### Load Rating of Metal Structures & Concrete Arches Under Fill











Jennifer Hart, PE Bridge Evaluation Team Manager

Chris Andrzejewski, PE Project Team Leader



Amy Huebschman, PE Structures Services Lead





# Under Fill Load Rating Progress & Application Development

- > 2011 AASTHO/TRB sponsored upgrades to CANDE-2007
- 2011-2012 Load ratings performed to generate H20 and HS20 Inventory and Operating LFR ratings for all under fill structures using CANDE: Culvert ANalysis and DEsign. > 900 Under Fill Structues
- ~2015 AASHTOWare BrR introduced the Culvert Analysis engine for reinforced concrete under fill slab structures.
- Ohio Department of Transportation shared a Metal Culvert spreadsheet with other DOTs.
- 2020 FHWA deadline for INDOT to complete and document all legal load ratings for all bridges.
- > 2022 CANDE Tool Box companion program useful for load rating.
- 2022 AASHTOWare BrR version 7.3 introduced Metal Culvert engine.

![](_page_1_Picture_8.jpeg)

# Culvert Load Rating Research

- NCHRP Project 15-28: Mlynarski, M., M.G. Katona, and T.J. McGrath. NCHRP Report 619: Modernize and Upgrade CANDE for Analysis and Design of Buried Structures. Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.D., 2008.
  - The product of this research is CANDE-2007.
  - In 2011, the CANDE-2007 software was updated to run on current versions of Windows
- NCHRP 15-54: Mlynarski, M., M.G. Katona, T.J. McGrath, and C. Clancy. Proposed Modifications to AASHTO Culvert Load Rating Specifications, Submitted July 2019.
  - Developed and executed full scale field tests on seven culverts. (Maryland, Massachusetts, Ohio, & Pennsylvania)
  - Developed and executed full analysis of subject culverts in both 3D and 2D.
  - Surveyed DOTs for current practices related to culvert rating. Ohio DOT and Michigan DOT provided Metal Culvert Spreadsheets.
  - Review current specification to determine where improvements could be made to the rating process.
  - 2022 CANDE Tool Box and revisions to CANDE analysis engine were developed to facilitate research.
  - Concrete Box models compared with AASHTOWare BrDR

### Under Fill Structures Missing Plans and/or Necessary Details

~190 Underfill structures, missing plans and/or necessary details rated using engineering judgment.

INDOT inspection assess culvert condition.

Select design vehicle based on year of construction. Use simple span moment comparison to generate all legal load rating factors.

Manual for Bridge Evaluation, 3rd Edition, Section 6.1.4 – Bridges with Unknown Structural Components

Average SU7 Legal RF = 1.6 (INDOT)

![](_page_3_Picture_6.jpeg)

pan Length	EJ Design RF	De	esign Vehio	le		Legal Vehicles						Eme	rgency Ve	hicle					
(ft)	HS20-44	H20-44	HS20-44	Min	H20-44	HS20-44	Alternate	AASHTO T	AASHTO T	AASHTO T	Lane-Type	SU4	SU5	SU6	SU7	Min RF	EV2	EV3	Min RF S
10		0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
20	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.00	1.7	1.7	1.4	1.9	2.1	2.4		1.7	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.37	2.0	1.4	1.35
30		0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
40		0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
50		0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
60		0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
70		0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
80		0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
90		0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
100		0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
110		0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	

### Reinforced Concrete Slabs & Box Structures Under Fill

~180 Underfill slab structures, previously rated using CANDE

Converted to AASHTOWare BrR following the introduction of the Culvert Analysis engine for under fill slab structures.

![](_page_4_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_4_Picture_5.jpeg)

### Metal Pipe Structures Under Fill

~180 Pipe structures rated using spreadsheet developed based on Design Data Sheet No. 19

Coordinated with INDOT inspection to collect field measurements.

Average SU7 Legal RF = 11.6 (INDOT)

**Chris Andrzejewski, PE** *Project Team Leader* 

United Consulting

-2022 AASHTOWare BrR 7.3 introduced Metal Culvert engine.

![](_page_5_Picture_7.jpeg)

### Reinforced Concrete Arch Structures Under Fill

~410 Rated using existing CANDE models & 2022 CANDE Tool Box.

2D FEA program developed for the structural design and analysis of soil bridges, buried culverts and underground structures.

Average SU7 Legal RF = 3.2 (INDOT)

#### Amy Huebschman, PE

*Structures Service Lead* EMCS, Inc

Future AASHTOWare BrR Enhancements planned to develop Concrete Arch engine.

![](_page_6_Picture_7.jpeg)

# Progress of Under Fill Evaluations

![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

Legal load ratings generated & decreased number of load ratings performed using Engineering Judgment

# 2023 Rating Program Used for INDOT Bridges

![](_page_8_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Which Structure Types?

- Corrugated Metal Pipes
- Long Span Structures
  - Horizontal ellipses
  - Low and high profile arches
  - Inverted pear shapes and pear arches
- Structural Plate Box Culverts

![](_page_10_Picture_8.jpeg)

# Why?

- Because Jennifer Hart said so?
- INDOT Bridge Inspection Manual (BIM) 3-5.0

#### 3-5.0 METHODS

Analytical methods should be used for load rating whenever possible. Engineering judgment may be used to supplement calculations. If necessary, when bridge geometry or material properties are not available and cannot be obtained economically, then engineering judgment may be used in place of analytical methods. In addition, a more conservative rating may be determined at the discretion of the Bridge Owner; this may mean posting the bridge at a lower tonnage than required by analysis.

AASHTOWARE Bridge Rating (BrR) shall be used to perform load ratings whenever possible. It is permissible to use other programs and/or engineering judgment in cases where the use of BrR is insufficient or not plausible due to program limitations. Additional resources are available on the bridge design website including a list of programs that may be used to supplement BrR.

![](_page_11_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### **Background Information**

- Load Rating Method
  - LRFR Methodology (Strength Limit State per LRFD 12.5.3)
  - Based on ODOT's CMP and Structural Plate Box Culvert Spreadsheets
    - Made public for use and modification
- Spreadsheet Assumptions
  - Ignores culvert skew to the roadway
  - Constant cover depth
  - Distributed load width is less than the culvert length
  - Single lane loaded only (including MPF) per LRFD 3.6.1.2.6a

![](_page_12_Picture_11.jpeg)

### **Topics Covered**

- Required information from field inspection notes and/or plans
- Overview of Spreadsheets
  - Changes needed to ODOT's spreadsheets
  - Methodology
- NCHRP 15-54: Proposed Changes to AASHTO Culvert Rating Specifications
- Incorporation into AASHTOWare BrR Version 7.3

![](_page_13_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_9.jpeg)

#### **Required Information for Pipes and Long Spans**

- Dimensions and properties
  - Structure type, seam type, span, rise, top radius, length, corrugation, metal thickness
- Cover\*
- Deterioration\*
  - Section loss
  - Deflection in the top
  - Seam failure (missing bolts/rivets)

\*Within the travel way

![](_page_14_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_11.jpeg)

### **Required Information for Boxes**

- Dimensions and properties
  - Span, rise, length, corrugation, metal thickness (crown <u>AND</u> haunch), inside bolt spacing (crown <u>AND</u> haunch)
- Cover\*
- Deterioration\*
  - Section loss
  - Deflection
  - Seam failure (missing bolts)

\*Within the travel way

![](_page_15_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_11.jpeg)

#### **Deeper Dive into Structure Identification**

- Contech's Structural Plate Design Guide
- Parts: Crown, Haunch, Rib, Leg, Arc
- Bolt spaces (N)
- Required Information
  - Arc Length (N) or Crown Plate (N) or Crown Rib Length (N)
  - Haunch Plate (N) or Haunch Rib Length (N)
  - Straight Leg Length (N)

![](_page_16_Figure_9.jpeg)

Image from Contech's Structural Plate Design Guide

![](_page_16_Picture_11.jpeg)

### **Corrugated Metal Pipe (and Long Span) Load Rating Spreadsheet Overview**

- Utilizes NCSPA procedure (NCSPA Design Data Sheet No. 19)
- LRFD 12.7 for calculating capacity and loads
- Rating Factors based on Capacity:

$$RF = \frac{C \pm \gamma_{dc} DC \pm \gamma_{DW} DW \pm \gamma_{EV} EV \pm \gamma_{EH} EH \pm \gamma_{ES} ES}{(\gamma_{LL})(LL + IM) \pm (\gamma_{AW})(AW)}$$

$$C = \varphi_c \varphi_s \varphi R_n$$

• Rating Factor based on AASHTO Minimum Cover Requirements: RF =  $H^2/(C \times h^2)$ 

![](_page_17_Picture_8.jpeg)

#### **BrR 7.3 vs CMP Load Rating Spreadsheet**

- Includes the ability for additional thrust due to the wearing surface and hydrostatic/saturated soil
- Allows multiple lanes loaded and varying fill depth
- Will ignore live load effects if criteria in LRFD 3.6.1.2.6a\* is met (RF --> 99)
  - \*NCHRP 15-54 has proposed changes to this criteria

![](_page_18_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### **CMP Load Rating Spreadsheet Overview**

- Input Tab Structure dimensions and information
- Output Tab Calculations and rating factors
- Reference Tabs Code references, section properties tables, steam strength tables, NCSPA Design Data Sheet No. 19, Critical Load Parameter

 Table A12-7—Minimum Longitudinal Seam Strength Corrugated Aluminum and Steel Pipe—Riveted or Spot Welded

$2 \times \frac{1}{2}$ and $2^{\frac{2}{3}} \times \frac{1}{2}$ in. Corrugated Aluminum Pipe								
Thickness (in.)	Rivet Size (in.)	Single Rivets (kip/ft)	Double Rivets (kip/ft)					
0.060	5/16	9.0	14.0					
0.075	5/16	9.0	18.0					
0.105	3/8	15.6	31.5					
0.135	3/8	16.2	33.0					
0.164	3/8	16.8	34.0					

![](_page_19_Figure_7.jpeg)

#### Table A12-1—Corrugated Steel Pipe—Cross-Section Properties

NCSPA DESIGN DATA SHEET NO. 19	LOAD RATING AND STRUCTURAL EVALUATION OF IN-SERVICE, CORRUGATED STEEL STRUCTURES
<ul> <li>serviceutality:</li> <li>a. Both totapus is no chilical to strength as ignorparly nettor.</li> <li>b. Both totapus is that and the platea are incomparly nettor.</li> <li>c. Both totapus is that and the platea are incomparly nettor.</li> <li>c. Both totapus is the nettor of the number of the instructured activity is the instructured activity is the instructure and the instructure activity is the instructure and the instructure activity is the instructure activity is the instructure activity is the instructure activity is a strengt of the instrengt of the i</li></ul>	$ \begin{array}{l} H. LOAD FATHCIApplicable only to sections carrying traffic. Fellowall structure reliaision guidance and basecelloualons on Fellow 3, 25 (20 most)      A. Basic ASSITC Equation:      Mass: Strength 1, 180 + 5F (L-1) - Ornating Load      Mass: Strength 1, 180 + 5F (L-1) - Ornating Load      Mass: Strength 1, 180 + 5F (L-1) - Investory Load      1. Wher      a. Massimum Strength is the massmum design      strength      b. FF = Flating Factor      c. D = Dend Load      d. L = I = Live Load I engalt      e. 13 = Load Factor      f. D = Dend Load      d. L = I = Live Load I engalt      e. 13 = Load Factor      f. D = Dend Load      f. L = Load Factor      f. For corrupated stoad structures      a. Masimum strength is:      1. Strengt$

Thickness	A	r	$I \times 10^{-3}$
(in.)	(in. <sup>2</sup> /ft)	(in.)	(in.4/in.)
0.028	0.304	_	_
0.034	0.380	—	_
0.040	0.456	0.0816	0.253
0.052	0.608	0.0824	0.344
0.064	0.761	0.0832	0.439
0.079	0.950	0.0846	0.567
0.109	1.331	0.0879	0.857
0.138	1.712	0.0919	1.205
0.168	2.098	0.0967	1.635

![](_page_19_Picture_11.jpeg)

#### **CMP Load Rating Spreadsheet Overview – Input Tab**

- Fill in yellow cells with measurements and structure information
- Refer to tables on the side and reference tabs for information

![](_page_20_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_5.jpeg)

\* For unsymmetrical structures, structures deflected more than 5% from design shape, or those that show localized distortions require that the actual maximum radius be determined in those distorted areas as show above. Use two times the actual maximum radius rather than the span in structural design checks. Typically this provides a conservative evaluation of the structure. Calculate maximum existing top radius by taking measurements around the upper periphery of the culvert using a ruler of length "P" to obtain values of "M". This should be done at selected stations along length of culvert, particularly at locations with noticeable sag.

#### LRFR of In-Service, Corrugated Metal Pipe Structures

Based on AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, Section 3, 4 & 12 & NCSPA Design Data Sheet No. 19 & ODOT Bridge Design Manual 2004 (effective 10-15-2010), Section 900

(do not use this spreadsheet to load rate structural Plate Box Culverts)								
Structure Information (from es	kisting bridge pla	ns & field n	neasurements):	]				
	("←" : choose from a drop-down list)							
Structure Type (to determine Minimum Cover):		Structural P	late Pipe	÷				
Seam Type (to determine Seam Strength):	Annular pipe w	/ spot welde	d, riveted or bolted seam	÷				
ucture Category (based on NCSPA Design Data Sheet No. 19)	Typical (NC	SPA design da	ata sheet No. 19, II. A. 1.)	÷				
* Depth of Fill "H" (ft) = (fill depth used for dead load calculations)	1.80							
* Minimum Cover Depth "H <sub>min</sub> " (ft) = (fill depth used to check minimum cover requirement)	1.80							
Span Length "S" (ft) =	15.00							
Rise "R" (ft) =	= 6.50							
Longitudinal Length of Structure "L" (ft) =	24.70							
Determine Actual Top Radius "Rt" (ft) =	9.50							
(can be determined by field measurements or hand								
	Metal Type		Steel	÷				
	Corrugation (if known)	6 x 2 (ste	el structural plate pipe)	÷				
	Gage number (if knowr		N/A	÷				
Metal Corrugation & Gage Information:	c (in) =		Note: if corrugation & gage num known, leave the input cells for "	nberare c""d"&				
	d (in) =		"t" blank; if corrugation & gage n	umber				
	t (in) =	0.250	are unknown, tield measuremen "d" & "t" are required.	ts of "c",				
Pipe Crown Deflection ** (if any) =	0%							
ss based on materials field evaluation (if any) =	0%							

![](_page_20_Picture_10.jpeg)

### Input Tab – Deviations/Additions from ODOT

- Culvert Condition Rating (NBI Item 62) Condition Factor
- $\eta_R$  Redundancy Factor 1.05 --> 1.00 per LRFD 12.5.4
- EV Legal Load LLDF per INDOT Bridge Inspection Manual (BIM) Part 3 Table 6A.4.4.2.3c-1 based on NCHRP 20-07 Task 410

![](_page_21_Picture_5.jpeg)

Table 6A.4.4.2.3c-1 - Generalized Live Load Factors yL for FAST Act Emergency Vehicles

EV Frequency	Traffic Volume (One Direction)	Live Load Distribution	EV2	EV3
10 EV anasinas	ADTT < 1000 free flowing	True or more longe	1.10	1.10
10 EV crossings	ADTT > 6000 free flowing	Two or more tanes	1.40	1.10
per day	ADTT > 6000 congested		1.50	1.20
10 EV ana since	ADTT < 1000 free flowing	From Defined	1.20	1.15
10 EV crossings	ADTT > 6000 free flowing	A palveie	1.50	1.35
per day	ADTT > 6000 congested	Anarysis	1.65	1.45
1 EV and in a	ADTT < 1000 free flowing	Transformer	1.10	1.10
1 EV crossing	ADTT > 6000 free flowing	I wo or more lanes	1.20	1.10
per day	ADTT > 6000 congested		1.30	1.10
1.537	ADTT < 1000 free flowing	Error D. Carol	1.20	1.10
I EV crossing	ADTT > 6000 free flowing	Analysia	1.30	1.20
per day	ADTT > 6000 congested	Anarysis	1.45	1.30

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> DF = LRFD-distribution factor. When one-lane distribution factor is used, the built-in multiple presence factor should be divided out.

#### Table from current INDOT Bridge Inspection Manual

![](_page_21_Picture_11.jpeg)

#### **CMP Load Rating Spreadsheet Overview – Output Tab**

- $RF = (C \gamma_{DC}DC \gamma_{EV}EV)/(\gamma_{LL}(LL + IM))$
- Capacity = Lesser of:
  - Wall Yield Strength
  - Wall Buckling Strength
  - Seam Strength
- Section Loss/Deflection accounted for in Wall Yield/Buckling Strength
- <u>No</u> straightforward guidelines to account for seam deterioration

Depth of cover	Seam Type:	Annular pipe w	- / spot welded, rive	ted or bolted	
Depth of cover	Les et et et et et				
Depth of cover	Longitudin	al Length of Str	ucture "L" (ft) =	24.70	
Depth of cover	AAS	HTO minimum	cover, "h" (ft) =	1.88	
	used to check AASH1	10 minimum co	ver requirment "H <sub>min</sub> " (ft) =	2.50	
φ <sub>loss</sub> = Section	Properties reductio	n factor on the e materials fie	basis of metal ld evaluation =	1.00	
φ <sub>1</sub> = Res	istance Factor for <b>wall</b> a	area and bucklin	g (Table 12.5.5-1)	1.00	
	φ <sub>2</sub> = Resistance Facto	r for seam strengt	h (Table 12.5.5-1)	0.67	
		δ = Soi	l density (k/ft <sup>3</sup> )	0.120	
		k = soil st	iffness factor =	0.22	
$\phi_{E}$ = Factor for	Distribution of Live on Backfill	Load with Dept Type (per AASHT	th of Fill based D LRFD 3.6.1.2.6)=	1.15	
Calculate the f <sub>c</sub>	, (critical buckling str	(AASHTO LRFD	12.7.2.4)		
if:	$S < \frac{r}{k} \sqrt{\frac{24E_m}{F_m}}$ , then j	$f_{cr} = F_u - \frac{F_u^2}{48E_m}$	$\left(\frac{kS}{r}\right)^2$		
if:	$S > \frac{r}{k} \sqrt{\frac{24E_m}{F_u}}, th$	hen $f_{cr} = \frac{12}{(ks)}$	$\frac{2E_m}{(r)^2}$		
Compare:	S (in) =	180.00	<	$\frac{r}{k}\sqrt{\frac{24E_n}{F_n}} =$	391.18
Therefore,	f <sub>cr</sub> =	40.24	ksi		
Calculate the T	ap (thrust capacity of	f the wall) :			
Se	am Strength (k/ft) =	132.0			
		1. wall yield s	trength = $\phi_1 \phi_{los}$	s F <sub>y</sub> A =	120.5
	T <sub>cap</sub> = less of:	2. wall bucklin	ng strength = f ¢	$\phi_1 \phi_{loss} f_{cr} A =$	146.9
		3. seam stren	gth = $\phi_2 x$ (seam	strength) =	88.4
Therefore,	T <sub>cap</sub> =	88.4	k/ft		

#### **CMP Load Rating Spreadsheet Overview – Output Tab**

- RF =  $(C \gamma_{DC}DC \gamma_{EV}EV)/(\gamma_{LL}(LL + IM))$
- Thrust due to Live Load and Dynamic Allowance:
  - ODOT and other states follow an older version of LRFD (conservative)
  - BrR follows current LRFD 3.6.1.2.6a\*
    - \*NCHRP 15-54 has proposed changes to the method of distribution
- Verify maximum number of axles for each vehicle to the span length

	H20-44	HS20-44	Alternate Military	AASHTO Type 3	AASHTO Type 3S2	AASHTO Type 3-3	Lane- Type*
Heavy Axle Load (kips)	32.00	32.00	24.00	17.00	15.50	14.00	10.50
neavy (1+IM) (kips) =	19.96	19.96	14.97	10.60	9.67	8.73	6.55
S <sub>axle 1</sub> (ft) =	14.00	14.00	14.00	14.00	14.00	14.00	14.00
xle 2 Load (kips)	8.00	32.00	24.00	17.00	15.50	14.00	10.50
P <sub>2 (1+IM)</sub> (kips) =	4.99	19.96	14.97	10.60	9.67	8.73	6.55
S <sub>axle 2</sub> (ft) =	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
xle 3 Load (kips)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
$P_{3(1+IM)}$ (lbs) =	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S <sub>w</sub> (ft) =	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00
H <sub>int</sub> (ft) =	5.07	5.07	5.10	5.13	5.13	5.13	5.15
<b>W</b> <sub>D</sub> (ft) =	4.33	4.33	3.91	3.55	3.47	3.49	3.29
<b>W</b> <sub>D</sub> (ft) =	4.33	4.33	3.91	3.55	3.47	3.49	3.29
H <sub>int-p</sub> (ft) =	13.25	13.25	13.25	13.25	13.25	13.25	13.25
L <sub>D</sub> (ft) =	3.16	3.16	3.16	3.16	3.16	3.16	3.16
$A_D = W_{D(total)} \times L_{D(total)} =$	13.69	13.69	12.37	11.22	10.97	11.06	10.40
P <sub>D</sub> (kips) =	19.96	19.96	14.97	10.60	9.67	8.73	6.55
$\rho_{(L+IM)} = P_D/A_D =$	1.46	1.46	1.21	0.94	0.88	0.79	0.65
F <sub>1</sub> =	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42
T(L+IM) (k/ft) =	3.28	3.28	2.72	2.13	1.98	1.78	1.46

 $\rho_{(\text{L+IM})}$  Increased for 0.2kip/ft for a 10' lane load

![](_page_23_Picture_10.jpeg)

### **Output Tab – Deviations/Additions from ODOT**

- Add INDOT Design, Legal, and Permit vehicles
- Update live load distribution to current LRFD code

Truck Configuration	LRFR Code Reference
H-20	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1a
HS-20	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1a
Alternate Military	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1a
AASHTO Type 3	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1a
AASHTO Type 3S2	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1a
AASHTO Type 3-3	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1a
Lane-Type*	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1a
EV2	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1a
EV3	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1a
NRL**	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1b
SU4	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1b
SU5	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1b
SU6	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1b
SU7	MBE 6A.4.4.2.1b

![](_page_24_Picture_5.jpeg)

\* Load and Resistance Factor Rating (LRFR) methodology only

\*\* Not to be used for load posting. Not required for Engineering Judgment (EJ) methodology.

Figure 3-4.2 Required Legal Vehicles

![](_page_24_Picture_9.jpeg)

### Structural Plate Box Culvert Load Rating Spreadsheet Overview

- Utilizes NCSPA procedure (NCSPA Design Data Sheet No. 19)
- LRFD 12.9 for calculating capacity and loads
- Rating Factors based on Capacity:

$$RF = \frac{C \pm \gamma_{dc} DC \pm \gamma_{DW} DW \pm \gamma_{EV} EV \pm \gamma_{EH} EH \pm \gamma_{ES} ES}{(\gamma_{LL})(LL + IM) \pm (\gamma_{AW})(AW)}$$

$$C = \varphi_c \varphi_s \varphi R_n$$

- Two Rating Factors:
  - Crown Capacity
  - Haunch Capacity

![](_page_25_Picture_10.jpeg)

#### **Metal Box Load Rating Spreadsheet Overview**

- Structural Plate Box Culvert Tab
  - Input: Structure dimensions and information, capacities, controlling axle group weight
  - Output: Load Rating Factor for crown and Load Rating Factor for haunch – use controlling RF
- Reference Tabs Code references, section properties tables, NCSPA Design Data Sheet No. 19

![](_page_26_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### **Continuing to Dive Deeper into Structure Identification...**

- Structure Number using Table 49C
- Using Tables 48A and 48B:

Structure Number

- + Haunch Gauge (HG)/Crown Gauge (CG)
- + Haunch Rib Spacing (HRS)/Crown Rib Spacing (CRS)

+ Cover

=> Rib Type + Verification of all information

![](_page_27_Picture_9.jpeg)

Photo showing rib bolt spacing in underside of structure

![](_page_27_Picture_11.jpeg)

#### Metal Box Load Rating Spreadsheet Overview – Input

- Fill in yellow cells"
  - Structure information
  - Moment capacity
  - Axle group weight
  - Load factors

![](_page_28_Picture_7.jpeg)

• Refer to tables on the side and reference tabs for information

	TA	BLE 33. PLATE	& RIB COMPO	SITE SECTION	PROPERTIES	, )				
	Metal Thickness, Inches									
	Spacing	0.125	0.150	0.175	0.200	0.225	0.250			
Rib Type	(Inches on Center)		Plastic M	oment Cap	acity, M_ ( k	ip-ft./ft.)				
No Rib		2.65	3.18	3.71	4.24	4.77	5.30			
Type II	@ 54	4.62	5.46	6.04	6.61	7.17	7.74			
	@ 27	6.18	7.25	7.94	8.60	9.25	9.87			
	@ 18	7.41	8.66	9.48	10.26	11.00	11.71			
	@ 9	10.63	12.13	13.08	14.05	15.03	16.02			
Type IV	@ 54	5.87	6.82	7.43	8.04	8.63	9.21			
	@ 27	8.32	9.59	10.39	11.14	11.85	12.55			
	@ 18	10.42	11.90	12.84	13.72	14.57	15.39			
	@ 9	16.45	18.46	19.41	20.38	21.37	22.37			
Type VI	@ 54	8.74	9.51	10.24	10.95	11.64	12.32			
	@ 27	13.76	14.33	15.16	16.19	17.36	17.48			
	@ 18	20.09	20.56	20.79	21.30	21.74	22.58			
	@ 9	32.24	34.35	36.46	38.54	39.88	40.63			

	TABLE 32. SECTION PROPERTIES OF PLATES ONLY 9" X 2-1/2" CORRUGATION								
Thickness (Inches)	Moment of Inertia (In.4/Ft.)	Section Modulus (In.³/Ft.)	Radius of Gyration (Inches)	Area of Section (In.²/Ft.)	Ultimate Seam Strength (kip/ft.)				
0.100	0.997	0.767	0.844	1.404	28.0				
0.125	1.248	0.951	0.844	1.750	41.0				
0.150	1.499	1.131	0.845	2.100	54.1				
0.175	1.751	1.309	0.845	2.449	63.7				
0.200	2.004	1,484	0.846	2,799	73.4				
0.225	2.258	1.657	0.847	3.149	83.2				
0.250	2.513	1.828	0.847	3.501	93.1				

#### LRFR of In-Service Structural Plate Box Culverts

Based on AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, Section 12 & NCSPA Design Data Sheet No. 19 & ODOT Bridge Design Manual 2004 (effective 10-15-2010), Section 900

![](_page_28_Figure_13.jpeg)

	Geometric Requirements for Box Culverts								
S =	Span	8'-9" to 25'-5"							
R =	Rise	2'-6" to 10'-6"							
r <sub>c</sub> =	Radius of crown	≤ 24'-9½"							
r <sub>h</sub> =	Radius of haunch	≥ 2'-6"							
Δ =	Haunch radius included angle	50° to 70°							
D =	Length of leg	measured to the bottom of the plate, may vary from 4¾" to 71"							
L =	Minimum length of rib on leg	least of 19", (D-3.0)", or to within 3.0" of the top of a concrete footing.							
H =	Height of cover from the box culvert rise to top of pavement	1.4' ≤ H ≤ 5.0'							

\* Compare the actual field measurements with the geometric requirements listed here, this spreadsheet can not be used if the geometric requirements are not meet. In that case, special analysis maybe required.

![](_page_28_Picture_16.jpeg)

#### Metal Box Load Rating Spreadsheet Overview – Input

- Capacity
  - Moment is distributed between the crown and haunch based on their relative stiffness
  - Adjust ratio of crown load to make ratios equal
- Live Load
  - Looks at axle group producing largest load

![](_page_29_Picture_7.jpeg)

		-					
Box Culvert Moment Capacity:							
	M <sub>cap (Crown)</sub> =	28.00	k-ft/ft				
	M <sub>cap (Haunch)</sub> =	12.00	k-ft/ft				
M <sub>cap</sub> is the moment cap	pacity of the crown or hau	unch (M <sub>o</sub> ) adjuste	d for conditio	n factors a	s shown in	the approp	riate

M<sub>cap</sub> is the moment capacity of the crown or haunch (M<sub>p</sub>) adjusted for condition factors as shown in the appropriate table in Appendix D of NCSPA Design Data Sheet No. 19 for Steel Box Culverts, see worksheet "steel box Mp tables" for M<sub>p</sub> values. For Aluminum Box Culverts manufactured by CONTECH, see worksheet "CONTECH-aluminum box Mp tables" for M<sub>p</sub> values. For Aluminum Box Culverts manufactured by other manufacturer, please contact the manufacturer for M<sub>p</sub> values.

![](_page_29_Figure_10.jpeg)

### Metal Box Load Rating Spreadsheet – Deviations/Additions from ODOT

- Add Culvert Condition Rating (NBI Item 62)
- Add structure information (rib spacing, plate thickness, etc.)
- $\eta_R$  Redundancy Factor 1.05 -- > 1.00 per LRFD 12.5.4
- EV Legal Load LLDF per INDOT BIM Part 3 Table 6A.4.4.2.3c-1 based on NCHRP 20-07 Task 410

![](_page_30_Picture_6.jpeg)

Table from Contech's Structural Plate Design Guide

![](_page_30_Picture_8.jpeg)

### Metal Box Load Rating Spreadsheet – Deviations/Additions from ODOT

- Add INDOT Design, Legal, and Permit vehicles
- Add Dynamic Allowance to Live Load per LRFD 3.6.2.2
- Add Multiple Presence Factor per LRFD 3.6.1.2.6a
- Change C<sub>2</sub>, adjustment coefficient for number of wheels per axle, table reference per LRFD C12.9.4.2

![](_page_31_Picture_6.jpeg)

Table 12.9.4.2-1—Adjustment Coefficient Values (C2) for Number of Wheels per Axle

Wheels per Notional Axle	Cover Depth (ft)				
Group	1.4	2.0	3.0	5.0	
2	1.18	1.21	1.24	1.02	
4	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
8	0.63	0.70	0.82	0.93	

Table from LRFD 9

![](_page_31_Picture_10.jpeg)

#### Metal Box Load Rating Spreadsheet – Tips for Low Ratings

- Take good photos to assist in proper structure identification
- Record accurate cover measurements (levels and string lines)
- Check plans for an accurate backfill density
- Reach out to Contech with the structure stamp information as they may have plans or additional information

![](_page_32_Picture_6.jpeg)

Photo showing structure stamp on underside of crown plate

![](_page_32_Picture_8.jpeg)

 A link to ODOT's webpage where the spreadsheet can be obtained will be hosted on INDOT's Design and Load Rating page

![](_page_33_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_4.jpeg)

### **Oldest Bridge in the World**

- Arkadiko Bridge (Kazarma Bridge)
- Est. ~1300 BC, Greece
- Greek Bronze Age, Mycenaen Period
- 72'-0" long with a 3'-0" Span

![](_page_34_Picture_6.jpeg)

### **EMCS Load Rating Contract**

- 78 Underfill Structures
- 31 Arches (New and Old)

# Nabin Ghimire – EMCS

**Mohamed Ahmed – Clark Dietz** 

![](_page_35_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_8.jpeg)

### **Current Design Guidance**

- INDOT Bridge Inspection Manual, Part 3 Load Rating
- AASHTO Manual for Bridge Evaluation, 3rd Edition with 2022 Interim Revisions
- AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition, 2020
- CANDE 2022 Culvert Analysis and Design Solution Methods and Formulations
- CANDE Tool-Box Manual for Load Rating

#### THE MANUAL FOR BRIDGE EVALUATION

![](_page_36_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_9.jpeg)

#### AASHTO MBE – 6A.10.4 Load Rating Equation for Culverts (Rev 2020)

$$RF = \frac{C \pm \gamma_{dc} DC \pm \gamma_{DW} DW \pm \gamma_{EV} EV \pm \gamma_{EH} EH \pm \gamma_{ES} ES}{(\gamma_{LL})(LL + IM) \pm (\gamma_{AW})(AW)}$$

$$C = \varphi_c \varphi_s \varphi R_n$$

### Load Factors (Strength I)-

- $\gamma_{\text{EV}}$  = LRFD BDS TABLE 3.4.1-1
- $\gamma_{EH} = 1.35 Max, 1.00 Min (Rect. ONLY)$
- $\gamma_{ES}$  = 1.50 Max, 0.75 Min
- $\gamma_{LL} = 2.00$

 $\gamma_{AW} = 2.00$  (Rect. ONLY)

- EV = Vertical Earth Pressure
- EH = Horizontal Earth Pressure
- ES = Uniform Earth Surcharge
- AW = Approaching Wheel Load

![](_page_37_Picture_14.jpeg)

#### AASHTO MBE – 6A.10.3 Culvert Rating; Finite Element Modeling

- Finite Element Program is Routinely Used
- MBE.C6A.10.3.3, CANDE
  - Continuous Load Scaling (CLS) Spread Live Load Longitudinally
  - Soil Modeling Duncan Soil Model
- LUSAS Geotechnical Soil-Structure Interaction

![](_page_38_Picture_7.jpeg)

CANDE- 2022 Culvert Analysis and Design

![](_page_38_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_10.jpeg)

### CANDE Software - FHWA Sponsored Est. 1973 – 2022 (FREE)

- <u>https://www.candeforculverts.com/home</u>
  - 1. Download CANDE-2007 with 2011 Upgrade
  - 2. Copy CANDE–2022 to Folder: C:\Program Files (x86)\CANDE-2007

	> This PC > Local Disk (C:) > Program	n Files (x86) > CANDE-200	)/		
]	Name	Date modified	Туре	Size	
	help	2/14/2023 3:17 PM	File folder		
	🚳 AbanGeometry.dll	7/30/2011 12:16 PM	Application exten	28 KB	
	🚳 absngnrl.dll	7/30/2011 12:16 PM	Application exten	16 KB	
2	] 🗟 CANDE_DLL.dll	6/30/2022 3:35 PM	Application exten	2,640 KB	
	CANDE_InputData_ClassLibrary.dll	7/30/2011 12:16 PM	Application exten	132 KB	
	CANDE_XML_ClassLibrary.dll	7/30/2011 12:16 PM	Application exten	52 KB	

3. Verify in Output Utilizing 2022

\*\*\* WELCOME TO CANDE-2022 (Version January, 2022) \*\*\*

![](_page_39_Figure_8.jpeg)

CANDE- 2022

![](_page_39_Picture_9.jpeg)

#### **CANDE Overall Design Steps**

- 1. Level 2 Half Mesh File
  - Pipe, Box and Arch
  - Auto Creates Finite Element Mesh (Nodes, Elements)
  - Many Existing Ratings in the Bridge File (ERMS)
- 2. Level 3 Full Mesh File via CANDE Tool Box
- 3. Level 3 Full Mesh File with Pavement Addition via CANDE Tool Box
- 4. Level 3 Full Mesh File with Moving Loads via CANDE Tool Box
- 5. Load Rating via CANDE Tool Box

![](_page_40_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_11.jpeg)

#### Step 1. CANDE Level 2 Half Mesh File - Geometric & Material Input

- New Model Scratch
  - Have Template for Input
  - Arbitrary Reinforcement Shape Recommended (Varied Wall Thickness and Reinforcement)
  - CREATES LEVEL 2 with Missing Input
    - = Level2.##-#######.cid
- FOLDER WITH FILES

	Control Information
Type of analysis Analysis Design	Level 2 Specific Canned mesh type Soil mesh pattem O Pipe mesh O Embankment
Method of analysis/design <ul> <li>LRFD</li> <li>Service</li> </ul>	Box mesh     O Box mesh     Arch mesh     Interface elements (pipe only)
Solution level Basticity (Level 1) FEM-auto mesh (Level 2) FEM-user mesh (Level 3)	<ul> <li>Pipe-soil</li> <li>Trench-insitu</li> <li>None</li> </ul>
Use the auto-generate option for the interface elements	MOD-Make changes to the basic mesh         Number of nodes to change         Number of elements to change         Number of nodes to change         Number of elements to change         Number of new loading/boundary conditions
Str.006-46-01374	Heading for output

![](_page_41_Picture_9.jpeg)

#### CANDE Level 2 Half Mesh File - Geometric & Material Input

C:\Users\amh\Documents\TEMP\CANDE Test\Level2-AN	ALYS-LRFD-TREN-Arch-CONCRETE - [	Input Co — 🗆 🗘
🖳 File Edit Run View Window Help		- 8
	31	
Show Help Show input	<b>0 0</b> M	laster Control A-1
Master Control - A	Type of analysis     Analysis	
Master Control 1	O Design	
Pipe Definition - B	Method of analysis	
Concrete Material and Strength Properties	LRFD	
Concrete Material Properties 2	O Service	
Concrete Wall Thickness and Reinforcement Pr	Solution level	
Concrete Resistance Factors for LRFD Limit Sta	<ul> <li>Elasticity (Level 1)</li> </ul>	
Solution Level Statements - C	FEM-auto mesh (Level 2)	
X Plot and Print Control (Level 2-Ach)	EEM-user mesh (Level 3)	
X Arch and Footing Dimensions (Level 2-Arch)	O TEM daer mean (Bever 5)	
Arch Segments and Angles (Level 2-Arch)	New Jerrit Pla	1
Control Parameters for Changes to Nodes, Elements	New Input file	Heading for output
Material Definition Statements - D	1	Number of culvert element groups
Material Definition 1 (in situ)	¥	
Matenal Control Parameters(Matenal 1)	30	Maximum number of iterations/step
Material Definition 2 (footing)		-
Material Control Parameters(Material 2)	0	Culvert ID (Process 12-50)
X Isotropic Linear Elastic Parameters	0	Process ID (Process 12-50)
Material Definition 3 (backfill)		
Material Control Parameters(Material 3)	0	Subdomain ID (Process 12-50)
X Isotropic Linear Elastic Parameters		1
Material Definition 4 (Interface 1)	Accept Input Cancel	
Matenal Control Parameters(Matenal 4)		
Material Definition 5 (Interface 2)		
Material Control Parameters(Material 5)		
Interface Angles		
Material Definition 6 (Interface 3)		
Material Control Parameters(Material 6)		
Interface Angles		
Material Definition 7 (Interface 4)		
Material Control Parameters(Material /)		
Material Definition 8 (Interface 5)		
Material Control Parameters(Material 8)		
Interface Angles		
Material Definition 9 (Interface 6)		
Material Control Parameters(Material 9)		
Interface Angles		
i 🗇 I Material Definition 10 (Interface 7)		
	J#J	
Ienu Selected: Master Control 1 Done	2	

 Half Arch Mesh with Load Steps for backfill of arch

![](_page_42_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### **CANDE Level 2 Half Mesh File**

• Material Properties (Pipe Definition 1)

#### Concrete

![](_page_43_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### 00

Material (Concrete) B-4 Arbitrary Specified Wall Thickness and Reinforcement Steel

	Wall thickness (in)	As Cage 1 (in^2/in)	As Cage 2 (in^2/in)	Cover Cage 1 (ìn)	Cover Cage 2 <mark>(</mark> in)
▶ 1	8	0.026	0.026	2	2
2	8	0.026	0.026	2	2
3	8	0.026	0.026	2	2
4	8	0.026	0.026	2	2
5	8.125	0.026	0.026	2	2
6	8.25	0.026	0.026	2	2
7	8.5	0.026	0.026	2	2
8	9	0.026	0.026	2	2
9	9.5	0.026	0.026	2	2
10	10.25	0.026	0.026	2	2
11	11	0.026	0.026	2	2
12	11.875	0.026	0.026	2	2
13	12.875	0.026	0.026	2	2
14	14	0.026	0.026	2	2
15	15.25	0.026	0.026	2	2
16	16.75	0.026	0.026	2	2
17	21.625	0.026	0.026	2	2
18	27.875	0.026	0.026	2	2
19	34	0.026	0.026	2	2
20	40.25	0.026	0.026	2	2

![](_page_43_Picture_8.jpeg)

#### **CANDE Level 2 Half Mesh File**

• Material Properties (Pipe Definition 1)

![](_page_44_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### **CANDE Level 2 Half Mesh File -** Geometric Definitions

![](_page_45_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### **CANDE Level 2 Half Mesh File -** Geometric Definitions

![](_page_46_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### **CANDE Level 2 Half Mesh File -** Geometric Definitions – OVERRIDES (opt.)

Level 2 - CX-1 Nodes, Elements and Boundary Conditi Extended	on Changes
Number of nodes to be changed with new coordinates	58
Number of elements to be changed with new properties	0
Number of new loading/boundary conditions to be added	0

#### Added Nodal Point Changes Input

Level 2 - CX-2
 Nodal Point Number and Changed Coordinates
 Extended

	Node Number	X-coordinate (în)	Y-coordinate (în)
• 1	198	0	118.002
2	200	0	118.002
3	199	0	118.002
4	194	12.668	117.58
5	196	12.668	117.58
6	195	12.668	117.58
7	190	25.282	116.323

Number of Nodes from Crown	Pipe-soil Interface Nodes <sup>(1)</sup>	Number of Nodes from Crown	Pipe-soil Interface Nodes <sup>(1)</sup>
1	198,200,199	11	132,143,133
2	194,196,195	12	130,144,131
3	190,192,191	13	128,145,129
4	167,169,168	14	118,120,119
5	164,166,165	15	115,117,116
5	164,166,165	15	115,117,116
6	161,163,162	16	109,111,110
7	158,160,159	17	103,105,104
8	138,140,139	18	97,99,98
9	136,141,137	19	91,93,92
10	134,142,135	20	(2)

Identification of interface element nodal connectivity

Notes:

 Three nodes define the pipe-soil interface at each pipe node around the arch. For every node triplet above (a, b, c),

a = pipe node IX(1)

b = soil node IX(2)

c = "free node" IX(3)

(2) Note that position #20, the arch connection into the footing, is not assigned an interface element.

Fig A-1: Pipe-soil Interface Nodes, Ref-Table 5.5-5, CANDE-2007 User Manual and Guideline

![](_page_47_Picture_14.jpeg)

#### **CANDE Level 2 Half Mesh File – Concrete Resistance Factors**

- 1. Steel Rebar Yielding due to Tension Stress: **0.90** (AASHTO 5.5.4.2)
- Concrete Crushing due to Thrust and Moment: 0.75 (AASHTO 5.5.4.2, Compression – Controlled Section with Spirals or Ties – Two Way Action Similar Support Condition)
- 3. Resistance factor for concrete shear failure: **0.90** (AASHTO 12.5.5-1, *Reinforced Concrete Pipe -Non-Direct Design*)
- 4. Resistance factor for radial concrete tension: **0.90** (AASHTO 12.5.5-1, Reinforced Concrete Pipe -Non-Direct Design)
- 5. Allowable crack width for service load: 0.01 in (AASHTO C5.6.7, Control of Cracking... Class 1 Exposure 0.017 in, NA typ)

#### CANDE Level 2 Half Mesh File – Material (Soil) Definitions

- In Situ Soil Below Footing and Trench, Standard Isotropic Linear Elastic
- Footing Concrete
- Backfill Unknown = ML95; Sandy Silt Soil with 95% Compaction

Duncan / Selig Soil Model; Density : 125pcf - 135 pcf

• Interface 1-19 – Angle for all 19 Interfaces

Coefficient of Friction = 0.3 (up to 1,000 - Bonded)

Tensile Breaking Force = 10 lb/in (up to 10,000 - Bonded)

![](_page_49_Picture_9.jpeg)

#### Step 2a. CANDE Level 3 Full Mesh File – CANDE Tool Box

• Selection Option 1 – Convert Level-2 Input File to Full – Mesh Level -3 File

![](_page_50_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### Step 2b. CANDE Level 3 Full Mesh File – CANDE

• Open Updated "Full –" .cid File in CANDE and Run

![](_page_51_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### Step 3a. CANDE Level 3 Pavement / DC Loads Addition – CANDE Tool Box

 Select Option 2 – Insert Pavement on Mesh-Surface of Full-Mesh Level-3 File

Enter the menu number below:

Menu number = 2

MENU OPTION #2: ADD ELASTIC PAVING LAYER OVER SOIL SURFACE, AND/OR CHANGE TOP SOIL LAYER TO AN ELASTIC WEARING COURSE. Using the following browser screen, select the Level 3 cid file to be modified to include elastic surface treatment.

Press enter to see browser screen.

Selected CID File Name = Full-Level2-ANALYS-LRFD-TREN-Arch-CONCRETE.cid

Good Start! First input line A-1 reads: Heading = Str.006-46-01374

Select treatment for soil-surface suboptions:

Enter 1 - to add pavement layer over surface elements. Generally recommeded for all load rating. (DEFAULT) Enter 2 - to replace top soil layer with elastic wearing course. Recommended to avoid failure of nonlinear models Enter 3 - to perform both options: Add pavement layer plus change top soil layer to an elastic wearing course.

Suboption selection = 1

Add any additional Dead Here as Pavement Unit Weight (Adjust for Load Factors)

![](_page_52_Picture_13.jpeg)

#### Step 3b. CANDE Level 3 Full Mesh File Pavement – CANDE

• Open Updated "Pave-Full - " .cid File in CANDE and Run

![](_page_53_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Picture_4.jpeg)

**Step 4a. CANDE Level 3 Moving Loads** – CANDE Tool Box

 Select Option 3 – Simulate Moving Vehicle over Surface of Pave-Full Level-3 File

Must Be Completed for ALL Vehicles

#### Enter the menu number below:

Menu number = 3

MENU OPTION #3: INSERT LIVE LOADS ON MESH SURFACE. Using the following browser screen, select the Level 3 cid file to add live loads and travel path.

Press enter to see browser screen.

Selected CID File Name = Pave-Full-Level2-ANALYS-LRFD-TREN-Arch-CONCRETE.cid

Good Start! First input line A-1 reads: Heading = Str.006-46-01374

Identify pipe-group number of structure subject to live loading, used to reference soil-cover height and vehicle positions. Enter reference pipe-group number, Default = 1

Step 4b. CANDE Level 3 Moving Load File – Open "Live-Pave-Full-".cid in CANDE and Run

![](_page_54_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Picture_13.jpeg)

#### Step 5. CANDE Load Rating – CANDE Tool Box

• Selection Option 5 – Perform Load Rating Calculations on Moving Load File

# Must be repeated for all Vehicles

![](_page_55_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Picture_6.jpeg)

**R.F > 1.0!** 

#### **CANDE Load Rating Results**— CANDE Tool Box (HL-93 INV shown)

#### BOTTOM LINE FINDINGS FOR LOAD RATING OF CULVERT

- \* Controlling design criterion = CONCRETE CRUSHING (psi)
- \* Controlling load-rating factor RF = 1.54
- \* Controlling local-node number = 20
- \* Controlling live-load step number = 22
- \* Safety assessment of culvert = SAFE

#### LOWEST RATING FACTORS PER DESIGN CRITERION AT CONTROLLING LOAD STEP AND NODE:

DESIGN-CRITERION	LOAD	LOCAL	DEAD-LOAD	LIVE-LOAD	EFFECTIVE	*RATING
(Strength)	STEP	NODE	DEMAND	DEMAND	CAPACITY	FACTOR
*STEEL YIELDING (psi)	15	17	161.19	15654.94	29700.00	1.89
*CONCRETE CRUSHING (psi)	22	20	321.53	1006.00	1875.00	1.54
*SHEAR FAILURE (lbs/in)	19	13	0.71	91.27	471.20	5.15
*RADIAL-TENSION FAIL (psi)	) 13	15	0.04	2.29	43.20	18.85

#### DEFINITIONS AND RELATIONS FOR EACH CRITERION "n":

- \* Rating Factor(n) = (Capacity(n) Dead(n))/Live(n)
  \* Total Demand(n) = Dead(n) + Live(n) at specified node
  \* Dead(n) = Dead load demand for criterion n (factored)
  \* Live(n) = Live load demand for criterion n (factored)
- \* Capacity(n) = Capacity for criterion n (factored)

![](_page_56_Picture_13.jpeg)

emcs

### Load Rating of Metal Structures & Concrete Arches Under Fill

#### **Questions?**

![](_page_57_Picture_2.jpeg)