



























![](_page_2_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_2_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_2_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_2_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_3_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_3_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_3_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_3_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_3_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_3_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_4_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_4_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_4_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_4_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_4_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_4_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_0.jpeg)

Presentation Goals
<ul> <li>Project Overview <ul> <li>Site Conditions</li> <li>Scope</li> <li>Alignment</li> <li>Constructability</li> </ul> </li> <li>Bascule Span Highlights</li> <li>Approach Substructure <ul> <li>Satisfied Aesthetic Requirements</li> <li>Satisfied Aubsurface Conditions</li> <li>Details for Long Life</li> </ul> </li> <li>Approach Superstructure <ul> <li>Satisfied Aesthetic Requirements</li> <li>Details for Long Life</li> <li>Innovation for Efficiency</li> <li>Innovation for Efficiency</li> <li>Innovation for Efficiency</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
HARDESTY & HANOVER, LLP E N G I N E E R I N G Byiti Charato Cafarea, Chiantagua Pajat Danisa

![](_page_6_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_2.jpeg)

Framing Plan 4 Span Continuous Unit					
	_/				
Prestr. Pr Fascia B	estr. ılb-T				
Beam					

![](_page_10_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_0.jpeg)

# DEPLOYABLE CONCRETE TECHNOLOGIES FOR PAVEMENTS

By Angel L Correa FHWA Resource Center, Atlanta

PRESENTED AT THE "VIRGINIA CONCRETE PAVEMENT CONFERENCE"

> Richmond, VA March 6, 2008

### Notice

- This presentation is presented by the FHWA in the interest of technology exchange.
- The US Government does not endorse products or manufacturers.
- Trade or manufacturers' names may appear in this presentation only because they are considered essential to the object of this presentation.

# **DISCUSSION TOPICS**

# • EQUIPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION

- QUALITY CONTROL
- DESIGN
- SOFTWARE
- WIDE PCCP SLABS

![](_page_14_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_16.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_1.jpeg)

GSI

GOMACO Smoothness Indicator

![](_page_15_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_4.jpeg)

000HETER(COUNTS-SI(***)) 3955 NALL BAND VIDTH(3) 0.00 BUTP HEIGHT(3N) 0.40 BUTP (UDTH(FT) 25.00	ALL DEAL TOP T ALL DEAL TOP T	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			
DUPP BOITOM OFF DATA FILLER HIGCC FT> 0.00 DATA FILLER HIGCC FT> 0.00	Seguer 1		Platrie lines has	Distantia	Praficia Inc
Serie (1916) 6016 (51717) 8000,00		Bette at	1.11 11	121 12	20.00
**** REPORT HEACER IS HARVES	747.al	2-18 at	her al	544.30	18.7
PRD: 10 1017 U.V.19 HH					
15 22 721 13	tireinereitette Taganet innige	(R) Palatera			
247-0	Tegreer's		in 181 Bassid its	Datable	
(1.6m), (41)(1.04(1.07)) • 23.28	1	1-10-11	2-42 41	Nam 101	2.5
	toner a	8+98.41	8-00 +1	800 87	74.4
Top Trace: Cox Profilograph 🧲	2	Во	ttom Trac	e: GSI	

![](_page_16_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

# Why Consider Elliptical Shapes

**Reduce Bearing Stress** 

**Engineer Dowel Spacing** 

**Reduce Cost** 

# **Dowel Bar Test Results**

Dowel Bar Type & Average Concrete Bearing Stress

Dowel Bar Description	e Concrete B	earing Stress
1.25 inch round steel	2,048 psi	(1.23 sq in)
1.5 inch round steel	1,568 psi	(1.77 sq in)
Large elliptical steel	1,147 psi	(2.08 sq in)
Medium elliptical steel	1,611 psi	(1.43 sq in)

# **DISCUSSION TOPICS**

- EQUIPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION
- QUALITY CONTROL
- DESIGN
- SOFTWARE
- WIDE PCCP SLABS

![](_page_17_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_0.jpeg)

## **MIT-Scan**

Developed by Magnetic Imaging Tools, GmbH Based on the principles of pulse induction

Advantages

- Works on fresh or hardened concrete
- Real-time, automated data analysis
- Very accurate
- Reliable
- Efficient (1-2 min per joint)

![](_page_18_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_1.jpeg)

# Reestablishing Maturity Curve Factors Affecting Maturity Cement Fly Ash Admixtures W/C ratio Mix type

Aggregate gradation

![](_page_19_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_5.jpeg)

# Air Void Analyzer allows ... More control of air-void characteristics in <u>fresh</u> concrete Quantify the air-void structure in the field Rapid QC/QA testing, useful for concrete placed in extreme climates

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

# **AVA Limitations**

Equipment is sensitive to vibration. Testing needs to be performed in a quiet environment, like a permanent structure.

Small sample size

Air characteristics are calculated based on assumed volume fractions. Sample excludes aggregate larger than 6 mm (0.24 in).

# **DISCUSSION TOPICS**

- EQUIPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION
- QUALITY CONTROL
- DESIGN
- SOFTWARE
- WIDE PCCP SLABS

![](_page_20_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_13.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

# DISCUSSION TOPICS • EQUIPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION • QUALITY CONTROL • DESIGN • SOFTWARE • WIDE PCCP SLABS

![](_page_21_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_5.jpeg)

# What are typical uses?

- Predict responses in cold and hot weather paving Predict potential strength gain for tight closures and opening to traffic
- Determine effects of design parameters on stress development
  - Joint spacing, thickness, base type
     Determine optimal mix characteristics
     Forensic studies crack development

![](_page_22_Figure_4.jpeg)

# DISCUSSION TOPICS

- EQUIPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION
- QUALITY CONTROL
- DESIGN
- SOFTWARE
- WIDE PCCP SLABS

![](_page_22_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_13.jpeg)

CRC WIDENED LANE (50,000 ADT 30% TRUCKS 90% RELIABILITY)					
		YRS TO	J FAILURE	ESAL	_'S
THICKNESS	% STEEL	12 FT WIDE	ā 13 FT WIDE	12 FT WIDE	13 FT WIDE
10	0.70	14.3	30.3	76 MILLION	191 MILLION
12	0.70	28.3	40+	175 MILLION	281+ MILLION
10	0.65	12.3	26.3	64 MILLION	159 MILLION
12	0.65	24.3	40+	145 MILLION	281+ MILLION

![](_page_23_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_3.jpeg)

Compatibility of Admixture Systems

![](_page_28_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_0.jpeg)

					100.00			
	Date Tected	Age (Days)	Unit Weight (grame)	Unit Weight (pol)	Maximum Load (pounds)	Compressive Strength (ps)	Average	Remarks
ELKO	1	\$18/2007			17684	1400		
ELKO	1	\$10/2007			23724	1663	1625	
239		\$/10/2007	\$772.2	143.0	28165	2242		in the mold for 2 days
240	1	ano/2007	2/67.7	143.8	2/826	2216	2228	in the mold for 2 days
141		6/10/2007	1011.0	146.0	16920	1011	1915	
FLKO	i	2/12/2007		146.0	21148	2480		
ELKO	4	8/12/2007			36922	2860	2670	
243	7	\$/16/2007	2815.2	144.7	37850	2948		
244	7	\$152007	3809.1	144,4	38720	3083	3040	
ELKO	7	1/7/1900			38313	3133		
ELKO	7	1/7/1900			40192	\$299	2165	
245	21	\$(29/2007	3832.4	146.3	61876	4114		Broken at 21 days for review
248	28	4/6/2007	2843.6	146.8	62016	4141		
21/	28	4/6/2007	388.4	164,4	64395	4331	4235	
ELKO	- 20	46/2007			62350			
ELKO		45/2007			62100	4784	1714	
102		45/0007	1011.0	146.9	Cacho	4588		Current under under 1 <sup>4</sup> 3 daur Jose anbei
243	28	45/2007	3830.0	145.2	66805	461		Cared under adar 1 <sup>4</sup> 2 days (Can and dual tank
250	28	45/2007	1025.0	146.1	69430	4722	4641	Cured under water 1 2 days (No cas)
251	58	60/2007						
ELKO	68	6/3/2007						
262	Permeability	4/6/2007						Bent to Boral (Ban Antanio)
263	Permeability	4/6/2007						Sent to Boral (San Antanio)

![](_page_30_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_0.jpeg)

## **Steps to Achieve Goal**

- Educate VDOT/Industry on End Result Specification
- Incorporate pilot specification on projects
- Revise specification based on pilot projects
- Full implementation of specification

VTRC

![](_page_34_Picture_7.jpeg)

# End Result Specifications (ERS) Contractor: Entirely responsible for supplying a product Agency: Responsible for accopting, rejecting, or

- Agency: Responsible for accepting, rejecting, or applying a price adjustment
- TRB Circular E-C074, Glossary of Highway Quality Assurance Terms.

![](_page_34_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_13.jpeg)

	Differences in Specifications				
	Item	Current	ERS		
	Mix Design	Prescriptive	Performance Measures		
	Testing	VDOT	Contractor and VDOT		
	Basis of Pay	Minimum	PWL		
4	VTRC				

# Pay Factor - by VDOT Pay factor based on PWL Compressive strength Permeability Pay as in the current spec Rideability Thickness (pavements)

# ERS Includes

- 1. QC Plan by the Contractor
  - Applicable to preconstruction and during construction
- 2. Mix design approval
- 3. Acceptance

# First Pilot Projects

# Salem:

VTRC

Route 11 over the New River and Norfolk Southern Railroad tracks near Radford University

# Culpeper:

Route 28 near Manassas

# 3. Acceptance

- Screening tests by the Contractor (slump, air content, unit weight, temperature)
- Pay factor tests by VDOT
- For structural, paving, and miscellaneous concrete
- Accepted on a lot-by-lot basis

![](_page_35_Picture_17.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_18.jpeg)

Salem Mix Proportions			
Material	Amount (lb/yd <sup>3</sup> )		
Cement Type I/II	318		
Fly ash Class F	159		
Slag	159		
Fine aggregate	1101		
Coarse aggregate	1755		
w/cm	0.45		
VTRC			

![](_page_36_Picture_1.jpeg)

Salem Strength and Permeability				
	Average (psi)	Std Dev		
Strength	5016	305		
Permeability	391	72		
N=31				
VTRC				

DISTRICT	PROJECT	STATUS
Bristol	PM07-084-186,C501	Ongoing
Culpeper	TBD	
Fredericksburg	Rte. 608 over Rte. 95 in Spotsylvania Co.	Ongoing
Fredericksburg	Rte. 3 over Piankatank River in Mathews Co.	On Hold
Fredericksburg	Rte. 624 over Cat Point Creek in Richmond	Ongoing
Hampton Roads	Rt. 175 – Chincoteague	Ongoing
Lynchburg	Rte. 734 over Cane Creek	Ongoing
Lynchburg	BR06-041-125, M400	Completed
Lynchburg	Carter Glass Bridge BR06-005-124, M400	Ongoing
Lynchburg	Rte. 652 over Graham Creek	Ongoing
Northern Virginia	Rt. 1 Bridge replacement at Neabsco Creek	Ongoing
Northern Virginia	I-95 – Fourth Lane	Ongoing
Richmond	Rt. 5 over Chickahominy	Ongoing
Salem	Rt. 723 Bridge over Nininger Creek 71610	Ongoing
Staunton	North Oak lane bridge replacement 60982	Completed
Staunton	Rte 340 Bridge	Ongoing

![](_page_36_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_0.jpeg)

# Concerns

- Cost (trial batch, QC)?
- Bids?

- Available materials hinder innovation?
- Contractor (bonus?) producer (penalty?)

![](_page_37_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_4.jpeg)

# Pier 3

- Owner: Northrop Grumman Newport News
- Architect: CH2MHill/Lockwood Greene
- □ Engineer: Ch2MHill/Lockwood Greene
- Contractor: W. F. Magann Corporation
   Supplier: Branscome Concrete, Coastal Precast Systems

![](_page_39_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Commercial Biotech 8 Office Building and Parking Garage

- Owner: Biotech 8, LLC
- Architect: McKinney and Company
- Engineer: McKinney and Company
- General Contractor: Kjellstrom and Lee
- Supplier: TCS Materials, Ready Mixed Concrete, Tindall Precast