

Zeitschrift: IABSE reports = Rapports AIPC = IVBH Berichte
Band: 73/1/73/2 (1995)

Artikel: Structural rehabilitation of a reinforced concrete and a prestressed concrete bridge
Autor: Croci, G. / Santoro, V.M. / Macri, F.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-55162>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 10.12.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Structural Rehabilitation of a Reinforced Concrete and a Prestressed Concrete Bridge

Réhabilitation de la structure de deux ponts, en béton armé et précontraint
Erneuerung einer Stahlbeton- und einer Spannbetonbrücke

G. CROCI
Professor
University of Rome
Rome, Italy

V.M. SANTORO
Structural Engineer
Tecnocrolli srl
Rome, Italy

F. MACRI
Structural Engineer
Tecnocrolli srl
Rome, Italy

SUMMARY

Two examples of works on reinforced and prestressed concrete bridges are described, each involving different aspects of problems faced by the maintenance programs that the Italian Roadway Board has carried out in recent years. The first case involves an old reinforced concrete bridge whose heavily damaged structures required radical repairs and anti-seismic measures. The second case concerns prestressed concrete span cantilever cables to be inserted in the cross section in order to restore safety margins and correct some of the deflections due to creep.

RÉSUMÉ

Deux exemples de travaux sur des ponts en béton armé et précontraint sont décrits, chacun impliquant différents aspects de problèmes rencontrés par les programmes de maintenance mis sur pied par l'Administration Italienne des Routes. Le premier cas concerne un vieux pont en béton armé dont les importants dommages structuraux ont demandé des réparations essentielles ainsi que des mesures antisismiques. Le deuxième cas concerne le renforcement de travées en porte-à-faux d'un pont en béton précontraint par l'ajout de câbles dans la section transversale, afin de rétablir les marges de sécurité et de corriger une partie des déformations dues au retrait.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Aus dem Unterhaltsprogramm der Italienischen Strassenamtes der letzten Jahren werden beispielhaft zwei Brücken mit unterschiedlichen Problemstellungen beschrieben. Eine alte Stahlbetonbrücke wies so schwere Schäden auf, dass sie radikale Sanierungs- und Erdbebenschutzmassnahmen benötigte. Im zweiten Fall waren in einer Spannbetonbrücke Kragarmvorspannkabel in den Betonquerschnitt einzubauen, um Sicherheitsreserven wiederherzustellen und einen Teil der Kriechdurchbiegung auszugleichen.



1. INTRODUCTION

Increased traffic rate and seismic damage in many sites have led to numerous interventions to repair and restore the structures of Italian highways. Deterioration and alteration of materials, deformations caused by creep and need for additional anti-seismic measures give rise to different types of problems. Two examples of strengthening measures are described. The first concerned twin 30-year old reinforced concrete cantilever and Gerber beam bridges on a highway in Southern Italy near the coast. The damage consisted mainly in degradation of the materials with alteration to the concrete, corrosion of uncovered steel bars and low-serviceability of the supports and joints associated with the extreme atmospheric conditions prevailing in the area. The viaducts were subjected to radical repairs (including the demolition of limited portions of the structure) and seismic rehabilitation by accomplishing the longitudinal continuity of the different spans through the elimination of the fixed supports on the piers and all the intermediate joints between the beams and transferring the seismic forces back to special supports constructed behind the abutments. The second example concerned a very long (90 meters) prestressed concrete five-span cantilever bridge that had suffered serious deformations due to creep in the concrete. In order to recover the safety margins of the structure and make it possible to restore the original elevations of the road surface, an additional prestressing cable system was inserted inside the cross section.

THE "GALLICO VIADUCTS"

2.1 Present situation

During the late eighties the Italian National Roadway Board (ANAS) carried out work on some of the viaducts of the Salerno-Reggio Calabria. This section runs through three mountainous regions of Southern Italy where environmental conditions are very severe. Traffic rates have increased heavily since the roads were originally built and it was feared that the present state of conservation of various structural elements was incompatible with the heavy increase in loads. The seismic nature of the area, the particular nature of alterations to materials and the very poor safety margins associated with the isostasy of the structure could have led to brittle collapse under the stress of traffic without warning. A detailed plan of interventions was therefore carried out on some viaducts, for example those known as Fiumara di Gallico and Piana di Gallico, which are near the coast towards the southern end of the Highway (figure 1) in one of the oldest (early sixties) and most threatened parts of the whole structure. The project aimed principally to improve the seismic behavior of the viaducts, adjust the structures to the increased loads and repair the areas, supports and the joints that had become altered. The operation was also intended to reduce the



FIGURE 1



SITUATION BEFORE THE INTERVENTIONS




FIGURE 3

maintenance costs for the Board. The two viaducts, each of which has separate decks for each direction of traffic, consist of six 37.4-meter cast-in-place spans, three of which are cantilevered and three consist Gerber beams with 26.6-meter spans supported on six 6-7 meter high piers (photo n. 2). The Gerber beams are supported by very narrow joints girder (figure 3) with four ribs connected by a lower slab for a short distance from the pier along the cantilever.

2.2 Causes of decay and damage

On account of the severe environmental conditions (marine salts in the rain water, wide temperature ranges, heavy traffic) and poor maintenance, the degradation has affected mainly structural elements such as the Gerber joints, in which the steel bars are completely uncovered and deeply corroded




photo 4 - Fiumara di Gallico Viaduct
Gerber joint (lower view)



photo 5 - Fiumara di Gallico
Gerber joint (detail)

(photo n. 4-5). The seat of the supported beams - which is further restricted by degradation - is so reduced as to cast doubt on the stability of the beams. Weathering has also removed the concrete bar covering in many areas of the decks, particularly on the west side, towards the coast. A detailed program of in situ tests (pull-out tests, carbonation tests, microdrilling and sampling of concrete, endoscopic tests, etc.) on the structure was carried out to evaluate the actual state of alteration of the material, their strength and the efficiency of the supports apparatus.

2.3 Intervention criteria

TYPICAL LONGITUDINAL SECTION




FIGURE 6

The principal objective of the intervention was to improve the seismic behaviour of the structure by creating a continuous kinematic chain between the various spans so as to transfer the horizontal actions to special purpose-built structures. In consideration of the state of the Gerber joints, it was decided to demolish these parts of the structure (figure 6) and rebuild them along more suitable geometric lines in order to ensure an adequate seat to the support, insert the bearing devices and accomplish the continuity of the structure by consolidating the upper slabs. The new structure was realized in Rheoplastic high-strength concrete connected to the remaining parts through connecting bars (figures n. 7-8). The supports on the piers were removed, after lifting the decks alternately, and replaced by mobile



unidirectional or bidirectional devices. The deck was connected at the ends to blocks built behind the abutments on special foundations with micropiles and steel tie-anchors. The connection was ensured through special shock-transmitting devices placed horizontally so as to permit slow displacements due to temperature variations and prevent impulsive actions. Two 1200 KN shock transmitters were inserted behind the abutments on each deck, capable of resisting an overall seismic force of little less than 5000 KN without damage (figure n. 9). In this way, the structure became an axially continuous beam whose longitudinal seismic forces are transferred to the blocks; the size of the foundations can resist such a force. Transversally, the continuity of the slabs allows most of the seismic forces to be transferred to the abutments - the most rigid supports - thus ensuring a more uniform distribution of

SITUATION AFTER THE INTERVENTIONS




FIGURE 7

the residual forces among the different piers. The forces acting on the head of the piers, up to about 1500 KN longitudinally and transversally, were reduced by the measures to tens of KN longitudinally (mainly friction forces) and to about 300 KN transversally. The measures thus led to an unloading of the piers in seismic conditions, so that no specific strengthening measures were required. In the National Roadway Board's strategy, the elimination of the surface joints will reduce the overall maintenance costs of the bridge. Special interventions on the deteriorated structures were also carried out. Three types of restoration were involved: the first involved the areas in which the surface concrete had been largely removed or

TYPICAL SLAB PLAN




FIGURE 8

**SEISMIC BLOCK BEHIND THE ABUTMENT
TYPICAL SECTION**




FIGURE 9

3. THE REGGIA VIADUCT

3.1 Present situation

The Reggia viaduct crosses the catch drain of the same name on the E45 Highway 30 km north of Perugia. It was built in the late seventies using the successive segment cantilever method on piers with a maximum height of 15 meters (photo 10). The cantilevers were then connected, so that the end result is a continuous 5-spans beam on 6 supports. The three central spans are 90 meters long and the lateral spans 45 meters. The supports on the central piers are of the fixed hinge type and those on




photo 10 - Reggia Viaduct - General view

the piers and on the abutments are simple supports. In order to avoid hyperstatic components during prestressing of the sewing cables of the central span, some provisional hydraulic jacks were inserted into the middle of that span. The cross section consists of a 3-cell box girders, 4.9 meters high at the level of the piers and 2.3 meters high in the midspan and on the supports of the abutments. Over the years the bridge has suffered some deflections in the lateral spans (piers 1-2 and 3-4), with a maximum amplitude of about 15 cm, while the central span shows no or minimum deflection (figure 11). These deformations called for a general re-examination of the structure, though they did not compromise the use of the viaduct.

3.2 Causes of decay and damage

The phenomena observed are related to creep processes that cannot easily be predicted at the design stage. On account of the construction method, based on a cantilevered section-by-section procedure that involved building a structure with provisional boundary conditions that differed from the final ones, the creep effects have produced a redistribution of the stress for permanent loads and, in particular, an increase in positive bending moments in the middle of the spans and a reduction near the piers (figure 12). The individual sections of the cantilevers were poured in different stages, with non-homogeneous pouring and weathering conditions, so that they presented different creep functions. Even minor uncertainties in calculating the dead or prestressing loads could also have led to considerable variations in the creep deformations, bearing in mind the effective reciprocal influences between the creep and the steel relaxation of the prestressing cables. Another factor that should be considered is the possible effect of the insertion of provisional hydraulic jacks in the middle of the central span, which may have partially compensated the creep deformations of the third span, jeopardizing the second and fourth spans.




FIGURE 11



3.3 Intervention criteria

The strengthening measures were designed to enhance the bending and shear strength of the deck and consisted in inserting prestressing cables in the lower part of the section in the middle of the




FIGURE 12

some cables are continuous from the first pier-head to the last, whilst others have only the length of one of the lateral spans. The only deviation device inside the box-girder, at midspan level (figure 14), consists of a steel frame connected to the ribs of the caisson to which the cable was connected after tensioning, so as to ensure continuity to the transversal section. Three devices were used for each span, one for each of the three cells of the box-girder. The frames were assembled with steel profiles and plates connected by high-strength bolts in order to allow transport and the mounting inside the



photo 13 - Prestressing cable system
and deviation device frame

In order to differentiate the amount of prestressing, a box-girder. A horizontal strut with St. Andrew's crosses was provided in order to resist to the friction component of the prestressing forces. The work was successfully carried out without restriction traffic and restored about 10% of the previous deformations. The increase in safety levels was assessed at around 30%. Thus the measures adopted significantly increased the durability of the structure by closing the cracks caused by creep. The load test performed on the bridge on completion of the work also showed an increase of the overall stiffness of the whole structure of about 20%.




FIGURE 14