

Brigham Young University BYU ScholarsArchive

All Theses and Dissertations

2018-04-01

# Chloride Concentration and Blow-Through Analysis for Concrete Bridge Decks Rehabilitated Using Hydro-Demolition

Elizabeth Ashleigh Roper Brigham Young University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd Part of the <u>Civil and Environmental Engineering Commons</u>

#### BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Roper, Elizabeth Ashleigh, "Chloride Concentration and Blow-Through Analysis for Concrete Bridge Decks Rehabilitated Using Hydro-Demolition" (2018). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 6779. https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/6779

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen\_amatangelo@byu.edu.



Chloride Concentration and Blow-Through Analyses for Concrete Bridge Decks Rehabilitated Using Hydrodemolition

Elizabeth Ashleigh Roper

A thesis submitted to the faculty of Brigham Young University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

W. Spencer Guthrie, Chair Fernando S. Fonseca Kevin W. Franke

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

Brigham Young University

Copyright © 2018 Elizabeth Ashleigh Roper



All Rights Reserved

# ABSTRACT

### Chloride Concentration and Blow-Through Analyses for Concrete Bridge Decks Rehabilitated Using Hydrodemolition

# Elizabeth Ashleigh Roper Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, BYU Master of Science

The objectives of this research were 1) to investigate the effects of hydrodemolition treatment timing on chloride concentration profiles in concrete bridge decks for depths of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel and 2) to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used. The research results are intended to provide engineers with guidance about the latest timing of hydrodemolition that can maintain a chloride concentration level below 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete at the levels of both the top and bottom mats of reinforcing steel, as well as about conditions that may indicate a higher probability of blow-through during hydrodemolition. The scope of this research included a questionnaire survey of hydrodemolition companies to summarize common practices in the field, numerical modeling of chloride concentration to investigate hydrodemolition treatment timing on typical Utah bridge decks, and structural analysis to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs during hydrodemolition.

While some survey respondents indicated that certain parameters vary, the responses are valuable for understanding typical practices and were used to design the numerical experiments. The numerical modeling generated chloride concentration profiles through a 75-year service life given a specific original cover depth (OCD), treatment time, and surface treatment usage. The results indicate that, when a surface treatment is used, the concentration at either the top or bottom mat of reinforcing steel does not reach or exceed 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete after hydrodemolition during the 75 years of simulated bridge deck service life. The results also indicate that, when a surface treatment is not used, the chloride concentration at the top mat of reinforcement exceeds 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete within 10, 15, and 20 years for OCD values of 2.0, 2.5, and 3.0 in., respectively. The numerical experiments generated results in terms of the main effect of each input variable on the occurrence of blowthroughs and interactions among selected input variables. For each analysis, blow-through can be expected when the calculated factor of safety is less than 1.0. The factor of safety significantly increases with increasing values of transverse rebar spacing and concrete compressive strength and decreasing values of depth of removal below the bottom of the top reinforcing mat, orifice size, and water pressure within the ranges of these parameters investigated in this experimentation. The factor of safety is relatively insensitive to jet angle. For both case studies evaluated in this research, the blow-through analysis correctly predicted a high or low potential for blow-through on the given deck.

Key words: blow-through, chloride concentration, concrete bridge deck, diffusion, hydrodemolition, surface treatment



#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and the Brigham Young University (BYU) Office of Research and Creative Activities provided funding for this research. The National Institute of Standards and Technology provided the software program used for numerical modeling of chloride concentration, and John De Leon, a member of the BYU Materials and Pavements Research Group, initiated creation of the spreadsheet used for blowthrough analysis. Information about current bridge deck rehabilitation practices was obtained from UDOT and several hydrodemolition companies, including HydroPressure Cleaning, Inc.; Hydro-Technologies, Inc.; Midwest Mobile Waterjet; Rampart Hydro Services, L.P.; and Redi Services, LLC. I appreciate the support, guidance, and mentorship of Dr. Fernando S. Fonseca and Dr. Kevin W. Franke as members of my graduate advisory committee. I am especially grateful for the time, care, and mentorship that Dr. W. Spencer Guthrie has given me through my most difficult academic years; he has taught me by example the importance of integrity, respect, and hard work. I am grateful to my parents, Greg and Tammara Newbill, who have always encouraged me to work hard in order to reach my most important goals. Finally, I thank my husband, Aaron, who has supported and encouraged me as I accomplished my academic and occupational goals.



L	LIST OF TABLESvi					
L	IST C	OF FIGURES	<i>ii</i>			
1	INT	FRODUCTION	. 1			
	1.1	Problem Statement	. 1			
	1.2	Research Objectives and Scope	. 5			
	1.3	Outline of Report	. 5			
2	BACKGROUND		. 7			
	2.1	Overview	. 7			
	2.2	Chloride-Induced Corrosion of Reinforcing Steel	. 7			
	2.3	Removal of Deteriorated Concrete Using Hydrodemolition	. 9			
	2.4	Application of Surface Treatments to Concrete Bridge Decks	12			
	2.5	Summary	13			
3	EX	PERIMENTAL METHODOLOGY	15			
	3.1	Overview	15			
	3.2	Questionnaire Survey	15			
	3.3	Chloride Concentration Analysis	16			
	3.4	Blow-through Analysis	22			
	3.5	Summary	30			
4	RE	SULTS AND ANALYSIS	33			
	4.1 0	Dverview	33			
	4.2 Questionnaire Survey					
	4.3 0	Chloride Concentration Analysis	36			
	4.4 E	4.4 Blow-through Analysis				
	4.5 Summary		58			
5	CO	NCLUSION	61			
	5.1 S	Summary	61			
	5.2 F	Findings	63			
	5.3 F	Recommendations	65			

# TABLE OF CONTENTS



REFERENCES	
APPENDIX A	SAMPLE INPUTS FOR CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION ANALYSIS 70
APPENDIX B	BLOW-THROUGH ANALYSIS FOR CASE STUDY #1
APPENDIX C	BLOW-THROUGH ANALYSIS FOR CASE STUDY #2 88
APPENDIX D	CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION AT TOP MAT OF REINFORCING
STEEL WITH AI	N APPLIED SURFACE TREATMENT
APPENDIX E	CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION AT BOTTOM MAT OF
REINFORCING	STEEL WITH AN APPLIED SURFACE TREATMENT
APPENDIX F	CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION AT TOP MAT OF REINFORCING
STEEL WITHOU	JT AN APPLIED SURFACE TREATMENT
APPENDIX G	CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION AT BOTTOM MAT OF
REINFORCING	STEEL WITHOUT AN APPLIED SURFACE TREATMENT



www.manaraa.com

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1: Monthly Temperature and Chloride Concentration Inputs for Chloride         Concentration Analysis         18
Table 3-2: Concrete Exposure and Property Inputs for Chloride Concentration Analysis
Table 4-1: Questionnaire Survey Results    34
Table 4-2: Maximum Chloride Concentrations for a 2.0-in. OCD with a Surface Treatment 39
Table 4-3: Maximum Chloride Concentrations for a 2.5-in. OCD with a Surface Treatment 39
Table 4-4: Maximum Chloride Concentrations for a 3.0-in. OCD with a Surface Treatment 39
Table 4-5: Maximum Chloride Concentrations for a 2.0-in. OCD without a         Surface Treatment
Table 4-6: Maximum Chloride Concentrations for a 2.5-in. OCD without a         Surface Treatment
Table 4-7: Maximum Chloride Concentrations for a 3.0-in. OCD without a         Surface Treatment
Table 4-8: Ranges of Parameters for Evaluation of Main Effects in Blow-through Analysis 43
Table 4-9: Ranges of Parameters for Evaluation of Interactions in Blow-through Analysis 47
Table 4-10: Parameter Combinations with Factor of Safety Less Than 3.0
Table 4-11: Blow-through Analysis Results for Various Scenarios for Case Study #1 54
Table 4-12: Blow-through Analysis Results for Various Scenarios for Case Study #2 57



# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Schematic of hydrodemolition equipment
Figure 1-2: Schematic of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel using hydrodemolition equipment
Figure 3-1: Area of blow-through analysis between two longitudinal bars and two transverse bars in the bottom mat of reinforcing steel
Figure 4-1: Simulated chloride concentrations at the top mat of reinforcement for a deck with a 2.0-in. OCD and a 3.375-in. removal depth with an applied surface treatment
Figure 4-2: Simulated chloride concentrations at the bottom mat of reinforcement for a deck with a 2.0-in. OCD and a 3.375-in. removal depth with an applied surface treatment
Figure 4-3: Simulated chloride concentrations at the top mat of reinforcement for a deck with a 2.0-in. OCD and a 3.375-in. removal depth without an applied surface treatment
Figure 4-4: Simulated chloride concentrations at the bottom mat of reinforcement for a deck with a 2.0-in. OCD and a 3.375-in. removal depth without an applied surface treatment
Figure 4-5: Main effect of transverse rebar spacing
Figure 4-6: Main effect of concrete compressive strength
Figure 4-7: Main effect of depth of removal below bottom of top reinforcing mat
Figure 4-8: Main effect of orifice size
Figure 4-9: Main effect of water pressure
Figure 4-10: Main effect of jet angle
Figure 4-11: Interaction between concrete compressive strength and transverse rebar spacing for water pressure of 10 ksi
Figure 4-12: Interaction between concrete compressive strength and transverse rebar spacing for water pressure of 20 ksi
Figure 4-13: Interaction between concrete compressive strength and transverse rebar spacing for water pressure of 30 ksi
Figure 4-14: Interaction between concrete compressive strength and transverse rebar spacing for water pressure of 40 ksi
Figure 4-15: Blow-through map for case study #1: (a) 0-350 ft, (b) 350-745 ft, (c) 745-1,075 ft, and (d) 1,075-1,425 ft



Figure 4-16: Significant blow-through of the deck in case study #1	
Figure 4-17: Significant efflorescence and cracking on the underside of the deck in case study #1	55
Figure 4-18: Blow-through map for case study #2: (a) 0-104.2 ft and (b) 104.2-208.5 ft	55
Figure 4-19: Insignificant blow-through of the deck in case study #2	56
Figure 4-20: Insignificant efflorescence and cracking on the underside of the deck in case study #2.	58



#### **1 INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1 Problem Statement**

Chloride-induced corrosion of reinforcing steel is one of the leading causes of concrete bridge deck deterioration (Grace et al. 2004, Lees 1992, Mays 1992, Mindess et al. 2003, Suryavanshi et al. 1998, Zhang et al. 1998). Chloride ions, generally resulting from the application of deicing salts as part of winter bridge maintenance, can diffuse into the surface of a concrete bridge deck and interact with the embedded reinforcing steel. Steel reinforcement typically begins to corrode at a chloride concentration of 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete, forming expansive rust (Hema et al. 2004). As concrete is relatively weak in tension, the tensile forces exerted by the expansive rust cause the surrounding concrete to crack (Patnaik and Baah 2015). Eventually, such cracking can lead to delaminations and potholes on the bridge deck surface, which decrease the structural integrity, ride quality, and service life of the bridge deck (Patnaik and Baah 2015).

Repair of these distresses requires removal and replacement of the damaged concrete. One technique that is especially useful for partial-depth concrete removal is hydrodemolition (Hopwood et al. 2015, Momber 2005, Wenzlick 2002). This technique, which is becoming an increasingly common practice, involves removal of deteriorated concrete from the top surface of a concrete bridge deck using high-pressure water jets as illustrated in Figure 1-1 (Wenzlick 2002). Following removal of the old concrete, new concrete is placed to restore or increase, as needed, the original deck thickness and specified design strength (Wenzlick 2002). A surface





Figure 1-1: Schematic of hydrodemolition equipment.



treatment is commonly applied to the new deck surface to prevent future ingress of chloride ions and/or water (Birdsall et al. 2007, Hopwood et al. 2015, Swamy and Tanikawa 1993).

Unlike traditional concrete removal techniques such as milling, which is limited to depths shallower than the top mat of reinforcing steel (Guthrie et al. 2008), hydrodemolition can be used to remove concrete from around and even below the top mat of reinforcing steel as shown in Figure 1-2 (Wenzlick 2002). Thus, bridge decks that may no longer be suitable for repair using traditional concrete removal techniques, due to the development of critical chloride concentrations at depths deeper than the top mat of reinforcing steel, may still be good candidates for repair using hydrodemolition. In these cases, depending on the chloride concentrations at the time of hydrodemolition and the depth of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel, the service life of the deck may be significantly extended. Specifically, a sufficient quantity of chloride ions must be removed from the deck so that, after application of a



Figure 1-2: Schematic of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel using hydrodemolition equipment.



surface treatment preventing further chloride ingress, equilibration of the remaining chloride ions in the repaired deck does not result in a chloride concentration greater than or equal to 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete at the top or bottom mat of reinforcing steel. While the effects of treatment timing on deck service life have been analyzed for traditional repair techniques involving removal of concrete to depths shallower than the top mat of reinforcing steel (Guthrie et al. 2008), the effects of treatment timing on deck service life have not been analyzed for repair involving hydrodemolition of concrete to depths deeper than the top mat of reinforcing steel.

When hydrodemolition is used to remove concrete to depths deeper than the top mat of reinforcing steel, the high-pressure water jets can sometimes blow through the entire depth of a concrete bridge deck, which is a very undesirable outcome (Hopwood et al. 2015). Such "blowthroughs" result in several major problems. One is that falling concrete debris can cause personal injury to people and/or damage to property under the bridge. Another is that the holes in the deck are not only hazardous to construction workers but they prevent containment of the hydrodemolition water, which can be harmful to the environment if not properly treated prior to being released. Finally, the occurrence of blow-throughs can significantly increase the cost of bridge deck repair because of the requirement for additional formwork and concrete material. While blow-throughs have been observed to occur in deck sections characterized by extensive cracking and efflorescence, they can also occur without warning in a seemingly sound bridge deck. While some limited anecdotal information exists about potentially influential factors (ICRI 2014), structural analyses are needed to quantify the effects of water pressure, jet orifice size, angle of impact, reinforcement dimensions, and concrete compressive strength on the occurrence of blow-through during hydrodemolition.



#### **1.2 Research Objectives and Scope**

The objectives of this research were 1) to investigate the effects of hydrodemolition treatment timing on chloride concentration profiles in concrete bridge decks for depths of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel and 2) to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used. The research results are intended to provide engineers with guidance about the latest timing of hydrodemolition that can maintain a chloride concentration level below 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete at the levels of both the top and bottom mats of reinforcing steel, as well as about conditions that may indicate a higher probability of blow-through during hydrodemolition. The scope of this research included a questionnaire survey of hydrodemolition companies to summarize common practices in the field, numerical modeling of chloride concentration to investigate hydrodemolition treatment timing on typical Utah bridge decks, and structural analysis to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs during hydrodemolition. In particular, the results of the questionnaire survey were used to identify appropriate inputs for the blow-through analysis.

#### **1.3 Outline of Report**

This report contains five chapters. This chapter defines the problem statement, introduces the research, and states the research objectives and scope. Chapter 2 provides background information obtained from a literature review about chloride-induced corrosion of reinforcing steel, removal of deteriorated concrete using hydrodemolition, and application of surface treatments to concrete bridge decks. Chapter 3 details the procedures for the questionnaire survey, chloride concentration analysis, and blow-through analysis, and Chapter 4 presents the



results of the survey and analyses. Chapter 5 provides a summary together with conclusions and recommendations resulting from this research.



#### 2 BACKGROUND

#### 2.1 Overview

Developed from a literature review performed for this research, the following sections discuss chloride-induced corrosion of reinforcing steel, removal of deteriorated concrete using hydrodemolition, and application of surface treatments to concrete bridge decks.

#### 2.2 Chloride-Induced Corrosion of Reinforcing Steel

With time, the diffusion and accumulation of chloride ions in reinforced concrete causes a breakdown of the protective environment that concrete naturally provides for reinforcing steel. Typically, the threshold value at which chloride ions initiate corrosion of reinforcing steel is 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete (Hema et al. 2004). Diffusion occurs as chloride ions move in response to spatial differences in entropy (Mays 1992), traveling from areas of higher concentration to areas of lower concentration (Freeze and Cheery 1979). The chloride diffusion process in a bridge deck is initiated when salt solutions contact the concrete surface. In cold regions, such as Utah, chloride ions are introduced to the surface of bridge decks in the form of deicing salts. After dissolution in water, chloride ions can diffuse into the concrete matrix and disperse to areas of lower concentration over time (Arora et al. 1997). The depth of chloride penetration into concrete over a given time period is governed by the chloride diffusion coefficient and the chloride concentration gradient (Grace et al. 2004). The diffusion coefficient is a measure of the rate at which chloride ions can diffuse through the concrete over time, while



the concentration gradient shows how the ions are dispersed throughout the concrete matrix. Larger diffusion coefficients and higher concentration gradients allow the chloride ions to diffuse more rapidly through the concrete.

According to Fick's first law of diffusion, chloride ions will diffuse in the direction of decreasing chloride concentration (Poulsen and Mejlbro 2006). Therefore, chloride ions can diffuse in any direction, including upward and downward, depending on the chloride concentration gradient. Thus, when new chloride-free concrete is placed on top of an existing chloride-laden concrete bridge deck, for example, chloride ions present in the existing concrete will diffuse upwards through the new concrete and downwards through the existing concrete over time.

Especially in cold regions, winter road maintenance practices affect chloride concentrations at the surface of bridge decks through the application of deicing salts. With all other factors held constant, the surface chloride concentration for bridges that receive more deicing salt applications is higher than that of bridges that receive fewer deicing salt applications. Furthermore, precipitation leads to higher moisture contents within the concrete matrix, which causes higher diffusion coefficients and greater ionic conduction (Guthrie et al. 2006). However, lower temperatures reduce ionic mobility, which results in lower diffusion rates during periods of cold weather (Clark and Hawley 1966, Lewis 2001).

To a large degree, the water-cement ratio and degree of hydration of the concrete determine the properties of the concrete matrix. Specifically, diffusion is limited by the degree of saturation and continuity of the pore water within the concrete matrix (Survananshi et al. 1998). As the degree of saturation and continuity of the pore water increase, the rate of diffusion increases (Zhang et al. 1998). For a given concrete mixture, the external chloride loading and



cover thickness govern the time required for chloride ions to accumulate in critical concentrations near the reinforcing steel. Cover thicknesses for concrete bridge decks are typically in the range of 2.0 to 3.0 in. (relative to the transverse reinforcing steel) (Hema et al. 2004). In the top mat of reinforcement, the transverse steel is located above the longitudinal steel; in the bottom mat of reinforcement, the transverse steel is located below the longitudinal steel.

Diffusion of chloride ions through the concrete matrix can lead to corrosion of the embedded reinforcing steel, deterioration of the surrounding concrete, and failure of the structure if left untreated. Various treatments and rehabilitation methods may be employed to maintain the safety and serviceability of concrete bridge decks.

#### 2.3 Removal of Deteriorated Concrete Using Hydrodemolition

Over time, chloride-induced corrosion necessitates rehabilitation of concrete bridge decks. The cost and extent of such work are dependent on the amount of deterioration that has occurred within the concrete. If the deterioration is limited to the concrete in the upper half of the deck, partial-depth repairs are appropriate. However, if the deterioration has extended into the lower half of the deck, full-depth repair is often necessary (Wenzlick 2002). Methods for removing deteriorated concrete from a bridge deck include jackhammering, milling, and hydrodemolition (Wenzlick 2002). While the first two methods generate harmful vibrations that can induce micro-cracking in the surrounding concrete and lead to further deterioration of the deck, hydrodemolition has proven to be less damaging to the existing concrete structure when used appropriately.



Hydrodemolition is the use of high-pressure water jets to remove deteriorated concrete from the surface of a structure (ICRI 2014). In the process of rehabilitating concrete bridge decks, new concrete is placed following hydrodemolition to restore or increase, as needed, the original deck thickness and specified design strength. Hydrodemolition is typically used for partial-depth repair rather than full-depth repair. The process involves use of fully-automated, high-pressure water jets with constant pressure, frequently exceeding 20,000 psi, to remove concrete from the top surface of the deck (Momber 2005). In some cases, concrete is removed to a predetermined depth, regardless of the degree of localized deterioration (Momber 2005). In other cases, a depth specification is not given, and the depth of concrete removal is governed mainly by the degree of deterioration (ICRI 2014); the high-pressure water jets are calibrated to remove low-strength and damaged concrete while leaving sound concrete in place on the concrete bridge deck (Wenzlick 2002). Therefore, in areas where concrete is in poor condition, concrete is removed to a greater depth. When the top mat of reinforcing steel is exposed, the hydrodemolition process also removes corrosion products, or rust, from the steel. One to four passes of the hydrodemolition jets are typically required to achieve the desired outcomes (Momber 2005).

Specific advantages and disadvantages apply to the use of hydrodemolition as part of the rehabilitation process for a concrete bridge deck. The main advantages of hydrodemolition include increased cost effectiveness, decreased time consumption, increased adhesion between the concrete substrate and new concrete, and decreased damage to the existing structure (Momber 2005, Wenzlick 2002). Removing deteriorated concrete from only the upper portion of the bridge deck decreases rehabilitation costs when compared to full-depth removal. Similarly, the high-pressure water jets can remove unsound concrete at a quicker rate than other methods,



such as jackhammering, which decreases the time necessary to complete rehabilitation (ICRI 2014, Wenzlick 2002). Adhesion between concrete layers increases as the greater exposed surface area of the substrate leads to improved mechanical interlock with the new concrete (Harries et al. 2013, ICRI 2014, Momber 2005); in particular, the increased pull-off strength of layers applied to hydrodemolished surfaces is a notable advantage of hydrodemolition compared to other concrete removal methods. Decreased damage to the existing structure is possible because the process does not generate harmful vibrations like jackhammering or milling (ICRI 2014, Wenzlick 2002).

The main disadvantages associated with hydrodemolition include environmental and safety concerns. Environmental concerns arise when even small quantities of the waste water, which has high levels of alkalinity and harmful solutes, bypass the collection system and enter the surrounding landscape (Momber 2005). The intensity of this problem is exacerbated when hydrodemolition is applied to bridges spanning water bodies or other environmentally sensitive areas. In these situations, extra care must be taken to also guard against blow-throughs, which can result from application of the high-pressure water jets to unsound concrete with extensive cracking, low-strength layers, or other defects (Hopwood 2015, ICRI 2014). Because of the possibility of waste water leakage and falling debris, blow-throughs pose both environmental and safety problems if special precautions are not taken (ICRI 2014). Specifically regarding safety, while people may be injured and/or property may be damaged by falling debris, the resulting holes in the bridge deck are also a significant hazard for construction personnel performing the rehabilitation work. Therefore, minimizing the occurrence of blow-throughs is critical.



#### 2.4 Application of Surface Treatments to Concrete Bridge Decks

One method of effectively and economically disrupting the ingress of chloride ions and/or moisture is adding a surface treatment (Birdsall et al. 2007, Swamy and Tanikawa 1993). Following a rehabilitation method involving removal of deteriorated material and placement of new concrete, for example, a surface treatment can be applied to seal the rehabilitated concrete deck against further chloride ingress. In some cases, application of a surface treatment can be delayed after deck rehabilitation, but the maximum extension in service life of concrete bridge decks is obtained if surface treatments are placed before chloride concentrations have reached critical levels at the top mat of reinforcing steel (Birdsall et al. 2007, Guthrie et al. 2008, Zhang et al. 1998). To achieve the desired effect, appropriate materials, deck preparation techniques, and placement methods must be utilized (Basheer et al. 1998).

The materials generally used in surface treatments applied to concrete bridge decks include binders and aggregates. The binders are typically urethane, silicon-based, or epoxy products, which function both as adhesives and as sealants (Guthrie et al. 2005). In many instances, aggregates are mixed with or broadcast into the binders to provide skid resistance and protection of the binders from ultraviolet radiation (Guthrie et al. 2005).

Appropriate deck preparation is necessary to ensure adequate adhesion between the concrete substrate and the applied surface treatment (Pan et al. 2016). A concrete bridge deck surface should be cleaned and roughened, using shot blasting, for example, to facilitate increased bond strength between the concrete substrate and the surface treatment (Guthrie et al. 2005). Following this roughening process, all debris should be removed from the deck surface, and, depending on the moisture content of the concrete, the deck may also need to be dried (Guthrie et al. 2005).



al. 2005); the presence of moisture on the deck surface or in the substrate can significantly reduce the bond strength (Guthrie et al. 2005, Pan et al. 2016).

Proper placement methods should be practiced to ensure that the surface treatment performs according to its design. While the materials comprising the surface treatment may be adequate, improper construction can cause premature failure of the surface treatment (Pan et al. 2016). The age and water content of the concrete substrate, treatment application method, and amount of treatment material govern the effectiveness of the surface treatment (Pan et al. 2016). If the underlying concrete has been poorly constructed or mixed, the surface treatment will likely not perform properly (Pan et al. 2016). The surface treatment should be allowed adequate curing time and protection from traffic to prevent premature failure (Weyers et al. 1993).

#### 2.5 Summary

Developed from a literature review performed for this research, this chapter discusses chloride-induced corrosion of reinforcing steel, removal of deteriorated concrete using hydrodemolition, and application of surface treatments to concrete bridge decks. With time, the diffusion and accumulation of chloride ions in reinforced concrete causes a breakdown of the protective environment that concrete naturally provides for reinforcing steel. Typically, the threshold value at which chloride ions initiate corrosion of reinforcing steel is 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete. The chloride diffusion process in a bridge deck is initiated when salt solutions contact the concrete surface. Diffusion of chloride ions through the concrete matrix can lead to corrosion of the embedded reinforcing steel, deterioration of the surrounding concrete, and failure of the structure if left untreated. Various treatments and rehabilitation methods may be employed to maintain the safety and serviceability of concrete bridge decks.



Methods for removing deteriorated concrete from a bridge deck include jackhammering, milling, and hydrodemolition. Hydrodemolition is the use of high-pressure water jets to remove deteriorated concrete from the surface of a structure. Specific advantages and disadvantages apply to the use of hydrodemolition as part of the rehabilitation process for a concrete bridge deck. The main advantages of hydrodemolition include increased cost effectiveness, decreased time consumption, increased adhesion between the substrate and new concrete, and decreased damage to the existing structure. The main disadvantages associated with hydrodemolition include environmental and safety concerns. Environmental concerns arise when even small quantities of the waste water, which has high levels of alkalinity and harmful solutes, bypass the collection system and enter the surrounding landscape. Extra care must be taken to also guard against blow-throughs, which can result from application of the high-pressure water jets to unsound concrete with extensive cracking, low-strength layers, or other defects.

One method of effectively and economically disrupting the ingress of chloride ions and/or moisture is adding a surface treatment. Following a rehabilitation method involving removal of deteriorated material and placement of new concrete, for example, a surface treatment can be applied to seal the rehabilitated concrete deck against further chloride ingress. To achieve the desired effect, appropriate materials, deck preparation techniques, and placement methods must be utilized.



#### **3 EXPERIMENTAL METHODOLOGY**

#### 3.1 Overview

The objectives of this research were met by conducting a questionnaire survey of hydrodemolition companies, performing numerical modeling of chloride concentration to investigate hydrodemolition treatment timing on typical Utah bridge decks, and using structural analysis to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs during hydrodemolition. This chapter describes the methodology utilized in the survey, explains the procedures utilized for numerical modeling of chloride concentration, and details the blowthrough analyses.

# 3.2 Questionnaire Survey

A questionnaire survey was conducted by telephone and email to assess current practices of selected hydrodemolition companies that rehabilitate concrete bridge decks throughout the country. The survey findings were used to design the numerical experiments performed to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used. Various hydrodemolition companies were selected based on their experience with hydrodemolition of bridge decks in climates and conditions similar to those in Utah, where deicing salts are routinely applied to bridges as part of winter maintenance.



A total of five persons, who were typically the managers of the hydrodemolition companies, participated in the survey. Each survey respondent was asked the following questions regarding hydrodemolition procedures for concrete bridge deck rehabilitation:

- Which states are serviced by the hydrodemolition company?
- What nozzle type is used for hydrodemolition of concrete bridge decks?
- What nozzle (orifice) size is typically used for hydrodemolition of concrete bridge decks?
- What water pressure is typically used for hydrodemolition of concrete bridge decks?
- What is the flow rate of the water through the nozzle jet?
- What is the standoff distance, or height that the hydrodemolition nozzle operates above the bridge deck?
- At what angle relative to the bridge deck surface does the hydrodemolition jet typically operate?
- What is the typical transverse speed of hydrodemolition jets on concrete bridge decks?
- How often do blow-throughs of the concrete bridge deck occur during hydrodemolition? The answers to these questions were compiled to assess the current bridge deck rehabilitation

practices of these hydrodemolition companies.

# 3.3 Chloride Concentration Analysis

Numerical modeling was performed to investigate the effects of hydrodemolition treatment timing on chloride concentration profiles in concrete bridge decks for depths of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel. Based on communications with UDOT engineers to determine current practice, appropriate ranges of removal and overlay depths were



selected for use in the modeling process. In addition, typical ranges in bridge deck thickness, original cover depth (OCD), and depth and size of steel reinforcement were selected.

Numerical modeling of chloride concentration was performed using a software program developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) (Bentz 2016). The program uses the one-dimensional approximation for diffusion based on Fick's second law, shown as Equation 3-1, to simulate the diffusion of chlorides through concrete (Poulsen and Mejlbro 2006):

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} = D \frac{\partial^2 c}{\partial x^2} \tag{3-1}$$

where:

C = chloride concentration, mol/m<sup>3</sup> t = time, s D = diffusion coefficient, m<sup>2</sup>/s x = position, m

The program considers several user-specified internal and external variables that affect chloride diffusion through concrete. Among the internal variables are concrete properties such as water-cement ratio, degree of hydration, volume fraction of aggregate, air content, diffusion coefficients, and initial chloride concentration. The values of these parameters were specified in this research to be the same for both the original concrete in the bridge deck and the concrete placed to restore the deck following hydrodemolition. The external variables include average monthly temperature, surface chloride concentration, and unexposed boundary condition. Average monthly temperatures used in the numerical modeling program are shown in Table 3-1.



Month	Temperature (°C)	Chloride, C <sub>s</sub> (mol/liter)
January	-2.3	4.273
February	1.2	3.865
March	5.4	3.326
April	9.8	2.800
May	14.9	2.429
June	20.6	2.311
July	25.5	2.479
August	24.2	2.887
September	18.4	3.427
October	11.8	3.952
November	4.9	4.324
December	-1.3	4.441

 Table 3-1: Monthly Temperature and Chloride Concentration Inputs for Chloride Concentration Analysis

The initial chloride concentration of the new concrete was assumed to be 0.0 g chloride/g cement, and the chloride concentration at the unexposed boundary condition was specified as "constant at zero" to reflect the absence of stay-in-place metal forms, which are no longer commonly used in Utah, on the bottom of the bridge deck (Guthrie et al. 2006). At the exposed boundary condition, a cyclic loading of chlorides on the top surface of the bridge deck was specified to simulate the seasonal exposure of bridges in Utah to deicing salt in the absence of a surface treatment; after a simulated surface treatment application, the chloride concentration at the top surface of the bridge deck was specified to be zero, as the treatment, if maintained over time, should prevent future ingress of chloride ions and/or water. The function used to approximate the surface chloride concentration through a typical year is given in Equation 3-2:

$$C = 3.38 + 1.07 \cdot \cos\left(\frac{\pi \cdot t}{6}\right) \tag{3-2}$$

where:



www.manaraa.com

C = chloride concentration of pore water for month t, mol/L

t = month of year from 1 to 12 to represent January to December, respectively.

This function was developed by previous researchers at Brigham Young University (BYU) (Birdsall et al. 2007). The development process involved measurement of average chloride concentration profiles for several concrete bridge decks in Utah and use of numerical modeling to iteratively determine a single chloride surface concentration model that provided the best possible matches between simulated and measured chloride data (Birdsall et al. 2007).

As shown in Table 3-2, specific inputs for the numerical modeling program were determined from local climatic conditions and with assistance from personnel at NIST. The beginning month of exposure shown in Table 3-2 refers to the first month of the winter season when snow and icy conditions generally necessitate application of deicing salts to roads and bridges to increase driver safety. The member thickness is the deck thickness, and the watercementitious material ratio, volume fraction of aggregate, air content, and diffusion coefficient are specified to match typical concrete mixture designs used for bridge deck construction in Utah (Birdsall et al. 2007). (To achieve a constant diffusion coefficient with time in the simulations, the constant diffusion coefficient was set to the desired value, and the initial diffusion coefficient was set to 0, as required in the numerical modeling program.) The time before exposure begins is set to reflect the expectation that a deck would not be exposed to deicing salts until at least 28 days following construction. The degree of hydration, empirical coefficient, activation energy, Langmuir isotherm constants, rate constants for binding, and cement compound contents are specified according to recommendations from NIST personnel. The external chloride concentration values are computed from Equation 3-2, which generates higher chloride



Property	Value
Beginning Month of Exposure	October
Member Thickness (m)	0.203, 0.229, or 0.254
Water-Cementitious Material Ratio, w/cm	0.44
Degree of Hydration	0.8
Volume Fraction of Aggregate (%)	65
Air Content (%)	6
Initial Chloride Concentration of Concrete (g Chloride/ g Cement)	0
Initial Diffusion Coefficient, D <sub>i</sub> (m <sup>2</sup> /s)	0
Constant Diffusion Coefficient, D <sub>inf</sub> (m <sup>2</sup> /s)	1.30E-11
Empirical Coefficient, m	0.6
Time before Exposure Begins (days)	28
Ratio of Surface-to-Bulk Diffusion Coefficients	1
Thickness of Surface Layer (mm)	0
Activation Energy for Diffusion (kJ/mol)	40
Langmuir Isotherm Alpha Constant	1.67
Langmuir Isotherm Beta Constant	4.08
Rate Constant of Binding (s <sup>-1</sup> )	1.00E-07
C <sub>3</sub> A Content of Cement (%)	5
C4AF Content of Cement (%)	5
Rate Constant for Aluminate Reactions with Chloride (s <sup>-1</sup> )	1.00E-08

Table 3-2: Concrete Exposure and Property Inputs for Chloride Concentration Analysis

concentrations for the months of October through February because these are the months that typically require deicing salt applications. Selection of the indicated values ensured as much consistency as possible with previous research performed at BYU (Birdsall et al. 2007, Guthrie et al. 2008).

For the specified bridge deck thicknesses of 8.0, 9.0, and 10.0 in., corresponding OCDs of 2.0, 2.5, and 3.0 in. (relative to the transverse reinforcing steel) were used in the simulations. Specific removal depths chosen for numerical modeling were computed as the sum of a given OCD, the diameter of a No. 5 reinforcing bar (0.625 in.) typically comprising the top mat, and an



additional depth of 0.75 in. below the top mat that is expected to occur as hydrodemolition contractors meet the required removal depth of 0.50 in. specified by UDOT. Therefore, the total removal depths, which were 3.375, 3.875, and 4.375 in., effectively represent the "worst-case" scenario for the numerical modeling; with the transverse bar being used as the datum in the top mat of reinforcing steel, the removal depths are shallower than if the longitudinal bar had been used, and the reduced removal depth corresponds to a greater amount of chloride-contaminated concrete being left in the bridge deck.

Besides removing potentially chloride-contaminated concrete from immediately around the reinforcing steel, extending the depth of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel also allows mechanical interlock with the new concrete placed after hydrodemolition. The concrete, which usually has a nominal maximum aggregate size of 0.75 in., can flow under the reinforcing steel and thereby largely eliminate the possibility of debonding from the surface of the original concrete.

Using these parameters, each simulation differed based on total duration of chloride exposure, time at which hydrodemolition is performed, OCD, depth of removal by the highpressure water jets, and application of a surface treatment on the rehabilitated concrete deck. With these variables accounted for, extensive numerical modeling of chloride concentration profiles was performed. Specifically, crossing the various levels of the experimental factors in a full-factorial structure generated a total of 36 unique combinations, or scenarios. Specifically, the experimentation included OCDs of 2.0, 2.5, and 3.0 in. (with corresponding removal depths of 3.375, 3.875, and 4.375 in.), treatment times of 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50 years following deck construction; and the presence or absence of an applied surface treatment. In the modeling, all aspects of rehabilitation, including hydrodemolition, placement of new concrete, and application



of a surface treatment, as applicable, were assumed to occur at the same time. The numerical modeling for each scenario was performed for a simulated 75-year service life as recommended by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA 2011).

Modeling of the decks without treatment was performed first to develop a baseline chloride concentration profile to which the chloride concentration profiles for various treatment times were compared. To develop the baseline profile, treatment timing was set at 1,000,000 days to ensure that the treatment would not affect the numerical modeling results during the simulation period. Modeling was then performed for each unique combination of OCD, treatment time, and surface treatment application to produce chloride concentration profiles that would be expected after rehabilitation was performed. The latest timing of rehabilitation that maintained a chloride concentration level below 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete at the levels of both the top and bottom mats of reinforcing steel was identified for each unique combination of OCD and surface treatment application. Appendix A includes images of the numerical modeling program with sample inputs for rehabilitation with a surface treatment application performed at a bridge deck age of 25 years.

#### **3.4 Blow-through Analysis**

For this research, a spreadsheet was developed to investigate six modes of failure, or blow-through, that can potentially be experienced by a concrete bridge deck during hydrodemolition. These modes of failure include bending, one-way shear, and two-way shear, each of which is analyzed in both the orientation where the length is greater than the width and in the orientation where the length is smaller than the width. For any of these failure modes, if the capacity of the concrete deck section is less than the forces applied by the high-pressure water jets, blow-through can be expected. The factor of safety against blow-through is calculated as the



shear or moment capacity of the simulated concrete deck section divided by the shear force or moment imparted by the high-pressure water jets.

In the spreadsheet, the concrete between two longitudinal bars and two transverse bars within the bottom mat of reinforcing steel was analyzed using the Euler-Bernoulli simplified beam theory (Gere and Goodno 2013). Figure 3-1 shows the area of analysis in the plane of the bottom mat of reinforcing steel, with the length of the beam being equal to the spacing between longitudinal reinforcing bars and the width of the beam being equal to the spacing between transverse reinforcing bars. The height of the beam was defined as the vertical distance from the middle of the longitudinal bar in the bottom mat of reinforcing steel; any concrete below the bottom mat of reinforcing steel was disregarded in the analysis. Defining the beam height with reference to the longitudinal bar instead of the transverse bar in the bottom mat effectively represents the "worst-case" scenario for the analysis; because the longitudinal bar is positioned just above the transverse bar within the bottom mat of reinforcing steel, the beam height is lower for a given removal depth than if the transverse bar had been used, and the lower beam height corresponds



Figure 3-1: Area of blow-through analysis between two longitudinal bars and two transverse bars in the bottom mat of reinforcing steel.



to a higher probability of blow-through during hydrodemolition. (Because the top mat of reinforcing steel is above the top of the scarified concrete, it was not included in the analysis; although the physical presence of the top mat of reinforcing steel may prevent point loading of the beam in certain locations, it is not otherwise expected to affect the occurrence of blow-throughs.) As a simplification in this research, the concrete within the beam was assumed to be intact, without cracking or other distresses, and was also assumed to have homogenous mechanical properties, such as compressive strength. However, the perimeter of the beam was assumed to be cracked on all four sides and was assumed to be simply supported along two parallel sides coinciding with the two longitudinal bars or the two transverse bars, depending on the analysis; because this "worst-case" approach disregards the structural benefits of possible concrete continuity across the reinforcing steel, the analysis yields deliberately conservative results in this respect.

Several calculations were required in the analysis of the simulated concrete beam, including those for modulus of rupture, moment of inertia, maximum moment, cracking moment, maximum shear force, one-way shear strength, and two-way shear strength. The modulus of rupture was calculated using Equation 3-3 (McCormac and Brown 2015):

$$f_r = 7.5\lambda \sqrt{f_c'} \tag{3-3}$$

where:

- $f_r$  = modulus of rupture of the concrete beam, psi
- $\lambda$  = correction for unit weight of the concrete based on the type of concrete ( $\lambda$  = 1 for normal concrete,  $\lambda$  = 0.85 for sand-lightweight concrete, and  $\lambda$  = 0.75 for all-lightweight concrete)



#### $f_c$ = compressive strength of the concrete, psi

The moment of inertia for analysis in the cases where the length was greater than the width and where the length was smaller than the width was computed using Equation 3-4 (McCormac and Brown 2015):

$$I = \frac{bh^3}{12} \tag{3-4}$$

where:

I= moment of inertia of the concrete beam, in.<sup>-4</sup>

b = horizontal width of the concrete beam, in.

h = vertical distance from the middle of the longitudinal bar in the bottom mat of reinforcing steel to the top of the scarified surface, in.

The maximum moment experienced by the beam was calculated using Equation 3-5 (McCormac and Brown 2015):

$$M_{max} = \frac{P\sin\theta L}{4} \tag{3-5}$$

where:

 $M_{max}$  = maximum moment experienced by the concrete beam, ft-lb

P = point load exerted on the deck from the high-pressure water jet, lb

 $\theta$  = angle between the jet and the deck surface with respect to vertical (i.e.

0 degrees is perpendicular to the horizontal plane of the deck surface),

#### degrees



L = horizontal length of the concrete beam, in.

The cracking moment of the concrete beam was calculated using Equation 3-6 (McCormac and Brown 2015):

$$M_{cr} = \frac{f_r I}{v} \tag{3-6}$$

where:

 $M_{cr}$  = cracking moment of the concrete beam, ft-lb

 $f_r$  = modulus of rupture of the concrete beam, psi

I = moment of inertia, in.<sup>-4</sup>

y= vertical distance to the neutral axis of the beam from the middle of the longitudinal bar on the bottom mat of reinforcing steel, in.

The maximum shear force experienced by the beam was calculated using Equation 3-7 (McCormac and Brown 2015):

$$V_{max} = \frac{P\sin\theta}{2} \tag{3-7}$$

where:

 $V_{max}$  = maximum shear force experienced by the concrete beam, lb

P = point load exerted on the deck surface from the high-pressure water jet, lb

 $\theta$  = angle between the jet and the deck surface with respect to vertical (i.e.

0 degrees is perpendicular to the horizontal plane of the deck surface),

degrees



The one-way shear strength of the beam was computed using Equation 3-8 (McCormac and Brown 2015):

$$V_{c1} = 2\lambda \sqrt{f_c'}bh \tag{3-8}$$

where:

 $V_{c1}$  = one-way shear strength of the concrete beam, lb

- $\lambda$  = correction for unit weight of the concrete based on the type of concrete ( $\lambda$  = 1 for normal concrete,  $\lambda$  = 0.85 for sand-lightweight concrete, and  $\lambda$  = 0.75 for all-lightweight concrete)
- $f_c'$  = compressive strength of the concrete, psi
- b = horizontal width of the concrete beam, in.
- h = vertical distance from the middle of the longitudinal bar in the bottom mat of reinforcing steel to the top of the scarified surface, in.

The two-way shear strength, or punching shear strength, of the concrete beam was calculated using Equation 3-9 (McCormac and Brown 2015):

$$V_{c2} = 4\lambda \sqrt{f_c'}bh \tag{3-9}$$

where:

 $V_{c2}$  = two-way shear strength, or punching shear, of the concrete beam, lb

 $\lambda$  = correction for unit weight of the concrete based on the type of concrete ( $\lambda$  = 1 for normal concrete,  $\lambda$  = 0.85 for sand-lightweight concrete, and  $\lambda$  = 0.75 for all-lightweight concrete)


$f_c$  = compressive strength of the concrete, psi

- b = horizontal width of the concrete beam, in.
- h = vertical distance from the middle of the longitudinal bar in the bottom mat of reinforcing steel to the top of the scarified surface, in.

The bridge deck parameters that were used as inputs in the blow-through analysis are bridge deck thickness, OCD, reinforcing bar size, longitudinal rebar spacing, transverse rebar spacing, type of concrete, concrete compressive strength, and removal depth. The bridge deck thickness typically varies from 7.0 to 10.0 in., with OCD values ranging from 2.0 to 3.0 in. The reinforcing bar size for bridge decks usually ranges from No. 4 to No. 10, and the transverse and longitudinal bars are assumed to be the same size in the analysis. Typically, the longitudinal bar spacing is 12 in., while the transverse bar spacing ranges from 6 to 12 in. The types of concrete that can be evaluated in the analysis include normal-weight, sand-lightweight, and alllightweight concrete. The concrete compressive strength should be in the range of 1,000 to 9,000 psi, and it should be measured prior to hydrodemolition; if cores cannot be tested, estimates of the compressive strength may be obtained using a nondestructive device such as the Schmidt rebound hammer, for example. The removal depth ranges from 0.25 to 1.50 in. below the bottom of the transverse bar in the top mat of reinforcing steel.

The hydrodemolition equipment parameters that were used as inputs in the blow-through analysis are orifice size, water pressure, and angle of jet with respect to vertical. The ranges of these parameters were selected using the results of the questionnaire survey. The orifice diameter typically ranges from 0.10 to 0.25 in.; while smaller diameters can be used, diameters larger than 0.25 in. are not recommended for hydrodemolition of concrete bridge decks. Water pressure



varies from 10,000 to 40,000 psi. The angle of the jet ranges from 0 to 90 degrees, with the jet angle being set at 0 degrees if the jet is completely perpendicular to the bridge deck. In the blow-through analysis, the high-pressure water jet is assumed to have a cross-sectional diameter equal to the orifice diameter as it contacts the deck surface, and the force of the jet on the deck surface is therefore calculated as the product of the orifice area and the water pressure.

Following development of the spreadsheet, numerical experiments were performed to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used. In one experiment, the main effect of each input variable on the occurrence of blow-throughs was evaluated by sequentially changing the value of the given variable across a typical range while holding the values of all other variables constant. In another experiment, the interactions among selected input variables were evaluated through a fullfactorial experimental design set up to specifically simulate conditions representative of current UDOT practice. For the full-factorial experiment, the remaining concrete thickness above the bottom mat of reinforcing steel was held constant at 2.0 in., representing a removal depth of 0.75 in. below the bottom of the top mat of reinforcing steel; this is the removal depth that will likely result from the 0.50-in. removal depth typically specified by UDOT for hydrodemolition of concrete bridge decks.

Finally, the blow-through analysis was applied to two case studies on bridge decks in northern Utah that were rehabilitated using hydrodemolition. One bridge deck, which was constructed in 1972 and rehabilitated in 2015 at an age of 43 years, experienced significant blowthroughs; the other bridge deck, which was constructed in 1988 and rehabilitated in 2016 at an age of 28 years, experienced insignificant blow-throughs. In each case study, possible values of input variables were selected from bridge plans provided by UDOT, photographs and



measurements taken during and after hydrodemolition, and information obtained from the hydrodemolition contractors. Specifically, supporting information from the bridge plans is given in Appendices B and C for case studies #1 and #2, respectively. Compilation of this information allowed development of expected "worst-case" scenarios that were then investigated for each deck using the blow-through analysis.

## 3.5 Summary

The objectives of this research were met by conducting a questionnaire survey of hydrodemolition companies, performing numerical modeling of chloride concentration to investigate hydrodemolition treatment timing on typical Utah bridge decks, and using structural analysis to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs during hydrodemolition. This chapter describes the methodology utilized in the survey, explains the procedures utilized for numerical modeling of chloride concentration, and details the blowthrough analyses.

A questionnaire survey was conducted by telephone and email to assess current practices of selected hydrodemolition companies that rehabilitate concrete bridge decks throughout the country. The survey findings were used to design the numerical experiments performed to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used. A total of five survey participants, who were typically the managers of the hydrodemolition companies, responded to the survey, and their answers were compiled to assess the current bridge deck rehabilitation practices of these hydrodemolition companies.

Numerical modeling was performed to investigate the effects of hydrodemolition treatment timing on chloride concentration profiles in concrete bridge decks for depths of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel. Based on communications with UDOT



engineers to determine current practice, appropriate ranges of removal and overlay depths were selected for use in the modeling process. Crossing the various levels of the experimental factors in a full-factorial structure generated a total of 36 unique combinations, or scenarios. Modeling of the decks without treatment was performed first to develop a baseline chloride concentration profile to which the chloride concentration profiles for various treatment times were compared. Modeling was then performed for each unique combination of OCD, treatment time, and surface treatment application to produce chloride concentration profiles that would be expected after rehabilitation was performed. The latest timing of rehabilitation that maintained a chloride concentration level below 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete at the levels of both the top and bottom mats of reinforcing steel was identified for each unique combination of OCD and surface treatment application.

For this research, a spreadsheet was developed to investigate six modes of failure, or blow-through, that can potentially be experienced by a concrete bridge deck during hydrodemolition. These modes of failure include bending, one-way shear, and two-way shear, each of which is analyzed in both the orientation where the length is greater than the width and in the orientation where the length is smaller than the width. For any of these failure modes, if the capacity of the concrete deck section is less than the forces applied by the high-pressure water jets, blow-through can be expected. The factor of safety against blow-through is calculated as the shear or moment capacity of the concrete section divided by the shear force or moment imparted by the high-pressure water jets. Several calculations were required in the analysis of the simulated concrete beam, including those for modulus of rupture, moment of inertia, maximum moment, cracking moment, maximum shear force, one-way shear strength, and two-way shear strength. The bridge deck parameters that were used as inputs in the blow-through analysis are



bridge deck thickness, OCD, reinforcing bar size, longitudinal rebar spacing, transverse rebar spacing, type of concrete, concrete compressive strength, and removal depth. The hydrodemolition equipment parameters that were used as inputs in the blow-through analysis are orifice size, water pressure, and angle of jet. Following development of the spreadsheet, numerical experiments were performed to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used. Finally, the blow-through analysis was applied to two case studies on bridge decks in northern Utah that were rehabilitated using hydrodemolition.



## 4 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

## 4.1 Overview

This chapter presents the results of the questionnaire survey, chloride concentration analysis, and blow-through analysis performed in this research.

# 4.2 Questionnaire Survey

The responses received in the questionnaire survey conducted to assess current practices of selected hydrodemolition companies are shown in Table 4-1. While some respondents indicated that certain parameters vary, depending on the project, the information in Table 4-1 is valuable for understanding typical practices and was used to design the numerical experiments performed to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used.

The survey responses indicate that both oscillating and rotating nozzle types are used in hydrodemolition of concrete bridge decks. An oscillating nozzle oscillates in the longitudinal direction as it moves transversely across the deck along a track while inclined at a fixed angle that sprays the water jet in the direction of transverse movement (ICRI 2014). A rotating nozzle rotates about its center while maintaining a slight fixed angle with respect to its vertical axis as it moves transversely across the deck along a track. In the past, hydrodemolition projects involving concrete bridge decks typically used an oscillating nozzle; however, current practice is moving



Company	States Serviced	Nozzle Type	Orifice Size (in.)	Water Pressure (ksi)	Flow Rate (gpm)	Standoff Distance (in.)	Jet Angle (degrees)	Transverse Speed (fps)	Blow- through
А	HI, MA, NJ, UT	Oscillating	Varies	10-40	Unknown	Varies	Unknown	Varies	Occurs Regularly
В	Midwest, TX	Oscillating	0.25	12-20	50-70	2.0	20	Varies	Occurs Regularly
С	Midwest, AK, CA, WA	Rotating	0.10	15-30	40	< 1.0	Unknown	Varies	Occurs Regularly
D	GA, LA, MI, NY, OH, UT	Rotating	0.10	34	48	0.5	Unknown	0.5	Occurs Regularly
Е	FL, NV, UT	Oscillating	0.10	20	43	1.0	0-15	Varies	Occurs Regularly

# **Table 4-1: Questionnaire Survey Results**



towards use of the more efficient rotating nozzle. A typical orifice size is either 0.10 in. or 0.25 in, with most of the respondents using 0.10 in. Some respondents indicated that an orifice size of 0.25 in. is inappropriate for hydrodemolition of concrete bridge decks because the greater force exerted by the high-pressure water jets with a larger orifice size increases the likelihood of blow-throughs. The water pressure ranges from 10 to 40 ksi, and flow rates generally range from 40 to 70 gallon per minute. The standoff distance, or the height that the hydrodemolition nozzle operates above the bridge deck, varies between 0.5 and 2.0 in., and the maximum jet angle relative to vertical is reported to be 15 or 20 degrees. While one respondent indicated that the transverse speed of the water jet is about 0.5 fps, all other respondents indicated that it varies by project.

All survey participants reported that blow-throughs are a common occurrence when using hydrodemolition on concrete bridge decks. A few mentioned that blow-throughs are most common on bridge decks with efflorescence on the underside of the deck, which is usually an indication that the deck has experienced extensive cracking and may have high chloride concentrations. All of the survey participants provide hydrodemolition services in states with harsh winter climates, similar to Utah, which necessitates the use of deicing salts on bridge decks and other roadways to ensure a higher level of driver safety when temperatures are below freezing. As previously discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, chloride ions from the deicing salts corrode the reinforcing steel and deteriorate the surrounding concrete. Blow-throughs can then occur as the high-pressure water jets break through the unsound concrete and corroded reinforcing steel.



## **4.3 Chloride Concentration Analysis**

The numerical modeling performed to investigate the effects of hydrodemolition treatment timing on chloride concentration profiles in concrete bridge decks for depths of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel generated chloride concentration profiles through a 75-year service life given a specific OCD, treatment time, and surface treatment usage. From these profiles, graphs of chloride concentration through time at the levels of both the top and bottom mats of reinforcing steel were prepared for each OCD value and surface treatment usage included in the modeling. Examples of graphs prepared for the top and bottom mats of reinforcing steel are given in Figures 4-1 and 4-2, respectively, for a bridge deck with a 2.0-in. OCD, a 3.375-in. removal depth, and an applied surface treatment, while similar graphs for the same conditions but without an applied surface treatment are given in Figures 4-3 and 4-4. Simulated treatment times are shown at 5-year intervals from 25 to 50 years of deck age, which is typical of current practice in the state of Utah.

The full sets of figures are provided in Appendices D through G. For each treatment year, these figures were used to determine the maximum chloride concentration that would occur at both mats of reinforcing steel after hydrodemolition and the deck age at which these maximum values occurred. In addition, when the maximum chloride concentration was greater than the threshold of 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete, the deck age at which the threshold was reached was also determined.

Tables 4-2 to 4-7 summarize the results obtained for the 36 unique scenarios that were produced from crossing the various levels of the experimental factors. Consistent with the numerical modeling, the treatment years and deck ages shown in the tables are rounded to the





Figure 4-1: Simulated chloride concentrations at the top mat of reinforcement for a deck with a 2.0-in. OCD and a 3.375-in. removal depth with an applied surface treatment.



Figure 4-2: Simulated chloride concentrations at the bottom mat of reinforcement for a deck with a 2.0-in. OCD and a 3.375-in. removal depth with an applied surface treatment.





Figure 4-3: Simulated chloride concentrations at the top mat of reinforcement for a deck with a 2.0-in. OCD and a 3.375-in. removal depth without an applied surface treatment.



Figure 4-4: Simulated chloride concentrations at the bottom mat of reinforcement for a deck with a 2.0-in. OCD and a 3.375-in. removal depth without an applied surface treatment.



Treatment Year	Maximum Chloride Concentration after Treatment at Top Mat (lb Cl <sup>-</sup> /yd <sup>3</sup> Concrete)	Year of Maximum Value at Top Mat	Maximum Chloride Concentration after Treatment at Bottom Mat (lb Cl <sup>-</sup> /yd <sup>3</sup> Concrete)	Year of Maximum Value at Bottom Mat
25	0.04	40	0.08	35
30	0.06	45	0.13	35
35	0.07	50	0.21	40
40	0.09	55	0.32	45
45	0.12	60	0.44	50
50	0.15	65	0.58	55

Table 4-2: Maximum Chloride Concentrations for a 2.0-in. OCD with a Surface Treatment

Table 4-3: Maximum Chloride Concentrations for a 2.5-in. OCD with a Surface Treatment

Treatment Year	Maximum Chloride Concentration after Treatment at Top Mat (lb Cl <sup>-</sup> /yd <sup>3</sup> Concrete)	Year of Maximum Value at Top Mat	Maximum Chloride Concentration after Treatment at Bottom Mat (lb Cl <sup>-</sup> /yd <sup>3</sup> Concrete)	Year of Maximum Value at Bottom Mat
25	0.02	40	0.03	35
30	0.03	45	0.06	40
35	0.04	50	0.09	40
40	0.06	55	0.15	45
45	0.07	60	0.22	50
50	0.09	65	0.31	55

# Table 4-4: Maximum Chloride Concentrations for a 3.0-in. OCD with a Surface Treatment

Treatment Year	Maximum Chloride Concentration after Treatment at Top Mat (lb Cl <sup>-</sup> /yd <sup>3</sup> Concrete)	Year of Maximum Value at Top Mat	Maximum Chloride Concentration after Treatment at Bottom Mat (lb Cl <sup>-</sup> /yd <sup>3</sup> Concrete)	Year of Maximum Value at Bottom Mat
25	0.01	40	0.01	35
30	0.02	45	0.03	40
35	0.03	50	0.05	45
40	0.04	55	0.07	50
45	0.05	60	0.11	50
50	0.06	65	0.16	55



		without a B	urrace rreatmen	t	
Treatment Year	Maximum Chloride Concentration after Treatment at Top Mat (lb Cl <sup>-</sup> /yd <sup>3</sup> Concrete)	Year of Maximum Value at Top Mat	Maximum Chloride Concentration after Treatment at Bottom Mat (lb Cl <sup>-</sup> /yd <sup>3</sup> Concrete)	Year of Maximum Value at Bottom Mat	Year Chloride Concentration at Top Mat ≥ 2.0 lb Cl <sup>-</sup> /yd <sup>3</sup> Concrete
25	15.21	75	0.66	75	35
30	14.68	75	0.50	75	40
35	13.97	75	0.37	75	45
40	13.01	75	0.32	45	50
45	11.84	75	0.44	50	55
50	10.34	75	0.58	55	60

 Table 4-5: Maximum Chloride Concentrations for a 2.0-in. OCD without a Surface Treatment

 Table 4-6: Maximum Chloride Concentrations for a 2.5-in. OCD without a Surface Treatment

Treatment	Maximum Chloride Concentration after Treatment at	Year of Maximum	Maximum Chloride Concentration after Treatment	Year of Maximum Value at	Year Chloride Concentration at Top Mat >	
1 Cai	Top Mat (1b $C1^{-1}/vd^{3}$	Top Mat	at Bottom Mat $(1b C1^{-}/vd^3)$	Bottom Mat	2.0 lb Cl <sup>-</sup> /yd <sup>3</sup>	
	Concrete)		Concrete)	Widt	Concrete	
25	11.83	75	0.29	75	40	
30	11.03	75	0.21	75	45	
35	10.09	75	0.15	75	50	
40	8.95	75	0.15	45	55	
45	7.53	75	0.22	50	60	
50	5.77	75	0.31	55	65	

nearest 5 years, as the exact deck ages at which either the maximum chloride concentrations were reached or the chloride concentrations exceeded the threshold value were not calculated.

Tables 4-2, 4-3, and 4-4 show the results for a bridge deck with an applied surface treatment for OCD values of 2.0, 2.5, and 3.0 in., respectively. The results indicate that, when a



		without a bu	Thee Treatment		
	Maximum		Maximum		
	Chloride	V	Chloride	Year of	Year Chloride
Treatment	Concentration	Y ear of	Concentration	Maximum	Concentration
Year	after Treatment at	Waximum	after Treatment	Value at	at Top Mat≥
	Top Mat	Value at	at Bottom Mat	Bottom	$2.0 \text{ lb Cl}^{-}/\text{yd}^{3}$
	(lb Cl-/yd3)	Top Mai	(lb Cl <sup>-</sup> /yd <sup>3</sup>	Mat	Concrete
	Concrete)		Concrete)		
25	9.28	75	0.13	75	45
30	8.37	75	0.09	75	50
35	7.32	75	0.06	75	55
40	6.13	75	0.07	50	60
45	4.82	75	0.11	50	65
50	3.62	75	0.16	55	70

 Table 4-7: Maximum Chloride Concentrations for a 3.0-in. OCD

 without a Surface Treatment

surface treatment is used, the concentration at either the top or bottom mat of reinforcing steel does not reach or exceed 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete after hydrodemolition during the 75 years of simulated bridge deck service life. With a majority of the original chloride ions being removed during the hydrodemolition process and with a surface treatment preventing further chloride ion ingress after hydrodemolition, changes in the chloride concentration over time are caused by upward and downward diffusion of the chloride ions that remain in the original concrete substrate. Due to their closer proximity to the bottom mat of reinforcing steel, the chloride ions reach maximum values at the bottom mat 5 to 10 years before they reach maximum values at the top mat, and the maximum values at the bottom mat are generally at least twice as high as the maximum values at the top mat.

Tables 4-5, 4-6, and 4-7 show the results for a bridge deck without an applied surface treatment for OCD values of 2.0, 2.5, and 3.0 in., respectively. The results indicate that, when a surface treatment is not used, the chloride concentration at the top mat of reinforcing steel exceeds 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete within 10, 15, and 20 years for OCD values



of 2.0, 2.5, and 3.0 in., respectively. Although a majority of the original chloride ions are removed during the hydrodemolition process, the absence of a surface treatment allows further chloride ion ingress after hydrodemolition. Therefore, changes in chloride concentration over time are caused not only by upward and downward diffusion of the chloride ions that remain in the original concrete substrate, but also by chloride ingress that results from the application of deicing salts. The results of the numerical modeling clearly suggest that a surface treatment should be applied as part of the rehabilitation process to seal the deck against further chloride ingress; although the results indicate that the chloride concentration at the bottom mat of reinforcing steel does not reach or exceed 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete during the 75 years of simulated bridge deck service life, the top mat of reinforcing steel will experience chloride-induced corrosion beginning 10 to 20 years after rehabilitation without an applied surface treatment.

#### 4.4 Blow-through Analysis

The numerical experiments performed to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used generated results in terms of the main effect of each input variable on the occurrence of blow-throughs and interactions among selected input variables. In addition, the blow-through analysis was applied to two bridge decks in northern Utah that were rehabilitated using hydrodemolition. For each analysis, blow-through can be expected when the calculated factor of safety is less than 1.0, but a minimum factor of safety of 3.0, as commonly specified in engineering practice, is desired to guard against blow-through.



Regarding the main effects of each input variable on the occurrence of blow-throughs, Table 4-8 lists the range, interval, and average for each input parameter that was varied in the experimentation. The parameters include transverse rebar spacing, concrete compressive strength, depth of removal below the bottom of the top reinforcing mat, orifice size, water pressure, and jet angle. The parameters that were held constant include reinforcing bar size, longitudinal rebar spacing, and concrete type. Specifically, based on typical UDOT practice, a No. 5 reinforcing bar size was assumed, the longitudinal rebar spacing was set at 12 in., and normal concrete, as opposed to lightweight concrete, was specified.

The main effects are presented in Figures 4-5 to 4-10, in which a dashed horizontal line marks a factor of safety of 3.0. The factor of safety significantly increases with increasing values of transverse rebar spacing and concrete compressive strength and decreasing values of depth of removal below the bottom of the top reinforcing mat, orifice size, and water pressure within the ranges of these parameters investigated in this experimentation. The factor of safety is relatively insensitive to jet angle. While a factor of safety less than 1.0 did not occur in these analyses of main effects, a factor of safety less than 3.0 occurred for an orifice size of 0.25 in., which supports the observation by some questionnaire survey respondents who indicated that an orifice

Table 4-8: I	Ranges of Para	meters for Eval	uation of Main	Effects in 1	Blow-Thro	ugh Analysis
Statistic	Transverse Rebar Spacing (in.)	Concrete Compressive Strength (psi)	Depth of Removal below Bottom of Top Reinforcing Mat (in.)	Orifice Size (in.)	Water Pressure (ksi)	Jet Angle (degrees)
Range	6-12	2,000-8,000	0.25-1.25	0.10, 0.25	10-40	0-20
Interval	1	1,000	0.25	NA	5	5
Average	9	5,000	0.75	0.10	25	10





Figure 4-5: Main effect of transverse rebar spacing.



Figure 4-6: Main effect of concrete compressive strength.





Figure 4-7: Main effect of depth of removal below bottom of top reinforcing mat.



Figure 4-8: Main effect of orifice size.





Figure 4-9: Main effect of water pressure.



Figure 4-10: Main effect of jet angle.



size of 0.25 in. is inappropriate for hydrodemolition of concrete bridge decks because the greater force exerted by the high-pressure water jets with a larger orifice size increases the likelihood of blow-throughs. In all cases, the governing mode of failure for each parameter investigated in the experiment was the bending moment in the orientation where the length of the concrete beam is greater than the width of the concrete beam.

Regarding the interactions among selected input variables, Table 4-9 lists the range and interval for each input parameter that was varied in the experimentation. The parameters include transverse rebar spacing, concrete compressive strength, and water pressure. The parameters that were held constant include reinforcing bar size, longitudinal rebar spacing, concrete type, depth of removal below the bottom of the top reinforcing mat, orifice size, and jet angle. Specifically, based on typical UDOT practice, a No. 5 reinforcing bar size was assumed, the longitudinal rebar spacing was set at 12 in., normal concrete was specified, the depth of removal below the bottom of the top reinforcing size was set at 0.10 in., and the jet angle was set at 10 degrees. As previously stated, a depth of removal of 0.75 in. below the top reinforcing mat of 2.0 in. The orifice size was held constant at 0.10 in. because that was the orifice size used by the majority of the survey respondents, and the results of the earlier experimentation (in terms of the main effect of each input variable) support selection of this value for minimizing the

Statistic	Transverse Rebar Spacing (in.)	Concrete Compressive Strength (psi)	Water Pressure (ksi)
Range	6-12	2,000-8,000	10-40
Interval	2	2,000	10

Table 4-9: Ranges of Parameters for Evaluation of Interactions in Blow-Through Analysis



occurrence of blow-through. A jet angle of 10 degrees with respect to the vertical axis of the nozzle was selected as an average value for most hydrodemolition projects.

The interactions are presented in Figures 4-11 to 4-14, in which a dashed horizontal line again marks a factor of safety of 3.0. While a factor of safety less than 1.0 did not occur in these analyses of interactions, a factor of safety less than 3.0 occurred for four combinations of the input parameters. The specific values of transverse rebar spacing, concrete compressive strength, and water pressure in those combinations are presented in Table 4-10. The values typically represent low transverse rebar spacing, low concrete compressive strength, and high water pressure. These combinations, and equivalent combinations not explicitly analyzed, should be avoided in practice to minimize the occurrence of blow-through during hydrodemolition. Furthermore, because the analysis performed in this research does not directly account for the



Figure 4-11: Interaction between concrete compressive strength and transverse rebar spacing for water pressure of 10 ksi.





Figure 4-12: Interaction between concrete compressive strength and transverse rebar spacing for water pressure of 20 ksi.



Figure 4-13: Interaction between concrete compressive strength and transverse rebar spacing for water pressure of 30 ksi.





Figure 4-14: Interaction between concrete compressive strength and transverse rebar spacing for water pressure of 40 ksi.

Combination	Transverse Rebar Spacing (in.)	Concrete Compressive Strength (psi)	Water Pressure (ksi)	Factor of Safety
1	6	2,000	30	2.58
2	6	2,000	40	1.96
3	8	2,000	40	2.58
4	6	4,000	40	2.73

 Table 4-10: Parameter Combinations with Factor of Safety Less Than 3.0

possibility of cracking in concrete bridge decks, the actual factors of safety may be considerably lower in all cases than those calculated and reported in Figures 4-5 to 4-14. In all cases, the governing mode of failure for each parameter investigated in the experiment was the bending moment in the orientation where the length of the concrete beam is greater than the width of the concrete beam.



Application of the blow-through analysis to two case studies on bridge decks in northern Utah that were rehabilitated using hydrodemolition generated results for a number of actual "worst-case" scenarios for both bridge decks. In the analyses, the total removal depth was calculated as the sum of the OCD for the top mat, the diameter of the transverse bar in the top mat, the diameter of the longitudinal bar in the top mat, and the specified depth of removal below the top mat. In addition, the height of the concrete beam was calculated as the difference between the deck thickness and the sum of the total removal depth, the 1.0-in. OCD for the bottom mat specified for both decks, the diameter of the transverse bar in the bottom mat, and half the diameter of the longitudinal bar in the bottom mat.

The extent of blow-through that occurred during hydrodemolition of the bridge deck investigated for case study #1 is shown in Figure 4-15, in which the areas that experienced blow-through are outlined. The blow-throughs were concentrated in areas between girders where the bottom of the deck was unsupported. Analysis showed that approximately 10.8 percent of the total bridge deck area experienced blow-through during hydrodemolition, which is a significant amount considering that the total bridge deck area is large at 40,613 ft<sup>2</sup>. An example of the extensive blow-through damage on the bridge deck in case study #1, photographed after hydrodemolition, is shown in Figure 4-16.

For case study #1, the values of several input parameters needed to perform a blowthrough analysis of this bridge deck were determined. The original bridge deck had a thickness of 7.5 in. (Guthrie et al. 2014). The OCD for the top mat of reinforcing steel was 2.0 in., while the OCD for the bottom mat of reinforcing steel was 1.0 in. For the transverse reinforcement, No. 4 and No. 5 bars were used in both the top and bottom mats. For the longitudinal reinforcement, No. 9 and No. 10 bars were used in the top mat, and No. 5 bar was used in the bottom mat. The





Figure 4-15: Blow-through map for case study #1: (a) 0-350 ft, (b) 350-745 ft, (c) 745-1,075 ft, and (d) 1,075-1,425 ft.



Figure 4-16: Significant blow-through of the deck in case study #1.



longitudinal reinforcement spacing generally varied from 10 to 12 in., while the transverse reinforcement spacing generally varied from 4 to 7 in.; the longitudinal reinforcement spacing was held constant at 12 in. in the analyses. The deck was constructed using normal concrete. The actual concrete compressive strength at the time of hydrodemolition was estimated to vary from 2,000 to 4,000 psi. The depth of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel was estimated to vary from 0.50 to 1.00 in. An oscillating nozzle was used, and the orifice size was 0.10 in. The water pressure for this project was 20,000 psi, and the jet angle was held constant at 10 degrees with respect to the vertical axis of the nozzle.

As shown in Table 4-11, nine scenarios were analyzed for case study #1 to evaluate the potential for the occurrence of blow-through. For all nine scenarios, the governing mode of failure is the bending moment in the orientation where the length of the concrete beam is greater than the width of the concrete beam. Five of the nine scenarios resulted in a factor of safety less efflorescence on the bottom of the deck as shown in Figure 4-17, the blow-through analysis developed in this research correctly predicted a high potential for blow-through on this deck.

The extent of blow-through that occurred during hydrodemolition of the bridge deck investigated for case study #2 is shown in Figure 4-18, in which the areas that experienced blowthrough are outlined. Analysis showed that less than 1.0 percent of the total bridge deck area experienced blow-through during hydrodemolition, which is an insignificant amount considering that the total bridge deck area is 5,210 ft2. An example of the minimal blow-through damage on the bridge deck in case study #2, photographed after hydrodemolition, is shown in Figure 4-19.

For case study #2, the values of several input parameters needed to perform a blowthrough analysis of this bridge deck were determined. The original bridge deck had a thickness of 8.5 in. The OCD for the top mat of reinforcing steel was 2.0 in., while the OCD for the bottom



					terina b				
парта Влазаветесь	1	2		-	1	5.0		3. 2.	
Tog Hongradinal Plendoring Era Drug	Sc. et	Note Me	1863 - 28 <sup>4</sup>	No. et	.85 IV	No 19	Se.M	So P	jja v
Lop Prenes rise Report rung Baa http://	No -	ta Lawar	de s	No -	No -	So e	de la		. 492 - 4
- Bretton Foorgardhaef Plendt study Boa Suite	50 - 2 19 - 2	N S	log *	2000 - 20 1000 - 20	New L	196 s.	18 ( ). <sup>†</sup>	The f	2010 2
Boartat. Diversitienne Repollenting Boar Mich	No -	No -	die s	No -	So -	Sec.	tere.	da e	.02-3
lekspitted Transferre Philos og orneg om o	¢	.i	÷	4	p		3	4 	al.
ine anti- 10 for to substance for en gran (part 10 de substance)	g.a.a.	4 ( <sub>111</sub>	- : -	<u>-</u> 1005	.jenne	25	i		25.000
lentre de legar lentre Les lengeulnat les als	90.77 19	8.57	673	9 g. g.	1 <sub>222</sub>	100	t ee	194	÷ · ·
lehnimum Etima en Saleix	1.46	es su j	jost.	147	0.56	i da	i El	<u>191</u>	
Presidentes Presidente program	Na	Nes.		le €r		$N_{M}$	25	Ne.	i des

# Table 4-11: Blow-through Analysis Results for Various Scenarios for Case Study #1





Figure 4-17: Significant efflorescence and cracking on the underside of the deck in case study #1.



**(b)** 

Figure 4-18: Blow-through map for case study #2: (a) 0-104.2 ft and (b) 104.2-208.5 ft.





Figure 4-19: Insignificant blow-through of the deck in case study #2.

mat of reinforcing steel was 1.0 in. For the transverse reinforcement, No. 5 bars were used in both the top and bottom mats. For the longitudinal reinforcement, No. 7 bars were used in the top mat, and No. 5 and No. 7 bars were used in the bottom mat. The longitudinal reinforcement spacing generally varied from 10 to 12 in., while the transverse reinforcement spacing generally varied from 4 to 6 in.; the longitudinal reinforcement spacing was held constant at 12 in. in the analyses. The deck was constructed using normal concrete. The actual concrete compressive strength at the time of hydrodemolition was estimated to vary from 2,000 to 4,000 psi. The depth of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel was estimated to vary from 0.50 to 1.00 in. A rotating nozzle was used, and the orifice size was 0.10 in. The water pressure for this project was 34,000 psi, and the jet angle was held constant at 10 degrees with respect to the vertical axis of the nozzle.

As shown in Table 4-12, nine scenarios were analyzed for case study #2 to evaluate the potential for the occurrence of blow-through. For all nine scenarios, the governing mode of failure is the bending moment in the orientation where the length of the concrete beam is greater



					o stado e				
Input Farmaraer	i i			-	•		1	:	4
nage An enging brock Friender reng Bhan Tarre		1947 - S.	Mr. T		N., 7			N T	an a
Topologies ense Reconstruine Blaco Maria	28 g	1. <del>1</del> . 1. 1. 19	Set I	lit t	19 e -	28 S.S.	No 1	No 1	255 7
Horon Liaig withod Relativity Bar Sign		N. C	1971 - 1 1	2000 - 10 100	28. <sup>1</sup>		N. "	39 <sup>- 1</sup>	Ne d
Borton Ditang et e Resolutione Bay 1988:	75 g	 	Sec.1	la r	194 M	21 A (S	No.1	da t	240 I
Assanted Interset Refer Sparing Grass			÷	4	-			9	di.
Connetz Composissen Strangthoppi	e 11.		a.	2		1.11	jee	gterer.	to a di
oranovat Lagal. Toti Av Tara "Llang or Erad "Piet Tar	2. <sup>44</sup>			Usa		T.F.		10	
o fortonal. Factor de Catero	est.	1.17	e di	÷		. 33		East	154
Prelimited Bilweystin pagit	N <sub>P</sub>		Sit		Ne.	M <sub>B</sub>		Als	250

Table 4-12: Blow-through Analysis Results for Various Scenarios for Case Study #2



than the width of the concrete beam. Although eight of the nine scenarios resulted in a factor of safety less than 3.0, none of the scenarios resulted in a factor of safety less than 1.0. Therefore, although the factors of safety may have actually been lower, due to minor cracking on the bottom of the deck as shown in Figure 4-20, the blow-through analysis developed in this research correctly predicted a low potential for blow-through on this deck.



Figure 4-20: Insignificant efflorescence and cracking on the underside of the deck in case study #2.

## 4.5 Summary

This chapter presents the results of the questionnaire survey, chloride concentration analysis, and blow-through analysis performed in this research. Regarding the questionnaire survey conducted to assess current practices of selected hydrodemolition companies, while some respondents indicated that certain parameters vary, depending on the project, the survey responses are valuable for understanding typical practices and were used to design the numerical experiments performed to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in



concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used. All survey participants reported that blowthroughs are a common occurrence when using hydrodemolition on concrete bridge decks. A few mentioned that blow-throughs are most common on bridge decks with efflorescence on the underside of the deck, which is usually an indication that the deck has experienced extensive cracking and may have high chloride concentrations.

The numerical modeling performed to investigate the effects of hydrodemolition treatment timing on chloride concentration profiles in concrete bridge decks for depths of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel generated chloride concentration profiles through a 75-year service life given a specific OCD, treatment time, and surface treatment usage. The results indicate that, when a surface treatment is used, the concentration at either the top or bottom mat of reinforcing steel does not reach or exceed 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete after hydrodemolition during the 75 years of simulated bridge deck service life. The results also indicate that, when a surface treatment is not used, the chloride concentration at the top mat of reinforcement exceeds 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete within 10, 15, and 20 years for OCD values of 2.0 2.5, and 3.0 in., respectively.

The numerical experiments performed to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used generated results in terms of the main effect of each input variable on the occurrence of blow-throughs and interactions among selected input variables. In addition, the blow-through analysis was applied to two bridge decks in northern Utah that were rehabilitated using hydrodemolition. For each analysis, blow-through can be expected when the calculated factor of safety is less than 1.0, but a minimum factor of safety of 3.0, as commonly specified in engineering practice, is desired to guard against blow-through. The factor of safety significantly increases with increasing values of



transverse rebar spacing and concrete compressive strength and decreasing values of depth of removal below the bottom of the top reinforcing mat, orifice size, and water pressure within the ranges of these parameters investigated in this experimentation. The factor of safety is relatively insensitive to jet angle. While a factor of safety less than 1.0 did not occur in the analyses of interactions, a factor of safety less than 3.0 occurred for four combinations of the input parameters. These combinations, and equivalent combinations not explicitly analyzed, should be avoided in practice to minimize the occurrence of blow-through during hydrodemolition.

Application of the blow-through analysis to two case studies on bridge decks in northern Utah that were rehabilitated using hydrodemolition generated results for a number of actual "worst-case" scenarios for both bridge decks. Nine scenarios were analyzed for each case study to evaluate the potential for the occurrence of blow-through. For case study #1, five of the nine scenarios resulted in a factor of safety less than 1.0, and all of the scenarios resulted in a factor of safety less than 3.0. Given that approximately 10.8 percent of the total bridge deck area experienced blow-through during hydrodemolition, the blow-through analysis developed in this research correctly predicted a high potential for blow-through on this deck. For case study #2, eight of the nine scenarios resulted in a factor of safety less than 3.0, but none of the scenarios resulted in a factor of safety less than 1.0. Given that less than 1.0 percent of the total bridge deck area experienced blow-through during hydrodemolition, the blow-through analysis developed in this research correctly predicted a low potential for blow-through analysis



## 5 CONCLUSION

## 5.1 Summary

The objectives of this research were 1) to investigate the effects of hydrodemolition treatment timing on chloride concentration profiles in concrete bridge decks for depths of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel and 2) to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used. The objectives of this research were met by conducting a questionnaire survey of hydrodemolition companies, performing numerical modeling of chloride concentration to investigate hydrodemolition treatment timing on typical Utah bridge decks, and using structural analysis to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs during hydrodemolition.

A questionnaire survey was conducted by telephone and email to assess current practices of selected hydrodemolition companies that rehabilitate concrete bridge decks throughout the country. The survey findings were used to design the numerical experiments performed to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used. A total of five survey participants, who were typically the managers of the hydrodemolition companies, responded to the survey, and their answers were compiled to assess the current bridge deck rehabilitation practices of these hydrodemolition companies.

Numerical modeling was performed to investigate the effects of hydrodemolition treatment timing on chloride concentration profiles in concrete bridge decks for depths of



concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel. Based on communications with UDOT engineers to determine current practice, appropriate ranges of removal and overlay depths were selected for use in the modeling process. Crossing the various levels of the experimental factors in a full-factorial structure generated a total of 36 unique combinations, or scenarios. Modeling of the decks without treatment was performed first to develop a baseline chloride concentration profile to which the chloride concentration profiles for various treatment times were compared. Modeling was then performed for each unique combination of OCD, treatment time, and surface treatment application to produce chloride concentration profiles that would be expected after hydrodemolition and rehabilitation were performed. The latest timing of rehabilitation that maintained a chloride concentration level below 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete at the levels of both the top and bottom mats of reinforcing steel was identified for each unique combination of OCD and surface treatment application.

For this research, a spreadsheet was developed to investigate six modes of failure, or blow-through, that can potentially be experienced by a concrete bridge deck during hydrodemolition. These modes of failure include bending, one-way shear, and two-way shear, each of which is analyzed in both the orientation where the length is greater than the width and in the orientation where the length is smaller than the width. For any of these failure modes, if the capacity of the concrete deck section is less than the forces applied by the high-pressure water jets, blow-through can be expected. The factor of safety against blow-through is calculated as the shear or moment capacity of the concrete section divided by the shear force or moment imparted by the high-pressure water jets. Several calculations were required in the analysis of the simulated concrete beam, including those for modulus of rupture, moment of inertia, maximum moment, cracking moment, maximum shear force, one-way shear strength, and two-way shear



strength. The bridge deck parameters that were used as inputs in the blow-through analysis are bridge deck thickness, OCD, reinforcing bar size, longitudinal rebar spacing, transverse rebar spacing, type of concrete, concrete compressive strength, and removal depth. The hydrodemolition equipment parameters that were used as inputs in the blow-through analysis are orifice size, water pressure, and angle of jet. Following development of the spreadsheet, numerical experiments were performed to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used. Finally, the blow-through analysis was applied to two case studies on bridge decks in northern Utah that were rehabilitated using hydrodemolition.

## **5.2 Findings**

While some survey respondents indicated that certain parameters vary, depending on the project, the responses are valuable for understanding typical practices and were used to design the numerical experiments performed to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used. All survey participants reported that blow-throughs are a common occurrence when using hydrodemolition on concrete bridge decks. A few mentioned that blow-throughs are most common on bridge decks with efflorescence on the underside of the deck, which is usually an indication that the deck has experienced extensive cracking and may have high chloride concentrations.

The numerical modeling performed to investigate the effects of hydrodemolition treatment timing on chloride concentration profiles in concrete bridge decks for depths of concrete removal below the top mat of reinforcing steel generated chloride concentration profiles through a 75-year service life given a specific OCD, treatment time, and surface treatment usage.


The results indicate that, when a surface treatment is used, the concentration at either the top or bottom mat of reinforcing steel does not reach or exceed 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete after hydrodemolition during the 75 years of simulated bridge deck service life. The results also indicate that, when a surface treatment is not used, the chloride concentration at the top mat of reinforcement exceeds 2.0 lb of chloride per cubic yard of concrete within 10, 15, and 20 years for OCD values of 2.0 2.5, and 3.0 in., respectively.

The numerical experiments performed to investigate factors that influence the occurrence of blow-throughs in concrete bridge decks when hydrodemolition is used generated results in terms of the main effect of each input variable on the occurrence of blow-throughs and interactions among selected input variables. In addition, the blow-through analysis was applied to two bridge decks in northern Utah that were rehabilitated using hydrodemolition. For each analysis, blow-through can be expected when the calculated factor of safety is less than 1.0, but a minimum factor of safety of 3.0, as commonly specified in engineering practice, is desired to guard against blow-through. The factor of safety significantly increases with increasing values of transverse rebar spacing and concrete compressive strength and decreasing values of depth of removal below the bottom of the top reinforcing mat, orifice size, and water pressure within the ranges of these parameters investigated in this experimentation. The factor of safety is relatively insensitive to jet angle. While a factor of safety less than 1.0 did not occur in the analyses of interactions, a factor of safety less than 3.0 occurred for four combinations of the input parameters. These combinations, and equivalent combinations not explicitly analyzed, should be avoided in practice to minimize the occurrence of blow-through during hydrodemolition.

Application of the blow-through analysis to two case studies on bridge decks in northern Utah that were rehabilitated using hydrodemolition generated results for a number of actual



64

"worst-case" scenarios for both bridge decks. Nine scenarios were analyzed for each case study to evaluate the potential for the occurrence of blow-through. For case study #1, five of the nine scenarios resulted in a factor of safety less than 1.0, and all of the scenarios resulted in a factor of safety less than 3.0. Given that approximately 10.8 percent of the total bridge deck area experienced blow-through during hydrodemolition, the blow-through analysis developed in this research correctly predicted a high potential for blow-through on this deck. For case study #2, eight of the nine scenarios resulted in a factor of safety less than 3.0, but none of the scenarios resulted in a factor of safety less than 1.0. Given that less than 1.0 percent of the total bridge deck area experienced blow-through during hydrodemolition, the blow-through analysis developed in this research correctly predicted a low potential for blow-through on this deck.

## **5.3 Recommendations**

Hydrodemolition should be considered as an effective means of removing chloridecontaminated concrete from immediately around and even below the top mat of reinforcing steel and allowing mechanical interlock with the new concrete placed after hydrodemolition. For bridge decks typical of those in Utah, treatment times from 25 to at least 50 years can be specified to achieve significant extensions in deck service life. To maximize deck service life, a surface treatment should be applied to seal the rehabilitated concrete deck against further chloride ingress.

The blow-through analysis developed in this research has potential for use as a tool for determining if bridge decks that are no longer suitable for repair using traditional concrete removal techniques may still be good candidates for repair using hydrodemolition. As the blow-through analysis assumes that the concrete within the simulated beam is intact, without cracking



65

or other distresses, the resulting calculations should be supplemented with visual inspection of the deck; extensive cracking and efflorescence on the bottom of the deck may indicate a higher probability of blow-through during hydrodemolition.



## REFERENCES

- Arora, P., Popov, B. N., Haran, B., Ramasubramanian, M., Popva, S., and White, R. E. (1997).
  "Corrosion initiation time of steel reinforcement in a chloride environment: A one dimensional solution." *Elsevier J. Corros Sci*, 39(4), 739-759.
- Basheer, L., Cleland, D. J., and Long, A. E. (1998). "Protection provided by surface treatments against chloride induced corrosion." *Springer J. Mat. and Struct.*, 31(211), 459-464.
- Bentz, D. P. (2007). "Prediction of a chloride ion penetration profile for a concrete." <a href="http://ciks.cbt.nist.gov/~bentz/clpen2.html">http://ciks.cbt.nist.gov/~bentz/clpen2.html</a> (June 1, 2016).
- Birdsall, A. W., Guthrie, W. S., and Bentz, D. P. (2007). "Effects of initial surface treatment timing on chloride concentrations in concrete bridge decks." *Transportation Research Record*, 2028, 103-110.
- Clark, G. L., and Hawley, G. G. (1966). *The encyclopedia of chemistry*, Reinhold Publishing Corporation, New York, NY.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). (2011). *Bridge preservation guide*, Publication Number FHWA-HIF-11042, Washington, DC.
- Freeze, R., and Cheery, J. (1979). Groundwater, Prentice Hall, NJ.
- Gere, J. M., and Goodno, B. J. (2013). *Mechanics of materials*, Eighth Edition, Cengage Learning, Stamford, CT.
- Grace, N., Hanson, J., and AbdelMessih, H. (2004). *Inspection and deterioration of bridge decks constructed using stay-in-place metal forms and epoxy-coated reinforcement*, Research Report R, Michigan Department of Transportation, Lansing, MI.
- Guthrie, W. S., Nolan, C. D., and Bentz, D. P. (2008). "Effect of initial scarification and overlay treatment timing on chloride concentrations in concrete bridge decks." *Transportation Research Record*, 2220, 66-74.
- Guthrie, W. S., Flannery, D. L., Baxter, J. S., and Mazzeo, B. A. (2014). *Demonstration of vertical impedance and acoustic impact-echo testing for condition assessment of a concrete bridge deck with a concrete overlay and polymer surface treatment*, Research Report, Utah Department of Transportation, Salt Lake City, UT.



- Guthrie, W. S., Frost, S. L., Birdsall, A. W., Linford, E. T., Ross, L. A., Crane, R. A., and Eggett, D. L. (2006). "Effect of stay-in-place metal forms on performance of concrete bridge decks." *Transportation Research Record*, 1958, 33-41.
- Guthrie, W. S., Nelsen, T., and Ross, L. A. (2005). *Performance of concrete bridge deck surface treatments*, Report No. UT-05.05, Utah Department of Transportation, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Harries, K., McCabe, M., and Sweriduk, M. (2013). Structural evaluation of slab rehabilitation by method of hydrodemolition and latex modified overlay, Report No. FHWA-PA-2013-006-PIT WO 01, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Harrisburg, PA.
- Hema, J., Guthrie, W. S., and Fonseca, F. (2004). *Concrete bridge deck condition assessment and improvement strategies*, Report No. UT-04.16, Utah Department of Transportation, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Hopwood, T., Goff, C., Wells, D., and Palle, S. (2015). *Hydrodemolition and use of a rapid early strength latex modified concrete overlay*, Report No. KTC-TA-15-01/KHIT6-15-1F, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Flemingsbury, KY.
- International Concrete Repair Institute (ICRI). (2014). *Guide for the preparation of concrete surfaces for repair using hydrodemolition methods*, Guideline No. 310.3R-2014, Rosemont, IL.
- Lees, T. P. (1992). "Deterioration mechanisms." *Durability of concrete structures*, G. Mays, ed., E & FN SPON, London, UK.
- Lewis, R. J. (2001). *Hawley's condensed chemical dictionary*, Fourteenth Edition, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, NY.
- Mays, G. (1992). Durability of concrete structures, E & FN SPON, London, UK.
- McCormac, J. C., and Brown, R. H. (2015). *Design of reinforced concrete*, Tenth Edition, Wiley, New York, NY.
- Mindess, S., Young, J. F., and Darwin, D. (2003). Concrete, Second Edition, Prentice Hall, NJ.
- Momber, A. W. (2005). *Hydrodemolition of concrete surfaces and reinforced concrete structures*, Aachen University, Aachen, Germany.
- Pan, X., Shi, Z., Shi, C., Ling, T., and Li, N. (2016). "A review of concrete surface treatment Part 1: types and mechanisms." *Elsevier J. Constr. Bldg. Mat.*, 132(1), 578-590.
- Patnaik, A., and Baah, P. (2015). *Cracking behavior of structural slab bridge decks*, Report No. FHWA/OH-2015/4, Ohio Department of Transportation, Columbus, OH.



- Poulsen, E., and Mejlbro, E. (2006). *Diffusion of chloride in concrete: Theory and application*, Taylor and Francis, Inc., New York, NY.
- Suryavanshi, A. K., Swamy, R. N., and McHugh, S. (1998). "Chloride penetration into reinforced concrete slabs." *Canadian J. of Civ. Eng.*, 25(1), 87-95.
- Swamy, R. N., and Tanikawa, S. (1993). "An external surface coating to protect concrete and steel from aggressive environments." *Springer J. Mat. and Struct.*, 26(162), 465-478.
- Wenzlick, J. D. (2002). *Hydrodemolition and repair of bridge decks*, Report No. RDTO2-002, Missouri Department of Transportation, Jefferson City, MO.
- Weyers, R. E., Prowell, B. D., Sprinkel, M. M., and Vorster, M. (1993). Concrete bridge protection, repair, and rehabilitation relative to reinforcement corrosion: A methods application manual, Report No. SHRP-S-360, Strategic Highway Research Program, Washington, DC.
- Zhang, J. Z., McLoughlin, I. M., and Buenfield, N. R. (1998). "Modeling of chloride diffusion into surface-treated concrete." *Elsevier J. Cem. Concr. Comp.*, 20(4), 253-261.



# APPENDIX A SAMPLE INPUTS FOR CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION ANALYSIS

Figure A-1 contains screenshots showing the inputs used while performing the numerical modeling. The inputs for the time of treatment, length of experiment (total duration of exposure), member thickness, depth of reinforcement, time of surface treatment application, time at which hydrodemolition (milling and filling) was performed, depth of concrete removal (milling), and thickness of new (filling) concrete were changed to reflect the parameters of each specific experiment. All other inputs were held constant, as depicted.



#### Chloride Penetration Simulation Including Mill and Fill

# **Prediction of a Chloride Ion Penetration Profile for a Concrete**



Prediction is based on a one-dimensional finite difference solution of Fick's second law of diffusion, with a variable external chloride concentration and a two-layer representation of the concrete. Surface treatment option has been added in 2006 and mill and fill option added in 2007 in collaboration with Prof. Guthrie of Brigham Young University.

# Please supply the following parameters (defaults provided)

### **Environmental Parameters**

2/23/2017

Specify external chloride concentration and temperature as a function of month of the year:

Month	Ext. chloride onc. (moles/liter)	Temperature (°C)
January	4.273	-2.278
February	3.865	1.167
March	3.326	5.444
April	2.800	9.833
May	2.429	14.889

1/5

## Figure A-1: Inputs used for numerical modeling program.



23/2017		Chloride Penetr	ation Simulation Including Mill and Fill
June	2.311	20.611	
July	2.479	25.500	
August	2.887	24.222	]
September	3.427	18.444	]
October	3.952	11.778	1
November	4.324	4.889	Í
December	4.441	-1.278	]
Structura	l Design Paran	neters	
Structura	l Design Paran	neters	
Member this	ckness 0.2032	m	
Depth of Re	einforcement 20.8	mm	
Concrete	Mixture Paran	aeters	
w/c ratio 0.4	44		
Degree of h	ydration .8		
Volume frac	ction of aggregate	65 %	
Air content	6 %		
Initial chlor	ide concentration of	of concrete 0.0	g chloride/g cement Guidance

## Diffusion Coefficients (D) of Original Concrete

Click here to view database of concrete diffusivities from literature.

https://concrete.nist.gov/clpenmillandfill.html

**Figure A-1: Continued.** 



2/5

#### Chloride Penetration Simulation Including Mill and Fill

Note that all diffusion coefficients are apparent diffusivity values, as we are modelling transport in the pore space of the concrete based on Fick's 2nd law.

Time dependent diffusion coefficient for bulk concrete takes the form of D=Dinf+Di\*t-m

#### Be sure that you use values of m in the range (0,1).

Reference: Mangat and Molloy, Materials and Structures, Vol. 27, 338-346, 1994. Note- Mangat and Molloy found m values ranging from 0.44 to 0.86 and also that approximately:

m=2.5(w/c)-0.6

2/23/2017

To have a constant D value with time, simply set Dinf to this desired value and Di to zero

Dinf 1.30E-11	m*m/s at 25 C

D<sub>i</sub> 0 m\*m/s

m 0.6

Curing time before exposure of concrete to chlorides 28.0 days (Recommended > 0)

The surface layer of the concrete may have a different (lower or higher) D value than the bulk concrete due to carbonation or poor curing practices. Input the surface layer D value relative to the bulk D value and the thickness of this layer. To bypass this feature, set the skin layer thickness to 0.0 or use D(surface concrete)/ D(bulk concrete)=1.0.

Ratio D (surface concrete)	D (bulk	concrete) 1.	5
Thickness of surface layer	0	mm	
Activation Energy for diffu	ision 40	.0	kJ/mole

#### Chloride Binding Parameters Guidance

Based on a Langmuir isotherm of the form: C(bound)=(alpha\*C(free))/(1.+beta\*C(free))

where C(bound) is in (mole Cl-)/kg cement and C(free) is in (mole Cl-)/L

Alpha 1.67

Beta 4.08

Rate constant for binding 1E-7 s-1

#### Chloride Reaction Parameters Guidance

Assuming the formation of Freidel's salt from all of the  $C_3A$  and  $C_4AF$  initially available in the cement powder.

https://concrete.nist.gov/clpenmillandfill.html

## Figure A-1: Continued.



3/5

2/23/2017		Chloride Pene	stration Simulati	on Including Mill and Fill
C <sub>3</sub> A content of cement	5.0	% on a mass t	basis	
C4AF content of cemen	t 5.0	% on a mass	basis	
Rate constant for alumi	nate react	tions with chloride	1.E-8	s-1

# New Feature (March 2006)

Allows application of a surface treatment at a specific time, beyond which further transfer of chlorides into/out of the top surface is prohibited.

Set this time to a time greater than the total exposure time to turn off this feature

Time at which surface treatment is applied 9125 days

# Mill and Fill Concrete Options (February 2007)

Time at which milling and filling is performed 9125	days
Depth of milling 0.085725 m	
Thickness of new (filling) concrete 0.085725 m	
w/c ratio of new concrete 0.44	
Degree of hydration of new concrete .8	
Volume fraction of aggregate for new concrete 65	%
Air content of new concrete 6 %	
Initial chloride concentration of new concrete 0.0	g chloride/g cement Guidance
Diffusion Coefficients (D) of New Concrete	

Time dependent diffusion coefficient for bulk concrete takes the form of D=Dinf+Di\*t-m

#### Be sure that you use values of m in the range (0,1).

To have a constant D value with time, simply set Dinf to this desired value and Di to zero

Dinf 1.30E-11 m\*m/s at 25 C

D<sub>i</sub> 0 m\*m/s

m 0.6

Curing time before exposure of new concrete to external chlorides 28.0 days (Recommended > 0)

https://concrete.nist.gov/clpenmillandfill.html

## Figure A-1: Continued.



4/5

2/23/2017

#### Chloride Penetration Simulation Including Mill and Fill

The surface layer of the concrete may have a different (lower or higher) D value than the bulk concrete due to carbonation or poor curing practices. Input the surface layer D value relative to the bulk D value and the thickness of this layer. To bypass this feature, set the skin layer thickness to 0.0 or use D(surface concrete)/ D(bulk concrete)=1.0.

Ratio D (surface concrete)/D (bulk concrete) 1.

Thickness of surface layer 0 mm

Figure A-1: Continued.



## APPENDIX B BLOW-THROUGH ANALYSIS FOR CASE STUDY #1

Figures B-1 and B-2 show the sections of the bridge plans that were used to determine identifiers for the bar sizes used for the blow-through analyses for case study #1. Figures B-3 and B-4 show the bridge plans that were used to determine which bar sizes were used as transverse reinforcement and longitudinal reinforcement, respectively. Figures B-5 through B-13 show the blow-through analysis outputs for each of the nine scenarios that were analyzed for case study #1.

Figure B-1: First set of reinforcement plans for bridge deck in case study #1.





Figure B-2: Second set of reinforcement plans for bridge deck in case study #1.





Figure B-3: Bridge schematic showing transverse reinforcing bar locations for bridge deck in case study #1.



Figure B-4: Bridge schematic showing longitudinal reinforcing bar locations for bridge deck in case study #1.



Constant of the Constant of the Second Se	The second
in a start and	
Eterol. Thesterory	78.5
Barrie of Brown, Rate Sugar, and the	
Exactly of Constants Stores and	3,120 - 5
A state of the sta	
We show Pare	1 - C C C C C C C C
14. 1914 A. Chargene	
Bortus Onworth	
Design (Constant)	9.9
Heart Load (P)	8
Designed integrate and whereas is it is a surgery to the second sec	1. A.
Enderson Reportand Comber Available	
And type Beinta - Sasharand Database	
Consistent sower firster gebeißt som Software de Marchesen () - somer som	5.9
Lances II.	
Costs (Costs)	1. Sec.
transfer the	
Contraction Course	
lingthe statistic of	
Photo Services Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Ann	17.1 \$ 1.8.
lige of Span	D/16 TW EV
have been been a free to be served by a server by a	0.80 m
Infect apart or from the first	_ 106 st
Obstances of Black And Bay	0.55%
Topping with starts and	484 Pd 44-B
Caracity of the second s	8.35 cm (g. )
Constants Decore Planets	
it's source on the set (V and	1. C. 27. C.
Company Manufacture Contemportal Contemportal Land	2000 - A.
Paskas in One-Way She h	
Providence Theory Browners of Concerns to	(77), N
Frances President Strain	
in second the second seco	28. Oct 40.
Constitution Block and BA	1200 A. 1. 18
a consistent from the second from the	
Champan She a bi	77.74
Chase What Sharra Source, pitted Environment of the	2778-35
States a Constant Same	
For dealer the a broken it for a second	17,4,4 %
Braisse et Estructure et trais	

Figure B-5: Blow-through analysis for scenario 1 of case study #1.



Depth to Top Fairstoner at Mat (2010)	$\frac{1}{20} q_{0}^{2}$
Some entra lan	2
Beck Hickory	1.5 %
English and Anna berg gradelige	Sec.
Provident State Concerns	8.025 %
Characterization and a set of a set of	
Wind Ash Peer	
Ubitzie des Preis, eine	6.5
(Jozefa Diemera)	1. A.
<ul> <li>Provide the structure</li> </ul>	0.5
Point Con (19)	1. Sec. 1. Sec
General management of the second	0.0
Schmerk Fichsenschlanden Ausberge	
Avecação processor de la contra de	
Countersonia Interiore Baran an Belviast Conduct of Con-	10 A
Celogia Ph	at 1.
f <sup>er</sup> 974 (0)	a
Harth (iv)	ar i c
Constants Fund	
Regise Date Reptaced	
Westerner (1995)	100 C 100
Tops of Source	1975 <del>9</del> - 6957
Course of or International Course of or International Pro-	10 F.S. 10
Manager of married and	5,296 m <sup>-1</sup>
Contraction of the second s	(2.99) as
Plante and Concept (C)	469,08 a.c.
Experience Management (M	2.43 (44)
(Condition Data of Florence - Condition Data of Florence - Condition - Cond	
Marine no preserve a serve	no se prime
[3] Construction Program Structure Structure (Construction 10) (1)	4,302,6
Estimated States Dates	
Environment (Res a Transmission of early set)	65.5 (1
Redet of Party Party State	
<ul> <li>The sign of the s</li></ul>	10 1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
and the second sec	and a second
Constants Press (Research	and the second
	2 T. 11 11 11
(1) Construction of the second secon second second sec	
	to the state
	1
<ul> <li>Management of the second s Second second seco</li></ul>	1.11
<ul> <li>a service of the second se </li> </ul>	

Figure B-6: Blow-through analysis for scenario 2 of case study #1.



	Description Correspondence and West (C.C.).	10.00
	Development Bay Elas	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
	Gene freedowar	7.5 m
	Centin to Baware Restausting Mart	A.a.
	Capitron Enconservi Province st	2. 578 6
	Phanlas of det Pressen	
	Wine to der Artzest	1. Sec.
	Mattale An Province	-024 
	phonetal de anne res	100 A
		(20)2 (20)2
	<ul> <li>Provide La Contractione de la contraction de la contr</li></ul>	
	201 Sugar Consumption Street Stree	D24
	Destruction Proceeding of Construction Comparison (Construction) Accession (Construction) Construction (Construction) (Construction) (Construction) Construction (Construction)	
	<ul> <li>A substance of the second state o</li></ul>	
Contrast and concerts		
	a v Ball SAR Disease fait	
	an da de la composition de la Composition de la composition de la comp	
	Concerne Loop	
	and a second	
	1. 240 - 15 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -	
	Introduction of Constanting March	Do be
	Type of Doard	ning riviger
	i i quant suite a suite de la company de	18.8 T 44"
	Mennander Mondaling	· 2 3 47
	Oni proce on General Association	0.53 a.
11 (A)	in gran we be we will be	West of the mostly
2	Countering Manager (1992)	and the second
	Considering Educated Restora-	
	We want to be a first the second	27,10
	<ul> <li>Ora-Avinoblasis braces of Consumerally ()</li> </ul>	6-00 its
	if an it's the falle when the second	
2. 2	<ul> <li>Prana here, follower forwards and forwards (Vilg).</li> </ul>	1977 1 7
	Planting Reality and States and	
	Resuperior Magneser (M.	1910 1 T
1	Coupling Montes (M.,)	1998 a. 46
	Carlo bring Charles Plane in	
	Staat an ore before a Walter L	44.25 25
	<ul> <li>One Haren Stueen timangen, en Companie (W. 1996)</li> </ul>	17 Mar 19
	The second second second second second second	
	<ul> <li>Economics likes also glass (loss), starting</li> </ul>	1278.0
	ef en mellen Frankening Store e	

Figure B-7: Blow-through analysis for scenario 3 for case study #1.



Cooling For Everyour a Nation Un	2.3° 40
Reported Bar Source	
Leask Thiot sees	2.5 w.
Datable Beat in Rentricipin Mar	£ 46
Deptilion Fundase Removal	- 175 w
They have grade of a company of the second	
wind the Fiers	
Margala Add Providence	
Mollare Diameter	
Another of Long Control of State	Seg.
Fors Colezifier	it in the second se
Energy Company see the registration of	1H
Benariot Fleiprian d' Donn er Amadabast	
Angelia per terterange Plant en angel beredae	
Comprehensive Strangth Berryd on Sinhaudi Mundour (Sotma var need) -	
us ngih mi	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
Sec	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
Teiger Bire	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
Concern Prov	
wgyr agar a Riesdad ar	
Charled a to the Statement of Market	852 c. a. a.
Tops of the second s	1.55 W PM
Montere of Instance (	1125 - 1
Morrison of the court of	A START
Effect and the constraint of the constraint of the	0.75.26
Phanese Areas and Ar	densi US, uruden
en e	15.1 day
Considered Theorem 1 to a set	
<ul> <li>Mile an example of the second sec second second sec</li></ul>	1. 1. Sec. 10.
a second a second s	
and a second	
En ander ander en de Barrer en de B Barrer de Barrer de B	and the
<ul> <li>South and the state of the stat</li></ul>	1000
<ul> <li>(1) (2007) 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007</li></ul>	and the second second
Program in the second	1769 (1972) (K. 1982) 1769 (1972) (K. 1982)
1.13080-2.00, 62 (1.10)	
Lisciant Tree of her an	
The sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-	
<ul> <li>Presidential and the subscription for each of the second se</li></ul>	7528.08
t administrative av dike er	
<ol> <li>Providelija Streen Streen pri ver Conscrete (V -)</li> </ol>	网络花文
<ul> <li>Tak we make make make and the and</li> </ul>	

Figure B-8: Blow-through analysis for scenario 4 for case study #1.



-	Continto Espídemento Estable II	10.00
	Constant and Section of	
	Nece Residences	7.8 m
	Design the Betternel severated and Plat	5 a.
	Trender of Concorner Barmonist	1.37S at
	No an and a start of the second se	
	A-Balaha A-Phatair	1
	Reported by Pression	2.0
	Donde Staneter	
	en de la tractione de la company	
	Phase Lag 201	E.
	Campa Comparison Frangel (Campa)	645
	Science Rozowski bistolet Avelabler	
	warm gewichter mach Fintenauth brantais	
Compressione brown	git husen on bohnan fills the Plane standil. 🦷	(20)
	Lengther	95
	Rase (6)	a.,
	tite-giv Hai	96
	Currente Prote	
	Nogradisera Skopla zastr	
-	Standard and Standards and	371 1 mm
	lopa ta bylar.	cone=diay
	Electronic systems (1997) and	6 38 m <sup>°</sup>
	Microsoft on concepts a disc	58.67 av
	Gistanic + outlie or al Deastor	0.46 m
	Machine Manual (Manual (Mala)	48-4 CO 47-8
1. A.	Constant and the second s	daity study
- P	Energia of Aug to National	
	the strent the strent is	1.1.103.00
	Circle defaultifies at Efforts and Contraste (H. 3	AND IN
	Fishter we Constant the second	
	Franciscus Show Strengther Constrant Mark	1997.5
	Fisher a Provide Stars	
	in an an in the second s	100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100
	f(x) = f(x) +	Class and a
	fill an annual The second fill and	the second second
	Conversion and the second s	1140.4
	<ul> <li>A second s</li></ul>	
	Description of the second sec second second sec	0.765
E. S.	<ul> <li>A second sec second second sec</li></ul>	
	<ol> <li>The first the state of the state of the state</li> </ol>	

Figure B-9: Blow-through analysis for scenario 5 for case study #1.



Denais on Franklands in U.S. Of	111.00
Burrandou Bri Sex	in the second
Deale Hocketsery.	7.5 m
Construct Section Renford Days	E.a.
Epatement Learnerster Reichardet	8 AT 16
County on our set \$138 or a	i
Software back and	· · · ·
Decide des Pressent	ei -
Mourrie Linaneses	
Single Science (1997)	94) 1947 -
- Anne Ussail Ch	
Bersign Over pressive Briengdoff er and	4
Behrtid, Parbound Namioa ( Available,	
is and populär to the Baltic Could be added	
<ul> <li>Constrais size the regulation and prediction devices the fore encoded in</li> </ul>	si.
Length di	
- Elsee 是4	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
hi ngi wi U.A	1. Sec.
Concreacioner Concreacioner	
A parent ere Angrunert	
Listator e Espana R. r	and Sec.
Especer Span	1100 1140
Linguage of Repairs Rule	96.45 m <sup>3</sup>
Managara and executions	16.1° m
Elist zone ou hier to al Asis foi.	13 GE (1
Chapter in General House of the sur-	Section as
Steadily of the mary officer	· 1946年1月1日
Casoling Due to Herrie	
Historia State and State	
Covertainen Stevens Serensen of Converses W. A.	100 Te
has been Choolean Block	
Conclusion Steps Congregorial Concerns March	900 8
in a second s	
14 Bit segmented and the second se	206.73 646
Crustine More of March	1010 1-2
<ul> <li>A strain the second seco</li></ul>	
Warehouse Eric and Alexandree and Alexandree	17.07
One twisy these places in the Way	13:32:4
an the second	
Preparation of Standard Structure and Constant of Constants Constant	7885 L
high and the first the second s	

Figure B-10: Blow-through analysis for scenario 6 for case study #1.



Course on Trans Constraint, and Price (199	A trace
Passaccourse Man Sace	5
Dent Tont of 2	7 Th an
Orightis to Richtere Piels descaragibilists	र्च क
Daptiers' Consister Review a	5 7 7 S av
durden er An Parren	
N396.06.080 P.347	
But the device store	44 - C
blauda Exproposi	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
Active of Constants	- 19-13 - 19-13
1. A	1. Sec.
States of the transferration of the states o	171 ·
And the analysis in a star second	
* ongreshive strangth starzation that and thranss shots use are the	3.
i en phrio	м. Т
Saso (3)	1. Sec.
$(1)_{2}(0, 0)_{1}$	
1945-1948 (1996) 	
w bisecter o methodere	
Weiter and the providence of the providence of the	474.8 620
Toper 11 option	oregen group
informer Collinguage (	O NS av
Manual retrieves (	pagt with
Encremente to These receipting for	0.8% av
httparts an islanged tid <sub>max</sub> (	434,68,8,46
<ul> <li>(c) spice p Marca (Marca)</li> </ul>	8.62
Crischarte Dass of December	
<ul> <li>Massing and Sharper Ways</li> </ul>	77.35
🚽 👘 One on of the state of th	1904 B
Field ward Break and Break and Break and	
2 Providung Sheur Smeright or Concrete (Might)	·····································
<ul> <li>Fallowers Expressing Files and</li> </ul>	
Al mar a that a bling f	222.04 (48)
an Crashara Romert (b).)	(7028 av 8
Crathern Castre	
Effective and the art of the sector of the s	61.086.20
<ul> <li>Diversitien Baseler, Smerroed of Concernment Magazine</li> </ul>	171161-061
Signature of the second s	
<ol> <li>Provokanja čili se provogili od rikova prejiti u prijelji po prejiti u prijelji po prejiti po pre</li></ol>	21.2.4
i na se	-

Figure B-11: Blow-through analysis for scenario 7 for case study #1.



Evolt relified Baintoscop Mat 108, 18.	and the second
Hainkartus Sar Bren	10 A
Const. Washington	11 A.
Construction Office (Construction)	
Altered An Alter State (1997) And Alter Andreas and Alter State (1997) And Alter Alter Alter Alter Alter Alter Altered Anticipation (1997) And Alter Alter Alter Alter Alter Alter Alter Alter Alter Alter Alter Alter Alter Alte	1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 -
UNUDER OF ALGERIC ASE REPRODUCED	2 - 2 - <u>2 - 1</u>
Acardon of Presser	
Wite Hotel Plant	1
Accepted the second	
Dursie Étais and	
88. <u>9</u> 99.013.0292.01	94 <u>9</u>
56.0041.0057.041	
Electronic patrone recently account of the second	p. 31
Sucharada Australia at 11 and 201 wheel and 20	
and the second	
<ul> <li>A second sec second second sec</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>Considerations and the second statement of th second statement of the second statement ot</li></ul>	5 M
l, eregri eige	
Siscentia.	
etwarda Byt	
i and a second	
a de la companya de l Norma de la companya d	
siddioed ace is white the contract and	
Puckal stat Parature 9	3.6 Jun 199
Forus of Securi	51-4-11, 80
American Construction of the Construction of t	1.5.6
and the second se	10 Set of
de ser en antier a de la de	1.076
	10000000000000000000000000000000000000
<ul> <li>Consider Constant Consta Constant Constant C</li></ul>	ACA 000 47400
<ul> <li>P Each open and the providence of t</li></ul>	9.55 A.S.
Crepency Ous to Descree	
Manager the second s	10,000,000
The state of the second secon second second sec	
<ul> <li>Apple and apple apple and apple app</li></ul>	
1 199 FG 071 998 77 219529	
and a second of the statement of the second s	
Eadure in Purioring Stream	
the stream side out of the	and the second second
La Real de de la Real de	
M. Januara Shera Count	100 A.
Cine-Mar Rees, Stress Ment Coppose Mart	1278 (F
<ul> <li>Support of the second se</li></ul>	100 C
partie participation of a second s	

Figure B-12: Blow-through analysis for scenario 8 for case study #1.



Quarters, Franklander (Maria, Park)	1000
Bauticicana Caro,	5
the infinition of the second	7.5.87
Elepticia Bates Reinterary Mac	8 ac
Experience Concernsion and	<u> </u>
Alexide of the Plat lear	
and the second secon	
Flag de l'Astrika es ver	4274
ALC LITTLE LAST THE SA	
66.98.034.03031 //////////////////////////////////	205 
<ul> <li>Arresta Statement</li> <li>Arresta Statement&lt;</li></ul>	4. A.
energy and the service of the servic	100°
(a) Define a strategy of the second filler and the second strategy of the second strateg	
ender systematics and a solution of the systematic systematics of the systematic systematic systematics of the systematic systematic systematics of the systematic systematic systematic systematics of the systematic systematic systematic systematics of the systematic systematic systematic systematic systematic systematics of the systematic systematic systematics of the systematic syste	
Construction and the second statement of the second	
n de cogra da la companya da la comp	16 A.
Louise (L) Martin (L)	
Contraction of the second s	
Nobel a second	
1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 - 1919 -	
West decrease of T	400 8 (p. n. )
ispects States	CODE TSU BY
all and the second s	675.66
Mostenit or stortes they	73-37-67
later access to based on the	-9-53 m
(Character and the second s	464.637 676
(Cradeny Workers (M))	sittin artik
Crise Line y Dass Contribution of	
(Recational Weight Company)	17 (Ph. 16
Constant as Stream Second Compares of 2	6.56 1-2
E altrice a Carle Max She as	
Principhing Bhave bravititiot for center vigit	(5.55
<ul> <li>Foundation Provide States (Provide States)</li> </ul>	
Statister Blancer (March	之后 医白白色
Considering Baparana (OL) h	Contraction of the second s
A Example e	
Marine works and the set William	70 x6 m
Cover of the Break Strong Row Commette Register	1393.4
the state of the s	
Constituting Education Science (Mag), 10	0.000
<sup>2</sup> Elsiensen eine nacheng Seisensen	

Figure B-13: Blow-through analysis for scenario 9 for case study #1.



## APPENDIX C BLOW-THROUGH ANALYSIS FOR CASE STUDY #2

Figure C-1 shows the sections of the bridge plans that were used to determine identifiers for the bar sizes used for the blow-through analyses for case study #2. Figures C-2 and C-3 show the bridge plans that were used to determine which bar sizes were used as transverse reinforcement and longitudinal reinforcement. Figures C-4 through C-12 show the blow-through analysis outputs for each of the trials that were analyzed for case study #2.

			- 19 A		
j		a de la companya de l	1.1	<del>12</del>	
		and the second	1.1.1		1.1
	1 i.i			- 6	
				the second second	
and the second	1 S 1 61	10 10 822 10			
				and the second	

Figure C-1: Reinforcement plans for bridge deck in case study #2.





Figure C-2: Bridge schematic showing transverse reinforcing bar locations, deck thickness, and cover depths for bridge deck in case study #2.



Figure C-3: Bridge schematic showing longitudinal reinforcing bar locations for bridge deck in case study #2.



89

-	Copilitia For Representa (14810), Gr	2.3° 40
	File control of Statistics	
	Least Distances	6 S w.
	Deputy to Existing a Reputy to the Mar	£ 46
	Depity in Functions Repaired	- 175 m
	Abun Seering Charles and a	
	winds the Para	1. Sec.
	Mongala And Programme	- 49
	Access Diameter	:
	Another Classed St.	iv-g
	Para La este i	it.
	Energin Compressions de mijstrit avances	DI
	Service Reprised Them of Arabitation	
	elase as particular and the course benefice	
Completeness Sten	gth Bank d' an finiteach blandour féisitmeas a nadh 🦷	43 - C
	Carogib un	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
	Sec. 20	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
	Masger Bre	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
	Corosee Prov	
	reginegere Replaced	
-	Masteles in Standard P	4 Marster at
	Forward for a	1.750 W PM
	Signature of Rooman , t	5.47 B.
	Morrison of the the fills	and the at
	Effective and leave stands for	: 23. 75
-	Manuel and Included 11.	25. 34 mars
	Construction of the second state of the second	COF
	Examples Dawood to ever	
	Mile mean terms of the state	130.025.05
	(3) Involve and Messing Contraction for the contraction Market and Contraction Market and Contraction Market and Contraction and Contractio	1990 B.
	Single and the second sec	
	Councement Repairs Provide the second second Second	1970 N.K.
	Stationary Description of the	
	lation and information of the	sea a sea de
		Contraction of the second
	A statistical statis Statistical statistical statis	
	And a second	-04 A.
:	Construction of the second se second second sec	22.440
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(a) We we share the state of the second s Second second s Second second seco	
	Construction (Construction) (Cons	
	n never bei geller heber lehter Sight bei socher helfe 1993 gi	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1.1004, 2.000, 2.	

Figure C-4: Blow-through analysis for scenario 1 for case study #2.



Septembro 7 co	เอี้ยงการคลุดีรัฐบารีไม่ป	- Court
	Revenuelas pitas Bass	- E
	fled: Red next	42 S. 48
(a payle)	Concern Strand des ing Mar	E an
- Freedom -	Bried Conversite Revices a	2.193 av
	Westman of dec Frances	
	Winicia Jeref 22 (	•
	Proteide dis Pretikae	1.5-
	192 colles 10 estue tes	45 - E
	Cogsta Load ( a	awg.
	Count Loads (Co	
Oergeelleegeet	taran brashqaraf <sub>alaasaa</sub> t	a si
positive Piezz	and the state of the state of the	
<ul> <li>wo:e0p.jpp;</li> </ul>	анад Вароце и Монкон	
<ul> <li>On oppleasive Briezogd Alace 2nd Brithmond I</li> </ul>	becobe (10) (2004 az energi)	2059
	្នុងកម្មនាំ ហើ	a -
	Pase (b)	8.5
	the light of the	
	V PERSONAL STATE	
	लेन्द्रम् अस् अस् विश्वतः भ्यानन	
	$\mathcal{U}(\phi_{1,0}^{(i)},\phi_{1}^{(i$	6.6 . 700
	Elected Chicago	070910-50
	Dang dalah sa keraja	5.25 (3)
	Concern of identical and	23 62 M
(Po)	and a conference faire by t	1.8(* ev.)
	Bernar and Mersaland Mersal	789 Bd avenue
	Caseboo Blamera ISL	and the second
	rankent Due to Descere	
	Masaran Show W.	THE WAY BY
Conservation Advancements	an an i Eastain an an an	2648 C + 45
	Assessment and West Disease	
	and of Connected Vision	5041
	Jone and Prane Landy Passars	
- A A	in the second	Section Section
	Construction of the second states	1000
	<ul> <li>Statistical Control (Control (Control))</li> <li>Statistical Control (Control (Control))</li> </ul>	
	Construction of the second state	The state of the second
the second s	and the second	12 C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 C 1 C
	and the second	1.
in the second		
2		COMPACT OF STREET, STR
<u></u>	andrah gerara ngalangan sejara sa	

Figure C-5: Blow-through analysis for scenario 2 for case study #2.



	Guest in The Shink wet a Part Col Co	2.6
	Here de Leer y Ever Gérie	2
	Ders Dustriess	0 S - 6
	Eternikova Rostova Rostava a gibita	$\hat{\theta} < \theta_{c}$
	Osphilol Coopets Period	3-87 <u>5</u> -86
	t je staljuga stali staljuga s	
	When der Husse	
	<ul> <li>And the effective of the ef</li></ul>	
	- 10.72 (\$ 10-976)	
	Pose Lossi (A)	
	Decigned interestions been placed as second	21
	Schunde Disingenes Nordoes Avial abie	
	A weed an Distance Repaired Semilar	
Соответские Серг	générasé na Celaria Handua Phanese cedra 🦷	2 <sup>1</sup>
	La repetier	100 C
	Eret i	
	magi dini	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
	ELCINA 142 A ELONA A ELCINA 142 A ELONA	
	entriples (cost in editor)	
	Catchener of Please reed, t	5.95 (10.17 <sup>3)</sup>
	E grade be wee	10-9-04 by
	Provident of inversion, e.g.	3.99 (4)
	Apple per President	්රුද්දින් හැදී
	<u> </u>	<u></u>
- T.	(Francisco Comercial data a	786 Sid in HE
1.1	i starrož pomora pitali	1975 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 - 1998 -
	La rectione de la transitione en	
	i sabutaato bitatat (M <sub>ana</sub> a	the real of the
- 12 1	Children Wahn Dave an Ordan ignition (Scholader Children)	1963
2000 - 100 -	<ul> <li>Bend Soldher when Blazzan</li> </ul>	=
	<ul> <li>Enclose y needs to see your consistent to an application.</li> </ul>	ineq. D
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
-	E CERETA DO CARDA DO LA DE	100 C 100 C 100 C
	C 180 C TABLE STATE ST	Second Code
		100 C
1. F. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	<ul> <li>A provide the second sec</li></ul>	our o
	<ul> <li>An a start of the start of the</li></ul>	
	Enter (here: Prove Association of the second second	
	<ul> <li>Construction of the second seco</li></ul>	
	<ul> <li>Second control of the second se second second s second second se</li></ul>	

Figure C-6: Blow-through analysis for scenario 3 for case study #2.



	Country Ton Residences (Are (CCD)	
	Former or a big time	
	Cards Heckness	15 m
	Deerloop from a Deministry Mer-	the state
	Depth of Constrons Formers at	3.075
-	Phylandiana and the Stringerics	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
	Marthelet Plans	1
	Mozale de Doessaale	191
	Nozife Diana i v	73
	Are the of Large 11 (	de g
	Portiord( )	5 - C
i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	lango Longo assese provinsi ang ang J	52 M
	Submail Retained Davidus Assets: 6	
	Average Schmed Her conclusion a	
— Солартекский Блан для Вакс	engene (effeksige fonderen eg (moerfelsenen ()	570
	Leogh I	
	elected 4	
	tie (glassia)	
	1.0100413-131-3	
	weiterweiterz strochach of	
•	Medicities of Reprinted in	See . The second
	i cost of Spran	0002-0014-0
	Close et al instriction (C)	1.5% 65
	Planant of installa P <sub>art</sub>	$\eta(r_1) = \eta(r_2)$
	English tarah Nerangkan ya	6 97 av
	Demonstration (Demonstration)	228 EM (H & R
T  = 1	Canada ang Manasas (A., Y	64 - A. <u>E</u> .
	Constitute Configuration of the second	
	Mangeon Stream Very	the second
- Den Series	- Way there as necessary conditioned by	الأرقي التركي المركز الم
	Elebere de Ceser-Maria (Bharai	
- E - Bran	anag shate Enrogian Concessivity 👘	1986-11
1. Sec.	<sup>27</sup> allere so Alexandrarig base or	
-	Phase print, Course of Market	2011 1936 - E
	Constant Meanwriter	Sec. 1.
	Christiang Dinning Fissure	
16 C	Constant to Base and March	(1994) - C
di Crus	- Han bee of built before the second structures of the	260 6.
	Charles and the Strage Strager	
E. E. Bran	Banks Bhas an Brissing Stand Constant State	a 1994 - 19
	Estate in Paradar, p Storag	

Figure C-7: Blow-through analysis for scenario 4 for case study #2.



	Capitate Top Remaining Station 1	2.17.61
	Semanang Ser Sure	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
	Sect Sectors and	8.5.6
	Conjunction Betternal anomalogy Plan	Sec. 1
	Evenue of Concerning hermonical	1.57 <u>5</u> ko i ji
	Manapara di set Parensi	
	A-Riskola Aer Hazar	
	Warne De Presso e	6.0
	Diozofe Discoetes	- (f)
	erniste i Musiasci (Musiasci (Musias	- 19 g
	7 a.	- E
	Caregor Competence : Energed at <sub>endored</sub> i Scontacit Roman a Neradore, Aredorides Areas at Roman a Neradore, Areadorides	dab
	And St. 2007 Children Problem Children and St. 2007 Children and S	
<ul> <li>Complete Randel Disc.</li> </ul>	wygel i na siere om tommerkov retkolokker i montke a stol bolk.	(26)
	L englister	10
	(0.356 MJ) 	
	naéa sa	
	ten (1984) - State (1997) Anna an Charles (1997)	
	wolfteit als webe set.	
	Nedelog at Capton of	3.35: 0 1:50
	Pope de Égain.	cese=diay
	$\frac{1}{2}$ for the state of the matrix $ \psi_{ij} _{ij} = 0$	4.18 m
	Meron ceronizado a dive	2.2 \$3 styl
	General a sufficient of the set o	(2) a.
4	Manufactor Montever (Manufactor)	16.3 34 gene
	Constitute a Phone and the Const	and the set
:	En explosive Automatic Mathematic	
	We are at the still	F
	Carle Geland Films on Filmsen mission Commonder (G. 1	47.5 (1)
	Past an manufacture of a state of	
	French and Shows Separate a Course of Mar	
	Fishing Contraction and the State of the Sta	10 Mar 10
1. A.		10 C 10 C 10 C 10 C
	E a ser a	TOTIC COLUMN
		of the second
	Constitution of a constitution	10 C 61 10
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Designation of the second sec second second sec	101 C
	Parate of the second of the second	2. S. S. S.
	(a) Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Seco Second Second Sec	
	e presenta characteria presenta controla del 1	-1449 C. S

Figure C-8: Blow-through analysis for scenario 5 for case study #2.



	Elepticia For Elementaria Matrifil Op	2. <sup>12</sup> 61
	Sectors g S & Sco	
	Leask Habi Gers	6 S. w.
	Dand Genheit, in Fleenbrichen Ste-	£.46
	George with Concerned Removal	1. S. C. S. M.
	film tees of details and	i i i
	without the Parts	
	Neg dia 364 Provisione	- 49
	Acres Gansta	of 1
	Anades of Lorentein	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
	Para Lo et Pa	it
	Energia Completi seve de majobilit <sub>ensere</sub> nt Borandt Reporter d'Ouent en kenelabret	14
	alayes a per cashara an Radi ya ang Disarday	
Complete rate Stran	gth Bark Slan Sofiau de Nordour (Elstres van ee St	2.5 C
	Cangdo un	95 - F
	Sector M	
	Mager Bre	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
	Corpers Pape	
	regyr agarte Replaced	
-	Could be in Stopping Right	338 . 83
	There as the ar	CONTRACTOR -
	Monter of Rooma Carls	Stief and
	More the first of the the the t	10 M of 1
	Charlander and As our stands of	6.37 25
	Marcon and Conserval 1, 1	25, 24, 47, 65
	Case in an and the second s	100 A 100
	Coundria Russia Paulier	
	hig mean testing if	Course of the
	On which we Drug as there is an early structure of the	28.8 (5)
	<sup>17</sup> all users Drugs when the are	
	Constants Black Free and Constants Mark	and the second second
	Style and the Party share a Style of	
- <u>-</u>	here and the second	17.000
	Constant Margaret	0000
- 11 - Contract - Contra	Example of the second sec	
	A CONTRACT DATE OF A CONTRACT OF	124.10
:	Construction of the second se second second sec	
-	new word that is an englished by the destruction of the second second second second second second second second	
	Here is a state of the state of	
	<ul> <li>And stands to sear parently of more reacting of 3</li> </ul>	a distance
-	1.5 (6 × 2 × 2 × 2 × 2 × 2 × 2 × 2 × 2 × 2 ×	

Figure C-9: Blow-through analysis for scenario 6 for case study #2.



Houses         E           Carde Dohrs are         0.5 a.           Carde Dohrs are         0.5 b.           Card Dohrs are         0.5 b. <tr< th=""><th>Example on Text Representing Revealed On</th><th>10 a. 1</th></tr<>	Example on Text Representing Revealed On	10 a. 1
Depth on Blancaut Remains (Barry 1997)         3.5.5.4.           Depth on Blancaut Remains (Barry 1997)         3.8.7.5.4.           Depth on Blancaut Remains (Barry 1997)         3.8.7.7.4.           Depth on Blancaut Remains (Barry 1997)         3.8.7.7.4. </th <th>Presente des plantes frazes</th> <th></th>	Presente des plantes frazes	
Depart of Economic Sections         Status         Status <th>Casola Thiata de s</th> <th></th>	Casola Thiata de s	
Description         Distribution of Programmer         Distribution           Biologic del Press	Legit in Exercise Rendering Ren	e an
Floridader 2013 (1997) (1997) (1997) Floridader 2013 (1997)	<u> </u>	<u> 335 a.</u>
Construction of Characteristic Structure State Stat	De némer a des d'Agricos	
Construction and Programs (a) Provide Equation (Construction) Provide Example Example Example Example Example Exa	heitigt Augest Mass	
1000 With a conserved in the second secon	Countier Jew Process and	SI
Provide of Underson Provided in the Provided in the Standard Provided Provided in the Standard Provided Provided Provided International Provided P	1202198 Calebra	•
Construction of Constructio	the gradient and a second s	99
And Sign Complete Subsection of Action (Monitory and Action) in the Action of Action (Monitory and Action (Monitory and Action) in the Action of Action (Monitory and Action) in the Action (Monitory and Action) in th	1100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100	
Maria age Datine 3 Determined Research     S       Compresence Differing de la service de la celebrative de	a na siya siya na siya na siya siya siya siya siya siya siya siy	ži.
Longitud en Strangele ziele et de la transferide de la Consectada de la constanti de la consta	Two upper Colonal J. Stetacourd Microban	
Ling gibrill branching Ling gibrill branching Ling gibrill Draw sens Flass Madeubur of Roador end Madeubur of Roador en	Construction Brangelics, and called a barrelise of the according	
Inspector       Haspetor         Inspector       Inspector         Againspace Posterior       Againspace Posterior         Inspector       Inspector	lige gibitit	
Handberg Land       Line result Land         Line result Land       A going see Replaced         Read-bar of Read-or al, 1       40.00 (cl)         Read-bar of Read-or al, 1       4	har-dt-	1. Sec.
<ul> <li>A group the Physics and</li> <li>Machalan of Randons in T. (2000) [10]</li> <li>Machalan of Construction (Machalan of Tables)</li> <li>Machalan of Construction (Machalan of Table</li></ul>	Prephora.	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
Marging Rec Propagate     4.8.03, [3]       Marg	Luorese 184	
Oradober of Statute et al.     4.0000 (18)       Depend Spran     Depend Spran     Depend Spran       Normare et beserville, in     0.08 (18)       Depend Spran     0.08 (18)	er Binneld and Friday Friday - Friday	
Bype of Sprin       Same water         Bype of Sprin <th>Construction of Chandrews and</th> <td>80036 (3)</td>	Construction of Chandrews and	80036 (3)
Numeric of boards (kg)     Numeric of boards (kg)     Numeric of boards (kg) <u>Destination Representation</u> <u>Destination of Representation</u> <u>DEStination</u> <u>Destination Representation</u> <u>DEStination</u> <u>DEStination</u> <u></u>	England Spear	300 B. 19520
Prometer in Research Res       12.83 and <u>Distances in Research Res</u> 18.83 and <u>Research Research Res</u> 18.33 and <u>Research Research Res</u> 193.33 and <u>Research Research Res</u> 193.34 and <u>Res</u> <t< th=""><th>Norman of the States of the St</th><th>- 5.0≷ st<sup>1</sup></th></t<>	Norman of the States of the St	- 5.0≷ st <sup>1</sup>
Encomposed Manager (Manager (Manage	Proving on college of the rest of the	12.83 47
<ul> <li>Historica, Maria et (A<sub>nod</sub>)</li> <li>Historica, Maria</li></ul>	Electronic Merce (Electronic Merce)	1.6 m
<ul> <li>Constant Robert Black and California a</li></ul>	Hagene in Manager (A. 1997)	223 33 4-81
If a three Desired Ferral     Mathematic Desired Stream and the formation of the f	Capabilities Main Beneditation	and have been
Maximum Breastruged     Maximum Breastruged       One Way Ebut at the english One example of Concerning Biology     Maximum Biology       Some Diversities Ebut at the english of Concerning Biology     Maximum Biology       Some Diversities Ebut at the english of Concerning Biology     Maximum Biology       Some Diversities Ebut at the english of Concerning Biology     Maximum Biology       Some Diversities Ebut at the english of Concerning Biology     Maximum Biology       Maximum Biology     Maximum Biology     Maximum Biology       One of the english of Concerning Biology     Maximum Biology     Maximum Biology       One of the english of Concerning Biology     Maximum Biology     Maximum Biology       One of the english of Concerning Biology     Maximum Biology     Maximum Biology       One of the Biology     Maximum Bi	A read December of	
Image: State of the second concerned with the second	And an ar Stress and	100 A 20 m
Preduce of Covertifier bits for     Statut and Street Specifier Covertifier bits for     Statut and Street Specifier Covertifier bits for       Preduce of Street Specifier Covertifier Bits     Statut and Street     Statut and Street       Preduce of Street Specifier Covertifier Bits     Statut and Street     Statut and Street       Preduce of Street Specifier Covertifier Bits     Statut and Street     Statut and Street       Preduce of Street Street Street Street     Statut and Street Street     Statut and Street Street       Preduce Street Street Street Street Street     Statut and Street Street Street Street Street     Statut and Street Street Street Street Street Street       Preduce Street S	Constant She and the second of Constant Ville	e pú que
Formalise a Bheera Barea para / Construction (Major     Clading (Major     Clading (Major     Clading (Major       Channes a Bheera (Breach and Bheer     Channes a Bheera (Breach and Bheer     Clading (Drans and Major     Clading (Drans and Major       Channes and Chang (Chae and Bheer     Channes a Bheera (Breach and Bheer     Clading (Drans and Major     Clading (Drans and Major       Channes and Chang (Chae and Bheera     Channes (Drans and Major     Clading (Drans and Major     Clading (Drans and Major       Channes and Chang (Chae and Bheera     Channes (Drans and Major     Clading (Drans and Bheera     Clading (Drans and Bheera       Channes and Chang (Chae and Bheera     Clading (Drans and Bheera     Clading (Drans and Bheera     Clading (Drans and Bheera       Channes and Chang (Drans and Bheera     Clading (Drans and Bheera     Clading (Drans and Bheera     Clading (Drans and Bheera	Findere av Orservicius blas av	
If and a public public data is Sheet     208-72 Juli       Observation Monetaria (March     2070-72 Juli       Observation (March     201-72 Juli       Observation (March     201-72 Juli	3. Sumpling blandbard bard and Construct Multi-	11.12
Objects and Depress (DB and Depress (DD and D	Canada Sheet	
Others and Mark     Apple Autom       Others and Mark     Others and Mark       Others and Description Offsets     Mark and Streets	<ul> <li>Diagona in Monary IM, 201</li> </ul>	228.72
Charactering Ocas for User, so User and the set of the	Caractering Plane and Mart	and Same
Conservation Densities (Conservation) (Conservation	Classification Otale to Dieso, le	
One-set with the Break global Constraints of Constraints (Constraints) (	- Description of the set Description	Tikt stigt see
Christian One relay take to Prior bing Stream prior Compared (V), 0 777,077	One-way Press Press de précision de la	1872 #
Francisco Structures (Compared Wight TTTTTT)	Colorado One milationa a	
	Print Lang France, reparation if Conceptual March	
PHONE BY DEVELOPMENT DEVELOPMENT	Final-tree as Print Party fails as	

Figure C-10: Blow-through analysis for scenario 7 for case study #2.



	Card on Conserving and March 19	26.5
	Floor a couport for the set	
	Figure 1 (Part) part -	8 °
	Genillete dani am Fisimi assinis Mus	the set
	Barthers Counters Same and	3,375
-	Ministry of Senetacovs	
	Westerland and	
	Dite the dist Plant trips	24.
	(Logita Eper stor	
	Andy of Loadin F	240
	Read and R	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
	Report Contractsive Strength (Contracts)	DC 1
	Witness Roberts and Marches. In station	
	Avera to Bornick Flatter of Average	
Сописнения сельсе	gd (Serged on Erfennik er mbos (Serre grandel) 🦷	0.20
	100 (Supple)	a second
	5sm(5)	99 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 -
	etangen del	a s
	льотканесе. У сунч	
	Аддья пайл Реші злей	
	Phone distance of the	4 (13 - 5 - 2.5)
	Spread Spread	and the second
	Manager and south a	145.65
	Momento, inears du	80.50 will
	Editorship & red Deliveral Alastip (	0.66 (6)
	the march and block and the march of the second	183 S.4 1E.
di seconda de la constante de	Crearing Reprint (M.)	10 S 46 B
- <del>1</del>	Cased in the Case of Francis of	
	Massertha Press, March	741 ED 8:
- 1	Carle Mean phease Science in the Experience of C	West of
	altere vietting milan brie at	
2	Republication for any filtre period of Connected and an	17160
1	Constant and the address from a	
	Theorem Review (17)	And the second second
	Construction (Construction)	and the second second
X.		
	Manager and Man	ALL AND A
	<ul> <li>For the second seco</li></ul>	
	Reading and the second s	
		0.000
	provide a la construcción de	

Figure C-11: Blow-through analysis for scenario 8 for case study #2.



	Exactives For Representing Mills (DCD)	and the second
	boorde organise forza:	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
	Caseda Thanking and	a a second a
	Deprive Disroans Reindowing Rein	2 - 65 - 65
	Cherces of Charles and a conserve	10.2 Co. 4.
	<ul> <li>Developed a Police Construction</li> </ul>	
	1997 - 1997 -	·
	1.0002000 (0.891 m.069251.005) 1.000000 (0.0000000000000000000000000000	the second s
	<ul> <li>Contraction of the second se Second second seco</li></ul>	
	na serie da	
	The second seco second second sec	
	a. We Shipper Constraints for the Address of the Constraint of the Society of the Constraint of the	n in
	[10] A. B.	
Contractor and Reviews	(1) A start and the second start of the sec	
And Burnet Concerning	<ul> <li>I and the second se Second second s Second second se</li></ul>	
	Constant and Constant	
	instanti di Antonio di	
	and an and a second	
	Sciences startise education	
	(North Average Statements)	10 o sai
	Type or Spare	onenurer.
	Plantered at levents (Fig.)	2 th 2 m
	Electronic de transferencies de la construcción de la const	24 <u>92</u> m <sup>2</sup>
	Elin social to Hautral Average	$q(S^{*}, m)$
	blassreau blomarc Bh	203 84 67 6
	Cargery way blow and (Mar)	million of the
A State of the second se	Classification Okais no Please in	
	<ul> <li>Essencem Stream Descent</li> </ul>	131-031-024
	<ul> <li>One-of an Brees Brees global Constants (V) press</li> </ul>	1273-14
	Preimaria One sway take ta	
	<ul> <li>Reaction processing to the Comparise Direction</li> </ul>	1.1.1.1
	Fishere in Princhers film a	
	Chapter and Series of His and	283 67 July 15
	Charles in the market of the	4722 met-
	Capatina Dua to Haster e	
	Ne general Asy get e	1.4.4% B
	One-wise block Sciences of Consister Wild	100 C
	his sugar Chevis Store	
	Constant State Courses of Constants W	5506 W
	Concerned and Since See a	

Figure C-12: Blow-through analysis for scenario 9 for case study #2.



# APPENDIX D CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION AT TOP MAT OF REINFORCING STEEL WITH AN APPLIED SURFACE TREATMENT

Figures D-1, D-2, and D-3 show the numerical modeling results for the top mat of reinforcing steel in a concrete bridge deck with a 2.0-, 2.5-, or 3.0-in. OCD, respectively, with an applied surface treatment.



Figure D-1: Simulated chloride concentrations at the top mat of reinforcement for a deck with 2.0-in. OCD and a 3.375-in. removal depth with an applied surface treatment.




Figure D-2: Simulated chloride concentrations at the top mat of reinforcement for a deck with 2.5-in. OCD and a 3.875-in. removal depth with an applied surface treatment.



Figure D-3: Simulated chloride concentrations at the top mat of reinforcement for a deck with 3.0-in. OCD and a 4.375-in. removal depth with an applied surface treatment.



## APPENDIX E CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION AT BOTTOM MAT OF REINFORCING STEEL WITH AN APPLIED SURFACE TREATMENT

Figures E-1, E-2, and E-3 show the numerical modeling results for the bottom mat of reinforcing steel in a concrete bridge deck with a 2.0-, 2.5-, or 3.0-in. OCD, respectively, with an applied surface treatment.



Figure E-1: Simulated chloride concentrations at the bottom mat of reinforcement for a deck with 2.0-in. OCD and a 3.375-in. removal depth with an applied surface treatment.





Figure E-2: Simulated chloride concentrations at the bottom mat of reinforcement for a deck with 2.5-in. OCD and a 3.875-in. removal depth with an applied surface treatment.



Figure E-3: Simulated chloride concentrations at the bottom mat of reinforcement for a deck with 3.0-in. OCD and a 4.375-in. removal depth with an applied surface treatment.



## APPENDIX F CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION AT TOP MAT OF REINFORCING STEEL WITHOUT AN APPLIED SURFACE TREATMENT

Figures F-1, F-2, and F-3 show the numerical modeling results for the top mat of reinforcing steel in a concrete bridge deck with a 2.0-, 2.5-, or 3.0-in. OCD, respectively, without an applied surface treatment.



Figure F-1: Simulated chloride concentrations at the top mat of reinforcement for a deck with 2.0-in. OCD and a 3.375-in. removal depth without an applied surface treatment.





Figure F-2: Simulated chloride concentrations at the top mat of reinforcement for a deck with 2.5-in. OCD and a 3.875-in. removal depth without an applied surface treatment.



Figure F-3: Simulated chloride concentrations at the top mat of reinforcement for a deck with 3.0-in. OCD and a 4.375-in. removal depth without an applied surface treatment.



104

## APPENDIX G CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION AT BOTTOM MAT OF REINFORCING STEEL WITHOUT AN APPLIED SURFACE TREATMENT

Figures G-1, G-2, and G-3 show the numerical modeling results for the bottom mat of reinforcing steel in a concrete bridge deck with a 2.0-, 2.5-, or 3.0-in. OCD, respectively, without an applied surface treatment.



Figure G-1: Simulated chloride concentrations at the bottom mat of reinforcement for a deck with 2.0-in. OCD and a 3.375-in. removal depth without an applied surface treatment.





Figure G-2: Simulated chloride concentrations at the bottom mat of reinforcement for a deck with 2.5-in. OCD and a 3.875-in. removal depth without an applied surface treatment.



Figure G-3: Simulated chloride concentrations at the bottom mat of reinforcement for a deck with 3.0-in. OCD and a 4.375-in. removal depth without an applied surface treatment.

