have shifted too far toward the private sector. This is yet another challenge that we as an industry will need to fold into our ongoing conversations about our future.

Based on the comments we received about the editorial and Leon's perspective in the Winter 2020 issue, we have decided to dedicate space in each issue of *ASPIRE* to broader engineering topics. In this issue, for example, Gregg and I offer a perspective on the human dynamics of closing a bridge or the roadway under a bridge (page 50).

The bridge community needs to revisit what the NTSB vice chairman calls the "safety management system" that should prevent catastrophes. We must work to never allow human habits and the time pressures of project delivery to disrupt our bridge engineer's *philotimo*.

References

1. National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB). 2019. *Pedestrian Bridge Collapse Over SW 8th Street, Miami, Florida, March 15, 2018*. Highway Accident Report NTSB/HAR-19/02 PB2019-101363. https://www.ntsb.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/HAR1902.pdf.
2. Schafer, J.R. 2015 (August 15). "*Philotimo*: A Greek Word Without Meaning but Very Meaningful" *Psychology Today* [blog post]. https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/let-their-words-do-the-talking/201508/philotimo-greek-word-without-meaning-very-meaningful.

DISCUSSION

The Effects of Strand Debonding

This is a discussion of "The Effects of Strand Debonding" by Dr. Oguzhan Bayrak published in the Winter 2020 issue of *ASPIRE* magazine (pp. 52–53). The explanations given by Dr. Bayrak are clear and welcomed. We would like to bring attention to two items:

1. In the paragraph following Eq. (5.7.3.5-2), Dr. Bayrak explains that stirrups in excess of those required to correspond to $V_s = (V_u/\phi_v)$ should not be used to artificially reduce the amount of longitudinal tie steel required. This is in accordance with the AASHTO LRFD specifications provision and should be followed. However, the equation given below the paragraph and described as the minimum value for the longitudinal tie force can be misleading and its use should be clarified. We recommend clarifying that the minimum requirement for longitudinal tie reinforcement should be the larger of Eq. (5.7.3.5-2) and the following equation given in the article:

$$A_{ps}f_{ps} + A_s f_y \ge \left(0.5\frac{V_u}{\phi_v} - V_p\right)\cot\theta$$

2. The discussion in the article, and also in the AASHTO LRFD specifications, indicates that debonded strands may not be used as part of the longitudinal tie reinforcement. We only partially agree with this statement. It is only valid when the debonded strands are not anchored after detensioning. Debonded strands can be anchored by embedding them into a cast-in-place diaphragm, which is a common detail in much of the United States for beams made continuous for live load. They can also be anchored by other means, such as using strand chucks and secondary end blocks. If debonded strands are anchored, it would be reasonable to assume that they contribute to the longitudinal tie resistance at the strength limit state.

Dr. Amgad Girgis, Micheal Asaad, and Dr. Maher Tadros
e.construct USA LLC
Omaha, Nebraska

Author's response

The author wishes to thank the discussers for their thoughtful comments. The points raised by the discussers are addressed in the same order.

1. The unnumbered equation in the subject article was provided for the purposes of clarifying the lower bound for Equation (5.7.3.5-2). The V_s value used in this equation cannot be greater than (V_u/ϕ_v). Therefore, the interpretation of the discussers is correct: Adding stirrups can only reduce the demand on the longitudinal tie up to a point. Put simply, the definition provided for V_s after Equation (5.7.3.5-1) in the AASHTO LRFD specifications reads "*shear resistance provided by transverse reinforcement at the section under investigation as given by Eq. 5.7.3.3-4, except V_s shall not be taken as greater than V_u/ϕ_v (kip)*." This limit placed on V_s should be taken into account when using Equation (5.7.3.5-2).
2. If positive anchorage is provided to debonded strands by extending them into diaphragms and bending them up or by using strand chucks, at the point where this positive anchorage is provided strand can be adequately developed or assumed to be "fixed." Under additional loads, it is true that the "fixed" or "positively anchored" debonded strand will pick up some additional strain, and associated stress. This creates an interesting distribution of stress along the length of a debonded strand. Additional stresses experienced by the debonded portion of a strand anchored at its end due to additional gravity loads acting on the beam will add to a "zero stress state" and not the effective prestress at the service limit state. So, with this important subtlety acknowledged, the author agrees with the discussers' point on this item. Finally, simply supported beams made continuous for live load creates a boundary condition that starts deviating from a simply supported beam end such as that depicted in Figure C5.7.3.5-1, where there is no moment reaction at the support.

Dr. Oguzhan Bayrak
University of Texas at Austin