

Final Report

**Jobsite Evaluation of Corrosion Resistant Alloys For
Use As Reinforcement In Concrete**

**Innovative Bridge Construction Program
(BD-440)**

submitted to

**Florida Department of Transportation Research Center
605 Suwannee Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399**

submitted by

**William H. Hartt
Center for Marine Materials
Department of Ocean Engineering
Florida Atlantic University – Sea Tech Campus
101 North Beach Road
Dania Beach, Florida 33004**

December, 2005

Disclaimer

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of the State of Florida Department of Transportation.

SI* (MODERN METRIC) CONVERSION FACTORS				
APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS TO SI UNITS				
SYMBOL	WHEN YOU KNOW	MULTIPLY BY	TO FIND	SYMBOL
LENGTH				
in	inches	25.4	millimeters	mm
ft	feet	0.305	meters	m
yd	yards	0.914	meters	m
mi	miles	1.61	kilometers	km
AREA				
in²	square inches	645.2	square millimeters	mm ²
ft²	square feet	0.093	square meters	m ²
yd²	square yard	0.836	square meters	m ²
ac	acres	0.405	hectares	ha
mi²	square miles	2.59	square kilometers	km ²
VOLUME				
fl oz	fluid ounces	29.57	milliliters	mL
gal	gallons	3.785	liters	L
ft³	cubic feet	0.028	cubic meters	m ³
yd³	cubic yards	0.765	cubic meters	m ³
MASS				
oz	ounces	28.35	grams	g
lb	pounds	0.454	kilograms	kg
T	short tons (2000 lb)	0.907	megagrams (or "metric ton")	Mg (or "t")
TEMPERATURE (exact degrees)				
°F	Fahrenheit	5 (F-32)/9 or (f-32)/1.8	Celsius	°C
ILLUMINATION				
fc	foot-candles	10.76	lux	lx
fl	foot-Lamberts	3.426	candela/m ²	cd/m ²
FORCE and PRESSURE or STRESS				
lbf	poundforce	4.45	newtons	N
lbf/in²	poundforce per square inch	6.89	kilopascals	kPa
APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS FROM SI UNITS				
SYMBOL	WHEN YOU KNOW	MULTIPLY BY	TO FIND	SYMBOL
LENGTH				
mm	millimeters	0.039	inches	in
m	meters	3.28	feet	ft
m	meters	1.09	yards	yd
km	kilometers	0.621	miles	mi
AREA				
mm²	square millimeters	0.0016	square inches	in ²
m²	square meters	10.764	square feet	ft ²
m²	square meters	1.195	square yards	yd ²
ha	hectares	2.47	acres	ac
km²	square kilometers	0.386	square miles	mi ²
VOLUME				
mL	milliliters	0.034	fluid ounces	fl oz
L	liters	0.264	gallons	gal
m³	cubic meters	35.314	cubic feet	ft ³
m³	cubic meters	1.307	cubic yards	yd ³
MASS				
g	grams	0.035	ounces	oz
kg	kilograms	2.202	pounds	lb
Mg (or "t")	megagrams (or "metric ton")	1.103	short tons (2000 lb)	T
TEMPERATURE (exact degrees)				
°C	Celsius	1.8C+32	Fahrenheit	°F
ILLUMINATION				
lx	lux	0.0929	foot-candles	fc
cd/m²	candela/m ²	0.2919	foot-Lamberts	fl
FORCE and PRESSURE or STRESS				
N	newtons	0.225	poundforce	lbf
kPa	kilopascals	0.145	poundforce per square inch	lbf/in ²

*SI is the symbol for the International System of Units. Approximate rounding should be made to comply with Section 4 of ASTM E380. (Revised March 2003.)

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Job Site Evaluation of Corrosion Resistant Alloys for Use As Reinforcement in Concrete Innovative Bridge Construction Program		5. Report Date December, 2005	
		6. Performing Organization Code FAU-OE-CMM-05	
7. Author(s) William H. Hartt and Diane K. Lysogorski		8. Performing Organization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Center for Marine Materials Florida Atlantic University – Sea Tech Campus 101 North Beach Road Dania Beach, Florida 33004 and Florida Department of Transportation – State Materials Office5007 NE 39th Avenue Gainesville, FL 32609		10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
		11. Contract or Grant No. BD 440	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Florida Department of Transportation 605 Suwannee Street, MS 30 Tallahassee, FL 32399		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes			
16. Abstract Premature deterioration of the nation's concrete highway and bridge structures as a consequence of chloride (salt) exposure and resultant corrosion of reinforcing steel has evolved during the past four decades to become a formidable technological and economic problem. In response to this, epoxy-coated reinforcing steel (ECR) was adapted in the mid-1970's as a pro-active measure to control this problem. Premature corrosion induced cracking of marine bridge substructures in Florida indicated, however, that ECR is of little benefit for this type of exposure; and while performance of ECR in northern bridge decks has been generally good to-date (30-plus years), still the degree of corrosion resistance to be afforded in the long-term to major structures with design lives of 75-100 years is uncertain. Corrosion resistant reinforcements, including stainless steels, are an alternative for such applications, and a component of the FHWA Innovative Bridge Research and Construction Program (IBRC) addressed incorporated of such reinforcements into approved state bridge construction projects. The present project evaluated a selected number of these in terms of the type of reinforcement used and difficulties and advantages that were encountered. Of the 27 approved state projects for which information could be gathered; 20 were either completed as planned or utilized an alternate corrosion resistant reinforcement. The different reinforcements types were solid Types 316 (three projects), 2201LDX (one project), and 2205 (five projects) stainless steels, Type 316 stainless clad black bar (three projects), MMFX-II™ (thirteen projects), and galvanized steel (three projects). In some cases, more than one corrosion resistant reinforcement was used on a single project. The various state projects demonstrated that, subject to availability, corrosion resistant reinforcing steel can be incorporated into bridge construction with relative ease and placed with less difficulty than ECR. Thus, these reinforcements are a viable technical alternative to ECR. Realizing the full benefit of this IBRC program, however, will depend upon individual states acquiring performance data and maintaining records on these structures for decades into the future.			
17. Key Word Corrosion, corrosion resistant reinforcing steel, stainless steel, concrete, bridges		18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through NTIS, Springfield, VA 22161	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 82	22. Price

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)

Reproduction of completed page authorized

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is indebted to engineers of the many State Departments of Transportation who cooperated in both time and effort with this study. Their names are too numerous to mentioned here but are listed as the State Contact in Table 1 and in Appendices A-G.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Premature deterioration of the nation's concrete highway and bridge structures as a consequence of chloride (salt) exposure and corrosion of reinforcing steel has evolved during the past several decades to become a formidable technological and economic problem. Specification of epoxy-coated reinforcing steel (ECR) for at-risk structures commenced some thirty years ago; however, corrosion induced cracking of concrete bridge substructures in the Florida Keys as early as seven years after construction led to concern that ECR may not provide the 75-100 year service life that is presently being required for major bridges. In response to this, recent attention has focused upon more corrosion resistant reinforcement, stainless steels in particular, as an alternative. This redirection has been facilitated by the transition in design and maintenance planning philosophy to a life-cycle costing basis, which gives credit for the fact that the higher initial expense of more corrosion resistant steel may be recovered later in the life of the structure as a consequence of reduced repairs and rehabilitations.

Within the above context, the Federal Highway Administration Innovative Bridge Research and Construction Program (IBRC) was established to encourage evaluation of corrosion resistant reinforcement in highway bridge projects. The present study was initiated as a three year undertaking to document such IBRC projects that utilized corrosion resistant reinforcement. Specific objectives were to 1) provide a summary of the different alternative reinforcements that have become available and which can be used in bridge construction, 2) provide a summary of representative IBRC projects that have employed corrosion resistant reinforcements, 3) acquire samples of the alternative reinforcement from different job-sites and characterize these in terms of a) composition, b) mechanical properties, c) uniformity, d) conformance to specification (where applicable), and e) performance in accelerated corrosion tests, and 4) establish a repository for the acquired reinforcement samples and preserve these as an archival record and reference for historical documentation purposes.

Records made available to the project team indicated that IBRC projects involving corrosion resistant reinforcement were approved for 27 states; and of these, 20 either completed the project as planned or with an alternate innovative reinforcement. The different innovative reinforcements and the number of projects for each () were:

1. Solid Type 316 stainless steel (3),

2. Solid Type 2201LDX stainless (1),
3. Solid Type 2205 stainless (3),
4. Type 316 stainless clad black bar (2),
5. MMFX-II™ (12), and
6. Galvanized steel (3).

Five different job sites were visited by the project team, reinforcement samples acquired, and a report issued (included here as appendices). In addition, sufficient information was available for two other projects such that a report could be issued. Evaluation of the field acquired samples indicated that these conformed to the applicable specification. Accelerated testing in both this and an ongoing companion study (BD 228) indicated corrosion resistance greatly in excess of that for black bar and in some cases what is anticipated for ECR also. A difficulty for many of the construction projects was that neither of the two producers of the clad stainless bar were able to reliability meet delivery schedules, and so alternative materials had to be substituted in all but two cases. Realizing the full benefit of employing corrosion resistant reinforcement in these IBRC projects will depend upon the individual states maintaining records and acquiring performance data for decades into the future. The various state projects demonstrated that, subject to availability, corrosion resistant reinforcing steel can be incorporated into bridge construction projects with relative ease and actually with less difficulty than ECR.

The study indicated that corrosion resistant reinforcing steel, including stainless steels, are a viable technical alternative to ECR.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page no.</u>
Background and Introduction	1
Project Objectives	2
IBRC Projects Involving Corrosion Resistant Reinforcement	3
General	3
Results and Discussion	8
Hallmark Projects	8
Compositional Analyses of Innovative Reinforcements from Job Sites	9
Mechanical Properties of Innovative Reinforcement Samples from Job Sites	9
Corrosion Testing of Job Site Bars	9
Conformance of Innovative Reinforcement to Specification	11
Reinforcement Costs	13
Conclusions	14
Bibliography	15
Appendix A: FHWA Project Number DE-00-01	17
Appendix B1: FHWA Project Number FL-00-01 (part 1)	24
Appendix B2: FHWA Project FL-00-01 (part 2)	29
Appendix C: FHWA Project Number MO-00-01	40
Appendix D: FHWA Project Number MT-01-01	44
Appendix E: FHWA Project NH-02-03	52
Appendix F: FHWA Project Number	62
Appendix G: FHWA Project Number SC-00-01	68

LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>page no.</u>
Figure 1: Distribution of information acquisition and analysis for the IBRC projects	7
Figure 2: Accelerated testing data for Type 2201 stainless steel specimens	12
Figure 3: Accelerated testing data for 316 clad stainless steel specimens from two sources	12
Figure 4: Accelerated testing data for stainless steel job site bars	13
Figure 5: Cost comparison of the various reinforcements	14

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>page no.</u>
Table 1: Listing of approved IBRC projects involving innovative reinforcing steel	4
Table 2: Listing of innovative reinforcements employed in IBRC projects	7
Table 3: Number of projects involving various innovative reinforcement types	7
Table 4: Chemical composition for corrosion resistant rebar samples	9
Table 5: Listing of mechanical properties for job site acquired bars	10

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

For a nation to be productive, its transportation system must be efficient and reliable. While deterioration of highway structures over time is a normal and expected occurrence, the rate at which this has occurred for bridges in the U.S. since advent in the 1960's of a clear roads policy and use of roadway deicing salts in northern locations has been severe and posed significant challenges, both economically and technically. Also important is that accelerated deterioration has occurred for bridges in coastal locations, both northern and southern, as a consequence of exposure to sea water (chlorides) and sea spray. In both cases (deicing salts and marine exposure), the deterioration is a consequence of the aggressive nature of chlorides in combination with availability of moisture and oxygen (1). Over half of the total bridge inventory in the United States is of the reinforced concrete type, and these structures have proved to be particularly susceptible. A recent study (2) has indicated that the annual direct cost of corrosion to bridges is \$5.9-9.7B. If indirect factors are included also, this cost can be as much as ten times higher (3).

In response to this problem, research studies that focused upon the utility of epoxy-coated reinforcing steel (ECR) were initiated; and in the early 1970's ECR was qualified as an alternative to black bar (4,5). Consequently, for the past 30 years ECR has been specified by state Departments of Transportation (DOTs) for major decks and substructures exposed to chlorides. At the same time, ECR was augmented by use of low water-to-cement ratio (w/c) concrete, possibly with pozzolans or corrosion inhibitors (or both), and covers of 65 mm or more (6).

However, in Florida coastal waters, ECR has proven ineffective (7-10) because of the combined effects of higher average temperature and more prolonged moist exposure. Several comprehensive research studies, including evaluations on actual bridges, were conducted that further investigated, first, the suitability of epoxy-coatings for reinforcement corrosion control and, second, in service ECR performance (11-13). The general finding from these was that time-to-corrosion initiation for ECR and black bar are approximately the same but that the propagation period for ECR to cause concrete surface cracking can range from about the same as for black bar, as noted for Florida bridge substructures, to decades in northern bridge decks. Thus, while ECR performance in the latter type application has been generally good to-date and results from long-term testing programs indicate that two mats of ECR in bridge decks should provide a 75-100 year service life with minimal maintenance as presently specified for major bridge structures

(13), still this is not known with certainty. In response to this, interest has focused during the past decade upon alternatives that afford more corrosion resistance than ECR, stainless steels in particular. Such corrosion resistant steels become particularly competitive on a life-cycle cost basis, since the higher initial expense of the steel per se may be recovered over the life of the structure via reduced repairs and rehabilitations.

The Innovative Bridge Research and Construction Program (IBRC)¹ was authorized by Congress in the TEA-21 legislation initially as a six year effort (FY 1998-2003) but was subsequently extended through May, 2005. The program objective was to provide resources whereby states could demonstrate the utility of innovative materials and technology in construction of bridge and highway structures. The majority of the funding (\$142M) was for actual repair, rehabilitation, and replacement of existing structures and for new construction with a lesser amount (\$4M) for research, both based upon innovative materials. Corrosion resistant reinforcements constitute one component of the Program.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

As part of the IBRC Program, a three year study was performed by Florida Atlantic University and the Florida Department of Transportation to document the projects that employed corrosion resistant reinforcements and to provide an evaluation of their use. Specific project objectives were as listed below:

- I. Provide a summary of the different alternative reinforcement products that have become available and which are being used in bridge construction.
- II. Provide a summary of representative IBRC projects that have employed corrosion resistant reinforcements.
- III. Acquire samples of the alternative reinforcement employed in IBRC projects from the different job sites and characterize these in terms of mechanical properties, uniformity, conformance to specification (where applicable), and performance in accelerated corrosion tests.
- IV. Establish a repository for the acquired reinforcement samples and preserve these as an archival record and reference for historical documentation purposes.

¹ Statutory references: 23 U.S.C. 503(b)(3)(A)(ii) & 503 (b)(3)(B); TEA-21 Section 5103

IBRC PROJECTS INVOLVING CORROSION RESISTANT REINFORCEMENT

General

Task I was accomplished in conjunction with a companion research project and resulted in an FHWA publication (14). Table 1 lists information that was made available to the project team regarding approved state IBRC projects involving innovative reinforcement (Task II). This shows that 27 state projects were approved; and of these, 20 either completed the project as planned or with an alternate innovative reinforcement. These completed projects include seven different types of innovative reinforcements, as listed in Table 2.² A dual listing is given for clad stainless steel since two very different production methods are involved. Likewise, Table 3 lists the number of projects, both as-planned and as-completed, that employed each specific reinforcement type. Those involving ECR and Black Bar reflect instances where the supplier was unable to meet schedule in providing the specified innovative reinforcement, and so these were used as the fall-backs. Delivery was particularly a problem in the case of stainless clad reinforcement, where one producer (Stelax, Inc., steel designated below as “Source 1”) went into receivership during the project time frame and the other (SMI Steel, Inc., designated as “Source 2”) experienced unexpected technical production difficulties. This was disappointing since stainless clad rebar has the potential of providing excellent corrosion resistance at relatively low unit cost. These two companies are addressing their respective difficulties, and one is now producing again and the second hopes to be in production next year. In many of the instances where a specified alternative reinforcement could not be delivered on schedule, MMFX-II™ served as the replacement; and this reinforcement was consistently delivered in a timely manner even though the lead time was sometimes short.

Figure 1 shows the number of projects in each of the Table 1 footnote classes. This indicates that five of the projects were visited by the project team (Note 1 designation). In each case, samples of the innovative reinforcement were acquired. For two additional projects (FHWA Project Numbers MO-00-01 and SC-00-01), one of which was completed prior to the present study, sufficient information was provided by the respective state DOT personnel that a report was prepared. Each of these seven reports is included below as Appendices A-G. In instances where samples of the innovative reinforcement were acquired from a job site,

² Galvanized steel reinforcement does not strictly qualify as “innovative” in that it has been available for many years and has been employed on a limited basis in past bridge construction.

Table 1: Listing of approved IBRC projects involving innovative reinforcing steel.

FHWA Project Number	DOT Structure No.	Road	DOT Contact	Reinforcement Specified	Reinforcement Used	Project Type	Comments
DE-00-01	1-119	SR 82	Keith Gray	SS Clad	MMFX-II™	Rehab	Note 1
FL-00-01	150048	SR 679	William Domico	Clad 316 SS	Solid Type 2205 SS	Repl	Note 2
FL-01-01	890146	Jensen Beach Causway	William Nickas	MMFX-II™	MMFX-II™	Repl	Note 1
	890145			Solid Type 2201 SS	Solid Type 2201 SS		
GA-02-01	123-00282D-004.00E	SR 282	Paul Liles	SS Clad	Black Bar	Repl	Note 3
ID-02-01	18710	Westmond Br, US-95	Luis Zarate	Clad 316 SS	MMFX™	Repl	Note 4
ID-02-02	12871	SH21	Ken Classen	MMFX-II™	MMFX-II™	Repl	Note 5
IL-98-07	011-6011	N 18 th St Bridge	Roy Baranzelli	-	Galvanized	New	Note 5
IN-00-01	I-65-267-5055A & JA	I-65	Tommy Nantung	SS Clad	ECR	Rehab	Note 5
IO-01-01	new	Hwy 520	Norm McDonald	MMFX-II™	MMFX-II™	New	Note 4
KY-01-02	105-1218-C0034	CR1218 Galloway Rd	Steve Goodpaster	MMFX-II™	MMFX-II™	Repl	Note 5
MI-01-02	33133045000R123	EBD I-496	Dave Juntunen	SS Clad	Solid SS	Repl	Note 4
MN-00-02	27168	T.H. 100 under	Erik Wolhowe	SS Clad	-	New	Note 6
MO-00-01	A6059	Rte 6	Ray Purvis	Solid 316LN SS	Solid 316LN SS	Repl	Note 7
MO-02-02	A6369	Rte 136	Ray Purvis	MMFX-II™	ECR	Repl	Note 3
MO-01-02	A6098	Rte 86	Ray Purvis	SS Clad	ECR	Repl	Note 3
MT-01-01	P00001180+0.399-1	US2	Joe Kolman, Nigel Mends	Solid Type 316 or 2205 SS	Solid Type 316LN SS	Repl	Note 1
NC-02-02		SR1178 over I-95	Roger Roschell	MMFX-II™	MMFX-II™	Deck	Note 4
ND-00-01	94-290.803	I-94	Clayton Schumaker	SS Clad	SS Clad	New	Note 5
NE-01-02	SLB00317	Skyline Drive	Gale Barnhill	SS Clad	ECR	New	Note 3
NH-02-01	003501370012300	I-93	Mark Whittemore	MMFX-II™	MMFX-II™	Rehab	Note 5
NH-02-03	016101850007700	I-293 WB over Frontage Rd. I-293 WB over Brown Ave.	Paul Nadeau	Clad 316L SS Type 316L or 316LN SS	ECR (EB) Galvanized (WB) ECR (EB) Galvanized (WB)	Repl	Note 1

Table 1 (continued): Listing of approved IBRC projects involving innovative reinforcing steel.

FHWA Project Number	DOT Structure No.	Road	DOT Contact	Reinforcement Specified	Reinforcement Used	Project Type	Comments
NJ-02-01	1604-161	Rte 23 NB	Harry Capers	MMFX-II™	MMFX-II™ not qualified based upon NJDOT testing. Clad stainless steel then specified but reverted to ECR when clad could not be delivered.	Repl	Note 3
NJ-02-01	1604-162	Rte 23 NB ramp I					
NJ-02-01	1604-163	Rte 23 SB ramp B					
NJ-02-01	1604-164	Rte 23 SB					
NJ-02-01	1606-175	Rte 46 WB, ramp G					
NJ-02-01	1609-153	I-80 ramp B					
NJ-02-01	1606-176	Rte 46 EB, ramp D & E					
NJ-02-01	1606-177	Rte 46 WB, ramp I					
NJ-02-01	1604-411	West Belt Bridge					
OK-01-01	14514	I-35	John Leonard, Jay Gilbreath	SS Clad	MMFX-II™	New	Note 1
PR-02	000002061	PR-102	Javier E. Ramos	MMFX-II™	MMFX-II™	New	Note 8
SC-00-01	264007300200	Rte SC73	Randy Cannon	Clad (Source 2), 2205 SS, and MMFX-II™		Repl	Note 4
SD-01-01	07-112-326	US281	Dan Johnston	MMFX-II™ then Clad 316 SS	Type 2205 SS	Repl	Note 4
SD-02-01	50178191	Russell Ave	Dan Johnston	MMFX-II™ then Clad 316 SS	Type 2205 SS	Repl	Note 4
SD-02-01	51180180	Maple Avenue	Dan Johnston	MMFX-II™ then Clad 316 SS	Type 2205 SS	Repl	Note 4
SD-02-01	50181180+50179191	I-29	Dan Johnston	MMFX-II™	ECR	Repl	Note 3
TX-02	-	Washington St. under IH-40	-	MMFX-II™	-	Deck	-
UT-01-01	2D653	EB SR-79	DOT	SS Clad	ECR		Note 3
VA-98-01	new	WBL Rte 460	Steve Sharp	SS Clad	SS Clad (Source 1)	New	Note 7
VA-01-01	6200 & 6202	Route 123 bridge over Occoquan	Steve Sharp	SS Clad	MMFX-II™	Repl	To be placed in 06

Table 1 (continued): Listing of approved IBRC projects involving innovative reinforcing steel.

FHWA Project Number	DOT Structure No.	Road	DOT Contact	Reinforcement Specified	Reinforcement Used	Project Type	Comments
VT-02-01	200034006410072	VT 105	David Scott	MMFX-II™	MMFX-II™	New	Note 5
WI-00-02	B-56-153	USH 12	Gerry Anderson	SS Clad	ECR	New	Note 5
WV-02-01	000011A074	Truss .07 mi E C/R 119-13	Terry Bailey	SS Clad	Black Bar	Repl	Note 3

Note 1: Project visited and inspected. Samples acquired and report issued.

Note 2: Project completed prior to the present study. No report issued but samples available.

Note 3: Project modified. Innovative reinforcement not used.

Note 4: Project not visited or inspected. No samples available.

Note 5: Project completed prior to the present study. No report or material available.

Note 6: Funds diverted to another project that did not involve innovative reinforcement.

Note 7: Project completed prior to the present study. Report issued. No material available.

Note 8: Project not visited. Samples acquired.

Table 2: Listing of innovative reinforcements employed in IBRC projects.

Designation	Common Name
-	Clad 316 SS (1)
-	Clad 316 SS (2)
ASTM A615, Grade 75	MMFX-II™
ASTM A955-98	SS Type 2201LDX
UNS-S31603	SS Type 316LN
UNS 31803	SS Type 2205
-	Galvanized Steel

Table 3: Number of projects involving various innovative reinforcement types.

	Planned	Constructed
Solid SS	4	9
Clad SS	18	3
MMFX-II™	24	13
Galvanized Steel	0	3
ECR	-	7
Black Bar	-	2




Figure 1: Distribution of information acquisition and analysis for the IBRC projects.

composition and mechanical properties were determined; and in some cases accelerated corrosion tests were performed.

Results and Discussion

Hallmark Projects: Two of the projects for which reports were written (MT-01-01 and SC-00-01) merit special comment because of their unique nature. The first involved a replacement bridge across the Middle Fork of the Flathead River on US 2 in Flathead County, Montana. Permitting and closure for repair issues are such that it was desirable to have this bridge in uninterrupted service for as long as possible. With regard to permitting, one end of the bridge terminates on land owned by Glacier National Park and the other on land administered by Flathead National Forest. At the same time, the Flathead River is under jurisdiction of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and contains several threatened or endangered species. Permitting for this project was complicated because these, as well as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and various State agencies, were also involved. Consequently, it was reasoned by the Montana Department of Transportation that any future repairs, rehabilitations, or replacement would be complex and difficult. In addition, because of the rural setting and mountainous surroundings, closure of this bridge results in a 480 km (300 mile) detour for motor traffic. For these reasons, the added initial cost of corrosion resistant reinforcement was particularly justified.

An additional issue that is particularly noteworthy arose in conjunction with this project (MT-00-01). The specification called for either Type 2205 or 316LN stainless as the reinforcement. It was assumed that the latter would be delivered because it generally is less expensive; however, the bridge engineer subsequently reported that the bars analyzed as Type 2205 stainless steel. While both material met specification and were acceptable, this situation points out a potential problem in that different stainless grades are generally not visually distinguishable. Consequently, where stainless reinforcement is employed, an independent determination should be made to confirm that the delivered product conforms to what was specified.

The second project (SC-00-01) was particularly noteworthy because it incorporated five different reinforcement scenarios, 1) Black Bar with discrete Galvashield XP™ embedded galvanic anodes, 2) Black Bar without anodes, 3) Type 2205 stainless steel, 4) Type 316 clad Black Bar (Source 2), and 5) MMFX-II™. Individual spans were constructed using one of these

five alternatives. It was initially intended that the Black Bar without anodes span would utilize 316 clad stainless steel from Source 1; however, delivery delays as discussed above precluded this. As constructed, this bridge affords an excellent opportunity for side-by-side comparison of a variety of reinforcing steel corrosion control alternatives.

A number of other projects also provide the opportunity for future side-by-side comparisons but in these cases between the corrosion resistant reinforcement and ECR. Thus, in instances of a divided highway one bridge commonly utilized ECR and the second an innovative reinforcement.

Compositional Analyses of Innovative Reinforcements from Job Sites: Chemical analysis was performed on samples of bars from six job sites, as reported in Table 4. The results indicate that composition for all MMFX-II™ bars is within the specified range for that material. For the Source 2 cladding (SC-00-01), carbon concentration exceeds the upper limit for some 316 grades and is at the upper limit for others. Bars of this composition should not be welded unless special precautions are taken. The MT-01-01 bars are within the specified composition range for 2205 stainless.

Table 4: Chemical composition for corrosion resistant rebar samples.

Project Number	Reinforcement Type	Composition, weight percent										
		C	Mn	P	S	Si	Cr	Ni	Mo	Cu	N	Fe
MT-01-01	Type 2205	0.03	1.79	0.029	0.001	0.32	22.46	5.09	3.16	0.24	0.17	Bal.
PA*	MMFX-II™	0.07	1.45	0.011	0.014	0.22	9.19	0.12	0.01	0.09	-	Bal.
PR-02	MMFX-II™	0.09	1.20	0.012	0.006	0.24	9.21	0.16	0.02	0.08	-	Bal.
OK-01-01	MMFX-II™	0.08	0.57	0.015	0.020	0.11	8.47	0.14	0.01	0.15	-	Bal.
DE-00-01	MMFX-II™	0.11	1.09	0.011	0.008	0.18	9.35	0.13	0.01	0.13	-	Bal.
SC-00-01	Clad (Source 2)	0.08	1.44	0.001	0.001	0.47	16.18	10.34	2.51	0.21	-	Bal.

* Not an IBRC project.

Mechanical Properties of Innovative Reinforcement Samples from Job Sites: Mechanical properties of samples of the same six corrosion resistant reinforcements that were chemically analyzed (Table 4) were determined, and the results are listed in Table 5. All bars were #5 and qualified as Grade 60, although the MMFX-II™ is of considerably higher strength than is normally experienced here. All bars met their applicable standard specification, where one exists.

Corrosion Testing of Job Site Bars: Type 2201 stainless samples acquired from the job site of Project FL-01-01 and clad bar samples (Source 2), which were from the same production run as

Table 5: Listing of mechanical properties for job site acquired bars.

Project Number	Reinforcement Type	Yield Point, ksi	Tensile Strength, ksi	Elong., %	Weight, lb/foot		Cold Bend++	Deform. Height, in.
					Theor.	Actual		
MT-01-01	Type 316LN	98	115	24	1.043	1.070	OK @ 180	0.043
PA*	MMFX-II™	145	162	6	1.043	1.003	+++	0.031
PR-02	MMFX-II™	140	158	10	1.043	1.018	+++	0.037
OK-01-01	MMFX-II™	***	159	9	1.043	1.004	OK@180	0.036
DE-00-01	MMFX-II™	***	173	5+	1.043	1.047	OK@180	0.035
SC-00-01**	Clad (Source 2)	72	105	15	1.043	1.059	OK @ 180	0.033

* Not an IBRC project.

** Material tested was stainless clad black bar from source 2.

*** No yield point identified.

+ Did not break in gage area.

++ Pin diameter 2.19 in.

+++ Insufficient length to test.

those used in Project SC-00-01, were subjected to corrosion testing in conjunction with a companion research project (15). Several different surface preparations (as-received (rolled), carbon steel shot blasted, silica sand blasted, and stainless steel shot blasted) were used for the former alloy (2201) as a part of a Florida Department of Transportation program to identify the most appropriate condition. Based upon that program, silica sand blasted 2201 was qualified for the project. Accelerated corrosion testing of MMFX-II™ bars from three job sites (PR-02, OK-01-01, and DE-00-01) as well as the Type 2205 bars from MT-01-01 were also tested.

The accelerated test procedure was modeled after that from an earlier program (16) and involved exposure of triplicate specimens to repetitive 1.75 hours wet – 4.25 hours dry cycles for a total of 84 days. The test solution was 0.3N KOH-0.05N NaOH (pH ~ 13.40) simulated pore water with 3.00, 9.00, and 15.00 weight percent (w/o) NaCl (1.82, 5.46, and 9.10 w/o Cl) for each of three successive 28 day periods. Polarization resistance (inversely proportional to corrosion rate) measurements were made periodically during the exposures using a Gamry CMS100 potentiostat with a scan rate of 0.333 mV/sec and polarizations of +/-0.020 V referenced to the free corrosion potential. Prior to scanning, potential was monitored for 300 seconds or to a time lapse until any variations were less than 0.1 mV/sec.

Figure 2 shows a plot of polarization resistance (Rp) as a function of exposure time for the various Type 2201 stainless specimens along with data for Black Bar and Type 316 stainless for comparison. Specimens labeled according to the four surface conditions were provided directly by the Florida Department of Transportation, whereas the specimen designated “Jensen Beach”

(these were silica sand blasted) were acquired directly from the job site where they had been stored uncovered about one km inland for approximately six weeks. The data show that Rp for the Type 2201 specimens occupy a band about 1-2 orders of magnitude above that for Black Bar and 1-2 orders of magnitude below the Type 316. Scatter of Rp for the different categories of Type 2201 specimens is about an order of magnitude with the silica sand and stainless steel blasted materials occupying the upper range. Also, there is a tendency beyond about 50 days for Rp to decrease with time (increasing corrosion rate).

Figure 3 shows a plot of Rp for MMFX-II™ specimens from three of the job sites compared to data for straight and bent bar specimens of this same steel (labeled “Lab”) that were provided directly to the project by MMFX Corporation. The results indicate general consistency between the different job site and lab MMFX-II™ specimens with Rp for these being 5-10 times greater than for Black Bar.

Figure 4 shows Rp versus time data for specimens prepared from MT-01-01 job site bars (Type 2205) and clad bars from the same heat as Project SC-00-01 (not actually from the job site). Data for the Type 316 and Type 2205 stainless that was provided directly to the project by a supplier are shown for comparison. Polarization resistance for the SC-00-01 clad bars varies from the lower range to an order of magnitude below that for the solid 316 (higher corrosion rate for the former). Results for the MT-01-01 specimens fall 3-10 times below those for the laboratory Type 2205 specimens. Thus, while data for laboratory received and job site MMFX-II™ bars are comparable, corrosion rate for the more corrosion resistant job site bars was higher than for the laboratory received counterpart. These differences are being evaluated in conjunction with the companion activity (15).

Conformance of Innovative Reinforcement to Specification: Mechanical properties of specimens prepared from the corrosion resistant reinforcement samples that were acquired from job sites (Table 5) were compared with those listed in the relevant specifications (ASTM A 955/A 955M-05a, “Standard Specification for Deformed and Plain Stainless-Steel Bars for Concrete Reinforcement,” for Type 2205 stainless; ASTM A 1035/A 1035M-05, “Standard Specification for Deformed and Plain, Low-carbon, Chromium, Steel Bar for Concrete Reinforcement,” for MMFX-II™; and AASHTO Designation MP 13M/MP 13-04, “Stainless Clad Deformed and Plain Round Steel Bars for Concrete Reinforcement,” for the clad bars). All properties of the




Figure 2: Accelerated testing data for Type 2201 stainless steel specimens.




Figure 3: Accelerated testing data for MMFX-II™ steel specimens.




Figure 4: Accelerated testing data for stainless steel job site bars.

stainlesses, both solid and clad, conformed to the applicable specification (ASTM A 955/A 955M-05a and AASHTO Designation MP 13M/MP 13-04, respectively). The same applies to MMFX-II™ (ASTM A 1035/A 1035M-05) with the exception of elongation, where 6 percent was measured for PA bars (not an IBRC project) and 5+ percent for SC-00-01 but with the specification value being 7 percent. It should be pointed out, however, that the ASTM specification pertaining to MMFX-II™ was only issued in 2004, and the bars in question were produced prior to that date.

Reinforcement Costs: Economics are an important component of any construction materials evaluation. For the reason of evaluating this within the context of the present study, reinforcement costs were acquired for projects for which reports were issued and are presented in Figure 5. This shows that the average cost for the 316 and 2205 stainlesses was \$5.34/kg and for the MMFX-II™ \$1.46/kg. These values may be misleading, however, for the following reasons:

1. Reinforcement costs can be expected to decline if the materials become more common.

2. For some unknown reason, the cost for MMFX-II™ employed in conjunction with Project FL-01-01 is unrealistically low (less than for Black Bar). On the other hand, the MMFX-II™ for DE-00-01 and OK-01-01 was provided on short notice because the originally specified clad bar could not be delivered in a timely manner. This could have elevated the cost.
3. The listed unit cost is not necessarily the lowest that was available, as material costs were often lumped into the contractor's bid. In the case of Project MT-01-01, the bid unit costs ranged from \$4.10 to \$5.27/kg. Apparently, by going with the lowest overall contractor bid, a premium was paid for the reinforcing steel per se.




Figure 5: Cost comparison of the various reinforcements.

CONCLUSIONS

The various IBRC projects demonstrated that, in most situations and subject to availability, corrosion resistant reinforcing steel can be incorporated into bridge construction projects with relative ease. Construction personnel at several job sites indicated that corrosion resistant reinforcement placement was more straightforward than for ECR because of the care that must be exercised to avoid coating damage on the latter. Further alloy development, particularly in the case of stainless clad, should be encouraged. Attempts should be made to compare results from ongoing laboratory studies, wherein methodologies for projecting long-term performance of corrosion resistant reinforcement from short-term tests are being developed, with data from the

IBRC bridges as the latter become available. This will require, however, that states maintain records for the respective bridges and commit to a long-term monitoring and data acquisition program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Virmani, Y.P, Jones, W.R., and Jones, D.H., *Public Roads*, Vol. 84(3), 1984, p. 96.
2. Koch, G.H., Brongers, P.H., Thompson, N.G., Virmani, Y.P, and Payer, J.H., "Corrosion Costs and Prevention Strategies in the United States," Report No. FHWA-RD-01-156, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, DC, March, 2002.
3. Yunovich, M, Thompson, N.G., and Virmani, Y.P., "Life Cycle Cost Analysis for Reinforced Concrete Bridge Decks," paper no. 03309 to be presented at CORROSION/03, March 10-14, 2003, San Diego.
4. Stafford, R.T., "Epoxy Coated Rebars," *Parking*, March-April, 1973, p. 39.
5. Clifton, J.R., Beehgly, H.F., and Mathey, R.G., "Non-Metallic Coatings for Concrete Reinforcing Bars," Report No. FHWA-RD-74-18, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, DC, Feb., 1974.
6. Virmani, Y.P. and Clemena, G.G., "Corrosion Protection: Concrete Bridges," Report No. FHWA-RD-98-088, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, DC, Sept., 1998.
7. Powers, R.G. and Kessler, R., "Corrosion Evaluation of Substructure, Long Key Bridge," Corrosion Report No. 87-9A, Florida Department of Transportation, Gainesville, FL, 1987.
8. Powers, R.G., "Corrosion of Epoxy-Coated Rebar, Keys Segmental Bridges Monroe County, Report No. 88-8A, Florida Department of Transportation, Gainesville, FL, August, 1988.
9. Zayed, A.M. and Sagues, A.A., "Corrosion of Epoxy-Coated Reinforcing Steel in Concrete," Paper No. 386 presented at CORROSION/89, New Orleans, LA, April 21, 1989.
10. Gustafson, D.P., "Epoxy Update," *Civil Engineering*, Vol. 58, No. 10, p. 38, 1988.
11. Clear, K.C., "Effectiveness of Epoxy-Coated Reinforcing Steel," Final Report submitted to Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute, Dec., 1991.
12. Clear, K.C., Hartt, W.H., McIntyre, J., and Lee, S-K, "Performance of Epoxy-Coated Reinforcing Steel in Highway Bridges," Report 370, Transportation Research Board, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1995.
13. Lee, S-K and Krauss, P.D., "Long-Term Performance of Epoxy-Coated Reinforcing Steel in Heavy Salt Contaminated Concrete," Report No. FHWA-HRT-04-090, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, DC, June, 2004.

14. Hartt, W.H., Powers, R.G., Leroux, V., and Lysogorski, "A Critical Literature Review of High-Performance Reinforcements in Concrete Bridge Applications," Report No. FHWA-HRT-04-093, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, DC, July, 2004.
15. Hartt, W.H., Powers, R.G., Lysogorski, D.K., Liroux, V, and Virmani, Y.P., "Corrosion Resistant Alloys for Reinforced Concrete," Draft Interim report submitted to FHWA by Florida Atlantic University, June 15, 2005.
16. McDonald, J.B., Pfiefer, D.F., and Blake, G.T., "The Corrosion Performance of Inorganic-, Ceramic-, and Metallic-Clad Reinforcing Bars and Solid Metallic Reinforcing Bars in Accelerated Screening Tests," Report No. FHWA-RD-96-085, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C, Oct., 1996.

APPENDIX A
FHWA Project Number DE-00-01

TEA 21 INNOVATIVE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM Evaluation Report

State: Delaware.

State DOT Contact: Mr. Keith Gray [(302) 760-2327]

Bridge Number: 1-119.

Project Type: Deck Replacement.

Location: Bridge on SR 82 crossing Red Clay Creek in Ashland, New Castle County.

Innovative Material: MMFX-II™ reinforcing steel.

Bridge Description: The bridge is a relatively short, historical, single span structure on a secondary roadway. As such, no deicing salts have normally been employed. Deterioration of the old deck involved concrete cracking and other distress that was apparently a consequence of freeze-thaw damage. The reinforcing steel (conventional black) was said to have been in good condition. Initially, stainless steel clad reinforcement was specified; but because of delivery problems, this was changed to MMFX-II™. The project consisted of a full deck replacement and painting of the existing steel girders. The approach roadway was repaved, and new steel beam guardrails (polyester coated brown) were placed. The guardrail was attached to new barrier walls that were constructed adjacent to the existing barrier. This was designed to match the historic architecture of the existing barrier. The existing alignments and roadway widths were maintained. Figure A-1 shows a side view of the bridge and of Red Clay Creek, while Figure A-2 is a photograph of the deck prior to concrete pouring but with the MMFX-II™ reinforcement in place.



Figure A-1: Side view of Bridge No. 1-119.



Figure A-2: Photograph of the bridge deck with MMFX-II™ reinforcement in place.

Innovation Justification: The bridge is subject to application of deicing salts, and chloride levels in the old deck were extremely high. It was considered that specification of a corrosion resistant reinforcement in the replacement deck would reduce maintenance costs and extend the life of the bridge.

Construction Sequence: The contractor's construction sequence for the deck replacement involved the following sequential steps:

1. Removal of the existing deck.
2. Partial removal of the backwalls and construction of new joints.
3. Sandblasting the steel girders.
4. Placement of welded on shear studs.
5. Painting.
6. Placement of the reinforcing steel and monitoring devices (the monitoring devices were placed by the University of Delaware to assess load-deflection behavior).
7. Construction of formwork including a longitudinal bulkhead.
8. Poured the south side of the bridge deck.
9. Poured the north side.
10. Construction of the longitudinal joint.
11. Pouring of curbs and safety walk.
12. Mechanically grooving the bridge deck.

A3 shows a general view of the in-place reinforcement, including that for the curb along one of the railings. Also shown are the girders and welded shear studs. A-4 provides a view of forming for the bulkhead at the other bridge end. A closer view of reinforcing bars and a girder with welded shear studs is shown in Figure A-5. The longitudinal and transverse bars are #5s with spacing for the former being 10 inches and the latter 12 inches. Figure A-6 is also a close-up view of the in-place



Figure A-3: General view of in-place reinforcement, girders with studs, curb, and bulkhead.



Figure A-4: Close-up view of reinforcing steel, girder with shear studs, gusset plate, and forming for bulkhead.




Figure A-5: Photograph of reinforcing steel and a girder with studs.




Figure A-6: Close-up view of in-place reinforcing steel showing superficial corrosion.

reinforcement showing superficial rusting. The steel had been on-site for approximately 20 days with rain having occurred during much of this time. This corrosion was judged to be less than what would have occurred with conventional uncoated black steel.

Reinforcement Specification: DeDOT did not have a material specification because, first, the use of MMFX-II™ steel was a field change and, second, the product is new. The

design was based upon properties of conventional steel, and it was considered that the higher strength of MMFX-II™ would provide a further factor of safety.

Concrete Specification: The concrete was DeDOT Class D, “Deck Concrete,” the mix design for which is given in Table A-1. Slab thickness varied from 10.5 inches at the center to 8.5 inches at the outside. Design cover over the reinforcement was 2.5 inches.

Table A-1: Concrete Mix Design.

Cement Content (Type I), pcy	458
Slag/Fly Ash, pcy	247
Fine Aggregate, pcy	1,051
Coarse Aggregate, pcy	1,846
Water Content, gal/cy	33.9
Water-Cement Ratio	0.4
WRA (Sikament-MP), oz/94 lbs cementitious material	40-80
Air Content, percent	5-8
Polypropylene Fibers, pcy	1.5

Job Contractor: Greggo and Ferrara, Inc.
4048 New Castle Avenue
New Castle, DE 19720
(302) 658-5241

Steel Supplier: MMFX Corporation of America, Inc. Subsequent to FHWA approval for substituting MMFX-II™ for stainless steel clad reinforcement, the contractor contacted MMFX-II™ directly to determine cost and availability. Straight bars were shipped to the contractor’s steel fabricator (ReSteel) where cuts and bends were made. ReSteel then shipped the bars directly to the job site. There were no delays or delivery problems in acquiring the MMFX-II™ reinforcing steel.

Material Cost: The MMFX-II™ material cost for 8.79 metric tons was \$15,120 for a unit price of \$0.78 per pound (\$1.72 per kg). The in-place reinforcing steel cost was \$2.95 per pound (\$6.49 per kg).

Job Site Storage: The reinforcing steel was delivered elevated on a flatbed truck and stored elevated and uncovered on the ground.

Material Acquisition: Six bent bar details were made available from the job storage site for testing by FAU and FDOT. Figure A-7 shows a photograph of these.



Figure A-7: Photograph of MMFX-II™ reinforcement details acquired from the job site.

APPENDIX B-1
FHWA Project Number FL-00-01, Part 1

TEA 21 INNOVATIVE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM Evaluation Report

State: Florida.

State DOT Contact: Mr. Randall Scott [(772) 225-1888]

Bridge Number: 890146 (East Relief Bridge).

Project Type: Replacement.

Location: Bridge crossing the St. Lucie River at Jensen Beach.

Innovative Material: MMFX-IITM Reinforcing Steel.

Bridge Description: This bridge is the eastern-most of two four lane structures³ that serve as a causeway between Jensen Beach and Stuart on the southeast Florida coast. It is replacing a 50 year old, low profile, two lane bridge that has become badly deteriorated because of the combined effects of brackish water, near-ocean exposure and age and is now functionally obsolete. Figure B-1.1 shows a perspective photograph of what is to be the north-most two lanes (west bound) phase of the bridge. Construction of the south-most (east bound) two lanes will commence once the north-most one is completed. The project is scheduled for completion in March, 2004. Each bent consists of four 0.6 m (24 inch) square prestressed pilings, conventionally reinforced pile caps, and 16 deck spans. These components, plus barrier and parapet walls, are reinforced with conventional steel except for eight deck spans (numbers 9-16) which are reinforced with MMFX-IITM. The deck spans are formed cap-to-cap using an



Figure B-1.1: Perspective view of replacement Bridge Number 890146.

³ The second or west-most bridge (Frank A. Wacha Bridge of Bridge Number 890145) is addressed in a companion IBRC report.

assembly of plywood on transverse and then on longitudinal I-beams. The framing is pulled subsequent to concrete setting and is reused.

Innovation Justification: The bridge is subject to a marine exposure in a semi-tropical south Florida coastal environment. It is anticipated that MMFX-II™ reinforcement will provide improved corrosion resistance and thereby facilitate achieving a 100 year design life.

Construction Sequence: The contractor's construction sequence involves the following steps:

13. Driving of conventional prestressed piles.
14. Forming, steel placement, and pouring of pile caps. Figure B-1.2 shows a view of piles and pile cap for a specific bent.
15. Deck Forming, steel placement and pouring of the deck. The deck is being placed from west to east with each span being formed and poured as a separate unit.

Figures B-1.3 and B-1.4 show photographs of the MMFX-II™ steel in place on the deck.



Figure B-1.2: Photograph of substructure components prior to decking.

Reinforcement Specification: At the time of construction, no national standard existed for MMFX-II™ reinforcing steel. In lieu of this, the manufacturer's "Product Bulletin" dated September, 2001 was employed. The eight MMFX-II™ deck spans require a total of 145,004 kg (319,734 pounds) of reinforcement. All longitudinal bars for both mats are #32 (metric designation) and are spaced at 165 mm in the top mat and 200 mm in the bottom. All transverse bars are #16 (metric designation) and are spaced at 300 mm in the top and 255 mm in the bottom mat.



Figure B-1.3: Photograph of MMFX-II™ deck steel in place.



Figure B-1.4: Second view of MMFX-II™ deck steel in place.

Concrete Specification: The concrete was specified as conforming to Class IV of Section 346 of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) State Specifications Office. Table B-1 provides a listing of required properties.

Job Contractor: Archer Western, Inc.
Jacksonville, FL

Steel Supplier: MMFX Steel Corporation of America, Inc.

Table B-1.1: Concrete Mix Design.

Min. Cementitious Content (Type II + Pozolans), kg/m ³	390
Maximum Water-Cement Ratio	0.41
Target Slump, mm	75
Air Content Range, percent	1-6
Minimum Compressive Strength (28d), MPa (ksi)	38 (5.5)
Water-Cement Ratio	0.41

Material Cost: The contractor indicated the in-place cost for MMFX-II™ as \$0.80/kg (\$0.36/pound). This is an abnormally low figure, particularly in view of the fact that the corresponding cost for black steel was \$1.00/kg (\$0.45/pound). Apparently, the true cost was concealed in a larger package; however, efforts to disclose the details of this have not been successful.

Job Site Storage: The bars were stored wrapped with polyethylene and elevated. Figure B-1.5 shows a photograph of this. This specific measure was considered important because there was a single delivery of all reinforcement. Consequently, bars for the south-most (east bound) bridge for which construction has not yet commenced will be on site for a number of months prior to placement.



Figure B-1.5: Photograph of stored MMFX-II™ reinforcing steel at the job site.

Construction Difficulties: No construction difficulties have been encountered.

APPENDIX B-2
FHWA Project FL-00-01 (part 2)

TEA 21 INNOVATIVE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM Evaluation Report

State: Florida.

State DOT Contact: Mr. Randall Scott, P.E. [(772) 225-1888]

Bridge Number: 890145 (Frank A. Wacha Bridge).

Project Type: Replacement.

Location: Bridge crossing the St. Lucie River at Jensen Beach.

Innovative Material: Type 2201 Stainless Steel Reinforcement.

Bridge Description: The bridge is the center of three two lane structures⁴ that serve as a causeway between Jensen Beach and South Hutchinson Island on the southeast Florida coast. It is replacing a 50 year old, low profile, two lane bascule bridge that has become badly deteriorated because of the combined effects of brackish water exposure and age and is now functionally obsolete. Figure B-2.1 shows a perspective photograph of the project which is scheduled for completion in March, 2005 (note the old bridge in the background). The substructure design involves conventional, driven prestressed piles, cast-in-place footers, columns and cast-in-place hammerhead column caps. The superstructure is constructed with precast Florida bulb-tee beams and a cast-in-place deck. Unlike northern areas that employ deicing salts such that



Figure B-2.1: Perspective photograph of the Jensen Beach Causeway Bridge under construction.

⁴ The second or east-most bridge (East Relief Bridge or Bridge Number 890146) is addressed in a companion IBRC report.

deterioration from embedded steel corrosion and concrete cracking and spalling is largely confined to the deck, it is the substructure of coastal bridges in Florida that typically experience the greatest distress. While most of the reinforcement in this bridge is conventional bar or prestressing strand, the footer and column of two piers (numbers 11 and 12 which are just to the right of the leftmost crane in Figure B-2.1) are being constructed using Type 2201 stainless steel. The east-most bridge, the construction of which is of longer duration, will have MMFX-II™ reinforcement in eight deck spans.

Innovation Justification: The bridge is subject to a marine exposure in a semi-tropical south Florida coastal environment. It is anticipated that 2201 stainless steel (ss) reinforcement will provide improved confidence in structures of this type achieving a 100 year life.

Construction Sequence: The contractor's construction sequence involved the following sequential steps:

1. Driving of conventional prestressed piles. Figure B-2.2 shows a photograph of these, as driven, for the number 12 pier.
2. Cut prestressed pilings to grade.
3. Placement of 203 mm (8 inch) thick seal slab and associated footer formwork.
4. Placement of footer reinforcement. Figure B-2.3 shows a photograph of this in progress for the footer of pier number 11, and Figure B-2.4 does the same for pier number 12.
5. Pouring of footer concrete.
6. Placement of prefabricated column reinforcement cage.
7. Placement of column formwork.
8. Pouring of column concrete.
9. Placement of hammerhead cap form.



Figure B-2.2: Photograph of driven, cut-off prestressed piles for pier 11.



Figure B-2.3: Photograph of formwork, piles, and reinforcement being placed in the footer of pier number 12.

10. Placement of cap steel.
11. Pouring of cap concrete.
12. Placement of Florida bulb-tee beams.
13. Deck placement.

Figure B-2.5 shows a closer view of the in-place 2201 bars at the bottom of the footer for



Figure B-2.4: Photograph of formwork, piles, and reinforcement being placed in the footer of pier number 12.

pier number 12. The threaded conventional steel bars and support I-beams upon the piles remain in place, but the black bars will be isolated from the 2201 prior to concrete pouring. The tie wire is also stainless steel (type unknown).

Figure b-2.6 shows a perspective view of the reinforcement cage for column number 11 as fabricated prior to placement. At the time of this photograph, the cage had been in this




Figure B-2.5: View of 2201 ss in place at the base of the footer formwork.



Figure B-2.6: Photograph of 2201 ss reinforcement cage for the column of pier number 11.

position for approximately six weeks. Figure B-2.7 is a close-up view of a portion of the cage showing the bars to be generally excellent condition. As Figure B-2.8 shows a conventional bar reinforcing steel cage for a hammerhead column cap that had been exposed for approximately the same length of time as the column cage (Figures B-2.6 and B-2.7). Here, rusting over the whole surface is apparent.



Figure B-2.7: Close-up view of a portion of the 2201 ss reinforcing bars in the column cage prior to placement in pier number 11.



Figure B-2.8: Photograph of the conventional bar reinforcement cage for a hammerhead column cap.

Figure B-2.9 shows a photograph that was taken several weeks after the ones above of the column steel and forms of pier number 11 in place.




Figure B-2.9: Photograph of pier number 11 column formwork and 2201 ss cage in place.

Reinforcement Specification: The column and bottom mat footer bars are #36 (metric designation) and the top mat footer bars are #19 (metric designation). A total of 8,048 kg (17,746 lb) of reinforcement was required for each footer. The column of pier number 11 required 10,422 kg (22,981 lb) of reinforcement and for pier number 12 9,741 kg (21,479 lb), the difference resulting from the difference in height. Clear cover in both cases is specified as 115 mm (4.5 inches).

Concrete Specification: The concrete was specified as conforming to Class IV of Section 346 of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) State Specifications Office. Table B-2.1 provides a listed of required properties.

Table B-2.1: Concrete Mix Design.

Min. Cementitious Content (Type II + Pozolans), kg/m ³	390
Target Slump, mm	75
Air Content Range, percent	1-6
Minimum Compressive Strength (28d), MPa (ksi)	38 (5.5)
Maximum Water-Cement Ratio	0.37

Job Contractor: Archer Western, Inc.
Jacksonville, FL

Steel Supplier: GerdauAmeriSteel, Inc. as supplied by Avesta Sheffield in Sweden.

Material Cost: The delivered cost was \$2.43/kg (\$1.10/pound).

Job Site Storage: The column cage fabrication commenced shortly after bars were delivered. Consequently, the bars were stored elevated but uncovered per FDOT Specification 415.

Special Considerations: Prior to delivery of the steel, the supplier (GerdauAmeriSteel, Inc.) expressed concern that the as-rolled 2201 would surface rust as a consequence of the use of carbon steel rolling and handling equipment. A test program was performed by the FDOT Corrosion Laboratory in Gainesville to assist in selection of an appropriate surface treatment. A copy of the report issued by FDOT is attached as Appendix A. Based upon this, blasting with silica sand was selected with the specification for this being described in Appendix B. From the appearance of the stainless steel at the job site (see Figures B-2.3 to B-2.7), this treatment accomplished what was intended.

During construction, ground leads were installed to the 2201 column steel. The purpose of these is to facilitate subsequent continuity and corrosion test measurements. The work was performed by Concorr Florida, Inc. under direction from the FDOT Corrosion Laboratory in Gainesville.

Construction Difficulties: The 2201 column and footer cages were fabricated on the construction site. There was concern at this time that, if mistakes were made such that replacement reinforcement was needed, a major project delay would result since the source was in Sweden. However, the fabrication occurred without incident; and so this concern did not materialize.

Appendix B2-1

Florida Department of Transportation Corrosion Research Laboratory

Four sets of 16mm bars of alloy 2201 stainless steel furnished by GerdauAmeristeel, Inc., were received for testing as per ASTM G85, "Standard Practice for Modified Salt Spray (Fog) Testing." The four sets received had different surface condition as per the following table:

Set #	As Received Surface Condition
1	Carbon Steel Shot Blasted
2	Plain
3	Sand Blasted
4	Stainless Steel Shot Blasted

Half of the bars for each set were pickled as per ASTM A380, "Standard Practice for Cleaning, Descaling, and Passivation of Stainless Steel Parts, Equipment, and Systems," Table A1.1 "Acid Descaling (Pickling) of Stainless Steel," Code B, followed by scrubbing with plastic fiber brush in hot running tap water. The bars were exposed in salt spray tank for 3 days positioned horizontally as shown in Figure B2-A1.



Figure B2-A1. Bars Positioned in salt fog chamber.

The following photographs show the condition of the bar samples after salt spray exposure:



Figure B2-A2: Bars 1A & 1B.



Figure B2-A3: Bars 2A & 2B.

Bar 1A. Shot Blasted with Carbon Steel , 98% area corroded, heavy corrosion
 Bar 1B. Shot Blasted with Carbon Steel and pickled, 3% area corroded, light corrosion.
 Bar 2A. Plain, 98% area corroded, heavy corrosion.
 Bar2B. Plain Pickled, 2% area corroded, light corrosion.



Figure B2-A4: Bars 3A & 3B.



Figure B2-A5: Bars 4A & 4B.

Bar 3A. Sand Blasted with silica sand, 5% area corroded, light corrosion.
 Bar 3B. Sand Blasted with silica sand and pickled, 1% area corroded, light corrosion.
 Bar 4A. Shot Blasted with Stainless Steel, 50% area corroded, light corrosion.
 Bar 4B. Shot blasted with Stainless Steel and Pickled, <1% area corroded, light corrosion.

Appendix B2-2



Jacksonville Mill
217 Yellow Water Road
Jacksonville, FL 32234

Stainless Blasting Procedure

Work to be performed at Blast Tech.

1. Rod Powers, State Materials Office, will be notified prior to blasting. 352/337-3134 work, 352/334-1649 fax, Rodney.powers@dot.state.fl.us e-mail
2. Bars will be placed on work stands approximately one third full. This will depend on the diameter of the bars. Bars will be blocked if the blasting causes them to roll.
3. The bars will be hand blasted with silica sand covering approximately one half the diameter. Blasting sand will not be reused.
4. The bars will then be rotated one third of a turn.
5. The bars will be hand blasted with silica sand covering approximately one half the diameter.
6. The bars will then be rotated another one third of a turn.
7. The bars will be hand blasted with silica sand covering approximately one half the diameter.
8. The blasters will then remove their hoods and inspect the bars touching up as needed. The bars shall be free of mill scale and red rust.
9. The bars will then be tied with 9 gauge PVC coated wire using eight ties.
10. The bundles will then be handled using a spreader beam and nylon straps to load on a spare trailer. The bars will be maintained upon wooden or padded cribbing during transport and storage.
11. Bill Stephens will visit and inspect loads prior to shipping.

APPENDIX C
FHWA Project Number MO-00-01

TEA 21 INNOVATIVE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM Evaluation Report

State: Missouri.

State DOT Contact: Mr. John D. Wenzlick [(405) 521-2606]

NBI Bridge Number: A6059

Project Type: Replacement Bridge.

Location: Bridge crossing Medicine Creek and an adjoining field runoff stream on SR 6 near Galt (approximately 100 miles NW of Kansas City).

Innovative Material: Solid Type 316LN Stainless Steel.

Bridge Description: The new bridge is one of a sequential pair, where the companion bridge (Bridge Number A6060) is approximately 600 feet east of the bridge in question. Bridge Number A6059 consists of a reinforced concrete slab that was formed conventionally. Bridge Number A6060, on the other hand, employed permanent precast prestressed structural form panels and a cast-in-place topping between the external girders. The slab overhang from the external girders was conventionally formed. Epoxy-coated reinforcing steel (ECR) was employed for the companion bridge. Roadway width and girder spacing are the same for the two bridges, but span length and skew differ. Both bridges were opened to traffic in June, 2001. Figure C-1* provides a perspective view of the two bridges, and Figure C-2 shows a profile of one



Figure C-1: General view of the Route 6 bridges.

* All photographs courtesy of Mr. John Wenzlick, MoDOT.

of the two. A view of the stainless steel reinforcement, as placed in the deck of Bridge Number A6059, is provided in Figure C-3. A report detailing the bridges and a comprehensive evaluation program that is planned is available from MoDOT (1).



Figure C-2: Side view of Bridge Number 6059.



Figure C-3: Photograph of bridge deck with stainless steel in place.

Innovation Justification: The anticipated good corrosion resistance of the Type 316LN stainless reinforcing steel compared to ECR and certainly to black steel should result in reduced maintenance and life-cycle cost for the bridge.

Construction Sequence:

Reinforcement Specification: The Type 316LN stainless steel met the specification of ASTM A955M Grade 420 deformed bars that were called for in Special Provisions.

Concrete Specification:

Job Contractor:

Steel Supplier: Empire Specialty Steel, Inc., Dunkirk, NY.

Material Cost: Material cost for the stainless steel for Bridge Number A059 was \$2.55 per pound (\$5.63 per kg). The ECR material cost for Bridge Number A6060, on the other hand, was \$0.80 per pound (\$1.77 per kg). Black steel priced at \$0.64 per pound (\$1.40 per kg).

Job Site Storage:

Problems:

Material Acquisition: No steel from the job site was available for evaluation.

Reference:

1. Wenzlick, J.D. and Yin, X., "Evaluation of Stainless Steel Reinforcement, Construction Report," Report No. RDT03-003, Missouri Dept. of Trans., P.O. Box 270, Jefferson City, MO 65102, Feb., 2003.

APPENDIX D
FHWA Project Number MT-01-01

TEA 21 INNOVATIVE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
Evaluation Report

State: Montana.

State DOT Contact: Mr. Nigel Mends [(406) 444-9221]

NBI Bridge Number: P00001180+0.399-1.

Project Type: Replacement.

Location: Bridge crossing the Middle Fork of the Flathead River on US 2 near Essex, Flathead County.

Innovative Material: Solid Stainless Steel Type AISI 316LN or 2205 reinforcement and related hardware.

Bridge Description: The new bridge is replacing an older one that is structurally obsolete. It is 190 m long with four spans of lengths 43, 52, 52, and 43 m. The two-lane roadway width is 12 m. Alignment is tangent across the bridge except for the last span which lies on a 5° 0' spiral. Four welded plate weathering steel girders, each with a 900x22 mm web and 400 mm wide flange which varies in thickness from 19 mm at mid-span to 64 mm over the piers, support the deck. The cast-in-place deck has a constant 2% superelevation. The specified deck thickness is 215 mm and the concrete cover over the top reinforcement 60 mm.

Innovation Justification: One end of the bridge terminates on land owned by Glacier National Park and the other on land administered by Flathead National Forest. The Flathead River that the bridge crosses is under jurisdiction of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Permitting was complicated because these, as well as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and various State agencies, were involved. Consequently, it was reasoned by the Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) that any future repairs, rehabilitations, or replacement would be complex and difficult. The bridge was anticipated to require relatively high maintenance if it were built using conventional reinforcement (ECR) because it is in a heavy snow area that experiences wintertime applications of MgCl₂ (liquid form) and numerous freeze-thaw cycles. In addition, because of the rural setting and mountainous surroundings, any bridge closure involves a 480 km (300 mile) detour. For this reason, extra expense that promoted longevity with minimal maintenance was considered justified.

Construction Sequence: The four piers were formed and poured during the second half of 2001, and the deck was placed in June and July, 2002. The site was visited on June 24, 2002 at which time approximately two-thirds of the reinforcement had been placed. Figure D-1 shows a photograph of the deck at that time.

Reinforcement Specification: The reinforcement for both mats was specified as pickled AISI Stainless Steel Type 316LN or 2205 which was to be delivered to the construction site free of any rusting.



Figure D-1: View of deck with stainless steel reinforcement placement in progress.

Table D-1: Concrete Mix Design.

Cement Content (minimum), kg/m ³	390
Water Content (maximum), kg/m ³	155
Slump Range, mm	40-80
Air Content, percent	6±1
Maximum Coarse Aggregate, mm	19
Compressive Strength (minimum), MPa	34

Concrete Specification: The concrete was termed, “Special Deck,” with properties as specified in Table D-1.

Job Contractor: Frontier West, Inc.
P.O. Box 16295
Masoula, MT 59808

Steel Supplier: Empire Steel. The reinforcing steel was acquired from Spain and shipped to the U.S. Cutting and bending, where necessary, were performed in Colorado; and the steel was then shipped to the job site. Guard angles were provided by Watson and Bowman in NY.

Material Cost: The reinforcement cost was estimated as \$3.50 per kg (\$1.60 per pound). Five bids were obtained which ranged from \$4.10 per kg (\$1.86 per pound) to \$5.27 per kg (\$2.39 per pound). The lowest bidder for the overall project was awarded the contract, with the reinforcement cost per se being \$5.20 per kg (\$2.36 per pound). A total of 106.5 tons of reinforcement was required.

Job Site Storage: Two truckloads arrived at the job site on June 13, 2002 and the remaining three truck loads during the week of June 17. These were off-loaded onto wooden 2x4 supports on the ground. Figure D-2 shows a photograph of this storage. The storage time was short, as placement commenced shortly after delivery. Packaging and

covering are described below. No problems were encountered in connection with delivery and storage.



Figure D-2: Photograph of bundled/wrapped bars at the job site.

Presence of Carbon Steel: Shear studs on the top girder flanges are carbon steel. Figure D-3 shows how these penetrate the bottom mat of stainless steel. The specification requires that there be no contact between the studs and reinforcement. This was accomplished using plastic caps over the studs. These had not been placed at the time on this site visit, and so they do not appear in Figure D-3. Stainless steel in the structure backwalls is tied to black bar.




Figure D-3: Photograph showing carbon steel shear studs protruding through bottom mat of stainless steel reinforcement.

Problems: The following difficulties were encountered with regard to incorporating stainless steel into this project.

1. MDT personnel indicated that industry was very encouraging with regard to using stainless steel reinforcement but was less that enthusiastic when specialized treatment and handling became involved. As one example, the supplier's pickling bath was 10 m long; and they would not invest in lengthening this to accommodate longer bars. Consequently, longer bars had to be cut for pickling and unnecessarily spliced when placed. This increased cost because of the additional material required for the lap splices.
2. The bars were processed and packaged in Spain using Teflon-coated stainless steel bands and a water-repellant, heavy paper-like wrapping. This wrapping can be seen in Figure D-2. When these bundles were opened at the job site, the reinforcement was clean and bright, and no rust spots were evident. However, bundles that were opened in Colorado for cutting and bending exhibited rust spots. Figure D-4 shows examples of these. Such corrosion apparently resulted because carbon steel (non-stainless) handling and bending equipment was used in conjunction with the cutting and bending operations. This is in spite of a pre-construction meeting with the supplier, at which time the need for special handling was discussed and agreed to. The bent bar details were repackaged in cardboard boxes only, as shown in Figure D-5. MDT is requiring that rusted bars be retreated in place according to ASTM Specification A380-94a.




Figure D-4: Examples of rust spots on reinforcement: (a) bundled bent bars in opened cardboard container and (b) straight reinforcement in place.



Figure D-5: Photograph showing cardboard packaged bent reinforcement details.

3. Procurement of the expansion joint guard angles was expensive because, first, the manufacturer treated this as a special order and, second, they were not used to fabricating stainless steel. The guard angles arrived at the site packaged with carbon steel bands. Figure D-6 is a photograph of guard angle in place.




Figure D-6: Photograph of a guard angle adjacent to an expansion joint.

4. Placement of the stainless steel rebar was estimated to have taken 1½-2 times longer than for conventional steel. This resulted because stainless steel chairs were not available as epoxy-coated ones are for ECR, and reinforcement had to be tied with wire individually to each plastic chair. Figure D-7 shows an array of chairs on the deck in preparation for placement of the top mat (see Figure D-1 also), and Figure D-8 shows a close-up view of a completed placement area where both the top and bottom bars are tied with wire to a



Figure D-7: Array of plastic chairs to which bars from both mats are tied.

chair. This difficulty should be overcome as stainless steel reinforcement usage becomes more common, at which time stainless steel or plastic chairs should be available.



Figure D-8: Close-up view of a plastic chair to which bars are tied.

5. MDT personnel assumed that the reinforcement would be AISI 316LN rather than 2205, which was also allowed, because the former is less expensive. Compositional analyses subsequent to placement revealed, however, that the reinforcement was 2205. While this, in and of itself, was not a problem, it does point out a need for identity confirmation of as-received stainless steel reinforcement.
6. Mass of the #22 (metric designation) stainless steel bars averaged 2.80 kg/m^3 , whereas the specification requires 2.85 kg/m^3 . Consequently, the bar mass was 98 percent of what was required. The reduced mass was subtracted from payment to the contractor based on the bid price per kg.
7. the specification deformation height for the #13 (metric designation) bars was 0.51 mm, whereas the actual height was approximately 0.33 mm (65 percent of what was required). A percentage reduction of payment to the contractor, based upon the bid price, resulted.

Material Acquisition: Four bent bar details were made available from the job site for testing by FAU and FDOT. Figure D-9 shows a photograph of these.




Figure D-9: Photograph of stainless steel reinforcement details acquired from the job site.

APPEXDIX E
FHWA Project NH-02-03

**TEA 21 INNOVATIVE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
Evaluation Report**

October 27, 2004

State: New Hampshire.

State DOT Contact: Mr. Paul Nadeau [(603) 645-1760].

NBI Bridge Number: 016101850007700.

Project Type: Replacement.

Location: Bridges on I-293 over Frontage Road and Brown Avenue, Manchester.

Innovative Material: Galvanizing reinforcing steel.

Bridge Description: These two bridges are discussed in a single report because of construction and innovative reinforcement commonalities and their proximity to one another. In each case, there are two lane east- and west-bound bridges that are part of a number of bridge reconstructions and replacements along I-293. The Frontage Road Bridge is about 300 m east of the Brown Avenue Bridge. Figure E-1 shows a perspective view of the latter bridge where the girders are set but the deck formwork has not been placed. Note job site storage of the galvanized reinforcement (circled) to the right of the in-place girders. Figure E-2 provides a closer view. The deck specifications call for longitudinal #5 bars with eight inch spacing and transverse #6 at six inch spacing. While a pavement overlay is normally employed for NH bridges, this is not being called for on the Frontage Road or Brown Avenue Bridges.



Figure E-1: General view of the Brown Avenue Bridge under construction.



Figure E-2: View of the in-place girders on the Brown Avenue Bridge. Note ECR extending from the top of the backwall.

Classification of galvanized reinforcement as innovative is conjecture, since this material has been available for decades, although its use as reinforcement in bridge construction has been limited. The fact that results from both research and field experience have been mixed from the corrosion performance standpoint, however, warrants its being included in this program.

Construction Sequence: At the time of the site visit (May 6, 2004), only the girders were in place on the Brown Avenue Bridge as noted above in conjunction with Figures E-1 and E-2. Construction was more advanced at Frontage Road as explained below. Figure E-3 shows a general view of the galvanized bar placement on the Frontage Road deck.

Reinforcement Specification: Initially, Type 316L or 316LN reinforcement conforming to AASHTO M 31M (M31) in accordance with ASTM A-955M-96 was specified for both Brown Avenue Bridges and 316L clad black bars (AASHTO M 31M (M31)) for the Frontage Road ones. The two EB bridges were replaced in 2003; but because suppliers were unable to provide the stainless steel, epoxy-coated reinforcement (ECR) was substituted. This same supply problem arose for the clad reinforcement in 2004, and galvanized reinforcement was used as a substitute here.

Material Cost: Table E-1 lists the as-bid costs for both the originally specified stainless and stainless clad reinforcement and for the replacement galvanized reinforcement for both bridges.

Concrete Specification: The concrete mix design is shown in Table E-2. This requires a minimum 30 MPa (4,000 psi) compressive strength at 28 days.




Figure E-3: In-place galvanized reinforcement on the Frontage Road Bridge deck.

Table E-1: Reinforcing steel costs.

Reinforcement Type	Bridge	Est. Quantity, kg	Unit Price	Est. Cost
Type 316L or 316LN	Brown Avenue	59,977	\$5.15/kg	\$308,882
Galvanized			\$2.92/kg	\$175,133
Clad Type 316L	Frontage Road	51,340	\$4.15/kg	\$213,061
Galvanized			\$3.54/kg	\$181,743

Table E-2: Concrete mix design.

	Sat'd Weight	Surface Dry Yield, m ³
Cement Quebec Type II	173 kg	0.055
Blue Circle NewCem	173 kg	0.059
Manch. S&G Fine Aggr.	700 kg	0.264
Manch. S&G 3/4"	864 kg	0.327
Manch. S&G 3/8"	211 kg	0.080
Water	155 liters	0.155
Total Air	6.0%	0.060
	Total	1.001

Daracem-100	3460 ml
Micro Air	2.0 ml
Water/cement ratio	0.45
Slump	127-203 mm
Unit Weight	2274 kg/m ³

Prime Job Contractor: George R. Cairns & Sons
8 Ledge Road
Windam, NH 03087
(603) 421-1888

Sub-Contractor: E.D. Swett, Inc.
8 Industrial Park Dr.
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 224-7401

Steel Supplier: Barker Steel Company, Inc., 55 Sumner Street, Milford, MA 01757.

Job Site Storage: The galvanized steel for both bridges was delivered in plastic wrapping just prior to the placement schedule for the Frontage Road Bridge. Figures E-4 and E-5 show photographs of bar storage at this latter site. A distant view of bars at the Brown Avenue Bridge was indicated in Figure E-1, and Figures E-6 and E-7 show closer views of straight and fabricated bars, respectively at this location.



Figure E-4: Photograph of bundled/wrapped bars at the Frontage Road job site.

Presence of Carbon Steel: Shear studs on the top girder flanges are carbon steel. A distant view of these can be seen in Figure E-3, and Figure E-8 provides a closer photograph. While no instances of electrical contact between the two metal types were apparent, this could inadvertently occur. Because potential of galvanized steel can be active to passive black steel, a corrosion cell could be established.

Innovation Justification: Northern bridge decks in NH experience heavy winter precipitation and deicing salt usage. Innovative reinforcements that provide enhanced corrosion resistance relative to that of black steel are being increasingly recognized as competitive on a life-cycle cost analysis basis.



Figure E-5: Fabricated galvanized bars at the Frontage Road Bridge job site.



Figure E-6: Photograph of stored galvanized bars at the Brown Avenue Bridge job site.



Figure E-7: Photograph of as-delivered galvanized bars at the Brown Avenue site after pulling back the plastic wrap.




Figure E-8: Close-up view of the in-place galvanized reinforcement relative to carbon steel studs.

Problems: The following difficulties and potential difficulties were cited for these two bridge projects:

2. The problems associated with acquisition of both the 316L/316LN stainless steel reinforcement (Frontage Road Bridge) and clad 316L stainless reinforcement (Brown Avenue Bridge) were noted above.

3. The potential galvanic corrosion problem that could arise from the galvanized reinforcement contacting the carbon steel studs that project from the top of girders was mentioned above.
4. Many of the as-delivered galvanized bars had a brown-greenish surface deposit. Examples of this can be seen on some of the bars in Figure E-8, and a closer view is shown in Figure E-9. This caused delays and additional effort in that the contractor was told to remove the deposits to the extent possible. It was later determined that the deposits were residuals from a chromate pretreatment. It is not unexpected for such “lack of prior experience” problems to arise with innovative reinforcement.
5. A concern was expressed that concrete cracking along the plastic mat spacers could occur because the openings in these may be too small to pass the coarse aggregate as the concrete is placed. Figure E-10 shows a photograph of a spacer in place. This, of course, is not related to the use of innovative reinforcement.



Figure E-9: Photograph of deposits on the galvanized reinforcing bars.




Figure E-10: Photograph of in-place bottom galvanized rebar mat with plastic mat spacer.

5. Fabricated bars for the Brown Avenue Bridge, in particular, exhibited areas of disbonded zinc coating. This apparently resulted when bars were bundled together as the galvanized layer dried and the bars were subsequently pulled apart. Zinc layer “dendrites” or “icicles” were also present. Examples of the former are shown in Figure E-10 (circled regions) and the latter in Figure E-11.




Figure E-10: Examples of disbonding of the galvanized layer on fabricated bars for the Brown Avenue Bridge.



Figure E-11: Galvanized layer disbanding and icicle on reinforcing bars. Examples of disbonding are also apparent.

Material Acquisition: The project team was able to acquire samples of the galvanized bars from the job site for analysis.

APPENDIX F
FHWA Project Number

**TEA 21 INNOVATIVE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
Evaluation Report**

State: Oklahoma.

State DOT Contact: Mr. John Leonard [(580) 336-7374]
Mr. James Gilbreath [(580) 336-7374]

NBI Bridge Number: 26415

Project Type: Replacement Bridge.

Location: Bridge crossing Chickaskia River on I-35 in Kay County.

Innovative Material: MMFX-II™ Reinforcing Steel.

Bridge Description: The new bridge comprises the two northbound lanes at the above location. The southbound bridge of the same design was completed one year earlier and employed epoxy-coated reinforcing steel. Overall length of the bridge is 200 m (657 ft) and total width 12.3 m (40.4 ft) and consists of five spans on four piers with 1.80 m (5.90 ft) diameter drilled shafts with cast-in-place caps and bulb-tee prestressed concrete beams. Deck design was by the empirical method. Initially, stainless steel clad reinforcement was specified; but because of delivery problems, this was changed to MMFX-II™. Figure F-1 shows a general view of the bridge at a time when the deck was being formed.

Innovation Justification: The anticipated good corrosion resistance of MMFX-II™ reinforcing steel is anticipated to result in reduced maintenance and life-cycle cost for the bridge.



Figure F-1: General view of the I-35 northbound bridge.

Construction Sequence: The deck was placed from south to north with each span being formed and poured as a separate unit. Figure F-2 shows a perspective photograph of the as-formed deck reinforcing steel as viewed from east to west across span 1. Figure F-3 provides a closer view, including an ECR spacer that separates the two mats and reinforcing steel from a girder, and Figure F-4 shows the tie-in of the parapet wall reinforcing steel to the deck. Slab thickness is eight inches and the reinforcement is comprised of #4 and #5 bars. Cover over the top steel is 2 3/8 inches.



Figure F-2: Photograph of in-place deck reinforcing steel.




Figure F-3: Close-up view of MMFX-II™ deck reinforcing steel.



Figure F-4: Photograph of reinforcing steel as placed in the deck and parapet wall.

Reinforcement Specification: At the time of construction, no national standard existed for MMFX-II™ reinforcing steel. In lieu of this, the manufacturer’s “Product Bulletin” dated September, 2001 was employed.

Concrete Specification: The concrete was termed, “Special Deck,” with mix design as specified in Table F-1. Because MMFX-II™ was anticipated to be less corrosion resistant than the clad stainless steel, the admixture IPANEX, which has corrosion inhibiting attributes,

Table F-1: Concrete Mix Design.

Cement Content (Type I), pcy	559
Slag/Fly Ash, pcy	133
Fine Aggregate, pcy	1,272
Coarse Aggregate (#67), pcy	1,710
Water Content, gal/cy	33
Water-Cement Ratio	0.40
Air Entraining Agent, oz.	6
Air Content, percent	5

was added via a change order.

Job Contractor: Muskogee Bridge Co., Inc.
P.O. Drawer 798
Muskogee, OK 74402
(918) 683-3051

Steel Supplier: TM Steel Corporation of America, Inc. The steel was produced by Birmingham Steel, 3630 Fourth Street, Flowood, MS 39208.

Material Cost: A total of 167,790 pounds of MMFX-IITM reinforcing steel was ordered for the project. The unit material cost was \$0.88 per pound for a total cost of \$146,863.

Job Site Storage: The steel was delivered via truck and stored uncovered outdoors on timbers. A crane was employed to move the steel to the deck, where it was placed by hand. Figure F-5 shows a perspective view of the storage location, and Figure F-6 provides a close-up view.



Figure F-5: Perspective view of steel storage site.



Figure F-6: Photograph of stored bars on timbers at job site.

Problems: Difficulties that were encountered with the companion, southbound bridge, which do not relate to the reinforcement per se but to structural problems, led to doing away with the elastomeric pads at piers 1 and 4 and installing expansion joints at these locations. Closure pours were not made here; and instead, these areas were poured with the adjoining slabs. The longitudinal steel was shortened to allow for expansion devices.

There was a five week period between the time the order for MMFX-II™ was placed and the steel delivered. Because the change from clad stainless steel to MMFX-II™ reinforcement was anticipated ahead of time, no project delay resulted.

Material Acquisition: Several lengths of reinforcing steel were made available from the job site for testing by FAU and FDOT.

APPENDIX G
FHWA Project Number SC-00-01

TEA 21 INNOVATIVE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM Evaluation Report

October 27, 2004

State: South Carolina.

State DOT Contact: Mr. Clay Bodiford [(843) 740-1574].

NBI Bridge Number: 107005400100

Project Type: Replacement.

Location: Bridges on S-54 (Chisolm Road over Tidal Creek), Charlestown County.

Innovative Material: Stainless steel Type 2205, Type 316 clad black bar, and MMFX-II™.

Bridge Description: The bridge is two lanes with the substructure consisting of six conventional prestressed piling bents with cast-in-place pile caps. These support five 28 foot wide by 30 foot long reinforced concrete deck spans (total length 150 feet). Figure G-1 provides a perspective view of the bridge under construction. The five spans, designated 1-5, extend generally from north to south and, along with the barrier parapets were placed with, respectively, black bar with discrete Galvashield XP™ embedded galvanic anodes, Type 2205 stainless steel, Type 316 clad black bar, black bars,⁵ and MMFX-II™. This combination of reinforcement types provides a unique opportunity to assess the relative long-term performance of these materials in an actual service environment.



Figure G-1: General view of the bridge under construction.

⁵ It was originally planned that span 4 would utilize stainless clad bars from a second source; however, these could not be delivered in a according to the construction schedule.

The deck slabs are 1'7" thick with 1) #5 longitudinal and transverse top mat bars on 16 inch centers and 2) #5 transverse bars with 12 inch spacing and staggered #5 and #9 longitudinal bars with six inch spacing in the bottom. Bar supports are Type 26 Standees, plastic BB.

Reinforcement Specification: As noted above, innovative reinforcement was used in Spans 2, 3 and 5, in addition to incorporation of discrete galvanic anodes on the black bars in Span 1. Table G-1 gives details for the different reinforcement types.

Table G-1: Reinforcement requirements and suppliers.

Reinforcing Steel	Specification	Supplier	Grade
Black	ASTM A706	-	60
Type 2205 SS	ASTM A955	Talley Metals	75
Type 316 stainless clad	ASTM A615 or A706	SMI, Corp.	60
MMFX-II™	Company Spec.	MMFX Corp.	100

Material Cost: Table G-2 lists the as-bid costs for the different reinforcement types.

Table G-2: Cost data for the different types of reinforcement.

Reinforcement Type	Quantity, lbs.	Unit Cost, per lb.	Total Cost
Black bar	22,529	\$0.27	\$6,083
Type 2205 stainless steel	10,990	\$2.42	\$26,500
Type 316 clad stainless	10,990	\$1.27	\$14,000
MMFX-II™	11,107	\$0.62	\$6,900

Steel Supplier: All reinforcement was purchased through SMI Corp. of Columbia, SC, although producers of the Type 2205 stainless and MMFX-II™ are as indicated in Table G-1.

Concrete Specification: The concrete mix specification was for Class 4000 concrete (4,000 psi minimum compressive strength at 28 days). This was supplied by Van-Smith Concrete Company in Charleston according to the mix design in Table G-3.

Table G-3: Concrete mix design.

Material	Source	Amount, cy
Cement	Holman Type I	541 lbs.
Fly Ash		140 lbs.
Fine Aggr.	Palmetto	1093 lbs.
Coarse Aggr.		1,810 lbs.
Air		4.50%
Water-Cementitious Ratio		0.40%
WRDA-35	WR Grace	26 oz.
Darex II	WR Grace	6 oz.
Weight per cf		142.8 lbs.

Construction: Figure G-2 to G-6 show photographs of various aspects of the deck steel placement and concrete pouring.



Figure G-2: View of MMFX-II™ placement in Span 5.



Figure G-3: View of 2205 stainless steel placement in Span 2.

Prime Job Contractor: Cape Romain Contracting, Inc.
660 Cape Romain Road
Wando, SC 29492
(843) 884-5167



Figure G-4: View of in-place clad stainless in Span 3.



Figure G-5: View of in-place black bars (Span 1) along with discrete galvanic anodes.

Presence of Carbon Steel: Carbon steel A25 dowels extend into the deck slabs from the backwalls. An example of these can be seen in the right foreground of Figure G-3. The specification calls for these to be wrapped with roofing felt, rubber, or another seepage-proofed compressible material to allow $\frac{1}{4}$ " of compressible material between the concrete and dowel. As such, electrical contact between the dowels and reinforcement was avoided.

Innovation Justification: The salt water climate of coastal South Carolina can result in shortened service life for bridge substructures and for decks in cases where profile is low. This project provides an excellent opportunity to investigate and compare

various innovative, corrosion resistant reinforcement options in side-by-side, actual bridge comparisons.



Figure G-6: Close-up view of discrete galvanic anodes on in-place Span 1 black bars.

Problems: As noted above, the original bridge specification called for Stelax clad 316 black core bars in Span 4. The company was unable to deliver these according to the project timing, and plain black bars were substituted.