

Michael Baker
Load Rating Process Training Course
 Welcome Housekeeping Introductions Overview of Training Course Objectives Training Course Schedule
We Make a Difference 2











Michael Baker						Contract of the second s	
Training Course Schedule							
SCDOT Load Rating Process							
	Course S Day 1	ich	edule				
				Est. Duration	Lesson		
	8:00 AM	•	8:05 AM	0:05	0	Welcome (Housekeeping)	
	8:05 AM	- 1	8:15 AM	0:10	1	Course Introduction	
	8:15 AM	-	8:40 AM	0:25	2	Introduction to Load Rating of Highway Bridges	
	8:40 AM	-	9:45 AM	1:05	3	Load Rating Guidance Document (LRGD) Highlights	
	9:45 AM		9:55 AM	0:10		Break	
	9:55 AM	-	10:55 AM	1:00	4	Load Rating Documentation for SCDOT Bridge File	
	10:55 AM	-	11:05 AM	0:10		Break	
	11:05 AM	-	11:40 AM	0:35	5	Bridge Posting	
	11:40 AM	-	11:50 AM	0:10	6	Help / Guidance Documents	
	11:50 AM	-	12:00 PM	0:10	7	Wrap Up - Questions and Answers	
						End of Course	
We Make a Difference						8	



























Michael Baker INTERNATIONAL SECTOR					
The Process					
In General, Each Load Rating Includes the Following:					
1. Review Existing Information					
2. Utilize Guidance Documents					
3. Assumptions & Supplemental Calculations					
4. Conspan, Midas, LEAP, Excel, BrR or Other Input [A3.1]					
5. Load Rating Summary Form (LRSF)					
6. QC Review Checklist					
7. Data Correction Form					
8. Labeling Diagram					
9. Posting Avoidance (if applicable)					
We Make a Difference 22					



Michael Baker					
Load Ratings					
 Goal: BrR File 	for Every Bridge				
 Other Softw 	are Permissible [A3.1]				
Table A3.1. Pret	erred Alternative Load Rating Software				
Preferred Alternative Software	Software Purpose				
CSI Bridge	General Finite Element Analysis & Complex Steel				
LARSA	General Finite Element Analysis & Complex Steel				
SAP	General Finite Element Analysis				
GT STRUDL	General Finite Element Analysis				
STAAD.Pro	General Finite Element Analysis				
MIDAS	General Finite Element Analysis				
Follow Provisi	ions of the I RGDI				
The procedures outlined in the LRGD <u>shall be followed in their entirety</u> , unless stated otherwise in this scope of services. This includes, but is not limited to, substructure load rating when required or if judgement during site assessment predicts it governing, data entry into rating software, completing the load rating process, post-processing the results, and completing the Load Rating Summary Form for each site.					
We Make a Difference	24				

Michael Baker		SCD ST
	ProjectWise	
Advanced resource Defactored resource Defactored resource Defactored resource Defactored Defactored	CORRELATES Develop of the second provided points () CORRELATES Develop of the Second point of the Second	Inter-GDBERAL FLES Overdar of Nametenance denge dang Name Na Name Na
We Make a Difference	25	

















Michael Baker	SCC ST
LRGD Highlights	
 Chapter 4 – Load Rating Process NBI Condition Ratings Deck, Superstructure, Substructure or Culvert < 4 or 2 Points 	
 Increased Dead Load during Inspection 	
Bridge Inspection Team Leader Request	
Program Manager Request	
We Make a Difference 34	



Michael Baker				
LRGD Highlights				
 Components of LRFR Load 	Rating Equation			
C = φ _c φ _s φ R _n For the Strength Limit S C = f _R For the Service or Fatigu	tate le Limit States			
φ _c φ _s ≥0.85	ϕ_{c} = LRFR Condition Factor ϕ_{s} = LRFR System Factor ϕ = LRFD Resistance Factor R_{n} = Nominal Resistance f_{R} = Allowable Stress			
We Make a Difference 3	6			







Michael Baker INTERNATIONAL SUCCESSION	
LRGD Highlights	
 Chapter 6 - General Requirements Other Loads Pedestrian loads need not be considered simultaneously with vehicular loads Sidewalk dead load shall be considered Wind loads Impact - SCDOT does not allow use of the reduced impact allowance (DLA) in Table C6A.4.4.3-1 unless authorized Live Load Distribution 	ie Loed 1 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1
We Make a Difference 40	



Michael Baker SCD LRGD Highlights 23k Chapter 6 – SC Modified Vehicles 12.05k 20'10" Table 6.5-1. Suite of Posting Vehicles Vehicle **Truck Type** Axle Configuration gle Unit 2 Axles -SU2 SC Representative School Bus 3 Axles C-SHV1A (65k) - Non-Inte e Only 6.5-2b SC- Type 3 (AASHTO modified) 6.5-1 4 or More Axles W2A (66k) - Non- Interstate Only 6.5-2b 6.5-2a 6.5-2a 5114 SU5 6.5-2a SU6 5117 6.5-2a SC-SHV3A (85k) - Non- Interstate Only 5 or More Axles mbination Unit 6.5-2b SC-SHV3B (90k) - Non- Interstate Only 6.5-2b SC - Type 3S2 (AASHTO Modified) Type 3-3 (AASHTO) 6.5-1 6.5-1 pe 3-3 + .2 klf Lane 6.5-1 ype 3-3 + .2 klf Lane 16k 6.5-1 14k 14k 12 12k 12k 6.5-2b) for load ratings of non-15' 15 16' 4 4 6.5-2b) for load rating of non-÷ We Make a Difference







SCE Michael Baker LRGD Highlights Chapter 6 – Material Properties Cont'd Unknown Reinforcing Steel, Fy - MBE Table 6A.5.2.2-1 - Built after 2000, 60 ksi Table 6A.5.2.2-1-Yield Strength of Reinforcing Steel Yield Strength, fy, Type of Reinforcing Steel ksi Unknown steel constructed prior to 1954 33.0 Structural grade 36.0 Billet or intermediate grade, Grade 40, 40.0 and unknown steel constructed during or after 1954 Rail or hard grade, Grade 50 50.0 Grade 60 60.0 We Make a Difference 46



Michael Baker						
LRGD Highlights						
Chapter 6 – Material	Properties Cont'd					
• Unknown Reinforc – Built before 200 – Built after 2006	ed Concrete, f'c 16, MBE Table 6A.5.2.1-1 , 4.0 ksi					
Table 6A.5.2.1-1—Minim Concrete by Year of Cons	um Compressive Strength of struction					
Year of Construction	Compressive Strength, f'_c , ksi					
D 1 1050	2.5					
Prior to 1959						







Michael Baker		
	LRGD Highlights	
 Chapte 	er 6 – Analysis Methods	
• Load • <u>Fo</u>	d Factors or LRFR, use MBE based on ADTT	
• Al	DTT = Average Daily Traffic (ADT) * (% Truck/100) ADT Direction of traffic One direction 100% Two direction 55% (AASHTO LRFD C3.6.1.4.2) Truck % Unknown Use AASHTO LRFD Table C3.6.1.4.2-1 =>> NBL AASHTO LRFD or Traffic E	ngineers
We Make a Difference	52	

LRGD H	lighlights	Booth Cauding Department
 Chapter 6 – Analysis Met 	hods	
Load Factors Table C3.6.1.4.2-1—Fraction of Trucks in Traffic	Classification: (112) NBIS Bridge Length: (104)Hwy Sys of Inv Rte: (026) Functional Class: (100) STRAHNET Desig: (101) Parallel Desig:	Yes Not on NHS Urban - Minor Arterial Not on STRAHNET route Not parallel structure
Class of Highway Fraction of Trucks in Traffic Rural Interstate 0.20 Urban Interstate 0.15 Other Rural 0.15 Other Urban 0.10	(102) Direction of Traffic: (103) Temp Struc Desig: Age and Service:	2-way traffic N/A
	(027) Year Built: (106) Year Recon: (42A) Type Serv on Bridge: (42B) Type Serv under Br: (28A) #Lanes on Struct: (28B) #Lanes under Struct:	1936 1976 Highway-Pedestrian Waterway 2 0
	(029) ADT & (030) Year: (109) Truck ADT (019) Bypass Det. Length:	6600 2017 6 % 3.1 miles
We Make a Difference	53	

Michael Baker					
LRGD Highlights					
Chapter 6 – Analysis Methods					
 Condition Factors MBE Table 6A.4.2.3-1 Reduction of Load Rating for Uncertainty in the Deteriorated Members and Increased Future Deterioration New Bridges Condition Factor = 1.0 					
Structural Condition of Member	φ_c	Superstructure Condition	Equivalent Member		
Fair Poor	1.00 0.95 0.85	6 or higher 5 4 or lower	Good or Satisfactory Fair Poor		
We Make a Difference		54			







Michael Baker				SCCCT	
LRGD Highlights					
 All superstructur Supplemental (Parapet & Raili Diaphragm/Cro Effective Width Haunch (Do not loads) Member Deteri 	e types: Calcs (if a ng Loads (i oss-Frame n (if BrR is t use Haund ioration	pplicable) if BrR is not c Loads not capable; i ch Window in	apable) user input) BrR; use meml	Der	
SIP Form Loads	Load Case Description				
	Load Case Name	Description	Stepe	Type	
 Square Repar 	001	OC acting on non-composite section	Non-composite (Stage 1)	90.0c	
يتقالها الم	002	OC acting on long-term composite section	Composite (long term) (Stage 2)	- 0.0C	
· Others	DC2 Overhead Sign	Over accergion long-term composere section	Composite (king term) (Stage 2)	50.00W	
Ciana	DC1 Hautch DC1 Additional Dark at Overhans		Non-composite (Stage 1)	0.00	
- Signs	DC2 Curb & Rai		Composite (long term) (Stage 2)	0.00	
We Make a Difference		58			







Michael Baker INTERNATIONAL		
LRGD Highlights		
 Chapter 10 – Prestressed Concrete Girder BrR Input Use Girder System Superstructure when inputting Do not use elastic shortening applied to the transformed beam section because the transformed section already accounts for this. Multi-Span Composite Simple Span for both dead and live loads Simple Span for dead load and continuous for live loads Input actual strand pattern if available Average humidity 70% 		











Michael Baker SCDƏT LRGD Highlights Chapter 11 – Steel Superstructures Cont'd **BrR** Input • Use Girder System Superstructure when inputting Do not input end diaphragms if they are not contributing • Additional 5% (without field splices) or 10% (with field splices) Add cross frame and stiffener weight manually for tangent bridges • 3D cross frame weight is calculated by BrR but stiffener weight is not Service II check for permit loads for LRFR We Make a Difference



Michael Baker			
LRGD Highlights			
 Chapter 11 - Steel Superstructures Cont'd Tangent analysis options Line Girder 3D Grid Curved analysis options Line Girder utilizing the V-load method 3D Grid 			
We Make a Difference 70			


















Michael Baker	
LRGD Highlights	
Chapter 18 - Complex and Non-Typical Bridges	
(App A18.1)	
Steel arch	
Concrete arch	
• Cable stay	
Suspension	
 Segmental concrete 	
 Complex or cantilevered steel truss 	
 Summary document – methodology and software 	
We Make a Difference 80	







Michael Baker	
	LRGD Highlights
What load c A. DC1 B. DC2 C. DW	ase is a haunch?
D. LL What load c plans? A. DC1	ase is a barrier generally unless noted on
B. DC2 C. DW D. LL	
We Make a Difference	84









General -	- Load Rating Process
 Bridge Plans As-Built As-Let Standard Plans Shop Drawings 	<text></text>
We Make a Difference	89

0	0
ŏ	Э

nael Baker RNATIONAL				
C NBI D	Genera atasheet	l – Lo	ad Rat	ting Process
2018 National Bridge I Bridge Report Bridge Identification: Structure Number: (001) State:	aventory sc	1820 (009) Location:	1MIS OF GREENVILLE	 Existing Data to be Confirmed by SA Team
(183) County: (183) County: (187) Faulty Crustel: (189) Faulty Crustel: (199) Latitude: (191) Latitude: (191) Kilometer Polt: (192) Boster Br. Struct. No: Classification: (192) Boster Br. Struct. No: Classification: (192) Nills Bridge Length: (192) Nills Bridge Length: (193) Strahoffer Design: (193) Strahoffer Desi	Seemine 3 HE NB BRUSHY CREEK A4 47 47 247 44 527 Autor of base tighesy relevant NIA Yes NA On interstate On interstate Travel Travel	(EC) Levit of Senior: (EC) Cools Spinory of the (EC) Cools Spinory of the (EC) Directional Suffic: (ED) Correctional Suffic: (ED) ALL Inventory Redet: (ED) ALL Inventory Cools (ED) ALL INVENTORY (ED) ALL INVENTORY	Manime Inset Aphnay North B0-020850 D0 N/A N/A N/A Part fratous relation for tructs On the road Date Highman Agency	 Contains General Bridge Data for Input into BrR
22) Direction of Traffic: 33) Temp Struc Desig: te and Service; 27) Year Reson: 24) Type Serv on Bridge: 28) Type Serv under Struct: 28) Alt Sanes on Struct: 28) ALT S. (030) Year: 29) ADT S. (030) Year: 29) ADT S. (030) Year: 29) ADT S. (030) Year:	1-4-3) traffic 1998 N/A N/A Volensy 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 % N/A N/A N/A	(837) Historical Value: <u>Bruchure Type and Malerial:</u> (848) Main Spanc: (848) Main Struct Malerial: (848) Main Struct Type: (849) Main Struct Type: (849) Japo Banci, (849) Type Maring Sur- (1884) Type Maring Sur-	Historical spinfcance not determinable	



Michael Baker							
Gen	General – Load Rating Process						
 Site Asses LRGD Appendix 	 Site Assessment Form LRGD Appendix [A5.4] 						
SCD	T	Site Assess	ment Form	Version: 1.0 Page 1 of 5			
(8) Asset ID: Bridge Coordinates	(2) District: (3) County: Select Distric - Select Co	(9) Bridge Location:	GE DATA	Site Assessment Date:			
(16) Latitude: (7) Facility Carried:	degrees minutes (6) Feature (seconds Longitude:	degrees (43, 44) Bridge Description	minutes seconds	-		
(45) Number of Ma	in Spans: (46) Number	r of Approach Spans:	(49) Structure Length:	(52) Structure Width (out-to-out)			
In this section, ind members to be rat which impact the is	ude information on items that affect 4. Do not include information that di ad rating; however, all critical findings	SECTION 2: FIELD NO the load rating, such as sife forms, utilit sen or affect the load rating, such as a should be reported in the attachment '	TES ies, attached signs, overlays inor deck cracking and spal Critical Deficiencies Form" if	etc. Include notes about deterioration of include ate assessment finding: Bridge Inspection Guidance Document.			







Michael Baker	Michael Baker				
Barrier Loads					
 Barrier Lo Only Thr If < 6 Gir Unless E If More to the Approx 	ads <u>ee Outer</u> Girde r <u>ders/Beams</u> , Ir Barriers are Diff than 6 Girders, f ropriate Girders	rs/Beams Re nput Barrier ferent Geomo Calculate Ba s/Beams	eceive the E Load in App etry rrier Load a	Barrier Load purtenances and Apply to	
	Uniform Distributed C Load Case Name Parapet (DC2) Bracket (DC1)	Concentrated Settler Span All Spans Y All Spans	Uniform Load (kip/ft) 0.047 0.121		
We Make a Difference		96			











	٨٠٢	umptions	
	A551	Junptions	
What traff	ric data woul	d you assume	if given the
following	NBI Data (dir	ection factor	and truck %)
Classification:			
112) NBIS Bridge Length: 104)Hwy Sys of Inv Rte: 026) Functional Class: 100) STRAHNET Desig: 101) Parallel Desig: 102) Direction of Traffic: 103) Temp Struc Desig:	Yes Not on NHS Urban - Collector Not on STRAHNET route Not parallel structure 2-way traffic N/A	(105) Federal Lands Hwy: (110) Desig National Netw: (020) Toll: (021) Maintenance Respon: (022) Owner: (037) Historical Value:	N/A Not part of national network for trucks On free road State Highway Agency State Highway Agency Not eligible for National Register
Age and Service:		Structure Type and Material:	
027) Year Built: 106) Year Recon: 42A) Type Serv on Bridge: 42B) Type Serv under Br: 28A) #Lanes on Struct: 28B) #Lanes under Struct: 029) ADT & (030) Year:	1960 N/A Highway Waterway 2 0 7400 2017 5 %	(045) # Main Spans: (430) Main Struct Material: (43B) Main Struct Type: (046) # App Spans: (44A) Appr Struct Material: (44B) Appr Struct Material: (107) Deck Struct Type: (108A) Type Wearing Sur: (108B) Type Meantrane:	3 Concrete Tee Beam 0 N/A N/A Concrete Cast-In-Place Monolithic Concrete None



	Assi	Imptions	
What traff following I	ic data would NBI Data (dir	d you assume ection factor	if given the and truck %)?
lassification: 112) NBIS Bridge Length: 104)Hwy Sys of Inv Rte: 026) Functional Class: 100) STRAHNET Desig: 101) Parallel Desig: 102) Direction of Traffic: 103) Temp Struc Desig:	Yes Not on NHS Rural - Local Not on STRAHNET route Not parallel structure 2-way traffic N/A	(105) Federal Lands Hwy: (110) Desig National Netw: (020) Toll: (021) Maintenance Respon: (022) Owner: (037) Historical Value:	N/A Not part of national network for trucks On free road State Highway Agency State Highway Agency Not eligible for National Register
tee and Service: 027) Year Built: 106) Year Recon: 42A) Type Serv on Bridge: 42B) Type Serv under Br:: 28A) #Lanes on Struct: 28B) #Lanes under Struct: 1029 ADT & (030) Year: 109) Truck ADT 019 Bypass Det. Length:	1962 N/A Highway Waterway 2 0 120 2017 N/A N/A	Structure Type and Material: (045) # Main Spans: (43A) Main Struct Material: (44B) Main Struct Type: (046) # Appr Struct Type: (44A) Appr Struct Type: (107) Deck Struct Type: (108A) Type Wearing Sur: (108B) Type Membrane: (108B) Type Membrane:	2 Prestessed concrete Stringer//Multi-beam or Girder 0 N/A N/A Concrete Precast Panels Bituminous Unknown Unknown

Michael Baker International		SCENT
As	sumptior	IS
 What traffic data wound NBI Data (direction) 	uld you assume factor and truc	if given the following k %)?
 A. 100% and 5% B. 0% and 5% C. 55% and 5% D. 55% and 15% 	(026) Functional Class: (100) STRAHNET Desig: (101) Parallel Desig: (102) Direction of Traffic: Table C3.6.1.4.2-1—Frac	Rural - Local Not on STRAHNET route Not parallel structure 2-way traffic
(109) Truck ADT N/A	Class of Highway Rural Interstate Urban Interstate Other Rural Other Urban	Operation of Trucks in Traffic 0.20 0.15 0.15 0.10
Traffic data was input in (in accordance with LRG 15% (in accordance with	nto BrR using D D Section 6.11. CRFD Table C	irectional % = 55% 1.2) and Truck % = 3.6.1.4.2-1).
We Make a Difference	105	
105		





1	n	7
т	υ	/

Michael Baker SCEFT						
Assumpt	Assumptions - Controlling Member					
 Controlling Me (X.X) on the L Ex: 2 Span Br 	 Controlling Member and Location (X.X) on the LRFR or LFR LRSF Ex: 2 Span Bridge: 2.5 for Span 2 Mid-span 					
	SECTION	2 - INVENTORY	AND OPERA	TING LOAD RATINGS		
Rating Vehicle	Rating Level	Controlling Member	Controlling Location	Controlling Limit State		
HL-93 Truck + Lane	Inventory	G14-G18	2.4	SERVICE-III PS Tensile Stress		
HL-93 Tandem + Lane (90%) HL-93 Tandem + Lane	Inventory	- G14-G18	- 2.5	- SERVICE-III PS Tensile Stress		
HL-93 Truck + Lane	Operating	G14-G18	2.1	STRENGTH-I Concrete Shear		
HL-93 Tandem + Lane	Operating	G14-G18	2.1	STRENGTH-I Concrete Shear		
We Make a Difference		108				







A	8		C D	E	P G	H
Asset ID (8	8	00000	Confirm motiching Asset AD to Justion	Asset ID matches collected information.	County	SPWRTANBURG
UAN			Autopopulates today's date		Route Type	Secondary road
				POPULATE DATA	Route Number	50
Created By	200		Ester nume of rater.	Data shown a for structure	Millipost	7.559
Number of Main Spans	10		Automoulates from Marco		Location .	6 4 ME NEW COOPERATE
Span Type	Limple		Select based on churchure data		Chintr	SCDOT
Design Load	H5-15		Select based on structure data		District	3
Design Load (33)	H 15		Autopopulates from Macro		Facility Carried by Structure	5-42-50
Route Type	Secondary to	6d	Autopopulates from Macro		Year Built	1970
Year Built (27)	1970		Autopopulates from Macro		Soute ADT	1100
Bridge Location (9)	6.4 MI NE WOOD	RUTT	Autopopulates from Macro		Route Year of ADT	2017
Facility Carried (7)	5-42-50	1.000	Autopopulates from Macro		iOrsign Loed	H 15
Peature intersected (6)	SOUTH TIGER I	IVER	Autopopulates from Macro		Main Superstructure Material	CONCRETE
Mile Root (11)	330		Autopopulates from Marys		the miner of Main Scenes	THE BEAM
District (2)	1		Autopopulates from Macro		Number of Approach Spans	0
County (3)	SPARTANBUS	NG .	Autopopulates from Macro.		Structure Length (FT)	330
Owner (22)	50001		Autopopulates from Macro.		Wear Surface Type	MONOLITHIC CONCRETE
Inpsection District	1		Autopopulates from Macro		ON Route Percent Truck Traffic	5
Wearing Surface Type (108)	MONOLITHIC COM	CRETE	Autopopulates from Macro		Inspection District	3
Bridge Description	Simple 10 Span RC	T Bridge	Aucoploguilantes based on 830; 831; 88; 828			
	Concerta		Select bases on structure data for			
		1001	predominant port of the structure			
	TeeBeam	*	predominant part of the structure			
Superstructure Type (43)	14 RCT		Autopopulates based on drop down			
	RCT		selection in 825 & 826.			
Man Departmenture Toma	-		Automotive from March			
is the structure a culvert?	NO		Autopopulates based on entry in B30			
Main Superstructure Material	CONCRETE		Autopopulates from Macro			
	1100		Autopopulates from Macro.			
ADT (29)						
ADT (29) ADT Year (30)	2017		Autopopulates from Macro.			

	Da	d R	at	in	gS	Su	mr	na	rvl	For
.e.A	8	¢	D	E	С	G	н	- 1	1	к
1	SCI	ЭT	LR	FR BRID	OGE LOA	DRAT	NG SUMI	MARY		Version 1.
3					SECTION 1 - 0	ENERAL BR	IDGE DATA			rage 1.cf.)
4	III) Asset ID		Route Type	223	(27) Year Built	1	(90) Date of inspection		(411) Date Rated	
5	00000		Secondary	road	1970		9/26/2019	1997 A		generation and the
6 7	54 Mille Lock 5.4 MillNE W	ADODRUFF		(7) Pecility Ce 5-42-50	stried		SOUTH TYGER R	cted/Route Cross RIVER	14	
8	(40) Length	(11) Milepost 2 539	(2) District	(3) County	IRG.	(22) Owner	(418) Conditions D	Auring Rating (NB	item 58, N2/ Item 59,	NBI (tare 60)
10	43. 44. 45. 8 4	46) Bridge Description	-	1. A CONTRACT	(31) Design La	ed be	(108) Existing Wea	ring Surface Type	e & Depth	
11	Simple 10 Sp	e 10 Span RCT Bridge HS-15 MON				MONOUTHIC CI	ONOUTHIC CONCRETE			
12	Rating Program	Program & Version Rating Program & Version Rating Method			AAGHTO Reference					
13	BrR 6.8.4 - AASHTO Engine		1	N/A	A.:		LRFR		MBE 3rd Edition, w/ 2019 Interims	
4	Sil) Deck		(59) Superstr	ucture	(60) Substruct	oune	N N/A (MRI)		(113) Scour Critical	
16		1	1. 4444	1	e parte actor		(Colorador)			
17				SECTION :	2 - INVENTORY	AND OPER	ATING LOAD RAT	TINGS		
18			1		Controlling	Controlling				
19	Eat	ting Vehicle	54	inglaval	Member	Location	Centrolling	Limit State	Rating	PHOM
20	41-93 Truck + L	Lane	in	ventory	62,63	1.6	STRENGTH-I Con	ncrete Fiexure	0.	137
22	41-93 Druck Tre	all + Lane (BCh)		ventory	03.65	1.5	ETERSOTIA-L Con	errete Flaining		-
23	4L-RS Truck + L	10.4	0	anating .	62.63	1.5	STRENGTH-I Con	increte Flexure	1	145
24	41-93 Truck Tru	ain + Lane (90%)	0	ierating						e
5	41-93 Tandem	+Lare		erating	62,63	1.5	STRENGTH-COM	ncrete Fieware	0	47
26	This LBFR Load	(Rating is based on	1710	tion Mana .	There itera	. Annual Ch	an farminar	[] (et /m.	en contein in Research	
28			E As	-Bult Plans	_ Unsign mans of	s Approved Se	op travenge		se expan in rienario	0
9			1	SEC	TION 3 - BRIDG	E LOAD RA	TING SUMMARY	6		
30	Control	ling Legal Truck	Load	Posting Reput	ed? (fires, comple	te Signing/Pos	ting form.	Corte	ulting Legal Load Rati	N Factor
31		EV3			No, see LFR summ	ary	and the second second		0.903	

Load I Section 5B of t Interstate Brid These Vehicles Level as per SC Cross-hatch th	Rati the LR lges shou CDOT I is Are	ng S RFR L Id be LRGI	Sum RSF Cons D Sec	nmary Fo Does Not Ap sidered at the tion 6.5	rm ply to e Perm	it
Section 5B of t Interstate Brid These Vehicles Level as per SC Cross-hatch th	the LR Iges s shou CDOT I is Are	RFR L Id be LRGI	RSF	Does Not Ap sidered at the tion 6.5	ply to e Perm	it
				State Druge	:5	
SECTION 58 - LEGAL RATINGS -	SC Specialized	Hauling Ve	hicles (SHV) -	Legal on Non-Interstate Only (P	Permit on Intersta	ite)
Rating	Weight	Controlling	Controlling	tegui on non interstate on (Rating	Rating
Rating Vehicle Level	(Tons)	Member	Location	Controlling Limit State	Factor	(Tons)
Legal	32.5	G14-G18	2.5	SERVICE-III PS Tensile Stress	0.795	25
Legal	35	G14-G18	2.5	SERVICE-III PS Tensile Stress	0.750	26
Legal	33	G14-G18	2.5	SERVICE-III PS Tensile Stress	0.796	26
Legal	40	614-618	2.5	SERVICE-III PS Tensile Stress	0.678	27
Legal	42.5	614-618	2.4	SERVICE-III PS Tensile Stress	0.828	35
Kaong venice Legal Legal Legal Legal Legal		32.5 35 33 40 42.5	(100k) Womber 32.5 G14-G18 35 G14-G18 33 G14-G18 40 G14-G18 42.5 G14-G18	(10%) Wether Occurs Occurs 32.5 614-618 2.5 35 614-618 2.5 33 614-618 2.5 40 614-618 2.5 40 614-618 2.5 5 40 614-618 2.5	Oromy Womber Collation Community future state 32.5 614-618 2.5 5 KRVICE-III PS Tensile Stress 35 G14-618 2.5 5 KRVICE-III PS Tensile Stress 33 G14-618 2.5 5 KRVICE-III PS Tensile Stress 40 G14-618 2.5 5 KRVICE-III PS Tensile Stress 42.5 G14-618 2.5 5 KRVICE-III PS Tensile Stress	(100%) Workholer Colation Christmann State Pactor 32.5 614-618 2.5 SERVICE-III PS Tensile Stress 0.795 35 G14-618 2.5 SERVICE-III PS Tensile Stress 0.750 33 G14-618 2.5 SERVICE-III PS Tensile Stress 0.796 40 G14-618 2.5 SERVICE-III PS Tensile Stress 0.676 42.5 G14-618 2.5 SERVICE-III PS Tensile Stress 0.676



<image><image><image><image><image>

Michael Baker		SCL	
Data	Correction I	Form	
 Field 63 and 65 - 5 Field 64 and 66 - 5 for the HL-93 Vehi LRFR Rating Report HL-93 Loading 	Should be Coded Should Provide th icle orted by Rating Fa	as 8 1e Govern Ratings actor Method Usir	ng
(63) Method of Operating Rating	1	8	Yes
(64) Operating Rating	87	1.27	Yes
(65) Method of Inventory Rating	1	8	Yes
(66) Inventory Rating	68	0.77	Yes
	Incorrect Data	Corrected Data	
We Make a Difference	118		







Michael Baker INTERNATIONAL
File Naming - BFP
 Supplemental Calculations File Naming Convention: Excel/Mathcad/Other File: [Asset ID]-LR_SuppCalcs-YYYY- MM-DD-001.xxx .PDF of Calculations File: [Asset ID]-LR_SuppCalcs-YYYY- MM-DD-002.pdf
 QC Review Checklist File Naming Convention: QC Review Checklist File: [Asset ID]-LR_QCList-YYYY-MM- DD-001.pdf
 Data Correction Form File Naming Convention: Data Correction Form File: [Asset ID]-LR_BridgeData- YYYY-MM-DD-001.pdf
We Make a Difference 122






















































Michael Baker SCDƏT **Posting Avoidance Measures** • For LRFR, if Shear Controls the Ratings, then Pursue **Posting Avoidance Procedures** LRGD 10.2.1.2 (#8): 8. For Control Options in BrR, see the screenshot in Figure 10.2.1.2-1. For an Example Load Case Description input, see Figure 10.2.1.2-2. For Prestressed Concrete Stress Limit input, see Figure 10.2.1.2-3. Note: the "Ignore design and legal load shear" box should only be checked if the requirements set forth in the MBE are met. MBE referenced in LRGD 10.2.1.2 (#8): • 6A.5.8-Evaluation for Shear The shear capacity of existing reinforced and prestressed concrete bridge members should be evaluated for permit loads. In-service concrete bridges that show no visible signs of shear distress need not be checked for shear when rating for the design load or legal loads We Make a Difference 150



Michael Baker	SCENT But Canto Equations of Engeneration
Posting Avoidance Measures	
Refined Analysis	
In some cases refined analy These are instances for white Furthermore, there are reas but not limited to: Capturing behavior the limits of the Spee methods can give err Obtaining more accu especially when app result in extensive re	sis is required to complete the design according to AASHTO LRFD. ch the specification approximate methods do not apply. sons why using a refined analysis might be advantageous, including not adequately accounted for by approximate methods and/or outside rifications. Even within the limits of applicability, approximate roneous indications of a structure's true behavior. urate, and less conservative, demands for existing structures, roximate methods result in conservative demands which in turn epair or replacement of structures.
	 Having listed some of what refined analysis is not, a definition of what refined analysis might include can begin to be constructed. A refined analysis might: Account for shear lag in deck and planar elements Account for the distortion of a cross-section Explicitly model cross-frames Explicitly model the deck as a plate (rather than a grid) in two dimensions Distribute load to girder lines based on interconnecting stiffness Assess capacity through the use of plastic hinges, such as by pushover analysis. Refined analyses are more sophisticated, and when correctly applied, generally more accurate than the current approximate methods contained in the AASHTO Specifications.
We Make a Difference	152





























