I Didn't Know They Could Do That!

Capabilities and Design Considerations for Flexible Buried Bridges

Western Bridge Engineers Seminar Reno, Nevada September 11, 2015

Joel Hahm, P.E. Senior Engineer Big R Bridge Greeley, CO jhahm@bigrbridge.com www.bigrbridge.com

Presentation Outline

•**Introduction to Buried Bridges** •**Design Considerations & Inputs** •**Case studies / applications** •**Questions**

•**Definition of Flexible Buried Bridges:**

- •**Any bridge that derives its support from both the structure and the surrounding soil through soilstructure interaction.**
- •**Generally 20 ft minimum span per AASHTO definitions or combination of smaller spans totaling at least 20 ft.**
- •**Structures consisting of corrugated metal are** *Flexible Buried Bridges***.**
- •**AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications Section 12 (design).**
- •**AASHTO LRFD Bridge Construction Specifications Section 26 (construction).**
- •**AASHTO Materials Specifications – M167**
- •**Flexible Buried Bridge Materials and Capabilities:**
- •**Advantages of Flexible Buried Bridges vs. Traditional Bridges:**
- •**Buried Bridge Applications:**

•**Definition of Flexible Buried Bridges:**

•**Flexible Buried Bridge Materials and Capabilities:**

•**Definition of Flexible Buried Bridges:**

- •**Flexible Buried Bridge Types and Capabilities:**
- •**Advantages of Flexible Buried Bridges vs. Traditional Bridges:**

•**Lower foundation costs & no bump at the end of the bridge (if foundations properly designed)**

•**No bridge deck or joints or bearings to maintain, repair, or replace (or keep from freezing)**

•**ABC benefits - No heavy equipment or specialized labor skills needed for construction, Shorter design & material lead times than rigid bridges, Can be installed in days or weeks rather than months, easier & cheaper to transport.**

•**Able to accommodate complex site geometries & road profiles, No need to narrow roadway (users often don't even know when they are crossing them), Can be lengthened for future road widening**

•**Structural redundancy, aesthetic flexibility, sustainability benefits**

•**Buried Bridge Applications:**

•**Definition of Flexible Buried Bridges:** •**Flexible Buried Bridge Types and Capabilities:** •**Advantages of Flexible Buried Bridges vs. Traditional Bridges:** •**Buried Bridge Applications:**

•**Bridge replacement** •**Limited site access, remote site** •**Grade separation** •**Drainage structures** •**Spans exceeding 80 ft** •**Wildlife / aquatic crossings** •**Environmentally sensitive crossings** •**Canal / utility crossings** •**Pedestrian access** •**Emergency / temp / detours** •**LVR, heavy loads** •**Phased construction**

Design Considerations & Inputs •**Site Geometry Inputs:**

•**Min/max clear span at xx elevation or xx ft below road**

•**Inside clearance / end area**

•**Hydraulic considerations – maximize span to reduce / eliminate multi-cell crossings**

•**Alignment relative to road**

•**Available distance from bottom of structure to top of road**

•**Flexibility (raise road grade, lower foundations, encroach on clearance box, etc.)**

•**Geometry Type:**

•**Site Soil Conditions & Backfill Properties:**

•**Loading / Performance Requirements:**

•**Other Considerations:**

Design Considerations & Inputs •**Site Geometry Inputs:**

•**Geometry Type (arch vs. box):**

•**Defined by AASHTO based on ratio of crown radius to haunch/side radius: >5:1 is a box** •**2 ft min cover for box (1.5 ft for spans ≤ 25 ft 4 in), 3 ft min cover for arch** •**Box designs governed by flexural capacity, arches by thrust capacity** •**Arch geometries are lighter / more efficient / lower structure cost**

•**Not an issue for specifier or owner to be concerned with – a qualified manufacturer can determine most efficient geometry based on project requirements & site limitations**

•**Site Soil Conditions & Backfill Properties:** •**Loading / Performance Requirements:** •**Other Considerations:**

Design Considerations & Inputs •**Site Geometry Inputs:** •**Geometry Type (arch vs. box):** •**Site Soil Conditions & Backfill Properties:** •**Boring logs & historical site data** •**Local geology & experience** •**Classification tests of representative materials** •**Scour depth & other hydraulic concerns** •**Identify backfill source prior to design & bidding** •**Consider site grading impacts** •**Loading / Performance Requirements:** •**Other Considerations:**

Design Considerations & Inputs

•**Site Geometry Inputs:**

- •**Geometry Type (arch vs. box):**
- •**Site Soil Conditions & Backfill Properties:**
- •**Loading / Performance Requirements:**

- •**HL-93 is AASHTO LRFD standard – simplifies NBI load rating reporting requirements**
	- •**U-80, mining vehicles, E-80 Cooper, heavy trucks (heavier than legal loads)**
	- •**Special design loads require axle loads & spacing, tire size, vehicle specs (if available)**
- •**Design capacity is driven by axle loading rather than GVW – less impact on design than a traditional or rigid bridge. As a result, buried bridges can generally carry higher loads.**
- •**Consider design benefits to raising road / lowering foundations to increase cover & carry more load**
- •**Other Considerations:**

Design Considerations & Inputs

•**Site Geometry Inputs:**

- •**Geometry Type (arch vs. box):**
- •**Site Soil Conditions & Backfill Properties:**
- •**Loading / Performance Requirements:**
- •**Other Considerations:**

•**Custom geometries provide lowest cost solution – define project requirements & let designer find best geometry options. FEA designs can be customized and optimized to site.**

•**Foundation types – design foundations based on settlement tolerance, consider foundation soil improvement to save on costs & improve quality. Biggest project cost / time savings vs. traditional & rigid bridges can come from foundations.**

•**Look at project costs rather than only comparative structure costs. Construction time & labor, foundations, grading, site access, equipment, maintenance, inspection, and other costs can be very different between flexible buried bridge & rigid / traditional bridge options.**

Case Studies / Applications

- **Small Span Rural Crossings**
- **NC State Veterans Home – Black Mountain, NC**
- **Emergency Bridge Replacement – Cape Girardeau County, MO**
- **Heavy Loads – NM, AK, IN, NE**

Weld County, Colorado

LE MINERA

R \mathcal{I}

Vantage, Washington

56'5" span x 15' rise box structure Black Mountain, North Carolina

SEAO

Design Requirements

- **New road to access new facility**
- **~15' distance from creek invert to road**
- **48' min clear span at 6' above creek invert**
- **Creek bed soils sensitive to scour (sands)**
- **Wide span to get beyond limits of disturbance**
- **Sloping transverse grade**
- **Considered traditional bridge early on – would have required ~100 ft + span based on creek banks.**

As Detailed in Project Documents

Buried Flexible Steel Bridge Option

Cost Comparison

US61 Over Buckeye Creek Cape Girardeau County, Missouri

Twin Custom Box Structures 30'8¼" span x 11'7½" rise

Design Requirements

- **Part of Missouri Safe & Sound Program**
- **First design-build project in Cape Girardeau County**
- **Emergency replacement for old steel truss bridge critical detour route for construction on nearby I-55**
- **Accelerated Bridge Construction**
- **Hydraulic requirements (flow area)**

Structure Comparison

Heavy Loads

Grants, New Mexico 2.7m lbs. Mining Shovel, 47 ft span

Peabod

18 FT 8 IN

Knox County, Indiana E-80 Cooper Engine, 52.5 ft span

礀

JEPX 243

 $\frac{\omega_{\text{eff}}}{\omega_{\text{eff}}} = \frac{1}{\omega_{\text{eff}}}$

日

Fort Knox Gold Mine Fairbanks, Alaska 1.8m lbs. Mining Shovel, 46 ft span

Randolph, Nebraska E-80 Cooper Engine, 3.67 ft cover, ~50 ft span

AM

LaCygne, Kansas RR Grade Separation, ~53.5 ft span County Road Over Dual Track Crossing

Thank You!

Joel Hahm, PE Senior Engineer Big R Bridge Greeley, CO jhahm@bigrbridge.com www.bigrbridge.com

