

JBK
RDB

924559

Paper No. _____

AN ASAE MEETING PRESENTATION

1
**PORTABLE TIMBER BRIDGE DESIGNS FOR
TEMPORARY FOREST ROADS**

by
**S.E. Taylor, Assistant Professor
Department of Agricultural Engineering
Auburn University, AL
and
G.L. Murphy, Group Leader
Transportation Systems Development
Region 8, USDA Forest Service
Atlanta, GA**

Written for presentation at the
1992 International Winter Meeting
sponsored by
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERS

Nashville Convention Center
Nashville, Tennessee
15-18 December 1992

SUMMARY: Efforts to reduce the environmental impacts from forest operations point to the need for improved stream crossing technology on temporary forest roads and skid trails. New designs of timber bridges appear to be cost-effective alternatives for portable stream crossing structures. Bridge design criteria and example designs for portable, longitudinal glued-laminated and stress-laminated timber bridges are discussed in this paper.

KEYWORDS: forest roads, glued-laminated timber, stream crossings, stress-laminated timber, timber bridges

The author(s) is solely responsible for the content of this technical presentation. The technical presentation does not necessarily reflect the official position of ASAE, and its printing and distribution does not constitute an endorsement of views which may be expressed.

Technical presentations are not subject to the formal peer review process by ASAE editorial committees; therefore are not to be presented as refereed publications.

Quotation from this work should state that it is from a presentation made by (name of author) at the (listed) ASAE meeting. EXAMPLE: From Author's last name, Initials. "Title of Presentation". Presented at the Date and Title of meeting, Paper No. American Society of Agricultural Engineers, 2950 Niles Rd., St. Joseph, MI 49085-9659 USA.

For information about securing permission to reprint or reproduce a technical presentation, please send inquiries to ASAE.



American Society of Agricultural Engineers
2950 Niles Road, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085-9659 USA
Voice: 616.429.0300 FAX: 616.429.3852

PORTABLE TIMBER BRIDGE DESIGNS FOR TEMPORARY FOREST ROADS

S.E. Taylor
Assoc. Member

G.L. Murphy¹

ABSTRACT

Efforts to reduce the environmental impacts from forest operations point to the need for improved stream crossing technology on temporary forest roads and skid trails. New designs of timber bridges appear to be cost-effective alternatives for portable stream crossing structures. Bridge design criteria and example designs for portable, longitudinal glued-laminated and stress-laminated timber bridges are discussed in this paper.

INTRODUCTION

Increasing concerns over environmental impacts from forest operations such as timber harvesting are leading to many new recommendations for forest practices. Most of these recommendations, which are called Best Management Practices (BMP's), are intended to reduce the potential for water pollution. Several studies in various states have shown that timber harvesting and the associated road construction are major contributors to nonpoint source pollution of forest streams. Harper (1979) listed several parameters related to nonpoint source pollution from silvicultural activities and indicated that reducing sediment in the stream should have one of the highest priorities for research. Rothwell (1983) and Swift (1985), in separate studies on forest roads and skid trails, found that stream crossings were the most frequent sources of erosion and sediment introduction into the stream. Therefore, there is a need to develop improved methods of stream crossings for forest roads and skid trails.

Fords and corrugated-metal or concrete culverts have been used as stream crossing structures on logging roads for many years. Using fords results in a continuous introduction of sediment into the stream as machines drive across the stream. While culverts alleviate this problem, there appear to be considerable sediment loads introduced into the stream during the excavation and fill work that accompanies culvert installation. Results reported by Swift (1985) showed that the cumulative amount of soil placed in a stream at the road-stream crossing during the construction period was over ten times greater than during the logging

¹ The authors are, respectively, Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Engineering, Auburn University, AL 36849-5417, and Group Leader, Transportation System Development, Region 8, USDA Forest Service, 1720 Peachtree Rd NW, Atlanta, GA 30367.

Acknowledgements: The portable stress-laminated timber bridge discussed in this paper was designed by Dade Foote, Structural Engineer, Region 8, USDA Forest Service, Atlanta, GA.

Some states are beginning to recommend the use of temporary or portable bridges as alternatives to fords or culverts. The rationale behind this recommendation is that the additional soil disturbance during installation and removal of a culvert or the use of a ford introduces excessive sediment into the stream. Indeed, Swift (1985) presented data that showed that most sedimentation from stream crossings occurs during the construction phase. This concern over sedimentation is of even greater importance when guidelines dictate that culverts or bridges be removed from intermittent-use or temporary roads after they are closed. In the case of a culvert, its removal may add a significant amount of sediment to the stream. In fact, these environmental concerns are the reason that many loggers will develop their timber harvesting plans so that they will not have to cross streams. However, this can be very costly due to the additional road building costs, which may range from \$500 to \$3,000 per mile of bare earth road in the southeastern states. Also, the additional road construction adds to the erosion and sedimentation problem. In some cases, landowners have stated that they have not even attempted to harvest small tracts of merchantable timber because the cost of the timber did not offset installing a culvert or permanent bridge and there was no other way to access the tract.

The installation and removal of a portable bridge, however, may involve little or no disturbance of the stream banks, resulting in very little additional sedimentation of the stream. Also, in the situations where additional roads would have been required or the timber would not have been harvested, the purchase price of a portable bridge could be offset by reducing road building costs, reducing transportation costs due to shorter haul distances, and increased income from harvesting and selling the timber. Portable bridges for spans up to 40 ft. appear to be feasible for most temporary stream crossings in timber harvesting operations, especially in the southern states.

Temporary Stream Crossing Structures

Steel Structures

Interest in portable stream crossing structures is currently very high due to these environmental issues. Mason (1990) gave an extensive description of many types of portable or prefabricated stream crossings that have been used in logging operations. Her discussion included pipe fascine systems, railroad flatcars, modular steel girder bridges with steel or timber decks, bridges made of steel truss panels (similar to the military's Bailey bridges), hinged steel bridges, and trailer- or armored military vehicle-launched bridges. These steel bridges were designed for spans ranging from 20 ft. up to 250 ft. Although the railroad flatcars and some of the prefabricated steel girder bridges have been used in logging operations, most of these bridges require heavy construction equipment for installation and removal due to their weight. Also, since they are prefabricated, their size may make transporting them to the site difficult. In addition, even though the military's Bailey bridge is lighter and can be assembled and installed with hand labor, this type of bridge does not

35 ft. long. The installed cost of the bridge was approximately \$11,500 (or \$27/ft²). However, its total weight was approximately 78,000 lbs. Although this bridge was very cost effective, its relatively high weight required the use of heavy construction equipment for installation and removal. Therefore, this bridge is probably not suitable as a portable bridge for most loggers.

Timber Structures

Mason (1990) also discussed several timber bridge designs including log stringer bridges, modular timber truss bridges, and longitudinal glued-laminated or stress-laminated bridges. Although the log stringer bridge has been used successfully for many years, the recent advances in timber bridge technology include several designs that should be easily adapted for use as portable bridges. Another "non-engineered" type of portable bridge was described by Bihun (1991). This timber bridge design is 12 ft. long and 12 ft. wide. It consists of 5 nominal 8x10 in. mechanically-laminated stringers that are 12 ft. long. The stringers are fabricated by bolting together 4 nominal 2x10's. Twelve-ft.-long 2x10 planks are laid flatwise on top of the stringers (perpendicular to the stringers) and 3x12 longitudinal runners are placed on top of the planks. This design has been constructed with unseasoned Eastern hemlock lumber and has been used to carry skidder traffic across small streams in Vermont. Although Bihun (1991) stated that the bridge had been field tested, this design probably has a limited range of vehicle loads that it can safely carry. Other loggers have also used timber dragline mats to carry skidder traffic over relatively short spans.

Design procedures for modern timber bridges can be found in the manual by Ritter (1990). Probably the most promising designs for spans up to 35 ft. consist of longitudinal glued-laminated (glulam) or stress-laminated decks that are placed across the stream. These longitudinal deck designs are relatively simple to construct, somewhat lightweight, and have comparatively thin cross sections. They can be prefabricated into large sections that can be quickly and easily installed at the stream crossing site. These bridges can be installed with typical forestry equipment, such as hydraulic knuckleboom loaders or skidders, without the need for heavy construction equipment. Also, it may be possible to install these bridges without operating the equipment in the stream and with a minimum of soil movement around the structure. This reduction in site disturbance should lead to a reduced sediment load on the stream.

Hassler et al. (1990) discussed the design, fabrication, and testing of a portable longitudinal stress-laminated deck bridge for truck traffic on logging roads. Their bridge was constructed of untreated, green, mixed hardwoods. It was 16 ft. wide, 40 ft. long, 10 in. deep, and was fabricated in two 8-ft.-wide modules. They estimated that the cost of the bridge was approximately \$7,000 excluding transportation costs to the site. It was installed to assist in timber harvesting activities in the West Virginia University Forest. They placed

moving a knuckleboom loader to the edge of the streambank. Therefore, the use of forwarders or skidders may be necessary.

Forwarders are vehicles that are equipped with smaller knuckleboom loaders and racks in which to carry wood. Forwarder payloads may be up to approximately 25,000 pounds. Although knuckleboom loaders are mounted on forwarders, they are smaller and therefore may not be able to lift payloads as large as the dedicated log loaders. However, their ability to carry bridge components in their racks may make them useful in installing smaller types of bridges. The skidder also may be used to drag bridge sections or components to the stream crossing. The weight of bridge section or components should be no more than approximately 10,000 pounds for many skidders to successfully transport them to the site. The maximum payload will depend on skidder or forwarder size. Regardless of the equipment used to lift or drag the bridge into place, provisions should be made to attach wire ropes, nylon straps, or chains to the bridge components so that they can be lifted without damaging the wood. The most convenient methods to transport portable timber bridges would be to use truck and trailer combinations that most loggers own. Therefore, it is important to design the bridge so that it can be broken down into sections for transport on logging trucks. Also, it may be possible to temporarily place the entire bridge or bridge sections on wheels and tow it to the site. However, this may be difficult to do on roads or skid trails that are still under construction.

Design Procedures

In addition to the publication by Ritter (1990), design procedures for timber bridges can be found in the AASHTO Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges (AASHTO, 1990, 1991). Little previous research has been conducted on appropriate design procedures for portable timber bridges on temporary forest roads. Knab et al. (1977) studied military theater of operations glulam bridges with design lives of 2 to 5 years. They concluded that using civilian design procedures, which are generally based on design lives of 50 to 75 years with relatively high levels of reliability, could result in unnecessarily conservative and uneconomical designs for the limited performance needs of theater of operations bridges. Using results from reliability analyses, they developed new design procedures and modification factors for allowable stresses that would result in adequate levels of structural safety for glulam stringer bridges. They concluded that a modification factor could be used that would result in increases for allowable stresses for bending, shear, and compression (both parallel- and perpendicular-to-grain) for these temporary military bridges. They did not, however, recommend changes in modulus of elasticity over those found in design data published by the American Institute of Timber Construction (AITC, 1987).

Other work by GangaRao and Zelina (1988) examined the design specifications for low volume civilian roads. They also concluded that many bridges on low volume roads

using the HS20 loads for design of a skidder bridge, for example, may be overly conservative. However, it may be difficult to insure that the bridge is not used for truck traffic at some point during its life. Therefore, the use of the HS20 load configuration may be the safest assumption for most cases, even though it may result in uneconomical bridge designs for some forestry equipment traffic.

Deflection Criteria

Ritter (1990) provided a good discussion of timber bridge deflection criteria. Deflection in bridge members is important for serviceability, performance, and aesthetics. In general, excessive deflections cause fasteners to loosen and wear surfaces, such as asphalt or concrete, to crack. Also, bridges that sag below a level plane can give the public a perception of structural inadequacy. Excessive deflections from moving vehicle loads also produce vertical movement and vibration that may annoy motorists. Since most portable bridges will not need an asphalt or concrete wear surface, concerns over deflection should not be as great as in highway bridges. However, the users' perception of the bridge may be a concern to the designer. Ritter (1990) noted that others have used deflection criteria ranging from $L/200$ to $L/1200$. He recommended a maximum deflection of $L/360$ for short-term loads and a maximum deflection criteria of $L/240$ for the combination of applied loads and dead load. It may be possible to relax these deflection criteria slightly in the case of a portable bridge. However, it may be more appropriate for the engineer to consider the relationship between the bridge span and the predicted deflection of the bridge in absolute terms instead of just using a criterion like $L/240$. For example, for a bridge with a 25 ft. span, $L/360$, $L/300$, $L/240$, and $L/180$ would be 0.83 in., 1 in., 1.25 in., and 1.67 in., respectively. In the case of some portable bridges, the designer may make the judgement that a deflection of 1.67 in. would not be excessive for the given bridge configuration, vehicle loads, and daily traffic for which it was designed.

EXAMPLE BRIDGE DESIGNS

Longitudinal Glued-Laminated Deck

Longitudinal glued-laminated deck bridges are composed of vertically-glued-laminated assemblies that are placed side by side across the stream. They are practical for clear spans up to 35 ft. The panels are typically fabricated in 48-in. widths and depths up to 10.5 in. for southern pine or 10.75 in. for western species. The panels can be interconnected with steel dowels or fasteners, but they are more commonly designed with transverse stiffener beams below the deck. These stiffener beams, which are usually bolted to the panels, help distribute wheel loads among the panels. The primary advantage to this type of bridge design is that it can be prefabricated in a few sections before shipping to the bridge site. All necessary cuts and holes can be made before preservative treatment.

research purposes and does not necessarily reflect the most economical width or length. A typical bridge used for log truck traffic would probably only need to be approximately 12 ft. wide and would therefore cost even less than the current bridge. Fabrication of this bridge has just been completed, but it has not been installed yet. Before the bridge is moved to the bridge site, the curb rails can be installed to minimize the amount of erection time at the site. The bridge can be transported to the site on a typical log trailer or equipment trailer. Each of the panels weighs approximately 5,500 pounds and should therefore be easily lifted with most knuckleboom loaders. Many types of articulated, rubber-tired front-end loaders should also be able to lift the panels. If necessary, the panels can be maneuvered into place using a grapple or cable skidder. Also, if the knuckleboom loader cannot be used at the stream crossing site, a skidder can be used to pull the panels to the stream crossing. A skidder also can be used to set the panels in place by securing a block and tackle on the opposite side of the stream and winching the panels across the stream. Installation or removal of this bridge can be accomplished in less than one day.

Longitudinal Stress-Laminated Deck

The concept of stress-laminating wood bridge decks began in Canada and has now been used in the construction of many permanent bridges in the U.S. In this system, vertical laminations of dimension lumber are stressed together with high strength steel rods. The rods squeeze the laminations together so that the stressed deck acts as a solid wood plate. The second portable timber design discussed here was designed by engineers in Region 8 of the USDA Forest Service and uses a longitudinal stress-laminated deck for its superstructure. The Forest Service also has a need for low-cost/low impact bridges for temporary stream crossings. In many cases, it is not economically feasible to construct and maintain permanent bridges for timber sales or other forest management activities in the National Forest System. To meet this need, engineers in Region 8 of the Forest Service have designed this portable stress-laminated bridge. This bridge is designed for HS20 loadings and is intended for use on temporary logging roads. Sketches of the bridge are shown in Figures 4 through 6.

The bridge consists of two separate stress-laminated panels 4.5 ft. wide. The panels are constructed with nominal 2x10 lumber for spans ranging from 16 ft. to 24 ft. Nominal 2x12 lumber is used for spans up to 32 ft. Each panel is stressed separately and then placed adjacent to the other panel with a 2 ft. space between panels. The overall width of the complete bridge is 11 ft. Solid sawn 6x6 curb rails run the length of the bridge. A unique design is used for a drop-in 3x12 filler panel in the space between the two deck panels. This filler panel primarily covers the gap between the two panels, but it also provides additional continuity between the deck panels. At each end of the bridge, the deck panels are placed on top of a 14-ft.-long solid sawn 12x12 sill, which sits directly on the stream bank. A minimum of 5 ft. is recommended between the edge of the sill and the edge of the stream. All timber components should be treated with creosote or pentachlorophenol in accordance with AWPA

Additional work is also needed to examine alternatives to other design practices. Stress-laminated designs that utilize laminated veneer lumber for bridge components are also attractive options for portable bridges. Many other design problems need to be explored. One example is in the use of stiffener beams for the glulam deck bridge. Alternatives to the stiffener beams that would allow quicker assembly or reduce the need to work under the bridge deck to attach the stiffener beams would make the system more attractive to the logger or road construction crew. Also, the use of only two longitudinal glulam panels in a manner similar to that used in the stress-laminated deck design is a possibility that needs additional study.

Cost Effectiveness

Detailed lifecycle cost information is needed to determine the economic feasibility of this concept. However, only initial cost data are available at this time. The portable hinged steel bridge designed for truck traffic, which was discussed earlier, has an estimated cost of \$13,000 (or \$43/ft² for a bridge that is 11.5 ft. wide and 26 ft. long) when shipped to states in the southern U.S. The two portable timber bridges discussed here have estimated costs of \$16,500 (or \$41/ft² for the glulam bridge that is 16 ft. wide with an effective span of 25 ft.) and \$14,000 (or \$40/ft² for the stress-laminated bridge that is 11 ft. wide with a span of 32 ft.). The glulam bridge would probably cost approximately \$13,000 if its width were reduced to 12 ft. Although the concrete bridge had a very low installed cost, its extreme weight prohibits it from being used effectively as a portable bridge. In cases where loggers build additional roads to prevent crossing streams, they would only have to build an additional 26 miles of road to equal the cost of purchasing a \$13,000 portable bridge (using road construction costs of \$500 per mile). This estimate does not account for the additional losses in productivity due to increased travel times when detouring around the stream crossing. Therefore, many loggers could probably pay for the investment in a portable bridge very quickly. In some cases, landowners have stated that they may not even harvest small tracts of merchantable timber because the cost of the timber does not offset installing a culvert or permanent bridge and there was no other way to access the tract. In these instances, the purchase price of a portable bridge could also be offset quickly by the loss in revenues due to not harvesting and selling the timber. Therefore, these portable bridge designs appear to be cost-effective stream crossing options for temporary forest roads. In addition, the cost of timber bridges is competitive with that of steel structures.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

New recommendations for forest practices are the result of pressure on the forest products industry to reduce environmental impacts from forest operations. One primary area of concern is improving water quality in forest streams. Construction of roads and the associated stream crossings during timber harvesting operations are one of the leading causes

to 32 ft. Since the glulam and stress-laminated panels each weigh approximately 5,500 pounds and 6,500 pounds, respectively, both designs can be installed and removed with knuckleboom log loaders or log skidders. Also, each bridge design can be transported on a typical log truck and trailer. Further research is underway to document the performance and longevity of these bridge designs. Additional research on bridges designed specifically for forestry equipment loads is also needed.

Cost comparisons between the portable timber bridge designs discussed here and commercial portable steel bridges show that the timber bridges may be cost effective solutions for portable stream crossings. The estimated costs for the glulam and stress-laminated bridges are approximately \$41/ft² and 40/ft², respectively, while the portable steel bridge may cost approximately \$43/ft² when shipped to the southern states. Additional research is needed to fully document the lifecycle costs and structural performance of these various designs of portable timber bridges. However, it appears that with modern timber bridge technology, portable timber bridges for temporary forest roads and skid trails are economical stream crossing structures.

Table 1. Example design moments and shear forces for a 30-ft.-span bridge based on various types of forest harvesting equipment. The truck loads for AASHTO H20 and HS20 are also shown.

Vehicle Type	Overall Wheelbase (ft)	Approximate Loaded Total Weight (lb)	Maximum Moment for the Vehicle (in. lb)	Maximum Shear (lb)
John Deere 770B Motor Grader	19.6	33,450	157,825	25,251
John Deere 450E Crawler Tractor	6.8	15,350	102,233	13,361
Caterpillar D5H Track Skidder	9.0	42,405	270,332	36,044
Caterpillar 528 Grapple Skidder	10.7	27,000	151,470	22,680
John Deere 540D Cable Skidder	9.6	21,700	127,555	18,580
John Deere 748E Grapple Skidder	12.1	34,500	181,448	28,246
Tree Farmer C6D Forwarder	17.3	38,390	126,262	27,476
AASHTO H20-44	variable	40,000	246,620	36,260
AASHTO HS20-44	variable	72,000	282,140	49,600




Figure 2. Plan view of the longitudinal glulam deck bridge.




Figure 4. Elevation view of the longitudinal stress-laminated timber deck bridge.




Figure 6. Section view of the longitudinal stress-laminated timber deck bridge.