



Bonneagar Iompair Éireann
Transport Infrastructure Ireland

TII Publications



Load Testing for Bridge Assessment

AM-STR-06014

June 2014

About TII

Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) is responsible for managing and improving the country's national road and light rail networks.

About TII Publications

TII maintains an online suite of technical publications, which is managed through the TII Publications website. The contents of TII Publications is clearly split into 'Standards' and 'Technical' documentation. All documentation for implementation on TII schemes is collectively referred to as TII Publications (Standards), and all other documentation within the system is collectively referred to as TII Publications (Technical). This system replaces the NRA Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (NRA DMRB) and the NRA Manual of Contract Documents for Road Works (NRA MCDRW).

Document Attributes

Each document within TII Publications has a range of attributes associated with it, which allows for efficient access and retrieval of the document from the website. These attributes are also contained on the inside cover of each current document, for reference. For migration of documents from the NRA and RPA to the new system, each current document was assigned with new outer front and rear covers. Apart from the covers, and inside cover pages, the documents contain the same information as previously within the NRA or RPA systems, including historical references such as those contained within NRA DMRB and NRA MCDRW.

Document Attributes

TII Publication Title	<i>Load Testing for Bridge Assessment</i>
TII Publication Number	<i>AM-STR-06014</i>

Activity	<i>Asset Management & Maintenance (AM)</i>
Stream	<i>Structures (STR)</i>
Document Number	<i>06014</i>

Document Set	<i>Standards</i>
Publication Date	<i>June 2014</i>
Historical Reference	<i>NRA BA 54</i>

NRA DMRB and MCDRW References

For all documents that existed within the NRA DMRB or the NRA MCDRW prior to the launch of TII Publications, the NRA document reference used previously is listed above under 'historical reference'. The TII Publication Number also shown above now supersedes this historical reference. All historical references within this document are deemed to be replaced by the TII Publication Number. For the equivalent TII Publication Number for all other historical references contained within this document, please refer to the TII Publications website.

Summary:

This Advice Note concerns the load testing of bridges for assessment and accompanies NRA BD 21.

**VOLUME 3 ROAD STRUCTURES:
INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE**

SECTION 4 ASSESSMENT

PART 6

NRA BA 54/14

**LOAD TESTING FOR BRIDGE
ASSESSMENT**

Contents

Chapter

1. Introduction
2. Load Tests
3. General Principles
4. Recommendations
5. References
6. Enquiries

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Older metal bridges (jack arch, trough deck, hogging plate, filler joist or similar types) and older concrete bridges may be found to be substandard when assessed using the calculation methods given in NRA BD 21 and NRA BA 16, the Assessment Standard and the associated Advice Note.
- 1.2 In many cases, bridges which seem to be carrying normal traffic satisfactorily without any undue signs of distress have "failed" assessment calculation. Understandably, Assessing Engineers have been reluctant to condemn such bridges on the basis of calculations alone and, consequently there has been growing interest in load tests as a possible means for increasing the assessed capacity.
- 1.3 Methods used for calculating the resistance model for assessment purposes are generally conservative. For example, composite action of the deck may be ignored and the transverse load distribution characteristics are taken as the bare minimum. Collapse tests carried out on a number of older types of bridges in the UK have shown that they may possess load capacities well in excess of the calculated values. This reserve capacity comes from additional sources of strength not normally taken into account in the calculations. Load testing can be used advantageously to identify such sources and to quantify, with a degree of certainty, the hidden reserve strength of individual bridges. NRA BD 21 recognises such possibilities and permits the use of load testing in certain circumstances.
- 1.4 This Advice Note is being published with a view to explaining the rationale behind the requirements given in NRA BD 21 concerning load testing.

Scope

- 1.5 Load tests referred to in this Advice Note are those essentially intended for use in conjunction with the assessment of a bridge and not those used for research-oriented experimental investigations.
- 1.6 The possibility that the assessment of a particular bridge could benefit from load testing can only be recognised by the Assessing Engineer. However, since this type of testing is primarily aimed at seeking out the hidden reserves of strength, the bridges most likely to be involved are those which contain features where such reserves may be found, and for which load testing is a practical proposition. Although not intended to be exhaustive, the following is a list of bridge types for which load testing may be usefully employed:
 - a) Small span bridges where either a single axle or a two-axle bogie could simulate the required traffic effects (i.e. the assessment loading).
 - b) Older bridges, of construction types now mainly unused, for which structural idealisation is particularly difficult. It is not envisaged at present that load tests will be meaningful in assessing masonry arch bridges.
 - c) In general, bridges without internal structural complexities such as transverse girders although such complexities by themselves would not mean that all types of tests would be pointless.
 - d) In general, bridges which, at least theoretically, can be termed as simply supported.
 - e) Failure due to inadequacy with respect to shear can be sudden and hence it is not envisaged that load tests will be used for aiding assessment of bridges for which inadequacy in shear is suspected from a preliminary assessment, unless the load levels can be kept sufficiently low and extra care is taken during the tests.

- 1.7 Load tests are used for assessment purposes as part of the NRA Stage 3 Assessment procedure. Generally load tests are divided into two categories; “Supplementary Load Tests” and Proving Load Tests”.

"Proving Load Tests" are intended as self- supporting alternatives to theoretical assessments. They are not permitted in Ireland.

"Supplementary Load Tests" are those which are intended to be used as an adjunct to theoretical calculations.

- 1.8 Tests carried out on redundant bridges or tests carried out for purposes other than improving the assessed load capacity of a bridge are not covered in this Advice Note.

Implementation

- 1.9 This Advice Note should be used forthwith for any load testing required for bridge assessment, provided that, in the opinion of the National Roads Authority, this would not result in significant additional expense or delay progress. Designers should confirm its application to particular schemes with the National Roads Authority.

2. LOAD TESTS

General

- 2.1 Load tests can take many forms, depending for example on the type of structure, the possible sources of any hidden strength and the particular weaknesses identified in the theoretical assessment. It is impossible to describe in a general manner any predetermined procedures for such tests. Clearly, the test procedure has to be drawn up individually for each case. The following is a brief description of the supplementary load tests defined in section 1.7.

Supplementary Load Tests to Verify Theoretical Assumptions

- 2.2 Supplementary load tests are those where vehicle, axle or patch loads, or combinations thereof, are placed on a bridge to determine individual aspects of its load resistance capacity so that assumptions made in the theoretical assessment can be made more pertinent to the individual structure. Such tests are carried out when the Assessing Engineer suspects that the structure may be stronger than indicated by a purely theoretical assessment. As mentioned in 2.1 above, there is no single procedure for supplementary load tests and each case has to be treated individually. However, the following procedure is given as an example of what such tests may involve in practice.
- 2.3 One or more test vehicles comprising an axle or a 2-axle bogie would be placed at various positions on the bridge. This load is intended to generate, for example, the bending moments produced by the assessment live loading. The loading, applied in increments, is kept well within the elastic range of the bridge flexural behaviour. The observed strains and deflections are then compared with corresponding theoretical values. If this comparison indicates hidden reserve capacity in the bridge, each possible source of the hidden strength such as end fixity, better transverse distribution and composite action are then examined, one by one, using knowledge gained in earlier collapse tests on similar bridges, where available.
- 2.4 If the hidden strength indicated by the test or a proportion of it can be accounted for and is justified then the theoretical model is modified and the assessment calculations are carried out using the revised model.

3. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Basic Principles of Assessment

- 3.1 The basic purpose of an assessment is to determine whether a particular bridge is able to carry the traffic of the day with adequate margins of safety. In order to satisfy this requirement, the assessment live load for short span bridges (loaded lengths less than 50m) allows for possible load increases due to axle impact effects, overloading and bunching of vehicles. The equivalent assessment live loading criteria for long span bridges are calculated by probabilistic means and have similarly been based on extreme loads. The assessment of a bridge primarily involves the checking of its adequacy at the ultimate limit state (ULS) for these extreme load conditions. The ULS conditions are, by their nature, intended to be of extremely low probability but nevertheless possible in reality. The partial safety factors are used in the calculations to ensure that sufficient margins of safety with respect to day to day loading are available and that the failure at the extreme situation remains of extremely low probability.
- 3.2 The adequacy of a bridge can only properly be determined, therefore, at the extreme load conditions represented by the ULS, and the commonly made observation that a particular bridge is known to be carrying certain loads regularly is of little meaning in terms of passing or failing assessment. If a bridge fails assessment at a particular load level and is used regularly without apparent distress by vehicles of that load level, it could simply mean that it has not been subjected to the most severe possible configuration of such loading and could still have less than the required margins of safety.
- 3.3 The assessment live loading (ALL) is a theoretical quasi-static representation of the actual traffic loading, which is composed of moving and discrete individual wheel contacts and is both repetitive and varying through time. This theoretical static loading is intended for use with calculations, which themselves have a certain degree of conservatism. The levels of the theoretical loading have been set so that when used with theoretical calculation methods, as far as past experience goes, the results will be safe. Hence it is questionable whether a static load test, without involving theoretical analysis, can adequately represent the real situation.
- 3.4 Road authorities have the responsibility to maintain adequate levels of safety for their bridges. Furthermore, they may not permit any activity, other than the intended use (i.e. for carrying the permitted traffic), which may result in reducing the levels of safety. It is insufficient just to show that a bridge can safely carry the traffic of the day, it must be demonstrated, as well, that it can also carry all other adverse combinations of possible vehicles with the adequate margins of safety.

Guiding Principles for Load Testing

- 3.5 Any load testing of a bridge should only be considered when calculated assessments, even after using the best available methods and information, such as results of material tests, recorded information on similar bridges and materials, maintenance and strengthening records etc., show it to be inadequate. Even then, such tests should only be used if there is a realistic possibility of improving its assessed capacity to a level which will be of significant benefit. For example, a reassessed capacity of a National road bridge to 7.5 tonnes may be of no practical use.
- 3.6 In order to avoid causing any damage, either during or subsequent to testing, to a bridge which is intended to remain in service after testing, the load levels used in the tests should not result in effects which exceed those caused by the loads carried by the bridge on a day to day basis. The size and placing of any test vehicles or axles are therefore important. For instance, the vehicle should not be deliberately mounted on the footpath to examine transverse stiffness. The estimates of day to day loading required for specifying the test maximum loads should be obtained from records or surveys.

-
- 3.7 The load test should be meaningful. This means, among other things, that the loading should reproduce both transverse and longitudinal effects. Furthermore, extreme care has to be taken in using the test results in assessment, bearing in mind that a one-off static test does not fully represent real traffic conditions.
- 3.8 The details of any load test should be agreed with the National Roads Authority. The testing body must have suitably qualified personnel in charge of the tests who are able to appreciate both the theoretical and practical implications of load testing. The assessing engineer must ensure that the test conforms to established practice and is not used as an exploratory research investigation.

Comments on Supplementary Load Testing

- 3.9 Based on the above principles, the following observations can be made regarding supplementary load tests.
- 3.10 This type of testing can be carried out reasonably safely and follows the principles of the NRA BD 21 requirements regarding load tests. However, extrapolation of the results of tests carried out with fairly low levels of loading to those likely to occur at the ultimate limit state needs caution. There is no safe basis for extrapolating unless the materials and their interconnections can be determined with a degree of certainty and earlier collapse tests have been carried out on bridges with similar materials and details so that some pattern of load carrying behaviour has been established.
- 3.11 Although the testing can be carried out by any competent test organisation in possession of the necessary equipment, it is essential to employ considerable specialist expertise in devising a load test, during the test itself and in the subsequent assessment, especially in deciding the reduction factors relating to earlier collapse tests.
- 3.12 When applying this method to bridges with suspected inadequate shear capacity, additional caution should be used as shear failure can be relatively sudden and the load levels used in the tests should be suitably limited.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 Supplementary tests which fall under the broad principles stated in NRA BD 21 and paragraphs 3.5 to 3.8, inclusive, of this Advice Note may be employed as an adjunct to assessment calculations.
- 4.2 Proving load tests are not permitted.
- 4.3 Load tests should be carried out only with the approval of the National Road Authority who will examine the Assessing Engineer's proposal and agree to the details of the tests. The Assessing Engineer should be directly responsible for the conduct of the tests as well as the subsequent interpolation of the results and must satisfy the National Roads Authority that the test itself will not reduce the existing safety levels by weakening the structure.
- 4.4 Research work on load testing methodologies in general, and those involving the use of structural reliability concepts in particular, has been undertaken in many countries⁽¹⁾. Use of such methodologies, when considered to be properly developed, may be used for individual assessments with the agreement of the National Roads Authority. In Ireland, research has been carried out in Ireland on the load testing and model simulations for a typical single span stone arch bridge⁽²⁾.

5. REFERENCES

5.1 NRA Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (NRA DMRB)

NRA BA 16 The Assessment of Road Bridges and Structures

NRA BD 21 The Assessment of Road Bridges and Structures

5.2 Fu G. and Tang J., Reliability Based Proof Load Factors for Short and Medium Span Bridges. 6th International Conference on Structural Safety and Reliability, Innsbruck, 1993.

5.3 Fanning P.J, Sobczaj L., Boothby T.E and Salomoni V., Load Testing and model simulations for a stone arch bridge. Bridge Structures, Vol.1, No. 4, December 2005 367-378.

6. ENQUIRIES

- 6.1 All technical enquiries or comments on this document or any of the documents listed as forming part of the NRA DMRB should be sent by e-mail to infoDMRB@nra.ie, addressed to the following:

“Head of Network Management, Engineering Standards & Research
National Roads Authority
St Martin’s House
Waterloo Road
Dublin 4”



Pat Maher
Head of Network Management,
Engineering Standards & Research



Bonneagar Iompair Éireann
Transport Infrastructure Ireland



Ionad Ghnó Gheata na
Páirce,
Stráid Gheata na Páirce,
Baile Átha Cliath 8, Éire



www.tii.ie



+353 (01) 646 3600



Parkgate Business Centre,
Parkgate Street,
Dublin 8, Ireland



info@tii.ie



+353 (01) 646 3601