APPENDIX B

Forms:

- Form 1 Bridge Data Part 1
- Form 1 Bridge Data Part 2
- Form 2 Can Bridge be Excluded from Further screening?
- Form 3 Record Relating to Settlement Slabs and Interspan Connections
- Form 4 Seismic Attributes Grading System Grading Sheet
- Form 5 Risk Register
- Sample of Form for Recording Information Collected During a Site Visit

NOTE: Electronic versions of these forms are available on diskette in word processing format (Forms 1, 2, 3, 5 and the site visit record) and spreadsheet format (Form 4)

SEISMIC SCREENING OF BRIDGES: FORM 1 OF 5 BRIDGE DATA (PART 1)

DDIDGE NAME	HIGHWAY ROUTE POSITION		
DRIDGE NAME	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Source of information (state ic	dentification numbers of files/drawings/site in	vestigation reports)	
Year designed			
Number of spans			
-	ntrelines (metres)		
-	(metres) (see A.1.3 (iv) for definition)		
	s continuous or interconnected? (see 3.3.2)	(Yes/No)	
How many in-span movement	joints in deck (i.e. other than at piers or abuta	nents)	
For span(s) tightly inter-linked is end overlap at any sup	I to adjacent span(s) and/or abutment(s): port less than 200mm?	(Yes/No/N.A.)	
For span(s) with an end secure is end overlap less than 3	ed only by holding down bolts: 00mm?	(Yes/No/N.A.)	
For span(s) non-tightly interlinis end overlap at any sup	nked to adjacent span(s) and/or abutment(s): port less than 400mm?	(Yes/No/N.A.)	
Overall width of structural dec	ck slab including integral kerbs (metres)		
Skew angle (degrees) at each	abutment		
Maximum pier height (top of	foundation to soffit of superstructure) (metres)	
Pier type(s) present	- slab on spread footing?	(Yes/No/N.A.)	
	- multi column, or slab on piles?	(Yes/No/N.A.)	
	- single column?	(Yes/No/N.A.)	
Abutment type (A.1.3.(vii))	- monolithic/tightly connected?	(Yes/No)	
Soil condition (A.1.1.(iii))	(Flexible/Intermediate/Rock or Very Stiff/I	Oon't know)	
Are foundations subject to liqu	uefaction effects? (A.1.1 (iv))		
	ow risk/Don't know)		
(High risk/Medium risk/L	,		

Issue 2

SEISMIC SCREENING OF BRIDGES: FORM 1 OF 5 BRIDGE DATA (PART 2)

HIGHWAY ROUTE POSITION			
BRIDGE NAME			
Annual average o	laily traffic (AADT) count using bridg	ge (v.p.d.) (see A.1.2(i) fo	r definition)
Estimated percen	tage of AADT due to local traffic		
Annual average of	laily traffic (AADT) count under bridg	ge (see A.1.2(iii)) (v.p.d.)	
Detour length (d ₁) (km)		
Normal route len	gth between detour connection points	(d_0) (km)	
Extra distance tra	velled (EDT) $(d_1 - d_0)$ (km)		
If local traffic is s	ignificantly more affected by detour t	han non-local traffic (see	A.1.2(ii)):
	Extra distanc	ce travelled by non-local tr	affic (km)
	Extra distance	ce travelled by local traffic	(km)
Assessed journey	speed of traffic over normal route be	tween detour connection p	oints (v ₀) (km/hr)
Assessed journey	speed of traffic on detour, with diver	ted traffic (v ₁) (km/hr)	
Nature and descri	ption of identified likely bottlenecks	(e.g. one lane bridge) on d	etour
Route type on bri	dge (note State Highway number if ap	oplicable; state if motorwa	y)
Facility crossed:	residential, operational (large gather	rings),	~~ ~~ `
(See A.1.2(iv))	commercial or industrial?		(Yes/No)
	parking/storage?		(Yes/No)
	other?		(Yes/No)
	railway?		(Yes/No)
Does bridge carry	railway? r: water, sewage, or gas in pipes of 10		(Yes/No)
Does bridge carry Remaining servic	water, sewage, or gas in pipes of 10	0 mm diameter or more? (>50yrs; 25-50 y	(Yes/No)
Remaining servic	water, sewage, or gas in pipes of 10		(Yes/No)
Remaining servic	r: water, sewage, or gas in pipes of 10 e life		(Yes/No)
Remaining servic	r: water, sewage, or gas in pipes of 10 e life		(Yes/No)
Remaining servic	r: water, sewage, or gas in pipes of 10 e life		(Yes/No)
Remaining servic	r: water, sewage, or gas in pipes of 10 e life		(Yes/No)
Remaining servic Seismic zone fact	r: water, sewage, or gas in pipes of 10 e life or for site (Z) (Appendix D)	(>50yrs; 25-50 y	(Yes/No)
Remaining servic Seismic zone fact	r: water, sewage, or gas in pipes of 10 e life	(>50yrs; 25-50 y	(Yes/No)

SEISMIC SCREENING OF BRIDGES: FORM 2 OF 5 CAN BRIDGE BE EXCLUDED FROM FURTHER SCREENING?

(Refer to Section 3.3 for definition of terminology)

HIGH	WAY	ROUTE POSITION	ON	
BRID	GE NA	ME		
Note:	A "yes	" conclusion from any one of the three bullet points mea	ans the bridge can be exclude	ed.
•		bridge designed after 1972 and is it in an area with a Zor exclude from the ranking procedure	ne Factor (Z) of less than 1.8 (Yes/No)	?
•	super the se	dge a single span with either monolithic abutments (sestructure overlap rating of 0 when rated in accordance veismic attributes grading system (see Appendix A)? exclude from the ranking procedure	ee A.1.3 (vii)) or with a with Section A.1.3 (iii) of (Yes/No)	
•	Is bri	dge of multi spans with "yes" as an answer to all the foll	owing questions:	
	-	is bridge of three spans or fewer?		
	-	are spans structurally continuous or connected with tigh	nt linkage bolts?	
	-	is overall bridge length-to-deck width ratio 8 or less?		
	-	is the skew angle less than 15 degrees?		
	-	is the span arrangement reasonably balanced, with no sp	pan exceeding 30 metres?	
	-	are all the piers of multi-column or slab form?		
	-	are all the piers less than 7 metres high from the top of soffit of the superstructure?	the foundation to the	
	-	does the bridge superstructure have monolithic abutmer a superstructure overlap rating of 0 when rate Section A.1.3 (iii) of the seismic attributes grading systems.	d in accordance with	
	-	are the foundations and abutments founded with little of failure in the event of soil liquefaction or instability?	verall likelihood of	
	-	is the bridge without unusual structural features (e.g. his inclined piers) that may justify inclusion in the ranking		
	If so,	exclude from the ranking procedure	(Yes/No)	
CON	CLUSI	ON: Can the bridge be excluded from the ranking	procedure? (Yes/No)	
Prepar	red by:	Date		
Verifi	ed by :	Date (Bridge Specialist)		

SEISMIC SCREENING OF BRIDGES: FORM 3 OF 5

HIGHY	VAY ROUTE POSITION	
BRIDG	E NAME	
9	DO THE BRIDGE ABUTMENTS INCLUDE APPROACH SETTLEMENT SLABS	?
	If YES:	
	Confirm here	
	If NO:	
	Confirm here	
	Further consideration is required to decide whether approach settlement slabs should retrofit.	l be installed
	DOES THE BRIDGE LACK CONNECTIONS BETWEEN SUPERSTRUCTURE EI (See Section 3.3.2 for definition)	LEMENTS?
	If YES:	
	What is the annual average daily traffic count using the bridge?	
	How many heavy vehicles use the bridge? (Figure 3, Appendix E)	•••••
	What is the seismic Zone Factor (Z) applicable to the bridge site?	
	If NO:	
	Confirm here	
Prepare	d by: Date	
Verified	l by:	•
	or Soismic Screening of Bridges SM110 Issue 2 10/98	

SEISMIC SCREENING OF BRIDGES: FORM 4 OF 5 SEISMIC ATTRIBUTES GRADING SYSTEM GRADING SHEET

(Refer to Appendix A for derivation of Rating values)

HIGHWAY	ROUTE POSITION					
BRIDGE NAME						••••••
		Rating		Weighting	3	Weigh Ratii
Hazard Index		J				Katii
Peak Ground Acceleration Rating			х	0.40	_	
Remaining Service Life Rating		***************************************	X	0.30	=	
Soil Condition Rating		***************************************	x	0.15	=	
Risk of Liquefaction Rating			x	0.15	=	
		Total =	Haza	rd Index		
Importance Index						
AADT on Bridge Rating (x <i>Detour Effect</i> Rating	()	x	0.50	=	
AADT under Bridge Rating			X	0.10	=	
Facility Crossed Rating			х	0.15	=	
Strategic Importance Rating			Х	0.15	=	
Critical Utility Rating			х	0.10	=	
		Total =	Impo	ortance Inde	x	
Vulnerability Index						
Year Designed Rating			x	0.25	=	*******************************
Superstructure Hinges Rating		******************	X	0.08	=	
Superstructure Overlap Rating			X	0.10	=	
Superstructure Length Rating			x	0.12	=	***************************************
Pier Type Rating			х	0.15	=	*****************
Skew Rating			X	0.05	=	
Abutment Type Rating			X	0.10	==	
Other Feature Rating			X	0.15	=	
		Total =	Vuln	erability Ind	ex	
Seismic Attributes Grade	= Hazard Index	x Importa	ınce T	ndex x Vi	ılnera	bility In
Seisme Membutes Grade	- Hazara mask ,	·				
	=					
Prepared by:		Date	••••••	********************************		
Verified by:		Date				
(Bridge Specialist)					
Manual for Seismic Screening of Bridges	SM110		Issue 2) 1	0/98	

SEISMIC SCREENING OF BRIDGES - FORM 5 OF 5 RISK REGISTER

BRIDGE NAME Otaki River Bridge		
ITEMACTION	VALUE	or DESCRIPTION/NOTES
Risk event/Page number for this bridge	1 of 2	
Seismic zone factor Z for this bridge	1.2	
Description of risk event and consequences		deck movement joints - linkage
Refer 3.9.3.3	1	exceedance of 150 mm support length
	or more join	IS.
Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) to cause	>0.4	
this risk event – Refer 3.9.3.4(b) g		
Likelihood (highlight one) Refer 3.9.3.4(b) (and Table 4 for key)	EDCBA	
Number of days D to reinstate the bridge to	180	Required only for a risk event with an unac
the existing traffic capacity Refer 3.10.2	100	level of risk – Refer 3.10.1
Number of days D' the detour will be in use	1.4	
before the existing crossing is repaired or a temporary crossing is opened. <i>Refer 3.10.2</i>	14	
Journey speed of traffic v_2 over the normal		PCD Transaction and transactin and transaction and transaction and transaction and transaction
route, with a temporary crossing or a reduced	60	Required only for a risk event with an unaction level of risk – Refer 3.10.1
level of service (km/hr). Refer 3.10.2		
D' x AADT x EDT	16632000	
Refer Table 3 Consequence class) highlight one Table 2	1 2 3 4 5	
Refer 3.9.3.4 (c)) per table $\begin{array}{c} \text{Table 2} \\ \text{Table 3} \end{array}$	1 2 3 4 5	
Level of risk category (highlight one)	LMSH	
Refer 3.9.3.4 (d)	LWISH	
Assess treatment options? (highlight one)	No/Yes	
Refer 3.9.3.5 (Risk L, M – No; S, H – Yes)		
Risk treatment options) describe, and state	Install seat	extenders beneath beam soffits - re
Refer 3.9.3.6) ROC	easy, with go	ood access; ROC \$25,000
Donk of wisk event for from analysis		
Rank of risk event for further analysis Refer 3.11.2	1	
Reasons for risk event rank where appropriate	– Refer 3.11.2	
Safety – possible loss of span support.		
General comments:		
		•
se additional sheets as required and note reference	es to supporting	information
repared by:	Date	•••••
(Bridge Specialist)		
(Blidge Specialist)		

SEISMIC SCREENING OF BRIDGES - FORM 5 OF 5 RISK REGISTER

HIGHWAY		ROUTE POSITION	
BRIDGE NAME			
TEM/ACTION	*VALUE	or a DESCRIPTIONA	VOTE:
Risk event/Page number for this bridge	of		
Seismic zone factor Z for this bridge			
Description of risk event and consequences Refer 3.9.3.3			
Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) to cause this			
risk event – Refer 3.9.3.4(b) g			
Likelihood (highlight one) Refer 3.9.3.4(b) (and Table 4 for key)	EDCBA		
Number of days D to reinstate the bridge to the		Required only for a risk e	vent wi
existing traffic capacity <i>Refer 3.10.2</i>		unacceptable level of risk -	
Number of days D' the detour will be in use			
before the existing crossing is repaired or a			
temporary crossing is opened. Refer 3.10.2			
Journey speed of traffic v ₂ over the normal		Required only for a risk e	vent wi
route, with a temporary crossing or a reduced		unacceptable level of risk -	
level of service (km/hr). <i>Refer 3.10.2</i> D' x AADT x EDT			
D x AAD1 x ED1 Refer Table 3			
Consequence class) highlight one Table 2	1 2 3 4 5		
Refer $3.9.3.4$ (c)) per table Table 3	1 2 3 4 5		
Level of risk category (highlight one)	LMSH		
Refer 3.9.3.4 (d)	T 141 O 11		- 55
Assess treatment options? (highlight one)	No/Yes		
Refer 3.9.3.5 (Risk L, M – No; S, H – Yes)			
Risk treatment options) describe, and state			
Refer 3.9.3.6) ROC			
		Control to the control of the contro	aga Til Santon
Rank of risk event for further analysis			
Refer 3.11.2	D C 2112	。 第16章 第16章 第1 6章 第16章 第16章 第16章 第16章 第16章 第16章 第16章 第1	
Reasons for risk event rank where appropriate –	кејег 3.11.2		
General comments:			
Use additional sheets as required and note reference	s to supporting	information	
Drangrad by	Dat	e	
Prepared by:(Bridge Specialist)	Dat		
(Diffuge Specialist)			
Verified by:	Dat	e	
Manual for Seismic Screening of Bridges		Issue 2 10/9	98
vianual for Seismic Screening of Briages	OIVIIIU	13340 4 10/.	

SEISMIC SCREENING OF BRIDGES RECORD OF OBSERVATIONS MADE DURING SITE VISIT

BRIDGE AUTHORITY/REGION	• • • • •
HIGHWAY ROUTE POSITION	· • • • •
BRIDGE NAME	· • • • •
Date of site visit	
All known drawings that illustrate the bridge	,
	•••••
Do the drawings fully illustrate the bridge? (Yes/No)	•••••
If "No", what features, including services, are there that vary from the drawings?	
Feature:	
Location:	
Photographs taken (identifier, direction of view etc.):	
Sketches made (attach):	
Are there any features of the structure that appear as possibly	
representing particular seismic vulnerabilities? (Yes/No)	
If "Yes" what are the features?	
Feature:	•••••
Location:	• • • • • •
Photographs taken (identifier, direction of view etc.):	
Sketches made (attach):	
Feature:	•••••
Location:	•••••
Photographs taken (identifier, direction of view etc.):	
Sketches made (attach):	
Feature:	•••••
Location:	••••
Photographs taken (identifier, direction of view etc.):	
Sketches made (attach):	
TITE VISITED AND REPORT PREPARED BY:	••••
DATE	••••
Manual for Seismic Screening of Bridges SM110 Issue 2 10/98	