# Part 3: Applications in Vehicle-Bridge Interaction

Several tools have been shown capable of simulating vehicle-bridge interaction and are leveraged in the following pages to further our understanding of dynamic amplification.

## Remediation and Smoothness Criteria

If a bridge is suspected to exhibit large dynamic amplification as a result of a rough roadway, the bridge owner may wish to grind the roadway smooth. Furthermore, to reduce dynamic amplification in new construction, deck profile specifications should provide smoothness targets. Currently, smoothness criteria are prescribed differently for different locations.

The IRI which is widely used as a smoothness criterion by providing upper limits, has already been shown to influence dynamic amplification. The IRI is a measure of vehicle response and can therefore only be implemented as a performance metric. As such it provides no methods for specifying or monitoring of smoothness during construction or grinding and will not be presented in this section. However, if a deck profile is shown to have a high IRI, intervention should be considered.

Rolling straightedge requirements are widely used for specifying localized roughness criteria and are expressed in terms of deviation over a certain length. Parameters commonly range from 1/8 to ¼ inch deviation over a 10 to 16 foot distance. A computer algorithm was developed that effectively smooths the profile according the straightedge requirements. The effect of this smoothing is illustrated in the following plot whereby a measured profile is compared to the same profile smoothed such that no point deviates more than 1/8th inch over 10ft.



The ability of straightedge criteria to limit dynamic amplification is assessed by simulating vehicle-bridge interaction with a problematic profile, and again with the profile smoothed according to specified criteria. The FE model of a single 140 ft. span with the 2.5 Hz vehicle model as described in the previous chapter was utilized for this study. Simulation parameters are summarized in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of modes included | 15 |  |
| Incremental distance along load-path | 6 | inches |
| Structural damping | 1% |  |
| Vehicle speed | 720 | in/sec |
| Solution time-step | 0.0015 | sec |

The following plot compares bridge midspan displacement amplification for the two profiles. Amplification was computed according to equation **XX**, for which the static displacement was taken as the maximum quasi-static (i.e. 5 in/sec) displacement.

The above plot clearly shows the 1/8th inch over 10 feet criterion is ineffective at limiting dynamic amplification.

The straightedge requirements effectively target features within a range of lengths. At normal traffic speeds profile features with lengths of **5-20 feet** result in forcing frequencies within the range of natural frequencies commonly exhibited by bridges. Therefore, the straightedge length should be specified long enough to avoid/remove long features. A variety of straightedge criterion were assessed with the 2-DOF state-space model of the 140ft. single-span bridge. Straightedge smoothing was performed with maximum specified deviation ranging from 1/8th inch to ½ inch and straightedge length ranging from 10 to 24 feet. The results are plotted below.

The preceding plot demonstrates the ability of straightedge requirements to limit dynamic amplification. Criteria that specify deviation limits greater than ¼” are wholly inadequate at limiting amplification. Even criteria with ¼” deviation limits were only successful at reducing the amplification to 1.33 when the straightedge length was 24 feet. Based on these findings it is recommended that straightedge criteria specify a maximum deviation of 1/8th inch over at least 16 feet.

## Vehicle Configurations

The many simulations that have thus far been reported, have considered a single vehicle traversing a bridge. In reality, bridges experience a large variety of different live-load configurations and many times are subjected to multiple vehicles at the same time.

### Traffic

The scenario of multiple-vehicle loading is accounted for in most design methodologies through the use of multi-presence factors. These factors serve to reduce the load presented by vehicles in adjacent lanes based on the assumption that vehicles with legal-limit weights are unlikely to occupy adjacent lanes at the same time. While this assumption may be valid for bridge response to static loads, other vehicles, including light vehicles (e.g. small passenger vehicles) may contribute to the dynamic response. The effect of other vehicles (traffic) on a bridge’s dynamic response and the dynamic amplification of a major load event are investigated.

#### Methods

Several traffic patterns were created with randomly distributed vehicles and varying density (i.e. vehicle spacing). Each pattern sampled 8 different vehicles that included HS20 trucks, a dump truck, a tractor-trailer, and small passenger vehicles. The vehicles and their axle configurations are provided below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Vehicle # | Axle # | Name | Distance from rear axle (ft) | Weight (kip) | Spring Stiffness (kip/in) | Damping Coefficient (lb-s/in) | Damping Ratio | Natural Frequency |
| 1 | 1 | HS20-32\_1 | 0 | 32 | 20 | 257.529 | 0.1 | 2.472 |
| 1 | HS20-32\_1 | 14 | 32 | 20 | 257.529 | 0.1 | 2.472 |
| 2 | HS20-8\_1 | 28 | 8 | 15 | 111.513 | 0.1 | 4.282 |
| 2 | 3 | HS20-32\_2 | 0 | 32 | 16 | 460.682 | 0.2 | 2.211 |
| 3 | HS20-32\_2 | 30 | 32 | 16 | 460.682 | 0.2 | 2.211 |
| 4 | HS20-8\_2 | 44 | 8 | 8 | 407.189 | 0.5 | 3.127 |
| 3 | 5 | HS20-32\_3 | 0 | 32 | 13 | 415.253 | 0.2 | 1.993 |
| 5 | HS20-32\_3 | 22 | 32 | 13 | 415.253 | 0.2 | 1.993 |
| 6 | HS20-8\_3 | 36 | 8 | 10 | 455.251 | 0.5 | 3.496 |
| 4 | 7 | tst-tand | 0 | 17 | 15 | 162.557 | 0.1 | 2.937 |
| 7 | tst-tand | 6 | 17 | 15 | 162.557 | 0.1 | 2.937 |
| 8 | tst-drive | 29 | 17 | 15 | 162.557 | 0.1 | 2.937 |
| 8 | tst-drive | 35 | 17 | 15 | 162.557 | 0.1 | 2.937 |
| 9 | tst-front | 51 | 12 | 2.2 | 261.522 | 0.5 | 1.339 |
| 5 | 10 | dump-rear | 0 | 25 | 12 | 176.318 | 0.1 | 2.166 |
| 10 | dump-rear | 5 | 25 | 12 | 176.318 | 0.1 | 2.166 |
| 11 | dump-front | 20 | 20 | 12 | 315.407 | 0.2 | 2.422 |
| 6 | 12 | car1 | 0 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 27.878 | 0.5 | 1.142 |
| 12 | car1 | 8 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 27.878 | 0.5 | 1.142 |
| 7 | 13 | car2 | 0 | 2 | 0.4 | 45.525 | 0.5 | 1.398 |
| 13 | car2 | 10 | 2 | 0.4 | 45.525 | 0.5 | 1.398 |
| 8 | 14 | car3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 124.676 | 0.5 | 2.553 |
| 14 | car3 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 124.676 | 0.5 | 2.553 |

Six traffic patterns were created with the following parameters. Each traffic pattern concluded with the dump truck (vehicle 5).

Table 3: Traffic Pattern Parameters

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Num. of Vehicles | Min. Spacing | Max. Spacing |
| 1 | 36 | 20 | 100 |
| 2 | 36 | 40 | 200 |
| 3 | 36 | 60 | 300 |
| 4 | 36 | 80 | 400 |
| 5 | 36 | 100 | 500 |
| 6 | 36 | 280 | 1400 |

The 3D FE model of the 2-span bridge with span lengths of 140 ft ([described previously](#_140ft._Bridge)) was used in simulations. Each traffic pattern was simulated at a speed of 960 in/sec (≈55 mph) as well as at 5 in/sec to provide the quasi-static response. The first 15 modes of vibration were included in the simulation. Simulation time-steps of 0.002 seconds and 0.5 seconds were used for the 960 in/sec and quasi-static simulations, respectively.

#### Results

The bridge responses acquired from the simulations of the traffic patterns are summarized in the following table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Max. Static Disp. (in.) | | Max. Dynamic Disp. (in.) | | Max. Amplification | |
|  | Span 1 | Span 2 | Span 1 | Span 2 | Span 1 | Span 2 |
| Traffic1 | **-0.41113** | **-0.41906** | **-0.588347** | -0.48383 | 1.431056 | 1.154555 |
| Traffic2 | -0.32891 | -0.32505 | -0.369981 | **-0.54378** | 1.12486 | **1.672918** |
| Traffic3 | -0.26793 | -0.26538 | -0.407771 | -0.38494 | 1.521942 | 1.450507 |
| Traffic4 | -0.26009 | -0.25963 | -0.438268 | -0.40802 | **1.685082** | 1.571517 |
| Traffic5 | -0.26012 | -0.25962 | -0.380595 | -0.40768 | 1.463129 | 1.570283 |
| Traffic6 | -0.25986 | -0.25962 | -0.356183 | -0.37011 | 1.370688 | 1.425589 |

Except in a few cases, large dynamic amplifications were observed for the traffic patterns. The time history corresponding to the events that produced the largest dynamic response are plotted below along with the quasi-static response.

Figure 1: Span-1 response to traffic pattern no. 1

Figure 2: Span-2 response to traffic pattern no. 2

The vehicles that are inducing the response shown in the above plots are vehicle numbers 3 and 5 (HS-20 and dump truck), respectively. The responses that these vehicles alone produce are provided below for comparison.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Max. Static Disp. (in.) | | Max. Dynamic Disp. (in.) | | Max. Amplification | |
|  | Span 1 | Span 2 | Span 1 | Span 2 | Span 1 | Span 2 |
| Vehicle3 | -0.251 | -0.252 | -0.304 | -0.320 | 1.21 | 1.27 |
| Vehicle5 | -0.245 | -0.245 | -0.336 | -0.337 | 1.37 | 1.38 |

All but two of the amplifications induced by the traffic patterns presented in table **XX** meet or exceed the amplification produced by a single vehicle. It can therefore be concluded that multiple vehicle loading serves to not only increase the static bridge response but may also result in dynamic amplification even greater than that which would be observed for a single vehicle.

The response of span 1 to the final vehicle (dump truck) is compared in the following plot.

The (dynamic) bridge response over the duration for which the last vehicle was on the bridge was a maximum for the first span under traffic pattern number 1 for which the final vehicle was preceded by an HS-20 (vehicle 3) at a spacing of 20 ft. That for span 2 was a maximum under traffic pattern number 2, for which the final vehicle was preceded by a tractor-trailer (vehicle 4) at a spacing of 40 ft. Those responses are plotted below.

Figure 3: Span-1 Response to final vehicle (#5) in traffic pattern 1

Figure 4: Span-2 Response to final vehicle (#5) in traffic pattern 2

The remaining traffic patterns failed to produce greater responses than if the final vehicle had no preceding vehicles. Incidentally, for all these remaining traffic patterns, the final vehicle was preceded by either a dump truck (vehicle 5) or HS-20 (vehicle 3) and at a distance not less than 60ft. The maximum responses for this final loading event for all traffic patterns are summarized in the following table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Max. Dynamic Disp. (in.) | | Dynamic Amplification | | Preceding Vehicle | Distance (ft.) |
|  | Span 1 | Span 2 | Span 1 | Span 2 |
| Traffic1 | -0.438 | -0.484 | 1.31 | 1.15 | 3 | 20 |
| Traffic2 | -0.370 | -0.544 | 1.12 | 1.67 | 4 | 40 |
| Traffic3 | -0.348 | -0.350 | 1.30 | 1.32 | 3 | 60 |
| Traffic4 | -0.341 | -0.301 | 1.39 | 1.23 | 5 | 80 |
| Traffic5 | -0.360 | -0.326 | 1.77 | 1.33 | 5 | 100 |
| Traffic6 | -0.351 | -0.344 | 1.43 | 1.41 | 3 | 280 |
| Vehicle5 | -0.336 | -0.337 | 1.37 | 1.38 | - | - |

The results provided in the previous table further demonstrate that traffic serves to increase structural response due to both increased static effects as well as increased dynamic amplification. However, small passenger vehicles have insufficient mass to appreciably excite the structure and thus will not have significant impact on bridge response to truck loads. Therefore, it is repeated truck loading that results in the greatest bridge response. The following section explores this further.

### Platooning

Platooning is when several trucks follow closely with reduced headway supported by control and communications technologies, resulting in a “train” of trucks. Therefore, a truck-train may be described by the following parameters:

1. Number of vehicles
2. Vehicle Dynamics (mass and suspension properties)
3. Vehicle spacing
4. Speed

To reduce simulation computing requirements, the number of vehicles will first be investigated. We may first bound this parameter by considering that the upper limit for number of vehicles is controlled by the time it takes for bridge motion induced by past trucks to damp out. Therefore, this parameter is dependent on vehicle spacing and speed and bridge length. Vehicle spacing is conservatively bounded at 15 feet for the closest spacing, and vehicle speed is not likely to exceed 1200 in/sec (68 mph).

The initial set for number of vehicles was (1:2:10). This parameter was investigated while holding vehicle spacing to the conservative minimum of 15 feet and platoon speed to the conservative maximum of 1200 in/sec (68 mph). Platoons were therefore composed of dump trucks (vehicle 5) spaced at 15 feet. The number of vehicles in each platoon was set according to: {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10}. Simulations were repeated for a vehicle headway spacing of 150 feet. The following plot displays the effect the number of vehicles has on dynamic bridge response.

As can be seen in the above plot, for both large and small vehicle spacing, the maximum response is captured with just 4 vehicles and any additional vehicles fail to increase the bridge response or appreciably change the nature of its motion.

The vehicle spacing was further investigated with the single-span 100-ft. model and with the single-span 140-ft. model. Dump trucks (vehicle 5) were arranged a consistent headway spacing that varied between runs. Platoons were assigned a speed of 1200 in/sec () and traveled over a real profile (measured). The results are summarized in the following plots which illustrate the effect of vehicle spacing on bridge response: amplification and displacement.

Figure : Response summary for 120ft single-span model

Figure : Response summary for 100ft single-span model.

As vehicle spacing decreases, more vehicles are able to fit on the bridge, thus increasing the total load experienced by the bridge. However, the dynamic amplification associated with this increased load tends to decrease as the vehicle spacing decreases (number of vehicles present on the bridge increases).

### Conclusions

Additional vehicles present additional loads to the bridge and ultimately increase bridge response. They may also increase dynamic amplification, when one vehicle enters the bridge while it is still in motion from the previous vehicle crossing. But the vehicles also present damping sources and will generally serve to reduce bridge vibration and thus dynamic amplification. This is echoed by simulations of truck platoons, which suggest that platooned vehicles present no greater risk to increased bridge dynamics than posed by other traffic conditions.

Estimations of dynamic amplification for a single vehicle event should consider the possibility that the bridge may already have been excited by a previous vehicle. However, the additional amplification experienced by the bridge in this scenario….

It is therefore recommended that multiple vehicle loading events including platoons be considered in static analysis. Dynamic amplification can be specified as found appropriate for a single vehicle.

### Future Work