

**Innovations Deserving
Exploratory Analysis Programs**

The logo for the IDEA program. It features the word "IDEA" in a large, bold, serif font. A horizontal line passes through the middle of the letters. A vertical gray rectangle is positioned behind the letter "I". Two thin lines extend from the bottom of this rectangle, one pointing towards the bottom left and the other towards the bottom right.

IDEA

Highway IDEA Program

Study on Control System for Live Load and Live Load Effects on Bridges

Final Report for Highway IDEA Project 59

Prepared by:

Andrzej S. Nowak and Junsik Eom, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

December 2003

TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD
OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

**INNOVATIONS DESERVING EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS (IDEA)
PROGRAMS
MANAGED BY THE TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD (TRB)**

This NCHRP-IDEA investigation was completed as part of the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP). The NCHRP-IDEA program is one of the four IDEA programs managed by the Transportation Research Board (TRB) to foster innovations in highway and intermodal surface transportation systems. The other three IDEA program areas are Transit-IDEA, which focuses on products and results for transit practice, in support of the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP), Safety-IDEA, which focuses on motor carrier safety practice, in support of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration and Federal Railroad Administration, and High Speed Rail-IDEA (HSR), which focuses on products and results for high speed rail practice, in support of the Federal Railroad Administration. The four IDEA program areas are integrated to promote the development and testing of nontraditional and innovative concepts, methods, and technologies for surface transportation systems.

For information on the IDEA Program contact IDEA Program, Transportation Research Board, 500 5th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001 (phone: 202/334-1461, fax: 202/334-3471, <http://www.nationalacademies.org/trb/idea>)

The project that is the subject of this contractor-authored report was a part of the Innovations Deserving Exploratory Analysis (IDEA) Programs, which are managed by the Transportation Research Board (TRB) with the approval of the Governing Board of the National Research Council. The members of the oversight committee that monitored the project and reviewed the report were chosen for their special competencies and with regard for appropriate balance. The views expressed in this report are those of the contractor who conducted the investigation documented in this report and do not necessarily reflect those of the Transportation Research Board, the National Research Council, or the sponsors of the IDEA Programs. This document has not been edited by TRB.

The Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, the National Research Council, and the organizations that sponsor the IDEA Programs do not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the object of the investigation.

Acknowledgment

This work was sponsored by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration, and was conducted as part of the Innovations Deserving Exploratory Analysis (IDEA) program for the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) which is administered by the Transportation Research Board of the National Research Council.

Disclaimer

This copy is an uncorrected draft as submitted by the research agency. A decision concerning acceptance by the Transportation Research Board and publication in the regular NCHRP-IDEA series will not be made until a complete technical review has been made and discussed with the researchers. The opinions and conclusions expressed or implied in the report are those of the research agency. They are not necessarily those of the Transportation Research Board, the National Research Council, or the Federal Highway Administration, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, or of the individual states participating in the National Cooperative Highway Research Program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

1. Introduction	1
2. Analytical Evaluation	3
2.1 Required input data	
2.2 Loads	
2.3 Load distribution	
2.4 Load carrying capacity	
2.5 Interpretation of results	
2.6 Rating factor	
2.7 Effect of deterioration	
3. Bridge Selection Criteria	19
4. Weight-in-Motion Measurement of Trucks.....	21
4.1 Procedure	
4.2 Equipment	
4.3 Installation of equipment	
4.4 Measurement	
4.5 Results of WIM Tests	
5. Dynamic Load Measurement	34
5.1 Procedure	
5.2 Equipment	
5.3 Installation of Equipment	
5.4 Measurement	
5.5 Processing and presentation of the results	
6. Fatigue Load Measurement	41
6.1 Procedure	
6.2 Equipment	
6.3 Installation of equipment	
6.4 Measurement	
6.5 Processing and Presentation of the Results	
7. Load Distribution Tests	49
7.1 Procedure	
7.2 Testing Equipment	

7.3 Installation of equipment	
7.4 Measurement	
7.5 Processing and Presentation of the Results	
8. Proof Load	56
8.1 Procedure	
8.2 Equipment	
8.3 Installation of equipment	
8.4 Load Selection	
8.5 Measurements	
8.6 Processing and Presentation of the Results	
9. Safety and Summary of Field Tests.....	69
9.1 Safety during Field Tests	
9.2 Summary of Field Testing	
References	74
Appendix A Data Acquisition Systems	78
Appendix B Normal Probability Paper.....	92
Appendix C Calculations of Load Carrying Capacity.....	100

Executive Summary

The objective of the study is to develop an integrated system for monitoring live load and verifying live load carrying capacity of highway bridges. The proposed approach is focused on the control of various parameters including: truck weight (axle weights and axle spacing), truck load distribution on bridge girders, dynamic load, as well as strain, stress and deflection of bridge components. This study involves experimental and analytical efforts. The major contributions include the improvement of field testing procedures for site-specific weigh-in-motion measurement of trucks, component-specific measurement of fatigue load spectra, calculation of critical truck loads (illegal overloads), accumulated fatigue load spectra, measurement of deflection, measurement of the dynamic load effect and dynamic load factor, derivation of reliability-based criteria for acceptability limits (truck weight, axle load, number of load cycles, deflection), elements of active control with on-site response to critical overload as determined by comparison with the developed reliability-based criteria (e.g. illegal truck, exceeded fatigue load limit), integration of truck weigh-in-motion with diagnostic testing (e.g. to verify load distribution factors) and proof load testing (to verify the minimum live load carrying capacity), derivation of reliability-based criteria for establishing proof load level for bridges.

The individual components of the comprehensive testing program were verified on 17 bridges. The final, multi-objective tests were carried out on a selected structure in Florida. The load was applied in form of fully loaded (up to the legal limit) trucks. The considered loading combinations include a single vehicle and two trucks side-by-side. The results of these and previous tests indicate that the girder distribution factors (GDF) specified by AASHTO for the spans from 10 to 30m are rather conservative. Dynamic load factors (DLF) were also measured for a single truck and two trucks side-by-side. It was observed that the dynamic load is not related to static load, and therefore DLF (defined as the ratio of dynamic load and static load) decreases for larger static load. Deflections due to truck loads are also considerably lower than analytically predicted values. The field tests confirmed that the developed procedures are efficient and can be

used as an alternative way to evaluate the adequacy of the bridge. The experience from this project allowed for a critical evaluation of the available procedures and equipment.

In addition, a considerable effort was focused on the development of the system reliability models for bridges. The computer procedures were based on the advanced non-linear finite element methods. It was found that the secondary elements such as sidewalks, curbs, parapets and diaphragms can increase truck carrying capacity by up to 40%. This part of the project was sponsored by the National Science Foundation and the results are presented in two journal papers.

The control system for highway load effects has already been applied on selected bridges in collaboration with the State DOT's in Michigan, Wisconsin and Florida. The truck traffic control can save a considerable amount of dollars in the budget assigned for bridge maintenance because of a more accurate site-specific evaluation. The Michigan DOT, based on the initial tests, justified the use of more permissive truck load distribution factors and lower dynamic load factors (0.1 in most cases, instead of 0.2-0.3 required by the code).

The results of this project are implemented on a regular basis. The project team has worked closely with the technical staff of Michigan DOT, as well as Wisconsin DOT and Florida DOT. The research work has been, and will continue to be presented at meetings, conferences, and in professional journals. In particular, practical needs are discussed to direct the research effort accordingly. The field work was carried out on bridges selected in coordination with State DOT's.

The report covers analytical methods for evaluation of existing bridges, criteria for selection of bridges for field tests, and five types of field tests (weigh-in-motion truck measurement, dynamic load measurement, fatigue load measurement, tests for verification of load distribution factors, and proof load testing).

1. Introduction

The objective of the study is to develop an integrated system for monitoring live load and verifying live load carrying capacity of highway bridges. The major contributions include the improvement of field testing procedures for site-specific weigh-in-motion measurement of trucks, component-specific measurement of fatigue load spectra, calculation of critical truck loads (illegal overloads), accumulated fatigue load spectra, measurement of deflection, measurement of the dynamic load effect and dynamic load factor, derivation of reliability-based criteria for acceptability limits (truck weight, axle load, number of load cycles, deflection), elements of active control with on-site response to critical overload as determined by comparison with the developed reliability-based criteria (e.g. illegal truck, exceeded fatigue load limit), integration of truck weigh-in-motion with diagnostic testing (e.g. to verify load distribution factors) and proof load testing (to verify the minimum live load carrying capacity), derivation of reliability-based criteria for establishing proof load level for bridges. This study involves experimental and analytical components.

Accuracy of bridge evaluation can be improved by using the recent developments in bridge diagnostics, structural tests, material tests, and structural analysis. Advanced diagnostic procedures can be applied to evaluation of the current capacity of the structure, monitoring of load and resistance history and evaluation of the accumulated damage. Full scale bridge tests provide very useful information about the structural behavior. There is a need for significantly more test data, covering various bridge types. However, extensive test programs are very costly. Therefore, a considerable effort should be directed towards evaluation and improvement of the current analytical methods, on the basis of available test data.

The individual components of the comprehensive testing program were verified on 17 bridges. The final, multi-objective tests were carried out on a selected structure in Florida. The load was applied in form of fully loaded (up to the legal limit) trucks. The considered loading combinations include a single vehicle and two trucks side-by-side.

The results of these and previous tests indicate that the girder distribution factors (GDF) specified by AASHTO for the spans from 10 to 30m are rather conservative. Dynamic load factors (DLF) were also measured for a single truck and two trucks side-by-side. It was observed that the dynamic load is not related to static load, and therefore DLF (defined as the ratio of dynamic load and static load) decreases for larger static load. Deflections due to truck loads are also considerably lower than analytically predicted values. The field tests confirmed that the developed procedures are efficient and can be used as an alternative way to evaluate the adequacy of the bridge.

The experience from this project allowed for a critical evaluation of the available procedures and equipment. This resulted in a summary of the prioritized research needs required for further improvement of the field testing efficiency.

In addition, a considerable effort was focused on the development of the system reliability models for bridges. The computer procedures were based on the advanced non-linear finite element methods. It was found that the secondary elements such as sidewalks, curbs, parapets and diaphragms can increase truck carrying capacity by up to 40%. This part of the project was sponsored by the National Science Foundation (NSF), and the results are not included in this report.

2. Analytical Evaluation

2.1. Required Input Data

Prior to field testing, the considered bridge must be evaluated analytically using the available design drawings and calculations. This evaluation is also required for a rating analysis. If the documentation is lost or incomplete, then there is a need for a visual inspection and some field measurements.

The field investigation is necessary to determine the current condition of the bridge, even if the design drawings and calculations are available. The needed information to get either from the plans or a field investigation is as follows:

- structural system of the bridge and geometry, including:
 - number of spans and span lengths
 - skewness
 - deck type, thickness, and amount of reinforcement
 - structural system (simple spans, continuous)
 - wearing surface (type and thickness)
 - girder properties (spacing, dimensions, reinforcement, composite action, haunch depth)
 - transverse member properties (types, locations)
 - sidewalk, curb, and railing presence
- material properties - of the wearing surface, deck, and girders
- supports - type (simple, fixed, others) and bearing material (steel, elastomeric)
- deterioration
 - deck (cracks, holes, spalling)
 - girders; cracks (location, lengths, and widths), and corrosion (location, patterns)
 - misalignment and movement at joints and bearings
 - condition of expansion joints

unusual thermal movements

condition of approaches

- other factors which may effect load testing

Data obtained from the field investigation and review of available records can be used to calculate the load capacity of the bridge; to identify critical structural elements, including connection details, and their load capacities; and to evaluate the presence of conditions which may enhance the response of the bridge to applied loads.

2.2. Loads

The basic load combination for highway bridges is a simultaneous occurrence of dead load, live load and dynamic load. This combination is used for the evaluation of existing bridges.

2.2.1. Dead Load

Dead load, D , is the gravity load due to the self weight of the structural and non structural elements permanently connected to the bridge. D can be described as:

$$D = D_1 + D_2 + D_3 + D_4 \quad (2-1)$$

where:

- D_1 = weight of factory made elements (steel, precast concrete members),
- D_2 = weight of cast-in-place concrete members,
- D_3 = weight of the wearing surface (e.g. asphalt),
- D_4 = miscellaneous weight (e.g. railing, luminaries).

If it is not possible to find exact value of the asphalt thickness, its average value may be taken as 80 mm. The weight of components that are not continuously distributed

on the bridge, such as the sidewalk, parapet, railing, and diaphragms, can be assumed uniformly distributed on the bridge surface.

2.2.2. Live Loads

Live load (L) covers a range of forces produced by vehicles moving on the bridge. Traditionally, the static and dynamic effects are considered separately. Therefore, in this section, L covers only the static component.

Generally, the number of design lanes should be determined by taking the integer part of the ratio $w/3600$, where w is the clear roadway width in mm between curbs and/or barriers.

Two live load models can be considered:

- HS-20 specified by the AASHTO Standard Code (1996)
- HL-93 specified by AASHTO LRFD Code (1998)

The HS-20 loading consists of a tractor truck with semi-trailer or the corresponding lane load as illustrated in Fig 2-1. The variable axle spacing should be adjusted to get the maximum moment.

The HL-93 loading consists of a combination of the design truck or design tandem, and design lane load, as shown in Fig. 2-2. The midspan moment due to HL-93 is about 1.25 HS-20 for 10 m span, 1.5 HS-20 for 25 m span, and 1.75 HS-20 for 50 m span. For continuous bridges, the negative moment is calculated using a uniform load and two trucks. The resulting moment is reduced by 10%.




Fig. 2-1. Design Live Load HS-20 in the AASHTO Standard (1996).







Fig. 2-2. Design Live Load HL-93 in AASHTO LRFD Code (1998).

MICHIGAN MAXIMUM LEGAL LOADS 1970




NOTE :
NUMBER BELOW WHEELS
INDICATES kN
PER AXLE.
AXLE SPACING IS FOR
TYPICAL VEHICLES

I



II




III

ANY BRIDGE WITH LESS CAPACITY WILL BE
POSTED FOR GROSS LOAD LIMIT


Fig. 2-3. Legal Loads (Michigan Bridge Analysis Guide 1983).

OTHER MAXIMUM LAGAL LOADS



MICHIGAN 11 AXLE THREE UNIT MAX. 730.6 kN

(Moments are less than two unit 686 kN for spans less then 33.22 meters)




NOTE :
NUMBER BELOW WHEELS
INDICATES kN
PER AXLE.
AXLE SPACING IS FOR
TYPICAL VEHICLES

AASHTO TYPE 3S2

5 axle

Max. 320.5 kN

II A



AASHTO TYPE 3

3 axle

222.7 kN

IA

MOMENTS FOR TYPE 3 & 3S2 on page 48 of AASHTO Manual.

If any bridge dates before about 1920 or has a known weakness (say less than 490 kN) the AASHTO type 3 and 3-S2 should be used for initial analysis.

If the resulting axle loads exceed legal loads then use veh. I & II.

Fig. 2-3. Legal Loads - Continued (Michigan Bridge Analysis Guide 1983).

Michigan Legal Loads are specified in the Michigan Bridge Analysis Guide (1983). Live load effects (moments and shear forces) are calculated for the trucks shown in Fig. 2-3.

2.2.3. Dynamic Load

The dynamic load is calculated by multiplying live load (L) by the dynamic load factor (DLF).

According to the AASHTO LRFD Code (1998), the dynamic load factor (DLF) shall not be applied to pedestrian loads or to the design lane load. It shall be applied only to the truck and tandem load, and in this case it is taken as 0.33.

In the AASHTO Standard Code (1996), dynamic load factor is specified as a function of span length only:

$$I = \frac{50}{3.28L + 125} \leq 0.30 \quad (2-2)$$

where:

L = Length in meters of the portion of the span that is loaded to produce the maximum stress in the member; typically, this is the bridge or girder span.

Field measurements have indicated that the dynamic (impact) load component, calculated in terms of strain or deflection, stays relatively constant. Therefore, with increased heavy truck load (static component), the dynamic load factor decreases (Nowak et. al., 1996; Nassif and Nowak, 1995; Moses, 1987). In these studies, the dynamic factors for Michigan 11-axle trucks were found to be less than 10 percent.

2.3. Load Distribution

According to the AASHTO Standard (1996) and AASHTO LRFD (1998), the live load bending moment for each interior girder is calculated by applying to the girder the fraction of the truck weight. This fraction is the girder distribution factor (GDF). All GDF's in this report are specified based on the entire truck weight rather than a wheel line (1/2 truck) load. In the AASHTO Standard Specifications, for bridges with concrete decks, the corresponding GDF is:

For single lane loading:

$$\text{Steel and prestressed concrete girders,} \quad GDF = S / 4.27 \quad (2-3a)$$

$$\text{Concrete T-beams,} \quad GDF = S / 3.96 \quad (2-3b)$$

For multiple lane loading:

$$\text{Steel and prestressed concrete girders,} \quad GDF = S / 3.36 \quad (2-3c)$$

$$\text{Concrete T-beams,} \quad GDF = S / 3.66 \quad (2-3d)$$

where S = girder spacing (m).

Note that, in the 1996 AASHTO Standard Specifications, GDF's are specified for a wheel line load. However, the denominators in Eq.2-3 are given for the whole truck.

For bridges with four or more girders, The AASHTO LRFD Code (1998) specifies the girder distribution factor (GDF) as a function of girder spacing, span length, stiffness parameters, and bridge skew. For moment in interior girders, the GDF is as follows:

For single lane loading,

$$GDF = \left(0.06 + \left(\frac{S}{4300} \right)^{0.4} \left(\frac{S}{L} \right)^{0.3} \left(\frac{K_g}{Lt_s^3} \right)^{0.1} \right) (1 - c_1 (\tan \theta)^{1.5}) \quad (2-4)$$

For multi-lane loading,

$$GDF = \left(0.075 + \left(\frac{S}{2900} \right)^{0.6} \left(\frac{S}{L} \right)^{0.2} \left(\frac{K_g}{Lt_s^3} \right)^{0.1} \right) (1 - c_1 (\tan \theta)^{1.5}) \quad (2-5)$$

$$c_1 = 0.25 \left(\frac{K_g}{Lt_s^3} \right)^{0.25} \left(\frac{S}{L} \right)^{0.5} \quad \text{if } 30^\circ < \theta < 60^\circ \quad (2-6)$$

$$c_1 = 0 \quad \text{if } \theta < 30^\circ$$

$$\text{use } \theta = 0 \quad \text{if } \theta > 60^\circ$$

where:

S = girder spacing (mm)

L = span length (mm)

$K_g = n(I + Ae_g^2)$

t_s = depth of concrete slab (mm)

n = modular ratio between girder and slab materials

I = moment of inertia of the girder (mm⁴)

A = area of the girder (mm²)

e_g = distance between the center of gravity of the girder and slab (mm)

θ = skew angle in degrees, measured as the angle between the centerline of a support and a line normal to the roadway centerline.

Because the term $K_g/(Lt_s^3)$ implies more accuracy than exists for bridge evaluation, it is recommended that it be taken as 1.0. The applicability ranges for these equations are:

$$1100 \leq S \leq 4900$$

$$110 \leq t_s \leq 300$$

$$6000 \leq L \leq 73000$$

Finite element analyses previously performed at the University of Michigan indicated that the GDF's specified in the AASHTO Code (1996) are too conservative for longer spans and larger girder spacings [Nowak and Hong, 1991]. Similar results were obtained by Zokai et al. (1991). Values proposed by Zokai et al. (1991) were adopted as

a basis for GDF's in the AASHTO LRFD Code (1998). Finite element analysis was performed by Bishara, Liu and El-Ali (1992). Bishara et al. (1992) considered 36 bridges with 2.7m spacing of girders, spans 22.5m, 30m and 37.5m, width 11.5m, 17m and 20m, and skew angles 0° , 20° , 40° and 60° . They also tested one bridge to validate analytical formulas. However, the resulting GDF's are unrealistically low, less than half of AASHTO (1996) or AASHTO LRFD (1998).

The actual GDFs were determined by field tests performed on seventeen short and medium span bridges. For comparison, the GDF's obtained in field tests as a part of this study, are plotted versus analytical values calculated using AASHTO Specifications (1996), and AASHTO LRFD Code (1998). The results are shown in Fig. 2.4 for a single truck (one lane loaded), and for two trucks (two lanes loaded).

Many bridges carry low volume roads. However current design and evaluation provisions are based on the assumption that two side-by-side fully loaded vehicles occur simultaneously. This event is unexpected on low volume trunk-line and secondary roads. In particular, it is practically unlikely to have two very heavy vehicles simultaneously on the bridge. The actual probability of such an event can be calculated using the approach developed for the AASHTO LRFD Code (Nowak and Hong 1991; Nowak 1993; Nowak 1995). Therefore, for bridges with low traffic volume ($ADTT < 1,000$), $GDF = S/4.27$ can be used. For higher traffic volume ($ADTT > 1000$), it is recommended to use GDF formulas specified in AASHTO LRFD Code (1998).




Fig. 2.4 GDF (Tests) vs. GDF (Code).

2.4. Load Carrying Capacity

The load carrying capacity of a bridge girder is to be calculated for moment and shear separately. It is recommended that bridges with steel girders be analyzed assuming composite action, even if designed non-compositely, unless signs of deterioration or slab-girder de-bonding suggest that composite action is lost. Field tests have indicated that steel-girder bridges exhibit composite action even if designed non-compositely (Nowak and Kim 1998; Nowak et al. 1999, Nowak and Eom 2001, and Nowak and Saraf 1996).

The calculation of load carrying capacity of the structure is described in Appendix C. This value should be equal to or greater than the load effect. The calculation of load effect, and the appropriate load factors to use for this computation, are described in following paragraphs.

2.5. Interpretation of Results

The analytical evaluation of the bridge shall be made according to the expressions below. The left side of the inequality is the load effect, while the right represents load carrying capacity.

According to the 1996 AASHTO Standard Specifications:

$$1.3(M_D + M_{DW} + M_L + M_I) \leq \phi M_n \quad (2-9a)$$

$$1.3(V_D + V_{DW} + V_L + V_I) \leq \phi V_n \quad (2-9b)$$

where $\phi = 1.0$ for steel and prestress concrete.

According to the 1998 AASHTO LRFD Code:

$$1.25M_D + 1.50M_{DW} + 1.75(M_L + M_I) \leq \phi M_n \quad (2-10a)$$

$$1.25V_D + 1.50V_{DW} + 1.75(V_L + V_I) \leq \phi V_n \quad (2-10b)$$

where:

M_D = moment due to dead load except asphalt

M_{DW} = moment due to dead load of asphalt

M_L = moment due to live load

M_I = moment due to dynamic load

M_n or ϕM_n = moment carrying capacity

V_D = shear due to dead load except asphalt

V_{DW} = shear due to dead load of asphalt

V_L = shear due to live load

V_I = shear due to dynamic load

V_n or ϕV_n = shear carrying capacity

ϕ = resistance factor

According to the 1998 AASHTO LRFD Specifications, values of ϕ 's shall be taken as:

ϕ = 1.00 (steel, prestressed concrete)

= 0.90 (reinforced concrete)

2.6. Rating Factor

Bridge members can have two different ratings, an operating rating and an inventory rating. Bridge rating formulas are not yet available in the LRFD format. The basic formulas for the theoretical rating of a bridge member, as expressed in the AASHTO Manual For Condition Evaluation of Bridges, are as follows :

Operating rating :

$$RF = \frac{1}{L} \frac{C - 1.3D}{1.3(1 + I)} \quad (2-11)$$

Inventory rating :

$$RF = \frac{1}{L} \frac{C - 1.3D}{2.17(1 + I)} \quad (2-12)$$

where:

D = dead load effect on the member, calculated from data on the plans and supplemented by field measurements.

L = live load effect on the member.

I = the impact factor to be used with the live load effect. It can be calculated as it is described in the section 2.2.3.

C = the capacity of the member to resist the applied load effects. For compact sections, this value is equal to M_n , and for non-compact sections, it is equal to F_n . M_n and F_n are described in Appendix C.

2.7. Effect of Deterioration

2.7.1. Corrosion

During the field investigation, the corrosion level and pattern on the main structural members should be determined. There are three basic changes which can occur in a steel bridge due to corrosion: loss of material, reduction of section parameters, and buildup of corrosion products.

Loss of material will result in a smaller net section, which may increase the stress level for a given load. When corrosion is localized, as in pitting, stress concentrations can occur and further increase the stress level.

A reduction in section area will also decrease the values of section properties, such as moment of inertia and radius of gyration. This change may occur in a nonlinear manner because the section properties are related to the square or cube of the dimension; just a slight loss of additional flange material can lead to large losses of bending capacity. Similarly, buckling capacity can be critically affected by the reduction in metal thickness.

The buildup of corrosion products can also adversely affect steel bridges. Rust formation may exert pressure on adjacent elements. This pressure can pry apart plates, causing stresses and eccentricities in the connected parts. The formation of "pack" rust around a bearing or hinge can lock the mechanism in place. A nonfunctional hinge may cause unintended stress in the structure.

These adverse effects of corrosion must be accounted for when calculating the load carrying capacity; the reduced sectional areas must be used. The buildup of corrosion and locking of supports should also be considered.

2.7.2. Fatigue

Produced by the cyclic loading of truck traffic, fatigue cracks are another common form of deterioration. Stress concentration spots around bolts and rivets are especially prone to develop fatigue cracks, as are corrosion-deteriorated locations.

When calculating the load carrying capacity of a bridge, the reduction of structural capacity of a member that has a fatigue crack should be determined.

3. Bridge Selection Criteria

The selection criteria are different depending on the objective and type of the test. In particular, in weigh-in-motion (WIM) measurements, the bridge is used as a scale and it has to satisfy the special requirements. Therefore, the selection criteria for WIM and other load tests are discussed separately.

3.1 Weigh-In-Motion Test

A weigh-in-motion test is used to determine gross vehicle weight, axle weight, and the axle spacing of trucks that travel over the bridge. The following criteria should be considered for bridge selection:

- traffic speed - most measuring equipment requires a minimum vehicle speed of about 40 km/h, so the presence of stop lights near the bridge may cause a problem.
- accessibility - the installation/setup crew must be able to reach the girders, with or without mechanical assistance, for installation of the strain transducers.
- low dynamic effect - dynamic effect is filtered out and the results include only static effect. High dynamic load may affect the results.
- two lane bridges - the equipment is set for measurements on two lanes. If there are more lanes of traffic then only two are instrumented.
- girder type - acceptable types include steel or prestressed concrete, and conditionally acceptable are box girders or slab bridges. The selection depends on calibration data.
- skew - optimal is 0 to 10 degrees, but acceptable is 10 to 25 degrees, and conditionally acceptable is 25 to 45 degrees, however after inspection of calibration data, and it can be used with one influence line.
- span length - optimal is 10 to 20 m, but acceptable is 7.5 to 30 m.
- bridge type - simple span bridges are preferred, but continuous bridges can also be handled.

3.2 Load Tests

Load Tests refer to Load Distribution Tests, Dynamic Load Tests, Fatigue Load Test and Proof Load Tests. The main objective of these tests is to find an unknown bridge property such as load distribution factor, impact factor, or actual load carrying capacity. The selection criteria for load tests are usually more permissive than for WIM tests. The following criteria should be considered:

- accessibility (clearance, feature below, water level, etc.), the installation/setup crew must be able to reach the girders for installation of the strain transducers and LVDTs. If there is water below the bridge, a special technique must be used for LVDT placement.
- sign of deterioration (spalling concrete, cracks, corrosion, etc.), if any; bridges with higher deterioration levels are generally chosen first, if a bridge is badly deteriorated, however, such that its likelihood to survive the load test undamaged is questionable, it should be repaired before testing.
- missing design documents
- existence of a low load rating
- consequences of traffic interruption (bridge or lane closure); field work may affect the traffic flow
- age of bridge
- degree of heavy truck traffic

3.3 Traffic Control

Bridge tests usually require special arrangements to prevent traffic congestion and accidents. State DOT's have their own procedures for closing lanes or the whole bridge. However, any interruption of a normal flow of traffic is undesirable, and this applies in particular to interstate highways and other busy roads. Therefore, the traffic volume measured in terms of the average daily traffic (ADT) or average daily truck traffic (ADTT) is an important parameter in the selection of bridges for tests.

The weigh-in-motion (WIM) measurements are often performed on bridges with high ADT and ADTT. However, the equipment is installed under the structure, therefore, it can be easier to find a suitable span.

4. Truck Weight-in-Motion Measurement (WIM)

4.1. Procedure

The primary bridge live load is truck traffic. In the past, truck load data were collected by surveys. The most common survey method consisted of weighing trucks with static scales, present at weigh stations along fixed locations on major highways. The usefulness of this data is limited, however, because many drivers of overloaded trucks intentionally avoid the scales. This results in a load bias toward lighter trucks.

A weight-in-motion test attempts to gather unbiased truck traffic data, which includes axle weight, axle spacing, vehicle speed, multiple truck presence on the bridge, and average daily truck traffic (ADTT). Sensors measure strains in girders, and these data are then used to calculate the truck parameters at the given traffic speed.

4.2. Equipment

Beneath the deck, the WIM system is invisible to the truck drivers, and so overloaded trucks do not avoid the bridge. Unbiased results can thus be obtained. The system is portable and easily installed to obtain site-specific truck data.

The Bridge WIM system consists of three basic components: strain transducers, axle detectors (tape switches or infrared sensors), and the data acquisition and processing system (Fig. 4-1). The analog front end (AFE) acts as a signal conditioner and amplifier with a capacity of 8 input channels. Each channel can condition and amplify signals from the strain transducers (see Appendix A).




Fig. 4-1. Weigh-in-Motion Truck Measurement System.

During data acquisition, the AFE maintains the strain signals at zero. The auto-balancing of the strain transducers is activated when the first axle of the vehicle crosses the first axle detector. As the truck crosses the axle detectors, the speed and axle spacing are determined by the system. When the vehicle drives upon the bridge, the strain

sampling is activated. When the last axle of the vehicle leaves the instrumented bridge span, the strain sampling is turned off. Data received from strain transducers are digitized and routed to the computer. The strain time history is decomposed using an influence line algorithm to determine vehicle axle weights. These data do not include dynamic loads. This process takes from 1.5 to 3.0 seconds, depending on the instrumented span length, vehicle length, number of axles, and speed. The data are then saved by the computer.

4.3. Installation of Equipment

Strains are measured in the lower flanges of the girders, so the strain transducer must be clamped to the upper or lower surface of the bottom flange of the steel girder (Fig. 4-2a). For concrete beams, a Hilti-gun rather than clamps, is recommended for attachment as shown in Fig. 4-2b. All transducers are placed on the girders at the same distance from the abutment, in the middle third of a simple span. The vehicle speed, time of arrival, and lane of travel are obtained using tape switches on the roadway placed before the instrumented span of the bridge (Fig.4-3).

Two types of lane sensors can be used depending on the site conditions: tape switches and infrared sensors. Tape switches consist of two metallic strips that are held apart when the bridge is unloaded. As a vehicle wheel passes over the tape, it forces the metallic strips into contact and grounds a switch. By completing the circuit, a voltage is impressed across the switch, and a signal is obtained at the instant the vehicle crosses the tape. This signal is fed to a computer, where the speed, axle spacing, and number of axles are determined. The tape switches are placed perpendicular to the traffic flow and are also used to trigger the strain data collection.




Fig. 4-2 Demountable Strain Transducer Mounted to the Lower Flange of steel girder and Concrete Beam.




Fig. 4-3 Plan of Roadway Sensor Configuration.

The major problem with tape switches is their vulnerability to damage by moving traffic, particularly if the pavement is wet. Various alternative devices can be considered, one of which is the infrared sensor.

The infrared system consists of a infrared light beam source and a reflector. The light source is installed on the side of the road, and the reflector is installed in the center of the traffic lane. The infrared system, however, is still vulnerable to damage by moving traffic. It is also more difficult to install than tape switches, and trucks can easily move the reflector, interrupting the operation (at which point the light beam must be aligned). The infrared system is not reliable for operation during rain.

4.4. Measurements

The strain transducers are connected to the main unit using 5 shielded cables. Cables also connect the main unit to the lane sensors. AC power is provided by a portable gasoline-powered generator. Communication with the weigh-in-motion system is through a separate portable computer. All data concerning influence lines, girders, and other physical parameters are entered into the WIM computer and the system is instructed to begin the weighing operation.

The WIM equipment is calibrated by running calibration trucks over the bridge several times in each lane. The best results are obtained for calibration trucks which are fully loaded multi-axle vehicles. The readings are verified and calibration constants are determined so that the instrumentation will predict the correct axle weights and spacing. The comparison of the results indicates that the accuracy of measurements is within about 10 percent for 11-axle trucks. For 5-axle trucks, gross vehicle weight (GVW) is within 5 percent, and axle loads are within 20 percent. The calibration is performed once for each tested structure.

The system is activated when the first tire triggers the lane sensor. Strain measurements are taken at the rate of 62.5 Hz. Vehicle speed is calculated from the time delay between the first and second tape signal. The number of axles and axle distances are computed by the system and recorded. The dynamic strains sampled from each channel are then decomposed into axle weights using preprogrammed influence lines. A smoothing technique is used to determine the static weights from the dynamic records. Results of axle spacing and weight calculations are stored in memory for later processing and summarization. The weighing operation results may be displayed in real time.

4.5. Results of WIM Tests

4.5.1. Gross Vehicle Weight Distributions

The WIM results can be presented in a traditional histogram (frequency or cumulative). Examples of frequency histograms are shown in Fig. 4-4 and 4-5. However, this approach does not allow for an efficient analysis of the extreme values (upper or lower tails) of the considered distribution. Therefore, results of gross vehicle weight (GVW) WIM measurements can also be shown as cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) on the normal probability paper as shown in Fig. 4-6. CDFs are used to present and compare the critical extreme values of the data. They are plotted on normal probability paper [Benjamin and Cornell, 1970], which is described as follows: The horizontal axis is the considered truck parameter (e.g. gross vehicle weight, axle weight, lane moment or shear force).




Fig. 4-4. Frequency Histograms of GVW for the Considered Bridges.




Fig. 4-5. Frequency Histograms of GVW for the Considered Bridges - Continued.




Fig. 4-6 CDFs of Gross vehicle Weight for the Considered Bridges.

The vertical axis represents the probability of a particular point being exceeded, p . The probability of being exceeded (vertical scale) is then replaced with the inverse standard normal distribution function denoted by $\Phi^{-1}(p)$. For example, $\Phi^{-1}(p) = 0$ corresponds to the probability of being exceeded $p = 0.5$, while $\Phi^{-1}(p) = 1$ corresponds to $p = 0.159$, and $\Phi^{-1}(p) = -1$ corresponds to $p = 0.841$, and so on. The construction and use of the normal probability paper is summarized in Appendix B.

The distribution of truck type by number of axles will typically bear a direct relationship to the GVW distribution; the larger the population of multiple axle vehicles

(greater than five axles) the greater the GVW load spectra. Past research has indicated that 92% to 98% of the trucks are four and five axle vehicles. Three and four axle vehicles are often configured similarly to five axle vehicles, and when included with five axle vehicles, this group accounts for 55% to 95% of the truck population. In Michigan, between 0% and 7.4% of the trucks have eleven axles.

Most states in the US allow a maximum GVW of 355 kN, where up to five axles per vehicle are permitted. The State of Michigan legal limit allows for an eleven axle truck of up to 730 kN, depending on axle configuration.

4.5.2 Axle Weight Distributions

Potentially more important for bridge fatigue and pavement design are the axle weights and axle spacings of the trucks passing over the bridge. Fig. 4-7 presents the distributions of the axle weights of the measured vehicles.

4.5.3. Lane Moment and Shear Distributions

Once truck data has been collected by a WIM test, the results can be used to generate the expected moments and shears for any bridge span. Each truck in the data base is analytically driven across the desired span (using influence lines) to determine the maximum static bending moment and shear per lane. The cumulative distribution functions of these load effects for the same span are then determined. As an example, the resulting CDF's for a specific span (27m) are shown in Fig. 4-8 for lane moment and Fig. 4-9 for lane shear. As a point of reference, the calculated load effects are divided by the values resulting from using the AASHTO LRFD (1998) design loads.




Fig. 4-7. CDFs of Axle Weight for the Considered Bridges.

Fig. 4-8 indicates that there is a wide variation of truck load distribution among the example bridges investigated. Maximum values of lane-moment-to-LRFD-moment ratio vary from 0.6 at M153/M39 to 2.0 at I94/M10. The variation of lane shears in Fig. 4-9 is similar to that of lane moments. For I94/M10, the extreme value exceeds 2.0. For

the other bridges, the maximum shears can be seen to vary from 0.65 at M153/M39 to 1.5 at I94/I75.




Fig. 4-8 CDFs of Lane Moment for the Span Length of 27 m.




Fig. 4-9 CDFs of Lane Shear for the Span Length of 27 m.

5. Dynamic Load Measurement

5.1. Procedure

The dynamic load can be a significant component of live load. Not only is it time variant and random in nature, but it depends on the vehicle type, vehicle weight, axle configuration, bridge span length, road roughness, and transverse truck position on the bridge. In a dynamic test, strain transducers are attached to the bridge girders, and stress values are recorded under actual moving traffic loads.

5.2. Equipment

The SCXI system, manufactured by National Instruments Corporation, can be used for a load distribution test. The SCXI system setup is shown in Fig. 5-1. In contrast to the WIM system, the SCXI system has neither an independent processor nor a memory module. The data acquisition mode is controlled from an external PC notebook computer, and the acquired data are processed and directly saved in the PC's hard drive.

The system is composed of 4 major components totaling 5 modules (Fig. 5-1): one SCXI-1000 chassis, one SCXI-1200 data acquisition module, two SCXI-1100 multiplexer modules, and one PC with LabView software. The power for all components is provided from a portable electric generator. The generator also supplies excitation for strain transducers through the AC to DC converter.

The SCXI-1000 chassis integrates the operation of multiple SCXI modules with a SCXI-1200 module. The chassis's bus includes guarded analog buses for signal routing and digital buses for transferring data and timing signals.




Fig. 5-1. SCXI Data Acquisition and Control System

The SCXI-1200 data acquisition module is a multifunction analog, digital, and timing module. It is connected directly to the standard PC parallel printer port. The

module has a 12-bit analog to digital converter (ADC) and a sustained sampling rate of 20 kHz in the Standard Parallel Port (SPP) mode. It acquires data from and controls several SCXI signal conditioning modules installed in the same chassis.

The SCXI-1100 is a 32 differential channel multiplexer amplifier module. It can be configured to sample a variety of millivolt and volt signals by using the selectable gain and bandwidth settings. The signals from the strain transducers are connected to the SCXI-1100 module. Each SCXI-1100 module multiplexes the 32 channels into a single channel of the SCXI-1200 module. Several SCXI-1100 modules can be cascaded to multiplex hundreds of signals into a single channel on a SCXI-1200 module. Conditioned signals from the SCXI-1100 are passed along the SCXibus in the back of the chassis to the SCXI-1200 data acquisition module. LabView is used to control the SCXI-1200 module and signal conditioning functions on the SCXI modules.

LabView is the data acquisition and control programming language installed on the PC. It has the necessary library functions for data acquisition, analysis, and presentation. The data acquisition parameters, such as sampling rate and data acquisition mode, are controlled with options in LabView. After data acquisition, the voltage data can be converted into strains by using the analysis routines in LabView. The results are displayed on the computer screen in real time and saved on the PC's hard drive. The SCXI system in conjunction with LabView has far more flexibility for data acquisition, analysis, and presentation than a system with built-in control software. With built-in control software, all routines are preprogrammed and unchangeable, while if LabView is used, the SCXI system can be controlled according to the user's specific needs and objectives.

5.3. Installation of Equipment

Strain transducers should be installed following the same procedure as described for a weigh-in-motion test, as explained in Chapter 4.3.

5.4. Measurement

This test can be carried out simultaneously with a weigh-in-motion test. Field measurements are taken by the SCXI system described above to determine the actual dynamic load effects and to verify the available analytical models [Hwang and Nowak, 1991; Nassif and Nowak, 1995; Kim and Nowak, 1997]. For each truck passage, the dynamic response is monitored by recording strain data. Truck weight, speed, axle configuration, and lane occupancy may also be determined and recorded from WIM measurements when a dynamic test is carried out. A suitable sampling rate for a dynamic test is 200 Hz.

5.5. Processing and Presentation of the Results

An example of the actual bridge response for a vehicle traveling at a highway speed is shown in Fig. 5-2. For comparison, also shown is an equivalent static response, which was developed from the same vehicle traveling at crawling speed.

There are different definitions for the dynamic load factor, as described by Bakht and Pinjarkar (1989). The dynamic load is usually considered as an equivalent static live load and it is expressed in terms of the dynamic load factor (DLF):

$$DLF = \mathcal{E}_{dyn} / \mathcal{E}_{stat} \quad (5-1)$$

where \mathcal{E}_{dyn} is the maximum dynamic response (in terms of stress, strain or deflection) measured from the test data, and $\mathcal{E}_{dyn} = \mathcal{E}_{total} - \mathcal{E}_{stat}$. \mathcal{E}_{total} is the total response, and \mathcal{E}_{stat} is the maximum static response obtained from the filtered dynamic response.




Fig. 5-2 Dynamic and Static Strain under a Truck Traveling at Highway Speed.

A numerical procedure is applied to filter and process collected data. The DLF is determined under normal truck traffic for various load ranges and axle configurations.

An example of the actual static and dynamic strains is shown in Fig. 5-3. In Fig. 5-4, the CDF of the static stress is plotted on normal probability paper. For each value of static stress, the corresponding dynamic stress is also shown. The stress due to dynamic load is nearly constant and is not dependent on truck weight. Fig. 5-5 shows dynamic load factors as a function of static strains. Also shown in the figure is a power curve fit, which approximately represents mean values of the DLF's. In general, the DLF decreases as static strain increases. Therefore, the DLF is smaller for heavier trucks.

Dynamic load effects can also be illustrated versus girders of bridge (Fig. 5-6). Typically, very large values for impact factors are found for girders with the lowest static strains. Exterior girders most commonly display this behavior, and as discussed earlier, large impact factors in girders of low static strain are of no concern.




Fig. 5-3. Static and Dynamic Strains.




Fig. 5-4. Typical CDF of Static Stress and Corresponding Dynamic Stress.




Fig. 5-5. Dynamic Load Factor versus Static Strain.




Fig. 5-6. Dynamic Load Factors vs. Girders

6. Fatigue Load Measurement

6.1. Procedure

Development of a probabilistic fatigue load model requires the collection of actual dynamic stress time histories for various members and components. Following a collection of time histories, the data must be processed into a usable form. The expected fatigue life of a component is then calculated using the rainflow method.

6.2. Equipment

The Stress Measuring System (SMS), with the main unit manufactured by the SoMat Corporation, is shown in Fig. 6-1. It collects component strain histories produced by actual traffic loads, and assembles the stress cycle histograms by the rainflow method of cycle counting and other counting methods. The data is then stored to memory and down-loaded at the conclusion of the test period. The rainflow method counts the number of cycles, n , in each predetermined stress range, S_i , for a given stress history. The SMS is capable of recording up to 4 billion cycles per channel for extended periods in an unattended mode. Strain transducers are attached to all girders at the lower mid-span flanges of a bridge.

The SoMat Corporation Strain Gage Module is shown in Fig. 6-1. It includes a power/processor/ communications module, a 1 Megabyte CMOS extended memory unit, and 8 strain gage signal conditioning modules. The system is designed to collect strains through 8 channels in both attended and unattended modes with a range of 2.1 mV to 12.5 mV. A notebook computer is used to communicate with the SoMat system to control the data acquisition mode, calibration, initialization, data display, and downloading of data. The SoMat system has been configured specifically for the purpose of collecting stress/strain histories and statistical analysis for highway bridges. This application is particularly suitable because of the modular component arrangement of the SoMat system.




Fig. 6-1 SoMat Strain Data Acquisition System.

The data-acquisition system consists of five major components totaling 12 modules; eight strain transducer signal conditioning modules, and one each for a battery pack, a Power/Communications module, a 1MB CMOS Extended Memory module, and a Model 2100 NSC 80180 processor (see Fig. 6-9). Regulated power is supplied by a rechargeable 11.3 - 13.4 volt electrically isolated DC/DC converter. This unit powers all

modules as well as provides excitation for the strain transducers. Serial communications via an RS 232C connector, and battery backup for memory protection, is provided by the Power/ Communications module. An Extended Memory Module of 1 megabyte, high speed, low power CMOS RAM with battery backup is included for data storage. The strain gage conditioning modules each provide 5-volt strain transducer excitation, internal shunt calibration resistors, and an 8-bit, analog-to-digital converter. Further information is given in Appendix A.

The strain measurement range is ± 2.1 -mV minimum and ± 12.5 mV maximum. The processor module consists of 32 kilobytes of programmable memory and an NSC 80180 high speed processor capable of sampling data in simultaneous mode resulting in a maximum sampling rate of 3000 Hz. Communication to the PC is via RS 232C at 57600 baud. Data acquisition modes include time history, burst time history, sequential peak valley, time at level matrix, rainflow matrix, and peak valley matrix. Following collection, data are reviewed and downloaded to the PC hard drive for storage, processing, analysis, and plotting.

6.3. Installation of Equipment

Strain transducers should be attached to the point of maximum moment of each girder. For simple spans, however, a midspan placement is sufficiently close to the point of maximum moment, and this can be used for attachment. The attachment technique is described in Chapter 4.3. Since the stresses are to be recorded over an extended period of time (a minimum of 1 week), the data acquisition system must be attached to a reliable and secure location on the bridge.

6.4. Measurements

Strain histories usually must be collected continuously for periods of at least one week long, although this time can be reduced using the rainflow algorithm [Nowak, Nassif and Frank, 1993; Nowak, Laman and Nassif, 1994; Laman and Nowak, 1996]. 50 Hz is a

sufficient sampling rate for a fatigue load test. Data should be collected for each bridge girder.

6.5. Processing and Presentation of the Results

6.5.1. Rainflow Method of Cycle Counting

Commonly occurring load histories in fatigue analysis often are categorized as either narrow band or wide band processes. Narrow band processes are characterized by an approximately constant period, such as that shown in Fig. 6-2(a). Wide band processes are characterized by higher frequency small excursions superimposed on a lower, variable frequency process, such as that shown in Fig. 6-2(b). For steel girder highway bridges, where the loading is both random and dynamic, the stress histories are wide band in nature.




Fig. 6-2 Example of Narrow and Wide Band Stress Histories.

Stress histories which are wide band in nature do not allow for simple cycle counting. The cycles are irregular with variable frequencies and amplitudes. Several cycle-counting methods are available for the case of wide band and nonstationary processes, and each are successful to a degree in predicting the fatigue life of a structure. The rainflow method is preferred due to the identification of stress ranges within the variable amplitude and frequency stress histogram, which are associated with closed

hysteresis loops. This is important when comparing the counted cycles with established fatigue test data obtained from constant amplitude stress histories.

The rainflow method counts the number of cycles, n , in each predetermined stress range, S_i , for a given stress history. Rules of counting are applied to the stress history after orienting the trace vertically, with the positive time axis pointing downward. This convention facilitates the flow of “rain” due to gravity along the trace and is merely a device to aid in the understanding of the method. Rules for the rainflow method are as follows (see Fig. 6-3):




Fig. 6-3 Rainflow Counting Diagram.

1. All positive peaks are evenly numbered.
2. A rainflow path is initiated at the inside of each stress peak and trough.
3. A “rainflow” progresses along a slope and “drips” down to the next slope.
4. A “rainflow” is permitted to continue unless the flow was initiated at a minimum more negative than the minimum opposite the flow, and similarly for a rainflow initiated a maximum. For example, path 1-8, 9-10, 2-3, 4-5, and 6-7.

5. A "rainflow" must stop if it meets another flow that flows from above. For example, path 3-3a, 5-5a, and 7-7a.
6. A "rainflow" is not initiated until the preceding flow has stopped.

Following the above procedure, each segment of the history is counted only once. Half cycles are counted between the most negative minimum and positive maximum, as well as the half cycles or interruptions between the maximum and minimum. As shown in Fig. 6-3, all negative trough-initiated half cycles will eventually be paired with a peak-initiated cycle of equal magnitude. For a more detailed explanation and discussion of the rainflow method and others, introductory texts on fatigue analysis are available [Banantine, Comer and Handrock, 1992].

6.5.2. Results of Strain Spectra Testing

To aid interpretation of the results, the CDFs of strain cycles and the corresponding equivalent stress values are plotted on normal probability paper (Fig. 6-4). For each bridge, the CDFs are shown for strains in girders numbered from 1 (exterior, on the right-hand side looking in the direction of the traffic).

As a means of comparison of fatigue live load, the equivalent stress, s_{eq} , is calculated for each girder using the following root mean cube (RMC) formula:

$$S_{eq} = \sqrt[3]{\sum p_i \cdot S_i^3} \quad (6-1)$$

where S_i = midpoint of the stress interval i and p_i = the relative frequency of cycle counts for interval i . The stress, S_i , is calculated as a product of strain and modulus of elasticity of steel. s_{eq} values are shown on a graph for each girder (Fig. 6-5).

Stress spectra considerably vary from girder to girder (component-specific). Therefore, the expected fatigue life is different depending on girder location. Exterior girders experience the lowest load spectra.




Fig. 6-4 Strains for Girders in Bridge US23/HR.




Fig. 6-5 Equivalent Stresses for Girders in Bridge US23/HR.

7. Load Distribution Tests

7.1. Procedure

The objective of this test is to determine the distribution of load to each girder. One or two trucks of known weight are used as the test load, and the resulting strains are collected from all girders. To determine the distribution of load transversely on the bridge, at least one strain value must be taken from each girder. To determine the longitudinal load distribution, strain values at the ends and quarter points of the girders are also necessary.

7.2. Testing Equipment

In load distribution tests, the SCXI data acquisition system described in Chapter 5.2, can be used with strain transducers.

7.3. Installation of Equipment

A typical installation layout for a highway bridge is shown in Fig. 7-1. The number and placement of instruments on the bridge may vary according to the test objective, but in general, transducers are placed to determine the distribution of load to the girders transversally and longitudinally, and to find the maximum load effects. Attachment of strain transducers is described in Chapter 4.3.

As with previous tests, the strain transducers are attached to the lower flanges of each girder at midspan, assuming that the bridge is a simple span. Although midspan is not the location of maximum stress, it is sufficiently close for test measurements. For continuous spans, the locations of maximum effect should be estimated analytically, and the transducers should be placed there.




Fig. 7-1. Typical Bridge Disposition Plan

Additionally, for at least one of the girders, strain transducers should be attached at each quarter point to determine influence line of girder. If the degree of support fixity is to be determined, it is also necessary to attach a strain transducer next to each support.

Since the locations of maximum load effect are to be determined, a visual inspection of the bridge girders may yield additional points of desirable gauge placement. If there is significant corrosion damage on the girders, for example, locations with the smallest remaining flange thickness should be monitored with a transducer.

All spans of multi-span structures should be tested. Although the simple spans of multi-span bridges can be tested individually, it would be useful to instrument neighboring spans to check for unintended continuity. If the spans are continuous, the measurements should be made simultaneously on all spans. In this case, strain transducers should also be attached around each pier.

If there is a lack of equipment or time to instrument all that is desired, points on the structure that are expected to provide the smallest load response should be eliminated

first. External steel girders with concrete facia often fall into this category, as do concrete girders that has extensive cracks or damage, which are not suitable for strain measurement. Additionally, it is sometimes not possible to attach displacement transducers at some spans, if there is deep water or un-reroutable traffic below.

7.4. Measurements

During the test, the trucks are driven across the bridge at crawling speed, which will generate the maximum static stresses. High-speed tests are used to determine impact factors and variations in response. 50 Hz is an appropriate sampling rate for this test.

The following load combinations may be performed for bridges which have two lanes. These loadings may be repeated at high speed.

- A truck along the center of the first lane
- A truck close to the curb of the first lane
- A truck along the center of the second lane
- A truck close to the curb of the second lane
- A truck along the center of the first lane and another truck along the center of the second lane.

To determine girder distribution and impact factors, strain data taken from the bottom-flanges of mid-span girders are adequate. For a complete bridge diagnostic test, however, displacement data (via LVDT's) is also necessary. During the tests, transducer signals are recorded continuously with suitable amplification and sampling rates.

7.5. Processing and Presentation of The Results

7.5.1. Load Distribution Factor Calculation from Test Results

Girder Distribution Factors (GDF) are calculated from the maximum strain obtained from the static loading at each girder at the same section along the length of the

bridge. Ghosn *et al.* (1986) assumed that GDF was equal to the ratio of the static strain at the girder to the sum of all the static strains. Stallings and Yoo (1993) used the weighted strains to account for the different section modulus of the girders. The GDF for the i th girder, GDF_i , can be expressed as follows:

$$GDF_i = \frac{M_i}{\sum_{j=1}^k M_j} = \frac{ES_i \epsilon_i}{\sum_{j=1}^k ES_j \epsilon_j} = \frac{\frac{S_i}{S_\ell} \epsilon_i}{\sum_{j=1}^k \frac{S_j}{S_\ell} \epsilon_j} = \frac{\epsilon_i w_i}{\sum_{j=1}^k \epsilon_j w_j} \quad (7-1)$$

where M_i = bending moment at the i th girder; E = modulus of elasticity; S_i = section modulus of the i th girder; S_ℓ = typical interior section modulus; ϵ_i = maximum bottom-flange static strain at the i th girder; w_i = ratio of the section modulus of the i th girder to that of a typical interior girder; and k = number of girders.

When all girders have the same section modulus (that is, when weight factors, w_i , are equal to one for all girders), Eq. (7-1) is the equivalent to that of Ghosn *et al.* Because of the edge stiffening effect due to sidewalks and barrier walls, the section modulus in exterior girders is slightly greater than that in interior girders. In other words, the weight factors, w_i , for exterior girders are greater than one. Therefore, from Eq. (7-1), if the weight factors, w_i , are assumed equal to one, the GDFs in interior girders will be slightly overestimated, and slightly underestimated in the exterior girders.

Measured GDFs can be compared with the values calculated according to the current design codes, expressions for which are given in Chapter 2.

7.5.2. Summarizing Results

The test and calculation results can be summarized graphically. The two charts of Fig. 7-2, for example, show stresses measured from girder mid-points and their resulting distribution factors. These graphs are prepared for each lane, and each line in a graph is drawn for a different truck position. A separate set of graphs can display the results of

two-lane loading (Fig. 7-3). The superposition of single lane loadings is also shown in this graph. The similarity between the superposition and two-lane loading curves indicates linear behavior of the structure. The code-specified GDF can also be plotted on this graph for comparison. The formulas for GDF in AASHTO (1996) and AASHTO LRFD Code (1994) are given in Chapter 2 of this report.




Fig. 7-2. Stress values measured from mid-span of girders while any lane was loaded and their distribution factors compared with code values.





Fig. 7-3. Stress values measured from mid-span of girders while two of lanes was loaded and their distribution factors.

8. Proof-Load Test

8.1. Procedure

The rating calculations and a preliminary design check of the selected bridges are carried out using the available design details and the deterioration (section loss) observed during site inspection. Proof load testing can be used either to find the yield capacity of the structure, or to check its ability to carry a specified live load. Usually, the yield capacity of a bridge is very high and requires exceptionally heavy loads, which make the tests uneconomical and slow. In this case, proof load tests are carried out to verify if the bridge can safely carry the maximum allowable legal load. Before the proof load tests, the target proof load is calculated as per Section 8.4.1. The type and placement of load, instrumentation and data acquisition setup would depend on the target proof load level.

8.2. Equipment

In proof load tests, the SCXI data acquisition system manufactured by National Instruments Corporation, can be used with strain transducers and displacement transducers (LVDT). The data acquisition system is described in Chapter 5.2. The information about displacement transducers (LVDT) can be found in Appendix A.

8.3. Installation of Equipment

A strain transducer is attached at midspan of each girder. Although this is not the location of maximum moment, it is sufficiently close for testing. It is also necessary to attach an LVDT next to each strain gauge to monitor displacement and verify the linearity of the structure's behavior. The sleeve of the LVDT is supported by a tripod beneath the measurement position. A tensioned steel wire connect the LVDT core to the bridge girder, so movement of the girder cause simultaneous movement of the core. To maintain tension in the wire, the other end of the transducer core is anchored to a heavy steel plate on the ground, via another wire and spring (Fig. 8-1). All transducers are placed on the

girders at the same distance from the abutment. The attachment technique of strain transducers is given in Chapter 4-3, and a typical data acquisition setup is shown in Fig. 8-1.




Fig. 8-1. Typical Data Acquisition Setup.

8.4 Load Selection

8.4.1 Calculation of Proof Load

In Michigan, the maximum moment in medium span bridges is caused by two unit 11-axle trucks. For such an 11-axle truck, the gross vehicle weight (GVW) can be up to 730 kN. It is more than twice the HS-20 design load (AASHTO Standard 1996).

The proof load level should be sufficiently higher than that from a two-unit 11-axle truck, to ensure the desired safety level. The report NCHRP No:12-28(13)A [Lichtenstein, 1993] provides guidelines for calculating the target proof load level. It suggest that the maximum allowable legal load should be multiplied by a factor X_p , which represents the live load factor needed to bring the bridge to an operating rating factor of 1.0. The guide recommends that X_p should be 1.4 before any adjustments are made. It also recommends the following adjustments to X_p , which should be considered in selecting a target live load magnitude.

- Increase X_p by 15 percent for one lane structures or for other spans in which the single lane loading augmented by an additional 15 percent would govern.
- Increase X_p by 10 percent for spans with fracture critical details. A similar increase in X_p shall be considered for structures without redundant load paths.
- Increase X_p by 10 percent if inspections are to be performed less often than 2-year frequency.
- Reduce X_p by 5 percent if the structure is ratable and there are no hidden details, and if the calculated rating factor exceeds 1.0.

Application of the recommended adjustment factors, leads to the target live load factor X_{pa} . The net percent increase (Σ) in X_p , is found by summing the appropriate adjustments given above. Then

$$X_{pa} = X_p [1 + (\Sigma/100)] \quad (8-1)$$

The target proof load (L_t) is then:

$$L_t = X_{pa} (1 + I) L_r \quad (8-2)$$

$$1.3 \leq X_{pa} \leq 2.2 \quad (8-3)$$

where Σ = net percent increase in X_p , i.e. summation of the appropriate adjustments, L_r = the live load due to the rating vehicle for the loaded lanes, I = impact factor, and X_{pa} = the target live load factor.

8.4.2 Selection of Proof Load

In the tests of some researchers (Juntunen and Isola, 1995), concrete barrier blocks, each weighing about 22 kN, were used as load. However, in most cases, the required number of concrete blocks would be so large (5 or 6 layers) that it is not feasible to fit them on one truck. Other types of loads, such as steel coils, sand and gravel etc., loaded on an 11-axle truck, can be considered, but it would require considerable effort to place or move the load. In addition, expensive and heavy equipment is needed to load the trucks. Other options, such as building a water tank on top of the bridge and using water as the proof load, are also possible. Two significant drawbacks of all of these options are the considerable resources required, and the need for a complete bridge closure to traffic for a long period of time. In addition, if the test procedure is carried out over an extended time period, temperature variations may be considerably large and can cause measuring inaccuracies.

As mentioned earlier, the moment at mid-span can be used as the critical value considered as the load effect for the proof load test. For a particular bridge, any load vehicle can be used that will generate a mid-span moment equivalent to that which would be produced by a vehicle of the maximum allowable legal load (L_r). The required mid-

span moments needed for a proof load are calculated using report NCHRP 12-28(13)A [Lichtenstein, 1993].

M-1 or M-60 military tanks are recommended as load in proof load tests. Since the mid-span moment can be increased by moving the tanks further onto the bridge, the load steps can be as small as desired, lowering the risk of collapse. The tanks can be placed accurately and quickly as compared to other load methods (such as concrete blocks), which results in a faster test and less traffic disruption. On average, one bridge can be tested in three hours. The use of tanks also allows for the passage of traffic over one lane of the bridge when the tanks are being positioned; a full closure is required only at the critical time of maximum load.

Each tank weighs more than 500 kN and the load is distributed over a track length of about 4.5 m, a load configuration that can generate high moments at mid-span. For some short-span bridges, just one tank is enough to generate the required proof load moment, while for moderate spans, two or more tanks are required. If two lanes of any bridge are loaded simultaneously, the required 15 percent increase for single lane loading is not applied. In past tests, tanks were provided by the Michigan National Guard. The front and side views of the M-60 tanks are shown in Fig. 8-2.

Tank tracks may cause damage to the bridge wearing surface. To avoid this damage, the tanks can be placed on flat bed trailers. Fig. 8-3 and 8-4 show the two different trailers used during a proof load test. Only the four rear axles of these trailers were used to load this specific bridge. For some tests, if the trailers are unavailable, or when the tanks must be positioned closely together to generate the required moment, the tanks can be placed directly on the pavement. Past tests indicate that the tanks do not always damage the pavement, and the tanks alone are easier to position than the tank/trailer combinations. Although the tanks are wider than the 11-axle trucks, the girder distribution factors for both vehicles are about the same for both composite and noncomposite structures [Saraf, Sokolik and Nowak, 1997].

Prior to the testing of each bridge, the axle weights of the four rear axles of a trailer/tank combination, shown in Figure 8-3 and 8-4, must be measured at a weigh station. If available, a portable scale can be used on site to improve the accuracy of the axle weights. As an example, typical axle weight values are shown in Fig. 8-3 and 8-4. The weight of the M-60 tank is specified in Michigan National Guard documents as 504.2 kN.




Fig. 8-2. M-60 Tank.




Fig. 8-3. Tank on a Military Trailer.




Fig. 8-4. Tank on a Commercial Trailer.

8.5. Measurements

8.5.1. Load Positions

As noted earlier, the proof load should be applied by gradually increasing the load until the target proof load level is reached. Tanks alone or on trailers should be moved from the supports to the mid-span in several steps to gradually increase the mid-span moment. Each step is referred to as a load position. For bridges that require more than

two tanks to generate the required proof load moment, adequate concrete barrier blocks can be placed close to the curbs on each side.

Tanks should be also placed in different locations in the transverse direction to check all girders. Generally, three locations are enough as shown in Fig. 8-5.

- upstream (tanks closer to the upstream railing)
- center and (tanks in center of the bridge)
- downstream (tanks closer to the downstream railing)




Fig. 8-5. Transverse Load Positions

8.5.2. Testing Procedures

The operator of the data acquisition system should have a clear view of the bridge deck. If this is not possible, good radio communication needs to be established. Before loading, it should be verified that all transducers and their connections are in working order. All problems should be resolved before the test begins. The noise levels of all channels should be checked, and mechanical or electrical noise sources should be

eliminated. Some significant but weak signals can be masked by a high noise level. 50 Hz should be used as the sampling rate.

As the load is gradually applied, strains and displacements are recorded for each load position. At all stages of field testing, the bridge response should be closely monitored and compared to analytically predicted values. If an unreasonable difference or a serious nonlinear behavior becomes apparent, the test should be stopped and the loads removed from the bridge. Other visible signs of distress, such as a buckling pattern appearing in a compressive zone of a steel member, or cracking in concrete, clearly indicate that the carrying capacity of bridge was exceeded.

8.6. Processing and Presentation of the Results

During the test, a large amount of data are recorded on some type of magnetic media. These data are then converted to format which is more suitable to process, and extraneous noise is filtered out.

Graphs are then prepared which present the results. If both strain and displacement are measured, the separate graphs should be prepared for each. If there is a lack data for a particular location, perhaps caused by a transducer failure, it is often possible to interpolate to these values.

There are two sets of stress-displacement graphs that can be prepared. The first set is prepared for each girder. Every line on this set of graphs will indicate a different transverse loading, such as downstream, center or upstream vehicle position. Although a small amount of nonlinear behavior is normal, the relation between the applied load and the deflection or stress should be nearly linear. If a nonlinearity displays an increase of rigidity, this may indicate that composite action increases with the load level, or that support fixity increases with load level. Conversely, a decreasing rigidity may indicate that composite action is being lost as the load increases, or that there are some points on the bridge which have yielded.

The second set of stress-displacement graphs are used to compare experimental and analytical results. One line on these graphs should show the maximum experimental results, while other lines can show the results of different analytical or numerical models. For example, several possible bridge models for comparison with the true results are: a composite structure, a non-composite structure, a bridge with pinned supports, with fixed supports, or a combination of these. By comparing these models with the experimental results, it becomes more clear which condition the actual bridge most closely resembles. These graphs are prepared for each girder and each transverse loading case.

Examples of these graphs are shown in Fig. 8-6, 8-7, 8-8, and 8-9.

Observed experimental deflections are compared with those predicted using the analytical model and AASHTO deflection limits.

The operating rating factor of the bridge is calculated for the moment produced by a two-unit, 11-axle truck. According to the report NCHRP No:12-28 (13) A [Lichtenstein, 1993], the operating rating factor at the conclusion of the proof load test should be calculated as follows:

$$OP = \frac{K_0 L_P}{X_{PA}} \quad (8-4)$$

where,

OP = operating level capacity.

L_P = actual maximum proof load applied to the bridge.

X_{pa} = the target live load factor (see Section 8.4.1).

K_0 = 1.00 if target load is reached.

= 0.88 if a distress level is reached prior to reaching the target load.

Therefore, the operating rating factor (ORF) would be

$$\text{ORF} = \text{OP} / L_r (1+I) \quad (8-5)$$

where L_r = maximum allowable legal load (e.g. maximum moment caused by a two-unit 11-axle truck). If the operating rating factor is bigger than 1, then the bridge is considered safe for legal truck traffic.




Fig. 8-6. Deflection vs. Lane Moment for any girder of the tested bridge.




Fig. 8-7. Experimental and Analytical Deflections of any girder of the tested bridge for Downstream [or Center or Upstream] Loading




Fig. 8-8. Stress Lane Moment of any girder of the tested bridge at mid [or quarter or end] point.




Fig. 8-9. Experimental and Analytical Stresses of any girder of the tested bridge for Downstream [or Center or Upstream] Loading.

9. Safety and Summary of Field Tests

9.1 Safety during Field Tests

During any load test, the bridge and the investigators experience some risk of injury. This is especially true for proof load tests, when loading is high and the bridge behavior is ultimately unknown. The risk increases when information about material strengths and as-built details is missing. In assessing the risk, consideration should be given to the following: the safety of personnel, possible structural damage, loss of equipment, and traffic disruption. The degree of risk involved depends upon the bridge type, condition, and location, the loading method and anticipated behavior.

Of particular importance is the degree of redundancy of the structure. Redundant bridges provide reserve strength that may prevent the failure of the entire structure upon the failure of a single element.

In the final draft report NCHRP No:12-28(13)A [Lichtenstein, 1993], the risks involved are classified in three groups:

- Minimum : Bridge sustains superficial damage requiring minimum repairs. No equipment damage or loss of life.
- Medium : Bridge sustains tolerable damage requiring minor repairs and traffic disruption. Possible equipment damage but no loss of life.
- Major : Bridge sustains significant damage requiring major repairs and rerouting of traffic for an extended period. Possible loss of equipment and loss of life.

The safety of the test personnel, the bridge, and the equipment are paramount during a test. Precautions should be taken to control and regulate traffic and pedestrians during the test. Generally, public vehicles and pedestrians should not be allowed on or under the bridge during testing.

Some specific safety measures for the bridge, the test equipment, and the test personnel are the following:

For Bridge :

Before the load test, structural weak points should be determined. In some cases, analytic or numeric models of the bridge may have to be constructed to facilitate this. Transducers should be attached to these areas and monitored continuously.

Likely failure mechanisms of the bridge should be identified, and can be used to determine where most safety measures should be considered. Bridge deterioration should be included.

Areas of structural deterioration or damage should be closely monitored during a load test. If crack growth or member deformation is observed, such as a wrinkle in the compression flange of a steel girder, the test must be stopped and the loads immediately removed. Moreover, if the structure emits noise during the loading, this may indicate component breaking or settling.

In a proof load test, the load should be gradually increased. At the end of each load step, measured values should be checked against those predicted, and the linear behavior of the structure should be verified. Between two load steps, when the load on the bridge is fixed, if displacements are increasing or if stresses are changing, this may indicate that the structure is not behaving elastically.

For Test Equipment :

To avoid damage, strain transducers should not be attached to uneven or twisted surfaces.

LVDT displacement transducers should be mounted carefully. If the core rubs on the body of the LVDT, its sensitivity may decrease, especially during dynamic measuring. Moreover, if the transducer body is not vertically aligned with the guide wire, the device may be damaged.

Cables and connectors should be protected direct sunlight, heat, moisture, and dust. They should also be protected from traffic and pedestrians.

If a power generator is used for the test, the output voltage should be monitored throughout the test. It should also be checked before powering the test equipment.

After every test, all equipment should be cleaned and oiled if it is necessary. Damaged cables and equipment should be clearly marked at the field and later repaired.

For Personnel :

Personnel who work on, under, or around the bridge should wear a bright reflective vest and hard hat, even if the traffic has stopped.

If equipment needs to be placed on a bridge lane or any place higher than two meters under the bridge, at least two people should be present for the task. The second worker is needed to observe traffic, hold a ladder, or otherwise monitor the activity to avoid accidents.

A first-aid kit should be kept close to test area, and a nearby telephone should be found in case it is needed in an emergency.

9.2 Summary of Field Testing

In general, the actual performance of bridges is different than predicted by the analytical calculations. There are several factors that effect the actual behavior of bridges.

Many of these factors are not considered in the design and load rating, although they can improve the bridge response to applied load. However, such increase of strength may not be present at the higher load levels. These affects can be summarized as follows.

- *Unintended Composite Action*

Most bridges build before 1950 were designed without shear connectors between the main load carrying girders and the concrete deck. Nevertheless, field tests have shown that such noncomposite decks consistently behave compositely. Although in all load tests to date this unintended composite action has been maintained, it is possible that this effect could be lost during the test. In this case, a sudden increase in stress may be observed. It is recommended that bridges with steel girders be analyzed assuming composite action, even if designed non-compositely, unless signs of deterioration or slab-girder de-bonding suggest that composite action is lost.

- *Load Distribution Effects*

An important part of the rating equation concerns the distribution of the live load to the main load-carrying members of the bridge, and to the individual components of a multi-component member. Typically, in design and rating, load distribution to main supporting members is based on the AASHTO Specifications distribution factors. However, this distribution is affected by several variables which greatly complicate the analysis. Except by field testing, it is impossible to find exact values of girder distribution factors.

- *Differences in Material Properties*

- *Unintended Continuity*

For simply-supported bridges it is assumed that the ends are supported on idealized rollers and do not carry any moment. However, tests have shown that there can be significant end moments attributable to the continuity provided by the deck slab as well as frozen bearings.

- *Participation of Secondary Members, Parapets, Railing, Curbs and Utilities*

Secondary bridge members are those members which are not directly in the load path of the structure, and includes lateral bracing members, diaphragms, wind bracing, parapets, railing, curbs and utilities. In some bridge types, secondary members enhance the load-carrying system by increasing the stiffness of the bridge.

- *Effects of Skew*

The conventional AASHTO Specifications (1996) live load distribution factors may not be applicable to girder system with large skews (20° or more).

- *Effects of Deterioration and Damage to Structural Members*

- *Portion of Load Carried By Deck*

Depending on the bridge span and the thickness of the deck, there may be a portion of the load carried directly by the deck slab spanning between end supports of the bridge.

- *Unintended Arching Action Due To Frozen Bearings*

References

1. AASHTO. (1994). *Manual for the Condition Evaluation of Bridges*, American Association of State and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C.
2. AASHTO. (1998). *LRFD Bridge Design Specifications*, American Association of State and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C.
3. AASHTO. (1996). *Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges, Bridge Design Specifications*, American Association of State and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C.
4. AASHTO Guide Specifications for Distribution of Loads for Highway Bridges, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C., 1994.
5. Bakht, B. and Pinjarkar, S. G. (1989). "Dynamic testing of highway bridges - a review.", *Transportation Research Record*, 1223, 93.
6. Bannantine, J. A., Comer, J. J., and Handrock, J. L. (1992). "Fundamentals of metal fatigue analysis.", *Prentice Hall*, New Jersey.
7. Benjamin, J. R., and Cornell, C. A. (1970). "Probability, statistics and decision for civil engineers.", *McGraw-Hill*, New York.
8. Bishara, A.G., Liu, M.C. and El-Ali, N.D. (1993). "Wheel load distribution on simply supported skew I-beam composite bridges.", *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, Vol. 119, No. 2, pp. 399-419.
9. Fu, C.C., Elhelbawey, M., Sahin, M.A. and Schelling, D.R. (1996). "Lateral distribution factor from bridge field testing." *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, Vol. 122, No. 9, pp. 1106-1109.
10. Ghosn, M., Moses, F., and Gobieski, J. (1989). "Evaluation of steel bridges using in-service testing." *Transportation Research Record 1072, Transportation Research Board*, Washington, D.C., pp. 71-78.
11. Hays, C.O., Sessions, L.M., and Berry, A.J. (1986), "Further studies on lateral load distribution using FEA." *Transportation Research Record 1072, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council*, Washington, 1986.

12. Hwang, E-S. and Nowak, A.S. (1991). "Simulation of dynamic load for bridges." *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, Vol. 117, No. 5, pp. 1413-1434.
13. Imbsen, R.A., and Nutt, R.V., "Load Distribution Study on Highway Bridge using STRUDL FEA" Proceeding, Conference on Computing in Civil Engineering, ASCE, New York, 1978.
14. Juntunen, D.A., and Isola, M.C. (1995). "Proof load test of R01 of 61131 M-37 over CSX Railroad, south of Bailey, Michigan.", *Michigan Department of Transportation*, Lansing, MI.
15. Kim, S., and Nowak, A. S. (1997). "Load distribution and impact factors for I-girder bridges." *Journal of Bridge Engineering, ASCE*. 2, 97.
16. Laman, J. A., and Nowak, A. S. (1996). "Fatigue-load models for girder bridges." *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, 122, 726.
17. Lichtenstein, A.G. (1998). "Manual for bridge rating through nondestructive load testing ." *NCHRP Project Number: 12-28(13)A, A.G. Lichtenstein and Associates, Inc.*, Fair Lawn, New Jersey.
18. *Michigan Bridge Analysis Guide*. (1983). Michigan Department of Transportation, Lansing.
19. *Michigan Design Manual: Bridge Design*. (1992) Michigan Department of Transportation, Lansing.
20. Moses, F. (1987). "Fatigue evaluation procedures for steel bridges.", *NCHRP Rep. No:299, Transportation Research Board*, Washington, D.C.
21. Nassif, H. and Nowak, A.S. (1995). "Dynamic load spectra for girder bridges." *Transportation Research Record*, No. 1476, pp. 69-83.
22. Nassif, H. and Nowak, A.S. (1996). "Dynamic load for girder bridges under normal traffic." *Archives of Civil Eng.*, Vol.XLII, No.4, pp. 381-400.
23. Nowak, A.S. and Hong, Y-K. (1991). "Bridge live load models." *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, Vol. 117, No. 9, pp. 2757-2767.
24. Nowak, A.S. (1993). "Live load model for highway bridges." *Journal of Structural Safety*, Vol. 13, Nos. 1+2, pp. 53-66.

25. Nowak, A.S., Nassif, H. and Frank, K.H. (1993). "Fatigue load spectra for steel girder bridge." *Transp. Research Record*, No. 1393, pp. 154-161.
26. Nowak, A.S., Kim, S-J., Laman, J., Saraf, V. and Sokolik, A.F. (1994). "Truck loads on selected bridges in the Detroit area.", *Final Report submitted to MDOT*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
27. Nowak, A. S., Laman, J. A., and Nassif, H. (1994). "Effect of truck loading on bridges." *Report UMCE 94-22. Dep. of Civil and Environmental Engineering*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
28. Nowak, A.S. (1995). "Calibration of LRFD bridge code." *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, Vol. 121, No. 8, pp. 1245-1251.
29. Nowak, A.S., Kim, S-J. and Stankiewicz, P.R. (1996). "Huron Parkway Bridge study.", *Report submitted to McNamee, Porter and Seeley and City of Ann Arbor*, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
30. Nowak, A.S. and Saraf, V. (1996). "Load testing of bridges.", *UMCEE 96-10, Final Report submitted to Mich. Dep. of Transp*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
31. Nowak, A.S., Kim, S-J. (1998). "Development of a guide for evaluation of existing bridges - Part I." *Report UMCE 98-12. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering University of Michigan*, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
32. Nowak, A.S. and Sanli, A, and Eom, J. "Development of a Guide for Evaluation of Existing Bridges, Part II." *UMCEE 98-13, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
33. Nowak, A.S. and Sanli, A, and Eom, J. "Development of a Guide for Evaluation of Existing Bridges, Phase II." *UMCEE 99-13, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
34. Nowak, A.S. and Eom, J. "Verification of Girder Distribution Factors for Existing Bridges." *UMCEE 00-10, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

35. Paultre, P., Chaallal, O., and Proulx, J., "Bridge Dynamics and Dynamic Amplification Factors-A Review of Analytical and Experimental Findings." *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering*, Vol. 19, pp. 260-278, 1992.
36. Saraf, V. and Nowak A.S. (1997). "Field evaluation of a steel girder bridge." *Transportation Research Record*, No. 1594, pp. 140-146.
37. Saraf, V., Sokolik, A.F., and Nowak, A.S. (1997). "Proof load testing of highway bridges." *Transportation Research Rec.* No.1541, pp. 51-57.
38. Schultz J.L., Commander B., Goble G.G., Frangpol D.M., Efficient field Testing and load Rating of Short – And Medium – Span Bridges, *Structural Engineering review*, Vol. 7, No 3 pp181-194, 1995.
39. Stallings, J.M., and Yoo, C.H. (1993). "Test and ratings of short-span steel bridges." *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE*, Vol. 119, No. 7, pp. 2150-2168.
40. Zokaie, T., Osterkamp, T.A., and Imbsen, R.A., Distribution of Wheel Loads on Highway Bridges, National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 12-26, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., 1991.

Appendix A. Information On Data Acquisition

A.1. Signal Types

Signals are often described as being either analog or digital. They are defined by how they convey useful data. Attributes such as amplitude, state, frequency, pulse-width, and phase can represent data.

A.1.1. Analog Signals

While all signals can be assumed to be changing with time, analog signals are the only ones that convey information within their incremental amplitude variations. In instrumentation and control applications, most analog signals are in the range of -10V to +10V or 4 to 20mA. Analog inputs can indicate how high a level is or how much stress is occurring in a girder.

A.1.2. Digital Signals

A digital signal is also called pulse. Digital and pulse signals have binary amplitude values; that is, they are represented by only two possible states - low and high. While low and high states can be represented by any voltage level, transistor-transistor-logic (TTL) levels are most often used. TTL levels are approximately 0V and 5V. The actual allowable ranges for TTL signals are :

Low level = 0V to 0.8V

High level = 2.0V to 5.0V

Thus, with analog signals what is important is how high the signal is, while with digital signals it matters only whether the signal is high or low (on or off, true or false). Figure A-1 illustrates the differences between analog and digital signals.




Fig. A-1. Digital and analog signals

A.2. Transducers

Sensors and transducers change physical phenomena into electrical signals. Therefore, they play a vital role in the electronic measuring systems. It is necessary to use different transducers to measure different physical values. A physical value may be force, stress, displacement, temperature, etc. The electrical equivalents produced by input transducers are most commonly in the form of voltage, current, charge, resistance or capacitance.

As will be shown, the process of signal conditioning will further convert these basic signals into voltage signals. This is important because the interior blocks of the data acquisition can only deal with voltage signals. Transducers which represent the measured value by means of the change of a physical property are called “passive transducers”. The strain gauge transducer belongs to this category. Transducers which deliver a voltage or current proportionate to the measured quantity are “active transducers”.

A.2.1. Strain Gages and Transducers

The strain gauge is one of the most important tools of the electrical measurement technique applied to the measurement of mechanical quantities. The strain of a body is always caused by an external influence or an internal effect. Strain may be caused by forces, pressures, moments, heat, structural changes of the material and the like.

Figure A-2 shows the principle construction of a standard strain gauge. Embedded between two plastic strips is the measuring grid, the active part of the gauge, and is made from a thin metal foil that is electrically conductive. The separate layers of the gauge are bonded together. The function of metallic strain gauges is basically a strain effect on the resistance of electrical conductors. The strain gauge must be mounted on the surface of the specimen of which the stress shall be determined. This is normally done with the aid of special cements. In Figure A-3, three different applications of strain gages are shown for a tensile load.




Fig. A-2. Schematic construction of an embedded foil gauge




Fig. A-3. Gauge designations of the tensile rod

Additional circuitry and instruments are needed to further process the measured value of the strain gauge. In 1843 the English physicist Sir Charles Wheatstone (1802-1875) found a bridge circuit for the measurement of electrical resistance. The Wheatstone bridge is well suited for the measurement of small changes of resistance and, therefore, is also suitable to measure the resistance change in a strain gauge. The form of this electronic circuit depends on gauge designation (Fig. A-4).




Fig. A-4. Different version of the Wheatstone bridge circuit

Special transducers can be designed for the measurement of strains. The transducer generally contains a properly formed spring element that produces a relation between the measured quantity and the strain on a suitable spot on the spring element (Fig. A-5). They are designed with a full bridge strain gauge configuration to increase their sensibility and to eliminate temperature effects.




Fig. A-5. An example of Strain Transducer

A.2.2. Linear Variable Differential Transformers (LVDT)

This transducer can convert the rectilinear motion of an object to which it is coupled mechanically into a corresponding electrical signal. A LVDT has one primary and two secondary coils. The magnetic core inside the coil winding assembly provides the magnetic flux path linking the primary and secondary coils (Fig. A-6). Secondary coils are connected serially to each other. When the LVDT is in its null position, the two voltages of secondary coils are of equal and opposite polarity. Thus, output voltage is zero. When the magnetic core is displaced from the null position, an electromagnetic imbalance occurs. This imbalance generates a differential AC output voltage across the secondary coils that is linearly proportional to the direction and magnitude of the displacement. Some LVDTs are designed together with their signal conditioning unit. In this case, the LVDT's need DC voltage as power, and they produce DC voltage.




Fig. A-6. Working principle of an LVDT

A.3. Signal Conditioning

Devices that convert analog signal to digital are usually designed to accept voltage inputs in the range of $\pm 10V$. Other signal ranges and signal types such as resistance or impedance changing generally require preprocessing to make them compatible. This task is known as signal conditioning and this unit is the component that delivers the electric signals from transducers to a data acquisition system. Signal conditioning device amplify low-level signals, isolate, filter, and excite bridge transducers to produce high-level signals for analog to digital devices.

A.3.1. Amplification

The most common type of conditioning is amplification. Most A/D converters are designed to operate with high-level input signals. Common A/D ranges include 0 to 10V, ± 5 , $\pm 10V$. When the maximum input signal is below 1V, accuracy is degraded. For the highest possible accuracy, the signal should be amplified so that the maximum voltage range of the conditioned signal equals the maximum input range of the A/D converter.

At the same time, every amplifier unit produces some noise. The amount of this noise depends on the amplification level and amplifier quality. Generally, noise increases faster after exceeding a specific value of gain factor. Therefore, there is an upper bound

of amplification level. Most often used unit for amplification is the decibel (dB). This unit is specified as follows;

$$Gain(dB) = 20 \log \frac{V_{out}}{V_{in}}$$

Where V_{in} and V_{out} are voltage values of the signals entering and leaving the amplifier, respectively.

Single-Ended and Differential Signals

Analog signals can be configured as either single-ended or differential input. Single ended inputs all share a common return or ground line. Only the high ends of the signals are connected to the amplifier. The low ends of the signals return to the amplifier through system ground connections. This arrangement works well for high-level signals when the difference in ground potential is relatively small. Problems arise when there is a large difference in ground potentials. This is usually caused by current flow (a ground loop) through the ground conductor.

A differential arrangement allows both the noninverting (+) and the inverting (-) inputs of the amplifier to make connections to both ends of the actual signal source. In this way, any ground-loop-induced voltage appears as a common-mode signal and is rejected by the differential properties of the amplifier. While differential connections can greatly reduce the effects of ground loops, they consume the equivalent of two single-ended inputs. Thus, a 16-channel, single-ended system can handle only 8 differential inputs.

A.3.2. Isolation

Another common application for signal conditioning is to isolate the transducer signals from the other divisions of the data acquisition system for safety purposes. The

system being monitored may contain high-voltage transients that could damage the computer.

An additional reason making isolation necessary is to make sure that the readings from the data acquisition device are not affected by differences in ground potentials or common-mode voltages. When the two channels of data acquisition system are each referenced to different grounds, problems occur if there is a potential difference between the two grounds. This difference can lead to what is known as a ground loop, which may cause inaccurate representation of the acquired signal, or if too large, may damage the measurement system. Using isolated signal conditioning modules eliminates the ground loop and ensures that the signals are accurately acquired.

A.3.3. Filtering

Filtering is used to separate desired signals from undesired signals, such as when an AC line frequency picks up and radio or TV station interference. All such signals are referred to as noise. Filtering can be performed, prior to the A/D conversion, using physical devices consisting of resistors, capacitors, inductors, and amplifiers. Filtering can also be accomplished, after conversion, using mathematical algorithms that operate on the digital data within the computer. This is known as digital signal processing (DSP).

Averaging is a simple example of DSP that is useful for reducing unwanted data fluctuations. By averaging a series of incoming data points, the signal-to-noise ratio can be effectively increased. Averaging will be most effective in reducing the effect of random, non-periodic noise. It is less effective in dealing with 50 or 60 Hz or other periodic noise sources. When the desired signal has lower frequency components than the error sources, a low-pass filter can be used. This includes the case where the real input signal frequency components can equal, or exceed, half the sampling rate. This filter is used to prevent sampled-data aliasing (Fig. A-7).

Aliasing results in the generation of spurious signals within the frequency range of interest that cannot be distinguished from real information. Hence, serious errors in the interpretation of the data can occur. Noise-filtering techniques, whether implemented in hardware or software, are designed to filter specific types of noise. In addition to low-pass filters, high pass and notch (band-reject) filters can also be used. For example, if the frequency band of interest includes the AC line frequency, a notch filter could be used to selectively remove this component.




Fig. A-7. Effects of Too Low Sampling Rate

A.3.4. Excitation

Signal conditioning also generates excitation for some transducers. Strain gauges, strain transducers and displacement transducers, for example, require external voltage or current excitation. Signal conditioning modules for these transducers usually provide these signals. Strain gauges are resistance devices in a Wheatstone bridge configuration, which often require bridge completion circuitry and excitation sources. Some LVDT type displacement transducers that have inductive components, require high frequency excitation voltage.

A.3.5. Linearization

Another common signal conditioning function is linearization. Many transducers have a nonlinear response to changes in the phenomenon being measured. Some

conditioners contain electronic circuits to linearize the response of the related transducer. But, generally, this process is done with software after the measurement.

A.4. Analog to Digital Conversion

A.4.1. Multiplexing

The multiplexer is simply a switch arrangement that allows many input channels to be serviced by one amplifier and one A/D converter (Fig. A-8). Software or auxiliary hardware can control this switch to select any one channel for processing at a given time. Because the amplifier and A/D converter are shared, the channels are read sequentially, causing the overall speed of the system to be reduced. The rated speed of amplifier and A/D converter will be divided by the number of input channels serviced. Therefore, the throughput rate is defined as the sample rate (per-channel speed) multiplied by the total number of channels.




Fig. A-8. A general data acquisition system

In an ideal system, all of the input channels would be read at the same instant in time. However, multiplexing inherently generates a time difference between each channel's reading. In general, many applications can tolerate the time difference between readings. However, some applications are very sensitive to time skew. In such time-

critical applications, the simultaneous sample/hold architecture is ideal (Fig. A-8). In these systems, each sample is held by a separate device before multiplexing.

A.4.2. Resolution

The number of bits that the analog to digital converter uses to represent the analog signal is the resolution. The higher the resolution, the higher the number of divisions the voltage range is broken into, and therefore, the smaller the detectable voltage changes. Figure A-9 shows a sine wave and its corresponding digital image as obtained by an ideal 3-bit ADC. A 3-bit converter divides the analog range into 2^3 , or 8 divisions. Each division is represented by a binary code between 000 and 111. The digital representation is not a good representation of the original analog signal because information has been lost in the conversion. By increasing the resolution to 16 bits, however, the number of codes from the ADC increases from 8 to 65,536.




Fig. A-9. Digitized sine wave with 3-bit resolution

A.4.3. Sampling

This parameter specifies how often conversion can take place. Using a faster sampling rate, more points will be acquired in a given time, providing a better

representation of the original signal. As shown in Figure A-7a, all input signals must be sampled at a sufficiently fast rate to faithfully reproduce the analog signal.

Obviously, if the signal is changing faster than the digital to analog converter is digitizing, errors are introduced into the measured data. In fact, data that is sampled too slowly can appear to be at a completely different frequency. This distortion of the signal is referred to as aliasing (Fig. A-7b).

According to the Nyquist theorem, a signal must be sampled at least twice the rate of the maximum frequency component to prevent aliasing. The frequency that is one-half the sampling frequency is referred to as the Nyquist frequency. Theoretically, it is possible to recover information about signals with frequencies at or below the Nyquist frequency. Due to aliasing, frequencies above the Nyquist frequency appear between the DC and Nyquist frequencies.

A.5. Recording

Last process of data acquisition is the recording of digitized signals. As a first step, these digital values are sent to semi-conductor memories called buffers. At the same time, in a microcomputer system, they are also sent to the computer's memory or directly to its hard disk. In general, recording to the computer memory is slower compared to the conversion time of the A/D system. Thus, buffer memories assure uninterrupted measuring and recording.

The separate systems that do not have magnetic media, such as a hard disk, record the signals in their internal memories. Their memory is generally big enough for at least a few measurements. They are often down loaded to the computer. This kind of measuring systems is also called as logger.

A.6. Noise

Signals entering a data acquisition and control system include unwanted noise. Whether this noise is troublesome depends on the signal-to-noise ratio and the specific application. In general, it is desirable to minimize noise to achieve high accuracy. Digital signals are relatively immune to noise because of their discrete and high-level nature. In contrast, analog signals are directly influenced by relatively low-level disturbances.

The major noise transfer mechanisms include conductive, inductive (magnetic), and capacitive coupling. Some noise transfer examples are:

- Switching high-current loads in nearby wiring can induce noise signals by magnetic coupling (transformer action).
- Signal wires running close to AC power cables can pick up 50 or 60 Hz noise by capacitive coupling.
- Allowing more than one power or signal return path can produce ground loops that inject errors by conduction.

Interference via capacitive or magnetic mechanisms usually requires that the disturbing source be close to the affected circuit. At high frequencies, however, radiated emissions (electromagnetic signals) can be propagated over long distances.

In all cases, the induced noise level will depend upon several user-influenced factors:

- Signal source output impedance
- Signal source load impedance (the input impedance to the data acquisition system)
- Lead-wire length, shielding, and grounding
- Proximity to noise source(s)
- Signal and noise amplitude

Another noise source is triboelectric induction. This refers to the generation of noise voltage due to friction. All commonly used insulators can produce a static discharge when moved across a dissimilar material. This effect is very small in most cases. However, it should not be ignored as a possible source of noise when motion of the cables or vibration of the system is involved. Special low-noise cables are available and use graphite lubricant between the inner surfaces to reduce friction.

In Table A-1, possible problems about noise and their solutions are summarized.

Table A-1. Troubleshooting guide for noise

Observation	Suspect	Possible Solution
Noise a Function of Cable Location	Capacitive coupling Inductive coupling	Use shielded or twisted pair. Reduce loop area; use twisted pair or metal shield
Average Value of Noise : Is not zero Is zero	Conductive paths or ground loops Capacitive coupling	Faulty cable or other leakage. Eliminate multiple ground connections Use shielded or twisted pair.
Shield Inserted Ground Significant Ground Insignificant	Capacitive coupling Inductive coupling	Use shielded or twisted pair. Reduce loop area; use twisted pair or metal shield.
Increasing Load Reduces Error Increases Error	Capacitive coupling Inductive coupling	Use shielded or twisted pair. Reduce loop area; use twisted pair or metal shield.
Dominant Feature Low Frequency	60 Hz AC line, motor, etc.	(1) Use shielded or twisted pair (2) Reduce loop area; use twisted pair or metal shield (3) Faulty cable or other leakage; eliminate multiple ground connections.
High Frequency	Electromagnetic radiation	Complete shield.
Noise a Function of Cable Movement	Triboelectric effect	Rigid or lubricated cable.
Noise is "White" or 1/f	Electronic amp., etc.	Not a cable problem.

Appendix B - Normal Probability Paper

The objective of this Appendix is to provide additional information on the construction and use of the normal probability paper. The construction of the normal probability paper is shown in Fig. B-1 and B-2.

B.1 Role of the normal probability paper

It is used for an efficient interpretation of statistical data

- applications in bridge engineering:
- evaluation of existing structures
- selection of repair/rehab materials
- to evaluate test data (material tests)
- to evaluate truck weight data
- to evaluate stress (or strain) data

B.2 Basic properties

Normal probability paper is a special scale, so that a normal distribution is represented by a straight line:

- any normal distribution is represented by a straight line
- any straight line represents a normal distribution.

For any distribution function, the mean and standard deviation can be read directly from the probability paper as shown in Fig. B-3.




Fig. B-1. Development Of Probability Paper Using Standard Normal Distribution.




Fig. B-2. Development Of Probability Paper Using Any Normal Distribution.




Fig. B-3. Mean And Standard Deviation Of A Normal Random Variable On Normal Probability Paper.

B.3 Use Of Normal Probability Paper

Manual procedure:

1. Collect the data to be plotted (e.g. n test results)

$$a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n.$$

2. Rank a_i 's, from the minimum to the maximum value. the rearranged a_i 's, are represented by

$$b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n$$

so that

$$b_1 \leq b_2 \leq \dots \leq b_n$$

3. For each b_i , calculate the probability corresponding to i,

$$p_i = i/(n+1)$$

4. Plot b_i vs. p_i , for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Computer procedure:

1. Prepare the file with original data to be plotted (e.g. n test results)

$$a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n.$$

2. Use rank command to rearrange a_i 's, from the minimum to the maximum value. the rearranged a_i 's, are represented by

$$b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n$$

so that

$$b_1 \leq b_2 \leq \dots \leq b_n$$

3. For each b_i , calculate the probability corresponding to i,

$$p_i = i/(n+1)$$

4. For each p_i calculate the corresponding value of the inverse standard normal function (available on most computers, if not then use the formula given on next page)

$$F_i^{-1} = \Phi^{-1}(P_i)$$

5. Using computer, plot b_i vs. F_i^{-1} , for $i = 1, \dots, N$.

Example

Plot Test Results On The Normal Probability Paper

original data:	5.9	6.5	7.2	5.5	6.4	6.5	5.3	6.8	5.9
rearranged data:	5.3	5.5	5.9	5.9	6.4	6.5	6.5	6.8	7.2
i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
$p_i = i/(n+1)$	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9




Fig. B-4. Example Of Data Plotted On The Normal Probability Paper

B.4 Inverse Standard Normal Function

$$x = \Phi^{-1}(p)$$

where p is probability.

for $p < 0.5$,

$$x = \Phi^{-1}(p) = -t + \frac{c_0 + c_1 t + c_2 t^2}{1 + d_1 t + d_2 t^2 + d_3 t^3}$$

where $c_0 = 2.515517$

$$c_1 = 0.802853$$

$$c_2 = 0.010328$$

$$d_1 = 1.432788$$

$$d_2 = 0.189269$$

$$d_3 = 0.001308$$

$$t = \sqrt{-\ln p^2}$$

For $p > 0.5$, Φ^{-1} is calculated for $(1 - p)$, and then

$$\Phi^{-1}(p) = -\Phi^{-1}(1 - p)$$

Normal random variable

Table B-1, $\Phi(x)$ for selected values of x .

X	$\Phi(X)$
4.0	0.9999683
3.0	0.99865
2.0	0.9772
1.0	0.841
0.0	0.5
-1.0	0.159
-2.0	0.0228
-3.0	0.00135
-4.0	0.0000317

Appendix C. Calculations of Load Carrying Capacities According to AASTHO LRFD Code.

C.1. Flexural Resistance

C.1.1. Prestressed Concrete Girders

The nominal resistance of prestressed concrete girders shall be taken as:

$$M_n = A_{ps}f_{ps}\left(d_p - \frac{a}{2}\right) + A_s f_y \left(d_s - \frac{a}{2}\right) - A_s' f_c' \left(d_s' - \frac{a}{2}\right) + 0.85 f_c' (b - b_w) \beta_1 h_f \left(\frac{a}{2} - \frac{h_f}{2}\right) \quad (C-1)$$

where:

M_n = nominal resistance specified for compact composite and compact non-composite sections (N-mm).

A_{ps} = area of prestressing (mm^2)

f_{ps} = average stress in prestressing steel at nominal bending resistance (MPa).

d_p = distance from extreme compression fiber to the centroid of prestressing tendons (mm)

A_s = area of non-prestressed tension reinforcement (mm^2)

f_y = specified yield strength of reinforcing bars (MPa)

d_s = distance from extreme compression fiber to the centroid of non-prestressed tensile reinforcement (mm).

A_s' = area of compression reinforcement (mm^2)

f_y' = specified yield strength of compression reinforcement (MPa)

d_s' = distance from extreme compression fiber to the centroid of compression reinforcement (mm).

f_c' = specified compressive strength of concrete at 28 days, unless another age is specified (MPa).

b = width of the compression face of the member (mm).

- b_w = width of web (mm).
 β_1 = stress block factor
 h_f = compression flange depth of an I or T member (mm)
 a = $c\beta_1$: depth of the equivalent stress block (mm)

$$f_{ps} = f_{pu} \left(1 - k \frac{c}{d_p} \right) \quad (C-2)$$

for which:

$$k = 2 \left(1.04 - \frac{f_{py}}{f_{pu}} \right) \quad (C-3)$$

for T-section behavior:

$$c = \frac{A_{ps}f_{pu} + A_s f_y - A_s' f_y' - 0.85\beta_1 f_c' (b - b_w) h_f}{0.85 f_c' \beta_1 b_w + k A_{ps} \frac{f_{pu}}{d_p}} \quad (C-4)$$

for rectangular section behavior:

$$c = \frac{A_{ps}f_{pu} + A_s f_y - A_s' f_y'}{0.85 f_c' \beta_1 b_w + k A_{ps} \frac{f_{pu}}{d_p}} \quad (C-5)$$

where:

- f_{pu} = specified tensile strength of prestressing steel (MPa)
 f_{py} = yield strength of prestressing steel (MPa)
 c = distance between the neutral axis and the compressive face (mm).

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta_1 &= 0.85 && \text{if } f_c' \leq 28 \text{ MPa} \\
 \beta_1 &= 0.85 - 0.05 \left(\frac{f_c' - 28}{7} \right) && \text{if } 28 \text{ MPa} < f_c' < 56 \text{ MPa} \\
 \beta_1 &= 0.65 && \text{if } f_c' \geq 56 \text{ MPa}
 \end{aligned} \quad (C-6)$$

C.1.2. Compact Steel I-Sections

For a non-composite compact steel I-section, nominal resistance shall be taken as:

$$M_n = F_y Z_x \quad (C-7)$$

where:

F_y = yield strength of steel

Z_x = plastic section modulus

For a composite compact steel I-section, nominal resistance shall be taken as:

$$M_n = M_p \quad (C-8)$$

M_p = plastic moment capacity, which can be calculated as described in section A6 -1 of the 1994 AASHTO LRFD Code.

The sections providing the flexural resistance of Eq.C-7 and 8 shall satisfy the following three checks:

a. Web slenderness check:

$$\frac{2D_{cp}}{t_w} \leq 3.76 \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_{yc}}} \quad (C-9)$$

where:

D_{cp} = depth of the web in compression

F_{yc} = specified minimum yield strength of the compression flange (MPa)

t_w = web thickness (mm)

E = modulus of elasticity of steel (MPa)

D_{cp} shall be calculated as follows:

a.1. For non-composite sections:

$$D_{cp} = \frac{D}{2A_w F_{yw}} (F_{yt} A_t + F_{yw} A_w - F_{yc} A_c) \quad \text{if } F_{yw} A_w \geq |F_{yc} A_c - F_{yt} A_t| \quad (\text{C-10})$$

otherwise,

$$D_{cp} = D \quad (\text{C-11})$$

where:

D = web depth (mm)

A_t = area of the tension flange (mm^2)

A_c = area of the compression flange (mm^2)

A_w = area of the web (mm^2)

F_{yt} = specified minimum yield strength of the tension flange (MPa)

F_{yc} = specified minimum yield strength of the compression flange

F_{yw} = specified minimum yield strength of the web

a.2. For composite sections:

- for sections in positive flexure, where the plastic neutral axis is in the web, D_{cp} shall be taken as:

$$D_{cp} = \frac{D}{2} \left[\frac{F_{yt} A_t - F_{yc} A_c - 0.85 f'_c A_s - F_{yr} A_r}{F_{yw} A_w} + 1 \right] \quad (\text{C-12})$$

where:

D_{cp} = depth of the web in compression at the plastic moment (mm)

A_s = area of the slab (mm^2)

A_t = area of the tension flange (mm^2)

A_c = area of the compression flange (mm^2)

A_w = area of the web (mm^2)

A_r = area of the longitudinal reinforcement included in the section (mm^2)

F_{yt} = specified minimum yield strength of the tension flange (MPa)

F_{yr} = specified minimum yield strength of the longitudinal reinforcement included in the section (MPa)

f'_c = specified minimum 28-day compressive strength of the concrete (MPa)

- For all other sections in positive flexure, D_{cp} shall be taken equal to 0 and the web slenderness requirement shall be considered to be satisfied.
- For sections in negative flexure, where the plastic neutral axis is in the web:

$$D_{cp} = \frac{D}{2A_w F_{yw}} (F_{yt} A_t + F_{yw} A_w + F_{yr} A_r - F_{yc} A_c) \quad (C-13)$$

- For all other sections in negative flexure, D_{cp} shall be taken equal to D .

b. Compression flange slenderness check:

For composite sections in positive flexure, this requirement is considered satisfied. For composite sections in negative flexure, or either positive or negative flexure cases of non-composite sections:

$$\frac{b_f}{2t_f} \leq 0.382 \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_{yc}}} \quad (C-14)$$

where:

b_f = width of the compression flange (mm)

t_f = flange thickness (mm)

c. Compression flange bracing check:

For composite sections in positive flexure, this requirement is considered satisfied. For composite sections in negative flexure, or either positive or negative flexure

cases of non-composite sections, the compression flanges of sections shall be braced to satisfy:

$$L_b \leq \left(0.124 - 0.0759 \left(\frac{M_L}{M_P} \right) \right) \left(\frac{r_y E}{F_{yc}} \right) \quad (C-15)$$

where:

L_b = the unbraced length (mm)

r_y = minimum radius of gyration of the steel section, with respect to the vertical axis (mm).

M_L = the lower moment due to the factored loading at either end of the unbraced length (N-mm).

M_P = plastic moment

F_{yc} = specified minimum yield strength of the compression flange at the section where r_y is determined (MPa).

C.1.3. Non-Compact Steel Sections

The nominal resistance of a non-compact section is taken as:

$$M_n = F_n S \quad (C-16)$$

where:

S = section modulus

For non-compact sections, bending stress rather than absolute moment is evaluated. The nominal flexural stress of each flange is defined as:

$$F_n = R_b R_h F_{yt} \quad (C-17)$$

where:

F_n = nominal stress specified for non-compact composite and non-compact non-composite sections (MPa).

R_b and R_h = flange-stress reduction factors

F_{yf} = specified minimum yield strength of the flange (MPa)

Hybrid Factor for Positive Flexure and Composite Sections, R_h

For flexural resistance of composite hybrid sections in positive flexure, the hybrid reduction factor shall be taken as:

$$R_h = 1 - \left[\frac{\beta\psi(1-\rho)^2(3-\psi+\rho\psi)}{6+\beta\psi(3-\psi)} \right] \quad (C-18)$$

where:

$$\rho = F_{yw}/F_{yb}$$

$$\beta = A_w/A_{fb}$$

$$\psi = d_n/d$$

d_n = distance from outer fiber of bottom flange

d = depth of steel section (mm)

F_{yb} = specified minimum yield strength of bottom flange (MPa)

F_{yw} = specified minimum yield strength of web (MPa)

A_w = web area (mm²)

A_{fb} = bottom flange area (mm²)

Hybrid Factor for Negative Flexure and Composite Sections or All Cases of Non-composite Sections, R_h

If the neutral axis of a composite hybrid section is located within 10% of the web depth from mid-depth of the web, or the section is non-composite, the hybrid factor shall be taken as:

$$R_h = \frac{12 + \beta(3\rho - \rho^3)}{12 + 2\beta} \quad (C-19)$$

where:

$$\rho = F_{yw}/f_{fl}$$

$$\beta = 2A_w/A_{tf}$$

f_{fl} = lesser of either the specified minimum yield strength, or the stress due to the factored loading in either flange (MPa)

A_{tf} = total area of both steel flanges and the longitudinal reinforcement included in the section (mm²)

For other composite hybrid sections in negative flexure, the hybrid factor shall be taken as:

$$R_h = \frac{M_{yr}}{M_y} \quad (C-20)$$

where:

M_y = yield resistance in terms of moment, when web yielding is disregarded (N-mm)

M_{yr} = yield resistance in terms of moment, when web yielding is accounted for (N-mm).

Load Shedding Factor for Compression Flanges, R_b

For composite sections, if either a longitudinal stiffener is provided, or equation the below is satisfied, then R_b shall be taken as 1.0.

$$\frac{2D_c}{t_w} \leq \lambda_b \sqrt{\frac{E}{f_c}} \quad (C-21)$$

If either of the above requirements are not satisfied or the section is non-composite, R_b shall be taken as:

$$R_b = 1 - \left(\frac{a_r}{1200 + 300a_r} \right) \left(\frac{2D_c}{t_w} - \lambda_b \sqrt{\frac{E}{f_c}} \right) \quad (C-22)$$

for which

$$a_r = \frac{2D_c t_w}{A_{fc}} \quad (C-23)$$

where:

λ_b = 5.76 for members with a compression flange area equal to or greater than the tension flange area

λ_b = 4.64 for members with a compression flange area less than the tension flange area

f_c = stress in the compression flange due to the factored loading (MPa).

A_{fc} = compression flange area (mm²)

Load Shedding Factor for Tension Flanges, R_b

For tension flanges, R_b shall be taken as 1.0.

The sections providing the flexural resistance of Eq.C-17 shall satisfy the following three conditions:

a. *Web slenderness check:*

$$\frac{2D_c}{t_w} \leq 6.77 \sqrt{\frac{E}{f_c}} \quad \text{without longitudinal stiffeners} \quad (C-24)$$

$$\frac{2D_c}{t_w} \leq 11.63 \sqrt{\frac{E}{f_c}} \quad \text{with longitudinal stiffeners} \quad (C-25)$$

where:

- D_c = depth of the web in compression in the elastic range (mm)
 f_c = stress in the compression flange due to the factored loading (MPa)

b. Compression flange slenderness:

For composite sections in positive flexure, this requirement is considered satisfied. For composite sections in negative flexure, or either positive or negative flexure cases of non-composite sections:

$$\frac{b_f}{2t_f} \leq 1.38 \sqrt{\frac{E}{f_c \sqrt{\frac{2D_c}{t_w}}}} \quad (C-26)$$

c. Compression flange bracing check:

For composite sections in positive flexure, this requirement is considered satisfied. For composite sections in negative flexure, or either positive or negative flexure cases of non-composite sections, the compression flanges of the section shall be braced to satisfy:

$$L_b \leq 1.76 r_t \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_{yc}}} \quad (C-27)$$

where:

- L_b = distance between points bracing the compression flange (mm).
 R_t = minimum radius of gyration of the compression flange of the steel section, plus one-third of the web in compression taken about the vertical axis (mm).

F_{yc} = specified minimum yield strength of the compression flange at the section where r_t is determined (MPa).

C.2. Shear Resistance

C.2.1. Concrete Sections

The nominal shear resistance, V_n , shall be determined as the lesser of the following two equations:

$$V_n = V_c + V_s + V_p \quad (C-28)$$

$$V_n = 0.25 f'_c b_v d_v + V_p \quad (C-29)$$

for which:

$$V_c = 0.083 \beta \sqrt{f'_c} b_v d_v \quad (C-30)$$

$$V_s = \frac{A_v f_y d_v (\cot \theta + \cot \alpha) \sin \alpha}{s} \quad (C-31)$$

where:

- b_v = effective web width taken as the minimum web width, with the depth d_v , modified for the presence of ducts where applicable (mm)
- d_v = effective shear depth taken as the distance, measured perpendicular to the neutral axis, between the resultants of the tensile and compressive forces due to flexure, but it need not be taken less than the greater of $0.9d_e$ or $0.72h$ (mm)
- s = spacing of stirrups (mm)
- β = factor indicating ability of diagonally cracked concrete to transmit tension
- θ = angle of inclination of diagonal compressive stresses (DEG)

- α = angle of inclination of transverse reinforcement to longitudinal axis (DEG).
- A_v = area of shear reinforcement within a distance s (mm^2)
- V_p = component in the direction of the applied shear of the effective prestressing force, positive if resisting the applied shear (N)

For non-prestressed concrete sections not subjected to axial tension and containing at least the minimum amount of transverse reinforcement, or which have an overall depth less than 400 mm, the following values may be used:

$$\beta = 2.0$$

$$\theta = 45^\circ$$

The minimum transverse reinforcement shall be taken as:

$$A_v = 0.083 \sqrt{f_c} \frac{b_s s}{f_y} \quad (\text{C-32})$$

where:

- A_v = area of a transverse reinforcement within distance s (mm^2)
- s = spacing of transverse reinforcement (mm)
- f_y = yield strength of transverse reinforcement (MPa)

C.2.2. Steel Sections

The nominal shear resistance of unstiffened webs of hybrid and homogeneous girders shall be taken as:

$$V_n = V_p = 0.58 F_{yw} D t_w \quad \text{if} \quad \frac{D}{t_w} \leq 2.46 \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_{yw}}} \quad (\text{C-33})$$

$$V_n = 1.48 t_w^2 \sqrt{E F_{yw}} \quad \text{if} \quad 2.46 \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_{yw}}} < \frac{D}{t_w} \leq 3.07 \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_{yw}}} \quad (\text{C-34})$$

$$V_n = \frac{4.55 t_w^3 E}{D} \quad \text{if} \quad \frac{D}{t_w} > 3.07 \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_{yw}}} \quad (\text{C-35})$$

where:

F_{yw} = specified minimum yield strength of the web (MPa)

D = web depth (mm)

t_w = thickness of web (mm)