Traffic loading – AASHTO, State Implementations and International Codes of Practice

Steve RHODES

Assistant Technical Director

LUSAS

Kingston-Upon-Thames, UK
steve.rhodes@lusas.com

Chartered Civil Engineer with over 20 years bridge experience; since 2008, writing and delivering training courses internationally.

Bryan DONOGHUE

Design Development Engineer

LUSAS

Kingston-Upon-Thames, UK
bryan.donoghue@lusas.com

Chartered Engineer with almost 20 years experience; since 2015, developing software functions to check designs to international Codes of Practice.

Philip ICKE

Regional Operations, Europe

LUSAS

Kingston-Upon-Thames, UK
philip.icke@lusas.com

Graduating in Civil Engineering over 25 years ago, since 2003, specialising in promotion and use of analysis and design software.

Contact: steve.rhodes@lusas.com

1   Abstract

Highway bridge design and rating requires the application of notional traffic load models, with the most onerous load patterns being determined using influence surfaces. Software speeds the process of obtaining critical traffic load patterns and effects. This paper compares the requirements of – and load effects arising from – AASHTO LRFD, various State Bridge Design Manual implementations, also touching on selected international Codes from Europe, Australia, Canada and China.

Keywords: Bridge design, software, traffic loading, codes of practice

2   Introduction

Modern bridge design requires traffic loading determined according to the relevant Code of Practice to be applied to a mathematical model of the structure.

This paper reports on a study which considered the notional, pseudo-static, gravitational highway traffic loading that is defined in a range of Codes from around the world.

These notional traffic loads are built on considerable assumptions: any basis in measured traffic data may be quite limited, and perhaps 30 or 40 years old [1]. In view of this, the significance of traffic load effects in design, and the commonplace movement of freight across state and national borders, it is perhaps surprising that studies comparing Codes are not more frequently encountered in literature. This study has been facilitated by the implementation of a range of Codes and State Bridge Design Manuals in the LUSAS software starting in 2010 (v14.5) and the involvement of engineers carrying out that work in the drafting of this paper. The findings indicate some large differences in the load effects which arise.

The traffic loading requirements for most Codes of Practice centre upon placement of notional vehicles superimposed upon a notional lane load (UDL) so as to create the most onerous load effect. Differences occur between codes due to magnitude of the loading, definition of notional lanes, dynamic effect factors and simultaneous lane loading factors. The most onerous traffic loading pattern is determined from the influence surface specific to the load effect of interest and the location of interest. The calculations are very much non-trivial – especially when considering multiple span bridges with skew supports or plan curvature, perhaps in conjunction with substructure stiffnesses.