



## **CENSEO Bridge Evaluation Framework Traffic Engineering**

Ruben M. Bazalar

COLUMBIA CBIPS Center for Buildings, Infrastructure and Public Space

## **CENSEO: BRIGDE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**

**STRATECY** 

**SUITABILITY** 

**DECISION** 

**IMPROVEMENT** 

**TRAFFIC ENGINEERIN** 

Level of Service

## **PROBLEM FRAMEWORK ARCHIITECTURE** CLIMATE CHANGE: Assesses a structure's cultural significance, aesthetics, and adaptability  $\bigoplus$ **DEAL-TIME DATA INTEGRATION** to future needs. Climate change intensifies natural disaster magnitudes. This exacerbation strains Key Performance Indicators: infrastructure resilience, urging advanced vulnerability and risk assessments to devise · Significance fortified engineering solutions. · Asthetic North America (R<sup>2</sup>=0.35)  $\bullet$  Fconomy  $100$ Western Europe (R<sup>2</sup>=0.13)  $-0.2$ · Adaptability Foresta (B<sup>2</sup> = 0.17)  $-0.4$ **RISK**  $Asin 18<sup>2</sup> = 0.441$ Ą  $\widehat{\omega}$ is n ASSESSMENT  $-0.6$  $2.5$ **RP**  $-0.8$  $0.0$  $-1.0$  $-2.5$ Western Europe (R<sup>2</sup>=0.0) **STRUCTURAL**  $-1.2$ Eurasia (R<sup>2</sup>=0.63)  $-5.0$  $A(1, B^2) = 0.01$ **Asset Properties**  $0.3$  $0A$  $0.5$  $0.6$  $07$  $0R$  $0.9$  $0.5$  $0.6$  $07$  $0.8$  $0.9$ intervalues<br>Imperaturitur  $S_{\text{min}}$  $S_{\text{min}}$ Evaluates safety, durability, and feasibility of interventions under Figure 1: Projected areal mean change in return periods for wet and windy (left) expected loads and hazards. as well as hot and dry (right) disasters. Data Integration Key Performance Indicators: **AGING INFRASTRUCTURE:** · Probability of Excedence (PoE) •  $Reliability Index (B)$ Aging infrastructure intensifies natural disaster repercussions due to outdated design • Remaining Service Life (RSL) standards, deteriorated materials, and lack of modern resilience measures. These factors dulti-Criteria Decision • Material Degradation Rate (MDR)  $MCDA$ collectively compromise structural integrity, escalate repair and recovery costs, and pose heightened safety risks. Non-deteriorating systems **Deteriorating systems TRAFFIC**  $R_1 > R_2$  $\mathfrak{g}$  $\tilde{\alpha}$ lity Δ ٨r **Sensitivity Analysis** Assesses impacts on mobility, congestion, and safety during and after **Comparative Analysis** interventions. sons 50% Step (i) + Step (ii) + Step (iii) + Step (iv) + Step (v) Key Performance Indicators: • Average Daily Traffic (ADT)  $0%$ • Level of Service (LOS) CENSED  $t_{h2}$  Time t  $t_{h2}$  Time t  $t_{01}$  $t_{h1}$  $ln 2$  $t_{01}$  $t_{h1}$  $I_{02}$ • Travel Time Savings (TTS) STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING • Accident Prediction Rate (APR) Figure 2: Functionality losses of non-deteriorating (left) and deteriorating systems (right) **CARBON FOOTPRINT:**  $80\%$ **ENVIRONMENTAL** The construction industry is a significant

contributor to global carbon emissions. primarily due to its supply chain's complexity and dependence on highcarbon materials and energy sources. This issue arises from inadequate consideration of indirect emissions, which dominate the total carbon footprint. The lack of comprehensive carbon footprint analyses for the construction sector, hampers effective policy-making.



Evaluates ecological impact, carbon footprint, and sustainability of intervention options.

Key Performance Indicators:

- Cabon Emissions (CO2 Equivalent)
- Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)
- Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA)
- Noise Impact Analysis (dB)



÷





hampers effective policy-making.

- · Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA)
- · Noise Impact Analysis (dB)





hampers effective policy-making.

· Noise Impact Analysis (dB)

· Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA)



## **AGING INFRASTRUCTURE:**



## **CARBON FOOTPRINT:**

The construction industry is a significant issue arises from inadequate hampers effective policy-making.

contributor to global carbon emissions, primarily due to its supply chain's complexity and dependence on high-carbon materials and energy sources. This issue arises from inadequate consideration of indirect emissions, which dominate the total carbon footprint. The lack of comprehensive carbon footprint analyses for the construction sector, hampers effective policy-making.



Figure 3: Direct, indirect (regional) and indirect (global) carbon emissions of top construction markets.

Evaluates ecological impact, carbon footprint, and sustainability of intervention options.

Key Performance Indicators

• Cabon Emissions (CO2 Equivalent)

- · Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)
- · Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA)
- · Noise Impact Analysis (dB)











## **CENSEO: BRIGDE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**

**STRATECY** 

**SUITABILITY** 

**DECISION** 

**IMPROVEMENT** 

**TRAFFIC ENGINEERIN** 

Level of Service

## **PROBLEM FRAMEWORK ARCHIITECTURE** CLIMATE CHANGE: Assesses a structure's cultural significance, aesthetics, and adaptability  $\bigoplus$ **DEAL-TIME DATA INTEGRATION** to future needs. Climate change intensifies natural disaster magnitudes. This exacerbation strains Key Performance Indicators: infrastructure resilience, urging advanced vulnerability and risk assessments to devise · Significance fortified engineering solutions. · Asthetic North America (R<sup>2</sup>=0.35)  $\bullet$  Fconomy  $100$ Western Europe (R<sup>2</sup>=0.13)  $-0.2$ · Adaptability Foresta (B<sup>2</sup> = 0.17)  $-0.4$ **RISK**  $Asin 18<sup>2</sup> = 0.441$ Ą  $\widehat{\omega}$ is n ASSESSMENT  $-0.6$  $2.5$ **RP**  $-0.8$  $0.0$  $-1.0$  $-2.5$ Western Europe (R<sup>2</sup>=0.0) **STRUCTURAL**  $-1.2$ Eurasia (R<sup>2</sup>=0.63)  $-5.0$  $A(1, B^2) = 0.01$ **Asset Properties**  $0.3$  $0A$  $0.5$  $0.6$  $07$  $0R$  $0.9$  $0.5$  $0.6$  $07$  $0.8$  $0.9$ intervalues<br>Imperaturitur  $S_{\text{min}}$  $S_{\text{min}}$ Evaluates safety, durability, and feasibility of interventions under Figure 1: Projected areal mean change in return periods for wet and windy (left) expected loads and hazards. as well as hot and dry (right) disasters. Data Integration Key Performance Indicators: **AGING INFRASTRUCTURE:** · Probability of Excedence (PoE) •  $Reliability Index (B)$ Aging infrastructure intensifies natural disaster repercussions due to outdated design • Remaining Service Life (RSL) standards, deteriorated materials, and lack of modern resilience measures. These factors dulti-Criteria Decision • Material Degradation Rate (MDR)  $MCDA$ collectively compromise structural integrity, escalate repair and recovery costs, and pose heightened safety risks. Non-deteriorating systems **Deteriorating systems TRAFFIC**  $R_1 > R_2$  $\mathfrak{g}$  $\tilde{\alpha}$ lity Δ ٨r **Sensitivity Analysis** Assesses impacts on mobility, congestion, and safety during and after **Comparative Analysis** interventions. sons 50% Step (i) + Step (ii) + Step (iii) + Step (iv) + Step (v) Key Performance Indicators: • Average Daily Traffic (ADT)  $0%$ • Level of Service (LOS) CENSED  $t_{h2}$  Time t  $t_{h2}$  Time t  $t_{01}$  $t_{h1}$  $ln 2$  $t_{01}$  $t_{h1}$  $I_{02}$ • Travel Time Savings (TTS) STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING • Accident Prediction Rate (APR) Figure 2: Functionality losses of non-deteriorating (left) and deteriorating systems (right) **CARBON FOOTPRINT:**  $80\%$ **ENVIRONMENTAL** The construction industry is a significant

contributor to global carbon emissions. primarily due to its supply chain's complexity and dependence on highcarbon materials and energy sources. This issue arises from inadequate consideration of indirect emissions, which dominate the total carbon footprint. The lack of comprehensive carbon footprint analyses for the construction sector, hampers effective policy-making.



Evaluates ecological impact, carbon footprint, and sustainability of intervention options.

Key Performance Indicators:

- Cabon Emissions (CO2 Equivalent)
- Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)
- Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA)
- Noise Impact Analysis (dB)



÷





**CENSED** 





 $1.0$ 

 $0.8$ 

 $0.4$ 

 $0.2$ 

 $0.0$ 

**WIND** 

## **AVE STRATEGY ACCURACY: HIGH**

 $\overline{\blacktriangledown}$ 

**POTENTIAL PROBLEM: SCOUR** 



KIP, FT, F

 $\boldsymbol{\mathrm{C}}$ 

 $-$ minor

moderate

extensive

 $-$ complete

 $\overline{\mathbf{v}}$ 

**FRAGILITY CURVES** 





engineering to control vibrations and reduce oscillations caused by various factors such as wind, traffic, and seismic activities.

**GLOBAL** 

 $\blacktriangledown$ 



**RISK: MEDIUM** 





**Allen** 

J<sup>B</sup> Allistine

 $+$   $-$ 

COLUMBIA CBIPS **Center for Buildings, Infrastructure and Public Space** 

# **Resources**

- Andrić, Jelena M., and Da-Gang Lu. "Risk assessment of bridges under multiple hazards in operation period." Safety science 83 (2016): 80-92.
- Argyroudis, Sotirios A., and Stergios Aristoteles Mitoulis. "Vulnerability of bridges to individual and multiple hazards-floods and earthquakes." Reliability engineering & system safety 210 (2021): 107564.
- Capacci, Luca, Fabio Biondini, and Dan M. Frangopol. "Resilience of aging structures and infrastructure systems with emphasis on seismic resilience of bridges and road networks." Resilient Cities and Structures 1.2 (2022): 23-41.
- Committee on Social Science, Policy, Economics, Education, and Decision, and Committee on Sustainability. "Integrating Resilience and Sustainability into Civil Engineering Projects." Reston, VA: American Society of Civil Engineers, 2023.
- Forcellini, Davide. "The role of climate change in the assessment of the seismic resilience of infrastructures." Infrastructures 6.5 (2021): 76.
- Gidaris, Ioannis, et al. "Multiple-hazard fragility and restoration models of highway bridges for regional risk and resilience assessment in the United States: State-of-the-art review." Journal of structural engineering 143.3 (2017): 04016188.
- Ji, Jun, Amr S. Elnashai, and Daniel A. Kuchma. "An analytical framework for seismic fragility analysis of RC high-rise buildings." \*Engineering Structures\* 29.12 (2007): 3197-3209.
- Jhong, Bing-Chen, Jung Huang, and Ching-Pin Tung. "Spatial assessment of climate risk for investigating climate adaptation strategies by evaluating spatial-temporal variability of extreme precipitation." Water Resources Management 33 (2019): 3377-3400.
- Khan, Saiful Arif, et al. "An integrated framework for bridge infrastructure resilience analysis against seismic hazard." Sustainable and Resilient Infrastructure 8.sup1 (2023): 5-25.
- Kim, Hyunjun, et al. "Flood fragility analysis for bridges with multiple failure modes." Advances in Mechanical Engineering 9.3 (2017): 1687814017696415.