes the tensile loads degreases. For this reason, only the first reinforcing board, which is orientated close to the holes, is mainly loaded by $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}, 90}$. Considering the average load-carrying capacities for the tested long beams, the first board in CLT beams was loaded by $F_{t, 90}=$ 13.5 kN . Against it, the next to the hole orientated board in DLT beams with five plies was loaded by $F_{t, 90}=13.9 \mathrm{kN}$ and for DLT beams with four plies, the corresponding board was loaded by $F_{t, 90}=8.55 \mathrm{kN}$.
Taking into account the load component for CLT beams with $F_{t, 90}=13.5 \mathrm{kN}$ and the cross-section of the reinforcing boards ( $94 \times 17.5 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}$ ), the first boards around the holes were loaded in tension by $f_{t, 0}=4.10 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. The timber used for the reinforcing layers was graded into the class C20/C22 according to [1] with a characteristic tensile strength in grain direction of $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{t}, 0, \mathrm{k}}=12-13 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. Due to the low tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis, no failure around the holes was observed. Although not observed, DLT could be better for beams with holes than CLT. The areas around the holes are loaded by tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis direction and by shear stresses. The resulting force which considers the shear and tensile force, is orientated diagonal to the beam axis direction and hence in the direction of the reinforcing layers in DLT elements. Similar results were made by Blass and Bejtka [13]. Glulam beams with holes were investigated which usually are prone to splitting due to tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction or due to shear stresses around the holes. Two reinforcing methods using self-tapping screws were investigated. One, where the screws were orientated perpendicular to the beam axis direction and one, where the screws were orientated at $45^{\circ}$ to the beam axis direction. The second reinforcing method seemed to be better, because the screws were able to transfer both, high tensile loads perpendicular to the grain direction and high
shear loads. Unfortunately, this effect couldn't be proved within this research project, because no one beam failed duel to shear stresses or high tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis direction and close to the holes area. Fortunately, it was demonstrated that beams with holes made using CLT or DLT usually are not prone to splitting around the holes area.
Likewise for long beams without holes, the investigated orientation of the reinforcing layers $\left(45^{\circ}\right.$ or $\left.90^{\circ}\right)$ does not affect the bending strength and the MOE. Considering the test results, those values are nearly similar for DLT and CLT beams.

### 3.4.5 Assessment of the beam type

The aim of the tests was to demonstrate the reinforcing effect of CLT and DLT beams which are loaded in bending and by tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction. Furthermore, the tests were done to assess the type of the beam (CLT vs. DLT) in respect to the load-carrying behaviour. The results show that timber splitting, which usually occurs in common glulam or solid wood beams loaded in bending and by high tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain, can be prevented using CLT or DLT. Thereby, the tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis direction can be transferred by the reinforcing layers. However, the relationship between the beam type (CLT vs. DLT) and the bending stiffness could not be investigated so far. To determine the relationship between the different beams type (CLT vs. DLT) and the bending stiffness, the stiffness properties for all single timber members must be taken into account. In addition, all test results, those for beams without singularities and those for beams with singularities should be taken into account.
Subsequent, all results are taken into two groups to assess the different beam types in terms of the MOE. One group consist the local MOE for short beams and the other group consists the MOE for long beams. Thereby, results for beams without singularities and for beams with singularities are taken into one group. This can be done, because the investigated singularities like notches and holes, does not affect the local MOE. The local MOE was determined using the beam deflection in between the both single loads according to equation (2). In the following tables the local MOE values for all tested short beams (Table 7) and for all tested long beams (Table 8) are displayed. The MOE values in row two consider the total beam thickness. Against it, the MOE values in row three consider only the thickness of the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers. In the bottom lines mean values, standard deviations and 5\%quantile are given.

Table 7 Mean value, standard deviation and $5 \%$-quantile for $E_{0}$ and $E_{0, \text { net }}$ for short beams

| Short CLT beam - 5-ply |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| specimen | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E}_{0} \\ {\left[\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}\right]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E}_{0, \text { net }} \\ {\left[\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}\right]} \end{gathered}$ |
| 1-1-1 | 8191 | 10921 |
| 1-1-2 | 8427 | 11236 |
| 1-1-3 | 8779 | 11705 |
| 1-1-4 | 7940 | 10587 |
| 1-1-5 | 7246 | 9662 |
| 1-1-6 | 7872 | 10497 |
| 1-1-7 | 7361 | 9815 |
| 1-1-8 | 7176 | 9568 |
| 1-1-9 | 8956 | 11942 |
| 1-1-10 | 7361 | 9815 |
| 1-1-11 | 8888 | 11851 |
| 1-1-12 | 7929 | 10573 |
| mean value | 8011 | 10681 |
| st.deviation | 648 | 864 |
| 5\%-quantile | 6850 | 9133 |


| Short DLT beam - 5-ply |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| specimen | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{0}}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{0} \text { net }}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 1}$ | 8087 | 10782 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 2}$ | 6810 | 9080 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 3}$ | 9711 | 12948 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 4}$ | 8471 | 11295 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 5}$ | 7802 | 10402 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 6}$ | 8811 | 11748 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 7}$ | 7678 | 10237 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1 - 8}$ | 8979 | 11971 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| mean value | $\mathbf{8 2 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0 5 8}$ |
| st.deviation | $\mathbf{8 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 9 7}$ |
| 5\%-quantile | $\mathbf{6 4 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 6 6 4}$ |


| Short DLT beam - 4-ply |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| specimen | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{0}}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{[} / \mathbf{m m}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{0} \text { net }}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 1}$ | 6008 | 9012 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 2}$ | 7500 | 11250 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 3}$ | 7897 | 11845 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 4}$ | 7785 | 11678 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 5}$ | 6659 | 9989 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 6}$ | 7365 | 11048 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 7}$ | 8432 | 12648 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 8}$ | 8097 | 12146 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 9}$ | - | - |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2 - 1 0}$ | 7801 | 11702 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| mean value | $\mathbf{7 5 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 2 5 8}$ |
| st.deviation | $\mathbf{7 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 2 6}$ |
| 5\%-quantile | $\mathbf{6 0 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 5 1}$ |

Table 8 Mean value, standard deviation and $5 \%$-quantile for $E_{0}$ and $E_{0, \text { net }}$ for long beams

| Long CLT beam - 5-ply |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| specimen | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{0}}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{2}\right]$ | $\mathbf{E}_{0, \text { net }}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{2}\right]$ |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 1}$ | 8642 | 11523 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 2}$ | 8851 | 11802 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 3}$ | 9514 | 12686 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 4}$ | 10629 | 14171 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 5}$ | 8674 | 11565 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 6}$ | 9588 | 12784 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 7}$ | 8223 | 10964 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 8}$ | 9026 | 12034 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 9}$ | 10007 | 13343 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 1 0}$ | 10352 | 13803 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 1 1}$ | 7045 | 9393 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2 - 1 2}$ | 9603 | 12804 |
| mean value | $\mathbf{9 1 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 2 3 9}$ |
| st.deviation | $\mathbf{9 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 1 9}$ |
| 5\%-quantile | $\mathbf{7 4 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 7 5}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


| Long DLT beam - 5-ply |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| specimen | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{0}}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{0 \text { net }}}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 1}$ | 8636 | 11514 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 2}$ | 9610 | 12814 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 3}$ | 9408 | 12544 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 4}$ | 9128 | 12171 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 5}$ | 8400 | 11201 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 6}$ | 8856 | 11808 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 7}$ | 9217 | 12289 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3 - 8}$ | 9221 | 12294 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| mean value | $\mathbf{9 0 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0 8 0}$ |
| st.deviation | $\mathbf{4 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 7}$ |
| 5\%-quantile | $\mathbf{8 2 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0 0 5}$ |


| Long DLT beam - 4-ply |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| specimen | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{0}}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{\mathbf{2}}\right]$ | $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{0 , \text { net }}}$ <br> $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{2}\right]$ |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 1}$ | 7592 | 11388 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 2}$ | 9249 | 13874 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 3}$ | 7902 | 11854 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 4}$ | 8223 | 12334 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 5}$ | 8313 | 12469 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 6}$ | 9321 | 13982 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 7}$ | 8199 | 12299 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 8}$ | 8693 | 13039 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 9}$ | 8390 | 12585 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4 - 1 0}$ | 8804 | 13206 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| mean value | $\mathbf{8 4 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 7 0 3}$ |
| st.deviation | $\mathbf{5 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 9}$ |
| 5\%-quantile | $\mathbf{7 4 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 1 1 1}$ |

MOE values ( $\mathrm{E}_{0, \text { net }}$ ) which consider only the thickness of parallel orientated layers can be used to compare the results for beams with five and with four plies. Taking into account the $5 \%$-quantile values, the orientation of the reinforcing layers $\left(90^{\circ}\right.$ or $45^{\circ}$ ) and hence the beam type (CLT vs. DLT) does not affect the local modulus of elasticity. The values for $E_{0, n e t, 5 \%}$ for CLT beams, DLT beams with five and four plies are nearly similar. However, a small difference in $E_{0, \text { net,5\% }}$ can be only noticed for long beams. The local MOE for beams with diagonal orientated reinforcing layers is about $12 \%$ higher than the corresponding local MOE for beams with perpendicular to the beam axis orientated reinforcing layers. Unfortunately, this comparison is quite
meaningless, because the properties of the single timber members were not taken into account.
In the next step the previously determined MOE values for the single timber members, which are orientated in the beam axis direction, are taken into account to determine the relationship between the beam type and the local modulus of elasticity. For each tested beam the local modulus of elasticity was calculated considering the MOE values for the single timber members using equation (9). In this calculation, the diagonal or perpendicular to the beam axis orientated layers were neglected.

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{0, \text { cal }}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(E_{i} \cdot I_{i}+E_{i} \cdot A_{i} \cdot a_{i}^{2}\right)}{I_{\text {net }}} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

With
$\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}} \quad$ MOE value for the parallel orientated board i
$I_{i} \quad$ Moment of inertia for the parallel orientated board $i$
$A_{i} \quad$ Cross-section for the parallel orientated board $i$
$a_{i} \quad$ Distance between the centre of gravity for board $i$ and the centre of gravity for the beam
$I_{\text {net }} \quad$ Moment of inertia for the beam considering only the parallel layers which act as a full plane

Using the beam configuration (Fig. 47 to Fig. 52) and the MOE values for each single and parallel to the beam axis orientated timber member (Table 14 to Table 19), the local modulus of elasticity $\mathrm{E}_{0, \text { cal }}$ for the corresponding beam were calculated. Those values were compared with the local MOE values $\mathrm{E}_{0, \text { net }}$ in Table 7 and Table 8.
In Fig. 90 to Fig. 95 the comparison between the calculated values ( $\mathrm{E}_{0, \mathrm{cal}}$ ) and the test results ( $E_{0, \text { net }}$ ) for each beam is given. Both values consider only the total thickness of the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers. The ratio between the test result $E_{0, \text { net }}$ and the calculated value $E_{0, \text { cal }}$ is displayed beneath each column pair. As long as this value is smaller than $100 \%$, the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers can't be considered theoretically as a full plane.
The summarisation of all results is given in Fig. 20. Thereby, for each beam type the lowest, the highest and the average value for the ratio between the test result $\mathrm{E}_{0 \text {,net }}$ and the calculated value $\mathrm{E}_{0, \text { cal }}$ is given. For short beams the average ratios are smaller than $100 \%$. Against it, the average values for long beams are higher than $100 \%$. Furthermore, for short and for long beams, the ratio between $E_{0, \text { net }}$ and $E_{0, \text { cal }}$ increases from CLT beams to DLT beams with five plies and finally to DLT beams with four plies. Obviously, the orientation of the reinforcing layers does affect the bending stiffness.


Fig. $20 \quad E_{0, \text { net }}$ versus $E_{0, \text { cal }}$ for each beam type
The previous investigations can be summarised as follows:

1. CLT and DLT beams can be used for beams which are loaded in bending and by tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis direction. Glulam and solid wood beams loaded by tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis direction or by high shear stresses are prone to splitting and hence they are less efficient compared to CLT and DLT beams.
2. In terms of shear stresses, DLT beams with diagonal to the beam axis orientated layers are better than CLT beams with perpendicular to the beam axis orientated layers. Hence, for short beams, where the load-carrying capacity is governed by shear, DLT instead of CLT for beams should be used.
3. Considering all results and the MOE values for the single timber members, local MOE values $\mathrm{E}_{0, \text { cal }}$ for all the tested beams were calculated. These MOE values were compared to the test results (Fig. 20). Thereby a relationship between the beam type (CLT vs. DLT) and the local MOE and hence the bending stiffness was noticed. Obviously, the local MOE and hence the bending stiffness is higher for beams with diagonal orientated layers compared to beams with perpendicular to the beam axis orientated layers.

## 4 Theoretical part of the work

The previously presented practical work demonstrates, that CLT and DLT provides an opportunity for beams loaded in bending and by tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis direction compared to solid wood or glulam beams. In contrast to CLT and DLT beams, glulam or solid wood beams loaded in bending and by tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis direction are prone to splitting. Against it, the reinforcing layers in CLT and DLT beams prevent splitting. Furthermore, the test results show that DLT beams are better than CLT beams in terms of the bending stiffness. Obviously, diagonal orientated reinforcing layers improve the bending stiffness. However, previous investigations were done on a limited number of beams. Due to this limitation, it was not possible to investigate all parameters which assess the loaddisplacement behaviour of beams loaded in bending. For example, the number of boards and the board dimensions were not investigated so far. The test results are as well not sufficient to determine the stress distribution in this highly complicated CLT or DLT element loaded in bending. To consider all these parameters either more tests are necessary or a finite element analysis is needed.
The following theoretical work is divided into two parts. First, different finite element models for CLT and DLT beams loaded in bending are investigated. A simplified beam model, a plane model and a solid model are presented. These different finite element models are used to demonstrate the dependence of different parameters on the load-displacement behaviour of CLT and DLT beams. Parameters which don't affect the load-displacement behaviour can be neglected. The simplified beam and plane model are used to determine all parameters, which affect the loaddisplacement behaviour. Based on these results, a solid model is presented.
Using the finite element solid model, which hits the reality best, a parameter study was done. Amongst others the number of parallel to the beam axis orientated timber members and the timber member dimensions were investigated. This investigation helps to understand the difference between the different beam types (CLT vs. DLT) and hence to qualify them.

### 4.1 Finite element analysis for CLT and DLT beams

### 4.1.1 Beam model

The simplest finite element model for edgewise orientated CLT and DLT elements loaded in bending is a 2-dimensional model using beam elements. Thereby, each board in any single layer is represented by a beam element with three degrees of freedom (translation in $x$ and $y$ direction and rotation about the nodal $z$ axis). Usually, the boards in real CLT or DLT elements are glued together only over the wide surfaces. The narrow surfaces between neighbouring boards are not glued together. For this reason, this simplified numerical model with beam elements for each single timber member can be used for edgewise orientated CLT and DLT elements. Beams representing the parallel to the beam axis orientated timber members are connected
with beams representing the perpendicular or diagonal to the beam axis orientated timber members to a grid. A similar grid model for CLT elements was used by Blaß and Görlacher [2]. Thereby, Blaß and Görlacher describe the load-displacement behaviour of CLT elements loaded as panels in shear using the grid model.
According to Blaß and Görlacher [2], the load-displacement behaviour of edgewise orientated CLT panels is mainly controlled by the connection between the crosswise orientated boards. Only with a rigid bonding between the crosswise orientated boards, the separate casting CLT panel can act as a full plate. However, with degreasing bonding stiffness between the crosswise orientated boards, the CLT panel shear and bending stiffness degreases.
To determine the bonding stiffness between crosswise orientated boards, torsion tests were done according to their real load-carrying behaviour (left in Fig. 21). Thereby two crosswise orientated single timber members were first glued together and after hardening, they were twisted relatively to each other until failure occurred (right in Fig. 21). These tests were used to determine the bonding stiffness and the torsion strength of the connection.


Fig. 21 Left: Test configuration. Right: Test specimen after failure (Figures taken from [2])

Blaß and Görlacher determined the bonding stiffness between $3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$ and $8.6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$ with an average value of about $5 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$. The load-displacement behavior of crosswise bonded timber members twisted relatively to each other is characterized by a linear-elastic behavior followed by a brittle failure. The average torsion strength was determined to $3.6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. The minimum torsion strength was $2.6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. Taking into account all test results, Blaß and Görlacher recommend for the bonding stiffness $3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$ and for the torsion strength $2.5 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$.
The bonding stiffness as defined by Blaß and Görlacher was used for the simplified grid or beam model. Thereby edgewise orientated CLT and DLT beams loaded in bending were investigated. The numerical investigations were done using the commercial finite element software ANSYS 10.

ANSYS 10 beam elements were used to create a single supported grid beam loaded in bending. Beam elements were used for parallel to the beam axis orientated boards and for perpendicular or diagonal orientated boards. Two single loads were applied in the third points of the beam length while the supports were applied at the beam ends. Half of the model, which represents a CLT beam, is displayed left in Fig. 22. Right in Fig. 22, half of the model for a DLT beam is displayed.


Fig. 22 Grid Model for CLT and DLT beams
The red lines in Fig. 22 represent the neutral axis of the parallel to the beam axis orientated boards. Thereby, their height $h_{p}$ is equal to the distance between the neutral axes of two side by side and parallel orientated boards. For the CLT beam, the blue lines represent the neutral axis of boards, which are orientated perpendicular to the beam axis direction. Thereby, their board height $h_{r}$ is equal to the distance between the board axes. In DLT beams, at least two diagonal layers are necessary to form a symmetric beam. Thereby, the diagonal layers must be orientated in the opposite direction to each other. Right in Fig. 22 the green and blue lines represent both diagonal layers which are orientated in the opposite direction to each other. Thereby, their height $h_{r}$ is equal to the distance between their neutral axes.
ANSYS 10 - Combin14-spring element was used to represent the torsion behaviour of the glue between the crosswise or diagonal orientated boards (Fig. 23). The end nodes of the Combin14 - spring element provide only one degree of freedom. Only rotation or moments can be transferred between the end nodes, while relative displacements or forces can't be. Therefore, the load-displacement behaviour of the Combine14-spring element is characterised only by the torsion stiffness.


Fig. 23 ANSYS 10 - Combin14-spring element used for the bonding between the boards

The finite element analysis was done, first to determine the influence of the bonding stiffness on the load-displacement behaviour of CLT and DLT beams and second, to determine the influence of the beam type (CLT vs. DLT) and geometry on the loaddisplacement behaviour. Therefore following parameters were varied:

Bonding stiffness according to $\mathrm{Blaß}$ and Görlacher Beam total height
Beam total length
Ration between the thickness of the parallel and the perpendicular layers
$\mathrm{K}=3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$ and $6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$
$\mathrm{H}=200 \mathrm{~mm}$ to 1000 mm
$\mathrm{L}=1000 \mathrm{~mm}$ to 10000 mm

$$
t_{p} / t_{r}=0.5 \text { to } 0.9
$$

For all single timber members a constant modulus of elasticity parallel to the grain direction of $E_{0}=12.800 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ was used. The height of the parallel and perpendicular or diagonal to the beam axis orientated boards was chosen to $h_{p}=h_{r}=100 \mathrm{~mm}$. The bonding connection area affects the torsion stiffness and hence the stiffness of the spring element. The torsion stiffness for the spring element is to calculate using the polar moment of inertia for the connection area and the bonding stiffness K as defined by Blaß and Görlacher. Therefore, the torsion stiffness $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ser }}$ for the spring element can be calculated according to equation (10).

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{s e r}=\frac{h_{p} \cdot h_{r}^{3}+h_{p}^{3} \cdot h_{r}}{12} \cdot K \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Taking into account all variations, 900 numerical calculations for each CLT and DLT beam were done. All calculations were done on a simple supported beam with two concentrated loads. Thereby the bending stresses in the parallel to the beam axis orientated boards and in particular the beam deflections were calculated. Using the beam deflections, the effective MOE values neglecting the shear component according to equation (2) were calculated. The effective MOE values, depending on the ra-
tion between the beam length $L$ and the beam height $H$, are displayed in the following diagrams.
The first diagram (Fig. 24) contains numerical results for CLT beams with crosswise orientated layers $\left(90^{\circ}\right)$ and with a bonding stiffness $K=3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$ as defined by Blaß and Görlacher. For a better overview, only a part of the 900 numerical results is displayed. Fig. 25 contains the diagram with numerical results for CLT beams with crosswise orientated layers $\left(90^{\circ}\right)$ and with a bonding stiffness $\mathrm{K}=6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$.


Fig. 24 Effective MOE for CLT beams $\left(90^{\circ}\right)$ with bonding stiffness $\mathrm{K}=3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$


Fig. 25 Effective MOE for CLT beams $\left(90^{\circ}\right)$ with bonding stiffness $\mathrm{K}=6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$
Assuming, that the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers with a total thickness $t_{p}$ act as a full plane, the theoretical MOE for the beam $E_{\text {ef }}$ can be calculated using equation (11). Thereby, the stiffness of the perpendicular or diagonal to the beam axis orientated layers with the total thickness $t_{r}$ is neglected.

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{e f}=E_{0} \cdot \frac{t_{p}}{t_{p}+t_{r}} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

For beams with a ratio between the parallel layers thickness $t_{p}$ and the total beam thickness $t$ of 0.5 , the effective MOE can be calculated to $E_{\text {ef }}=0.5 \cdot E_{0}=6400 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. For a ratio of 0.9 between the parallel layers thickness $t_{p}$ and the total beam thickness $t$, the effective MOE is $E_{\text {ef }}=0.9 \cdot E_{0}=11520 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. As already mentioned, a MOE value of $E_{0}=12800 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ was used for all single timber members. Those calculated effective MOE values for beams with $t_{p} / t=0.5$ and $t_{p} / t=0.9$ are represented in Fig. 24, Fig. 25 and in the following figures by red lines.
Only for large values between the beam length $L$ and the beam height $H$, the numerical results are nearly similar to the calculated values according to equation (11). Hence, it can be assumed, that the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers act as a full plane. Unfortunately, with degreasing L/H ratio, the effective MOE value degreases. Beams loaded in bending generally are made with length to height ratios between 5 and 20. For CLT beams loaded in bending with L/H-ratios between 5 and 20 and with $\mathrm{K}=3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$, the effective MOE can be calculated between 1700 and $9700 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. Due to the low modulus of elasticity and hence due to a low bending
stiffness, CLT beams with an L/H-ratio smaller than 20 are not suitable for being loaded in bending.
Even the numerical results considering $\mathrm{K}=6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$ are not better (Fig. 25). For beams with an L/H-ratio between 5 and 20 the effective stiffness can be calculated between 3.000 and $10600 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. A higher bonding stiffness than $\mathrm{K}=6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$ is hardly to reach. Therefore a higher increase in bending stiffness for CLT beams can not be expected. This results show that CLT elements with crosswise orientated layers even with stiffer bonding are ineffective for beams loaded in bending, in particular for L/H < 20.
Using equal parameters, numerical calculations on DLT beams according to the model right in Fig. 22 with diagonal orientated boards were done. The results for DLT beams with a bonding stiffness of $\mathrm{K}=3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$ are displayed in Fig. 26. Fig. 27 contains the results for DLT beams with a bonding stiffness of $K=6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$.


Fig. 26 Effective MOE for DLT beams $\left(45^{\circ}\right)$ with bonding stiffness $\mathrm{K}=3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$


Fig. 27 Effective MOE for DLT beams $\left(45^{\circ}\right)$ with bonding stiffness $K=6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$
For DLT beams with an L/H-ratio between 5 and 20 the effective MOE can be calculated between 6300 and $11600 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. Compared to CLT beams, the effective MOE value and hence the bending stiffness between L/H = 5 and 20 are clearly higher. The numerical calculations with DLT beams show, that the effective MOE and hence the bending stiffness are not affected by the bonding stiffness. For $K=3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$ and $\mathrm{K}=6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$ the results in Fig. 26 and Fig. 27 are quite similar. Therefore, the bonding stiffness doesn't affect the load-carrying behaviour of DLT beams.
Compared to CLT beams, DLT beams seem to be better in terms of bending stiffness as well for larger L/H-ratios. For longer beams, the numerically determined MOE value is not only similar to the effective MOE value according to equation (11), which already considers the parallel layers as a full plane, but even larger. Obviously, in addition to the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers, the diagonal orientated layers affect the bending stiffness of CLT beams. The highest increase in MOE compared to a full plane was reached for CLT beams with four parallel to the beam axis orientated boards with $t_{p} / t=0.5$. Using the finite element analysis, the MOE for those DLT beam was determined to $E_{\text {ef }}=7140 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$, which is $12 \%$ larger than the corresponding value $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}=0.5 \cdot \mathrm{E}_{0}=6400 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ according to equation (11).
The presented finite element analysis was done on a simplified model using beam elements. Thereby, beams representing parallel orientated boards were linked together with beams representing perpendicular or diagonal orientated boards using torsion springs. The bonding behaviour between the boards is characterised by the torsion stiffness using torsion springs. The load-displacement behaviour and hence the bending stiffness for suchlike simplified models can be estimated using common
calculation models, like for example the shear analogy method (German: Schubanalogieverfahren) or the theory for flexible connected beams. The theory for flexible connected timber beams was first investigated by Möhler in 1956 [3].
Möhler determined this theory to calculate flexible connected beams loaded in bending. Thereby, up to three single timber members can be connected together using nails, dowels, screw and other dowel-type fasteners. The fasteners are orientated along the splice between the timber members to transfer shear loads. Thereby, the fasteners in the splice between the parallel timber members are loaded in the beam axis direction.
Due to the build-up, edgewise orientated CLT and DLT beams loaded in bending can be considered as flexible connected beams. Thereby, the parallel to the beam axis orientated boards represent the continuous beam members. Against it, perpendicular or diagonal to the beam axis orientated boards can be considered as flexibility between the parallel to the beam axis orientated boards. The theory for flexible connected beams considers the flexibility in the splice using a flexibility parameter $\gamma_{i}$. The flexibility parameter $\gamma_{i}$ depends on the stiffness $\mathrm{K} / \mathrm{s}$ along the splice. For lateral loaded dowel-type fasteners, K is the stiffness modulus and $s$ the distance between the dowel-type fasteners in the beam axis direction.
The theory for flexible connected beams according to Möhler can be used as well for CLT and DLT beams loaded in bending. Thereby, first the flexibility parameter $\gamma_{i}$ is to determine. For CLT beams loaded in bending, it can be assumed that each perpendicular to the beam axis orientated board acts likewise a lateral loaded dowel-type fastener. The distance between the axes of the perpendicular to the beam axis orientated boards is s. Likewise dowel-type fasteners, perpendicular to the beam axis orientated boards are loaded perpendicular to their axis. Hence, the stiffness $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{CLT}}$ can be calculated assuming a cantilever beam loaded by a single load $F$ at the free end. The span of the cantilever beam is equal to the distance between two parallel to the beam axis orientated boards. The bonding stiffness is represented by two torsion springs at the cantilever beam ends with the torsion stiffness $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{R}}$. The stiffness $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{CLT}}$ for each perpendicular to the beam axis orientated board along the splice between the parallel boards depends on the single load $F$ and the lateral deflection $u$ at the cantilever beam ends. The deflection $u$ for a cantilever beam with two torsion springs $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{R}}$ at the beam ends is to calculate using following equation.

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=\frac{F \cdot \ell^{3}}{12 \cdot E \cdot I}+\frac{F \cdot \ell^{2}}{2 \cdot K_{R}} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The torsion spring stiffness $K_{R}$ is the product of the polar moment of inertia and the bonding stiffness $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ser }}$ as determined by Blaß and Görlacher. The polar moment of inertia depends on the bonding area dimensions, the length a and the width b .

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{R}=\frac{a \cdot b^{3}+a^{3} \cdot b}{12} \cdot K_{s e r} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

The stiffness $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{CLT}}$ for each perpendicular to the beam axis orientated board in the splice between the parallel to the beam axis orientated boards can be calculated using following equation.

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{C L T}=\frac{F}{u}=\frac{12}{\ell^{2} \cdot\left[\frac{\ell}{E \cdot I_{r}}+\frac{6}{K_{R}}\right]}=\frac{12}{\ell^{2} \cdot\left[\frac{12 \cdot \ell}{E \cdot b \cdot t_{r}^{3}}+\frac{72}{a \cdot b^{3}+a^{3} \cdot b \cdot K_{s e r}}\right]} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{CLT}}$ and the distance s can be used to calculate the flexibility parameter $\gamma_{\mathrm{i}}$ and hence the strength and stiffness properties for CLT beams loaded in bending according to [3].
For DLT beams with diagonal to the beam axis orientated beams it can be assumed, that the bonding stiffness does not affect the load-carrying capacity of DLT beam loaded in bending. Numerical results using a simplified finite element analysis confirm this assumption. Therefore, the diagonal to the beam axis orientated beams act more or less as slopes in the splice between the parallel to the beam axis orientated boards. Using this assumption the diagonal orientated boards transfer only tensile loads. Hence, the stiffness $K_{D L T}$ for each diagonal orientated board in the splice between two parallel to the beam axis orientated boards can be calculated according to equation (15). This equation considers the inclination of the diagonal orientated boards.

$$
\begin{equation*}
K_{D L T}=\frac{F}{u}=\frac{F}{\varepsilon \cdot \ell}=\frac{F \cdot E}{\sigma \cdot \ell}=\frac{A \cdot E}{\ell}=\frac{b \cdot t_{r} \cdot E}{\ell} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{DLT}}$ and the distance s , the flexibility parameter $\gamma_{\mathrm{i}}$ and hence the strength and stiffness properties for DLT beams loaded in bending can be calculated according to [3].
Using the theory for flexible connected beams according to [3] and equation (14) for CLT beams or equation (15) for DLT beams, the effective MOE depending on the ratio between the beam length $L$ and the beam height $H$ was calculated. To compare numerical and analytical results together, equal parameters as for the finite element analysis were used:
$\ell=h_{p}=100 \mathrm{~mm} \quad$ Height $h_{p}$ of the parallel boards which is the distance $\ell$ between the parallel boards axes
$a=h_{p}=100 \mathrm{~mm} \quad$ Height a of the bonding connection area
$b=h_{r}=100 \mathrm{~mm} \quad$ Length $b$ of the bonding connection area
$\mathrm{K}_{\text {ser }}=3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3} \quad$ Bonding stiffness as defined by Blaß and Görlacher
$\mathrm{E}_{0}=12.800 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2} \mathrm{MOE}$ in grain direction for each single timber member
$t_{p} \quad$ Total thickness of the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers $t_{p}=0.5 \cdot \mathrm{t}=50 \mathrm{~mm}$ and $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{p}}=0.9 \cdot \mathrm{t}=90 \mathrm{~mm}$

Fig. 28 consists of both, numerical results from the finite element analysis and analytical results using equation (14) for CLT beams and equation (15) for DLT beams.


Fig. 28 Effective MOE for DLT beams ( $45^{\circ}$ ) and CLT beams $\left(90^{\circ}\right)$ - Comparison between numerical and analytical results

The blue lines represent the results for beams with a total thickness of the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers $t_{p}=0.9 \cdot t$. For CLT and DLT beams with $t_{p}=0.5 \cdot t$, the results are represented by the black lines. Solid lines represent numerical finite element results while analytical results using the theory for flexible connected beams are represented by the dashed lines. In Fig. 28 only results for beams with two parallel orientated boards are given.
Fig. 28 shows that the analytical results are nearly similar to the numerical finite element results. For this reason, equations (14) and (15), which were used to estimate the flexibility parameter for CLT and DLT beams seem to be realistic. Hence the equations can be used to qualify the beam types and parameters in terms of the bending stiffness of the beams. For a ratio between the cantilever length (distance between the axes of the parallel orientated boards) and the total thickness of the reinforcing layers $\ell \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{r}}>1$, the stiffness $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{DLT}}$ for DLT beams is always larger than the stiffness $K_{\text {CLT }}$ for CLT beams. This is even valid, when an unlimited bonding stiffness $\mathrm{K}_{\text {ser }}$ is assumed. For this reason, the effective modulus of elasticity for DLT beams is usually larger than the corresponding value for CLT beams. Hence, in terms of bending stiffness, DLT beams seem to be better than CLT beams.
Both, the finite element analysis and the analytical calculations using a simplified beam model show that DLT beams are quite better than CLT beams in terms of bending stiffness. The results show furthermore, that the bonding stiffness in the range between 3 and $6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}$ does not affect the bending stiffness of CLT and DLT beams significantly. Nevertheless this simplified model using beam elements and
torsion springs is not suitable to determine the load-carrying capacity of CLT and DLT beams. First, this beam model does not consider orthotropic material properties for the single timber members. Second, it is not proved how the friction between neighbored timber members affects the beam performance. And finally, the simplified beam model does not display the real bonding condition, which occurs in CLT and DLT beams. Here, the beams are connected only between two nodes. Against it, in reality, crosswise or diagonal orientated beams are connected over the full surface.

### 4.1.2 Plane model

The previously presented beam model is not suitable to determine the loaddisplacement behaviour of CLT and DLT beams loaded in bending. First, orthotropic material properties were neglected using the beam model. Second, the bonding between the single timber members was represented by only one connection node between the torsion spring and the bonding area. Finally, the friction between the single timber members was not considered at all. To improve the finite element analysis a plane model as displayed in Fig. 29 was developed.
Thereby, ANSYS 10 plane elements "Plane182" were used to represent the parallel, perpendicular and diagonal orientated single timber members. These plane elements were fitted with orthotropic material properties for timber. In the splices between neighboured single timber members contact elements using "Contact171" and "Target169" were arranged. These contact elements were placed between the parallel, perpendicular and diagonal to the beam axis orientated timber members.


Fig. 29 Plane model considering contact between boards, orthotropic material properties and bonding

Plane182 elements are defined by four nodes with two degrees of freedom at each node. The two degrees of freedom are translation in x and y direction. Unfortunately, rotation is not supported by plane elements. Hence, bonding between timber members as defined by Blaß and Görlacher couldn't be considered using only the Plane182 elements. To solve this problem, an additional supporting frame made out of four beam elements and four diagonal beam elements was arranged in each bonding area between neighboured timber members. This supporting frame was made using rigid beam elements with three degrees of freedom. The frames dimensions were similar to the dimensions of the real bonding area. In contrast to the simplified beam model with only one connection node between two single timber members, the size of the connection area in the plane model was similar to the real connection area.
The four edge nodes of the supporting frame were connected to the nodes of the plane elements. Each bonding surface was equipped with one frame. Hence, each connection had two supporting frames. The diagonal beams in each frame crossed each other in one node, which was arranged in the middle of the frame. Between these middle nodes of two neighboured supporting frames, torsion springs using "Combin14" elements were placed. As for the simplified beam model, the spring elements represented the bonding properties between two timber members.
Although the plane model seems to be better than the beam model, the plane model is characterised by one disadvantage. The plane model can't consider the beam build-up in the out-of-plane direction. For this reason the plane model can' be used to determine, whether a DLT beam with two side by side and diagonal orientated layers is better than a DLT beam with two diagonal layers, which are separated by a parallel to the beam axis orientated layer. This plane model helps merely to qualify the contact and hence the influence of friction between single timber members on the loadcarrying behaviour of CLT and DLT beams. To investigate the influence of friction between timber members, 72 numerical calculations using the plane model in Fig. 29 were done. The finite element analysis was done on single supported CLT and DLT beams loaded by two single loads. CLT beams were calculated with two crosswise orientated layers. Against it, for DLT beams three layers are necessary. One layer is orientated in the parallel direction while two layers are orientated in the diagonal and in the opposite direction to each other. Following parameters were varied:
Beam height:
Ratio between beam length and beam height:
Friction coefficient:
Beam type:
Following parameters were considered as constant:

MOE in grain direction:
MOE perpendicular to the grain:
Shear modulus:
Bonding stiffness:
$H=200,400$ and 600 mm
L/H = 6, 12, 18 and 24
$\mu=0.2,0.6$ and 1.0
CLT and DLT

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{E}_{0}=12800 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2} \\
& \mathrm{E}_{90}=275 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2} \\
& \mathrm{G}=550 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2} \\
& \mathrm{~K}=3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

Ratio between $t_{\text {parallel }}$ and $t_{\text {perpendicular }} \quad t_{P} / t_{R}=1$
Width of timber members in parallel layers $\quad h_{P}=100 \mathrm{~mm}$
Width of timber members in perpendicular layers $\quad h_{R}=100 \mathrm{~mm}$
Using 72 finite element calculations, local and global modulus of elasticity and main stresses were calculated. The global modulus of elasticity consider the shear deflection while the local modulus of elasticity not. To determine the local modulus of elasticity, the relative displacements in the area between the two single loads were determined. Following equation was used to calculate the local modulus of elasticity:

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{e f}=\frac{a \cdot \ell_{1}^{2} \cdot F}{8 \cdot I \cdot \Delta u} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

## With

a Distance between beam support and neighbouring single load
$\ell_{1} \quad$ Length in the area between single loads
$\Delta u \quad$ Relative displacement between both measurement points
F Single load
I Moment of inertia
Table 9 consist local MOE values $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for CLT beams. In Table 11 the MOE values for DLT beams are given. To demonstrate the influence of friction, Table 10 and Table 12 are given. In Table 10 and Table 12, based on the $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for a friction coefficient $\mu=$ 0.6 , the MOE deviations for $\mu=0.2$ and $\mu=1.0$ are given. The differences are very small, even inexistent. Hence, friction does not affect the local modulus of elasticity for CLT and DLT beams in the calculations. Based on these results, contact between narrow surfaces will be neglected for further models.

Table $9 \quad E_{\text {ef }}$ for CLT beams using the plane model

| $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for CLT | $\mathrm{H}=\mathbf{2 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{H}=\mathbf{4 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{H}=\mathbf{6 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LH | $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 6}$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 1497 | $\mathbf{1 5 1 0}$ | 1524 | 1408 | $\mathbf{1 4 3 2}$ | 1456 | 1228 | $\mathbf{1 2 5 6}$ | 1286 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 3873 | $\mathbf{3 9 0 5}$ | 3940 | 3596 | $\mathbf{3 6 7 7}$ | 3762 | 3847 | $\mathbf{3 9 9 1}$ | 4140 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 5802 | $\mathbf{5 8 2 2}$ | 5839 | 5541 | $\mathbf{5 6 7 0}$ | 5800 | 5833 | $\mathbf{5 9 6 5}$ | 6102 |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 6833 | $\mathbf{6 8 4 8}$ | 6941 | 6553 | $\mathbf{6 6 3 3}$ | 6722 | 5915 | $\mathbf{5 9 8 0}$ | 6069 |

Table $10 \quad E_{\text {ef }}$ for CLT beams using the plane model - influence of friction

| $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for CLT | $\mathrm{H}=\mathbf{2 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{H}=\mathbf{4 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{H}=\mathbf{6 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{L H}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | $-0,89 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 5 1 0}$ | $0,95 \%$ | $-1,72 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 4 3 2}$ | $1,68 \%$ | $-2,31 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 2 5 6}$ | $2,34 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $-0,81 \%$ | 3905 | $0,89 \%$ | $-2,21 \%$ | 3677 | $2,29 \%$ | $-3,60 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 9 9 1}$ | $3,73 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $-0,34 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 8 2 2}$ | $0,30 \%$ | $-2,28 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 6 7 0}$ | $2,29 \%$ | $-2,22 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 9 6 5}$ | $2,30 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $-0,22 \%$ | $\mathbf{6 8 4 8}$ | $1,35 \%$ | $-1,21 \%$ | $\mathbf{6 6 3 3}$ | $1,33 \%$ | $-1,09 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 9 8 0}$ | $1,50 \%$ |

Table $11 \quad \mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for DLT beams using the plane model

| $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for DLT | $\mathrm{H}=\mathbf{2 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{H}=\mathbf{4 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{H}=\mathbf{6 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LH | $\mathbf{0 , 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 5431 | $\mathbf{5 4 7 6}$ | 5517 | 6343 | $\mathbf{6 4 3 2}$ | 6514 | 6729 | $\mathbf{6 7 8 2}$ | 6824 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 7307 | $\mathbf{7 3 2 4}$ | 7343 | 7292 | $\mathbf{7 3 0 5}$ | 7317 | 7247 | $\mathbf{7 2 5 3}$ | 7257 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 7585 | $\mathbf{7 5 9 1}$ | 7595 | 7370 | $\mathbf{7 3 7 2}$ | 7375 | 7282 | $\mathbf{7 2 8 3}$ | 7283 |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 7741 | $\mathbf{7 7 4 3}$ | 7744 | 7402 | $\mathbf{7 4 0 2}$ | 7403 | 7293 | $\mathbf{7 2 9 3}$ | 7293 |

Table $12 \quad E_{\text {ef }}$ for DLT beams using the plane model - influence of friction

| $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for DLT | $\mathrm{H}=\mathbf{2 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |  |  | H = $\mathbf{4 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{H}=\mathbf{6 0 0} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{L H}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 , 6}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | $-0,81 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 4 7 6}$ | $0,75 \%$ | $-1,38 \%$ | $\mathbf{6 4 3 2}$ | $1,29 \%$ | $-0,79 \%$ | $\mathbf{6 7 8 2}$ | $0,61 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $-0,23 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 3 2 4}$ | $0,25 \%$ | $-0,18 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 3 0 5}$ | $0,16 \%$ | $-0,08 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 2 5 3}$ | $0,06 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $-0,08 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 5 9 1}$ | $0,06 \%$ | $-0,04 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 3 7 2}$ | $0,03 \%$ | $-0,02 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 2 8 3}$ | $0,01 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $-0,02 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 7 4 3}$ | $0,02 \%$ | $0,00 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 4 0 2}$ | $0,01 \%$ | $0,00 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 2 9 3}$ | $0,00 \%$ |

Following results present the difference between CLT and DLT beams. Fig. 30 consists numerical results for a friction coefficient $\mu=0.6$. The relationship between local MOE values and the ratio between the beam length and the beam height is shown. The solid lines represent the results for DLT beams, while the mashed lines represent the results for CLT beams. As already presented (see beam model), the MOE values for DLT beams are higher than the corresponding values for CLT beams. For this reason, DLT beams loaded in bending are more effective in terms of bending stiffness than comparable CLT beams.


Fig. 30 Effective MOE $E_{\text {ef }}$ for CLT and DLT elements (plane model with $\mu=0.6$ )

### 4.1.3 Solid model

A simplified beam model and a modified plane model were presented. Both models have some restrictions. Hence, they are not suitable to determine the loaddisplacement behaviour of CLT and DLT beams loaded in bending. The beam model doesn't consider orthotropic material properties and represents the bonding between two single timber members using one node. Although, the plane model considers orthotropic material properties and a bonding connection area with realistic dimensions, the plane model cannot be used to determine the influence of the beam buildup in the out-of-plane direction. To evade these restrictions, a solid model was developed. The solid model was made using ANSYS 10 solid elements "Solid95". The element "Solid95" is characterised by 20 nodes with three degrees of freedom. Among others, orthotropic material properties were considered. In contrast to the previously presented models, the solid model considers all three dimensional directions. Hence, the real beam build-up can be considered. For this reason, CLT beams with five plies and in particular DLT beams with four and five plies were investigated. All numerical investigations were done considering the same beam build-up as for the test specimens.
The previously presented numerical results show, that the bonding stiffness in the range as defined by Blaß and Görlacher, doesn't affect the load-displacement behaviour of CLT and DLT beams loaded in bending. Therefore, the bonding stiffness as defined by Blaß and Görlacher is neglected in the solid model. Due to the fact, that the solid model considers as well the beam build-up in the out-of-plane direction, the contact between single timber members can be presented by simple connection. Thereby, the nodes in the bonding connection area between two neighboured single timber members are glued together. This special fusion between two single timber members around the bonding connection area was realised using contact elements ("Contact174" and "Target170"). To prevent sliding between the nodes, "keyoption 12 " was set to 5 . For KO $12=5$, contact and target elements are always bonded together.
In the splices between the narrow surfaces no contact elements were applied. Using the plane model it was demonstrated, that friction between the narrow surfaces of neighboured boards does not affect the load-displacement behaviour of CLT and DLT beams. The friction between the narrow surfaces of neighboured boards should be neglected anyway, because it's difficult to control. In reality, the gap thickness varies due to changing moisture content. In case of swelling, gaps become smaller and in case of shrinkage they become larger. Gaps with 6 mm thickness are usual in larger CLT and DLT elements. Considering a gap width of 6 mm , contact between the narrow surfaces of neighboured boards cannot be transferred at small deflections anyway.
First, a finite element analysis using the solid model was done to compare the numerical results with the test results. Using the finite element analysis, CLT and DLT beams were analysed, which are completely similar to the tested specimens in terms
of geometry and material properties. Numerical investigations were done on short (series 1-1) and long (series 1-2) CLT beams with five plies. Furthermore, short (series 2-1) and long (series 2-3) DLT beams with five plies as well as short (series 2-2) and long (series 2-4) DLT beams with four plies were investigated. The geometry for all beams is summarised in chapter 3.4.1 and 3.4.2. The beam build-up is given in Fig. 47 to Fig. 52. All beams were loaded by the average ultimate load from previous tests.
Table 3 consist the ultimate loads for short beams while Table 4 deals with the ultimate loads for long beams. The finite element analysis was done considering a modulus of elasticity in grain direction of $11900 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. This MOE corresponds to the average MOE $\mathrm{E}_{50 \%}$, which was determined for the single timber members used for the parallel layers (Table 2). Further stiffness parameters, like the MOE perpendicular to grain and the shear modulus were not previously determined. Based on the DIN 1052:2004-08, the MOE perpendicular to the grain direction $E_{90^{\circ}}$ was assumed as $E_{90^{\circ}}=E_{0^{\circ}} / 30=400 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. The shear modulus $G$ was assumed as $G=750 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ while the rolling shear modulus $G_{R s}$ was assumed as $G_{R S}=G / 10=75 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. The chosen ratio between $E_{0}$ and $E_{90}$ and between $G$ and $G_{R s}$ corresponds to the ratio for timber according to DIN 1052:2004-08.
The investigated systems are displayed in Fig. 96 (specimen 1-1), Fig. 99 (specimen 2-1), Fig. 102 (specimen 2-2), Fig. 105 (specimen 1-2), Fig. 108 (specimen 2-3) and Fig. 111 (specimen 2-4). Those figures present full CLT and DLT beam systems with supports and loading plates. Parallel and perpendicular or diagonal to the beam axis orientated layers are displayed separately. Fig. 96 to Fig. 113 show beams under loading and the axial stresses distribution. In addition, the lateral deformation in the out-of-plane direction (z-axis) is displayed. The beam deformation in the out-of-plane direction was scaled with factor five for short beams and with factor three for long beams to improve the view. Hence, it can be noticed, that DLT beams with diagonal to the beam axis orientated layers are prone to twist. Both diagonal layers are orientated in the opposite direction and with an eccentricity to the beam axis. Due to this orientation, DLT beams are loaded in torsion which leads to twisting. The torsion moment increases with increasing shear load and with increasing eccentricity of the diagonal orientated layers. Therefore, DLT beams should be produced with diagonal orientated layers located as close as possible to the beam axis and in between the parallel layers. Then, torsion moments can be reduced and beam twisting can be prevented. Outside on the beam surface orientated diagonal layers should be avoided. Although the investigated DLT beams are prone to twist, the tested and numerically calculated beams never failed in buckling. Compared to the beam size, the deflection in the out-of-plane direction is too small.
To qualify the different beam types, stresses and stiffness properties were determined. For all six beam types, normal stresses in the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers along path 1 were determined. Shear stresses for all six beam types were determined along path 2. It can be assumed, that the maximum normal
stresses in the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers occur along path 1 while the maximum shear stresses in the parallel orientated layers occur along path 2. The definition of the different paths considering the different beam types is given in Fig. 31 and Fig. 32.


Fig. 31 Path definition for short beams (path 1 for $\sigma_{x}$, path 2 for $\tau_{x y}$, path 3 for $\sigma_{y}$ )


Fig. 32 Path definition for long beams (path 1 for $\sigma_{\mathrm{x}}$, path 2 for $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}}$, path 3 for $\sigma_{\mathrm{y}}$ )
In addition, (tensile) stresses perpendicular to the grain direction in the perpendicular to the CLT beam axis orientated inner layers along path 3 were determined. Due to the bending of the CLT beams, the top beam surface is loaded in compression while the bottom beam surface is loaded in tension. Therefore, perpendicular to the beam axis orientated boards are loaded in tension perpendicular to their grain direction. This investigation was done, because timber is very week in tension perpendicular to
the grain direction. However, tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction in the diagonal to the beam axis orientated boards in DLT beams were not determined. Compared to the perpendicular to the beam axis orientated boards in CLT beams, the diagonal orientated boards in DLT beams are loaded by much smaller tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction due to the diagonal orientation.
Normal stresses in the parallel layer along path 1 are presented for short beams in Fig. 33 and for long beams in Fig. 34. Although the distribution and the maximum values seem to be equal, they are quite different. The maximum bending stress for the short CLT beam was calculated to $46.3 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$, while the maximum bending stress for the short DLT beam with five plies was calculated to $45.7 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ (-1\%). Although the bending stresses and the cross sections are quite similar, the short DLT beam with five plies is better than the short CLT beam. The short CLT beam was loaded by 270 kN, while the short DLT beam with five plies was loaded by 301 kN (+12\%). Even better is the short DLT beam with four plies. Assuming a total loading of 229 kN , the maximum bending stress was calculated to $47.8 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ which is quite similar to the maximum stresses for the short CLT beam. However, the short DLT beam with four plies was loaded by 229 kN which corresponds to an effective loading of $105 / 70 \cdot 229 \mathrm{kN}=344 \mathrm{kN}$ considering only two parallel layers with a total thickness of 70 mm for the DLT beam with four plies and three parallel layers with a total thickness of 105 mm for the CLT beam with five plies. For this reason, the performance of the investigated DLT beam with four layers is $27 \%$ higher compared to the investigated short CLT beam.
Similar results were made for long beams (Fig. 34). The long CLT beam was loaded by 91.8 kN as determined in tests. Thereby, the maximum bending stress was determined to $47.6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. The long DLT beam with five plies was loaded by 87.1 kN which is $5.1 \%$ smaller than the corresponding load for the long CLT beam. However, the maximal bending stress was determined to $41.6 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ which is even $12.6 \%$ smaller than the maximum bending stress value for the long CLT beam. Therefore, the performance of the long DLT beam with five plies is about $7.5 \%$ better compared to the long CLT beam. Even better are the results for the long DLT beam with four plies. The long DLT beam with four plies was loaded by 58.3 kN or being transferred to a thickness of totally 105 mm for the parallel layers, by $105 / 70 \cdot 58.3 \mathrm{kN}=87.5 \mathrm{kN}$. Compared to the long CLT beam, the effective loading is quite similar ( $-0.2 \%$ ). However, the calculated maximum bending stress for the long DLT beam with four plies was $40.4 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ which is $15.1 \%$ smaller than the corresponding value for the long CLT beam. Therefore, the performance of the long DLT beam with four plies is about $15 \%$ better compared to the investigated long CLT beam.
Taking into account the bending stresses, DLT beams with four plies seem to be better than DLT beams.
The main results are as well summarized in Table 13. Column three consist loads, which were used for the finite element analysis. These values are equal to the corre-
sponding test results. The maximum bending stresses along path 1 for the different beams, which correspond to the loads in column three, are given in column four.


Fig. 33 Distribution of normal stresses $\sigma_{x}$ along path 1 for short beams


Fig. 34 Distribution of normal stresses $\sigma_{x}$ along path 1 for long beams

Shear stresses distribution along path 2 for short beams is presented in Fig. 35. Fig. 36 contains the shear stresses distribution along path 2 for long beams. The maximum values for shear stresses along path 2 are given in column five in Table 13. The determined shear stresses for CLT and DLT beams with five plies are quite similar. Against it, for short and long DLT beams with four layers, the determined shear stresses are lower than the corresponding values for the other beam configurations. Using the beam theory and taking into account only the parallel layers, the maximum shear stresses for the short CLT beam, loaded by 270 kN , can be calculated to $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}, \text { net,par }}=5.36 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. Against it, according to the finite element analysis result, the maximum shear stress is $\tau_{x y}=5.82 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}(+8.6 \%)$. The maximum shear stress for the short DLT beam with five plies loaded by 301 kN can be calculated to $\tau_{\mathrm{xy} \text {,net,par }}=$ $5.98 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ according to the beam theory. Against it, the finite element analysis provides a maximum shear stress, which is $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}}=5.12 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}(-13 \%)$. The short DLT beam with four plies is even better. The maximum shear tress for the short DLT beam with four plies loaded by 229 kN can be calculated to $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}, \mathrm{net}, \mathrm{par}}=6.82 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ considering the beam theory. Thereby, the maximum shear stress in the finite element analysis was determined to $\tau_{x y}=3.70 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$, which is $46 \%$ smaller than the calculated shear stress according to the beam theory. Using the finite element analysis, the maximum shear stress for the short CLT beam is even $8.6 \%$ higher than the corresponding value according to the beam theory. For the short DLT beam with five plies, the numerically determined shear stress is $13 \%$ smaller than the corresponding value according to the beam theory. Against it, the maximum shear stress for the short DLT beam with four plies is about $46 \%$ smaller than the corresponding value according to the beam theory. Hence, the investigated short DLT beams with four plies provide the best shear performance.
In terms of shear stresses, long beams behave similar to the short beams. For the long CLT beam loaded by 91.8 kN , the shear stress can be calculated to $\tau_{\mathrm{xy} \text {, net,par }}=$ $2.43 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ according to the beam theory while the maximum shear stress using the finite element analysis was determined to $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}}=2.84 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}(+17 \%)$. For the long DLT beam with five plies loaded by 87.1 kN the shear stress can be calculated to $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}, \text { net,par }}$ $=2.30 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ according to the beam theory while the maximum shear stress using the finite element analysis was determined to $\tau_{x y}=2.19 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}(-4.8 \%)$. The long DLT beam with four plies is even better. The long DLT beam with four plies loaded by 58.3 kN , is loaded by a maximum shear stress $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}, \text { net,par }}=2.31 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ according to the beam theory. Against it, using the finite element analysis, the maximum shear stress was determined to $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}}=1.35 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$, which is $42 \%$ smaller than the shear stress according to the beam theory. Likewise for short beams, the shear performance for DLT beams with four plies is the best while the shear performance for CLT beams is the worst.


Fig. 35 Distribution of shear stresses $\tau_{x y}$ along path 2 for short beams


Fig. 36 Distribution of shear stresses $\tau_{x y}$ along path 2 for long beams
Finally, tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction in the inner layers of CLT beams were investigated. The distribution for the investigated short CLT beam is displayed in Fig. 37. Fig. 38 contains the stresses distribution perpendicular to the grain
direction for the long CLT beam. The maximum values are given in Table 13 in column six. The larger the ratio between the beam deflection and the beam length, the higher the tensile stresses at the bottom surface of the beams. The maximum tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction were determined to $\sigma_{y, \max }=1,29 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ for the short CLT beam and $\sigma_{y, \max }=1,28 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ for the long CLT beam. Compared to the very low tensile strength perpendicular to the grain direction for timber, the stresses reached almost the tensile strength. Taking into account the DIN 1052:2004-08, the characteristic tensile strength perpendicular to the grain direction is $f_{t, 90, \mathrm{k}}=0.4 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. However, the average value for the tensile strength perpendicular to the grain direction is usually significantly higher and reaches sometimes values around $1 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ and even more. For this reason, no cracks or splitting was observed in the test specimens. Furthermore, cracks and splitting in the perpendicular to the beam axis orientated boards were obviously prevented by the parallel to the beam axis orientated boards. Nevertheless, the results show, that tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction in particular in the perpendicular to the beam axis orientated boards in CLT beams occur and can't be neglected.


Fig. 37 Distribution of stresses perpendicular to beam axis $\sigma_{y}$ along path 3 for short beams


Fig. 38 Distribution of stresses perpendicular to beam axis $\sigma_{y}$ along path 3 for long beams

In the following Table 13 all numerical results are summarised. The values in column one to six were already discussed. Furthermore, MOE values for the investigated CLT and DLT beams were determined. In column seven the local MOE is given. This MOE was determined using the whole beam thickness and equation (16). In column eight the average test results are given. These values were determined considering the net timber thickness, which corresponds to the total thickness of the parallel layers. The ratio between the MOE values, determined in the finite element analysis, and the corresponding test result is displayed in column nine. For short beams the ration between $E$ and $E_{0}$ is around $90 \%$. Against it, the ratio for long beams is around $100 \%$. Taking into account all results, in particular those for the MOE values, the investigated finite element solid model is suitable to determine the load-displacement behaviour of CLT and DLT beams loaded in bending.

Table 13 Summarisation of the finite element analysis

|  |  | $\mathbf{F}_{\text {tot }}$ | $\sigma_{\mathbf{x}, \max }$ | $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}, \max }$ | $\sigma_{\mathrm{y}, \max }$ | $\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{E}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{E} / \mathbf{E}_{0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $[\mathbf{k N}]$ | $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{2}\right]$ | $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{2}\right]$ | $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{2}\right]$ | $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathbf{m m}^{2}\right]$ | $\left[\mathbf{N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}\right]$ | $[-]$ |
| $\mathbf{1 - 1}$ | CLT-5ply-short | 270 | 46,3 | 5,82 | 1,29 | 7214 | 7782 | $93 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 - 1}$ | DLT-5ply-short | 301 | 45,7 | 5,12 | - | 6370 | 7769 | $82 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 - 2}$ | DLT-4ply-short | 229 | 47,8 | 3,70 | - | 6756 | 7170 | $94 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 - 2}$ | CLT-5ply-long | 91,8 | 47,6 | 2,84 | 1,28 | 9240 | 9206 | $100 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 - 3}$ | DLT-5ply-long | 87,1 | 41,6 | 2,19 | - | 9319 | 9075 | $103 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 - 4}$ | DLT-4ply-long | 58,3 | 40,4 | 1,35 | - | 8658 | 8672 | $100 \%$ |

The finite element analysis results from the solid model are nearly similar to the test results. Therefore, the solid model fits the real load-displacement behaviour of CLT and DLT beams loaded in bending the best. In the second step of the theoretical part of the work, a parameter study was done using the solid model. Thereby, short and long CLT beams with five plies and short and long DLT beams with four and five plies were calculated varying following parameters:

Number of parallel boards in each parallel layer:
Width of the perpendicular or diagonal orientated board compared to the width of the parallel orientated board:
Total thickness of all perpendicular or diagonal layers:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{p}}=2,3,4,5 \text { and } 6 \\
& \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{r}}=0.5 \cdot \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{p}}, 1.0 \cdot \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{p}}, 1.5 \cdot \mathrm{~h}_{\mathrm{p}} \\
& \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{r}}=20,35 \text { and } 50 \mathrm{~mm}
\end{aligned}
$$

Considering all parameters, 45 numerical calculations for each beam type were done. For six different beam types, altogether 270 numerical calculations were done. Other parameters were used as taken for the tested specimens. Hence, short beams were 360 mm in the height and 2300 mm in the length. The thickness of the parallel layers was chosen to 35 mm which is similar to the used boards. Long beams were 270 mm in the height and 4000 mm in the length. The thickness of the parallel layers was chosen as well to 35 mm . The loads and supports were applied at the same position likewise for the tests.
The stiffness parameters (MOE and shear modulus) were equal to those which were already used for the first investigations. The modulus of elasticity in grain direction was used as $11900 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. This MOE corresponds to the average MOE E $50 \%$, which was determined for the single timber members used for the parallel layers (Table 2). Further stiffness parameters, like the MOE perpendicular to the grain direction and the shear modulus were not determined. Therefore, the MOE perpendicular to the grain direction $E_{90^{\circ}}$ was assumed as $E_{90^{\circ}}=E_{0^{\circ}} / 30=400 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. The shear modulus $G$ was assumed as $G=750 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ while the rolling shear modulus $G_{R s}$ was assumed as $G_{R S}=G / 10=75 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$. The ratio between $E_{0}$ and $E_{90}$ as well as the ration between $G$ and $G_{R s}$ corresponds to the ratio for timber according to DIN 1052:2004-08.
First, the local modulus of elasticity neglecting the shear influence according to equation (16) was determined for all 270 beams. Detailed results are given in Fig. 114 to Fig. 119. Each figure contains results for a single beam type. The local MOE was determined considering the total beam thickness, including parallel, perpendicular and diagonal to the beam axis orientated layers. The results are given in dependence of the number of parallel boards per single layer (x-axis). Red lines represent beams, which were calculated with a total thickness of the perpendicular or diagonal layers of $t_{r}=50 \mathrm{~mm}$. Beams with a total thickness of the perpendicular or diagonal layers $t_{r}=$ 35 mm are represented by the blue lines. And finally, black lines represent beams with $t_{r}=20 \mathrm{~mm}$. The total thickness of the parallel layers was $t_{p}=105 \mathrm{~mm}$ for beams with five plies and $t_{p}=70 \mathrm{~mm}$ for beams with four plies. The ratio between the width
of the inner layers $h_{r}$ and the width of the parallel layers $h_{p}$ is varied by the different lines, too.
Subsequent, only results for beams with a thickness ratio of $t_{p} / t=75 \%$ ( $78 \%$ ) are summarised in two diagrams. Fig. 39 contains the results for short beams, while results for long beams are summarised in Fig. 40. These diagrams are used to qualify the different beam types in terms of the effective modulus of elasticity.


Fig. $39 \quad E_{\text {ef }}$ for short beams with $t_{p} / t=75 \%(78 \%)$


Fig. $40 \quad E_{\text {ef }}$ for long beams with $t_{p} / t=75 \%(78 \%)$
Both diagrams show clearly, that DLT beams with four plies (series 2-2 and 2-4) are better than the other two beam types. Compared to CLT (series 1-1 and 1-2) and DLT beams with five plies (series 2-1 and 2-3), the MOE values for DLT beams with four plies are always higher. Thereby, the thickness ratio for beams with four and five plies is quite similar. Fig. 39 and Fig. 40 contain results for beams with $t_{p} / t=75 \%$ and $78 \%$. The ratio $t_{p} / t=75 \%$ corresponds to beams with five plies ( $t=140 \mathrm{~mm}, t_{p}=105$ $\mathrm{mm}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{r}}=35 \mathrm{~mm}$ ), while the ratio $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{p}} / \mathrm{t}=78 \%$ corresponds to beams with four plies ( $\mathrm{t}=$ $90 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{p}}=70 \mathrm{~mm}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{r}}=20 \mathrm{~mm}$ ). In spite of the small difference between $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{p}} / \mathrm{t}$ for beams with five and four plies, the results are pretty comparable. As already mentioned, two side by side and in the opposite direction orientated diagonal layers increase the modulus of elasticity and hence the bending stiffness for the beams. Against it, diagonal orientated layers, which are separated by a parallel layer (DLT beam with five plies), are not able to increase the bending stiffness. Obviously, due to their separation by at least one parallel layer, they cannot be considered as a full plane.
Furthermore, the results present an effect, which was previously mentioned using the theory for flexible connected beams. With increasing number of parallel to the beam axis orientated boards, the beam MOE degreases. This undesirable effect is large for CLT and DLT beams with five plies and is quite small for DLT beams with four plies. In particular, long DLT beams with four plies aren't affected by this undesirable effect. One more factor, which affects the beam MOE, is the width $h_{r} / h_{p}$ of the perpendicular or diagonal to the beam axis orientated boards. With degreasing width $h_{r}$ the MOE degreases. Considering all results it can be concluded, that with increasing amount
of single timber members used for CLT or DLT beams, the beam MOE and the bending stiffness degreases.
Fig. 39 and Fig. 40 contain the MOE values $E_{\text {ef }}$, which consider the whole timber thickness. However, of larger interest is the ratio between the MOE values for CLT and DLT beams and the MOE values for geometrical identical solid beams. Subsequently, the MOE values $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef,par }}$ for CLT and DLT beams according to equation (17) were determined.

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{i, p a r}=E_{i} \cdot \frac{t_{p, t o t}}{t_{p, t o t}+t_{r, t o t}} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

These values were compared to the MOE values $\mathrm{E}_{\text {net,par }}$ for geometrical identical solid beams. The whole results, which show the relationship between the ratio $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef,par }}$ / $\mathrm{E}_{\text {net,par }}$ and the number of parallel boards, are given in Fig. 120 to Fig. 125. Each figure contains the results for each single beam type. Both MOE values, $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef,par }}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{\text {net,par, }}$ consider only the thickness of the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers. The MOE $\mathrm{E}_{\text {net,par }}$ for geometrical identical solid beams was calculated using equation (17) and considering the average MOE for the single timber members $\left(E_{0}=11900 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}\right)$. The ratio between $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef,par }}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{\text {net,par }}$ helps to determine the beam quality in terms of bending stiffness. As long as the ratio equals 100\%, the parallel layers can be considered as a full plane. Is the ration between $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef,par }}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{\text {net,par }}$ smaller than $100 \%$, the parallel layers cannot be considered as a full plane. In this case, the flexibility between the parallel layers is to low. Against it, a ration between $E_{\text {ef,par }}$ and $E_{\text {net,par }}$ greater than $100 \%$ occur, when the parallel to the beam axis orientated layers act as a full plane and in addition, the perpendicular or diagonal layers act as an additional plane.
Subsequently, the different results are discussed. For better understanding, only results for beams with a thickness ratio of $t_{p} / t=75 \% ~(78 \%)$ are taken into account. Fig. 41 contains results for short beams, while results for long beams are given in Fig. 42. The remaining results are displayed in the attachment in Fig. 120 to Fig. 125.


Fig. 41 Ratio between $E_{\text {ef }}$ and $E_{\text {net }}$ for short beams with $t_{p} / t=75 \%(78 \%)$


Fig. 42 Ratio between $E_{\text {ef }}$ and $E_{\text {net }}$ for long beams with $t_{p} / t=75 \%(78 \%)$
Taking into account both, short and long beams, the ratio between $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef,par }}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{\text {net,par }}$ for DLT beams with four plies is higher than the corresponding ratio for CLT and DLT beams with five plies. As displayed in Fig. 41, the ratio $E_{\text {ef,par }} / E_{\text {net,par }}$ is for all investi-
gated short beams smaller than $100 \%$ and degreases with increasing number of parallel boards. Usually, the load-carrying capacity for short solid beams isn't governed by bending stiffness and by deflection. However, due to the low ratio $E_{\text {ef,par }} / E_{\text {net,par }}$, short CLT beams in particular with numerous parallel boards should be checked even for bending stiffness and for deflection. The smallest value between $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef,par }}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{\text {net,par }}$ was about $55 \%$. For this reason, CLT beams with many parallel boards are prone to large deflection which can govern their load-carrying capacity. Against it, the degreasing in MOE for short DLT beams with four layers is much smaller.
Long beams are prone to large deflections. Hence, the bending stiffness can govern their load-carrying capacity. Therefore, long beams should be detailed to minimise their deflection and to maximise their bending stiffness. According to Fig. 42, DLT beams with side by side orientated diagonal layers should be used for longer beams. For the investigated DLT beams with four plies, the ratio $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef,par }} / \mathrm{E}_{\text {net,par }}$ is always larger than $100 \%$. Obviously, the two side by side and in the opposite direction orientated diagonal layers act as an additional full panel, which increase the effective MOE and the bending stiffness of the beam.
Against it, the MOE for CLT and DLT beams with five plies is lower and degreases with increasing number of parallel to the beam axis orientated boards or/and with degreasing width $h_{r}$ of the reinforcing layers. CLT beams loaded in bending should be detailed in order to maximise the board's dimensions. The bending stiffness degreases with increasing number of single timber members. The worst ratio between $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef,par }}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{\text {net,par }}$ for long beams was determined for CLT beams with a ratio between $h_{r}$ and $h_{p}$ of 0.5 and with six parallel to the beam axis orientated boards. In this case, the ratio between $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef,par }}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{\text {net,par }}$ is only $85 \%$. Considering a beam thickness ratio of $75 \%$, the bending stiffness for such a CLT beam is about $64 \%$ of the corresponding bending stiffness for a geometrical identical solid beam. Taking into account these results, long beams should be detailed either as DLT beams with side by side orientated diagonal layers or as CLT and DLT beams in general with a small number of timber members.
Fig. 126 to Fig. 131 contains the results for the bending edge stresses along path 1. The definition of path 1 is given in Fig. 31 and Fig. 32. All results are given as a ratio between $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}, \text { net,par }}$ in dependence of the number of parallel to the beam axis orientated boards. The bending edge stress $\sigma_{m}$ was determined from the finite element analysis as the maximum value along path 1 . Against it, $\sigma_{m, n e t, p a r}$ was calculated according to the beam theory taking into account the total thickness of the parallel layers and considering the parallel orientated layers as a full plane. Therefore following equation was used:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{m, \text { net }, \text { ar }}=\frac{M}{W_{p}}=\frac{6 \cdot F \cdot a}{\left(\sum h_{p}\right)^{2} \cdot \sum t_{p}} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

As long as the ratio between $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}, \text { net,par }}$ is exactly $100 \%$, the beam can be considered as a geometrical identical solid beam with reduced beam thickness. Thereby,
the beam thickness is equal to the total thickness of the parallel layers. With increasing ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t, p a r, ~ t h e ~ p e r f o r m a n c e ~ o f ~ C L T ~ a n d ~ D L T ~ b e a m s ~ i n ~ t e r m s ~}^{\text {D }}$ of bending edge stresses degreases. In this case, the bending edge stresses are even higher than the bending edge stresses calculated according to the beam theory. Against it, the performance of the beams increases for degreasing ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{net,par}}$. In the special case, where the ratio between $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}, \text { net,par }}$ is equal to the ratio between the total thickness of the parallel layers and the total beam thickness $\left(\sigma_{m} / \sigma_{m, n e t, p a r}=t_{p} / t\right)$, the performance of the CLT or DLT beam becomes equal to the performance of a geometrical identical solid beam.
To compare the different beam types together, the results for $t_{p} / t=75 \%(78 \%)$ were summarised in two diagrams. Fig. 43 contains the results for short beams, while in Fig. 44 results for long beams are given. Detailed results considering three different cases of $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{p}} / \mathrm{t}$ are given in the attachment in Fig. 126 to Fig. 131.


Fig. 43 Ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, \text { net }}$ for short beams with $t_{p} / t=75 \%(78 \%)$


Fig. 44 Ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t}$ for long beams with $t_{p} / t=75 \% ~(78 \%)$
For both, short and long beams, the performance of CLT beams is the worst while the performance of DLT beams with four plies is the best. Red lines represent the results for CLT beams. For short CLT beams, the ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t, p a r}$ was determined between $98 \%$ for $n_{p}=2$ and $122 \%$ for $n_{p}=6$. Against it, the ratio between $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}, \text { net,par }}$ for short DLT beams with four plies was determined between $88 \%$ for $n_{p}=2$ and $95 \%$ for $n_{p}=6$. The results for DLT beams with four plies are represented by black lines. All beam types behave similar: With increasing number of parallel to the beam axis orientated boards, the ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t, p a r}$ increases. Hence, the beam performance in terms of bending stresses degreases. However, the width $h_{r}$ of the perpendicular or diagonal to the beam axis orientated boards influence the bending edge stresses, too. With degreasing width $h_{r}$, the ratio between $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathrm{m}, \text { net,par }}$ increases.
Results for long beams (Fig. 44) are quite similar to those for short beams. For long CLT beams, the ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t, p a r}$ was determined between $96 \%$ for $n_{p}=2$ and $116 \%$ for $n_{p}=6$. Against it, the ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t, p a r}$ for long DLT beams with four plies was determined between $91 \%$ for $n_{p}=2$ and $96 \%$ for $n_{p}=6$. Hence, the results for long DLT beams with four plies are $5 \%$ to $20 \%$ smaller than the corresponding results for long CLT beams. Likewise for short beams, for long CLT and DLT beams the ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t, p a r}$ increases with increasing number $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{p}}$ of parallel to the beam axis orientated boards.
To minimise bending stresses, beams loaded in bending should be produced using DLT instead of CLT elements. Those DLT elements should be made using side by side and in the opposite direction orientated boards. Furthermore, it is recommended
to use DLT beams with a low number of boards with a large height. DLT beams with many narrow boards are not recommended.
Finally, shear stresses along path 2 were investigated using the finite element analysis. The definition of path 2 is given in Fig. 31 and Fig. 32. Path 2 contains the maximum shear stresses in the parallel to the beam axis orientated boards. All 270 results are given in diagrams in Fig. 132 to Fig. 137. In each diagram the results for each beam type with different $t_{p} / t$ - ratios are given. To discuss the results, the following Fig. 45 and Fig. 46 contain only results for beams with a thickness ratio of $t_{p} / t=75 \%$ ( $78 \%$ ). Fig. 45 contains results for short beams while results for long beams are given in Fig. 46.


Fig. 45 Ratio between $\tau_{x y}$ and $\tau_{x y, \text { net }}$ for short beams with $t_{p} / t=75 \% ~(78 \%)$


Fig. 46 Ratio between $\tau_{x y}$ and $\tau_{x y, n e t}$ for long beams with $t_{p} / t=75 \%(78 \%)$
As in the previous diagrams, the red lines represent CLT beams (series 1-1 and 1-2), blue lines represent DLT beams with five plies (series 2-1 and 2-3) and results for DLT beams with four plies (series $2-2$ and $2-4$ ) are represented by black lines. Thereby, the ratio between the maximum shear stress $\tau_{x y}$ along path 2 taken from the finite element analysis and the maximum shear stress $\tau_{x y, n e t, p a r}$ calculated according to equation (19), in dependence on the number of parallel boards, is given.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau_{x y, n e t, p a r}=1,5 \cdot \frac{F}{A_{p}}=\frac{F}{\sum h_{p} \cdot \sum t_{p}} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

The maximum shear stress $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}, \text { net,par }}$ according to equation (19) corresponds to the shear stress for an equivalent solid beam with a beam thickness which equals to the thickness of the parallel layers in the CLT or DLT beams. The smaller the ratio between the shear stress $\tau_{x y}$ along path 2 and the maximum shear stress $\tau_{x y, n e t, p a r}$, the better is the performance of a beam. As expected, CLT beams are prone to fail in shear earlier than geometrical identical DLT beams with five or four plies. While for short CLT beams the ratio $\tau_{x y} / \tau_{\mathrm{xy} \text {,net,par }}$ is between $76 \%$ and $153 \%$, the ratio $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}} / \tau_{\mathrm{xy}, \text { net,par }}$ for short DLT beams with four layers is only between $54 \%$ and $61 \%$. Similar situation can be observed for long beams. For long CLT beams the ratio $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}} / \tau_{\mathrm{xy}, \text { net,par }}$ is between $76 \%$ and $145 \%$, while for long DLT beams with four layers the ratio $\tau_{x y} / \tau_{x y, \text { net,par }}$ is between $34 \%$ and $65 \%$.
In the special case, where the ratio between $\tau_{x y}$ and $\tau_{x y, n e t, p a r}$ is equal to the ratio between the total thickness of the parallel layers and the total beam thickness $\left(\tau_{x y} / \tau_{x y, \text { net,par }}=t_{p} / t\right)$, the performance of the CLT or DLT beam becomes equal to the
performance of a geometrical identical solid beam. In case, where the ratio between $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}}$ and $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}, \text { net,par }}$ is even smaller than the ratio $t_{p} / t$, the beam shear performance is even better than for a similar solid beam. This case occurs in particular for the investigated DLT beams with four plies.
As already mentioned, CLT and DLT beams are suitable for beams loaded in bending and by tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis direction. They are prone to transfer even high (tensile) loads perpendicular to the beam axis direction. Against it, comparable solid beams are prone to splitting. However, the bending performance of CLT and DLT beams is suboptimal compared to beams made of solid wood. Tests were made to investigate the load-carrying behaviour of CLT and DLT beams. Unfortunately due to the limited test specimen number, not all investigations were made and not all of the assumptions were proved. Hence, different finite element calculations were done. Using the finite element solid model, which fits the real CLT and DLT load-carrying behaviour the best, a parameter study was done. The finite element analysis shows, that the performance of CLT and DLT beams depends on the beam type and on the beam geometry. The best performance can be obtained using DLT beams. Thereby, the DLT beams should be produced with side by side and in the opposite direction orientated diagonal layers. Diagonal layers shouldn't be separated by parallel layers. The parallel to the beam axis orientated layers should be placed outside on the surface of the diagonal layers. Furthermore, the number of single timber members should be reduced to a minimum. With increasing number of single timber members, the stiffness and strength performance degreases. The necessary thickness of the single timber members and hence the ratio between $t_{r}$ and $t_{p}$ should be estimated in order to the ratio between the perpendicular to the beam axis orientated loads and the loads in the beam axis direction.
Using the diagrams in Fig. 114 to Fig. 137, the real stresses and the MOE values can be estimated for CLT and DLT beams. Using these diagrams, factors can be generated. These factors can be used to calculate maximum stresses and the MOE values for CLT and DLT beams loaded in bending based on the beam theory.

## 5 Summary and future prospects

The aim of this research work was to investigate the performance of cross laminated timber elements for beams loaded in bending and by tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction. Usually, beams loaded in bending are made out of solid wood or glulam. Both, solid wood and glulam, provide high strength and stiffness properties in grain direction while the strength and stiffness properties perpendicular to the grain direction are very small. For this reason, solid wood and glulam are less effective in beams, which are loaded both, in bending and by tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction. Examples for beams loaded perpendicular to the grain direction in tension are curved beams, beams with holes and beams with notched beam supports.
Cross laminated timber is a multilayer plate element with crosswise orientated layers. Usually, cross laminated timber is loaded as a plate in the out-of-plane direction or as a panel in the in-plane direction. Therefore, cross laminated timber is used for floors, for roofs and for wall systems. Due to the crosswise orientation of the layers, edgewise orientated CLT could be used as well for beams loaded both, in bending and by tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction. Thereby, parallel layers would transfer normal loads while the perpendicular to the beam axis orientated layers would act as reinforcement to transfer tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis direction.
Compared to geometrical identical solid wood or glulam beams, CLT beams are less stiff in bending. Hence, CLT as material for long beams is inefficient. The performance of long beams is usually governed by the bending stiffness. For this reason, a new and more effective element for beams loaded in bending was developed. Based on the idea of a CLT element with crosswise orientated boards, a diagonal orientated element (DLT) was investigated. Compared to CLT with crosswise orientated layers, the DLT element is a multilayer element with diagonal orientated layers. At least two diagonal layers are necessary to make a symmetric DLT beam. The diagonal layers must be orientated in couples and in the opposite direction to each other. Within this research work, two cases for DLT beams were investigated: DLT elements with diagonal layers, which are separated by a parallel layer and DLT elements with side by side orientated diagonal layers were investigated. Likewise CLT elements, DLT elements contain parallel orientated layers, too.
Within this research work, beams were manufactured using self-made CLT and DLT elements. To enforce shear failure, short CLT and DLT beams were made. Long CLT and DLT were made to enforce bending failure. For beams made using DLT elements, two cases were studied: Beams were made either with DLT elements with separated diagonal layers or with DLT elements with side by side orientated diagonal layers. Altogether 60 short and long, CLT and DLT beams with four and five plies were produced.
All beams were tested in bending. 30 tests were done on unchanged beams while 30 tests were done on beams with notched beam supports or with holes. The results for
beams with notched beam supports and with holes are nearly similar to those for beams without any singularities. Using CLT and DLT instead of solid wood, brittle timber failure could be prevented. The beams with notched beam supports and with holes were designed to enforce timber splitting at lower loads. Due to the perpendicular or diagonal reinforcing layers, timber splitting was prevented very well.
Unfortunately, the test results couldn't be used to qualify, whether CLT or DLT elements are better for beams loaded in bending. To quantify CLT and DLT beams, a finite element analysis was performed. First, different numerical models were studied. A beam, a plane and a solid model were discussed. Governing parameters were investigated and those, which don't affect the load-displacement behaviour, were neglected. Finally, the solid model was used for a parameter study. The solid model fits the load-displacement behaviour of CLT and DLT beams the best. Numerical calculations were done on totally 270 beams. Thereby, it was clearly demonstrated, that DLT elements provides a higher performance than CLT elements for beams loaded in bending. However, this result is more valid for DLT beams with side by side and in the opposite direction and diagonal to the beam axis orientated layers. Against it, diagonal orientated layers, which are separated by at least one parallel layer, are less good.
This work doesn't provide general equations to calculate the strength and stiffness properties for CLT and DLT beams loaded in bending. This work rather shows how to calculate CLT and DLT beams using a finite element analysis and which model fits the real load-displacement behaviour the best. Finally, this work presents a completely new, until now not investigated, DLT product, which can be used very well for beams loaded both, in bending and by tensile stresses perpendicular to the grain direction.
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## 7 Appendix



Fig. 47 Species 1.1 - Short beam with $90^{\circ}$ reinforcing layers - 5 ply


Fig. 48 Species 1.2 - Long beam with $90^{\circ}$ reinforcing layers - 5 ply


Fig. 49 Species 2.1 - Short beam with $45^{\circ}$ reinforcing layers - 5 ply


Fig. 50 Species 2.2 - Short beam with $45^{\circ}$ reinforcing layers - 4 ply


Fig. 51 Species 2.3 - Long beam with $45^{\circ}$ reinforcing layers - 5 ply


Fig. 52 Species 2.4 - Long beam with $45^{\circ}$ reinforcing layers - 4 ply


Fig. 53 Species 1.1 - Application of the PRF glue on the first parallel layer


Fig. 54 Species 1.1 - Left: Assembling of the first reinforcing layer ( $90^{\circ}$ ). Right: Assembling of the second parallel layer


Fig. 55 Species 1.1-Application of the PRF glue on the second parallel layer


Fig. 56 Species 1.1 - Beam with a fixing frame on the way to the press


Fig. 57 Species 1.1 - Two beams in a fixing frame on the way to the press


Fig. 58 Species 1.2 - Beams after pressing


Fig. 59 Species 2.5 - Diagonal reinforcing layer with a PRF glue surface


Fig. 60 Species 2.4 - Assembling of the diagonal layer on the first parallel layer


Fig. 61 Species 2.4 - Assembling of the second diagonal layer


Fig. 62 Species 2.4-Assembling of the second diagonal layer


Fig. 63 Species 2.4 - Assembling of the second parallel layer


Fig. 64 Species 2.4 - Beam in a fixing frame short before on the way to the press


Fig. 65 Species 2.3 - Beams after pressing


Fig. 66 Species 1.2 and 2.3 - Beams after pressing

Table 14 Allocation of parameters in species 1-1, numeration displayed in Fig. 47

|  | Dynamic MOE in $\mathrm{kN} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ - Dry timber density in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 1 | 11-526 | 11,2-376 | 12,3-539 | 6,26-471 | 9,65-445 | 9,07-390 | 9,99-474 | 11,1-452 | 11,3-429 | 7,51-410 | 8,61-488 | 8,61-488 |
| 2 | 10,2-468 | 10,6-432 | 11,8-407 | 10,2-463 | 9,65-445 | 9,06-463 | 10,9-463 | 9,69-446 | 9,69-446 | 8,1-479 | 10,3-444 | 10,3-444 |
| 3 | 11,1-470 | 6,73-386 | 7,72-411 | 7,39-461 | 10,8-467 | 12,2-453 | 12,3-456 | 9,97-421 | 9,97-421 | 6,24-477 | 9,79-382 | 6,41-408 |
| 4 | 8,94-439 | 11,3-481 | 10,9-446 | 9,73-446 | 8,55-456 | 11,3-487 | 10,9-463 | 9,6-467 | 10,7-411 | 7,25-455 | 12,1-467 | 15,1-534 |
| 5 | 11,9-455 | 10,7-442 | 6,26-471 | 8,01-485 | 10,4-473 | 8,78-422 | 9,71-451 | 10,7-488 | 10,7-411 | 6,24-477 | 12,1-467 | 15,1-534 |
| 6 | 9,49-418 | 11,2-376 | 9,22-420 | 10,6-431 | 9,65-548 | 8,29-432 | 9,69-446 | 10,7-411 | 11,1-452 | 10,7-472 | 9,79-382 | 8,61-488 |
| 7 | 8,76-442 | 11,8-486 | 9,18-481 | 7,5-448 | 9,65-445 | 6,94-401 | 8,7-418 | 7,52-436 | 10,7-488 | 7,52-436 | 10,7-454 | 14,6-524 |
| 8 | 11 | 11 | 6,47-417 | 7,72-411 | 12,9-478 | 11,2-376 | 7,75-428 | 9,61-453 | 13,4-484 | 11,3-456 | 6,41-408 | 9,79-382 |
| 9 | 10,4-473 | 6,98-480 | 10,6-481 | 11,8-407 | 11-526 | 9,07-390 | 7,52-436 | 6,24-477 | 7,41-437 | 7,03-395 | 12,1-467 | 10,8-450 |
| 10 | 8,55-456 | 8,29-432 | 14,8-485 | 14,8-485 | 8,94-439 | 10,6-432 | 9,18-481 | 7,75-428 | 12,3-456 | 14,5-488 | 9,79-382 | 9,83-447 |
| 11 | 12 | 6,94-401 | 14,4-487 | 10,2-463 | 8,76-442 | 7,1-441 | 8,84-561 | 10,2-464 | 10,9-463 | 7 | 5 | 14,6-524 |
| 12 | 9,65-548 | 9,67-472 | 10,9-463 | 9,61-449 | 8,16-423 | 10,1-462 | 5,9-448 | 9,6-467 | 12,3-456 | 5,9-448 | 12,8-555 | 6,41-408 |
| 13 | 9,49-418 | 10,7-442 | 11,8-407 | 7,5-448 | 8,55-456 | 13,2-481 | 11,3-429 | 7,75-428 | 7,41-437 | 11,6-499 | 8,14-418 | 14,6-524 |
| 14 | 8,7 | 9,06-463 | 7,5-448 | 6,26-471 | 10,8-467 | 9,06-463 | 11,1-452 | 7,51-410 | 13,4-484 | 5,9-448 | 9,79-382 | 8,61-488 |
| 15 | 8,94 | 8,78-422 | 12,3-539 | 12,3-539 | 11,1-470 | 10,7-442 | 12,6-461 | 10,2-425 | 11,3-429 | 10,2-425 | 10,8-450 | 8,14-418 |
| 16 | 8,36-430 | 13,2-481 | 11,2-512 | 6,98-480 | 8,93-406 | 9,06-463 | 5,9-448 | 9,11-425 | 9,96-524 | 11,3-456 | 12,8-555 | 10,3-489 |
| 17 | 8,93-406 | 9,06-463 | 10,9-446 | 9,61-449 | 8,36-430 | 11,3-481 | 7,75-428 | 9,69-446 | 9,6-467 | 13,4-484 | 8,96-445 | 8,99-416 |
| 18 | 11 | 8,78-422 | 6,47-417 | 9,22-420 | 8,97-423 | 6,94-401 | 7,25-455 | 9,97-421 | 8 | 10,7-488 | 9,83-447 | 8 |
| 19 | 8,97-423 | 12,2-453 | 6,47-417 | 12,2-453 | 11-526 | 10,7-442 | 9,28-395 | 6,24-477 | 8,16-396 | 9,97-421 | 7,66-380 | 10,3-489 |
| 20 | 8,16-423 | 8,29-432 | 10,2-463 | 7,5-448 | 14,1-540 | 9,07-390 | 10,3-477 | 10,2-425 | 10,9-463 | 9,6-467 | 8,96-445 | 9,83-447 |
| 21 | 10 | 6,98-480 | 9,22-420 | 10,2-463 | 10 | 6,73-386 | 11,3-429 | 14,5-488 | 9,97-421 | 6,24-477 | 10,3-489 | 88 |
| 22 | 14,1-540 | 7,1-441 | 8,01-485 | 10,6-431 | 8,55-456 | 10,6-432 | 14,5-488 | 7,41-437 | 7,71-415 | 10,2-425 | 8,99-416 | 8,14-418 |
| 23 | 9,65-548 | 10,1-462 | 9,99-474 | 9,22-420 | 9,65-445 | 11,3-481 | 8,16-396 | 11,3-456 | 7,51-410 | 11,1-452 | 8,96-445 | 8,99-416 |
| 24 | 10,8-467 | 7,1-446 | 9,73-446 | 10,9-446 | 9,65-548 | 12,2-453 | 7,71-415 | 9,61-453 | 9,96-524 | 13,4-484 | 6,41-408 | 8,99-416 |
| 25 | 10,2-468 | 9,67-472 | 9,61-449 | 11,2-512 | 10,3-442 | 11,2-376 | 11,6-499 | 11,3-456 | 10,7-472 | 9,11-425 | 8,64-409 | 8,14-418 |
| 26 | 11,9-455 | 14,4-487 | 9,73-446 | 6,26-471 | 8,97-423 | 10,2-468 | 10,3-477 | 14,5-488 | 10,3-477 | 9,71-451 | 7,82-418 | 10,3-489 |
| 27 | 11,2-507 | 11,2-376 | 7,25-455 | 9,99-474 | 8,36-430 | 11,2-376 | 9,98-472 | 10,7-411 | 9,98-472 | 10,7-488 | 14,6-524 | 8,61-488 |
| 28 | 8,97-423 | 8,01-485 | 9,96-524 | 8,78-422 | 10,3-442 | 11,8-486 | 11,6-499 | 11,1-452 | 11,3-567 | 7,51-410 | 10,7-454 | 10,7-454 |
| 29 | 10,3-442 | 10,6-481 | 7,03-395 | 8,78-422 | 10,2-468 | 10,6-546 | 8,7-418 | 10,2-464 | 7,39-461 | 14,5-488 | 8,64-409 | 10,7-454 |
| 30 | 9,65-445 | 6,26-471 | 9,18-481 | 9,06-463 | 8,93-406 | 6,98-480 | 10,7-472 | 9,11-425 | 9,96-524 | 10,3-477 | 12,8-555 | 12,1-467 |
| 31 | 8,55-456 | 7,5-448 | 6,47-417 | 10,1-462 | 9,49-418 | 7,1-441 | 11,6-499 | 9,97-421 | 7,71-415 | 11,3-456 | 8,61-488 | 12,1-467 |
| 32 | 12,9-478 | 9,61-449 | 10,6-481 | 7,1-446 | 11,1-470 | 10,1-462 | 9,71-451 | 12,3-456 | 12,6-461 | 9,6-467 | 8,14-418 | 10,3-444 |
| 33 | 9,65-548 | 10,9-463 | 9,22-420 | 13,2-481 | 11,9-455 | 7,1-446 | 10,7-472 | 13,4-484 | 8,28-445 | 9,61-453 | 10,7-454 | 10,7-454 |
| 34 | 10,4-473 | 10,6-481 | 14,8-485 | 8,29-432 | 9,49-418 | 9,67-472 | 9,71-451 | 12,3-456 | 10,9-463 | 8,7-418 | 8,64-409 | 15,1-534 |
| 35 | 11,1-470 | 12,3-539 | 10,3-477 | 10,9-446 | 8,76-442 | 10,6-546 | 10,9-463 | 9,11-425 | 8,84-561 | 7,25-455 | 12,8-555 | 15,1-534 |
| 36 | 11,9-455 | 11,3-487 | 11,2-512 | 7,72-411 | 10,8-467 | 7,1-441 | 13,4-484 | 8,1-479 | 9,98-472 | 8,84-561 | 8,14-418 | 9,79-382 |
| 37 | 10,8-467 | 14,4-487 | 11,3-567 | 11,2-512 | 11,2-507 | 11,8-486 | 10,9-463 | 8,1-479 | 9,98-472 | 7,71-415 | 10,8-450 | 10,8-450 |
| 38 | 8,76-442 | 9,67-472 | 7,72-411 | 11,2-512 | 10,2-468 | 11,2-376 | 10,7-488 | 11,1-452 | 7,39-461 | 10,7-488 | 8,64-409 | 9,64-439 |
| 39 | 9,49-418 | 10,6-431 | 9,18-481 | 7,72-411 | 8,16-423 | 10,6-432 | 9,98-472 | 7,75-428 | 8,28-445 | 10,2-425 | 9,83-447 | 7,66-380 |
| 40 | 8,93-406 | 10,2-463 | 8,01-485 | 11,8-407 | 8,76-442 | 11,3-481 | 8,28-445 | 7,51-410 | 8,16-396 | 12,6-461 | 7,66-380 | 15,1-534 |
| 41 | 8,36-430 | 10,6-431 | 9,73-446 | 11,8-407 | 8,55-456 | 8,78-422 | 8,84-561 | 7,03-395 | 8,16-396 | 9,69-446 | 7,82-418 | 10,3-444 |
| 42 | 10,3-442 | 14,8-485 | 10,6-431 | 10,6-481 | 9,65-548 | 11,3-487 | 8,7-418 | 10,7-411 | 7,39-461 | 8,1-479 | 8,64-409 | 10,8-450 |
| 43 | 8,97-423 | 11,8-486 | 10,2-463 | 8,29-432 | 12,9-478 | 11,2-376 | 8,84-561 | 10,2-464 | 7,52-436 | 10,7-411 | 9,83-447 | 12,8-555 |
| 44 | 11-526 | 10,6-546 | 9,61-449 | 6,47-417 | 10,4-473 | 13,2-481 | 8,16-396 | 10,2-464 | 11,6-499 | 12,3-456 | 7,66-380 | 8,99-416 |
| 45 | 10,1-462 | 6,98-480 | 14,8-485 | 10,9-463 | 10,3-442 | 9,67-472 | 8,7-418 | 7,03-395 | 10,7-472 | 9,71-451 | 8,96-445 | 7,66-380 |
| 46 | 11,3-481 | 6,73-386 | 12,3-539 | 9,99-474 | 11-526 | 10,7-442 | 9,28-395 | 7,71-415 | 9,71-451 | 9,96-524 | 10,8-450 | 14,6-524 |
| 47 | 10,6-432 | 10,6-432 | 11,2-512 | 14,8-485 | 14,1-540 | 11,2-376 | 11,3-429 | 6,24-477 | 7,25-455 | 7,75-428 | 8,64-409 | 12,8-555 |
| 48 | 13,2-481 | 10,6-481 | 10,9-446 | 12,3-539 | 10,2-468 | 11,8-486 | 12,6-461 | 11,6-499 | 9,61-453 | 9,61-453 | 10,3-444 | 9,83-447 |
| 49 | 7,1-441 | 9,73-446 | 7,72-411 | 6,47-417 | 11,1-470 | 12,2-453 | 7,25-455 | 10,2-464 | 9,28-395 | 7,71-415 | 8,96-445 | 8,99-416 |
| 50 | 10,6-546 | 11,2-376 | 11,8-407 | 10,9-463 | 8,93-406 | 6,98-480 | 5,9-448 | 9,69-446 | 10,3-477 | 10,7-472 | 10,3-489 | 14,6-524 |
| 51 | 11,8-486 | 9,07-390 | 10,9-463 | 7,1-441 | 8,97-423 | 10,1-462 | 5,9-448 | 10,2-425 | 7,41-437 | 14,5-488 | 10,3-489 | 7,82-418 |
| 52 | 12,9-478 | 9,98-472 | 9,28-395 | 8,01-485 | 9,49-418 | 8,16-396 | 7,39-461 | 7,51-410 | 9,28-395 | 9,61-453 | 10,3-444 | 7,66-380 |


| A | $13,2-438$ | $13,8-453$ | $13,6-480$ | $11,3-449$ | $11,6-467$ | $11,1-420$ | $12,2-466$ | $11,9-461$ | $14,2-472$ | $10,9-490$ | $10,1-430$ | $9,75-436$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | $10,4-427$ | $10,3-421$ | $12,1-442$ | $12,1-441$ | $11,4-449$ | $10,4-458$ | $10,9-461$ | $11,6-482$ | $11,4-437$ | $10,9-424$ | $14,4-435$ | $12,7-451$ |
| C | $10,2-440$ | $12,1-454$ | $10,6-421$ | $13,5-505$ | $12,3-475$ | $12,6-503$ | $10,4-402$ | $14,1-479$ | $11,6-441$ | $13,6-460$ | $13-455$ | $11-359$ |
| D | $11,4-433$ | $12,1-414$ | $13,7-462$ | $13,1-440$ | $13,2-464$ | $14,5-520$ | $13,3-431$ | $10,2-418$ | $13,6-466$ | $10,1-434$ | $11,4-389$ | $15-478$ |
| E | $14,4-485$ | $12,2-468$ | $13,4-502$ | $10,5-454$ | $9,41-430$ | $13,3-470$ | $13,1-434$ | $12,2-447$ | $11-438$ | $11,8-486$ | $14,4-440$ | $10,7-375$ |
| F | $11,2-451$ | $9,45-416$ | $13,6-477$ | $10,8-404$ | $12,9-461$ | $12,1-438$ | $10,9-426$ | $10,5-433$ | $12,1-421$ | $8,48-428$ | $10,9-484$ | $15,1-434$ |
| G | $14,8-518$ | $11,1-479$ | $10,7-437$ | $11,5-438$ | $11,5-457$ | $11,4-431$ | $10,1-422$ | $9,22-407$ | $12,5-481$ | $11,9-452$ | $9,35-424$ | $12,4-452$ |
| H | $14,3-518$ | $10,1-413$ | $13,3-431$ | $10,6-421$ | $11,4-440$ | $12,9-453$ | $10,9-426$ | $10,2-431$ | $15,6-540$ | $12,4-464$ | $14,4-462$ | $12,4-469$ |
| I | $12,1-454$ | $12,1-456$ | $12,2-452$ | $10,4-424$ | $14,2-472$ | $9,99-409$ | $10,8-440$ | $11,6-449$ | $11,5-425$ | $11,7-450$ | $10,1-429$ | $10,8-367$ |
| J | $11,1-427$ | $12-452$ | $9,24-435$ | $9,77-440$ | $11,4-419$ | $13,5-473$ | $12,1-450$ | $9,98-432$ | $13-503$ | $12,9-529$ | $10,4-450$ | $9,67-375$ |
| K | $8,97-436$ | $12,3-417$ | $9,26-403$ | $11,7-447$ | $10,6-439$ | $11,3-428$ | $13,6-484$ | $11,3-437$ | $10,7-429$ | $12,4-495$ | $15,5-516$ | $9,66-456$ |
| L | $10,8-456$ | $13,9-460$ | $9,31-447$ | $12,4-486$ | $11,5-451$ | $14,9-486$ | $10,1-408$ | $11,8-446$ | $12,9-458$ | $10,8-427$ | $10,6-361$ | $15,1-465$ |

Table 15 Allocation of parameters in species 1-2, numeration displayed in Fig. 48

|  | Dynamic MOE in $\mathrm{kN} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$ - Dry timber density in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 1 | 10,4-467 | 11,7-415 | 12,6-480 | 6,17-395 | 11,2-431 | 11,2-431 | 10,6-465 | 8,14-423 | 8,97-439 | 11,2-536 | 9,12-416 | 10,6-464 |
| 2 | 11,7-462 | 9,89-429 | 7,38-399 | 6,17-395 | 9,62-470 | 8,97-439 | 9,89-429 | 8,56-459 | 11,2-431 | 5,92-466 | 8,41-419 | 7,2-475 |
| 3 | 8,49-442 | 6,5-398 | 6,95-465 | 6,17-395 | 8,76-369 | 9,62-470 | 5,34-355 | 8,68-436 | 9,39-384 | 10,7-461 | 10,9-483 | 7,24-444 |
| 4 | 8,39-412 | 5,34-355 | 7,41-371 | 13,6-564 | 11,6-443 | 8,97-439 | 6,5-398 | 8,15-440 | 8,9-395 | 9,42-416 | 6,39-432 | 8,09-409 |
| 5 | 9,73-448 | 5,34-355 | 9,51-488 | 13,6-564 | 10,7-449 | 11,2-431 | 13,1-424 | 9,47-370 | 11,6-443 | 7,13-445 | 5,68-429 | 8,45-385 |
| 6 | 9,73-448 | 9,73-448 | 13,2-505 | 7,87-493 | 11,1-430 | 8,9-395 | 6,56-373 | 11,1-463 | 5,22-448 | 10,7-461 | 8,68-436 | 14,9-503 |
| 7 | 10,4-467 | 9,73-448 | 9,28-495 | 7,87-493 | 6,69-434 | 6,69-434 | 9,87-399 | 9,12-416 | 7,15-489 | 7,13-445 | 5,54-425 | 8,14-426 |
| 8 | 12,1-451 | 11,7-462 | 6,95-465 | 7,87-493 | 8,93-414 | 5,22-448 | 10,9-452 | 5,68-429 | 9,39-384 | 10,2-475 | 8,15-440 | 8,52-409 |
| 9 | 9,37-469 | 10,4-467 | 7,38-399 | 12,7-434 | 10,7-461 | 8,86-479 | 13,1-424 | 10,9-418 | 8,86-479 | 6,78-393 | 10,9-418 | 66 |
| 10 | 13,2-463 | 8,49-442 | 12,6-480 | 12,7-434 | 9,42-416 | 9,95-428 | 8,23-398 | 8,68-436 | 11,2-431 | 11,2-495 | 9,47-370 | 10,7-446 |
| 11 | 9,28-495 | 8,39-412 | 7,41-371 | 10,7-500 | 6,14-327 | 9,49-456 | 9,89-429 | 5,54-425 | 8,97-439 | 5,91-451 | 9,29-435 | 46 |
| 12 | 9,43-389 | 7,46-445 | 9,28-453 | 10,7-500 | 9,39-384 | 6,39-420 | 10,6-465 | 10,9-418 | 9,93-403 | 7,13-434 | 6,91-418 | 9,57-481 |
| 13 | 12,1-451 | 7,84-410 | 10,1-489 | 9,92-418 | 8,93-414 | 9,62-470 | 5,34-355 | 6,2-515 | 6,39-420 | 9,42-416 | 8,14-423 | 450 |
| 14 | 9,37-469 | 8,24-442 | 10,4-467 | 6,17-395 | 7,38-477 | 9,39-384 | 6,5-398 | 9,47-370 | 9,95-428 | 8,9-452 | 4,51-425 | 09-463 |
| 15 | 9,28-495 | 9,32-440 | 7,46-445 | 6,17-395 | 8,97-439 | 7,13-445 | 8,17-431 | 8,9-410 | 10,7-449 | 9-471 | 8,9-410 | 6,23-426 |
| 16 | 7,46-445 | 12,1-451 | 7,46-445 | 8,25-397 | 9,95-428 | 9,42-416 | 8,78-427 | 7,93-461 | 11,1-430 | 5,92-466 | 8,56-459 | 8,18-413 |
| 17 | 7,84-410 | 9,37-469 | 9,73-448 | 10,7-500 | 9,49-456 | 8,93-414 | 11-387 | 4,51-425 | 8,93-414 | 7,34-471 | 10,1-441 | 9,1-459 |
| 18 | 9,32-440 | 9,28-495 | 12,6-480 | 8,49-442 | 5,22-448 | 8,76-369 | 11,9-418 | 11,5-407 | 8,76-369 | 7,39-455 | 8,15-417 | 48-438 |
| 19 | 8,24-442 | 9,43-389 | 8,24-442 | 11,7-462 | 8,86-479 | 11,6-443 | 10-410 | 8,15-417 | 11,6-443 | 10,7-449 | 9,42-425 | 9,08-418 |
| 20 | 13,2-505 | 12,1-451 | 6,95-465 | 13,4-538 | 8,9-395 | 10,7-461 | 11,2-428 | 6,28-400 | 7,39-455 | 12,4-522 | 11,5-407 | 8,95-407 |
| 21 | 10,4-467 | 9,37-469 | 6,95-465 | 13,4-538 | 8,18-413 | 9,62-470 | 8,58-373 | 8,14-423 | 7,38-477 | 8,22-414 | 6,91-418 | 10,6-464 |
| 22 | 11,7-462 | 8,77-458 | 7,41-371 | 9,92-418 | 6,39-420 | 7,15-489 | 13,1-424 | 10,9-483 | 8,86-479 | 6,25-406 | 9,38-405 | 1-440 |
| 23 | 8,49-442 | 11,7-485 | 10,8-493 | 7,87-493 | 7,39-455 | 9,95-428 | 8,23-398 | 8,41-419 | 9,93-403 | 9,71-420 | 10,9-483 | 8,09-409 |
| 24 | 8,39-412 | 9,58-481 | 12,6-480 | 8,25-397 | 6,39-420 | 9,49-456 | 9,89-429 | 11,1-463 | 6,69-434 | 8,74-467 | 6,39-432 | 8,45-385 |
| 25 | 9,28-453 | 9,51-488 | 7,38-399 | 8,25-397 | 8,87-450 | 6,39-420 | 12,4-413 | 6,91-418 | 8,9-395 | 10,2-502 | 8,9-410 | 8,9-466 |
| 26 | 11,7-485 | 8,39-412 | 10,8-493 | 6,17-395 | 7,24-444 | 7,38-477 | 11,2-428 | 5,68-429 | 7,15-489 | 7,34-471 | 5,68-429 | 8,52-409 |
| 27 | 8,77-458 | 11,7-462 | 11,7-462 | 7,97-387 | 6,69-434 | 6,69-434 | 12,4-413 | 9,38-405 | 11,2-536 | 9,89-474 | 9,29-435 | 14,9-503 |
| 28 | 9,32-440 | 8,49-442 | 9,32-440 | 8,25-397 | 7,38-477 | 8,86-479 | 10,9-452 | 5,54-425 | 6,78-393 | 11,8-521 | 8,15-417 | 8,14-426 |
| 29 | 7,84-410 | 9,28-495 | 6-360 | 7,97-387 | 5,22-448 | 7,38-477 | 8,23-398 | 8,15-440 | 11,8-521 | 11,8-521 | 9,42-425 | 9,08-418 |
| 30 | 7,46-445 | 9,43-389 | 11,7-485 | 7,97-387 | 8,9-395 | 5,22-448 | 11,7-415 | 10,9-418 | 7,34-471 | 12,4-522 | 11,5-407 | 8,95-407 |
| 31 | 9,28-453 | 10,9-452 | 9,58-481 | 18,2-551 | 8,45-385 | 9,95-428 | 9,87-399 | 9,12-416 | 11,2-495 | 10,2-502 | 8,15-440 | 9,1-459 |
| 32 | 13,2-463 | 9,89-429 | 7,38-399 | 7,46-440 | 10,7-461 | 8,86-479 | 13,1-424 | 8,68-436 | 9-471 | 9,71-420 | 10,9-418 | 7,24-444 |
| 33 | 8,24-442 | 6,5-398 | 18,2-551 | 9,92-418 | 8,09-409 | 9,49-456 | 5,34-355 | 9,12-416 | 8,9-452 | 5,91-451 | 9,47-370 | 9,57-481 |
| 34 | 8,77-458 | 9,73-448 | 9,28-495 | 18,2-551 | 11-440 | 7,15-489 | 10,6-465 | 10,9-483 | 10,2-475 | 7,13-434 | 8,56-459 | 7,2-475 |
| 35 | 11,7-485 | 10,4-467 | 12,6-480 | 8,49-442 | 10,6-464 | 6,39-420 | 6,5-398 | 8,41-419 | 5,91-451 | 6,86-424 | 6,28-400 | 9,57-484 |
| 36 | 9,58-481 | 8,54-439 | 7,38-39 | 12,7-4 | 8,9-466 | 10,7-449 | 9,38-405 | 9,47-370 | 6,25-406 | 8,74-467 | 7,93-461 | 10,7-446 |
| 37 | 6,52-417 | 12,4-413 | 12,6-480 | 11-465 | 8,52-409 | 11,1-430 | 9,12-416 | 11,2-428 | 8,76-369 | 10,2-502 | 8,41-419 | 9,57-481 |
| 38 | 13,2-505 | 7,4 | 6-360 | 7,97 | 14,9 - | 8,93-4 | 11,1 | 10-410 | 8,93-414 | 9-471 | 11,1-463 | 87-450 |
| 39 | 9,58-481 | 9,28-453 | 13,4-538 | 12,7-434 | 8,14-426 | 8,76-369 | 10,1-441 | 5,34-355 | 8,22-414 | 11,2-536 | 6,39-432 | 6,23-426 |
| 40 | 9,51-488 | 8,77-458 | 7,84-410 | 12,7-43 | 14,9-503 | 11,6-443 | 6,28-400 | 9,89-429 | 6,25-406 | 10,3-453 | 10,9-483 | 8,18-413 |
| 41 | 9,28-453 | 11,7-485 | 6-360 | 18,2-551 | 10,6-464 | 8,97-439 | 9,42-425 | 11-482 | 11,1-430 | 11,2-495 | 5,54-425 | 9,09-463 |
| 42 | 6,52-417 | 9,32-440 | 10,8-493 | 7,97-387 | 8,45-385 | 11,2-431 | 11,5-407 | 8,56-459 | 7,13-434 | 10,2-475 | 8,68-436 | 8,52-409 |
| 43 | 9,58-481 | 10,1-489 | 9,58-481 | 7,97-387 | 9,62-470 | 9,39-384 | 9,42-504 | 10,1-441 | 6,86-424 | 5,92-466 | 6,91-418 | 9,29-435 |
| 44 | 13,2-463 | 13,2-505 | 13,2-463 | 7,97-387 | 8,09-409 | 7,13-445 | 7,93-461 | 6,28-400 | 10,7-449 | 6,25-406 | 9,38-405 | 14,9-503 |
| 45 | 13,2-463 | 7,84-410 | 9,43-389 | 10,7-500 | 7,24-444 | 9,42-416 | 4,51-425 | 10,1-441 | 7,39-455 | 5,91-451 | 9,29-435 | 6,18-339 |
| 46 | 8,77-458 | 6,56-373 | 10,7-500 | 7,41-371 | 6,18-339 | 9,62-470 | 11,9-418 | 8,58-373 | 6,86-424 | 8,22-414 | 9,57-481 | 6,28-400 |
| 47 | 11,7-485 | 8,17-431 | 9,28-495 | 6,95-465 | 9,1-459 | 8,9-395 | 11-387 | 8,78-427 | 7,3-392 | 6,86-424 | 9,08-418 | 8,56-459 |
| 48 | 11,7-462 | 13,1-424 | 13,2-463 | 8,03-456 | 9,57-481 | 9,95-428 | 11-482 | 11,9-418 | 8,22-414 | 6,25-406 | 8,95-407 | 9,47-370 |
| 49 | 6,52-417 | 11-482 | 6,52-417 | 9,93-419 | 8,87-450 | 6,39-420 | 6,82-392 | 6,56-373 | 7,34-471 | 7,3-392 | 9,48-438 | 6,2-515 |
| 50 | 12,1-451 | 10-463 | 7,41-371 | 11,7-506 | 7,2-475 | 9,49-456 | 10-463 | 6,82-392 | 5,92-466 | 10,3-453 | 8,9-466 | 10,9-418 |
| 51 | 13,2-505 | 11,7-415 | 7,41-371 | 9,93-419 | 9,57-484 | 6,69-434 | 8,54-439 | 8,17-431 | 10,3-453 | 9-471 | 8,52-409 | 8,9-410 |
| 52 | 10,1-489 | 11,2-428 | 9,93-419 | 7,41-371 | 9,08-418 | 9,93-403 | 10-410 | 12,4-413 | 10,2-475 | 8,74-467 | 8,18-413 | 7,93-461 |
| 53 | 8,24-442 | 11,2-428 | 7,46-440 | 11,7-506 | 9,48-438 | 11,1-430 | 12,4-413 | 11,2-428 | 6,78-393 | 9,71-420 | 9,48-438 | 11,5-407 |
| 54 | 9,32-440 | 10-410 | 11,7-506 | 6-360 | 6,23-426 | 7,39-455 | 8,58-373 | 10-410 | 9,49-456 | 5,59-423 | 6,18-339 | 9,42-425 |
| 55 | 7,84-410 | 10,9-452 | 9,93-419 | 7,87-493 | 11-440 | 10,7-449 | 8,78-427 | 11-387 | 7,3-392 | 10,2-502 | 9,1-459 | 8,15-417 |
| 56 | 9,73-448 | 11-387 | 6,95-465 | 6,95-465 | 8,45-385 | 11,1-430 | 11-482 | 11-482 | 11,2-495 | 7,34-471 | 9,57-484 | 8,68-436 |


| 57 | 10,4-467 | 8,23-398 | 8,03-456 | 11,7-506 | 10,6-464 | 8,93-414 | 10-463 | 10-463 | 8,9-452 | 9-471 | 7,2-475 | 5,54-425 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 58 | 11,7-462 | 9,87-399 | 7,41-371 | 9,93-419 | 8,09-409 | 8,76-369 | 6,56-373 | 10,6-465 | 9,71-420 | 10,2-502 | 9,57-481 | 9,29-435 |
| 59 | 9,43-389 | 8,78-427 | 7,46-440 | 8,03-456 | 14,9-503 | 9,42-416 | 6,82-392 | 5,34-355 | 8,74-467 | 5,59-423 | 10,7-446 | 5,68-429 |
| 60 | 13,2-463 | 11,9-418 | 13,6-564 | 6,95-465 | 8,52-409 | 10,7-461 | 8,17-431 | 13,1-424 | 11,2-536 | 5,91-451 | 8,95-407 | 8,14-423 |
| 61 | 7,84-410 | 11,9-418 | 12,6-480 | 9,92-418 | 8,9-466 | 6,14-327 | 9,87-399 | 8,23-398 | 10,3-453 | 9,89-474 | 9,08-418 | 6,91-418 |
| 62 | 7,46-445 | 10-410 | 6-360 | 8,03-456 | 8,9-395 | 10,7-461 | 6,5-398 | 9,87-399 | 5,91-451 | 12,4-522 | 8,87-450 | 8,41-419 |
| 63 | 9,28-453 | 8,23-398 | 10,7-500 | 13,6-564 | 6,69-434 | 11,6-443 | 5,34-355 | 11,7-415 | 7,13-434 | 11,2-536 | 9,09-463 | 9,12-416 |
| 64 | 8,39-412 | 9,87-399 | 7,46-440 | 6-360 | 7,38-477 | 8,97-439 | 10,6-465 | 9,89-429 | 10,3-453 | 10,2-475 | 8,9-466 | 6,39-432 |
| 65 | 8,49-442 | 10,6-465 | 11,7-506 | 9,92-418 | 9,62-470 | 8,93-414 | 10,9-452 | 6,5-398 | 9,71-420 | 9,28-424 | 8,52-409 | 10,9-483 |
| 66 | 11,7-462 | 8,77-45 | 7,97-387 | 9,93-419 | 7,2 | 8,76-369 | 9,42-504 | 8,78-427 | 10,2-502 | 9,71-420 | 8,14-426 | 8,68-436 |
| 67 | 13,2-505 | 8,58-373 | 18,2-551 | 7,87-493 | 7,24-444 | 11,2-431 | 8,9-410 | 9,42-504 | 8,9-452 | 5,91-451 | 14,9-503 | 8,15-440 |
| 68 | 10,1-489 | 10,9-452 | 11,7-506 | 9,93-419 | 10,6-464 | 9,39-384 | 4,51-425 | 11-387 | 9-471 | 9,89-474 | 10,6-464 | 5,54-425 |
| 69 | 8,24-442 | 13,1-42 | 6-360 | 7,87-493 | 11-440 | 7,13-445 | 11,5-407 | 11,9-418 | 5,92-466 | 12,4-522 | 8,09-409 | 11,5-407 |
| 70 | 9,32-440 | 11-387 | 13,6-564 | 11,7-506 | 8,45-385 | 6,39-420 | 9,42-425 | 9,87-399 | 9,89-474 | 8,74-467 | 8,45-385 | 9,42-425 |
| 71 | 9,37-469 | 11,9-418 | 10,7-500 | 11,7-506 | 8,14-426 | 6,14-327 | 5,54-425 | 11,7-415 | 12,4-522 | 6,78-393 | 9,1-459 | 8,15-417 |
| 72 | 11,7-485 | 8,78-427 | 7,46-440 | 10,8-493 | 14,9-503 | 7,13-445 | 10,9-418 | 10-463 | 9-471 | 7,34-471 | 9,08-418 | 10,1-441 |
| 73 | 9,37-469 | 8,58-373 | 7,46-440 | 10,8-493 | 10,7-446 | 7,39-455 | 6,28-400 | 6,56-373 | 8,9-452 | 6,78-393 | 8,95-407 | 10,9-418 |
| 74 | 12,1-451 | 12,4-4 | 8,03-456 | 10,8-493 | 8,52-409 | 11,1-430 | 8,15-440 | 8,17-431 | 5,59-423 | 6,25-406 | 9,57-484 | 8,56-459 |
| 75 | 9,51-488 | 8,54-439 | 6,52-417 | 10,8-493 | 8,9-466 | 9,93-403 | 10,1-441 | 8,54-439 | 9,71-420 | 6,86-424 | 11-440 | 9,47-370 |
| 76 | 8,49-442 | 11,7-415 | 9,51-488 | 11-465 | 6,18-339 | 7,38-477 | 8,56-459 | 12,4-413 | 8,74-467 | 8,22-414 | 9,57-481 | 8,87-450 |
| 77 | 9,28-453 | 6,56-373 | 9,43-389 | 9,93-419 | 9,1-459 | 5,22-448 | 9,47-370 | 8,23-398 | 11,2-536 | 7,13-434 | 9,09-463 | 9,09-463 |
| 78 | 8,39-412 | 10-463 | 11-465 | 9,73-448 | 6,23-426 | 8,86-479 | 5,68-429 | 13,1-424 | 10,2-475 | 11,8-521 | 8,87-450 | 8,18-413 |
| 79 | 7,84-410 | 11-482 | 11-46 | 10,4-467 | 8,18 | 8,9-395 | 8,14-423 | 6,5-398 | 11,2-495 | 10,3-453 | 8,18-413 | 6,23-426 |
| 80 | 7,46-445 | 6,82-392 | 9,28-453 | 13,4-538 | 9,48-438 | 7,15-489 | 6,39-432 | 10,9-452 | 8,22-414 | 11,2-536 | 9,57-484 | 6,18-339 |
| 81 | 9,43-389 | 6,56-373 | 8,25-397 | 6-360 | 9,08-418 | 6,14-327 | 6,39-432 | 8,58-373 | 6,78-393 | 10,2-475 | 9,1-459 | 8,9-410 |
| 82 | 13,2-463 | 11-482 | 8,25-397 | 12,7-434 | 9,62-470 | 11,6-443 | 10,9-483 | 8,78-427 | 10,2-475 | 11,2-495 | 7,2-475 | 4,51-425 |
| 83 | 6,52-417 | 8,17-431 | 8,25-397 | 11-465 | 7,2-475 | 10,7-461 | 9,38-405 | 11,9-418 | 11,2-495 | 8,74-467 | 10,6-464 | 9,29-435 |
| 84 | 8,77-458 | 8,54-439 | 8,39-412 | 8,03-456 | 7,2-475 | 9,42-416 | 6,91-418 | 11-387 | 7,3-392 | 9,89-474 | 8,45-385 | 5,68-429 |
| 85 | 11,7-485 | 9,87-399 | 8,39-412 | 11-465 | 9,57-484 | 7,39-455 | 9,42-504 | 10-410 | 9,89-474 | 11,8-521 | 8,09-409 | 8,14-423 |
| 86 | 8,24-442 | 8,23-398 | 13,4-538 | 6,17-395 | 9,1-459 | 8,76-369 | 11,5-407 | 11-482 | 5,91-451 | 9-471 | 9,08-418 | 6,91-418 |
| 87 | 10,1-489 | 12,4-413 | 13,4-538 | 11-465 | 6,18-339 | 11,1-430 | 4,51-425 | 10-463 | 5,92-466 | 8,9-452 | 8,95-407 | 8,41-419 |
| 88 | 13,2-505 | 11,2-428 | 10,7-500 | 9,92-418 | 8,18-413 | 8,97-439 | 9,29-435 | 6,56-373 | 11,8-521 | 10,2-502 | 9,57-484 | 9,12-416 |
| 89 | 13,2-505 | 10-410 | 7,46-445 | 11-465 | 9,09-463 | 9,39-384 | 8,9-410 | 8,17-431 | 6,86-424 | 9,71-420 | 8,14-426 | 6,39-432 |
| 90 | 10,1-489 | 8,17-431 | 8,03-456 | 8,25-397 | 8,87-450 | 7,13-445 | 9,42-425 | 8,54-439 | 8,22-414 | 6,25-406 | 6,23-426 | 10,9-483 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | 7,88-377 | 12,9-497 | 13,6-481 | 13,5-516 | 9,59-414 | 9,87-399 | 11,6-409 | 12,6-447 | 11,8-500 | 12,1-445 | 12,5-444 | 9,59-437 |
| B | 14,2-464 | 11,7-453 | 12-466 | 11,3-444 | 13,3-45 | 8,29-375 | 15,2-459 | 9,94-418 | 9,88-424 | 14,8-464 | 11,6-478 | 9,86-414 |
| C | 14,5-458 | 12,4-453 | 12,7-529 | 15,6-477 | 14,4-476 | 15,5-479 | 8,98-356 | 14,2-469 | 12,8-448 | 10,1-445 | 12,3-483 | 13,2-484 |
| D | 14,3-439 | 8,97-413 | 12,3-435 | 11,1-541 | 12,7-448 | 13,9-470 | 11,3-445 | 13,2-455 | 13,3-449 | 12,3-430 | 8,59-383 | 11,4-428 |
| E | 9,52-415 | 11,5-439 | 10,7-458 | 10,1-399 | 12-408 | 8,83-437 | 13,9-454 | 9,39-422 | 14,3-462 | 14,5-461 | 13,4-447 | 9,95-399 |
| F | 11,5-443 | 10,1-415 | 16,5-546 | 12,5-543 | 10,5-397 | 11,7-458 | 11,8-441 | 8,54-391 | 15,6-507 | 13,6-466 | 11,1-477 | 11,7-420 |
| G | 12,9-444 | 11,8-448 | 11,9-453 | 15,6-490 | 15,1-471 | 6,86-392 | 10,8-439 | 9,91-401 | 12,2-xxx | 13,1-488 | 13,7-445 | 11,6-463 |
| H | 13,3-459 | 13,7-529 | 12,4-458 | 13,2-511 | 11,1-410 | 11,1-434 | 8,3-403 | 12,8-505 | 10,8-439 | 7,13-404 | 9,64-415 | 14,9-525 |
| I | 13,6-458 | 13,2-536 | 11,9-451 | 15,1-508 | 13,4-479 | 8,84-395 | 10,7-438 | 14,5-476 | 12,8-480 | 13-453 | 9,46-400 | 14,8-532 |
| J | 11-490 | 12,3-529 | 9,76-483 | 10,8-391 | 10,6-489 | 10,9-418 | 12,2-439 | 13,3-481 | 12,8-xxx | 15-473 | 11-435 | 13,8-482 |
| K | 14,8-497 | 14,1-491 | 16,8-510 | 13,4-511 | 11,8-467 | 13,7-473 | 12,3-498 | 12,1-439 | 12,5-xxx | 12,3-498 | 12,2-481 | 9,41-442 |
| L | 12,6-428 | 13,6-467 | 10,5-410 | 15,8-528 | 11,5-443 | 11,2-468 | 13,6-491 | 13,9-460 | 13,1-460 | 15,7-452 | 15-511 | 12,3-424 |
| M | 11-434 | 13,2-402 | 12,4-435 | 14,1-450 | 8,56-347 | 11,7-449 | 10,7-441 | 12,3-513 | 12,3-473 | 14,7-480 | 13,1-462 | 11,6-367 |
| N | 7,55-401 | 11,4-361 | 9,49-438 | 11,7-472 | 11-429 | 11,2-409 | 15,8-477 | 11,3-450 | 12,4-453 | 9,22-407 | 13,4-488 | 12,6-471 |
| 0 | 12,9-464 | 16,2-446 | 15,8-475 | 15,7-446 | 13,3-500 | 13,5-453 | 10,7-417 | 11,3-462 | 12,9-520 | 13,7-464 | 9,65-535 | 12-429 |
| P | 12,5-481 | 14-490 | 11,1-406 | 10,2-421 | 13,6-491 | 16,2-494 | 16,1-514 | 13,3-499 | 13,4-459 | 14,1-461 | 11,3-413 | 12-486 |
| Q | 15-505 | 14,3-490 | 10,5-492 | 13,8-400 | 9,96-415 | 13,3-454 | 11,5-446 | 13,3-501 | 7,79-388 | 14,7-475 | 11,8-452 | 8,57-349 |
| R | 13,3-468 | 9,69-430 | 12,4-489 | 11,2-418 | 13,5-473 | 14,8-479 | 13,2-500 | 10,2-405 | 13,6-454 | 12,4-431 | 9,83-395 | 10,6-433 |

Table 16 Allocation of parameters in species 2－1，numeration displayed in Fig． 49

|  | Dynamic MOE in $\mathrm{kN} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$－Dry timber density in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| layer orientation | 八 | \／ | \／ | 八 | 八 | \／ | 1／ | 八 |
| 1 | 14，8－512 | 9，5－366 | 8，95－399 | 11，3－456 | 8，28－428 | 8，53－441 | 9，97－419 | 15－470 |
| 2 | 6，23－426 | 7，45－444 | 10，8－472 | 10，2－495 | 11，5－445 | 12，4－465 | 11－449 | 9，32－450 |
| 3 | 15，7－539 | 11，7－478 | 12，4－473 | 11，2－495 | 11，5－445 | 10，7－410 | 10，5－467 | 11，2－394 |
| 4 | 12－405 | 10，6－475 | 8，56－431 | 11，2－495 | 11，5－445 | 10，7－410 | 12－405 | 11，2－394 |
| 5 | 9，89－472 | 11，7－478 | 8，56－431 | 9，71－467 | 11，5－445 | 10，7－410 | 7，45－444 | 10，4－463 |
| 6 | 9，32－450 | 11，1－464 | 7，47－402 | 9，71－467 | 7，29－366 | 10，7－410 | 13，3－502 | 10，4－463 |
| 7 | 12，1－470 | 7，45－444 | 7，47－402 | 11，2－495 | 7，29－366 | 9，98－493 | 7，56－410 | 10，5－461 |
| 8 | 9，83－404 | 13，6－468 | 8，56－431 | 8，52－464 | 6，49－424 | 9，98－493 | 11，2－438 | 10，5－461 |
| 9 | 15，7－539 | 11，9－440 | 8，56－431 | 8，52－464 | 6，49－424 | 10，9－406 | 11，2－438 | 12，9－407 |
| 10 | 10，4－463 | 10，6－475 | 9，54－405 | 8，52－464 | 6，49－424 | 15，3－540 | 11，8－502 | 12，9－407 |
| 11 | 11，4－448 | 10，5－450 | 9，54－405 | 12，2－466 | 6，49－424 | 15，3－540 | 11，8－502 | 9，32－448 |
| 12 | 11，2－390 | 11，7－460 | 9，54－405 | 12，2－466 | 7，29－366 | 9，98－493 | 10，2－480 | 9，32－448 |
| 13 | 13，9－462 | 11，1－464 | 7，47－402 | 8，52－464 | 7，29－366 | 10，7－418 | 10，2－480 | 9，93－433 |
| 14 | 12，5－455 | 10，6－475 | 7，47－402 | 12，2－466 | 12－501 | 15，3－540 | 11，4－448 | 9，93－433 |
| 15 | 7，56－410 | 11，7－478 | 12－501 | 12，2－466 | 12－501 | 15，3－540 | 10，8－466 | 9，71－467 |
| 16 | 13，6－468 | 10，9－464 | 10，4－462 | 13，1－487 | 12－501 | 10，8－471 | 10，8－466 | 9，71－467 |
| 17 | 13，6－468 | 10，9－464 | 10，4－462 | 13，1－487 | 9，96－419 | 10，8－471 | 10，4－441 | 10，2－495 |
| 18 | 7，56－410 | 11，7－478 | 10，4－462 | 11，1－457 | 9，96－419 | 10，3－440 | 10，4－441 | 10，2－495 |
| 19 | 11，9－440 | 11，7－460 | 10，4－462 | 13，1－487 | 9，96－419 | 10，3－440 | 10，1－429 | 10，3－440 |
| 20 | 11，9－440 | 7，45－444 | 10，8－437 | 11，1－457 | 9，96－419 | 11，2－394 | 10，1－429 | 10，3－440 |
| 21 | 12，5－480 | 10，5－440 | 11，5－380 | 9，32－450 | 13，1－526 | 14－469 | 9，81－430 | 9，52－404 |
| 22 | 9，11－429 | 10，1－423 | 10，9－454 | 11，9－483 | 8，6－415 | 12，2－495 | 7，35－433 | 11，5－468 |
| 23 | 13，9－462 | 10，1－429 | 10，8－472 | 13，1－487 | 11，6－491 | 12，4－465 | 12，5－455 | 9，32－450 |
| 24 | 11，2－390 | 10，4－441 | 10，8－472 | 10，8－437 | 10，7－380 | 10，2－440 | 12，5－455 | 9，32－450 |
| 25 | 11，4－448 | 10，8－466 | 6，23－361 | 12－475 | 10，7－380 | 10，2－440 | 12，5－455 | 14－584 |
| 26 | 10，8－466 | 11，4－448 | 6，23－361 | 10，9－406 | 10，7－380 | 9，98－493 | 13，3－502 | 14－584 |
| 27 | 10，4－441 | 8，08－413 | 6，23－361 | 10，9－406 | 10，7－380 | 9，98－493 | 10，1－452 | 14－584 |
| 28 | 10，1－429 | 11，2－390 | 12，2－461 | 10，9－406 | 10，2－523 | 10，2－440 | 11，7－460 | 14－584 |
| 29 | 13，6－468 | 13，9－462 | 12，2－461 | 12－475 | 10，2－523 | 10，2－440 | 9，83－404 | 9，89－472 |
| 30 | 12，6－530 | 11－449 | 12，2－461 | 12－475 | 12，7－458 | 10，5－461 | 13，9－462 | 9，89－472 |
| 31 | 10，1－452 | 9，83－404 | 7，56－444 | 12－475 | 12，7－458 | 10，5－461 | 11，2－390 | 9，89－472 |
| 32 | 9，83－404 | 12，1－470 | 7，56－444 | 9，53－468 | 11，6－491 | 12，4－465 | 8，08－413 | 10，4－432 |
| 33 | 10，1－452 | 12，6－530 | 7，56－444 | 10，8－437 | 11，6－491 | 12，4－465 | 8，08－413 | 10，4－432 |
| 34 | 10，5－450 | 13，3－502 | 7，56－444 | 10，8－437 | 11，6－491 | 9，32－448 | 8，08－413 | 10，4－432 |
| 35 | 10，5－450 | 12－442 | 10，5－450 | 11，1－457 | 10，2－523 | 9，32－448 | 15，8－507 | 11，2－438 |
| 36 | 13，3－502 | 7，56－410 | 14，1－507 | 11，1－457 | 10，2－523 | 9，93－433 | 15，8－507 | 11，2－438 |
| 37 | 12，6－530 | 11，9－440 | 14，1－507 | 9，53－468 | 12，7－458 | 9，93－433 | 15，8－507 | 11，8－502 |
| 38 | 12，1－470 | 12－405 | 14，1－507 | 9，53－468 | 12，7－458 | 11，2－394 | 15，8－507 | 11，8－502 |
| 39 | 11－449 | 15，7－539 | 14，1－507 | 9，53－468 | 12，4－473 | 10，8－472 | 10，5－467 | 10，2－480 |
| 40 | 11－449 | 12－405 | 12，2－461 | 12，9－407 | 12，4－473 | 6，23－361 | 10，5－467 | 10，2－480 |
| 41 | 15，7－539 | 10，1－452 | 12，4－473 | 12，9－407 | 11，2－495 | 9，54－405 | 10，5－467 | 10，4－463 |
| 42 | 10，7－417 | 8，73－423 | 9，57－464 | 8，19－430 | 9，22－398 | 10，1－441 | 10，1－457 | 9，37－431 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | 11，7－443 | 11－403 | 14，7－464 | 11，7－432 | 11－446 | 12，3－449 | 11，7－460 | 9，01－399 |
| B | 14，1－472 | 9，71－436 | 11，8－459 | 12，3－428 | 12，8－450 | 15－474 | 12，7－468 | 13，3－498 |
| C | 15，6－491 | 11，1－419 | 11，6－466 | 11，1－418 | 10，2－452 | 8，64－437 | 10，8－456 | 9，88－429 |
| D | 11，8－387 | 13，7－454 | 12，5－470 | 16，2－524 | 11，5－427 | 7，88－418 | 12，4－514 | 10，3－419 |
| E | 15，5－489 | 10，6－349 | 9，63－428 | 9，26－357 | 11，9－420 | 10，3－382 | 11，8－400 | 17，4－516 |
| F | 13，8－471 | 11－433 | 7，78－425 | 9，63－399 | 12，3－486 | 11，4－452 | 10，7－431 | 11，4－419 |
| G | 10，6－428 | 13，6－491 | 14，4－468 | 8，8－408 | 10，3－454 | 11－445 | 14，3－449 | 11－470 |
| H | 10，8－377 | 10，1－351 | 11，5－431 | 9，29－414 | 11，9－445 | 16，4－527 | 13，8－480 | 14，3－489 |
| I | 7，76－401 | 12，5－493 | 10，8－431 | 15，8－522 | 12，9－451 | 13－458 | 12，3－480 | 12，6－428 |
| J | 11，5－394 | 11－434 | 14，1－518 | 13－465 | 14－483 | 10，3－442 | 9，89－408 | 9，85－414 |
| K | 9，78－390 | 14，2－498 | 10，2－398 | 9，44－410 | 8，97－391 | 10，7－453 | 11，3－445 | 8，94－407 |
| L | 13，4－447 | 7，98－404 | 12，7－457 | 12，5－482 | 13，7－473 | 13，4－466 | 9，49－443 | 10，8－468 |

Table 17 Allocation of parameters in species 2－2，numeration displayed in Fig． 50

|  | Dynamic MOE in $\mathrm{kN} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$－Dry timber density in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| layer orientation | 八 | $1 /$ | 八 | 1／ | \／ | 八 | $1 /$ | 八 | 八 | 八 |
| 1 | 11，9－474 | 7，16－400 | 11，5－438 | 9，56－429 | 11，6－437 | 9，96－447 | 12，6－466 | 9，56－448 | 9，33－456 | 16，6－497 |
| 2 | 9，52－475 | 16，5－526 | 10，2－439 | 9，55－488 | 9，74－451 | 12，2－429 | 9，22－398 | 13，7－438 | 13，1－532 | 8，6－452 |
| 3 | 11，4－424 | 12，5－477 | 9，5－428 | 9，55－488 | 11，1－390 | 10，9－454 | 9，55－499 | 13，7－438 | 10，9－464 | 14－584 |
| 4 | 13，1－526 | 10，2－439 | 10，5－473 | 12，6－495 | 10，5－440 | 10，9－454 | 12，2－429 | 9，18－464 | 8，47－437 | 9，04－447 |
| 5 | 9，94－369 | 10，5－457 | 8，24－427 | 10－472 | 11，5－419 | 10，8－387 | 8，52－464 | 6，86－452 | 12－442 | 8，6－415 |
| 6 | 10，2－439 | 10，3－439 | 11，4－476 | 10，5－457 | 10，8－406 | 10，8－387 | 11，4－530 | 6，86－452 | 11，7－460 | 8，6－415 |
| 7 | 11，7－450 | 12，5－477 | 13，3－452 | 13，1－526 | 13，3－452 | 9，84－462 | 10，3－512 | 8，52－464 | 10，5－450 | 7，12－462 |
| 8 | 9，54－444 | 10－472 | 11，7－450 | 13，1－526 | 8，86－403 | 9，84－462 | 10，3－512 | 8，52－464 | 8，47－437 | 12－442 |
| 9 | 11，6－401 | 12，6－495 | 9，45－473 | 11，2－398 | 11，4－476 | 13，5－530 | 11，4－530 | 8，28－428 | 7，12－462 | 11，1－460 |
| 10 | 9，5－428 | 9，5－428 | 14，8－514 | 12，5－502 | 11，7－450 | 13，5－530 | 8，52－464 | 8，28－428 | 10，6－475 | 13，1－532 |
| 11 | 11，5－419 | 9，94－369 | 8，97－424 | 11，2－398 | 9，45－473 | 8，6－415 | 12，2－429 | 8，28－428 | 8，47－437 | 10，2－412 |
| 12 | 12，8－485 | 10，1－457 | 9，92－495 | 12，5－502 | 14，8－514 | 8，6－415 | 9，55－499 | 8，53－441 | 7，45－423 | 9，13－414 |
| 13 | 13，3－501 | 10，4－473 | 11，6－401 | 9，5－366 | 9，84－462 | 12，2－458 | 9，22－398 | 11，4－530 | 9，04－447 | 11，1－464 |
| 14 | 12，8－485 | 12，5－477 | 9，52－475 | 12，6－495 | 13，5－530 | 12，2－458 | 8，95－399 | 11，4－530 | 10，9－464 | 10，2－412 |
| 15 | 9，54－444 | 9，31－458 | 7，67－471 | 16，5－526 | 10，1－441 | 7，98－439 | 8，26－468 | 10，3－512 | 11，1－460 | 9，13－414 |
| 16 | 9，92－495 | 10，3－439 | 13，3－501 | 9，5－366 | 11，1－467 | 7，98－439 | 11，1－467 | 10，3－512 | 11，1－460 | 9，13－414 |
| 17 | 12，5－480 | 10，3－439 | 12，8－485 | 10，1－457 | 8，53－441 | 14，5－496 | 10，1－441 | 6，89－406 | 12－442 | 9，13－414 |
| 18 | 11，7－450 | 15，5－506 | 9，94－369 | 12，1－446 | 15，6－518 | 14，5－496 | 12－465 | 6，89－406 | 13，1－532 | 10，2－412 |
| 19 | 9，52－475 | 15，5－506 | 10，8－406 | 9，5－366 | 6，89－406 | 14，5－496 | 8，53－441 | 13，3－452 | 13，1－532 | 10，2－412 |
| 20 | 7，67－471 | 10－472 | 11，5－419 | 8，73－423 | 8，24－427 | 14，5－496 | 15，6－518 | 12－465 | 11，1－460 | 11，1－464 |
| 21 | 8，91－447 | 9，36－423 | 8，68－442 | 10，1－437 | 14，4－528 | 9，92－495 | 11，2－453 | 10，5－462 | 12，2－465 | 12，8－460 |
| 22 | 11，5－428 | 11，1－460 | 11，2－459 | 9，65－496 | 7，95－442 | 8，97－424 | 11，3－460 | 11，1－450 | 8，97－447 | 8，88－446 |
| 23 | 7，67－471 | 10，1－457 | 11，5－468 | 12，1－446 | 11，1－390 | 10，1－441 | 9，96－447 | 9，55－499 | 13，7－438 | 7，45－423 |
| 24 | 11，1－390 | 8，24－427 | 10，8－406 | 8，73－423 | 11，1－390 | 9，22－398 | 9，74－451 | 15－470 | 9，03－413 | 7，12－462 |
| 25 | 9，74－451 | 11，4－476 | 10，5－440 | 10，4－473 | 11，4－424 | 11，1－467 | 10，9－454 | 9，06－471 | 9，64－439 | 15－470 |
| 26 | 12，8－485 | 8，73－423 | 10，5－440 | 11，7－493 | 10，5－473 | 9，31－458 | 8，8－456 | 10，1－441 | 10，7－448 | 9，04－447 |
| 27 | 12，2－495 | 10，4－473 | 12，5－480 | 9，55－488 | 9，74－451 | 11，1－467 | 10，8－387 | 12，2－429 | 9，03－413 | 15－470 |
| 28 | 9，88－492 | 11，4－424 | 8，86－403 | 15，5－506 | 13，3－452 | 9，22－398 | 13，5－530 | 8，26－468 | 9，03－413 | 11，7－493 |
| 29 | 9，54－444 | 10，2－439 | 10，1－423 | 12，1－446 | 10，8－406 | 8，8－466 | 10，1－423 | 8，95－399 | 12，2－458 | 9，18－464 |
| 30 | 8，24－427 | 9，5－428 | 8，86－403 | 12，5－502 | 9，96－447 | 14－584 | 6，86－452 | 8，8－456 | 7，98－439 | 8，6－452 |
| 31 | 14，8－514 | 9，94－369 | 9，88－492 | 11，2－398 | 11，5－468 | 12－465 | 10，8－387 | 8，26－468 | 10，7－448 | 9，31－458 |
| 32 | 9，45－473 | 11，2－398 | 11，6－401 | 14，8－514 | 12，5－480 | 8，28－428 | 6，89－406 | 7，99－424 | 9，06－471 | 7，12－462 |
| 33 | 8，97－424 | 15，5－506 | 12，2－495 | 9，92－495 | 11，5－468 | 9，06－471 | 9，84－462 | 8，8－456 | 10，7－448 | 9，03－413 |
| 34 | 9，92－495 | 9，55－488 | 9，52－475 | 10，5－473 | 11，5－419 | 13，7－438 | 8，85－442 | 8，85－442 | 7，98－439 | 8，47－437 |
| 35 | 10，5－473 | 12，6－495 | 7，67－471 | 10，1－457 | 9，96－447 | 9，55－499 | 12，5－480 | 7，99－424 | 12，2－458 | 9，31－458 |
| 36 | 11，4－476 | 16，5－526 | 9，88－492 | 9，5－366 | 11，5－468 | 15－470 | 10，1－423 | 13，3－501 | 8，8－466 | 9，04－447 |
| 37 | 11，6－401 | 12，1－446 | 12，2－495 | 10，3－439 | 8，86－403 | 12－465 | 7，99－424 | 8，85－442 | 9，31－458 | 11，7－493 |
| 38 | 9，45－473 | 10－472 | 11，4－424 | 10，5－457 | 10，9－454 | 8，8－466 | 8，8－456 | 8，53－441 | 9，31－458 | 7，45－423 |
| 39 | 9，88－492 | 8，73－423 | 8，97－424 | 12，5－502 | 7，99－424 | 9，18－464 | 8，26－468 | 15，6－518 | 10，7－448 | 8，6－452 |
| 40 | 12，2－495 | 13，1－526 | 9，96－447 | 12，5－477 | 8，95－399 | 11，7－493 | 10，5－440 | 15，6－518 | 8，6－452 | 9，18－464 |
| 41 | 13，3－501 | 8，97－424 | 10，1－423 | 10，4－473 | 6，86－452 | 8，95－399 | 8，85－442 | 9，54－444 | 9，31－458 | 9，31－458 |
| 42 | 11－465 | 9，94－405 | 9，27－445 | 15－488 | 11，4－424 | 14，8－514 | 10，2－463 | 9，58－456 | 11，9－438 | 13，5－471 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | 7，45－393 | 11，2－453 | 10，9－458 | 12，7－508 | 14，9－499 | 14，7－459 | 11，9－472 | 10，5－400 | 10，9－458 | 11，9－449 |
| B | 12，3－480 | 13－421 | 11，2－437 | 12，9－461 | 12，2－435 | 11，3－451 | 11，1－433 | 12，9－449 | 17，1－568 | 8，24－403 |
| C | 14，6－469 | 8，08－400 | 11，3－xxx | 12，6－465 | 12，4－491 | 14，7－502 | 11，9－473 | 10，1－427 | 12，4－406 | 11，2－419 |
| D | 13，5－452 | 10，6－414 | 11，9－xxx | 12，7－423 | 8，6－416 | 12，2－535 | 11，2－449 | 10，6－426 | 9，02－397 | 12，3－401 |
| E | 6，31－392 | 15，5－448 | 11，2－423 | 11－449 | 8，89－422 | 7，01－381 | 7，58－380 | 10，4－425 | 14，9－508 | 10，4－430 |
| F | 11，3－380 | 11，9－476 | 9，9－408 | 11，5－442 | 11，2－425 | 12，8－398 | 13，8－473 | 14，6－515 | 9，34－391 | 13，7－415 |
| G | 10，8－433 | 9，78－434 | 11－426 | 10，3－416 | 14，7－541 | 12，9－596 | 12，5－486 | 11，2－435 | 13－458 | 10，1－398 |
| H | 12，4－498 | 9，71－405 | 15，6－535 | 12，6－484 | 12，6－497 | 8，93－418 | 15，2－452 | 11，6－439 | 11，7－378 | 13，8－460 |

Table 18 Allocation of parameters in species 2－3，numeration displayed in Fig． 51

|  | Dynamic MOE in $\mathrm{kN} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$－Dry timber density in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| layer orientation | 八 | $1 /$ | $1 /$ | 八 | 八 | \／ | $1 /$ | 八 |
| 1 | 11，7－460 | 13，3－502 | 9，85－461 | 15，2－523 | 9，03－413 | 11，5－459 | 10，7－448 | 7，45－444 |
| 2 | 6，07－387 | 9－420 | 12，1－484 | 9，06－419 | 11，4－433 | 9，3－469 | 12，2－394 | 10，2－480 |
| 3 | 7，36－386 | 10，2－480 | 9，06－419 | 14，6－445 | 7，62－429 | 7，02－438 | 11，9－450 | 8，66－429 |
| 4 | 8，26－414 | 9，81－486 | 7，58－496 | 7，58－496 | 13，8－456 | 16，1－514 | 8，16－447 | 11，8－435 |
| 5 | 8，58－434 | 10，1－449 | 14，6－445 | 10，8－444 | 10，7－435 | 11－462 | 9，83－434 | 10，3－403 |
| 6 | 9，58－456 | 8，93－440 | 10，8－444 | 6，48－428 | 11－462 | 11，3－444 | 11，8－493 | 11，9－450 |
| 7 | 11，1－450 | 7，18－436 | 10，2－439 | 7，98－510 | 9，3－469 | 9，31－361 | 10，1－449 | 6，54－411 |
| 8 | 9，19－415 | 12，2－394 | 8，26－454 | 10，2－439 | 7，36－386 | 6，48－428 | 7，77－395 | 9，57－526 |
| 9 | 7，4－384 | 9，68－454 | 11，5－439 | 9，37－431 | 11，4－433 | 11，8－435 | 7，77－371 | 11，5－428 |
| 10 | 5，56－405 | 9，19－415 | 11，3－456 | 7，35－433 | 13，5－484 | 13，8－456 | 9，85－416 | 10，2－480 |
| 11 | 7，49－447 | 8，58－434 | 12，7－461 | 10－429 | 9，05－408 | 12，2－462 | 10，1－403 | 7，77－395 |
| 12 | 9，68－454 | 7，77－371 | 9，37－431 | 12，1－484 | 12，2－462 | 12－415 | 8，93－440 | 9，05－408 |
| 13 | 7，49－447 | 11，3－444 | 10－429 | 12，7－461 | 12－415 | 12－415 | 10，8－447 | 7，77－395 |
| 14 | 7，77－371 | 10，1－403 | 14，8－512 | 9，52－416 | 8，71－440 | 8，71－440 | 11，9－450 | 6，48－428 |
| 15 | 11，5－434 | 8，52－494 | 10，2－487 | 8，44－428 | 10，3－445 | 9，76－472 | 8，99－384 | 8，36－481 |
| 16 | 7，98－510 | 9，83－434 | 8，26－454 | 8，3－360 | 9，35－437 | 8，99－391 | 12，2－394 | 9，57－526 |
| 17 | 7，77－395 | 14－530 | 10，2－439 | 10，8－447 | 10，5－459 | 14，9－492 | 8，16－447 | 11，5－428 |
| 18 | 8，66－429 | 8，66－429 | 10，1－426 | 10，8－447 | 11，8－435 | 10，7－435 | 11，8－493 | 9，83－435 |
| 19 | 8，26－414 | 15，2－485 | 9，11－429 | 8，3－360 | 8，19－412 | 11－462 | 8，26－414 | 6，15－408 |
| 20 | 11－517 | 8，99－391 | 11，7－462 | 8，44－428 | 9，31－361 | 9，3－469 | 10，1－449 | 8，91－396 |
| 21 | 12－401 | 10，1－449 | 10－428 | 9，52－416 | 11，3－444 | 11，4－433 | 11，7－433 | 9，83－435 |
| 22 | 9，56－429 | 10，1－403 | 10，2－487 | 11，1－450 | 13，5－484 | 8，76－402 | 9，83－434 | 7，77－371 |
| 23 | 13，2－447 | 11，9－450 | 10，5－450 | 11，5－434 | 8，13－466 | 14，9－492 | 13，5－484 | 6，52－432 |
| 24 | 10－428 | 9，83－434 | 10，7－417 | 9，97－419 | 11，5－428 | 7，44－420 | 8，3－360 | 9，19－415 |
| 25 | 8，3－360 | 8，16－447 | 13，2－447 | 10，1－426 | 14，4－535 | 9，02－422 | 8，44－428 | 11，8－435 |
| 26 | 11－517 | 9，68－454 | 9，06－419 | 11，3－456 | 11，5－382 | 7，62－412 | 14，4－535 | 9，81－486 |
| 27 | 7，65－411 | 7，49－447 | 7，58－496 | 11，3－456 | 11－462 | 9，43－395 | 11，3－444 | 9，05－408 |
| 28 | 7，18－436 | 8，58－434 | 14，6－445 | 10，5－450 | 10，7－435 | 9，76－472 | 9，31－361 | 10，3－403 |
| 29 | 6，52－432 | 10，1－449 | 9，97－419 | 11，5－439 | 7，62－412 | 6，07－387 | 11－517 | 12，2－394 |
| 30 | 12－401 | 11，7－433 | 13，2－447 | 12，7－461 | 9，02－422 | 7，97－387 | 9，22－410 | 12－401 |
| 31 | 10，8－447 | 8，52－494 | 10，1－426 | 11，5－439 | 9，26－453 | 9，76－472 | 7，65－411 | 7，77－395 |
| 32 | 8，44－428 | 10，1－403 | 7，35－433 | 10，5－450 | 14，9－492 | 8，76－402 | 7，18－436 | 8，19－412 |
| 33 | 9，52－416 | 12，2－394 | 9，76－448 | 12，1－484 | 7，44－420 | 11－462 | 8，52－494 |  |
| 34 | 12，7－460 | 8，93－440 | 15，6－518 | 10－455 | 7，12－462 | 12，7－443 | 13，1－532 | 11，9－440 |
| 35 | 12，2－394 | 10，5－450 | 8，67－425 | 11，4－458 | 7，31－424 | 12－442 | 11，2－394 |  |
| 36 | 9，63－461 | 9，56－429 | 7，98－510 | 8，26－454 | 5，56－405 |  | 6，15－408 | 8，66－388 |
| 37 | 7，62－429 | 6，21－441 | 13，2－447 | 10，2－487 | 7，36－386 | 11，5－428 | 9，83－435 | 8，91－396 |
| 38 | 9，56－448 | 9－420 | 10，1－426 | 9，37－431 | 5，56－405 | 13，5－484 | 8，99－384 | 13，5－484 |
| 39 | 10，6－444 | 9，16－437 | 10－428 | 12，7－461 | 9，76－472 | 9，35－437 | 10，8－447 | 8，99－384 |
| 40 | 10，7－417 | 6，07－387 | 9，37－431 | 14，6－445 | 9，57－526 | 10，5－459 | 10，1－403 | 5，62－416 |
| 41 | 15，6－518 | 14－530 | 10－429 | 7，58－496 | 14，4－535 | 11，5－382 | 8，93－440 | 10，2－480 |
| 42 | 7，18－436 | 7，36－386 | 7，35－433 | 9，06－419 | 9－420 | 8，76－402 | 8，44－428 | 5，62－416 |
| 43 | 8，26－414 | 8，93－440 | 9，97－419 | 10，2－439 | 9，85－416 | 7，02－438 | 8，3－360 | 9，85－416 |
| 44 | 11－517 | 8，93－440 | 9，63－461 | 10，2－439 | 11，3－444 | 7，02－438 | 12－401 | 8，78－429 |
| 45 | 7，62－429 | 14－530 | 9，58－456 | 7，98－510 | 9，31－361 | 13，8－456 | 9，56－429 | 10，5－459 |
| 46 | 7，02－438 | 9，31－361 | 11，1－450 | 7，98－510 | 8，19－412 | 6，48－428 | 8，66－388 | 10，3－403 |
| 47 | 9，11－429 | 7，36－386 | 11，5－434 | 10，8－444 | 11，8－435 | 13，8－456 | 6，54－411 | 5，62－416 |
| 48 | 11，7－462 | 6，15－408 | 9，56－448 | 7，58－496 | 10，5－459 | 12，2－462 | 11，7－433 | 14－530 |
| 49 | 14，8－512 | 9，19－415 | 9，11－429 | 9，06－419 | 9，35－437 | 12－415 | 8，26－414 | 8，58－434 |
| 50 | 6，52－432 | 8，58－434 | 10，7－417 | 14，6－445 | 9，05－408 | 8，71－440 | 14－530 | 8，78－429 |
| 51 | 11，8－493 | 5，62－416 | 10，6－444 | 10，8－444 | 13，5－484 | 10，3－445 | 9，52－416 | 10，5－459 |
| 52 | 9，22－410 | 8，16－447 | 7，35－433 | 9，58－456 | 8，13－466 | 7，62－412 | 7，65－411 | 8，19－412 |
| 53 | 6，21－441 | 8，99－384 | 10－429 | 9，63－461 | 11，5－382 | 8，99－391 | 8，52－494 | 10，2－480 |
| 54 | 10，7－447 | 11，9－450 | 11，7－462 | 9，56－448 | 14，4－535 | 14，9－492 | 11－517 | 10，3－403 |


| 55 | 8,99-391 | 11,7-433 | 9,97-419 | 10,6-444 | 11,5-428 | 7,44-420 | 6,52-432 | 6,54-411 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56 | 7,4-384 | 9,26-453 | 13,2-447 | 14,8-512 | 7,62-412 | 9,02-422 | 7,18-436 | 9,35-437 |
| 57 | 9,56-429 | 5,56-405 | 9,11-429 | 11,7-462 | 9,02-422 | 9,43-395 | 8,13-466 | 8,16-447 |
| 58 | 6,52-432 | 5,56-405 | 10,1-426 | 9,11-429 | 9,19-415 | 9,43-395 | 8,78-429 | 8,78-429 |
| 59 | 7,65-411 | 8,36-481 | 10-428 | 10,7-417 | 14,9-492 | 7,62-412 | 14,4-535 | 8,91-396 |
| 60 | 9,22-410 | 8,99-384 | 9,76-448 | 10-428 | 8,76-402 | 9,3-469 | 9,22-410 | 8,66-429 |
| 61 | 16,1-514 | 11,8-493 | 9,56-448 | 11,7-462 | 9,43-395 | 7,44-420 | 9,68-454 | 9,56-429 |
| 62 | 9-420 | 11,7-433 | 10,6-444 | 10,8-444 | 9,76-472 | 10,7-435 | 7,49-447 | 9,68-454 |
| 63 | 6,07-387 | 7,4-384 | 10,7-417 | 14,8-512 | 10,3-445 | 9,16-437 | 11,5-382 | 8,36-481 |
| 64 | 9,83-434 | 7,62-429 | 9,58-456 | 12,1-484 | 8,71-440 | 12,2-462 | 11,5-382 | 7,49-447 |
| 65 | 8,52-494 | 9,59-443 | 11,1-450 | 11,5-439 | 12-415 | 9,3-469 | 8,13-466 | 9,35-437 |
| 66 | 11,8-493 | 8,99-391 | 9,63-461 | 10,5-450 | 12,2-462 | 11,4-433 | 9,81-486 | 9,83-435 |
| 67 | 7,65-411 | 8,66-429 | 11,5-434 | 11,3-456 | 13,8-456 | 10,7-435 | 9,81-486 | 8,36-481 |
| 68 | 14-530 |  | 15-524 | 10,7-459 | 9,04-447 | 11,8-465 | 11,4-530 | 12-405 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | 9,58-407 | 13,3-469 | 14,4-475 | 13,9-458 | 9,94-436 | 12,4-452 | 15,1-472 | 16,3-501 |
| B | 8,15-428 | 10,8-448 | 11,7-497 | 12,3-441 | 10,3-441 | 9,26-424 | 10,7-447 | 10,5-421 |
| C | 14,1-476 | 8,75-431 | 9,78-505 | 8-378 | 12,1-439 | 10,7-430 | 12,6-450 | 13,9-494 |
| D | 18,2-566 | 15-475 | 15,7-545 | 13-496 | 9,95-400 | 7,96-399 | 12 - xxx | 13,2-465 |
| E | 13,3-420 | 13,7-501 | 15,1-481 | 12,6-481 | 11,9-456 | 10,2-422 | 9,11-395 | 14,8-486 |
| F | 12,4-427 | 10,3-430 | 10,8-395 | 10,3-425 | 13,8-500 | 9,58-390 | 12,7-440 | 14,7-488 |
| G | 10,5-428 | 10,3-439 | 11,4-417 | 13,2-459 | 9,87-416 | 10,8-459 | 13,8-510 | 11,4-448 |
| H | 14,7-530 | 11,6-403 | 11,6-475 | 9,1-418 | 7,34-373 | 13,9-535 | 7,38-396 | 11,9-429 |
| I | 12,3-449 | 10,1-441 | 9,95-399 | 13,3-475 | 14,4-474 | 10,4-458 | 13,4-447 | 12,5-463 |
| J | 14,5-448 | 15,1-463 | 13,2-475 | 9,69-408 | 11,5-434 | 12,9-455 | 13,9-440 | 13,2-450 |
| K | 16,6-537 | 13,6-480 | 11,2-465 | 11,4-389 | 13,5-483 | 11,2-399 | 10,7-473 | 10,6-422 |
| L | 9,45-408 | 13,8-501 | 12-446 | 7,62-367 | 10,9-454 | 13,8-469 | 12,6-459 | 10,5-334 |
| M | 11,7-478 | 12,9-505 | 16,3-577 | 12,2-513 | 10,9-476 | 13,3-488 | 12,8-456 | 8,48-393 |
| N | 6,67-427 | 13,6-467 | 14-471 | 9,29-404 | 9,17-422 | 10,6-488 | 9,2-404 | 16,4-477 |
| 0 | 11,1-417 | 11,1-448 | 9,12-408 | 10,8-419 | 13,1-443 | 13,5-440 | 14,3-464 | 10-438 |
| P | 9,03-432 | 12,4-408 | 13,8-475 | 13,1-481 | 10,7-399 | 9,58-418 | 12,6-444 | 12,9-522 |
| Q | 11,7-429 | 12,2-494 | 11,7-393 | 14,3-515 | 13,2-542 | 10,6-388 | 12,1-474 | 14,9-565 |
| R | 11,2-434 | 14,1-499 | 12,9-444 | 11,6-420 | 12,4-422 | 12,5-451 | 11,2-421 | 13-462 |

Table 19 Allocation of parameters in species 2－4，numeration displayed in Fig． 52

|  | Dynamic MOE in $\mathrm{kN} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$－Dry timber density in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| layer orientation | 八 | \／ | 八 | 1／ | \／ | 八 | $1 /$ | 八 | 八 | 八 |
| 1 | 8，39－429 | 13，9－486 |  | 8，86－403 | 11，5－445 | 10，3－440 | 10，9－406 | 9，13－414 | 8，16－447 | 12－405 |
| 2 | 14－584 | 11－465 |  | 9，33－456 | 8，19－430 | 11，2－451 | 5，46－409 | 15，2－523 | 15，5－543 | 8，92－438 |
| 3 | 7，97－387 | 13，6－475 | 11，3－456 | 12，8－460 | 12，2－440 | 9，65－496 | 12，2－555 | 15－524 | 12，2－439 | 11－453 |
| 4 | 12，6－466 | 11，5－438 | 14，8－512 | 9，52－404 | 13，5－477 | 9，85－461 | 13，9－486 | 7，56－444 | 9，64－439 | 8，97－447 |
| 5 | 14－469 | 10，3－488 | 14，8－498 | 9，67－410 | 7，91－439 | 12，9－435 | 9，53－437 | 9，94－405 | 7，4－384 | 8，38－433 |
| 6 | 12，2－465 | 12，7－474 | 10，9－418 | 8，92－438 | 16，8－496 | 6，48－400 | 8，88－446 | 11－453 | 6，21－441 | 9，32－450 |
| 7 | 16，8－496 | 9，21－453 | 9，36－423 | 10，8－455 | 12，6－466 | 13，4－487 | 13－507 | 7，12－443 | 9，22－410 | 7，12－443 |
| 8 | 14，4－528 | 9，2－499 | 9，27－445 | 11，6－434 | 11，2－453 | 11，9－438 | 12－477 | 8，38－433 | 10，1－497 | 69 |
| 9 | 8，19－430 | 10，7－498 | 9，76－448 | 6，62－429 | 14，4－528 | 10－455 | 10，5－424 | 10，4－469 | 7，97－448 | 10，8－455 |
| 10 | 7，95－442 | 13－470 | 9，97－419 | 7，12－443 | 11，8－453 | 7，31－424 | 10－455 | 9，32－450 | 5，87－462 | 9，71－428 |
| 11 | 7，97－387 | 11，5－417 | 7，35－433 | 8，92－438 | 9，65－496 | 11，8－465 | 11，9－438 | 8，67－425 | 12，6－433 | 11，4－458 |
| 12 | 5，87－462 | 9，94－405 | 12，7－461 | 8，38－433 | 8，91－447 | 11，5－459 | 11，9－483 | 12，7－460 | 7，97－387 | 12－457 |
| 13 | 7，84－410 | 14，7－484 | 10，5－462 | 7，16－400 | 11，2－451 | 11，2－499 | 12，1－467 | 12，5－461 | 12，6－433 | 8，77－433 |
| 14 | 8，79－421 | 10，5－462 | 8，68－442 | 11－453 | 11，5－459 | 13，9－486 | 9，57－464 | 12，5－453 | 9，16－437 | 13，8－471 |
| 15 | 8，79－421 | 8，68－442 | 13－470 | 6，62－429 | 12，7－443 | 12，2－555 | 11，5－380 | 10，2－448 | 9，59－443 | 10，7－459 |
| 16 | 9，59－443 | 11，6－496 | 11，5－417 | 11，6－434 | 16，8－496 | 6，73－460 | 12，4－462 | 12，8－460 | 10，1－497 | 16，6－497 |
| 17 | 15，5－543 | 13－470 | 11，5－417 | 9，94－405 | 12，2－465 | 5，46－409 | 12，7－500 | 9，33－456 | 9，26－453 | 71 |
| 18 | 10－493 | 10，3－488 | 12，7－474 | 12，5－453 | 8，97－453 | 11，2－459 | 9，99－388 | 13，8－471 | 6，12－396 | 12，7－460 |
| 19 | 8，78－429 | 11，5－438 | 11，6－496 | 12，5－461 | 11，2－451 | 11，8－453 | 11，2－499 | 8，77－433 | 12，2－439 | 9，32－450 |
| 20 | 6，21－441 | 11，5－438 | 12，7－472 | 8，77－433 | 12，9－435 | 10，1－437 | 5，46－409 | 12－457 | 8，79－421 | 8，67－425 |
| 21 | 12，2－439 | 9，2－499 | 13，4－529 | 12－457 | 7，31－424 | 11，3－460 | 6，73－460 | 11，4－458 | 6，12－396 | 15，2－523 |
| 22 | 15，5－543 | 12，7－472 | 11，6－496 | 11，4－458 | 11，3－460 | 12，7－443 | 6，48－400 | 9，71－428 | 10，7－447 | 10，2－448 |
| 23 | 11，8－453 | 11－465 | 12，7－474 | 10，7－459 | 11，2－459 | 8，97－453 | 13，4－487 | 16，6－497 | 5，87－462 | 10，4－469 |
| 24 | 10，2－463 | 10，7－498 | 9，21－453 | 13，8－471 | 15－488 | 15－488 | 9，53－437 | 13，5－471 | 16，1－514 | 15－524 |
| 25 | 11，2－453 | 13，6－475 | 9，27－445 | 8，97－447 | 10，2－463 | 8，91－447 | 9，85－461 | 9，67－410 | 7，97－448 | 10，8－455 |
| 26 | 14，4－528 | 14，7－484 | 13－470 | 9，33－456 | 8，19－430 | 9，57－429 | 12，4－462 | 10，7－429 | 12，6－433 | 13，4－487 |
| 27 | 11，6－437 | 11，6－496 | 10，5－462 | 12，7－460 | 12，2－440 | 11，6－437 | 9，99－388 | 9，36－423 | 6，21－441 | 6，48－400 |
| 28 | 13，1－460 | 8，68－442 | 8，68－442 | 9，52－404 | 16，8－496 | 9，99－388 | 11，2－499 | 10，9－418 | 10，7－500 | 11，9－483 |
| 29 | 9，57－429 | 8，68－442 | 13，4－529 | 7，12－443 | 13，5－477 | 13－507 | 5，46－409 | 9，27－445 | 10，7－447 | 11，5－380 |
| 30 | 7，97－387 | 10，5－462 | 14，8－498 | 7，16－400 | 14－469 | 11，8－475 | 12，7－500 | 11，9－474 | 6，12－396 | 12，7－500 |
| 31 | 10－493 | 12，7－474 | 10，9－418 | 10，8－455 | 7，91－439 | 7，95－442 | 12，2－555 | 14，8－498 | 9，16－437 | 12，4－462 |
| 32 | 12，2－439 | 13，4－529 | 9，36－423 | 11，6－434 | 12，2－465 | 10，2－463 | 8，97－447 | 8，52－462 | 16，1－514 | 9，57－464 |
| 33 | 11，8－475 | 9，21－453 | 10，7－429 | 9，32－450 | 12，6－466 | 13，1－460 | 9，57－464 | 9，76－449 | 7，97－448 | 9，53－437 |
| 34 | 9，54－405 | 12，7－500 | 15，7－539 | 9，53－468 | 8，56－431 | 10，7－410 | 9，45－473 | 9，06－419 | 14，8－498 | 10，5－461 |
| 35 | 10，2－440 | 10，7－429 | 7，18－436 | 10，2－448 | 9，96－419 | 8，52－464 | 8，24－427 | 11，5－419 | 13，7－438 | 10，6－475 |
| 36 | 11，8－465 | 11，9－474 | 12，1－484 | 8，38－433 | 9，53－437 | 8，19－430 | 12，1－467 | 7，16－400 | 12，2－439 | 8，77－433 |
| 37 | 8，97－453 | 9，27－445 | 11，5－439 | 8，97－447 | 8，97－453 | 12，2－440 | 11，5－380 | 11－453 | 8，79－421 | 13，8－471 |
| 38 | 12，9－435 | 9，36－423 | 8，52－462 | 6，73－460 | 11，6－496 | 12，2－465 | 12，9－495 | 7，12－443 | 6，12－396 | 12－457 |
| 39 | 12，7－443 | 10，9－418 | 10，7－429 | 12，2－555 | 12，9－435 | 11－474 | 11，9－483 | 10，7－459 | 6，28－389 | 8，67－425 |
| 40 | 11，5－459 | 10，7－429 | 10，5－450 | 13，9－486 | 7，31－424 | 12－477 | 9，57－464 | 9，94－405 | 6，28－389 | 12，8－460 |
| 41 | 8，91－447 | 8，52－462 | 9，76－449 | 8，92－438 | 11，8－465 | 11－474 | 11－474 | 9，52－404 | 12，2－439 | 10，7－459 |
| 42 | 11，2－451 | 9，76－449 | 9，76－448 | 10－455 | 12，2－465 | 9，81－430 | 12，7－500 | 8，92－438 | 8，66－388 | 12，5－453 |
| 43 | 7，31－424 | 14，8－498 | 10，7－498 | 8，97－447 | 14－469 | 10，5－424 | 12，4－462 | 6，62－429 | 10，1－497 | 12，5－461 |
| 44 | 10，1－437 | 10，5－462 | 13，6－475 | 11－453 | 11，8－475 | 8，88－446 | 11，2－499 | 12，7－460 | 15，2－485 | 9，71－428 |
| 45 | 9，65－496 | 13，4－529 | 11，5－438 | 6，62－429 | 9，57－429 | 12，6－466 | 12－477 | 12，5－461 | 9，59－443 | 15－524 |
| 46 | 11，2－459 | 11，6－496 | 9，21－453 | 13－507 | 11，8－453 | 13，5－477 | 9，99－388 | 11，4－458 | 12，6－433 | 10，2－448 |
| 47 | 15－488 | 8，68－442 | 10，6－444 | 9，99－388 | 11，6－437 | 11，2－453 | 11－474 | 12－457 | 5，87－462 | 15，2－523 |
| 48 | 13，5－477 | 10，7－429 | 9，2－499 | 9，57－464 | 13，1－460 | 15－488 | 8，88－446 | 10，8－455 | 12，6－433 | 13，5－471 |
| 49 | 12，2－440 | 8，52－462 | 14，7－484 | 11，9－483 | 10，2－463 | 11，3－460 | 10，5－424 | 11，6－434 | 10－493 | 11，4－458 |
| 50 | 11，2－453 | 9，76－449 | 11，9－474 | 11，5－380 | 10，1－437 | 12，7－443 | 9，81－430 | 8，38－433 | 6，12－396 | 16，6－497 |
| 51 | 7，91－439 | 14，8－498 | 11－465 | 12，4－462 | 7，95－442 | 8，91－447 | 13，9－486 | 9，33－456 | 9，16－437 | 9，67－410 |
| 52 | 9，57－429 | 11，9－474 | 11，1－450 | 13，9－486 | 14－469 | 11，2－451 | 12，2－555 | 10，4－469 | 10，1－497 | 12，7－460 |
| 53 | 11，8－475 | 11，5－438 | 11，5－434 | 12，1－467 | 7，91－439 | 8，97－453 | 6，48－400 | 15－524 | 9，26－453 | 12，5－461 |
| 54 | 7，95－442 | 11－465 | 9，63－461 | 12，7－500 | 12，2－440 | 11，8－465 | 12，1－467 | 15，2－523 | 8，79－421 | 12，5－453 |


| 55 | 10,2-463 | 10,3-488 | 9,58-456 | 6,48-400 | 11,2-453 | 12,9-435 | 13-507 | 8,67-425 | 9,59-443 | 8,67-425 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56 | 11,6-437 | 10,9-418 | 9,56-448 | 10,5-424 | 13,5-477 | 9,65-496 | 11,9-483 | 12,5-453 | 6,21-441 | 10,2-448 |
| 57 | 13,1-460 | 10,7-498 | 9,2-499 | 8,88-446 | 12,6-466 | 14-469 | 11,5-380 | 9,32-450 | 16,1-514 | 15,2-523 |
| 58 | 10,7-447 | 9,27-445 | 11,1-450 | 9,81-430 | 14,4-528 | 16,8-496 | 12-477 | 10,2-448 | 7,97-448 | 7,16-400 |
| 59 | 11,3-460 | 9,36-423 | 10,7-498 | 12-477 | 8,19-430 | 14,4-528 | 11-474 | 12,8-460 | 9,59-443 | 9,94-405 |
| 60 | 11,8-453 | 13,6-475 | 14,7-484 | 11,2-499 | 10,1-437 | 7,31-424 | 8,88-446 | 8,77-433 | 7,97-448 | 15-524 |
| 61 | 15,5-543 | 12,7-472 | 11,9-474 | 5,46-409 | 8,91-447 | 11,8-475 | 10,5-424 | 13,5-471 | 7,4-384 | 9,71-428 |
| 62 | 6,21-441 | 9,2-499 | 11,5-438 | 9,85-461 | 11,2-459 | 10,1-437 | 11,9-438 | 16,6-497 | 9,26-453 | 9,52-404 |
| 63 | 5,87-462 | 11,5-417 | 11-465 | 10-455 | 7,95-442 | 11,2-459 | 13-507 | 9,71-428 | 10,1-497 | 9,33-456 |
| 64 | 14-584 | 13,4-529 | 13,6-475 | 8,97-447 | 11,8-465 | 11,6-437 | 9,85-461 | 10,7-459 | 6,21-441 | 9,67-410 |
| 65 | 9,81-430 | 12,7-474 | 8,52-462 | 11,9-438 | 9,65-496 | 13,1-460 | 10-455 | 13,8-471 | 11,5-479 | 13,5-471 |
| 66 | 6,28-389 | 9,21-453 | 9,76-449 | 11,9-438 | 15-488 | 9,57-429 | 9,81-430 | 9,52-404 | 11,5-479 | 16,6-497 |
| 67 | 11,6-434 | 14,7-484 | 9,76-448 | 9,85-461 | 8,91-447 | 11,5-459 | 13,4-487 | 9,67-410 | 6,28-389 | 12,8-460 |
| 68 | 12,2-461 | 14,6-445 | 12,5-455 | 15,8-507 | 9,93-433 | 12,2-466 | 10,2-440 | 10,8-406 | 9,71-428 | 12,6-530 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | 13,6-452 | 12,3-466 | 15,2-479 | 10,9-466 | 13,6-463 | 11-426 | 11,5-462 | 15,2-497 | 10,3-541 | 12,4-436 |
| B | 9,76-454 | 10,8-470 | 10,9-401 | 10,8-404 | 13,4-460 | 12-436 | 9,33-381 | 12,1-431 | 15,6-556 | 13,1-473 |
| C | 11,9-452 | 13-453 | 9,73-420 | 13,6-481 | 11,2-465 | 13,5-490 | 10,6-421 | 10,1-411 | 9,84-450 | 12,1-507 |
| D | 9,72-411 | 15,8-552 | 10,7-469 | 10,5-415 | 12,8-496 | 12,8-473 | 16,7-549 | 13,4-489 | 14,5-491 | 9,75-408 |
| E | 13,2-475 | 14,5-487 | 11,1-469 | 12,3-504 | 12,4-494 | 13,8-463 | 11,6-441 | 9,92-404 | 12-445 | 9,33-415 |
| F | 8,73-387 | 11-471 | 14,4-475 | 10,7-397 | 9,18-386 | 13,3-459 | 11,2-422 | 11,6-450 | 8,56-392 | 14,1-483 |
| G | 10,4-442 | 13,6-449 | 12,8-454 | 11-456 | 13,1-482 | 15,4-478 | 14,7-512 | 12,7-461 | 13,3-445 | 16,5-521 |
| H | 12,3-460 | 14,5-513 | 11,5-419 | 10,9-448 | 11,2-449 | 12,7-461 | 8,96-387 | 9,96-439 | 13,9-463 | 9,94-406 |
| I | 15,7-526 | 13-433 | 9,65-449 | 10,1-441 | 15,9-530 | 13,1-474 | 11,1-424 | 12,1-464 | 12,7-488 | 12,4-475 |
| J | 9,53-422 | 10,3-421 | 9,44-412 | 9,46-384 | 11,4-472 | 17,5-530 | 13,7-492 | 14,5-495 | 11,8-463 | 12,8-476 |
| K | 8,13-413 | 8,18-418 | 11,9-448 | 11,6-467 | 12,8-482 | 8,01-414 | 12,3-471 | 9,42-426 | 11,5-467 | 8,41-444 |
| L | 12,3-467 | 14,6-495 | 9,19-409 | 13,4-471 | 13,4-509 | 11,6-508 | 13-474 | 12,9-457 | 12,2-434 | 8,53-382 |



Fig. 67 Load-displacement behaviour for short beams


Fig. 68 Load-displacement behaviour for short beams


Fig. 69 Load-displacement behaviour for short beams


Fig. 70 Typical failure in bending for CLT beam (left). Failure at the CLT beam end (right)


Fig. 71 Typical failure for DLT beams with five plies


Fig. 72 Test set-up and typical failure for DLT beams with four plies


Fig. 73 Load-displacement behaviour for long beams


Fig. 74 Load-displacement behaviour for long beams


Fig. 75 Load-displacement behaviour for long beams


Fig. 76 Testing assembly for long beams (left). Loaded long beam before bending failure (right)


Fig. 77 Typical failure for long beams displayed as an example on a DLT beam with five plies


Fig. 78 DLT beam with four plies before and after bending failure


Fig. 79 Load-displacement behaviour for short beams with notches


Fig. 80 Load-displacement behaviour for short beams with notches


Fig. 81 Load-displacement behaviour for short beams with notches


Fig. 82 Typical failure of the reinforcing layer in short CLT beams with notches


Fig. 83 Failure of the reinforcing layer in short DLT beams with five plies and with notches


Fig. 84 Testing assembly for beams with notches (left). Failure of the reinforcing layer in short DLT beams with four plies and with notches (right)


Fig. 85 Load-displacement behaviour for long beams with holes


Fig. 86 Load-displacement behaviour for long beams with holes


Fig. 87 Load-displacement behaviour for long beams with holes


Fig. 88 Testing assembly for beams with holes before testing (left) and before failure (right)


Fig. 89 Bending failure for CLT beams (left) and for DLT beams (right)


Fig. $90 \quad E_{0, \text { net }}\left(E_{0}\right)$ versus $E_{\text {cal }}$ for specimens 1-1 (short CLT with five plies)


Fig. $91 \quad E_{0, \text { net }}\left(E_{0}\right)$ versus $E_{\text {cal }}$ for specimens 1-2 (long CLT with five plies)


Fig. $92 \quad \mathrm{E}_{0, \text { net }}\left(\mathrm{E}_{0}\right)$ versus $\mathrm{E}_{\text {cal }}$ for specimens 2-1 (short DLT with five plies)


Fig. $93 \quad E_{0, \text { net }}\left(E_{0}\right)$ versus $E_{\text {cal }}$ for specimens 2-2 (short DLT with four plies)


Fig. $94 \quad E_{0, \text { net }}\left(E_{0}\right)$ versus $E_{\text {cal }}$ for specimens 2-3 (long DLT with five plies)


Fig. $95 \quad E_{0, \text { net }}\left(E_{0}\right)$ versus $E_{\text {cal }}$ for specimens 2-4 (long DLT with four plies)


Fig. 96 FE system for specimen 1-1 (short CLT with five plies)


Fig. 97 Beam end with deflection in z-direction (Sp.1-1, five times distorted)


Fig. 98 Bending stresses (top) and deflection in z-direction (bottom) (five times distorted)


Fig. 99 FE system for specimen 2-1 (short DLT with five plies)


Fig. 100 Beam end with deflection in z-direction (Sp.2-1, five times distorted)




Fig. 101 Bending stresses (top) and deflection in z-direction (bottom) (five times distorted)


Fig. 102 FE system for specimen 2-2 (short DLT with four plies)


Fig. 103 Beam end with deflection in z-direction (Sp.2-2, five times distorted)


Fig. 104 Bending stresses (top) and deflection in z-direction (bottom) (five times distorted)


Fig. 105 FE system for specimen 1-2 (long CLT with five plies)


Fig. 106 Beam end with deflection in z-direction (Sp.1-2, three times distorted)


Fig. 107 Bending stresses (top) and deflection in z-direction (bottom) (three times distorted)


Fig. 108 FE system for specimen 2-3 (long DLT with five plies)


Fig. 109 Beam end with deflection in z-direction (Sp.2-3, three times distorted)


Fig. 110 Bending stresses (top) and deflection in z-direction (bottom) (three times distorted)


Fig. 111 FE system for specimen 2-4 (long DLT with four plies)


Fig. 112 Beam end with deflection in z-direction (Sp.2-4, three times distorted)


Fig. 113 Bending stresses (top) and deflection in z-direction (bottom) (three times distorted)


Fig. $114 \mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for short 5-ply CLT beams (Series 1-1)


Fig. $115 \mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for short 5-ply DLT beams (Series 2-1)


Fig. $116 \mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for short 4-ply DLT beams (Series 2-2)


Fig. $117 \mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for long 5-ply CLT beams (Series 1-2)


Fig. $118 \mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for long 5-ply DLT beams (Series 2-3)


Fig. $119 \mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ for long 4-ply DLT beams (Series 2-4)


Fig. 120 Ratio between $E_{\text {ef }}$ and $E_{\text {net }}$ for short 5-ply CLT beams (Series 1-1)


Fig. 121 Ratio between $E_{\text {ef }}$ and $E_{\text {net }}$ for short 5-ply DLT beams (Series 2-1)


Fig. 122 Ratio between $E_{\text {ef }}$ and $E_{\text {net }}$ for short 4-ply DLT beams (Series 2-2)


Fig. 123 Ratio between $E_{\text {ef }}$ and $E_{\text {net }}$ for long 5-ply CLT beams (Series 1-2)


Fig. 124 Ratio between $E_{\text {ef }}$ and $E_{\text {net }}$ for long 5-ply DLT beams (Series 2-3)


Fig. 125 Ratio between $\mathrm{E}_{\text {ef }}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{\text {net }}$ for long 4-ply DLT beams (Series 2-4)


Fig. 126 Ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t}$ for short 5-ply CLT beams (Series 1-1)


Fig. 127 Ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t}$ for short 5-ply DLT beams (Series 2-1)


Fig. 128 Ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t}$ for short 4-ply DLT beams (Series 2-2)


Fig. 129 Ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t}$ for long 5-ply CLT beams (Series 1-2)


Fig. 130 Ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t}$ for long 5-ply DLT beams (Series 2-3)


Fig. 131 Ratio between $\sigma_{m}$ and $\sigma_{m, n e t}$ for long 4-ply DLT beams (Series 2-4)


Fig. 132 Ratio between $\tau_{x y}$ and $\tau_{x y, \text { net }}$ for short 5-ply CLT beams (Series 1-1)


Fig. 133 Ratio between $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}}$ and $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}, \text { net }}$ for short 5-ply DLT beams (Series 2-1)


Fig. 134 Ratio between $\tau_{x y}$ and $\tau_{x y, \text { net }}$ for short 4-ply DLT beams (Series 2-2)


Fig. 135 Ratio between $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}}$ and $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}, \text { net }}$ for long 5-ply CLT beams (Series 2-1)


Fig. 136 Ratio between $\tau_{x y}$ and $\tau_{x y, \text { net }}$ for long 5-ply DLT beams (Series 2-3)


Fig. 137 Ratio between $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}}$ and $\tau_{\mathrm{xy}, \text { net }}$ for long 4-ply DLT beams (Series 2-4)

# Karlsruher Institut für Technologie Lehrstuhl für Ingenieurholzbau und Baukonstruktionen 

Cross laminated timber (CLT) is a plate-like multi layer element with crosswise arrangement of lamellas glued together between the wide sides. Compared to solid timber, CLT provides higher dimensional stability and less variable strength and stiffness properties in the main axis and perpendicular to it. Currently, CLT elements are commonly used as massive building systems for floor, roof and wall elements loaded in and perpendicular to the plane.
Due to its crosswise structure, CLT could be used for long-span beams, too, in particular with tensile stresses perpendicular to the beam axis or high shear stresses, where e.g. glulam is prone to splitting. Within this research project, funded by DAAD, CLT beams were optimised, resulting in diagonal orientated timber (DLT), a new development to expand the field of application. In this work, both CLT and DLT beams were tested in edgewise bending. Their loadcarrying behaviour was studied using experimental results and finite element analysis.


