

PERFORMANCE OF INTEGRAL BRIDGE WITH VARIOUS SPAN
LENGTHS

TUAN KHUSAIRRY BIN TUAN ABDUL MANAF

A project report submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Engineering (Civil – Structure)

Faculty of Civil Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JANUARY 2014

To my beloved wife, family, lecturers and friends

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I am so grateful towards ALLAH S.W.T that bestowed me the strength and opportunity to finish my report. In the process of preparing and completing this report, I was in contact either directly or indirectly with many people, academicians and supplier. They have contributed towards my understanding and thought.

In particular, I wish to express my greatest appreciation to my supervisor, A.P. Dr. Arizu Bin Sulaiman for his encouragement, guidance, critics and motivations.

At the same moment, I am grateful to all my family members for their support and encouragement. My sincere appreciations also to my beloved wife, Zalina Binti Mohamed Fauzi and not forgetting to all my children, Mohamad Arfan, Mardhiatul Afzan, Maizatul Aqilah and Marissa Amanda.

I also indebted to Faculty of Civil Engineering, University Technology Malaysia for giving me an opportunity to gain the experience, widen my knowledge, and the facilities provided to me had simplified my work throughout the study period.

I hope my findings in the study will expand the knowledge in this field and contribute to all of us in future.

ABSTRACT

An integral bridge may be defined as having no expansion joints or sliding bearings, the deck is continuous across the length of the bridge. Among the advantages of this type of bridge is reducing the cost of maintenance and bringing comfort to road users as there is no connection between the superstructure and substructure. However, this type of bridge is quite different in comparison to the conventional bridge in terms of the analysis and design. The aim of this study is to examine the performance, with respect to the terms of reference of the PWD Bridge Unit of integral bridges in excess of 60 m span length. This study is also intended to investigate and make a comparison between integral bridges with various span lengths in terms of the performance particularly for the reactions resulting from the applied load. A series of integral bridges with different span configurations and lengths have been designed and analyzed using STAAD Pro. The results show that when the span increases, the values of hogging moments at connection between beam and pier increase significantly. From the analysis and design that have been made, it can be concluded that for integral bridges with lengths more than 70 m (for example, configuration of bridge of 20m + 40m + 20m), the bridge can be designed as an integral bridge but the thickness of the deck slab should be increased in order to sustain the resulting negative hogging moment on the connections between the beams and piers. However, the cost incurred due to increasing the thickness of the deck slab should be calculated in order to assess whether a bridge should be designed as an integral bridge or conventional bridge.

ABSTRAK

Jambatan integral boleh ditakrifkan sebagai tidak mempunyai sendi pengembangan atau gelongsor galas, yang mana pada bahagian papaknya adalah bersambung terus dari bahagian rentang kepada bahagian sub-struktur. Antara kelebihan jambatan jenis ini adalah dapat mengurangkan kos penyelenggaraan dan memberi keselesaan kepada pengguna jalan raya kerana tiada penyambungan antara sub-struktur dan struktur atas. Walaubagaimanapun, jambatan jenis ini adalah amat berbeza berbanding dengan jambatan konvensional dari segi analisis dan reka bentuk. Tujuan kajian adalah untuk mengkaji prestasi jambatan dengan merujuk kepada terma rujukan Bahagian Jambatan JKR Malaysia, bagi mengkaji jambatan integral yang melebihi 60 m panjang rentang. Kajian ini juga bertujuan untuk menyasat dan membuat perbandingan di antara jambatan integral dengan pelbagai panjang rentang dari segi prestasi terutamanya bagi tindak balas yang terhasil daripada beban kenaaan. Bagi tujuan tersebut, beberapa model jambatan integral dengan panjang dan konfigurasi rentang yang berbeza telah direka bentuk dan dianalisis dengan menggunakan perisian STAAD Pro. Keputusan yang diperolehi menunjukkan bahawa apabila span bertambah, nilai-nilai momen negatif pada sambungan antara rasuk dan tiang sambut meningkat dengan ketara. Daripada analisis dan reka bentuk yang telah dibuat, dapat dibuat kesimpulan bahawa untuk jambatan integral dengan panjang lebih daripada 70 m (sebagai contoh, konfigurasi jambatan 20m + 40m + 20m), ianya boleh direka bentuk sebagai jambatan integral tetapi ketebalan papak perlu ditambah bagi membolehkannya mengambil momen negatif yang terhasil pada sambungan antara rasuk dan tiang sambut. Walaubagaimanapun, perbandingan kos yang terhasil disebabkan oleh pertambahan ketebalan papak perlu dibuat bagi menilai samada sesuatu jambatan itu perlu direka bentuk sebagai jambatan integral atau jambatan konvensional.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	CONTENT	PAGE
	TITLE	i
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATIONS	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	vi
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF TABLES	x
	LIST OF FIGURES	xii
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xvii
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xix
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Introduction	1
	1.2 Aim and Objectives	3
	1.3 Problem Statement	4
	1.4 The Scope of the Study	5
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	6
	2.1 Introduction	6
	2.2 Design Bridge System	7
	2.2.1 Simply Supported/Semi Integral Bridge	9
	2.2.2 Integral Bridge	10

2.3	Sequence of Construction for Integral Bridge	12
2.4	Design Issues	14
2.4.1	Continuity and Abutment Fixity	14
2.4.2	Abutment Piles	15
2.4.3	Skew	16
2.5	Design Principle and Approach	17
2.5.1	Limit State Design	17
2.5.2	Ultimate Limit State	18
2.5.3	Serviceability Limit State	19
2.5.4	Design Life	19
2.6	Bridge Loading	20
2.6.1	Dead and Superimposed Dead Loading	22
2.6.2	Imposed Traffic loading	23
2.6.3	Imposed Loading Due to Road Traffic	24
2.6.4	Thermal Loading	25
2.7	Load Combinations (Load Cases)	25
2.7.1	Load Combinations Based to the BD37/01	27
3	METHODOLOGY	31
3.1	Introduction	31
3.2	Problem Identification	33
3.3	Structural Model and Construction Stages	33
3.3.1	Construction Sequence	35
3.4	Integral Bridge Modeling	38
3.5	Perform Analysis	41
3.6	Comparison result between four Integral Bridge Models With Various Span Lengths and Design Verification	41
3.7	Expected Findings	41
4	ANALYSIS AND DESIGN	43
4.1	Introduction	43
4.2	Bridge Modeling	43
4.2.1	Geometry Definition	46
4.2.2	“General” Definition	47
4.2.3	Section Properties of the Elements	48

4.2.4	Support General	51
4.2.5	Load Consideration	54
4.2.6	Lateral Earth Pressure	60
4.3	Perform Analysis	63
4.3.1	Comparison Result between Four Integral Bridge Models with Various Span Lengths	67
4.4	Integral Bridge Design	69
4.5	Adaptation of Real Integral Bridge Design	79
5	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	82
5.1	Introduction	82
5.2	Analysis of Bridge Models	83
5.2.1	Analysis of Bridge Models using STAAD Pro	83
5.3	Result Obtained From the Analysis	85
5.3.1	Result of Bridge Model no. 1	85
5.3.2	Result of Bridge Model no. 2	90
5.3.3	Result of Bridge Model no. 3	96
5.3.4	Result of Bridge Model no. 4	102
5.4	Discussion	108
6	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION	111
5.1	Conclusion	111
5.2	Recommendation	113
	REFERENCES	114
	APPENDICES	116

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
5.1	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at point 1 (Abutment) – Bridge model no. 1	85
5.2	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at point 2 (Abutment) – Bridge model no. 1	86
5.3	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at mid span – Bridge model no. 1	86
5.4	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at point 1 (Abutment) – Bridge model no. 2	90
5.5	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at point 2 (Abutment) – Bridge model no. 2	90
5.6	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at point 3 (Pier) – Bridge model no. 2	91
5.7	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at mid span – Bridge model no. 2	91
5.8	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at point 1 (Abutment) – Bridge model no. 3	96

5.9	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at point 2 (Abutment) – Bridge model no. 3	96
5.10	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at point 3 (Pier) – Bridge model no. 3	97
5.11	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at mid span – Bridge model no. 3	97
5.12	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at point 1 (Abutment) – Bridge model no. 4	102
5.13	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at point 2 (Abutment) – Bridge model no. 4	102
5.14	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at point 3 (Pier) – Bridge model no. 3	103
5.15	The values of bending moment, shear force and displacement at mid span – Bridge model no. 3	103

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1(a)	Multi Span Bridge	8
2.1(b)	Single Span Bridge	8
2.2	Single Span Integral Bridge	8
2.3	Semi Integral Abutment	10
2.4	Integral Bridge	11
2.5	Sequence of Construction for Integral Bridge	13
2.6	Connection between superstructure and substructure for integral bridge	15
3.1	Flow Chart of the Research Methodology	32
3.2(a)	Cross-section of elevation view of integral bridge	34
3.2(b)	Typical Cross-section of abutment and pier	34
3.3	First Construction Stage	36
3.4	Second Construction Stage	37
3.5	Third Construction Stage	37

3.6	Fourth Construction Stage	38
3.7	Example of integral bridge modeling system	40
4.1(a)	Bridge model no. 1	44
4.1(b)	Bridge model no. 2	45
4.1(c)	Bridge model no. 3	45
4.1(d)	Bridge model no. 4	46
4.2	Integral bridge model with lines geometry	47
4.3	General icon in STAAD Pro	48
4.4(a)	PTT Beam Diagram	49
4.4(b)	The values of properties for section of PTT Beam	49
4.5	The values of properties for section of PTT Beam will to assigned to the beam element	50
4.6(a)	Example section properties for abutment element	50
4.6(b)	Example section properties for pile element	51
4.7	Structural support assigned for pinned	53
4.8	Structural support assigned based to spring values	53
4.9	Structure model view after assigned spring stiffness	54
4.10	Example assigned dead load for self-weight of beam	56
4.11	Create Surface of Deck	57
4.12	Define roadway (carriageway width)	58

4.13	Run live load analysis using STAAD Beava version	58
4.14	Example assigned live load generated by Beava version	59
4.15	Example of Beava live load transferred to STAAD Pro	59
4.16(a)	Horizontal force (earth pressure) on abutment	61
4.16(b)	Assigned horizontal force to the abutment using STAAD Pro	62
4.17	Calculation using the Bowles method by Excel sheet	63
4.18(a)	Bending moment of the structure	66
4.18(b)	Shear force of the structure	66
4.18(c)	Displacement of the integral bridge structure	67
4.19(a)	Single span 40 m	68
4.19(b)	Multiple spans 60m	68
4.19(c)	Multiple spans 70m	68
4.19(d)	Multiple spans 80m	69
4.20	Arrangement of Reinforcement at Abutment (single span 40 meter)	72
4.21	Arrangement of Reinforcement at Abutment (multiple spans 70 meter)	75
4.22	Arrangement of Reinforcement at Abutment (multiple spans 80 meter)	78
4.23	Layout of the bridge	79
4.24	Isometric view	80
4.25	Result moment	80

4.23	Detail drawings for abutment of Sg. Penggorak, Pahang	81
5.1(i)	Bending moment resulting from live load and other loads except dead load	84
5.1(ii)	Shear force resulting from live load and other loads including dead load	84
5.1(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at point 1	87
5.1(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at point 1	87
5.2(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at point 2	88
5.2(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at point 2	88
5.3(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at mid span	89
5.3(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at mid span	89
5.4(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at point 1	92
5.4(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at point 1	92
5.5(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at point 2	93
5.5(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at point 2	93
5.6(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at point 3	94
5.6(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at point 3	94
5.7(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at mid span	95
5.7(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at mid span	95
5.8(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at point 1	98
5.8(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at point 1	98

5.9(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at point 2	99
5.9(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at point 2	99
5.10(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at point 3	100
5.10(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at point 3	100
5.11(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at mid span	101
5.11(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at mid span	101
5.12(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at point 1	104
5.12(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at point 1	104
5.13(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at point 2	105
5.13(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at point 2	105
5.14(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at point 3	106
5.14(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at point 3	106
5.15(a)	Graph of bending moment vs load combinations at mid span	107
5.15(b)	Graph of shear force vs load combinations at mid span	107
5.16	Arrangement of reinforcement on pier	109

LIST OF SYMBOLS

STAAD Pro	-	Structure software for analysis
S. Pro Beava	-	Software for live load analysis
WIM	-	Weight in motion
HA(UDL)	-	Distributed live load
HA(KEL)	-	Knife edge load
HB	-	Special vehicle live load
SW	-	Self-weight
DL	-	Dead load
Pa	-	Earth pressure
Ap.slab	-	Approach slab
Tr	-	Traction load
STC	-	Shrinkage, temperature and creep
TEM	-	Uniform temperature load
G_a	-	Self-weight of beam
G_c	-	Self-weight of slab
S_o	-	Earth pressure at rest
G_{fin}	-	Finishes load
K_s	-	Stiffness of soil (K-value)
I_{xx}	-	Second moment area about x axis
I_{yy}	-	Second moment area about y axis
A_{csbeam}	-	Cross-section area of beam
$A_{csdeckslab}$	-	Cross-section area of deckslab
$\gamma_{concrete}$	-	Density of concrete
γ	-	Density of soil
\emptyset	-	Angle of friction

f_{cu}	-	Strength of concrete
f_y	-	Strength of reinforcement
M_{max}	-	Maximum bending moment
V_{max}	-	Maximum shear force
Z	-	Lever arm
d	-	Effective depth
A_s	-	Area of reinforcement required
$A_{s\text{ prov}}$	-	Area of reinforcement provided
A_{sv}	-	Area of reinforcement link
f_{yv}	-	Strength of link reinforcement
S_v	-	centre to centre of link spacing

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A - D	Example of calculation for soil stiffness	117 - 120

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Integral Bridge is designed without any expansion joints in the bridge deck. They are generally designed with the stiffness and flexibilities spread throughout the structure/soil system so that all supports to accommodate all type of loads (primary and secondary loads). They are single or multiple span bridges having their superstructure cast integrally with their substructure. Generally these bridges include capped pile stub abutments and piers. In other words, these types of bridge are constructed without any movement joints between spans and abutments/piers.

One of the most important aspects in the design is that it can affect the life and maintenance cost structure with the reduction or elimination of road expansion joints and bearings. Unfortunately, this is too often overlooked or avoided. Joints and bearings are expensive to buy, install, maintain and repair and more costly to replace. The most frequently encountered corrosion problem involves leaking expansion joints and seal that permit salt-laden run-off water from roadway surface

to attack the girder ends, bearings and supporting reinforced concrete substructures. Elastomeric glands get filled with dirt, rocks and trash and ultimately fail to function.

In the UK, the highways Agency Department Standard, BD57/01 and TOR Bridge Unit CKASJ JKR Malaysia “Design for Durability” requires designers to consider designing all bridges with length up to 60 meter and skew angles of less than 30 degrees as integral bridges. However, the basis of this requirement is yet to be justified.

The principal advantages of integral bridge include the following:

- (i) Lower construction costs and future maintenance costs. In conventional bridges much of the cost of maintenance is related to repair of damage at joints.
- (ii) Fewer piles are required for foundation support. No battered piled piles are needed.
- (iii) Construction is simple and rapid. The integral bridge act as a whole unit.
- (iv) Reduced removal of existing elements. Integral abutment and pier bridges can be built around the existing foundation without requiring the complete removal of existing substructure.
- (v) The smooth, uninterrupted deck of the integral bridge is aesthetically pleasing and it improves vehicular riding quality.

- (vi) Design efficiencies are achieved in substructure design. Longitudinal and transverse loads acting upon the superstructure may be distributed over more number of supports.

1.2 Aim and Objectives

The aim of the study is basically focus on the integral bridges capability with respect to the performance of the integral bridge is comparison to conventional simply supported bridges after the application of primary and secondary loads. Subsequently, the objectives of the study are as follows:

- (i) To obtain the length limit for integral bridges in an analytical way, where the limit factors include capacity of abutments and piers due to primary and secondary loads.
- (ii) To perform structural study on multiple spans integral bridge, through analysis to further understand the performance these types of bridges.
- (iii) To perform analysis modeling using STAAD Pro software to determine the bending moment, shear forces, displacement for the whole bridge system.
- (iv) To compare the results of integral bridges model with the various length.

1.3 Problem Statement

In general, integral bridges are designed for a range of less than 60 meters in length of span. If referred to the terms of reference from Bridge Unit, CKASJ JKR Malaysia, length of integral bridges not more than 60 meters and not more than 30 degrees of skew. This limit must be proved by theoretical studies of the behavior of an integral bridge.

This research is to find out and make a comparison of integral bridges with various span lengths in terms of the performance particularly for the reactions resulting (bending moments and shear forces) from the applied load. This study will also look at what is essentially an integral bridges should be designed not exceed 60 meters, and what happens if integral bridges designed beyond the limit particularly for the multiple spans bridge.

Generally, the overall problems of this study are:

- (i) There is no solid basis for the limits of integral bridges.
- (ii) The behavior of an integral bridge that exceeds the limit, particularly for the more than 60 meters long and what are the things to be considered in terms of how to design is limited.
- (iii) There is no exact concept of loading that is correct for the analysis of integral bridges.

1.4 The scope of the study

One of the scopes of the study is to check the structural capacity of the design concept for beams, piers, abutments and foundation systems and make a comparison of the design for integral bridge and conventional type. This study is also includes the combination of load cases acting on the bridge and evaluate the behavior of the bridge and make a comparison between single span and multiple span.

In addition, studies to assess the key parameters to be considered in the analysis and design of integral bridges and evaluate the ability of integral bridge structure based on the theory by using the software to modeling the structure system. Results of the analysis will be considered in this study are such as bending moments and shear forces on the connection between the beam and abutment/pier and also the reaction force at the pile system due to soil interaction.

REFERENCES

1. O'Brien E.J., Keogh D.L. and Lehane B.M. (1999), *Bridge Deck Analysis*. London, E & FN Spon.
2. Connal J. (2002) *Integral Abutment Bridges – Australian and US Practice, Design & Construction of Integral Bridges*.
3. Dr. Abd. Aziz Arshad (2001), *Course on: Bridge Design to JKR Specification*, Civil & Structure Engineering Technical Division (IEM).
4. Barker R.M. and Puckett J.A. (1997), *Design of Highway Bridges, Based On AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specification*.
5. Manual Design For Road and Bridge, BA42/96 (1996), *Integral Bridge Design*, Department of Highway, UK.
6. Terms of Reference for Bridges and Viaducts Structures (Conventional) (2012), Bridge Unit, CKASJ, JKR Malaysia.)
7. Chatterjee S. (2003), *Modern Steel Bridges*. UK Blackwell Science LTD.
8. Vasant C. Mistry (2004), *Integral Abutment and Jointless Bridges*, Federal Highway Administration, Washington DC, USA.
9. Sergei Terzaghi and Gillian Sisk (2009), *Integral Bridge Design – Derivation of the spring constant for modelling soil structure interaction*.
10. Jaromir Krizek (2011), *Integral Bridges Soil-Structure Interaction*, Czech Rep.
11. Unit Jambatan (1984), *Buku Panduan Rekabentuk Jambatan*, JKR Malaysia.

12. Azlan Abd. Rahman (2013), Lecture Notes: *Bridge Engineering, Integral Bridge Design*, UTM.