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Introduction

• Generally, bridge investment and management decisions are multi-alternative-oriented.

• Although many bridge management systems (BMSs) contain some form of life-cycle costing (LCC), the use of LCC in bridge engineering is scarce.

• LCC in many BMSs has mainly been applied within the bridge operation phase to support decisions related to existing bridges.

• Even though BMSs and LCC are interrelated, many bridge management researches have treated them as separate aspects; therefore, neither may lead to the best usable decision-support tools.
Aim and Scope

The project aims at enhancing the bridge investment and management decisions by upgrading and expanding the use of LCC in the Swedish Bridge and Tunnel Management System (BaTMan). This licentiate thesis is the first development step toward this aim:

- Address the possible LCC applications for bridges

- Supported with a detailed case study, demonstrate the LCC implementation on whether to **repair or to replace a bridge**, *(Paper I and II)*.

- Supported with a detailed case study, demonstrate the LCC implementation on whether to **repair or to replace a specific bridge structural member**, *(Paper III)*.
The Swedish Bridge and Tunnel Management System (BaTMan)

https://batman.vv.se/batman/
BaTMan

- Sweden has a long tradition in bridge management. Since 1944, information about the condition of the national road network has been documented and stored in different archives.

- The Swedish Transport Administration (Trafikverket) is the largest bridge manager in Sweden. The latest update of Trafikverket's BMS is called a Bridge and Tunnel Management system (BaTMan), which was introduced in 2004.

- BaTMan is recognized as the best-known software-based digital BMS in Europe.

- All information is given on repair, strengthening, and maintenance, including their costs.

- Furthermore, the system consists of a separate navigation tool (WebHybris) that can access the BaTMan’s database and answer any related question for any research or management purposes.
BaTMan Navigation Tool (WebHybris)
The Swedish Bridge Stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge Function Type</th>
<th>Total No. Of Bridges</th>
<th>Bridge Total Area (m²)</th>
<th>Bridge Total Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>23,848</td>
<td>7,644,208</td>
<td>668,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BaTMan's Bridges</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,129</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,644,208</strong></td>
<td><strong>668,381</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafikverket's Bridges in BaTMan</td>
<td>20,050</td>
<td>5,858,570</td>
<td>528,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trafikverket's Bridges in BaTMan</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,858,570</strong></td>
<td><strong>528,905</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bridge Construction Material]

- Slab Bridge
- Slab-Frame Bridge
- Beam Bridge
- Beam-Frame Bridge
- Culvert Bridge
- Open Spandrel Arch Bridge
- Cable Stayed Bridge
- Suspension Bridge
- Other Bridge types

![Bridge Length Distribution]

- L < 5m: 2.56%
- 5m ≤ L < 10m: 19%
- 10m ≤ L < 20m: 7%
- 20m ≤ L < 30m: 8%
- 30m ≤ L < 50m: 8%
- 50m ≤ L < 100m: 3.76%
- 100m ≤ L < 200m: 26%
- 200m ≤ L < 500m: 28%
- 500m ≤ L < 1000m: 1.02%
- 1000m ≤ L: 0.14%
- Special Material: 0.03%
The Swedish Bridge Stock

Based on 56,291 spans for 34,591 bridges
BaTMan’s Condition Class (CC) System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CC</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Defective function</td>
<td>Immediate action is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Defective function within 3 years</td>
<td>Action has to be taken within 3 years period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Defective function within 10 years</td>
<td>Action has to be taken within 10 years period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Defective function beyond 10 years (No damage at time of inspection)</td>
<td>No action is needed within the coming 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ The structural members functional conditions will automatically be converted to numerical values that can easily be used in the LCC analysis.
Comprehensive Integrated LCC Implementation Scheme

1. Idea
   - Whole-life costing, WLC
   - Life-cycle costing, LCC

2. Early Planning & Initial Study
   - Get a preliminary bridge LCC & specify the most cost-effective road corridor

3. Feasibility Study
   - Propose an optimal conceptual design

   - Specify the optimal bridge’s design proposal
   - Decide whether to repair or to renew a bridge

5. Bidding & Tendering
   - Specify the optimal bridge’s structural member
   - Specify the optimal repair strategy

6. Detail Design & Construction
   - Specify the optimal structural member’s replacement alternative

7. Operation & Maintenance
   - Specify the optimal bridge’s replacement alternative

8. LCC Saving Potential

- A decision on whether or not to undertake the project
- Tender documents
- Contract
- Inauguration
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LCC Analysis Tools

• Net Present Value Method (NPV):

\[
NPV = \sum_{n=0}^{L} \frac{C_n}{(1+r)^n}
\]

• Equivalent Annual Cost Technique (EAC):

\[
EAC = NPV \times A_{t,r} = NPV \times \frac{r}{1-(1+r)^{-L}}
\]

• Net Saving (NS) and the Opportunity Loss (OL):

\[
NS = (EAC_A - EAC_B) \times \frac{1-(1+r)^{-L_B}}{r} \quad OL = (EAC_A - EAC_B) \times \frac{1-(1+r)^{-L_A}}{r}
\]

• Bridge work zone user cost (WZUC): Will be calculated using BaTMan-LCC
Case-Studies

Construction Year: 1934

Construction Year: 1929

(Residual service life is not more than three years, if no action is taken CC2)
Case-Study: Täbyån Bridge

Bridge No.: [18-352-1]
Construction Year: 1929
Simply Supported
Total length = 9.5 m
Total width = 5.3 m
ADT = 84
Superstructure: CC2
Substructure: CC2
Strategies: Repair or Renewal

Strategy (A)

Immediately repair the bridge

- Step 1: optimize between the available replacement options.
- Step 2: optimize between the promoted replacement proposal and the repair strategy.

Strategy (B)

Utilizing the bridge’s residual service life without action and then renew it

28 July 2015
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The average real initial costs of the Swedish bridges different types, based on cost data for 2,508 bridges constructed between 1980 and 2011.
Replacement Alternatives

The inflation rate for the Swedish bridges initial costs

\[ Y = 458.37X - 904726 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.9189 \]

28 July 2015
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The LCC analysis excluding and including the user cost has promoted the third alternative, Steel arch culvert, EAC equals to 67,671 SEK/year.
# Replacement and Repair Optimization

## Strategies Input Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies description</th>
<th>Strategy (A)</th>
<th>Strategy (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategies description</td>
<td>Immediate repair</td>
<td>Utilizing the bridge residual service life without action and then replace it by a steel open-bottom arch culvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge’s Residual service life without action, (Years)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated service life after an action (Year)</td>
<td>3 20</td>
<td>4 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy initial cost (SEK)</td>
<td>895,000</td>
<td>1,474,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual O&amp;M cost (SEK)</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>During the current bridge residual service life After the bridge replacement 8,500 2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The required construction duration (Days)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequently, strategy (B) is the most cost-effective strategy.

The NS is equal to 282,864 SEK/63 years or 12,359 SEK/year for a life span equals to 63 years.

The OL is equal to 167,963 SEK/20 years or 12,359 SEK/year for a life span equals to 20 years.
Analysis Results Including the Bridge User Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category &amp; Term</th>
<th>Strategy (A)</th>
<th>Strategy (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Present Value (SEK)</td>
<td>2,215,523</td>
<td>2,902,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent Annual Cost (SEK/year)</td>
<td>163,022</td>
<td>126,798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequently, strategy (B) remains the most cost-effective strategy.
Sensitivity analysis (1): The impact of varying the discount rate

- Strategy (B) remains the most cost effective strategy.
- The discount rate, in this case, does not have considerable impact on the final decision.
Sensitivity analysis (2): The impact of varying the initial cost of strategy (A)

If there is a possibility to negotiate the initial cost of strategy (A), it might be more profitable to choose it as the most cost-effective solution when its initial cost is less than 727,037 SEK instead of 895,000 SEK.
Sensitivity analysis (3): The bridge service life extension after repair

If the repair strategy (A) can guarantee a bridge’s service life extension longer than 28 years instead of 20 years, then it can be chosen as the most cost-effective choice instead of strategy (B). This is fairly impossible.
Sensitivity analysis (4): The new bridge’s anticipated service life

Strategy (B) remains the most cost-effective choice as much as the service life of the new bridge is longer than 33 years. It is fairly well known.
Even if the three years in becomes zero “Replace now” (CC3), strategy (B) remains the most-cost effective.
The EAC for strategy (A) and (B) are equal to 69,612 SEK/year and 60,497 SEK/year respectively.

Consequently, strategy (B) remains the most cost-effective choice.
Large-Scale Feasibility

- Confidently, the bridge should not be repaired and should be replaced after utilizing its residual service life.

- Trafikverket is responsible for:
  - 23,948 bridges with a total bridge area of 5,516,590 m²
  - 6,268 bridges older than 70 years, total bridge area of 619,944 m².

- The analysis shows that, the opportunity loss is equal to 241 SEK/year/m²

- Consider that 50% of the Trafikverket’s old bridges might be subjected to wrong decision, This means:
  - Trafikverket can save/might loose 74.7 million SEK each year

- This loss will stand for 20 year, this also means:
  - Trafikverket can save/might loose 1.49 billion SEK during the coming 20 years.
BaTMan-LCC relation with BaTMan

1. Detailed Info., price etc. (N/A in BaTMan)
2. BaTMan-LCC (KTH)
3. WebHybris
4. NVDB

- Nationell Vägdatabas
- Skogsnäringen
- Kommuner och Landsting
- Lantmäteriet
- Trafikverket
- Transportstyrelsen
Conclusion & Comments

• LCC applications for bridges should be developed in accordance with the available BMS and should benefit from the BMS’s inventory data.

• Not easy to draw a general conclusion from LCC analysis because the results are strongly dependent on the input. However, usually when the NS is a considerable amount, the variation of the included parameters will not have that significant influence on the final decision and vice versa.

• By using OL technique, the decision makers will be able to estimate the consequences of their decisions, and it will promote forward thinking.

• One of the key components of the LCC is the incorporation of uncertainty into the analysis. Therefore, the sensitivity analysis is an important step in such analysis which can address the critical parameters for the final decision.
Further Research

• The main goal of ETSI is to develop a unified, reliable and usable Nordic methodology and an Internet-based computer tool for bridge life-cycle optimization. Same methodology could be adopted to fit the BMSs in other Nordic counties.

• Clarify how a BMS with an integrated LCC tool can support network-level decisions for prioritizing bridges for repair or replacement purposes, taking into account the OL from the project-level analysis.

• Clarify the possible LCC applications for bridges during the tendering phase where the largest LCC saving potential can be achieved.

• Upgrading BaTMan itself to accommodate the LCC applications of BaTMan-LCC tool is the main future task of this project.

• Possibilities of using *advance monitoring systems* which may increase the allowable time needed to implement an action.
Acknowledgements

- My main supervisor, Professor **Håkan Sundquist**, and my assistant supervisor Professor **Raid Karoumi** for the support and constructive guidance throughout my studies.

- My germane supervisor from Trafikverket Dr. **George Racutanu**.

- Bridge specialists in Trafikverket **George Chamoun** and **Johan Severinsson** for their close collaborations and fruitful discussions.

- Mr. **Peter Rosengren** from CNet Svenska AB and all staff on **BaTMa-Helpdesk** for giving me licenses to WebHybris and BaTMa.

- Everybody contributed to my pleasant time at KTH especially my colleagues at the Division of Structural Engineering and Bridges.

- The financial support and collaboration of **the Swedish Transport Administration** and **ETSI Project** are greatly appreciated.
Thank You

Questions?