







Division of Research
& Innovation

Visual Inspection & Capacity Assessment of Earthquake Damaged Reinforced Concrete Bridge Elements

Final Report



Visual Inspection & Capacity Assessment of Earthquake Damaged Reinforced Concrete Bridge Elements

Final Report

Report No. CA08-0284

November 2008

Prepared By:

Department of Structural Engineering
School of Engineering
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093-0085

California Department of Transportation
Structure Maintenance and Investigations
1801 30th Street
Sacramento, CA 95816

Prepared For:

California Department of Transportation
Structure Maintenance and Investigations
1801 30th Street
Sacramento, CA 95816

California Department of Transportation
Division of Research and Innovation, MS-83
1227 O Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

DISCLAIMER STATEMENT

This document is disseminated in the interest of information exchange. The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the State of California or the Federal Highway Administration. This publication does not constitute a standard, specification or regulation. This report does not constitute an endorsement by the Department of any product described herein.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
TECHNICAL REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE
 TR0003 (REV. 10/98)

1. REPORT NUMBER CA08-0284		2. GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION NUMBER		3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Visual Inspection & Capacity Assessment of Earthquake Damaged Reinforced Concrete Bridge Elements				5. REPORT DATE November, 2008	
7. AUTHOR(S) Marc Veletzos ¹ , Mario Panagioutou ¹ , Jose Restrepo ¹ , Stephen Sahs ²				6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS ¹ Department of Structural Engineering School of Engineering University of California, San Diego La Jolla, CA 92093-0085 ² California Department of Transportation Structure Maintenance and Investigations 1801 30 th Street Sacramento, CA 95816				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO. ¹ SSRP-06/19	
12. SPONSORING AGENCY AND ADDRESS California Department of Transportation Division of Research and Innovation, MS-83 1227 O Street Sacramento, CA 95814				10. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
				11. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER DRI Research Task No. 0284 Contract No. 65A0156	
				13. TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED Final Report	
				14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE 913	
15. SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES This report captures the 'fundamental research components' developed primarily by UCSD researchers within a larger research-to-deployment effort coordinated by the Caltrans Division of Structures Maintenance and Investigations (SM&I) of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The larger effort includes 'deployment products' developed jointly by UCSD researchers in collaboration with Caltrans SM&I staff consisting of a training manual for visual capacity assessment, an inspection manual with detailed procedures for post-earthquake inspection, and associated slide sets used for training of bridge engineers involved with emergency response. The deployment products and other resource materials are summarized in appendices to the report and can be obtained through direct request to Caltrans SM&I.					
16. ABSTRACT The overarching objective of this project was to produce standard procedures, and associated training materials, for the conduct of post-earthquake visual inspection and capacity assessment of damaged reinforced concrete (RC) bridges where the procedures are consistent with both Caltrans seismic design strategies and the extensive body of research laboratory testing that has been conducted in support of Caltrans seismic design. This report presents the fundamental research concepts and experiment-based resources used in the broader development by Caltrans of standard procedures and associated training materials. It includes: 1) a summary report describing principles for classification and capacity assessment of earthquake damaged reinforced concrete bridges, and 2) an extensive visual catalog of RC bridge damage from both laboratory tests and field observations; all characterized using a consistent engineering terminology tied to bridge performance.					
17. KEY WORDS Reinforced Concrete Bridge, Earthquake, Visual Inspection, Column Damage, Capacity Assessment, Emergency Response			18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161		
19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION (of this report) Unclassified		20. NUMBER OF PAGES 392 Pages		21. PRICE	

Visual Inspection & Capacity Assessment of Earthquake Damaged Reinforced Concrete Bridge Elements.

Final Report

Preface:

This report captures the ‘fundamental research components’ developed primarily by UCSD researchers within a larger research-to-deployment effort coordinated by the Caltrans Division of Structures Maintenance and Investigations (SM&I) of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The larger effort includes ‘deployment products’ developed jointly by UCSD researchers in collaboration with Caltrans SM&I staff consisting of a training manual for visual capacity assessment, an inspection manual with detailed procedures for post-earthquake inspection, and associated slide sets used for training of bridge engineers involved with emergency response. The deployment products and other resource materials are summarized in appendices to the report and can be obtained through direct request to Caltrans SM&I.

Abstract:

The overarching objective of this project was to produce standard procedures, and associated training materials, for the conduct of post-earthquake visual inspection and capacity assessment of damaged reinforced concrete (RC) bridges where the procedures are consistent with both Caltrans seismic design strategies and the extensive body of research laboratory testing that has been conducted in support of Caltrans seismic design.

This report presents the fundamental research concepts and experiment-based resources used in the broader development by Caltrans of standard procedures and associated training materials. It includes: 1) a summary report describing principles for classification and capacity assessment of earthquake damaged reinforced concrete bridges, and 2) an extensive visual catalog of RC bridge damage from both laboratory tests and field observations; all characterized using a consistent engineering terminology tied to bridge performance.

Visual Inspection & Capacity Assessment of Earthquake Damaged Reinforced Concrete (RC) Bridge Elements.

Final Report

Section 1: Summary Report - Post Seismic Inspection and Capacity Assessment of RC Bridges (UCSD Report SSRP-06/19)

Section 2: Visual Catalog of RC Bridge Damage

Part 1: Laboratory Test Photos and Associated Hysteresis Curves for Component Behavior

Part 2: Catalog of Bridge Damage from Historical Earthquakes 1971-2004

Part 3: Comparison of Observed Damage between Laboratory Tests and Historical Earthquakes

Part 4: Bridge Component Damage for Performance Levels IV and V

Part 5: Performance Curves for Various Bridge Components

Appendices: Summary of Related Resources Available By Request Through SM&I

A: Research Deployment Products (Developed Collaboratively by UCSD and SM&I)

B: Resources Used in Caltrans Emergency Response Training (Developed by SM&I)

Visual Inspection & Capacity Assessment of Earthquake Damaged Reinforced Concrete Bridge Elements.

Final Report

Section 1

Summary Report:

**Post Seismic Inspection and Capacity Assessment
of Reinforced Concrete Bridges
(UCSD Report SSRP-06/19)**



**STRUCTURAL SYSTEMS
RESEARCH PROJECT**

Report No.
SSRP-06/19
Final

**POST SEISMIC INSPECTION AND
CAPACITY ASSESSMENT OF
REINFORCED CONCRETE BRIDGES**

by

**MARC J. VELETZOS
MARIOS PANAGIOTOU
JOSÉ I. RESTREPO**

Final Report Submitted to the California Department of
Transportation (Caltrans) Under Contract No. 65A0156

July 2006

Department of Structural Engineering
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093-0085

University of California, San Diego
Department of Structural Engineering
Structural Systems Research Project

Report No. SSRP-06/19

**Post Seismic Inspection and Capacity Assessment of
Reinforced Concrete Bridges**

by

Marc J. Veletzos

Graduate Student Researcher

Marios Panagiotou

Graduate Student Researcher

José I. Restrepo

Associate Professor of Structural Engineering

Final Report Submitted to the California Department of Transportation
(Caltrans) Under Contract No. 65A0156

Department of Structural Engineering
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093-0085

July 2006

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Post Seismic Inspection and Capacity Assessment of Reinforced Concrete Bridges		5. Report Date June, 2006	
		6. Performing Organization Code UCSD/ SSRP-06/19	
7. Author(s) Marc J. Veletzos, Marios Panagioutou, Jose I. Restrepo		8. Performing Organization Report No. UCSD / SSRP- 06/19	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Department of Structural Engineering School of Engineering University of California, San Diego La Jolla, California 92093-0085		10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
		11. Contracts or Grant No. 65A0156	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address California Department of Transportation Engineering Service Center 1801 30 th St., West Building MS-9 Sacramento, California 95807		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes Prepared in cooperation with the State of California Department of Transportation.			
16. Abstract California has experienced several moderate size earthquakes in the last 30 years, yet the Office of Structures Maintenance and Investigation at the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) does not have a standard procedure or a training program for the assessment of damage and the determination of the remaining load capacity of earthquake damage reinforced concrete (RC) bridge elements. In order to develop a standard procedure and training program, a Visual Bridge Catalog has been developed that documents damage from laboratory experiments and from historic earthquakes and classifies the performance of an array of bridge components, sub-assemblages, and systems in a consistent format. Results from the evaluation of numerous case studies using this damage/performance approach has lead to the formulation of Training and Inspection Manuals to aid in post-earthquake visual inspection of reinforced concrete bridges. In addition to these manuals and the visual catalog, an online computer based training class has been developed to easily communicate this information to Caltrans Maintenance and Inspection Engineers. This report presents excerpts of the Visual Catalog, summarizes the Training and Inspection Manuals, and outlines the damage assessment and load capacity determination procedures for earthquake induced damage to reinforced concrete bridge columns.			
17. Key Words Seismic, inspection, assessment, columns, reinforce concrete		18. Distribution Statement Unlimited	
19. Security Classification (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classification (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 18	22. Price

Disclaimer

The accuracy of the information presented in this report is the sole responsibility of the authors. All recommendations, opinions, and conclusions presented in the report are those of the authors, and do not necessarily express the beliefs of the California Department of Transportation or the State of California.

Acknowledgments

This research project was made possible by funding from the California Department of Transportation under contract No. 65A0156. The input of Steve Sahs, Tom Harrington and others at Caltrans was greatly appreciated.

The authors would also like to acknowledge the hard work of our undergraduate Structural Engineering interns, Jose Amador, Jose Ramirez, Justin Chung, Justin Chang, Alex Gascon, Chad Closs and our web-designer Dasha Tymoshenko. Without their efforts much of this work could not have been completed.

Abstract

California has experienced several moderate size earthquakes in the last 30 years, yet the Office of Structures Maintenance and Investigation at the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) does not have a standard procedure or a training program for the assessment of damage and the determination of the remaining load capacity of earthquake damage reinforced concrete (RC) bridge elements. In order to develop a standard procedure and training program, a Visual Bridge Catalog has been developed that documents damage from laboratory experiments and from historic earthquakes and classifies the performance of an array of bridge components, sub-assemblages, and systems in a consistent format. Results from the evaluation of numerous case studies using this damage/performance approach has lead to the formulation of Training and Inspection Manuals to aid in post-earthquake visual inspection of reinforced concrete bridges. In addition to these manuals and the visual catalog, an online computer based training class has been developed to easily communicate this information to Caltrans Maintenance and Inspection Engineers.

This report presents excerpts of the Visual Catalog, summarizes the Training and Inspection Manuals, and outlines the damage assessment and load capacity determination procedures for earthquake induced damage to reinforced concrete bridge columns.

Table of Contents

Disclaimer.....	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Figures.....	vi
List of Tables	vi
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Caltrans Current Practice	3
3. Post Earthquake Inspection and Assessment Tools.....	4
3.1. Visual Catalog of RC Bridge Damage.....	4
3.2. Capacity Assessment Training Manual	6
3.3. Post-Earthquake Inspection Manual for RC Bridge Columns.....	7
3.4. Web-Site and On-Line Training Course	7
4. Inspection and Assessment Protocol.....	9
4.1. Phase I – Determine Performance Curve.....	9
4.2. Phase II – Identify Damage Level	12
4.3. Phase III – Assess Bridge System.....	14
5. Protocol Testing.....	15
6. Performance Curve Pilot Study	16
7. Conclusions.....	17
8. References.....	18

List of Figures

Figure 1 - Excerpt from "Visual Catalog of RC Bridge Damage"	5
Figure 2 - Excerpt from "Capacity Assessment Training Manual"	6
Figure 3 - Excerpt from "Bridge Seismic Inspection and Capacity Assessment" Web-Site	8
Figure 4 - Performance Curves	10
Figure 5 - Column Failure Mode and Performance Curve Decision Making Flowchart .	11
Figure 6 - Visualization of Remaining Capacity of Bridge Columns.....	14

List of Tables

Table 1 – Performance Assessment (Hose, 2001)	13
Table 2 - Decision-making Matrix for Damaged Bridge Columns	13

1. Introduction

California is expecting to experience several moderate size earthquakes per decade. The San Francisco Bay area alone has a 62% probability of experiencing a Magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake by the year 2032 (Michael et. al., 2004). Seismic events of this magnitude can cause disruptions to the road network and result in important economic losses as a result of the impact. Despite this fact, the Office of Structures Maintenance and Investigation (SMI) at Caltrans does not have a standard procedure or a training program for the assessment of damage and the determination of the remaining load capacity of earthquake damage reinforced concrete (RC) bridge elements.

Following the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, the Mora Drive Overcrossing in Santa Clara County was closed and opened several times, because different departments had different opinions on the safety of the bridge. The lack of consensus caused public confusion and wasted the time and efforts of inspection engineers. This repeated closing and opening of the same bridge was partly caused by confusion regarding departmental responsibilities, which has since been clarified. It was also caused by discrepancies between the experience and judgment of Caltrans engineers. A common inspection and assessment protocol should prevent this from occurring in the future.

In order to develop a standard procedure and training program, Caltrans has supported a project that has developed a number of inspection and assessment tools. These tools include a first edition of a “Visual Catalog of RC Bridge Damage”, a “Capacity Assessment Training Manual”, and a “Post Earthquake Inspection Manual for RC Bridge

Columns”. All of these documents have been transcribed into a web-based format. In addition to these manuals, an online computer based training class has been developed to assist in training Caltrans Maintenance and Inspection Engineers.

The inspection and assessment tools are based on over fifteen years of bridge seismic research. They touch upon details of seismic design practices and the historic performance of bridge components. Yet they also provide a simple step by step approach to post earthquake inspection and assessment that can be learned on the fly if necessary

2. Caltrans Current Practice

Following any emergency, SMI is officially responsible for all reports, investigations and recommendations for California bridges. They are, however, not the first responders to bridge sites. SMI has three offices in California (Sacramento, Oakland, and Los Angeles) and due to their locations, they can be many hours away from a large number of bridge in the state. The first responders are typically district construction and maintenance crews who are usually already out in the field. Engineers working in the SMI may have more experience with post seismic inspection than local construction and maintenance engineers, but there is no standard procedure for what to look for or guidelines on how to assess the remaining capacity of bridges after a significant seismic event. Thus, the decisions are ultimately based on the experience and judgment of each individual engineer, which can vary greatly.

3. Post Earthquake Inspection and Assessment Tools

3.1. Visual Catalog of RC Bridge Damage

The “Visual Catalog of RC Bridge Damage” documents damage from laboratory experiments and from historic earthquakes and classifies the performance of an array of bridge components, sub-assemblages, and systems in a consistent format. The Visual Catalog organizes photos of over one hundred test units from forty research reports dating back to 1990. The damage to each test unit has been classified into five different damage levels. The Visual Catalog also includes a force-displacement diagram of the test to document the performance of each test unit. A sample page from the Visual Catalog is shown in Figure 1. The Visual Catalog also organizes and classifies photos from fourteen historic earthquakes dating back to the 1971 San Fernando event.

F1 – Flexural - Ductile




Figure 1 - Excerpt from "Visual Catalog of RC Bridge Damage"

The intention is that this document will be used by inspection and maintenance engineers as a reference to confirm the type and level of damage observed after an earthquake. It will also be used as a teaching tool to train engineers in identifying the failure type and level of damage to bridge components.

3.2. Capacity Assessment Training Manual

The "Capacity Assessment Training Manual" will be a primary teaching tool for inspection and maintenance engineers. This document discusses seismic design concepts such as inelastic response, plastic hinge mechanisms, and capacity design principles. It explains the vulnerabilities of bridge from different design provision eras and reviews the past performance of RC bridge components and the seismic vulnerabilities of different construction methods. The training manual also discussed post earthquake bridge evaluation and ends with lessons learned about damage evaluation and capacity assessment. An excerpt from this manual is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2 - Excerpt from "Capacity Assessment Training Manual"

3.3. Post-Earthquake Inspection Manual for RC Bridge Columns

The “Post Earthquake Inspection Manual for RC Bridge Columns”, clearly identifies a simple step by step procedure that guides maintenance and inspection engineers in the determination of the remaining capacity of damaged reinforced concrete bridge structures. The general protocol is outlined elsewhere in this paper. Ideally, Caltrans engineers will be trained in the procedure prior to a significant seismic event. This, however, is not always practical, so the protocol has been developed to be simple enough to be followed in the field without prior training if necessary.

3.4. Web-Site and On-Line Training Course

The information in the above documents has been transformed into a web-site for easy access and information transfer. Inaccessible information is useless information, so every attempt has been made to make all these tools as available as possible. The home page of the web-site is shown in Figure 3.

Bridge Seismic Inspection and Capacity Assessment :: - Mozilla Firefox

File Edit View Go Bookmarks ScrapBook Tools Help

Bridge Seismic Inspection & Capacity Assessment

Home | About | Contact Us | Site Map

Catalog of Bridge Damage | Capacity Assessment Training Manual | RC Column Inspection Manual | On-Line Training Course



California is expecting to experience several moderate size earthquakes per decade. These earthquakes can cause disruptions to the road network and result in important economic losses as a result of the impact. Despite this fact, the Office of Structures Maintenance and Investigation at Caltrans does not have a standard procedure or a training program for the assessment of damage and the determination of the remaining load capacity of earthquake damage reinforced concrete (RC) bridge elements.

In order to develop a standard procedure and training program, Caltrans has supported a research program that has developed a number of tools:


The **"Visual Catalog of RC Bridge Damage"** documents damage from laboratory experiments and from historic earthquakes and classifies the performance of an array of bridge components, sub-assemblages, and systems in a consistent format. The intention is that this document will be used by inspection and maintenance engineers as a reference to confirm the type and level of damage observed after an earthquake. It can also be used as a teaching tool to train engineering in identifying the type and level of damage to bridge components.



The **"Capacity Assessment Training Manual"** will be the main teaching tool and discusses seismic design concepts, the performance of RC bridge components and post earthquake bridge evaluation.



The **"Post Earthquake Inspection Manual for Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns"** clearly identifies a step by step procedure that guides Caltrans maintenance and inspection engineers in the determination of the remaining capacity of damaged reinforced concrete bridge structure.




In addition to these manuals, an **online computer based training class** has been developed to easily communicate this information to Caltrans Maintenance and Inspection Engineers as well as to all other interested parties.

Figure 3 - Excerpt from "Bridge Seismic Inspection and Capacity Assessment" Web-Site

4. Inspection and Assessment Protocol

Since the 1971 San Fernando earthquake, bridges in California have been designed with the goal of restricting all seismic damage to the columns while all other components remain essentially undamaged. Because of this fact, the focus of the inspection and assessment protocol has been limited to bridge columns. The primary goal of the post seismic inspection and assessment protocol is to keep things simple and conservative. Thus the protocol can be summed up in three phases.

Phase I - Determine the performance curve

Phase II - Identify the damage level

Phase III - Assess bridge system

4.1. Phase I – Determine Performance Curve

This phase is probably the most complicated and time intensive portion of the protocol as it requires access to all construction drawing of the bridge. Each column needs to be associated with a performance curve that best summarizes the expected seismic response. There are three performance curves to choose from: Ductile, Strength Degrading, and Brittle (see Figure 4). The engineer can determine the anticipated performance curve by following the decision making flowchart shown in Figure 5. This phase is most efficiently performed before hand in the office. The use of summary tables identifying the design detail and the performance curve for every column is recommended.




Figure 4 - Performance Curves




Figure 5 - Column Failure Mode and Performance Curve Decision Making Flowchart

4.2. Phase II – Identify Damage Level

This phase must be performed on the bridge site after a significant seismic event. Engineers are guided by a step-by-step procedure with the goal of determining where each column is on their respective performance curve. The steps are as follows.

Step 1 - Check for diagonal cracks.

Step 2 - Check for horizontal cracks.

Step 3 - Check for incipient concrete crushing or spalling.

Step 4 - Check for longitudinal bar buckling.

Step 5 - Check for rupture of transverse reinforcement

Step 6 - Determine the damage level based on the observations above.

The engineer is assisted by quantitative performance descriptions of each damage level (see Table 1) and a decision making matrix (see Table 2). It is recommended that the engineer refer to the “Visual Catalog of RC Bridge Damage” to confirm the level of damage they determine after following the six step procedure.

Table 1 – Performance Assessment (Hose, 2001)

Damage Level	Performance Level	Qualitative Performance Description	Quantitative Performance Description
I	Cracking	Onset of hairline cracks	Barely visible residual cracks
II	Yielding	Theoretical first yield of longitudinal reinforcement	Residual crack width ~ 0.008in
III	Initiation of Local Mechanism	Initiation of inelastic deformation. Onset of concrete spalling. Development of diagonal cracks.	Residual crack width 0.04in – 0.08in Length of spalled region > 1/10 cross-section depth.
IV	Full Development of Local Mechanism	Wide crack widths/spalling over full local mechanism region.	Residual crack width > 0.08in. Diagonal cracks extend over 2/3 cross-section depth. Length of spalled region > ½ cross-section depth.
V	Strength Degradation	Buckling of main reinforcement. Rupture of transverse reinforcement. Crushing of core concrete.	Lateral capacity below 85% of maximum. Measurable dilation > 5% of original member dimension.

Table 2 - Decision-making Matrix for Damaged Bridge Columns

Field Observations				Conclusions	
Pronounced Horizontal Cracks	Pronounced Diagonal Cracks	Incipient Concrete Crushing/ Spalling	Long. Bar Buckling	Damage Level	Possible Failure Type
No	Yes	No	No	III	Shear
Yes or No	Yes	Yes	Yes or No	IV or V	Shear
Yes	No	No	No	II or III	Flexure
Yes	No	Yes	No	IV	Flexure
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	V	Flexure

4.3. Phase III – Assess Bridge System

In this phase, it is recommended that engineers plot the level of damage of each column on their respective performance curve. This will assist the engineer in visualizing the remaining capacity of the structure (see Figure 6). It is important to note that bridges are complex structures and decisions about the bridge should include issues beyond column damage, such as damage to the superstructure, the abutments and expansion joints.




Figure 6 - Visualization of Remaining Capacity of Bridge Columns

5. Protocol Testing

The inspection and assessment protocol has been tested on undergraduate and graduate structural engineering students from the University of California at San Diego. The students have been asked to assess a number of columns that have been tested at the Charles Lee Powell Structural Laboratories and have been given no guidance other than what is in the inspection and assessment tools. The students helped the authors identify portions of the protocol that required clarification.

6. Performance Curve Pilot Study

A pilot study to identify the performance curve for every column on over two hundred bridges in California has been completed. This pilot study will allow Caltrans engineers to skip Phase I of the inspection and assessment protocol and save them valuable time and effort in the immediate hours following a major earthquake.

7. Conclusions

Post earthquake inspection and capacity assessment tools have been developed to assist Caltrans engineers after a significant seismic event. These tools include a “Visual Catalog of RC Bridge Damage”, a “Capacity Assessment Training Manual” and a “Post Earthquake Inspection Manual for RC Bridge Columns”. These tools have been transcribed into a web-based format to maximize accessibility and information transfer. Furthermore an on-line training course has been developed that will assist in training Caltrans maintenance and inspection engineers. These tools will help to standardize the inspection and assessment of bridges and improve the efficiency of Caltrans engineers during the important early hours after a large earthquake.

8. References

Hose Y.D., "Seismic Performance and Flexural Behavior of Plastic Hinge Regions in Flexural Bridge Columns", PhD Dissertation, UCSD, 2001.

Michael A.J., Ross S.L., Simpson R.W., Zoback, M.L., Schwartz D.P., Blanpeid, M.L., Understanding Earthquake Hazards in the San Francisco Bay Region, USGS Fact Sheet 039-03, September, 2004.

Visual Inspection & Capacity Assessment of Earthquake Damaged Reinforced Concrete Bridge Elements.

Final Report

Section 2

Visual Catalog of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Damage

- Part 1: Laboratory Test Photos and Associated Hysteresis Curves for Component Behavior
- Part 2: Catalog of Bridge Damage from Historical Earthquakes 1971-2004
- Part 3: Comparison of Observed Damage Between Laboratory Tests and Historical Earthquakes
- Part 4: Bridge Component Damage for Performance Levels IV and V
- Part 5: Performance Curves for Various Bridge Components

**California Department of Transportation
Structure Maintenance and Investigations**

**Visual Catalog
of Reinforced Concrete
Bridge Damage**

**© Copyright 2007 California Department of Transportation
All Rights Reserved**

Date: June 20, 2007

Acknowledgements

California Department of Transportation Structure Maintenance and Investigation would like to acknowledge the University of California San Diego Department of Structural Engineering, Dr. Frieder Seible (Dean of Structural Engineering), for the outstanding work on the “Visual Inspection and Capacity Assessment of Earthquake Damaged RC Bridge Elements” research project. This manual/catalog is a result of that research.

Special acknowledgements go to the UCSD Project Managers, Dr. Yael “Lilli” Van Dan Einde and Dr. Jose Restrepo, and Graduate Researchers, Marios Panagiotou and Marc Veletzos. All laboratory test and earthquake field photos have been gathered by UCSD researchers from many sources including UCSD Structural Systems Research Projects, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, National Information Service for Earthquake Engineering, Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, and Caltrans Structure Maintenance and Investigations.

Other acknowledgements go to California Department of Transportation Structure Maintenance and Investigation, Structure Division of Research, Division of Earthquake Engineering, and Structure Design.

Key personnel for Structure Maintenance and Investigations were Tom Harrington, Office Chief, who initiated the Research that generated Earthquake Inspection manuals and Senior Bridge Engineer Stephen Sahs, the Research Project Manager and research contributor.

Disclaimer: The material and manuals generated from this research, “Visual Inspection and Capacity Assessment of Earthquake Damaged RC bridge Elements”, should be used as a guide and training purposes only and should never replace engineering judgment in the field.

Visual Catalog of Bridge Damage

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
--------------------------------	---

Introduction

Organization	1
Damage Levels	2
Seismic Design Provisions	2
Discussion of Bridge Component Behavior.....	5
References	7

Part I - Laboratory Tests Photos

Components

Columns

Ordinary Columns

Flexural.....	13
Shear.....	35
Lap Splice.....	46

Special Sections

Hollow.....	50
Boundary elements.....	54
Flared	58

Special Material

Lightweight	63
MMX Steel	67
Steel Column	70

Joints	73
---------------------	----

Superstructure	80
-----------------------------	----

Foundations	89
--------------------------	----

Abutments/Shear Keys	97
-----------------------------------	----

Retrofit	105
Sub-Assemblages – Systems	
Column Superstructure Sub-Assemblages	119
Column Foundation Sub-Assemblages	129
Double Deck Viaduct	131
Precast	134
Part II - Field Photos from Historic Earthquakes	
Classification According to Earthquake	
San Fernando, USA 1971	141
Imperial Valley, USA 1979	144
Whittier Narrows 1987	146
Loma Prieta 1989	150
Erzincan, Turkey 1992	158
Northridge, USA 1994	160
Morgan Hill, USA 1994	178
Kobe, Japan 1995	180
Adana-Ceyhan 1998	187
Izmit, Turkey 1999	189
Duzce, Turkey 1999	193
Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999	195
Kocaeli, Turkey 1999	208
Mid Niigata Prefecture Earthquake, Japan 2004	211
Classification According to Type of Damage	
Columns	
Flexural	217
Shear	222
Retrofit	241
Joint Damage	243
Superstructure	
Deck	249
Cap beams/Girder	256

Span Collapse	259
Movement.....	264
Foundations/Soil Damage	268
Abutments/Shear Keys	271
Bearing Damage	280
Total Collapse	283

Part III - Correlation

Correlation of Field Photos with Laboratory Database

Flexural	288
Shear	292
Joints	295
Cap Beam – Column	298
Abutments/Shear Keys	300
Superstructure	305
Foundation	307
Other cases	309

Part IV – Details

Details of Extreme Damage Levels

Flexural Level V	312
Shear Level V	313
Lap Splice	314
Retrofit – Level IV	315
Retrofit – Level V	316
Joints - Level V	317
Foundation - Level V	318
Shear Key – Level V	319

Part V – Performance Curves

Correlation of Damage Level with Performance Curves

Columns	321
Joints	329

Foundations	332
Abutments	337

Appendix

References by Catalog Number.....	339
-----------------------------------	-----

INTRODUCTION

California is expecting to experience several moderate size earthquakes per decade. These earthquakes can cause disruptions to the road network and result in important economic losses as a result of the impact. Despite this fact, the Office of Structures Maintenance and Investigation at Caltrans does not have a standard procedure or a training program for the assessment of damage and the determination of the remaining load capacity of earthquake damage reinforced concrete (RC) bridge elements.

In order to develop a standard procedure and training program, Caltrans has supported a research program that has developed a number of tools: a “Visual Catalog of RC Bridge Damage”, a “Capacity Assessment Training Manual”, and a “Post Earthquake Inspection Manual for Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns”. In addition to these manuals, an online computer based training class has been developed to easily communicate this information to Caltrans Maintenance and Inspection Engineers as well as to all other interested parties.

The “Visual Catalog of RC Bridge Damage” documents damage from laboratory experiments and from historic earthquakes and classifies the performance of an array of bridge components, sub-assemblages, and systems in a consistent format. The intention is that this document will be used by inspection and maintenance engineers as a reference to confirm the type and level of damage observed after an earthquake. It can also be used as a teaching tool to train engineering in identifying the type and level of damage to bridge components.

ORGANIZATION

The Caltrans Visual Bridge Catalog of Bridge Damage has been divided into five parts.

Part I is a catalog of laboratory test photos that are arranged by bridge component. The behavior of each laboratory experiment is documented with photos from various damage levels as well as a hysteresis curve of the response.

Part II is a catalog of photos from historical earthquakes dating from the 1971 San Fernando earthquake to the 2004 Mid Niigata Prefecture earthquake in Japan. For ease of referencing, the photos in this section have been arranged by earthquake as well as by type of damage.

Part III compares damage observed in laboratory experiments to damage from historical earthquakes. The intent of this section is to prove to the reader that what is observed in carefully controlled lab condition is in fact a realistic representation of in-situ behavior.

Part IV characterizes the damage at performance level IV and V for various bridge components. This section provides more detail than shown in Part I.

Part V defines performance curves for various bridge components. The performance is classified into one of three categories: ductile, strength degrading, or brittle. The damage level at various stages along the curve is indicated to clearly illustrate proximity to component failure.

DAMAGE LEVELS

This catalog utilizes a five stage damage classification system. Damage level I indicates no damage while damage level V indicates local failure or component collapse. See the table below for further descriptions.

<u>Level</u>	<u>Damage Classification</u>	<u>Damage Description</u>	<u>Repair Description</u>	<u>Socio-Economic Description</u>
I	None	Barely visible cracking	No Repair	Fully Operational
II	Minor	Cracking	Possible Repair	Operational
III	Moderate	Open cracks; onset of spalling	Minimum Repair	Life Safety
IV	Major	Very wide cracks; extended spalling	Repair	Near Collapse
V	Local Failure/Collapse	Visible permanent deformation	Replacement	Collapse

SEISMIC DESIGN PROVISIONS

Seismic design provisions have evolved significantly over the decades in order to fill deficiencies that became apparent after significant seismic events. Of particular importance are the 1906 San Francisco Earthquake, the 1971 San Fernando Earthquake, and the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake. In order to accurately assess the remaining strength in a bridge structure after a seismic event, it is imperative to understand the typical vulnerabilities of the design era. These vulnerabilities can be identified by their physical characteristics and design details.

Pre 1971 Design

In 1940, California developed the first seismic design provision for bridge in the country. This early seismic design code was simplistic and recognized that earthquakes produce forces that are proportional to the dead weight of the structure. Until 1965 the maximum lateral seismic design force was only 6% of the structural dead weight. In 1965, Caltrans incorporated the period of the structure into the design equations along with various amplification factors. The maximum lateral seismic design force increased to 13% of the weight of the structure. This was for very specific cases and was not typical of all bridge structures.

Potential Vulnerabilities (non-retrofitted bridges)

- Column shear failure
- Column longitudinal reinforcement pull-out
- Unseating of expansion hinges

Typical Design Details

- Column shear reinforcement → #4 at 12" (typical, regardless of column size or size of column longitudinal bars)

- Very short seat widths at expansion joints (6-8" typ.)
- Inadequate lap splice of column long bars near footing ($\sim 20 d_b$)
- Inadequate development of column long bars into footing ($\sim 20 d_b$, without std. hooks)
- Lap splicing of column transverse rebar in cover (i.e. no 135 deg seismic hooks into core concrete)

1971 – 1994 Design

The 1971 San Fernando earthquake completely change the way California bridges are designed. Bridge engineers recognized the importance of detailing and ductility in the response of bridge structures, and the concept of capacity design was slowly incorporated into the design code. Bridges that were in the design phase when the earthquake occurred had their lateral design forces increased by a factor of 2 or 2.5 to about 0.3g, while future bridges had to account for fault proximity, site conditions, dynamic structural response and ductile details for RC construction. These provisions were incorporated into the Caltrans code in 1974 and while it was updated regularly, it remained, for all practical purposes, unchanged when the 1994 Northridge earthquake occurred. By 1980 the standard practice was to design for plastic shear of the columns. That is, the design intent was to fail the column in flexure with all other portions of the bridge remaining elastic.

The 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake prompted Caltrans to solicit the Applied Technology Council to review and revise the Caltrans design standards, performance criteria, specifications and practices. Work began in 1991, but their findings were not complete when the 1994 Northridge event occurred.

Potential Vulnerabilities (non-retrofitted bridges)

- Column shear failure of plastic hinge regions
- Shear failure of flared columns
- Unseating of expansion joint hinges

Typical New Design Details

- Closer spacing and improved column shear detailing (typical spacing 4"-6", but no confinement/anti-buckling requirement of plastic hinge region)
- Top reinforcement matt in footing and pile caps (but no shear reinforcement)
- Column longitudinal splices prohibited at maximum moment locations
- Short seat widths at expansion joint hinges ($\sim 12"$)
- Poor flare detailing (no gap between top of flare and superstructure)
- No joint reinforcement

Potential Vulnerabilities (retrofitted bridges)

- Failure of expansion joint hinge restrainers and subsequent unseating of expansion hinges, particularly for bridges with large skew (>30 deg)

Typical Retrofit Design Details

- Expansion joint hinge restrainers, short (connected to concrete bolster on either side of expansion joint)

Post 1994 Design

The Caltrans seismic design provisions of this era incorporated essentially all of the recommendations from the Applied Technology Council as stated in ATC-32. The recommendations included a capacity design approach that will ensure a ductile flexural failure of the column while all other bridge components remain elastic. In order to achieve this goal they

recommended minimizing the number of expansion joints, avoiding large skews, minimize the use of column flares, considerations for shear demands in footings, joint shear in cap/column and footing/column connections, anti-buckling reinforcement in column plastic hinges and increasing the seat width at expansion joint hinges.

The 1994 Northridge earthquake validated the knowledge gained from recent research and from the Loma Prieta earthquake. While significant damage occurred, it was primarily in not retrofitted pre 1971 designs or bridges with the early hinge restrainer retrofits. Bridges with steel jacket column retrofits performed particularly well.

Typical New Design Details

- Tight confinement reinforcement in plastic hinge regions (~4" spacing)
- Long seats widths at expansion joints (~24")
- Improved flare column details (Gap between top of flare and superstructure)
- No lap splices in plastic hinge zones
- Shear reinforcement in footings
- Cap/column and footing/column joint reinforcement

Typical Retrofit Design Details

- Steel or concrete column jackets
- Expansion joint seat width extenders (8" XX-strong pipes)
- Top mat reinforcement in footings and perhaps additional piles.
- Expansion joint hinge restrainers, long (connected from bolster at one side of hinge to the superstructure web on the other side of the hinge)

DISCUSSION OF BRIDGE COMPONENT BEHAVIOR

Column Flexural Behavior

The flexural response of columns is influenced by a number of factors, including the axial load ratio, aspect ratio, and reinforcement ratio. The most important factor of all, however, is the design details that vary based on the era in which the column was designed.

Pre '71 Designs

Columns designed to pre 1971 standards typically cannot obtain their full flexural capacity since column shear failure will occur prior to development of column yield moments. However, if the column yield moment is reached the strength will degrade quickly as the transverse reinforcement of the plastic hinge region is deficient. Fracture of the transverse reinforcement is likely as is buckling of the column longitudinal reinforcement.

A common practice for this design period was to lap splices the longitudinal column reinforcement at the critical moment location just above the footing. Another common practice was to embed the column longitudinal bars into the footing or bent cap without 90 degree hooks that ensure proper bar development. In both cases the lap splice or embedment depth was less than 20 bar diameters. This is insufficient to develop the yield strength of the reinforcement. Columns designed in this fashion will not obtain the yield moment of the section and can be very brittle and lead to structural collapse. See the 'Lap Splice' section for more information.

'71-'94 Designs

Columns designed between 1971 and 1994 typically do not adequately consider the cyclic degradation of concrete shear strength within the plastic hinge. Consequently they develop the yield moment of the section but degrade after repeated cycles due to shear failure in the hinge. Fracture of the transverse reinforcement is likely as is buckling of the column longitudinal reinforcement.

Post '94 Designs

Columns designed after 1994 are characterized by heavy confinement of the plastic hinge region with transverse reinforcement spaced at less than 6 longitudinal bar diameters. This type of design is very ductile. The confinement ensures that the column longitudinal bars do not buckle and that shear failure of the column and plastic hinge does not occur.

Column Shear Behavior

The shear strength of reinforced concrete sections comes from four essentially independent mechanisms: 1) shear friction in the compression zone, 2) dowel action of the longitudinal reinforcement, 3) aggregate interlock, and 4) transverse reinforcement truss mechanism. Dowel action contributes minimally to the overall strength of the section and is unreliable, thus it is typically ignored. The relative contribution of the remaining three mechanisms, to the overall column behavior, is highly dependant on the era in which the bridge was designed.

Pre '71 Designs

A typical pre 1971 column design has very little transverse reinforcement, typically #4's at 12 inches regardless of column size. Thus the column must rely predominantly on shear friction and aggregate interlock. Problems arise as the concrete cracks because the aggregate interlock component of shear strength reduces quickly with increasing crack width. The lack of transverse reinforcement produces a very brittle column shear behavior, which loses all strength shortly after the column cracks appear.

'71-'94 Designs

Columns design during this era follow the capacity design approach and typically provide sufficient column reinforcement to develop the yield strength of the column. However, concrete shear strength cyclic degradation and longitudinal column bar buckling was not completely appreciated at this time. Thus it is not uncommon for shear failure to occur within the plastic hinge.

Post '94 Designs

Post 1994 column shear designs are characterized by closely spaced transverse reinforcement and heavy confinement of plastic hinge regions. These designs will typically force a ductile flexural failure of the column, but if this does not occur, ductile shear failure is likely. The shear demand is transferred primarily by the transverse reinforcement in the form of a truss mechanism. Failure will occur due to yielding and subsequent fracture of the transverse reinforcement after significant cracking.

Column Lap Splice Behavior

A common practice for pre 1971 designs was to lap splices the longitudinal column reinforcement at the critical moment location just above the footing. These lap splice are typically less than 20 bar diameters long and are insufficient to develop the yield strength of the reinforcement. Columns designed in this fashion will not obtain the yield moment of the section and can be very brittle and may lead to structural collapse. Seismic response of lap splice connections can be improved with sufficient clamping pressure from transverse reinforcement.

Hollow Column

Hollow columns are used on large, long span bridges to improve the efficiency of the piers by removing unnecessary material at the center of the very large columns.

Circular column must have inner and outer circumferential hoops as well as radial ties to prevent implosion. The radial ties must go around the longitudinal and circumferential bars to be effective. Rectangular sections are not as susceptible to implosion because they have a wider effective compression zone.

Flared Columns

Flared columns are used to engage more of the superstructure and to improve aesthetics. Prior to the '94 Northridge earthquake, column flares were assumed, incorrectly, to be non-structural. Shear failure of pre '94 designed flared columns is possible since the column was designed for the shear due to yielding of the column, but not the shear due to yielding of the column and flare.

Post 1994 designs consider the strength of the flare or they provide a gap between the flare and the superstructure to ensure that the flare is purely architectural and does not add any strength to the column.

Lightweight Columns

Earthquake induced demands are proportional to the weight of the bridge structure. It stands to reason that reducing the weight of the bridge will reduce the seismic demands and consequently the size of structural members may be reduced as well. Thus using lightweight concrete may reduce the cost of the bridge.

The shear strength of lightweight concrete is typically 75% that of normal weight concrete. To account for this reduced concrete contribution to the total shear strength of a column, additional transverse reinforcement may be necessary. If designed properly, lightweight concrete columns can exhibit a desirable ductile flexural response.

Connections/Joints

The 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake showed the deficiencies in column-cap and column-footing connections. This is particularly so for outrigger bents. Seismic design provisions did not provide sufficient guidance until 1994. Prior to 1994, it was common practice to provide no shear reinforcement in the connections. This will prohibit transfer of the column yield moment. Failure can be brittle and lead to collapse of the structure.

Superstructure

Bridge superstructures have generally performed quite well during an earthquake. Problems have arisen primarily at expansion joints where damage to bearings or local concrete spalling due to impact of adjacent spans may occur. This type of damage is not catastrophic and is repairable. Major problems have arisen due to inadequate seat length at expansion joints. Large relative displacements between adjacent spans at expansion joints have, on occasion, exceeded the capacity of the seat length, causing the supported span to collapse. This is particularly a problem in early (pre 1971) bridge designs and for bridges with large skews, for which torsional deformations add to the lateral displacement demands.

Foundations

Bridge foundations have generally performed well in earthquakes. Foundation damage that has occurred has been after column damage and is minor compared to the column damage. Early (pre 1971) bridge foundations are typically very small and have only a bottom mat of reinforcement and no shear reinforcement. Thus they cannot carry a negative moment induced by soil overburden or tension piles and flexure or shear failure of the footing or column-footing connection is possible.

Soil liquefaction or lateral spreading due to seismic motions is possible at some bridge locations. Vertical settlement or lateral movement of bridge foundations may occur causing foundation, column and potentially superstructure damage. Total structural collapse is not common unless the movement is large enough to unseat the superstructure at an expansion joint.

Abutments/Shear Keys

Abutment seismic design philosophy has generally been focused around the protection of piles below the abutment. Thus various elements of the abutment are designed to be sacrificial in order to limit the demands on the piles. Failure of shear keys due to transverse motion and punching shear failure of the back wall is likely. Neither failure will cause total structural collapse, and is typically repairable.

Liquefaction, lateral spreading or poor soil compaction at the abutment has caused vertical settlement or lateral movement in a number of earthquakes. Unless this movement is large enough to unseat the superstructure, total structural collapse is not common

REFERENCES

1. Benzoni, G., Ohtaki, T., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Performance of Circular Reinforced Concrete Columns under Varying Axial Load, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/04, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1996.
2. Calderone, Anthony J., Lehman, Dawn E., Moehle, Jack P., Behavior of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns Having Varying Aspect Ratios and Varying Lengths of Confinement, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2000/08, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, January 2001.
3. Chai, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Flexural Retrofit of Circular Reinf. Concrete Bridge Columns by Steel Jacketing-Experimental Studies, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 91/06, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 1991.
4. Dazio, A., Seible, F., Structural Testing of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Spans Pier W2, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2002/11, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2003.
5. Dowell, R., Burgueño, R., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Mari, A., The Terminal Separation Replacement Structure Proof test and Retrofit Test, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/15, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 1994.
6. Esmaeily-Gh, Asadollah, Xiao, Yan, Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Subjected to Various Loading Patterns, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2002/15, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, December 2002

7. Gibson, N., Filiatrault, A., and Ashford, S., Performance of Bridge Joints Subjected to a Large Velocity Pulse, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/10, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 2001.
8. Hewes, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Design and Performance of Precast Concrete Segmental Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/25, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 2002.
9. Hines, E.M., Dazio, A., Seible, F., Structural Testing of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Skyway Piers, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2002/01, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 2002.
10. Holombo, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Longitudinal Seismic Response of Precast Spliced-Girder Bridges, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 98/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, April 1998.
11. Holombo, J., MacRae, G., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Steel Column Proof-tests of the Bayshore and Central Viaducts, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 95/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, April 1995.
12. Hose, Y., Seible, F., Priestley, N., Strategic Relocation of Plastic Hinges in Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1997
13. Ingham, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Performance of Bridge Knee Joints - Vol. I, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/12, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 1994.
14. Innamorato, D, Seible, F., Hegemier, G., Priestley, M.J.N., Ho, F., Full Scale Test of a Two Column Bridge Bent with Carbon Fiber Jacket Retrofit, Advanced Composite Technology Transfer ACTT-96/10, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1996.
15. Kowalsky, M.J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Flexural Behavior of Lightweight Concrete Columns under Seismic Conditions, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/08, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, December 1996.
16. Kowalsky, M.J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Shear Behavior of Lightweight Concrete Columns under Seismic Conditions, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 95/10, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, July 1995.
17. Lehman, Dawn E., Moehle, Jack P., Seismic Performance of Well-Confined Concrete Bridge Columns, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 1998/01, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, December 2000.
18. MacGregor J.G., Wight J.K. “Reinforced Concrete : Mechanics And Design”, 4th Ed., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc., 2005.
19. Megally, S. H., Garg, M., Seible, F., Dowell, Robert K., Seismic Performance of Precast Segmental Bridge Superstructures, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/24, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.
20. Megally, S. H., Silva, P.F., Seible, F., Seismic Response of Sacrificial Shear Keys in Bridge Abutments, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/23, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.

21. Melek, Murat, Wallace, John W., Conte, Joel P., Experimental Assessment of Columns with Short Lap Splices Subjected to Cyclic Loads, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2003/04, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, April 2003.
22. Moehle et al, “Highway Bridges and Traffic Management”, *Earthquake Spectra*, Vol. 11, Supplement C, Chapter 6, April, 1995
23. National Information Service for Earthquake Engineering.
http://nisee.berkeley.edu/northridge/highway_bridges.html (accessed Dec 2004)
24. Ohtaki, T., Benzoni, G., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Performance of a Full Scale Bridge Column-As Built and As Repaired, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/07, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, November 1996.
25. Patty, J., Seible, F., Uang, C-M., Seismic Response of Integral Bridge Connections, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2000/16, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 2002.
26. Priestley, M.J.N., Seible F., Calvi G.M., “Seismic Design And Retrofit of Bridges”, 1st Ed., New York, New York : John Wiley And Sons, Inc., 1996.
27. Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Anderson, D., Proof Test of a Retrofit Concept for the San Francisco Double-Deck Viaducts, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 92/03, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, July 1992.
28. Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Benzoni, G., Seismic Response of Columns with Low Longitudinal Steel Ratios, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/08, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 1994.
29. Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Chai, Y.H., Wong, R., Santa Monica Viaduct Retrofit - Full-Scale Test on Col. Lap Splice with #11 (35 mm) Reinforcement, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 92/08, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, September 1992.
30. Ranzo, G., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Performance of Circular Hollow Columns Subjected to High Shear, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/01, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, March 2001.
31. Roberts, J.E., “Caltrans Structural Control for Bridges in High-Seismic Zones”, *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 2005, Vol. 34, pages 449-470.
32. Sanchez, A., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Performance of Flared Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/06, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 1997.
33. Schoettler, M., Restrepo, J., Seible, F., BART Aerial Guideway Bent Proof Test, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2002/13, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 2002.
34. Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Latham, C., Silva, P., Full-Scale Bridge Column/Superstructure Connection Tests under Simulated Longitudinal Seismic Loads, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/14, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 1994.

35. Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Sun, Z.L., San Francisco Flexural Retrofit Validation Tests on Rectangular Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 90/07, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, December 1990.
36. Shmoldas, A., Shleifer, G., Seible, F., Innamorato, D., Carbon Fiber Retrofit of the Arroyo Seco Spandrel Column, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/13, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 1997.
37. Silva, P., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Response of Standard Caltrans Pile-To-Pile Cap Connections Under Simulated Seismic Loads, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/09, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, November 1997.
38. Silva, P.F., Sritharan, S., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Full-Scale Test of the Alaska Cast-In-Place Steel Shell Three Column Bridge Bent, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 98/13, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, February 1999.
39. Sritharan, S., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Design And Performance Of Concrete Multi-Column Bents For Bridges, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/03, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 1997.
40. Sritharan, S., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Response of Column/Cap Beam Tee Connections w/Cap Beam Prestressing, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/09, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, December 1996.
41. Stephan, B., Restrepo, J., Seible F., Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Built Incorporating MFX Steel, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2003/09, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 2003.
42. Sun, Z., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Diagnostics and Retrofit of Rectangular Bridge Columns for Seismic Loads, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 93/07, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, July 1993.
43. Xiao, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Experimental Evaluation of a Typical Bridge Column Footing Designed to Current Caltrans Standards, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 95/08, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, March 1995.
44. Xiao, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Hamada, N., Seismic Assessment and Retrofit of Bridge Footings, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/11, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 1994.
45. Xiao, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Steel Jacket Retrofit for Enhancing Shear Strength of Short Rectang. Reinforced Concrete Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 92/07, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, July 1993.


Part I

Laboratory tests photos

Ordinary Columns

Flexural


F1 – Flexural - Ductile




F-d Graph



Level II




Level III



Level IV




Level V (buckling of long. bars)




Level V


F2- Flexural - Ductile



F-d Graph




Level II



Level II




Level IV




Level V cycle 1 (buckling of long bars)


F4 – Flexural - Ductile



F-d Graph



Level IV



Level V




Level V -(buckling of bars)



Level V

F5 – Flexural - Ductile




F-d Graph



Level II



Level IV



Level V - cycle 1 - (buckling of long bars)

F6 – Flexural - Ductile






Figure 3.24: Column 430 Force-Displacement Response

F-d Graph



Level II



Level III



Level V - cycle 1 – (buckling of long. Bars)

F7 – Flexural - Ductile




Figure 3.33: Column 815 Force-Displacement Response


F-d Graph



Level II




Level IV



Level V – cycle 1 – (buckling of long. Bars)



Level V



Level V cycle 2 (fracture of long. bars)

F8 – Flexural - Ductile






Figure 3.39: Column 1015 Force-Displacement Response


F-d Graph



Level II



Level III




Level V (permanent deformation)



Level V (buckling of long bars)


F9 – Flexural - Ductile



F-d Graph



Level I



Level II



Level III




Level IV



Level V (buckling of long. bars)

F10 – Flexural - Ductile



F-d Graph



Level I



Level II



Level III




Level IV




Level V (buckling of long bars)

F11 – Flexural - Ductile




F-d Graph



Level I



Level II



Level III




Level IV




Level V (buckling of long. bars)

F12 – Flexural – Ductile




F-d Graph




Level I




Level II



Level III




Level IV




Level V (permanent deformation)


F13 – Flexural – Ductile



F-d Graph



Level I




Level II



Level III







Level IV



Level V (buckling of long bars)


F14 – Flexural - Ductile

	
<p>F-d Graph</p>	<p>Level II</p>
	
<p>Level IV</p>	<p>Level IV</p>
	
<p>Level V</p>	<p>Level V</p>

F15 – Flexural – Ductile

<p>Horizontal Force (kN)</p> <p>Drift Ratio(%)</p>	<p>STRUCTURAL LAB F15-15 COL 2 LOAD VARY KIN LOAD 74 KIN DRIFT 1.0 % MAR 11 1999</p>
<p>F-d Graph</p>	<p>Level II</p>
<p>STRUCTURAL LAB F15-15 COL 2 LOAD VARY KIN LOAD 90 KIN DRIFT 4.0 % MAR 11 1999</p>	
<p>Level III</p>	<p>Level IV</p>
<p>STRUCTURAL LAB F15-15 COL 2 LOAD VARY KIN LOAD 90 KIN DRIFT 6.0 % MAR 11 1999</p>	
<p>Level V</p>	<p>Level V</p>

F16 – Flexural – Ductile



F-d Graph



Level II



Level III




Level IV



Level IV

F17 – Flexural/Shear – Ductile



F-d Graph



Level I



Level II



Level III




Level IV




Level V

F18 – Flexural – Brittle



F-d Graph



Level I




Level II



Level III




Level IV




Level V - (buckling of long. bars)

F19 – Flexural – Ductile




Level I



Level II



Level III



Level IV




Level V - (buckling of long bars)

F20 – Flexural – Strength Degrading

<p style="text-align: center;">F-d Graph</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Level III</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Level V</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Level V</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Level V fracture stirrup, buckling bars</p>


F21 – Flexural – Ductile




F-d Graph



Level I



Level III



Level V (permanent deformation)




Level V cycle 1 (buckling of bars)



Level V cycle 2 (fracture of bars)

Shear


S1 – Shear – Ductile



F-d Graph



Level II



Level III




Level IV




Level V


S2 – Shear – Brittle



F-d Graph



Level I



Level II



Level III




Level IV




Level V


S3 – Shear – Brittle




Level II



Level III







Level IV







Level V


S4 – Shear – Brittle

	 <p>(a) Initial stage of testing</p>
F-d response	Level II
	
Level III	Level IV
	
Level V	Level V


S5 – Shear – Brittle

	
F-d Graph	Level II
	
Level III	Level IV
	
Level V	Level V

S6 – Shear – Brittle




Level III



Level IV




Level V



Level V

S7 – Shear – Brittle



F-d graph



Level II



Level III



Level IV




Level V



Level V


S8 – Shear – Brittle



F-d graph




Level II



Level III



Level IV




Level V



Level V

S9 – Shear – Brittle



F-d graph



Level II



Level III



Level IV




Level V




Level V

Lap Splice

LS1 – Lap Splice – Brittle



F-d Graph



Level II



Level III



Level IV




Level V



Level V


LS2 – Lap Splice - Ductile



F-d Graph




Level II




Level III



Level IV (inclination of cracks at splice)



Level V –well confined region below lap splice




Level V - bond slip – space of bars


Special Sections

Hollow


SS1 – Flexural – Ductile



F-d Graph



Level II




Level III




Level V

Ref: SSRP 2001/01, HS-1


SS2 – Flexural – Ductile




F-d Graph



Level III





Level IV




Level V

SS3 – Shear – Brittle



Level II




Level IV




Level V

Columns with Boundary Elements


SS4 – Flexural – Ductile



F-d Graph




Level II




Level III



Level IV




Level III




Level V


SS5 – Flexural – Ductile




F-d graph




Level II




Level II



Level II tension side



Level III




Level III tension side


SS5 – Flexural – Ductile




Level IV




Level IV Tension side



Level V




Level V tension side



Level V

Flared


SS6 – Flexural – Ductile



F-d Graph



Level I



Level II



Level III




Level IV




Level V


SS7 – Flexural - Ductile



F-d Graph



Level II



Level III



Level III




Level IV




Level V

SS8 – Flexural – Ductile




F-d response




Level I



Level II



Level III



Level IV




Level V

Special Material

Lightweight

SM1 – Flexural – Ductile



F-d Graph



Level III



Level IV



Level IV




Level V




Level V

SM2 – Flexural – Ductile




F-d Graph



Level IV



Level IV




Level V – permanent deformation




Level V

SM3 – Shear –



Level III



Level III




Level IV



Level V

MMX Steel

SM4 – Shear - Brittle




F-d Graph



Level V




Level V



Level V

SM5 – Shear – Brittle




F-d Graph



Level V (Hoop fracture)




Level V longitudinal bar fracture)



Level V

Steel Columns


SM6 – Shear - Brittle




F-d Graph



Level III




Level IV



Level V


SM7 – Shear – Brittle




F-d Graph



Level III




Level IV



Level V

Joints

J1 – Flexural – Ductile




F-d Graph




Level II



Level III



Level IV



Level V



Level V


J2



Level III



Level IV




Level IV




Level V


J3 – Shear - Brittle




F-d Graph




Level II



Level III




Level IV




Level V


J4 – Shear - Brittle



F-d Graph



Level III



Level IV




Level V




Level V


J5 – Shear - Brittle




F-d Graph



Level II




Level III




Level IV


J6 – Shear - Brittle



F-d Graph



Level III



Level IV




Level V




Level V

Superstructure


SP1 – Flexural - Brittle




F-d Graph



Level III




Level IV




Level V

SP2 – Flexural - Ductile




F-d Graph



Level III



Level III




Level IV




Level V


SP3 – Flexural - Ductile



F-d Graph



Level III



Level IV




Level V




Level V

SP4 – Flexural – Brittle



F-d Graph



Level IV




Level V



Level V


SP5 – Flexural – Brittle



F-d Graph



Level II




Level V



Level V (Compression failure)




Level V (prestress steel failure- lower tendon)




Level V


SP6 – Flexural - Brittle




F-d Graph



Level II




Level IV



Level IV




Level V



Level V

SP7 – Flexural – Brittle



F-d Graph



Level I




Level IV



Level V




Level V



Level V


SP8 – Flexural – Ductile




F-d Graph




Level II



Level III



Level IV




Level V




Level V

Foundations


F1 – Shear – Brittle




F-d Graph



Level I




Level II



Level III




Level IV




Level V

F2 – Degrading - Ductile




Level I



Level II



Level III




Level IV



Level V


F3 – Degrading – Ductile




F-d Graph




Level I




Level II



Level III




Level IV




Level V

F4 – Flexural - Ductile



F-d Graph



Level I



Level II



Level III penetration of footing cracks




Level IV



Level V

F5 – Flexural - Ductile



Level I



Level II



Level III




Level IV



Level V

F6 – Flexural – Brittle



F-d Graph




Level II




Level III



Level IV




Level V



Level V column-footing shear cracks

F7 – Flexural - Ductile



F-d Graph



Level II



Level III



Level IV




Level V



Level V permanent deformation

Abutments/Shear Keys

SK1 – Shear - Brittle



F-d Graph



Level I



Level II



Level III




Level IV



Level V


SK2 – Shear - Brittle




F-d Graph



Level I




Level III



Level V

SK3 – Shear - Brittle



F-d Graph



Level I



Level II



Level III




Level IV



Level V

SK4 – Shear - Brittle



F-d Graph



Level II



Level II



Level III




Level IV



Level V

SK5 – Shear - Brittle



F-d Graph




Level I




Level II



Level III




Level IV



Level V

SK6 – Shear – Brittle




F-d Graph




Level I



Level II



Level III




Level IV




Level V

SK7 – Shear




Level I



Level II



Level III




Level IV



Level V

Retrofit


R1 – Flexural



F-d Graph




Without Retrofit



Without - Level IV



Level III




Level V permanent deformation




Level V bars rupture


R2 – Flexural - Ductile




Level I



Level II shear cracking at joint



Level III spalling at gap region of cap beam



Level IV cap beam penetration of reinforcement



Level V - fracture of long. Bars

R3 – Flexural



Level II flexural cracks at joint



Level III joint shear cracks (from pull out)




Level IV splitting cracks of cap beam




Level IV


R4 – Flexural



Level II first cracks at interface



Level III cracks in jacket filaments and gap




Level IV extensive spalling at plastic hinge



Level V jacket cracks, bar rupture

R5 – Flexural – Ductile



F-d Graph




Level III without retrofit



Level V without retrofit



Test setup – retrofit




Level IV after removal of jacket



Level V after removal of jacket

R6 – Shear - Brittle




F-d Graph



Test setup




Level III spalling at gap region




Level V permanent deformation


R7 – Flexural - Ductile




F-d Graph



Level I - Cracks on Pedestal




Level I - First vertical on column interface



Level II - Above jacket cracks



Level III - Spalling of cover concrete at pedestal




Level IV - Gap between pedestal column


R7 – Flexural



Concrete cones around starter bars



Level IV Dilation of jacket



Level V - Sliding of column




Level V




Level V


R8 – Flexural – Brittle




F-d Graph



Level II



Level III



Level III




Level IV



Level V

R9 – Flexural – Ductile



F-d Graph



Level III



Level V




Level V



Level V


R10 – Flexural - Ductile




F-d Graph




Level I




Level II



Level III




Level IV



Level V

R11 – Flexural - Ductile



F-d Graph



Level II



Level IV




Level IV (Residual crack at end of test)

Sub-Assemblages - Systems

Column Superstructure Sub-Assemblages

SM1 – Flexural - Ductile




F-d Graph




Level III




Level IV



Level V




Level IV superstructure cracks




Level IV superstructure cracks


SM3 – Flexural – Ductile




F-d Graph




Level II




Level III



Level IV




Level IV




Level V


SM4 – Flexural - Ductile




F-d Graph




Level III



Level IV




Level IV




Level IV


SM5 – Shear - Brittle



F-d Graph




Level III



Level III at bottom



Level IV




Level IV




Level V Girder


SM6 – Shear – Brittle




F-d Graph



Level III




Level IV



Level IV




Level IV




Level V


SM7 – Shear – Brittle



F-d Graph




Level II



Level III



Level IV




Level IV bent cap




Level V bent cap/girder


SM8 – Shear – Brittle




F-d Graph



Level II




Level III



Level IV




Level V




Level V

SM9 – Flexural – Ductile




F-d Graph




Level II




Level II



Level III



Level IV



Level V

Column Foundation Sub-Assemblages

SM10 – Flexural



Test setup



Level III



Level V pile cap rotation




Level V residual displacement



Level V

Double Deck Viaduct


SM11 – Flexural - Ductile



F-d Graph



Level II



Level II edge girder



Level II outside face cap column



Level II cap beam between superstructure-girder




Level III


SM11 – Flexural – Ductile



Level III outside face cap column



Level III



Level IV outside face cap column



Level IV top of edge girder




Level IV



Level V

Precast

SM12 – Flexural – Ductile




F-d Graph



Level III




Level III




Level IV


SM13 – Flexural – Ductile




F-d Graph



Level III




Level IV




Level V

SM14 – Shear – Brittle




F-d Graph



Level III




Level IV




Level IV

SM15 – Flexural - Ductile




F-d Graph



Level III



Level IV



Level V

Part II

Field photo database - Earthquake events

Classification according to Earthquake

San Fernando, USA 1971

San Fernando, USA 1971



Failure – buckling of long bars




Failure – buckling of long bars



Shear failure



Shear failure




Failure at Column Base



Shear failure


San Fernando, USA 1971



Total failure



Total failure



Span failure




Pullout Failure



Exterior shear key failure

Imperial Valley, USA 1979

Imperial Valley, USA 1979



Abutment – Level V



Shear- Level V



Abutment – Level V

New River Bridge

Whittier Narrows, USA 1987

Whittier Narrows, USA 1987



Cracks at column-beam interface Level III



Top column spalling -Level II



Shear - Level V



Shear - Level V



Shear - Level V



Shear - Level V


Whittier Narrows, USA 1987



Joint shear crack- Level V




Cap beam top – bottom spalling –Level III



Abutment damage – Level IV



Abutment spalling-Level III



Abutment rocker support keeper plates failure




Superstructure pounding – Level IV


Whittier Narrows, USA 1987



Shear Level V



Fractured steel bars Level V



Shear Level - V



Shear Level -Level V

Loma Prieta, USA 1989

Loma Prieta, USA 1989



Flexural – Level III



Flexural – Level IV



Shear Level IV



Shear Level IV



Shear Level V



Shear – Level V

Loma Prieta, USA 1989



Shear – Level V



Shear – Level V



Shear failure



Joint Shear – Level V

Loma Prieta, USA 1989




Shear failure



Shear failure




Joint damage – Level V




Loma Prieta, USA 1989



Joint failure



Joint failure



Joint failure



Collapse of girder bridge




Total failure




Total failure

Loma Prieta, USA 1989



Abutment horizontal offset – Level V



Abutment vertical offset – Level V



Beam damage – Level IV



Total Failure



Total Failure



Failure angle seats (Oakland Bay Bridge)

Loma Prieta, USA 1989




Total Failure



Collapsed deck (Struve Slough Bridge)



Collapsed deck (Cypress Street Viaduct)



Shear cracking- Level IV



Lateral Displacement – Level V(Struve Slough)



Deck cut-through by piers (Struve Bridge)

Loma Prieta, USA 1989




Joint-Level V




Joint-Level V (I-980)




Spalled concrete at base - Level IV



Level V (Corralitos Creek Bridge)



Misaligned hinge - Level V



Shear Crack - Level IV (Mora Drive Overpass)

Erzincan, Turkey 1992

Erzincan, Turkey 1992



Cracking of abutment wall – Level IV



Pounding above piers – Level V



Shear crack on column – Level IV

Kemah Highway

Northridge, USA 1994

Northridge, USA 1994



Flexural – Level II



Flexural – Level III



Flexural Level III



Flexural Level IV



Flexural Level IV

Northridge, USA 1994




Shear Level III



Shear Level III



Shear Level IV



Shear Level IV



Shear - Level IV



Shear - Level V

Northridge, USA 1994



Shear Level V



Shear Level V



Shear Level V



Shear Level V



Shear Level V



Shear Level V

Northridge, USA 1994



Shear failure



Shear failure



Shear failure



Shear failure



Shear failure



Shear failure

Northridge, USA 1994



Column superstructure spalling Level III



Column foundation Flexural Level III



Shear collar failure



Shear collar failure



Total Failure



Shear cracks in abutment Level - IV

Northridge, USA 1994



Lap splice retrofit



Lap splice retrofit



Lap splice retrofit



Lap splice retrofit

Northridge, USA 1994



Shear – Level V




Shear failure



Shear – Level V



Shear failure



Failure



Shear – Level V

Northridge, USA 1994



Total failure



Total failure



Total failure



Total failure




Total failure




Total failure

Northridge, USA 1994



Pounding at movement joint – Level IV



Pounding at movement joint – Level IV



Abutment damage- Level IV



Abutment damage-Level V



Deck failure




Damaged movement joint – Level IV

Northridge, USA 1994



Failure



Abutment – wing - wall failure



Abutment failure



Hinge fractured restrainer rods



Hinge restrainer pullout



Hinge restrainer pullout close to abutment

Northridge, USA 1994



Deck collapse



Abutment Failure



Failure of anchor bolts for a girder



Spalling – Level IV



Disturbed soil – Level IV



Separation of soil and column- Level V

Northridge, USA 1994



Soil separation



Barrier cracking – Level IV



Deck damage- Level IV



Curb separation – Level IV

Northridge, USA 1994



Joint movement – Level V



Abutment connection cracks –Level V



Abutment damage – Level IV



Abutment connection failure




Abutment failure



Abutment failure


Northridge, USA 1994




Abutment – Level V



Deck Collapse



Abutment Failure




Column Failure



Column Base Failure

Northridge, USA 1994



Superstructure – Level IV




Abutment Failure




Total Failure



Span Collapse




(Gavin Canyon Undercrossing) – Span Collapse



Deck Collapse

Northridge, USA 1994




Shear Failure



Shear - Level V




Shear Level V



Shear Level V



Column Failure



Column Failure

Northridge, USA 1994



Deck and Abutment displacements – Level V




Deck Failure



Column Failure



Internal Shear keys damage –Level V




Abutment/Deck displacement – Level V




Abutment – Level V

Morgan Hill, USA 1994


Morgan Hill, USA 1994



Column – Level V



Abutment Restrainer Failure



Sheared off bolts

Highway Bridge

Kobe, Japan 1995

Kobe, Japan 1995



Flexural level IV



Flexural level IV



Shear Level V



Shear Level V



Shear Level V



Shear failure

Kobe, Japan 1995




Shear failure



Shear failure



Shear failure



Shear failure



Shear failure



Shear failure

Kobe, Japan 1995



Shear failure



Shear failure




Shear failure



Shear failure

Kobe, Japan 1995



Shear failure



Total failure



Total failure



Total failure



Column failure




Total failure

Kobe, Japan 1995



Total failure




Column Weld failure




Total failure



Total failure



Total failure



Total failure

Kobe, Japan 1995



Total failure



Total failure-Weld failure



Total failure-permanent deformation



Girder failure

Adana-Ceyhan 1998

Adana-Ceyhan 1998

	
	<p>Superstructure- Level IV</p>
	
<p>Superstructure- Level V</p>	<p>Superstructure- Level IV</p>

The Ceyhan Bridge

Izmit, Turkey 1999

Izmit, Turkey 1999



Total failure



Abutment-Level III



Abutment-Level III



Abutment-Level III



Span Collapse



Failure of bearing pad

Izmit, Turkey 1999



Superstructure-Level V



Abutment-Level V



Superstructure-Level V



Superstructure-Level V




Superstructure-Level V



Transversal movement – Level V

Izmit, Turkey 1999



Total failure-prestressed beam girder bridge



Spalling due to Girder impact –Level IV

Duzce, Turkey 1999

Duzce, Turkey 1999



Slope failure



Longitudinal movement-Level V

Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999

Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999



Flexural – Level V



Rupture of long reinforcement at joint



Joint column damage Level IV



Reinforcement fracture



Shear failure



Shear Failure

Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999



Column shear-off



Separation at construction joint



Superstructure drop off



Column failure to excessive ground movement




Spans separation



Ground separation near pier


Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999

	
<p>Abutment slumping</p>	<p>Wing wall and embankment failure</p>
	
<p>Permanent deck transverse displacement – Level V</p>	<p>Soil liquefaction around pier</p>
	
<p>Uneven bridge deck due to pier settlement</p>	<p>Unseating of superstructure</p>

Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999



Unseating of Superstructure



Unseating of Superstructure



Unseating of Superstructure



Unseating of Superstructure

Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999



Shear cracking-Level IV



Shear cracking-Level IV



Shear cracking-Level IV

Mau-uo-Shi Bridge

Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999



Column Damage, Level V



Column, Bearing Damage, Level V



Lateral movement - Level V



Bearing Damage – Level V

Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999



Shear-Level V



Shear-Level V



Total Failure




Unseating of Superstructure



Shear-Level IV

I-jiang Bridge

Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999




Superstructure Failure



Superstructure Failure



Excessive movement-Level V



Cap Beam-Superstructure-Level V

Jyi Lu Bridge

Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999




Cap Beam-Superstructure-Level V



Column-Shear-Level IV



Column-Shear-Level IV



Column-Shear-Level IV

Jyi Lu Bridge

Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999




Total Failure




Total Failure



Total Failure



Total Failure



Total Failure

Shih-Wui Bridge

Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999



Total Failure



Total Failure



Total Failure

Ming Ju Bridge

Chi-Chi, Taiwan 1999




Total Failure



Expansion of joints-Level V



Shear-Level V



Shear Failure (Wu Shu Bridge)




Total Failure (Pin ling bridge)

Kocaeli, Turkey 1999

Kocaeli, Turkey 1999



Deck failure (tectonic compression zones)



Shear Failure



Deck failure



Abutment failure (TEM bridge)



Abutment damage (Sakarya River)



Deck failure


Kocaeli, Turkey 1999



Level IV -Displaced spans (TEM Sakarya Viaduct)



Total Failure (TEM Arifiye Road Bridge)



Total Failure (Sakarya Bridge)

Mid Niigata Prefecture Earthquake, Japan 2004

Mid Niigata Prefecture Earthquake, Japan 2004



Shear-Level V



Shear-Level V



Shear-Level V



Shear-Level V

Mid Niigata Prefecture Earthquake, Japan 2004



Shear-Level V



Shear-Level V



Shear-Level V



Shear-Level V

Mid Niigata Prefecture Earthquake, Japan 2004



Abutment-Level V



Abutment-Level V



Classification according to type of Damage


Columns

Flexural Damage

Flexural Damage




Level III



Level V



Level V



Failure



Level II



Level III

Flexural Damage



Level II



Level IV



Level II



Level III



Level III



Level IV

Flexural Damage



Level IV



Level III



Level IV



Level IV




Level V




Level III


Flexural Damage



Level III



Level V



Failure



Level V



Level V Fractured steel bars



Failure

Shear Damage

Shear Damage



Failure



Failure




Failure



Failure



Failure



Failure

Shear Damage



Fialure



Level V



Level V



Level V



Level V




Level V

Shear Damage



Level V



Level V




Level V



Level V



Failure



Weld Failure

Shear Damage



Level IV




Level III



Level III



Level IV



Level IV



Level IV

Shear Damage



Level V




Level V



Level V



Level V



Level V



Level V

Shear Damage



Failure



Failure



Failure



Failure



Failure



Failure

Shear Damage



Level V




Failure



Level IV



Failure



Level V



Level V

Shear Damage



Level V



Shear collar failure



Level V



Level V



Level V



Level V

Shear Damage



Failure



Failure



Failure



Failure



Failure



Failure

Shear Damage



Level V



Level V



Level V



Level V



Failure



Failure

Shear Damage



Failure



Level V



Level V



Level IV



Level IV



Level V

Shear Damage



Level V



Level V



Level V



Level V



Level V



Level V

Shear Damage




Level IV



Level V



Level IV



Level V



Level IV



Failure

Shear Damage



Total failure



Total failure



Failure



Total failure



Failure



Level IV

Shear Damage




Level V



Failure



Failure



Level V




Level IV



Level IV

Shear Damage



Failure



Total failure



Total failure



Total failure



Total failure




Total failure

Shear Damage



Failure




Failure




Failure



Failure



Failure



Failure

Shear Damage



Failure

Retrofit

Retrofit



Lap splice retrofit



Lap splice retrofit



Lap splice retrofit



Lap splice retrofit

Joint Damage

Joint Damage



Joint-Shear Crack Level V



Level IV



Level V



Level V



Level V

Joint Damage



Level V



Column Foundation Pedestal – Level V



Column Girder Interface – Level V



Level IV



Level V



Level V

Joint Damage



Level V



Level V



Level V



Level V




Joint Shear Failure



Level IV

Joint Damage



Level V

Superstructure

Deck Damage

Deck Damage



Curb separation – Level IV



Barrier cracking – Level IV



Level IV



Level IV



Uneven deck due to pier settlement – Level V



Deck failure (tectonic compression zones)

Deck Damage



Failure



Failure



Level IV



Level V



Deck cut-through by piers




Level V

Deck Damage



Level V



Level IV




Slope failure causes road collapse



Deck and Abutment displacements – Level V




Girder bridge collapse



Abutment/Deck displacement – Level V

Deck Damage



Failure of deck



Level V



Level IV



Level V



Level IV



Level V

Deck Damage



Failure



Failure




Collapse of girder bridge



Failure



Level III




Level IV

Deck Damage



Pounding above piers – Level V



Level V



Level V



Level V – Expansion of joints



Lateral Displacement – Level V

Cap Beam/Girder

Cap Beam/Girder



Buckling – Level V



Level V



Level V



Girder Failure



Level V



Girder-Level V

Cap Beam/Girder



Bottom Spalling Level III



Separation abutment superstructure –Level V

Span Collapse

Span Collapse



Span Collapse



Span Collapse



Span Collapse



Span Collapse



Collapsed span



Span Collapse

Span Collapse



Span Collapse



Span Collapse



Span Collapse



Span Collapse




Span Collapse



Span Collapse

Span Collapse




Span Collapse




Span Collapse (TEM Arifiye Road Bridge)




Span Collapse



Span Collapse



Span Collapse Pin ling bridge



Span Collapse

Span Collapse



Span Collapse



Collapsed span



Collapsed span



Steel deck collapse

Movement

Movement



Lateral movement - Level V



Movement Level IV



Movement Level V



Movement Level IV



Movement Level V



Movement Level V

Movement



Movement Damaged angle seats



Movement Level V



Movement Level V



Movement Level V



Movement Level V



Movement Level IV

Movement



Movement Level IV



Level V Longitudinal movement



Level V- Transversal movement



Excessive movement – Level V



Level V- Longitudinal movement

Foundations/Soil Damage

Foundations/Soil Damage




Ground crack under a bridge



Soil liquefaction around pier



Settlement around bridge column



10 cm. gap between column and soil- Level V



Ejected sand



Soil failure due to fault line

Foundations/Soil Damage



Abutments/Shear Keys

Abutments/Shear Keys



Level V



Level IV



Level V



Level V



Level V



Level III

Abutments/Shear Keys



Internal Shear Keys




Failure



Level IV



Level V




Failure

Abutments/Shear Keys



Failure



Failure



Level V



Level III



Level III



Level III

Abutments/Shear Keys



Level IV



Failure



Level V Transversal movement



Failure



Level V Pounding damage



Level V Separation of Abutment

Abutments/Shear Keys



Level V



Abutment slumping



Level V



Level V




Level V




Level V


Abutments/Shear Keys



Abutment horizontal offset



Abutment vertical offset



Level IV



Level IV



Level V



Level V

Abutments/Shear Keys




Failure




Failure



Failure



Failure



Level IV



Level IV- Crack due to Girder impact

Abutments/Shear Keys



Abutment/Superstructure separation



Spalling of concrete at abutment

Bearing Damage

Bearing Damage



Failure of Elastomeric bearing




Failure of anchor bolts on girder



Girder movement causes bearing failure



Failure of bearing pad



Bearing sliding

Bearing Damage



Level IV



Level IV



Level V

Total Collapse

Total Collapse



Total Failure



Total Failure



Total Failure



Failure Pin Ling Bridge




Total Failure




Total Failure

Total Collapse



Failure Pre-stress concrete failure



Total Failure (Sakarya Bridge)



Failure



Total Failure



Total Failure




Total Failure

Total Collapse



Total failure



Total failure



Total Failure



Total Failure



Total Failure



Pull out failure

Part III


Correlation of Field photo with Laboratory database

Flexural

Flexural



Flexural – Level IV



Flexural – Level IV



Flexural Level V

Flexural



Flexural – Level V




Flexural – Level V



Flexural – Level V


Flexural



Flexural – Level III




Flexural – Level V – rupture of long. Bars




Flared Columns-Level IV

Shear


Shear



Shear - Level III




Shear - Level IV



Shear - Level IV

Shear



Shear - Level V




Shear - Level V




Lap splice – Base – Level IV

Joints

Joints



Knee Joint - Level IV




Tee Joint - Level IV




Tee joint - Level V


Joints



Level V



Level IV




Level V

Cap Beam-Column

Cap Beam-Column



Level III




Level IV

Abutments-Shear Keys


Abutments-Shear Keys



Level V



Level V



Level III


Abutments-Shear Keys



Level V



Level v



Level V

Abutments-Shear Keys




Abutment-Shear key -Level V



Superstructure

Super Structure



Level IV




Level IV




Level V

Foundation

Foundation




Level V



Level V

Other Cases

Other Cases



Level V –gap between pedestal column

PART IV

Details of Extreme Performance Levels

Flexural Level V





Buckling of longitudinal reinforcement



Fracture of longitudinal bars and stirrups




Fracture of longitudinal bars



Permanent deformation


Shear Level V



diagonal crack (plastic hinge region-base)



Diagonal crack- midheight




Diagonal crack - midheight

Lap Splice




Level III -Crack at midheight




Level V - BOND SLIP – space of bars


Retrofit Level IV



Gap between column pedestal



Dilation of jacket




Extensive spalling – plastic hinge region


Retrofit Level V



Buckling of long bars




Sliding of column



Permanent deformation

Joints Level V




Shear crack-tee joint



Shear crack-knees joint

Foundations Level V




Shear cracks



Pile cap rotation



Shear crack-retrofit foundation



Shear splitting

Shear Keys Level V




Diagonal Shear crack

Part V


Correlation of lab photos with Performance Curves

Column Performance Curves


Ductile Curve




Ductile Curve




Strength Degrading Curve




Strength Degrading Curve




Brittle Curve



Brittle Curve




Brittle Curve




Joint Performance Curves

Ductile Curve (J1)




Brittle Curve (J2)




Foundation Performance Curves

Ductile Curve (F4)




Degrading Curve (F3)




Limited Ductility Response

Brittle Curve (F1)




Brittle Curve (F6)



Abutment Performance Curves

Brittle Curve (SK5)



Appendix

References by Catalog Number

<u>Catalog #</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Test Unit</u>
F1	Calderone, Anthony J., Lehman, Dawn E., Moehle, Jack P., Behavior of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns Having Varying Aspect Ratios and Varying Lengths of Confinement, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2000/08, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, January 2001.	328
F2	Calderone, Anthony J., Lehman, Dawn E., Moehle, Jack P., Behavior of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns Having Varying Aspect Ratios and Varying Lengths of Confinement, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2000/08, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, January 2001.	328-T
F3	Calderone, Anthony J., Lehman, Dawn E., Moehle, Jack P., Behavior of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns Having Varying Aspect Ratios and Varying Lengths of Confinement, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2000/08, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, January 2001.	828
F4	Calderone, Anthony J., Lehman, Dawn E., Moehle, Jack P., Behavior of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns Having Varying Aspect Ratios and Varying Lengths of Confinement, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2000/08, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, January 2001.	1028
F5	Lehman, Dawn E., Moehle, Jack P., Seismic Performance of Well-Confined Concrete Bridge Columns, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 1998/01, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, December 2000.	415
F6	Lehman, Dawn E., Moehle, Jack P., Seismic Performance of Well-Confined Concrete Bridge Columns, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 1998/01, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, December 2000.	430
F7	Lehman, Dawn E., Moehle, Jack P., Seismic Performance of Well-Confined Concrete Bridge Columns, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 1998/01, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, December 2000.	815
F8	Lehman, Dawn E., Moehle, Jack P., Seismic Performance of Well-Confined Concrete Bridge Columns, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 1998/01, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, December 2000.	1015

F9	Hose, Y., Seible, F., Priestley, N., Strategic Relocation of Plastic Hinges in Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1997	SRPH-1
F10	Hose, Y., Seible, F., Priestley, N., Strategic Relocation of Plastic Hinges in Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1997	SRPH-2
F11	Hose, Y., Seible, F., Priestley, N., Strategic Relocation of Plastic Hinges in Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1997	SRPH-3
F12	Hose, Y., Seible, F., Priestley, N., Strategic Relocation of Plastic Hinges in Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1997	SRPH-4
F13	Gibson, N., Filiatrault, A., and Ashford, S., Performance of Bridge Joints Subjected to a Large Velocity Pulse, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/10, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 2001.	
F14	Esmaeily-Gh, Asadollah, Xiao, Yan, Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Subjected to Various Loading Patterns, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2002/15, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, December 2002	1
F15	Esmaeily-Gh, Asadollah, Xiao, Yan, Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Subjected to Various Loading Patterns, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2002/15, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, December 2002	2
F15	Esmaeily-Gh, Asadollah, Xiao, Yan, Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Subjected to Various Loading Patterns, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2002/15, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, December 2002	5
F16	Esmaeily-Gh, Asadollah, Xiao, Yan, Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Subjected to Various Loading Patterns, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2002/15, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, December 2002	6
F17	Hose, Y., Seible, F., Priestley, N., Strategic Relocation of Plastic Hinges in Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1997	SRPH-17

F18	Sun, Z., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Diagnostics and Retrofit of Rectangular Bridge Columns for Seismic Loads, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 93/07, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, July 1993.	R1
F19	Sun, Z., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Diagnostics and Retrofit of Rectangular Bridge Columns for Seismic Loads, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 93/07, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, July 1993.	R5
F20	Esmaeily-Gh, Asadollah, Xiao, Yan, Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Subjected to Various Loading Patterns, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2002/15, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, December 2002	3
F21	Lehman, Dawn E., Moehle, Jack P., Seismic Performance of Well-Confined Concrete Bridge Columns, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 1998/01, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, December 2000.	407
S1	Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Benzoni, G., Seismic Response of Columns with Low Longitudinal Steel Ratios, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/08, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 1994.	
S2	Hose, Y., Seible, F., Priestley, N., Strategic Relocation of Plastic Hinges in Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1997	SRPH-6
S3	Ohtaki, T., Benzoni, G., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Performance of a Full Scale Bridge Column-As Built and As Repaired, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/07, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, November 1996.	L1
S4	Benzoni, G., Ohtaki, T., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Performance of Circular Reinforced Concrete Columns under Varying Axial Load, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/04, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1996.	
S5	Benzoni, G., Ohtaki, T., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Performance of Circular Reinforced Concrete Columns under Varying Axial Load, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/04, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1996.	CS3

S6	Benzoni, G., Ohtaki, T., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Performance of Circular Reinforced Concrete Columns under Varying Axial Load, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/04, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1996.	
S7	Xiao, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Steel Jacket Retrofit for Enhancing Shear Strength of Short Rectang. Reinforced Concrete Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 92/07, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, July 1993.	R1
S8	Xiao, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Steel Jacket Retrofit for Enhancing Shear Strength of Short Rectang. Reinforced Concrete Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 92/07, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, July 1993.	R3
S9	Xiao, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Steel Jacket Retrofit for Enhancing Shear Strength of Short Rectang. Reinforced Concrete Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 92/07, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, July 1993.	R5
LS1	Melek, Murat, Wallace, John W., Conte, Joel P., Experimental Assessment of Columns with Short Lap Splices Subjected to Cyclic Loads, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center PEER – 2003/04, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, April 2003.	
LS2	Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Chai, Y.H., Wong, R., Santa Monica Viaduct Retrofit - Full-Scale Test on Col. Lap Splice with #11 (35 mm) Reinforcement, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 92/08, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, September 1992.	
SS1	Ranzo, G., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Performance of Circular Hollow Columns Subjected to High Shear, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/01, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, March 2001.	HS-1
SS2	Ranzo, G., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Performance of Circular Hollow Columns Subjected to High Shear, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/01, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, March 2001.	HS-2
SS3	Ranzo, G., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Performance of Circular Hollow Columns Subjected to High Shear, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/01, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, March 2001.	HS-3
SS4	Hines, E.M., Dazio, A., Seible, F., Structural Testing of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Skyway Piers, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2002/01, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 2002.	

SS5	Dazio, A., Seible, F., Structural Testing of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Spans Pier W2, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2002/11, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2003.	
SS6	Sanchez, A., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Performance of Flared Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/06, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 1997.	RDS1
SS7	Sanchez, A., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Performance of Flared Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/06, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 1997.	RDS2
SS8	Sanchez, A., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Performance of Flared Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/06, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 1997.	RDS6
SM1	Kowalsky, M.J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Flexural Behavior of Lightweight Concrete Columns under Seismic Conditions, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/08, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, December 1996.	FL1
SM1	Kowalsky, M.J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Flexural Behavior of Lightweight Concrete Columns under Seismic Conditions, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/08, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, December 1996.	
SM2	Kowalsky, M.J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Flexural Behavior of Lightweight Concrete Columns under Seismic Conditions, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/08, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, December 1996.	FL3
SM3	Kowalsky, M.J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Shear Behavior of Lightweight Concrete Columns under Seismic Conditions, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 95/10, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, July 1995.	
SM4	Stephan, B., Restrepo, J., Seible F., Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Built Incorporating MMFX Steel, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2003/09, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 2003.	Unit 1
SM5	Stephan, B., Restrepo, J., Seible F., Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Built Incorporating MMFX Steel, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2003/09, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 2003.	Unit 2

SM6	Holombo, J., MacRae, G., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Steel Column Proof-tests of the Bayshore and Central Viaducts, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 95/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, April 1995.	
SM7	Holombo, J., MacRae, G., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Steel Column Proof-tests of the Bayshore and Central Viaducts, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 95/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, April 1995.	Retro
J1	Sritharan, S., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Design And Performance Of Concrete Multi-Column Bents For Bridges, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/03, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 1997.	MCB1
J2	Sritharan, S., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Design And Performance Of Concrete Multi-Column Bents For Bridges, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/03, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 1997.	MCB1
J3	Ingham, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Performance of Bridge Knee Joints - Vol. I, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/12, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 1994.	Unit 1
J4	Ingham, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Performance of Bridge Knee Joints - Vol. I, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/12, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 1994.	Unit 2
J5	Ingham, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Performance of Bridge Knee Joints - Vol. I, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/12, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 1994.	Unit 5
J6	Ingham, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Performance of Bridge Knee Joints - Vol. I, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/12, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 1994.	Unit 7
SP1	Megally, S. H., Garg, M., Seible, F., Dowell, Robert K., Seismic Performance of Precast Segmental Bridge Superstructures, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/24, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	100 INT Phase I
SP2	Megally, S. H., Garg, M., Seible, F., Dowell, Robert K., Seismic Performance of Precast Segmental Bridge Superstructures, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/24, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	100 INT- CIP Phase I

SP3	Megally, S. H., Garg, M., Seible, F., Dowell, Robert K., Seismic Performance of Precast Segmental Bridge Superstructures, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/24, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	100 EXT Phase I
SP4	Megally, S. H., Garg, M., Seible, F., Dowell, Robert K., Seismic Performance of Precast Segmental Bridge Superstructures, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/24, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	50INT/50E XT Phase I
SP5	Megally, S. H., Garg, M., Seible, F., Dowell, Robert K., Seismic Performance of Precast Segmental Bridge Superstructures, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/24, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	100 INT Phase II
SP6	Megally, S. H., Garg, M., Seible, F., Dowell, Robert K., Seismic Performance of Precast Segmental Bridge Superstructures, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/24, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	100 INT- CIP Phase II
SP7	Megally, S. H., Garg, M., Seible, F., Dowell, Robert K., Seismic Performance of Precast Segmental Bridge Superstructures, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/24, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	100 EXT Phase II
SP8	Megally, S. H., Garg, M., Seible, F., Dowell, Robert K., Seismic Performance of Precast Segmental Bridge Superstructures, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/24, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	50INT/50E XT Phase II
F1	Silva, P., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Response of Standard Caltrans Pile-To-Pile Cap Connections Under Simulated Seismic Loads, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/09, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, November 1997.	STD 1
F2	Silva, P., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Response of Standard Caltrans Pile-To-Pile Cap Connections Under Simulated Seismic Loads, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/09, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, November 1997.	STD 2
F3	Silva, P., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Response of Standard Caltrans Pile-To-Pile Cap Connections Under Simulated Seismic Loads, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/09, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, November 1997.	STD 3
F4	Xiao, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Experimental Evaluation of a Typical Bridge Column Footing Designed to Current Caltrans Standards, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 95/08, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, March 1995.	

F5	Xiao, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Hamada, N., Seismic Assessment and Retrofit of Bridge Footings, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/11, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 1994.	Retrofit F2CR
F6	Xiao, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Hamada, N., Seismic Assessment and Retrofit of Bridge Footings, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/11, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 1994.	F1RA
F7	Xiao, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Hamada, N., Seismic Assessment and Retrofit of Bridge Footings, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/11, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 1994.	F3RR
SK1	Megally, S. H., Silva, P.F., Seible, F., Seismic Response of Sacrificial Shear Keys in Bridge Abutments, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/23, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	1A
SK2	Megally, S. H., Silva, P.F., Seible, F., Seismic Response of Sacrificial Shear Keys in Bridge Abutments, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/23, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	2C
SK3	Megally, S. H., Silva, P.F., Seible, F., Seismic Response of Sacrificial Shear Keys in Bridge Abutments, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/23, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	2D
SK4	Megally, S. H., Silva, P.F., Seible, F., Seismic Response of Sacrificial Shear Keys in Bridge Abutments, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/23, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	1A
SK5	Megally, S. H., Silva, P.F., Seible, F., Seismic Response of Sacrificial Shear Keys in Bridge Abutments, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/23, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	1B
SK6	Megally, S. H., Silva, P.F., Seible, F., Seismic Response of Sacrificial Shear Keys in Bridge Abutments, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/23, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	2B
SK7	Megally, S. H., Silva, P.F., Seible, F., Seismic Response of Sacrificial Shear Keys in Bridge Abutments, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/23, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, May 2002.	3A

R1	Chai, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Flexural Retrofit of Circular Reinf. Concrete Bridge Columns by Steel Jacketing-Experimental Studies, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 91/06, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 1991.	
R2	Silva, P.F., Sritharan, S., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Full-Scale Test of the Alaska Cast-In-Place Steel Shell Three Column Bridge Bent, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 98/13, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, February 1999.	
R3	Innamorato, D, Seible, F., Hegemier, G., Priestley, M.J.N., Ho, F., Full Scale Test of a Two Column Bridge Bent with Carbon Fiber Jacket Retrofit, Advanced Composite Technology Transfer ACTT-96/10, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1996.	SMV-I
R4	Innamorato, D, Seible, F., Hegemier, G., Priestley, M.J.N., Ho, F., Full Scale Test of a Two Column Bridge Bent with Carbon Fiber Jacket Retrofit, Advanced Composite Technology Transfer ACTT-96/10, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, August 1996.	SMV-II
R5	Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Sun, Z.L., San Francisco Flexural Retrofit Validation Tests on Rectangular Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 90/07, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, December 1990.	
R6	Xiao, Y., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Steel Jacket Retrofit for Enhancing Shear Strength of Short Rectang. Reinforced Concrete Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 92/07, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, July 1993.	R-4
R7	Shmoldas, A., Shleifer, G., Seible, F., Innamorato, D., Carbon Fiber Retrofit of the Arroyo Seco Spandrel Column, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 97/13, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 1997.	
R8	Dowell, R., Burgueño, R., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Mari, A., The Terminal Separation Replacement Structure Proofstest and Retrofit Test, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/15, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 1994.	Proof Test
R9	Dowell, R., Burgueño, R., Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Mari, A., The Terminal Separation Replacement Structure Proofstest and Retrofit Test, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/15, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 1994.	
R10	Hewes, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Design and Performance of Precast Concrete Segmental Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/25, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 2002.	JH1-T1

R11	Hewes, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seismic Design and Performance of Precast Concrete Segmental Bridge Columns, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2001/25, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 2002.	JH2-T1
SM1	Seible, F., Priestley, M.J.N., Latham, C., Silva, P., Full-Scale Bridge Column/Superstructure Connection Tests under Simulated Longitudinal Seismic Loads, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 94/14, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, June 1994.	
SM2	Sritharan, S., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Response of Column/Cap Beam Tee Connections w/Cap Beam Prestressing, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/09, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, December 1996.	IC1
SM3	Sritharan, S., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Response of Column/Cap Beam Tee Connections w/Cap Beam Prestressing, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/09, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, December 1996.	IC2
SM4	Sritharan, S., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Seismic Response of Column/Cap Beam Tee Connections w/Cap Beam Prestressing, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 96/09, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, December 1996.	IC3
SM5	Patty, J., Seible, F., Uang, C-M., Seismic Response of Integral Bridge Connections, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2000/16, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 2002.	Specimen 1 (CR-NS)
SM6	Patty, J., Seible, F., Uang, C-M., Seismic Response of Integral Bridge Connections, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2000/16, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 2002.	Specimen 2 (CR-S)
SM7	Patty, J., Seible, F., Uang, C-M., Seismic Response of Integral Bridge Connections, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2000/16, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 2002.	Specimen 3 (PT-NS)
SM8	Patty, J., Seible, F., Uang, C-M., Seismic Response of Integral Bridge Connections, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2000/16, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 2002.	Specimen 4 (PT-S)
SM9	Patty, J., Seible, F., Uang, C-M., Seismic Response of Integral Bridge Connections, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2000/16, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 2002.	

SM10	Schoettler, M., Restrepo, J., Seible, F., BART Aerial Guideway Bent Proof Test, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 2002/13, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, October 2002.	
SM11	Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Anderson, D., Proof Test of a Retrofit Concept for the San Francisco Double-Deck Viaducts, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 92/03, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, July 1992.	
SM12	Holombo, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Longitudinal Seismic Response of Precast Spliced-Girder Bridges, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 98/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, April 1998.	Bulb Tee
SM13	Holombo, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Longitudinal Seismic Response of Precast Spliced-Girder Bridges, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 98/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, April 1998.	Bath Tub
SM14	Holombo, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Longitudinal Seismic Response of Precast Spliced-Girder Bridges, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 98/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, April 1998.	Bulb Tee Super
SM15	Holombo, J., Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Longitudinal Seismic Response of Precast Spliced-Girder Bridges, Structural Systems Research Project SSRP – 98/05, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, April 1998.	Bath Tub Super

Visual Inspection & Capacity Assessment of Earthquake Damaged Reinforced Concrete Bridge Elements.

Final Report

Appendices

Summary of Related Resources Available by Request through SM&I

- A: Research Deployment Products (Developed Collaboratively by UCSD and SM&I)
- B: Resources Used in Caltrans Emergency Response Training (Developed by SM&I)

Appendix A: Research Deployment Products (Developed Collaboratively by UCSD and SM&I)

1) Reinforced Concrete Bridge Capacity Assessment Training Manual

This manual is the primary teaching resource from the project that describes fundamental concepts required for RC bridge capacity assessment. It includes discussion of seismic design concepts, the performance of RC bridge components, post earthquake evaluation, and lessons learned.

2) Post-Earthquake Inspection Manual for Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns

This manual identifies a step-by-step procedure to guide maintenance and inspection engineers in the determination of the remaining capacity of damaged reinforced concrete bridge columns.

3) Training Slide Sets for RC Bridge Capacity Assessment

These slide sets present key concepts from the Reinforced Concrete Bridge Capacity Assessment Training Manual and the Post Earthquake Inspection Manual for Reinforced Concrete Columns. There are four modules:

Lecture 1: California Seismic Design Concepts (43 slides)

Concepts presented include response and plastic mechanisms, capacity design, material properties, construction techniques, and typical design provisions from pre-1971, 1971-'94, and post 1994.

Lecture 2: Performance of Bridge Components (26 slides)

Illustrates typical columns, flexural failure, shear failure, lap splice failure, hollow column, flared column, lightweight concrete column, connections/joint, superstructure, foundations, abutments/shear keys, bearings and restrainers.

Lecture 3: Post-Earthquake Column Evaluation and Lessons Learned (35 slides)

Addresses damage evaluation, performance curves, failure mechanisms, performance curve determinations, serviceability guidelines, flexure vs. shear, design era, shear vs. lap splice, abutments, and connections.

Lecture 4: Post-Earthquake Column Typing (56 slides)

Provides detailed steps following a flow chart to determine 'type' of column being inspected for use by office engineers and possibly field personnel.

Appendix B: Resources Used in Caltrans Emergency Response Training (Developed by SM&I)

1) Caltrans SM&I Emergency Response Plan

This plan outlines roles and responsibilities of, and provides a list of actions to be taken by, Structures Maintenance and Investigations (SM&I) staff after a catastrophic event involving structures on the state highway system. It applies to earthquakes, floods, and any major catastrophe involving state highway structures.

2) SM&I Training Program Slide Sets

These slide sets are used to train SM&I and affiliated staff on emergency response procedures involving Caltrans bridges with emphasis on earthquake disaster response. There are five modules:

Lecture 1: SM&I Emergency Response Plan (106 slides)

Reviews SM&I's emergency response procedures as detailed in the Caltrans SM&I Emergency Response Plan. The objective is to assure that the trainee understands the Department's duties as well as their own duties.

Lecture 2: California Seismic Retrofits (31 slides)

Illustrates California bridge seismic retrofit strategies and elements in more detail.

Lecture 3: Field Investigation (88 slides)

Describes what to expect and what elements to inspect after an earthquake. Provides examples of actual damaged elements, and lists available inspection tools and techniques for post earthquake inspection.

Lecture 4: Analyze/Recommendations/Repairs and Reports (41 slides)

Outlines process of making field decisions, conducting post-investigation analyses, and providing damage reporting and work recommendations needed to assess either the closing of a structure or the opening of a structure with shoring and/or emergency repairs.

Lecture 5: ABME Combined 1-4 Post Earthquake Column Typing (102 slides)

An overview compilation of the more detailed four-part training slide sets for Post Earthquake Inspection and RC Column Capacity Assessment training that was developed with University of California San Diego (see Appendix A-3).