

An ACI Technical Publication

SYMPOSIUM VOLUME



Sustainable Performance of Concrete Bridges and Elements Subjected to Aggressive Environments: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Rehabilitation

Editors:
Yail J. Kim
Baolin Wan
Isamu Yoshitake

SP-304



American Concrete Institute
Always advancing



Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Sustainable Performance of Concrete Bridges and Elements Subjected to Aggressive Environments: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Rehabilitation

Editors:
Yail J. Kim
Baolin Wan
Isamu Yoshitake



American Concrete Institute

Always advancing

SP-304

First printing, October 2015

Discussion is welcomed for all materials published in this issue and will appear ten months from this journal's date if the discussion is received within four months of the paper's print publication. Discussion of material received after specified dates will be considered individually for publication or private response. ACI Standards published in ACI Journals for public comment have discussion due dates printed with the Standard.

The Institute is not responsible for the statements or opinions expressed in its publications. Institute publications are not able to, nor intended to, supplant individual training, responsibility, or judgment of the user, or the supplier, of the information presented.

The papers in this volume have been reviewed under Institute publication procedures by individuals expert in the subject areas of the papers.

Copyright © 2015
AMERICAN CONCRETE INSTITUTE
38800 Country Club Dr.
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48331

All rights reserved, including rights of reproduction and use in any form or by any means, including the making of copies by any photo process, or by any electronic or mechanical device, printed or written or oral, or recording for sound or visual reproduction or for use in any knowledge or retrieval system or device, unless permission in writing is obtained from the copyright proprietors.

Printed in the United States of America

Editorial production: Ryan Jay

ISBN-13: 978-1-942727-47-7

Preface

Since the major milestones of sustainability, such as the Hannover Principle in 1991 and the Kyoto Protocol in 1997, the concept of sustainability has been broadly adopted by various disciplines. New construction consumes considerable amounts of energy and materials, and CO₂ emission in 2020 is expected to increase by 100%, compared with that of today. Technical communities are responsible for improving the sustainability of the built-environment by using more durable and highly efficient materials to reduce the need for replacement, maintenance, or repair. When subjected to aggressive environments, the performance of constructed concrete bridges and their elements is of interest from socioeconomic perspectives. Advances in a variety of aspects are required to achieve such a goal, including the durability of concrete members, performance monitoring technologies, evaluation methodologies, damage assessment, and structural rehabilitation. This Special Publication (SP) includes 10 papers selected from the three special sessions held at the ACI Fall convention in Washington, DC, October 2014. Each submitted manuscript has been rigorously reviewed and evaluated by at least two experts. The editors wish to thank all contributing authors and anonymous reviewers for their endeavors.

Yail J. Kim, Baolin Wan, and Isamu Yoshitake
Editors
University of Colorado Denver,
Marquette University, and
Yamaguchi University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SP-304—1

Response Surface Metamodel-based Performance Reliability Reinforced for Concrete Beams Strengthened with FRP sheets 1
Authors: Junwon Seo, Yail J. Kim, and Shadi Zandyavari

SP-304—2

Reducing Deck Cracking in Composite Bridges by Controlling Long Term Properties 21
Authors: Fatmir Menkulasi, Doug Nelson, Carin L. Roberts Wollmann, and Thomas E. Cousins

SP-304—3

Monitoring of the 205-ft long Pretensioned Precast Super Girders of the Alaskan Way Viaduct, Seattle, WA..... 41
Authors: Sameh S. Badie, David Chapman, Anthony Mizumori, Yu Jiang, Stephen J. Seguirant, and Bijan Khaleghi

SP-304—4

Using GFRP Reinforcing as a cost effective solution to extending the service life of bridge decks: A case study of the Kansas Department of Transportation I-635 Bridges over State Ave in Kansas City, KS 53
Authors: Ryan Koch and Jon Karst

SP-304—5

Analytical Modeling of Reinforced Concrete Beams Strengthened with Mechanically Fastened Fiber-reinforced Polymers (MF-FRP).....65
Authors: Gordon Salisbury and Vicki Brown

SP-304—6

Use of Self-consolidating Concrete and High Volume Fly Ash Concrete in Missouri Bridge A7957 85
Authors: Eli S. Hernandez and John J. Myers

SP-304—7

Managing ASR and DEF in Concrete Bridge Columns 101
Author: Mark E. Williams

SP-304—8

Assessment of Early Corrosion in Prestressed Concrete Based on Open-Circuit Potential and Polarization Resistance.....113
Authors: William Vélez and Fabio Matta

SP-304—9

The Role of Shrinkage Strains Causing Early-Age Cracking in Cast-in-Place Concrete Bridge Decks 123
Authors: Tayyeb Mohammadi, Baolin Wan and Christopher M. Foley

SP-304—10

Finite Element Modeling of RC Beams Strengthened with Prestressed NSM CFRP Strips Subjected to Severe Environmental Conditions 141
Authors: Hamid Y. Omran and Raafat El-Hacha

Response Surface Metamodel-based Performance Reliability for Reinforced Concrete Beams Strengthened with FRP sheets

Junwon Seo, Yail J. Kim, and Shadi Zandyavari

Synopsis: This paper presents the performance reliability of reinforced concrete beams strengthened with fiber reinforced polymer (FRP) sheets, including structural fragility. Emphasis is placed on the development of effective strains that can represent FRP-debonding failure. The reliability predicted by a conventional standard log-normal cumulative probability density function and by the proposed response surface metamodel (RSM) combined with Monte-Carlo simulation (MCS) is employed to assess the contribution of physical attributes to debonding failure. The models are constructed based on a large set of experimental database consisting of 230 test beams collected from published literature. Another aspect of the study encompasses the effect of various RSM parameters on the variation of effective strains, such as FRP thickness (t_f), steel reinforcement ratio (ρ), concrete strength (f'_c), beam height (h), beam width (w), span length (L), and shear span (a). The mutual interaction between these parameters indicates that those related to beam geometry (i.e., L , w , h , and a parameters) and the t_f parameter are significant factors influencing the effective strain of FRP-strengthened beams.

Keywords: debonding, effective strain, fiber reinforced polymer (FRP), fragility, performance reliability, response surface metamodel (RSM)

ACI member **Junwon Seo** is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD. He is an associate member of ACI Committees 341 (Earthquake-Resistant Concrete Bridges), 343 (Concrete Bridge Design: Joint ACI-ASCE), and 345 (Concrete Bridge Construction, Maintenance, and Repair). His research interests encompass the structural behavior of irregular bridges and other structures, multi-hazard vulnerability and sustainability assessment, repair, retrofit and rehabilitation, structural reliability and risk analysis, and structural health monitoring. He is a licensed Professional Engineer in Iowa.

ACI member **Yail J. Kim** is an Associate Professor in the Department of Civil Engineering at the University of Colorado Denver, Denver, CO. He is the Chair of ACI Committee 345 (Concrete Bridge Construction, Maintenance, and Repair) and is a member of Committees 342 (Evaluation of Concrete Bridges and Bridge Elements) and 440 (Fiber Reinforced Polymer Reinforcement). He also chairs ACI 440I (FRP-prestressed Concrete). His research interest includes the application of advanced composite materials for structures, structural complexity, structural reliability, and science-based structural engineering, including and statistical and quantum physics. He is a licensed Professional Engineer in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

ACI student member **Shadi Zandyavari** is a Graduate Student in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD.

INTRODUCTION

Structural fragility/reliability has been used for assessing seismic risk in constructed facilities such as highway bridges. Fragility (also known as vulnerability) is defined as a conditional probability that a structure exceeds a prescribed damage state when subjected to various levels of natural or man-made hazards. Reliability is, on the other hand, defined as the extent of achieving the given functionality of a structure exposed to distressful hazards. Previous studies have shown that use of either empirical or analytical vulnerability functions can be regarded as one of the standard approaches for seismic fragility estimation [1-9], while analytical vulnerability functions are dominantly employed because in-situ data are limitedly available in most cases [1-6]. Conventional methodologies for generating analytical vulnerability functions include the statistical extrapolation of a structure's performance along with Monte Carlo simulation (MCS) [2-6]. Seo et al. [5] estimated the structural fragility of steel moment-frame structures using MCS-based response surface metamodels (RSM). The joint RSM-MCS method enables the efficient fragility assessments of a group of steel moment-frame structures when compared to the conventional methodologies. Ghosh et al. [6] utilized metamodels combined with MCS to evaluate existing bridges subjected to seismic load. Although the concept of structural fragility and corresponding reliability are proven to be robust in evaluating the performance of civil structures, it has not fully been integrated into the resiliency appraisal of retrofitted structural members.

Over the past couple of decades, fiber reinforced polymer (FRP) composites have been used for enhancing the behavior of deteriorated reinforced concrete members, including several advantages such as favorable strength-to-weight ratio, non-corrosive characteristics, and reduced long-term maintenance costs [10]. A number of studies on FRP-strengthening were concerned with the performance evaluation of various structural systems in static, fatigue, and seismic loadings [11]. The reliability-oriented assessment of such a strengthening method was, however, rarely reported, particularly structural fragility accounting for critical failure modes such as FRP-debonding. This paper proposes a theoretical framework for examining the debonding vulnerability of reinforced concrete beams strengthened with FRP sheets. Of interest is a relationship between FRP-debonding and performance reliability. An RSM model was built using a large number of laboratory test data compiled from published literature, encompassing geometric and material parameters, in order to predict the effective strain of FRP. It is worth noting that the effective strain controls the response of a strengthened beam in such a way that FRP-debonding failure takes place when the strain of the strengthening system exceeds its effective strain. The experimentally validated RSM model coupled with MCS was implemented to generate the debonding fragility of FRP-strengthened beams, which was compared with a conventional fragility approach, followed by quantifying performance reliability.

RESPONSE SURFACE METAMODEL

This section discusses the development of a prediction model for debonding strain of an FRP-strengthened beam based on a statistical approach and its validation against experimental data.

Development

The RSM model proposed is a second-order polynomial function as shown in Eq. 1:

$$y = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_{ii} x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j>i}^k \beta_{ij} x_i x_j + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

where y is the dependent variable representing the effective FRP strain of a strengthened beam at debonding failure; x_i and x_j are the independent input variables dependent upon the geometric and material properties of the beam; β_0 , β_i , β_{ii} , and β_{ij} are empirical coefficients to be determined by statistical analysis on test data; k is the number of input variables, and ε is the statistical bias. Such a statistical RSM model is expected to generate a fragility curve for FRP-strengthened members at low computational expenses [5]. A large set of database comprising 230 test beams was used to develop an RSM model, as listed in Table 1 where several parameters are presented: beam height (h), beam width (w), span length (L), shear span (a), compressive strength of concrete (f'_c), thickness of FRP (t_f), and steel reinforcement ratio (ρ). The effect of shear span (a) and shear-span-to-depth-ratio (a/d) on the flexure of the beams is basically identical from a fundamental mechanics standpoint. To identify the necessary statistical coefficients of the parameterized model, the JMP software [12] was utilized for least-square analysis. Equation 2 is the refined format of the proposed RSM model (units are in mm and MPa) to predict the effective stain of an FRP-strengthened beam (ε_e):

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_e = & \beta_0 + \beta_1(L - L_{ave}) + \beta_2(w - w_{ave}) + \beta_3(h - h_{ave}) + \beta_4(\rho - \rho_{ave}) + \beta_5(a - a_{ave}) + \beta_6(\sqrt{f'_c} - \sqrt{f'_{c,ave}}) \\ & + \beta_7(\sqrt{t_f} - \sqrt{t_{f,ave}}) + \beta_8(L - L_{ave})^2 + \beta_9(L - L_{ave})(w - w_{ave}) + \beta_{10}(L - L_{ave})(h - h_{ave}) + \beta_{11}(L - L_{ave})(\rho - \rho_{ave}) \\ & + \beta_{12}(L - L_{ave})(a - a_{ave}) + \beta_{13}(L - L_{ave})(\sqrt{f'_c} - \sqrt{f'_{c,ave}}) + \beta_{14}(L - L_{ave})(\sqrt{t_f} - \sqrt{t_{f,ave}}) + \beta_{15}(w - w_{ave})^2 \\ & + \beta_{16}(w - w_{ave})(h - h_{ave}) + \beta_{17}(w - w_{ave})\rho + \beta_{18}(w - w_{ave})(a - a_{ave}) + \beta_{19}(w - w_{ave})(\sqrt{f'_c} - \sqrt{f'_{c,ave}}) \\ & + \beta_{20}(w - w_{ave})(\sqrt{t_f} - \sqrt{t_{f,ave}}) + \beta_{21}(h - h_{ave})^2 + \beta_{22}(h - h_{ave})(\rho - \rho_{ave}) + \beta_{23}(h - h_{ave})(a - a_{ave}) \\ & + \beta_{24}(h - h_{ave})(\sqrt{f'_c} - \sqrt{f'_{c,ave}}) + \beta_{25}(h - h_{ave})(\sqrt{t_f} - \sqrt{t_{f,ave}}) + \beta_{26}(\rho - \rho_{ave})^2 + \beta_{27}(\rho - \rho_{ave})(a - a_{ave}) \\ & + \beta_{28}(\rho - \rho_{ave})(\sqrt{f'_c} - \sqrt{f'_{c,ave}}) + \beta_{29}\rho(\sqrt{t_f} - \sqrt{t_{f,ave}}) + \beta_{30}(a - a_{ave})^2 + \beta_{31}(a - a_{ave})(\sqrt{f'_c} - \sqrt{f'_{c,ave}}) \\ & + \beta_{32}(a - a_{ave})(\sqrt{t_f} - \sqrt{t_{f,ave}}) + \beta_{33}(\sqrt{f'_c} - \sqrt{f'_{c,ave}})^2 + \beta_{34}(\sqrt{f'_c} - \sqrt{f'_{c,ave}})(\sqrt{t_f} - \sqrt{t_{f,ave}}) + \beta_{35}(\sqrt{t_f} - \sqrt{t_{f,ave}})^2 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Table 2 exhibits the average properties of each RSM parameter, while Table 3 summarizes the statistically determined RSM coefficients (β_0 through β_{35}).

Validation

Figure 1 shows a typical comparison between the experimental and predicted debonding strains (or effective strains) with respect to FRP thickness. With an increase in FRP thickness (t_f), the effective strain of the strengthened beams was exponentially reduced. This observation can be explained by the fact that interfacial shear stresses along the bond-line of the beams augmented when an FRP thickness increased until the stress exceeded a critical stress that would result in FRP-debonding failure. Acceptable agreement was made between the test and model, as shown in Fig. 1, with a correlation coefficient of 0.75. The margins of error for the predicted mean and standard deviation against those of the test data were 36% and 26%, respectively. Given that the experimental beams were independently designed and tested by a number of researchers, such a range of prediction error appears to be inevitable [13]. Although some discrepancy was noticed between the test and prediction, it is reasonable to conclude that the RSM model developed can represent the behavior of FRP-strengthened beams in terms of effective strains.

EFFECT OF PARAMETER VARIATION

The effect of the aforementioned RSM parameters and the mutual interaction between two selected attributes and FRP-debonding were studied in the following subsections.

Effect of a Single Parameter

Figure 2 shows the variation of effective strains with respect to the RSM parameters, including FRP thickness (t_f), steel reinforcement ratio (ρ), concrete strength (f'_c), beam height (h), beam width (w), span length (L), and shear span (a). It was found that the effective strain of FRP tended to decrease with an increase in the h , L , ρ , and t_f parameters, while tended to increase when the w , f'_c , and a parameters were raised. The physical interpretation of each attribute is discussed as follows:

- *FRP thickness* [Fig. 2(a)]: as explained previously, FRP thickness influences the development of interfacial stress along the bond-line. From a mechanics point of view, the interfacial stress is a function of hyperbolic trigonometry with respect to FRP thickness [14]
- *Steel reinforcement ratio* [Fig. 2(b)]: when more steel reinforcing bars are used the flexural rigidity of the beam augments (i.e., the stiffness of the beam increases), thereby accelerating the development of normal stresses along the bonded FRP. It should, however, be noted that such an increase in flexural rigidity may not be significant, which is in conformance with the variation range of the effective strain given in Fig. 2(b)
- *Concrete strength* [Fig. 2(c)]: FRP-debonding occurs inside a concrete substrate in most cases since the strength of the concrete cover is less than that of a bonding agent. An increase in concrete strength can, therefore, increase resistance to the occurrence of FRP-debonding
- *Beam height* [Fig. 2(d)]: the effect of beam height is in principle analogous to that of the steel reinforcement ratio, provided that an increase in beam height results in an increase in flexural rigidity
- *Beam width* [Fig. 2(e)]: as the width of a beam soffit becomes wider, interfacial stresses are reduced due to an increased contact area. The full coverage of a beam substrate by FRP is thus generally recommended in practice
- *Beam length* [Fig. 2(f)]: the bending moment of a beam is directly proportional to its span length so that any increase in flexural moment detrimentally affects the behavior of the strengthened beam, which entails an increased probability of FRP-debonding.
- *Shear span* [Fig. 2(g)]: the applied shear stress to the interfacial layer is redistributed when the length of a shear span increased, which is similar to the stress-reduction mechanism discussed in the beam width parameter.

According to the RSM prediction (Fig. 2), significant parameters influencing the effective strain of a strengthened beam were FRP thickness, beam width, beam length, and shear span. Given the geometric properties of an existing beam may not be controllable when a strengthening design is conducted, attention should be paid to the thickness of FRP: if thick FRP sheets are necessary to meet the requirement of flexural strengthening, additional thoughts shall be necessary such as use of anchorage for addressing premature debonding failure, in addition to a debonding strain check as per design guidelines. Table 4 lists the results of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), including F statistics for individual parameters. All parameters were statistically meaningful at a confidence level of 95% except for the beam height (h) and steel reinforcement ratio (ρ). The most influential factor was the FRP thickness ($\sqrt{t_f}$), followed by the beam width (w) and concrete strength ($\sqrt{f'_c}$). These observations statistically confirm the contributing parameters of mechanics-based FRP-debonding models [14], namely, the occurrence of debonding failure is dominated by the extent of interfacial stresses that are a function of FRP thickness and bonded area as well as the substrate concrete strength.

Interaction between Two Parameters

Figures 3 to 8 exhibit the mutual interaction between the RSM parameters influencing the effective strain of FRP-strengthened beams. The variation range of each parameter was taken from the maximum and minimum values of those listed in Table 1. When two parameters were simultaneously compared, all other parameters mentioned earlier were set to their average values (Table 2). The interaction effect of beam height (h) along with other parameters is provided in Fig. 3. It was found that a combination of the beam height (h) and beam length (L) parameters had the most significant impact on the variation of effective strains ranging from 0% to 3.5% [Fig. 3(b)], while that of the beam height (h) and steel reinforcement ratio (ρ) was least influential on the effective strain development from 0% to 0.8% [Fig. 3(c)]. It should be worthwhile to note that the efficacy of FRP-strengthening is virtually none when the

effective strain value of 0% is associated. Figure 4 is dedicated to the contribution of the beam width parameter (w). The interaction between the beam width (w) and beam length (L) parameters was noticeable [Fig. 4(a)], given a large variation in effective strain was predicted up to 7%. A combination between the beam length (L) and FRP thickness (t_f) parameters resulted in a substantial effect on developing effective strains from 0% to 8% when compared to other cases, as shown in Fig. 5. The interaction effect of steel reinforcement ratio (ρ) is given in Fig. 6. The effective strain of FRP-strengthened beams changed from 0.3% to 0.7% when the concrete strength (f'_c) parameter increased from 20 MPa to 80 MPa at a reinforcement ratio of 0.5% [Fig. 6(a)]; on the other hand, the variation range of the effective strain enlarged as the reinforcement ratio (ρ) approached 4% where effective strains varied from 0% to 0.8%. As shown in Fig. 6(b), a simultaneous increase in steel reinforcement ratio (ρ) and FRP thickness (t_f) caused a consistent decrease in effective strain. Although a high reinforcement ratio tended to reduce the effectiveness of FRP-strengthening (i.e., low effective strain), such a trend became compensated with an increase in shear span length [Fig. 6(c)] due to the stress redistribution mechanism explained earlier. Figure 7(a) illustrates that the shear span parameter (a) was much more susceptible to the development of effective strain than concrete strength (f'_c). The contribution of the FRP thickness (t_f) and shear span (a) parameters was however similar, as shown in Fig. 7(b). The last interaction effect was provided in Fig. 8, including the concrete strength (f'_c) and FRP thickness (t_f) parameters. When an FRP thickness increased from 0 mm [0 in] to 5 mm [0.2 in] at a concrete strength of 20 MPa [2900 psi], the effective strain was reduced from 0.3% to 0%. Such a change in effective strain became more pronounced as a concrete strength augmented. For instance, the effective strain decreased from 0.9% to 0.2% and 1.3% to 0.4% with a variation in FRP thickness from 0 mm [0 in] to 5 mm [0.2 in] at a concrete strength of 50 MPa [7250 psi] and 80 MPa [11600 psi], respectively. It should be noted that an FRP thickness of 0 mm [0 in] given in Fig. 8 can indicate a very thin thickness of FRP sheet (e.g., $t_f = 0.167$ mm [0.0066 in], [15]), rather than an unstrengthened case.

FRAGILITY OF FRP-DEBONDING AND PERFORMANCE RELIABILITY

The structural fragility of FRP-debonding associated with performance reliability was predicted using a conventional standard log-normal cumulative probability density function and the joint RSM-MCS method. Below is a summary of the modeling approaches taken and technical discussion.

Model Formulation

Conventional fragility approach

The probability of debonding occurrence may be predicted by Eq. 3 [16]:

$$p_f = \Phi \left[\frac{\ln(S_d / S_c)}{\sqrt{\beta_d^2 + \beta_c^2}} \right] \quad (3)$$

where $\Phi[]$, S_d , S_c , β_d , and β_c are the standard normal distribution function, the demand of FRP-debonding, the median capacity of FRP-concrete interface, and corresponding logarithmic standard deviations, respectively. The demand of FRP-debonding may be expressed by [16]:

$$S_d = x^a e^b \quad (4)$$

where x is the RSM parameter and a and b are the regression coefficients of the FRP-effective strain (ε_e) which can be obtainable from Eqs. 2 and 5:

$$\ln(\varepsilon_e) = a \ln(x) + b \quad (5)$$

To generate a conventional FRP-debonding fragility curve, the experimental effective strains corresponding to the metrics listed in Table 1 was used to calculate the probability of exceedance related to the constituent parameters. Figure 9(a) typically shows how to obtain the regression coefficients a and b using a relationship between the effective strain and beam width. The slope and intercept of the best-fit line provided the following coefficients: $a = 0.1804$ and $b = -1.5628$. The demand of FRP-debonding (S_d) and its standard deviation (β_d) were then computed for each beam width of the 230 experimental beams listed in Table 1. The median capacity of the FRP-concrete

interface (S_c) and corresponding standard deviation (β_c) were estimated for the 230 beam data using the equation proposed by Kim and Harries [17]:

$$\varepsilon_e = \frac{0.05}{100} \left(\frac{wa}{hL\rho} \right)^{0.1} \sqrt{\frac{f'_c}{t_f}} \quad (6)$$

in which all the variables are defined earlier and their units are in mm and MPa. The solved results were substituted into Eq. 3 to determine the exceedance probability of a specific value for all the parameters associated with FRP-debonding (Eq. 2). Finally, the performance reliability (R_p) of an FRP-strengthened beam in terms of debonding resistance is obtained:

$$R_p = 1 - p_f \quad (7)$$

Joint RSM-MCS fragility

Best-fit distribution functions for each parameter given in Table 1 were acquired using the *allfitdist* feature of the MATLAB software [18] that can fit various types of probability distributions within an empirical distribution range. The fitted distribution functions were linked with MCS for numerical iteration assisted by the Cristal Ball software [19]. Two kinds of parameters were taken into consideration: governing and non-governing parameters. The value of a governing parameter was fixed, whereas that of a non-governing parameter was randomly selected within a boundary of the fitted distribution function. For example, FRP thickness has a substantial variation within the given interval [Fig. 2(a)] so that this attribute can be considered a governing parameter. The rest of non-governing parameters, including steel reinforcement ratio, beam height, beam width, beam length, concrete strength, and shear span, are sampled in random order from their intervals at a certain FRP thickness for the generation of an FRP variation-based fragility curve. The effective strains generated by the MCS (10,000 random samples per parameter) were compared with those predicted by Eq. 6 so that the probability of exceedance could be estimated for a specific governing parameter. A value in a fragility curve is then created for a certain failure level in conjunction with effective strains. Such a process is repeated at other failure levels to generate a fragility curve for different failure levels of another governing parameter. Lognormal functions were also fitted to the simulated data of each parameter. For example, Fig. 9(b) reveals an example plot for the beam width parameter with respect to effective strains. The intercept and slope of the fitted line on a lognormal distribution response were taken as the mean and standard deviation of the logarithmic relationship between the effective strain and beam width and were used for developing an MCS fragility curve.

Predicted Performance Reliability

Figure 10 shows the predicted performance reliability of each RSM parameter, along with a comparison between the conventional and RSM-MSC approaches. Figure 10(a) emphasizes the effect of FRP thickness. The reliability of the FRP-concrete interface estimated by the conventional method at an FRP thickness of 1 mm, 2 mm, 4 mm, and 6 mm was 60%, 25%, 12%, and 7%, respectively, while corresponding RSM-MSC solutions provided 58%, 25%, 18%, and 15%. This appears that there is no significant discrepancy at all values of the FRP thickness between these two approaches. The contribution of a steel reinforcement ratio to performance reliability was not substantial unlike the case of the FRP thickness parameter, as shown in Fig. 10(b) where a variation range between 60% and 40% was predicted. Given a steel reinforcement ratio less than 2% is typically used in practice, the performance reliability of strengthened beams may be regarded as 50% irrespective of the steel ratio. Figure 10(c) illustrates a relationship between the reliability and concrete strength. When the concrete strength of the strengthened beam was less than 30 MPa [4350 psi], the reliability was maintained below 30%. Such a low level of reliability, however, gradually increased with an increase in concrete strength. These observations imply that aged concrete structures with a low concrete strength (e.g., 20 MPa [2900 psi] or less) may need extra care when a strengthening design is carried out. Figures 10(d) through (g) depict the effect of beam geometry on the variation of reliability. The contribution of the beam length parameter [Fig. 10(f)] was relatively less significant than that of other parameters. The significant discrepancy between the conventional and the RSM-MSC methods shown in Fig. 10(f) is attributed to the fact that the slope and intercept of the best-fit line created by the conventional method, using the effective strains corresponding to discrete points of beam length from the limited experimental database, are not identical to those created by the RSM-MCS with the corresponding effective strains that were replicated via the RSM.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study has examined performance reliability associated with the structural fragility of FRP-strengthened beams (i.e., effective strain) based on a conventional standard log-normal cumulative probability density function and the proposed joint RSM-MCS method. A large set of 230 experimental data was employed to develop an RSM function for FRP-strengthened beams and the response of unstrengthened beams was outside the scope of the research. The effect of various geometric configurations, that is to say a size effect, was examined when interacting with other physical attributes. The conventional and the proposed approaches exhibited nearly indistinguishable responses for most parameters, excluding the beam length parameter, and hence further refinement appears to be necessary to claim the effectiveness of the proposed approach. Nevertheless, an ultimate merit of the application of joint RSM-MCS to the experimental beam data is its flexibility for efficient use in their performance reliability and parametric studies to examine the single effect and mutual interaction between RSM parameters. Specifically, studied was the mutual interaction between the RSM parameters and FRP-debonding. The effective strain of the FRP-concrete interface was influenced by a number of attributes such as stress redistribution along the bond-line, flexural rigidity of the strengthened beam, failure plane, and external loading conditions. With an increase in the beam height and length, steel reinforcement ratio, and FRP thickness parameters, the effective strains were reduced; however, the effect of the beam width, concrete strength, and shear span parameters showed an opposite trend. The mutual interaction between the RSM parameters revealed that the beam geometry (i.e., length, width, height, and shear span) and FRP thickness were significant factors affecting the effective strain development. The contribution of concrete strength was somewhat notable, while that of a reinforcement ratio was negligible. The degree of surface preparation for a concrete substrate could be another parameter to consider, whereas most published papers did not provide quantifiable information which restricted a mathematical formulation in the current investigation. The predicted performance reliability illustrated that the risk of FRP-debonding failure was substantially raised when an FRP thickness increased and when a low concrete strength was used.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge financial support from the South Dakota State University Research and Scholarship Program with a grant number of SA1400621. The experimental database used was originally compiled by the Task Group on ACI Committee 440 (Fiber Reinforced Polymer Reinforcement) and part of the database was adopted for this research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Shirazian, S., Ghayamghmian, M.R., and Nouri, G.R., 2011, "Developing of fragility curve for two-span simply supported concrete bridge in near fault area", World of Science, Engineering and Technology Conference, 51, 450-454.
- [2] Unnikrishnan, V.U., Prasad, M.A., and Rao, B.N., 2013, "Development of fragility curves using high dimensional model representation", Journal of Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics, 42, 419-430.
- [3] Seo, J. and Linzell, D.G., 2010, "Probabilistic vulnerability scenarios for horizontally curved, steel, I-girder bridges under earthquake loads", Journal of Transportation Research Board, 2202(3), 206-211.
- [4] Seo, J., and Linzell, D.G., 2012, "Horizontally curved steel bridge seismic vulnerability assessment", Engineering Structures, 34, 21-32.
- [5] Seo, J., Duenas-Osorio, L., Craig, J.I., and Goodno, B.J., 2012, "Metamodel-based regional vulnerability estimate of irregular steel moment-frame structures subjected to earthquake events", Engineering Structures, 45, 585-597.
- [6] Ghosh, J., Padgett, J.E., and Duenas-Osorio, L., 2013, "Surrogate modeling and failure surface visualization for efficient seismic vulnerability assessment of highway bridges", Journal of Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics, 34, 189-199.
- [7] Gulec, C.K., Whittaker, A.S., and Hooper, J.D., 2010, "Fragility functions for low aspect ratio reinforced concrete walls", Engineering Structures, 32(2), 894-901.
- [8] ATC-13, 1985, "Earthquake damage evaluation data for California, applied technology council. FEMA contract no. EMW-C-0912, Redwood City, CA.
- [9] Rota, M., Penna, A., and Strobbia, C.L., 2008, "Processing Italian damage data to derive typological fragility curves", Journal of Soil Dynamic Earthquake Engineering, 28, 933-947.

- [10] Bank, L.C., 2006, "Composites for construction: structural design with FRP materials", John Wiley and Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ.
- [11] Bakis, C.E., Bank, L.C., Brown, V.L., Cosenza, E., Davalos, J.F., Lesko, J.J., Machida, A., Rizkalla, S.H., and Triantafillou, T.C., 2002, "Fiber-Reinforced Polymer Composites for Construction-State-of-the-Art Review", *Journal of Composites for Construction*, 6(2), 73-87.
- [12] JMP, 2014, "JMP: statistical discovery: version 11", SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC.
- [13] Smith, S.T. and Teng, J.G., 2002, "FRP-strengthened RC beams. II: assessment of debonding strength models", *Engineering Structures*, 24, 397-417.
- [14] Smith, S.T. and Teng, J.G., 2001, "Interfacial stresses in plated beams", *Engineering Structures*, 23(7), 857-871.
- [15] BASF. 2007. MBrace® CF130 Unidirectional high strength carbon fiber fabric for the MBrace composite strengthening system, BASF Construction Chemicals, Shakopee, MN.
- [16] Choi, E., 2002, "Seismic Analysis and Retrofit of Mid-America Bridges", PhD thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA.
- [17] Kim, Y.J., and Harries, K., 2013, "Statistical characterization of reinforced concrete beams strengthened with FRP sheets", *Journal of Composites for Construction*, 17(3), 357-370.
- [18] The MathWorks, 2013, "MATLAB and Statistics Toolbox Release", The MathWorks, Inc., Natick, MA.
- [19] Oracle, 2008, "Oracle Crystal Ball", Oracle Corp., Redwood Shores, CA.
- [20] Ahmed, O. 2000. Strengthening of RC beams by means of externally bonded CFRP laminates- improved model for plate end shear, PhD Thesis, Department of Civil Engineering, Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium.
- [21] Aidoo, J., Harries, K.A., and Petrou, M.F. 2006. Full-scale experimental investigation of repair of reinforced concrete interstate bridge using CFRP materials, *Journal of Bridge Engineering*, 11(3), 350-358.
- [22] Arduini, M., Nanni, A., and Romagnolo, M. 2004. Performance of one-way reinforced concrete slabs with externally bonded fiber-reinforced polymer strengthening, *ACI Structural Journal*, 101(2), 193-201.
- [23] Beber, A.J., Filho, A.C., and Campagnolo, J.L. 2001. CFRP in the strengthening of reinforced concrete beams, *Proceedings of International Conference on FRP Composites in Civil Engineering*, 391-398.
- [24] Brena, S.F., Bramblett, R.M., Wood, S.L., and Kreger, M.E. 2003. Increasing flexural capacity of reinforced concrete beams using carbon fiber-reinforced polymer composites, *ACI Structural Journal*, 100(1), 36-46.
- [25] Ceroni, F. and Prota, A. 2001. Experimental behavior of RC beams strengthened by FRP sheets, *Proceedings of International Conference on Composites in Constructions*, 499-504.
- [26] Chan, T.K. and Niall, M. 2001. Strengthening of one-way slabs using carbon fibre plates: the effect of preload, *CSE Research Bulletin*, No. 14, Nanyang Technology University, Singapore.
- [27] Chicoine, T. 1997. Analyse et conception d'ancrages sur les poutres renforcees en flexion a l'aide des materiaux composites, M.A.Sc. thesis, Department de genie civil, Universite de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, QC, Canada.
- [28] David, E., Djelal, C., Ragneau, E., and Bodin, F.B. 1999. Use of FRP to strengthen and repair RC beams: experimental study and numerical simulations, *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Advanced Composites for Concrete Repair*, London, UK.
- [29] Dimande, A.O. 2003. Interface influence on the flexural strengthening of concrete structures with FRP systems, MS Thesis, FEUP, Oporto.
- [30] Fang, T.Q. 2002. Study on U-shaped sheet behavior of anti-debonding in the concrete beam reinforced flexurally with FRP, Master's thesis, Tsinghua University, Tsinghua, China.

Response Surface Metamodel-based Performance Reliability for Reinforced Concrete Beams Strengthened with FRP sheets

- [31] Fanning, P.J. and Kelly, O. 2001. Ultimate response of RC beams strengthened with CFRP plates, *Journal of Composites for Construction*, 5(2), 122-127.
- [32] Gao, B., Leung, W.H., Cheng, C.M., Kim, J.K., and Leung, C.K.Y. 2001. Effects of adhesive properties on strengthening of concrete beams with composite strips, *Proceedings of International Conference on FRP Composites in Civil Engineering*, 423-432.
- [33] Garden, H.N. and Hollaway, L.C. 1998. An experimental study of the influence of plate end anchorage of carbon fibre composite plates used to strengthen reinforced concrete beams, *Composite Structures*, 42, 175-188.
- [34] Garden, H.N., Hollaway, L.C., and Thorne, A.M. 1997. A preliminary evaluation of carbon fibre reinforced polymer plates for strengthening reinforced concrete members, *Structures and Buildings*, 122, 127-142.
- [35] Garden, H.N., Auantrill, R.J., Hollaway, L.C., Thorne, A.M., and Parke, G.A.R. 1998. An experimental study of the anchorage length of carbon fibre composite plates used to strength reinforced concrete beams, *Construction and Building Materials*, 12, 203-219.
- [36] Grace, N.F., Abdel-Sayed, G., and Ragheb, W.F. 2002. Strengthening of concrete beams using innovative ductile fiber-reinforced polymer fabric, *ACI Structural Journal*, 99(5), 692-700.
- [37] Juvandes, L.F.P. 1999. Strengthening and rehabilitation of concrete structures using CFRP composites, PhD Thesis, FEUP, Oporto.
- [38] Kaminska, M.E. and Kotynia, R. 2000. Experimental research on RC beams strengthened with CFRP strips, Report No. 9, Department of Concrete Structures, Technical University of Lodz, Poland.
- [39] Kim, Y.J., Fam, A., Kong, A., and El-Hacha, R. 2005. Flexural strengthening of RC beams using steel reinforced polymer (SRP) composites, American Concrete Institute (ACI) Special Publication on Fiber Reinforced Polymer Reinforcement for Concrete Structures (SP-230), 1647-1664.
- [40] Kotynia, R. and Kaminska, M.E. 2003. Ductility and failure mode of RC beams strengthened for flexure with CFRP, Report No. 13, Department of Concrete Structures, Technical University of Lodz, Poland.
- [41] Matthys, S. 2000. Structural behaviour and design of concrete members strengthened with externally bonded FRP reinforcement, PhD thesis, University of Ghent, Ghent, Belgium.
- [42] M'Bazaa, I. 1995. Reinforcement en flexion des poutres en beton arme a l'aide des lamelles en materiaux composites: optimization de la longueur des lamelles, M.A.Sc. thesis, Department de genie civil, Universite de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, QC, Canada.
- [43] Nguyen, D.M., Chan, T.K., and Cheong, H.K. 2001. Brittle failure and bond development length of CFRP-concrete beams, *Journal of Composites for Construction*, 5(1), 12-17.
- [44] Quantrill, R.J., Hollaway, L.C., and Thorne, A.M. 1996. Experimental and analytical investigation of FRP strengthened beam response: part I, *Magazine of Concrete Research*, 48, 177, 331-342.
- [45] Quattlebaum, J., Harries, K.A., and Petrou, M.F. 2005. Comparison of three CFRP flexural retrofit systems under monotonic and fatigue loads, *Journal of Bridge Engineering*, 10(6), 731-740.
- [46] Rahimi, H. and Hutchinson, A. 2001. Concrete beams strengthened with externally bonded FRP plates, *Journal of Composites for Construction*, 5(1), 44-56.
- [47] Reeve, B.Z. 2005. Effect of adhesive stiffness and CFRP geometry on the behavior of externally bonded CFRP retrofit measures subject to monotonic loads, MS Thesis, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.
- [48] Ritchie, P.A., Thomas, D.A., Lu, L., and Connelly, G.M. 1991. External reinforcement of concrete beams using fiber reinforced plastics, *ACI Structural Journal*, 88(4), 490-500.
- [49] Ross, C.A., Jerome, D.M., Tedesco, J.W., and Hughes, M.L. 1999. Strengthening of reinforced concrete beams with externally bonded composite laminates, *ACI Structural Journal*, 96(2), 212-220.

- [50] Saadatmanesh, H. and Ehsani, M.R. 1991. RC beams strengthened with GFRP plates I: experimental study, *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 117(11), 3417-3433.
- [51] Sharif, A., Al-Sulaimani, G.J., Basunbul, I.A., Baluch, M.H., and Ghaleb, B.N. 1994. Strengthening of initially loaded reinforced concrete beams using FRP plates, *ACI Structural Journal*, 91(2), 160-168.
- [52] Shin, Y.S. and Lee, C. 2003. Flexural behavior of reinforced concrete beams strengthened with carbon fiber-reinforced polymer laminates at different levels of sustaining load, *ACI Structural Journal*, 100(2), 231-239.
- [53] Spadea, G., Bencardino, F., and Swamy, R. 1998. Structural behavior of composite RC beams with externally bonded CFRP, *Journal of Composites for Construction*, 2(3), 132-137.
- [54] Tan, K.H. and Mathivoli, M. 1999. Behaviour of preloaded reinforced concrete beams strengthened with carbon fibre sheets, 4th International Symposium on Fibre Reinforced Polymer for Reinforced Concrete Structures, Baltimore, MD, ACI-SP-188, 159-170.
- [55] Teng, J.G., Smith, S.T., Yao, J., and Chen, J.F. 2003. Intermediate crack-induced debonding in RC beams and slabs, *Construction and Building Materials*, 17(6-7), 447-462.
- [56] Triantafillou, T.C. and Plevris, N. 1992. Strengthening of RC beams with epoxy-bonded-fiber-composite materials, *Materials and Structures*, 25, 201-211.
- [57] Tumialan, G., Serra, P., Nanni, A. and Belarbi, A. 1999. Concrete cover delamination in reinforced concrete beams strengthened with carbon fiber reinforced polymer sheets, ACI-SP 188, American Concrete Institute, Farmington, MI, 725-735.
- [58] White, T.W., Soudki, K.A., and Erki, M.A. 2001. Response of RC beams strengthened with CFRP laminates and subjected to a high rate of loading, *Journal of Composites for Construction*, 5(3), 153-162.
- [59] Xiong, G.J., Jiang, H., Huang, J.Z., Yang, J.Z., and Xie, H.C. 2001. Behavior of concrete beams strengthened with hybrid carbon fiber glass fiber sheets, *Proceedings of International Conference on FRP Composites in Civil Engineering*, 407-414.
- [60] Ye, L.P., Cui, W., and Yue, Q.R. 2001. Analysis and calculation of flexural strength of RC members strengthened with CFRP sheet, *Building Structures*, 35(3), 3-5.
- [61] Yi, W.J. and Huang, H.M. 2001. Experimental study on the flexural behavior of RC beams strengthened with CFRP laminates, *Proceedings of International Conference on FRP Composites in Civil Engineering*, 399-406.
- [62] Zhao, M., Zhao, H.D., and Zhang, Y. 2002. Experimental study on flexural RC members strengthened with CFRP fabrics, *Structural Engineering*, 2, 52-58.

Table 1— Experimental database of FRP-strengthened beams partially reproduced based on [17]

Reference	Beam ID	h (mm)	w (mm)	L (mm)	f'_c (MPa)	ρ (%)	t_f (mm)	a (mm)
Ahmed [20]	AF.2	225	125	1500	41	0.36	0.33	500
	Af.2-1	225	125	1500	41	0.36	0.33	500
	AF.3	225	125	1500	41	0.36	0.33	500
	AF.4	225	125	1500	41	0.36	0.33	500
	DF.1	225	125	1500	42	0.54	0.17	500
	DF.2	225	125	1500	42	0.54	0.33	500
	DF.3	225	125	1500	40.5	0.54	0.5	500
	DF.4	225	125	1500	40.5	0.54	0.67	500
	BF.2-1	225	125	1500	41	0.36	0.33	500
	BF.3-1	225	125	1500	41	0.36	0.33	500
	CF.2-1	225	125	1500	43	0.46	0.33	500
	CF.3-1	225	125	1500	43	0.54	0.33	500
	CF.4-1	225	125	1500	43	0.74	0.33	500
	EF.1-1	225	125	1500	46	0.54	0.33	500
	EF.3-1	225	125	1500	38	0.54	0.33	500
	EF.4-1	225	125	1500	33	0.54	0.33	500
	FF.2-3	225	125	1500	39.5	0.54	0.5	700
Aidoo et al. [21]	CS	825	343	8840	45	2.62	1.4	4420

Response Surface Metamodel-based Performance Reliability for
Reinforced Concrete Beams Strengthened with FRP sheets

Reference	Beam ID	h (mm)	w (mm)	L (mm)	f'_c (MPa)	ρ (%)	t_f (mm)	a (mm)
Arduini et al. [22]	S-T1L1p	240	1500	4500	38.8	0.25	0.165	1500
	S-T2L1	240	1500	4500	38.8	0.78	0.165	1500
	S-T2L2	240	1500	4500	38.8	0.78	0.66	1500
	S-T3L1	240	900	4500	38.8	0.57	0.165	1500
	S-T3L2	240	1500	4500	38.8	0.34	0.165	1500
	S-T4L1	240	1500	4500	38.8	2.02	0.165	1500
	S-T4L2	240	1500	4500	38.8	2.02	0.33	1500
Beber et al. [23]	VR5	250	120	2349	33.6	0.52	0.44	783
	VR6	250	120	2349	33.6	0.52	0.44	783
	VR7	250	120	2349	33.6	0.52	0.77	783
	VR8	250	120	2349	33.6	0.52	0.77	783
	VR9	250	120	2349	33.6	0.52	1.1	783
	VR10	250	120	2349	33.6	0.52	1.1	783
Brena et al. [24]	A1	356	203	2690	35.1	0.56	0.33	1065
	A2	356	203	2690	35.1	0.56	0.33	1065
	A3	356	203	2690	35.1	0.56	0.33	1065
	A4	356	203	2690	37.2	0.56	0.165	1065
	B1	356	203	2690	37.2	0.56	0.336	1065
	B3	356	203	2690	37.2	0.56	0.336	1065
	C1	406	203	3000	35.1	0.49	2.08	1220
	C2	406	203	3000	35.1	0.49	2.08	1220
	C4	406	203	3000	37.2	0.49	2.08	1220
	D1	406	203	3000	37.2	0.49	1.19	1220
	D2	406	203	3000	37.2	0.49	1.19	1220
	D3	406	203	3000	37.2	0.49	2.38	1220
Ceroni & Prota [25]	A2	100	150	1800	29	0.67	0.165	750
	A3	100	150	1800	29	0.67	0.165	750
Chan & Niall [26]	S6-50-0	100	330	2500	53.36	0.34	1.2	850
	S6-50-1	100	330	2500	53.36	0.34	1.2	850
	S8-50-0	100	330	2500	53.36	0.61	1.2	850
	S8-50-1	100	330	2500	53.36	0.61	1.2	850
Chicoine [27]	P0	300	200	3000	44.3	0.26	0.9	1000
	P1	300	200	3000	44.3	0.26	0.9	1000
	P3	300	200	3000	44.3	0.26	0.9	1000
David et al [28]	P4	300	150	2800	40	0.68	6	900
	P7	300	150	2800	40	0.68	1.2	900
Dimande [29]	V.A	100	75	900	46.9	0.75	0.117	450
	V.B	100	75	900	46.9	0.75	0.117	450
	V.C	100	75	900	46.9	0.75	0.117	450
	V.D	100	75	900	46.9	0.75	0.117	450
	V.E	100	75	900	46.9	0.75	0.117	450
	V.F	100	75	900	46.9	0.75	0.351	450
	V.G	100	75	900	46.9	0.75	0.351	450
	V.H	100	75	900	46.9	0.75	1.4	450
Fang [30]	B1	200	150	1500	24.96	0.50	0.11	550
	B2	200	150	1500	24.96	0.50	0.11	550
	B3	200	150	1500	24.96	0.50	0.11	550
Fanning & Kelly [31]	F10	240	155	2800	80	0.91	1.2	1100
	F3	240	155	2800	80	0.91	1.2	1100
	F4	240	155	2800	80	0.91	1.2	1100
	F5	240	155	2800	80	0.91	1.2	1100
	F6	240	155	2800	80	0.91	1.2	1100
	F7	240	155	2800	80	0.91	1.2	1100
	F8	240	155	2800	80	0.91	1.2	1100
	F9	240	155	2800	80	0.91	1.2	1100
Gao et al. [32]	BB1	200	150	1500	35.7	0.52	0.22	500
	BB2	200	150	1500	35.7	0.52	0.22	500

Reference	Beam ID	h (mm)	w (mm)	L (mm)	f'_c (MPa)	ρ (%)	t_f (mm)	a (mm)
	BB3	200	150	1500	35.7	0.52	0.22	500
	BB4	200	150	1500	35.7	0.52	0.44	500
	BB5	200	150	1500	35.7	0.52	0.44	500
	BB6	200	150	1500	35.7	0.52	0.44	500
Garden & Hollaway [33]	Can-05	100	100	1174	51.2	0.85	0.82	587
	Can-06	100	100	1544	51.2	0.85	0.82	772
	Can-07	100	100	1544	51.2	0.85	0.82	772
Garden et al [34]	1Au	100	100	900	57.9	0.85	0.5	300
	2Au	100	100	900	57.9	0.85	0.5	340
	3Au	100	100	900	57.9	0.85	0.5	400
	1Bu	100	100	900	57.9	0.85	0.7	300
	1B2u	100	100	900	57.9	0.85	0.7	300
	2Bu	100	100	900	57.9	0.85	0.7	340
	3Bu	100	100	900	57.9	0.85	0.7	400
	1Cu	100	100	900	57.9	0.85	1	300
	2Cu	100	100	900	57.9	0.85	1	340
	3Cu	100	100	900	57.9	0.85	1	400
Garden et al [35]	1U1.0	100	100	1000	44.8	0.85	0.82	300
	2U1.0	100	100	1000	44.8	0.85	0.82	300
	3U1.0	100	100	1000	44.8	0.85	0.82	340
	4U1.0	100	100	1000	44.8	0.85	0.82	400
	5U1.0	100	100	1000	44.8	0.85	0.82	400
	1U2.3	230	130	2300	39	0.79	0.82	845
	1U4.5	230	145	4500	39	0.68	0.82	1525
Grace et al. [36]	C-3	254	152	2440	55.2	1.04	1.9	839
Juvandes [37]	LA3R	76	441	1600	60.2	0.25	0.222	550
	LB1R	81	438	1600	61.6	0.24	0.222	550
	LC3R	81	425	1600	65.8	0.25	0.222	550
	LC4R	77	445	1600	65.5	0.25	0.222	550
	LA4S	80	435	1600	60.3	0.24	1.2	550
	LB2S	85	439	1600	61.8	0.23	1.2	550
	LC1S	81	439	1600	65.6	0.24	1.2	550
	LC2S	85	438	1600	65.7	0.23	1.2	550
	LD3BL	85	433	1600	49.2	0.23	1.4	550
	LD4BL	81	445	1600	49	0.24	1.4	550
	LE3I	82	437	1600	50.2	0.24	1.4	550
	LE4I	78	441	1600	50.2	0.25	1.4	550
	A.1	150	100	1500	31.6	1.05	1.2	650
	A.4	150	100	1500	38.4	1.05	1.2	650
	B.7	150	75	1500	36	0.13	1.2	650
	B.11	150	75	1500	32.4	0.13	1.2	650
	C.5	150	150	1410	21.3	2.01	1.2	605
Kaminska and Kotynia [38]	B-04/S	300	150	3000	28.5	0.35	1.2	800
	B-04/S L2.1	300	150	2100	28.5	0.35	1.2	800
	B-04/M	300	150	3000	29.7	0.35	1.2	800
	B-04/M L2.1	300	150	2100	29.7	0.35	1.2	800
	B-06/S	300	150	3000	32.3	0.50	1.2	800
	B-06/S	300	150	3000	32.3	0.50	1.2	800
	B-08/S	300	150	3000	33.8	0.75	1.2	800
	BO-08/S	300	150	3000	36.5	0.75	1.2	800
	BF-04/0.5S	300	150	3000	33	0.35	1.2	1500
Kim et al. [39]	SRP 30	150	100	1110	46.2	1.33	1.2	555
	SRP 60	150	100	1110	46.2	1.33	1.2	555

Response Surface Metamodel-based Performance Reliability for
Reinforced Concrete Beams Strengthened with FRP sheets

Reference	Beam ID	h (mm)	w (mm)	L (mm)	f'_c (MPa)	ρ (%)	t_f (mm)	a (mm)
Kotynia and Kaminska [40]	SRP 100	150	100	1110	46.2	1.33	1.2	555
	B-08M	300	150	4200	37.3	0.50	1.4	1400
	B-08Mk	300	150	4200	32	0.50	1.4	1400
	B-08Mn	300	150	4200	38.2	0.50	1.4	1400
	B-08S	300	150	4200	32.3	0.50	1.2	1400
	B-083m	300	150	4200	34.4	0.50	1.14	1400
	B-083mb	300	150	4200	25.8	0.50	0.76	1400
Matthys [41]	BO-08Smb	300	150	4200	27.4	0.50	1.2	1400
	BF2	450	200	3800	36.5	0.89	1.2	1250
	BF3	450	200	3800	34.9	0.89	1.2	1250
	BF4	450	200	3800	30.8	0.89	1.2	1250
	BF5	450	200	3800	37.4	0.89	1.2	1250
	BF8	450	200	3800	39.4	0.45	1.2	1250
	BF9	450	200	3800	33.7	0.45	1.2	1250
M'Bazaa [42]	B3	400	300	3800	30	0.33	0.51	1100
	P0	300	200	3000	44.3	0.33	0.9	1000
Ngyuen et al. [43]	A950	95	120	1500	32.1	2.07	1.2	250
	A1100	95	120	1500	32.1	2.07	1.2	250
	A1150	95	120	1500	32.1	2.07	1.2	250
	B1	93	120	1500	44.6	0.51	1.2	250
	B2	100	120	1500	44.6	5.24	1.2	250
	C5	135	120	1500	25.1	1.45	1.2	240
	C10	125	120	1500	25.1	1.57	1.2	240
	C20	105	120	1500	25.1	1.87	1.2	240
Quantrill et al. [44]	A1b	100	100	1000	58.1	0.85	1.2	300
	B2	100	100	1000	44	0.85	1.2	300
	B3	100	100	1000	44	0.85	1.2	300
	B4	100	100	1000	44	0.85	1.6	300
Quattlebaum et al. [45]	CS	254	152	4600	29.9	0.98	1.4	2300
Rahimi & Hutchinson [46]	A4	150	200	2100	54	0.52	0.8	750
	A5	150	200	2100	54	0.52	0.8	750
	A6	150	200	2100	54	0.52	1.2	750
	A7	150	200	2100	54	0.52	1.2	750
	A8	150	200	2100	54	0.52	0.8	750
	A9	150	200	2100	54	0.52	0.8	750
	B3	150	200	2100	54	0.52	0.4	750
	B4	150	200	2100	54	0.52	0.4	750
	B5	150	200	2100	54	0.52	1.2	750
	B6	150	200	2100	54	0.52	1.2	750
Reeve [47]	B7	150	200	2100	54	0.52	1.8	750
	B8	150	200	2100	54	0.52	1.8	750
	L1	250	150	4537	23.3	1.01	1.4	2268.5
	L2	250	150	4537	23.3	1.01	1.4	2268.5
	L2x1	250	150	4537	23.3	1.01	1.4	2268.5
	L4	250	150	4537	23.3	1.01	1.4	2268.5
	H1	250	150	4537	23.3	1.01	1.4	2268.5
	H2	250	150	4537	23.3	1.01	1.4	2268.5
Ritchie et al. [48]	H2x1	250	150	4537	23.3	1.01	1.4	2268.5
	H4	250	150	4537	23.3	1.01	1.4	2268.5
	C	305	152	2438	40	0.55	4.8	915
	D	305	152	2438	40	0.55	4.8	915
	G	305	152	2438	43.2	0.55	4.2	915
	I	305	152	2438	40	0.55	4.06	914
	M	305	152	2438	43.2	0.55	1.27	914
	F	304.8	152	2438	35	0.67	9.4	914.4
	L	304.8	152	2438	35	0.67	1.27	914.4

Reference	Beam ID	h (mm)	w (mm)	L (mm)	f'_c (MPa)	ρ (%)	t_f (mm)	a (mm)
Ross et al. [49]	B1	200	200	2742	54.8	0.46	4.5	914
	B2	200	200	2742	54.8	0.83	4.5	914
	B3	200	200	2742	54.8	1.24	4.5	914
	B4	200	200	2742	54.8	1.83	4.5	914
	B5	200	200	2742	54.8	2.50	4.5	914
	B6	200	200	2742	54.8	3.30	4.5	914
Saadatmanesh and Ehsani [50]	B	455	205	4575	35	1.05	6	1982
	D	455	205	4575	35	1.05	6	1982
Sharif et al. [51]	P3	150	150	1180	37.7	0.70	3	393
	P2	150	150	1180	37.7	0.70	2	393
Shin & Lee [52]	R2O	250	150	2200	18	0.71	0.22	800
	R3O	250	150	2200	18	1.06	0.22	800
Spadea et al [53]	A1.1	300	140	4800	24.9	0.96	1.2	1800
	A3.1	300	140	4800	24.9	0.96	1.2	1800
Tan and Mathivoli [54]	A00	150	100	1800	28.6	1.05	0.22	600
	A15	150	100	1800	31.4	1.05	0.22	600
	A25	150	100	1800	29.7	1.05	0.22	600
	A40	150	100	1800	31.4	1.05	0.22	600
	A60	150	100	1800	28.6	1.05	0.22	600
	A75	150	100	1800	28.5	1.05	0.22	600
	A90	150	100	1800	30.1	1.05	0.22	600
Teng et al. [55]	GS1-I	151.2	302	2000	22.56	0.34	1.27	1000
	CS1-I	150.8	303	2000	21.44	0.34	0.165	1000
	CP1-I	150.5	301.5	2000	27.04	0.69	1.2	1000
	CP2-I	151.9	303.6	2000	37.68	0.68	1.2	1000
Triantafillou & Plevris [56]	B4	127	76	1220	43.58	0.39	0.65	458
	B5	127	76	1220	43.58	0.39	0.65	458
	B6	127	76	1220	43.58	0.39	0.9	458
	B7	127	76	1220	43.58	0.39	0.9	458
	B8	127	76	1220	43.58	0.39	1.9	458
Tumialan et al. [57]	A1	300	150	2130	50.6	1.76	0.165	1065
	A2	300	150	2130	50.6	1.76	0.33	1065
	A7	300	150	2130	50.6	1.76	0.33	1065
	C1	300	150	2130	50.6	1.76	0.165	1065
White et al. [58]	RA	300	150	2800	45.6	1.56	0.44	1000
	RB	300	150	2800	45.6	1.56	0.44	1000
Xiong et al. [59]	CF1	150	120	1800	15.68	1.26	0.11	600
	GF1	150	120	1800	15.68	1.26	0.08	600
	CF3	120	80	1200	15.68	2.36	0.11	400
Ye et al. [60]	BM0	200	400	3760	40.24	1.15	0.111	1380
Yi & Huang [61]	B 06	180	100	2000	32.64	0.84	0.22	700
	B 08	180	100	2000	34	0.84	0.33	700
Zhao et al. [62]	LL-3	250	150	1600	20.16	0.60	0.166	600
	LL-4	250	150	1600	33.12	0.60	0.166	600
	LL-5	250	150	1600	20.16	0.82	0.083	600

h = beam height; w = beam width; L = span length; a = shear span; f'_c = concrete strength in compression; ρ = steel reinforcement ratio; t_f = FRP thickness; a = shear span length
[1 mm = 0.0394 in; 1 MPa = 145.038 psi]

Response Surface Metamodel-based Performance Reliability for Reinforced Concrete Beams Strengthened with FRP sheets

Table 2—Average property of RSM parameters

Parameter	Property
h	212.9 mm [8.4 in]
w	204.3 mm [8.0 in]
L	2301.4 mm [7.6 ft]
ρ	0.79%
a	856.2 mm [33.7 in]
$\sqrt{f'_c}$	6.37
$\sqrt{t_f}$	0.95


Table 3—Statistical coefficients for RSM parameters

Parameter	Coefficient	Parameter	Coefficient	Parameter	Coefficient	Parameter	Coefficient
β_0	0.699981860	β_9	0.000003708	β_{18}	-0.000001620	β_{27}	-0.000003888
β_1	-0.000222101	β_{10}	-0.000000073	β_{19}	0.000394565	β_{28}	0.031525656
β_2	0.000875085	β_{11}	-0.001131978	β_{20}	-0.001042398	β_{29}	-0.047545024
β_3	-0.000075095	β_{12}	0.000000265	β_{21}	0.000000078	β_{30}	0.000000146
β_4	-0.030622844	β_{13}	-0.000004066	β_{22}	0.000131358	β_{31}	-0.000056777
β_5	0.000119648	β_{14}	0.000755277	β_{23}	-0.000000219	β_{32}	-0.000947194
β_6	0.086594988	β_{15}	-0.000000676	β_{24}	0.000043769	β_{33}	-0.004190976
β_7	-0.764317041	β_{16}	0.000000399	β_{25}	0.000474248	β_{34}	-0.055246108
β_8	-0.000001033	β_{17}	-0.000295394	β_{26}	-0.008112305	β_{35}	0.257868896

Table 4—Multivariate analysis of variance

Parameter	F statistics	Significance
h	0.1763	0.6750
w	61.3873	<0.0001*
L	13.1175	0.0004*
ρ	3.46	0.0642
a	7.6919	0.0060*
$\sqrt{f'_c}$	32.2942	<0.0001*
$\sqrt{t_f}$	391.2163	<0.0001*

*: statistically meaningful at a confidence level of 95%



[1 mm = 0.0394 in]

Fig. 1—Comparison between RSM and experimental effective strains with respect to FRP thickness




Fig. 2—Effect of single RSM parameters on effective strain of FRP-strengthened beams: (a) FRP thickness; (b) steel reinforcement ratio; (c) concrete strength; (d) beam height; (e) beam width; (f) beam length; (g) shear span

Response Surface Metamodel-based Performance Reliability for Reinforced Concrete Beams Strengthened with FRP sheets




Fig. 3—Interaction between beam height and other parameters: (a) beam width; (b) beam length; (c) steel reinforcement ratio; (d) shear span; (e) concrete strength; (f) FRP thickness




Fig. 4—Interaction between beam width and other parameters: (a) beam length; (b) steel reinforcement ratio; (c) shear span; (d) concrete strength; (e) FRP thickness




Fig. 5—Interaction between beam length and other parameters: (a) shear span; (b) concrete strength; (c) FRP thickness; (d) steel reinforcement ratio




Fig. 6—Interaction between steel reinforcement ratio and other parameters: (a) concrete strength; (b) FRP thickness; (c) shear span




Fig. 7— Interaction between shear span and other parameters: (a) concrete strength; (b) FRP thickness




Fig. 8— Interaction between FRP thickness and concrete strength




Fig. 9—Log-normal probability plot of effective strain for a range of beam width: (a) conventional method; (b) joint RSM-MCS method




Fig. 10—Reliability response of FRP-strengthened beams: (a) FRP thickness; (b) steel reinforcement ratio; (c) concrete strength; (d) beam height; (e) beam width; (f) beam length; (g) shear span

Reducing Deck Cracking in Composite Bridges by Controlling Long Term Properties

Fatmir Menkulasi, Doug Nelson, Carin L. Roberts Wollmann and Tommy Cousins

Synopsis: Composite concrete bridges are widely used because they combine the advantages of precast concrete with those of cast-in-place concrete. However, because of the difference in shrinkage properties between the girder and the deck and because of the sequence of construction, the deck is subject to differential shrinkage tensile stresses. These tensile stresses may lead to excessive cracking. This paper demonstrates how the likelihood of deck cracking due to differential shrinkage can be reduced and how consequently the resistance of composite concrete bridges against time dependent effects can be enhanced by choosing a deck mix with low shrinkage and high creep. An experimental study on the long term properties of seven deck mixes is presented to identify a deck mix with the aforementioned properties. A comparison of three composite concrete bridge systems used for short-to-medium-span bridges is performed to identify the bridge system that is most resistant against time dependent effects. The mix with saturated lightweight fine aggregates appears to best alleviate tensile stresses due to differential shrinkage and the bridge system with precast inverted T-beams and tapered webs appears to be the most resistant.

Keywords: composite bridges, cracking, creep, differential shrinkage, tensile stresses

ACI member **Fatmir Menkulasi** is an assistant professor in the College of Engineering and Science at Louisiana Tech, Ruston, LA. He is an associate member of ACI Committees 343 and 423. His research interests include the development of resilient and sustainable composite bridge systems. He is a licensed Professional Engineer in Virginia, USA.

ACI member **Doug Nelson** is a structural engineer with Figg Engineering in Dallas, TX. His research interests include the application of cementitious composites to increase the durability and longevity of bridges.

Carin L. Roberts Wollmann, FACI, is a Professor in the Via Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA. She is chair of ACI committee 423, and member of 239 and 318B. Her research interests include reinforced and prestressed concrete structures and bridge design and construction. She is a licensed Professional Engineer in North Carolina, USA.

ACI Member **Tommy Cousins** is a Professor in the Glenn Department of Civil Engineering, Clemson University, Clemson, SC. He is a member of ACI Committee 408 and associate member of 440. His research interests include long term bridge monitoring, behavior of bridge structures and use of high performance materials. He is a licensed Professional Engineer in Louisiana, USA.

INTRODUCTION

State departments of transportation expend significant effort and resources on the construction of durable bridges. A durable bridge is defined as one with a long service life and low maintenance requirements, which lead directly to low life-cycle costs. Deterioration of concrete bridges is the result of harmful environmental conditions such as: water, deicing chemicals, freezing temperatures, mechanical abrasion etc. The most serious threats to durability are generally posed by combinations of two or more of these conditions [1]. Cracks in concrete bridge decks provide easy access for water and deicing chemicals, which shorten the life of the deck, especially in bridges subject to aggressive environments. Both materials increase the effects of freeze-thaw damage, while the deicing chemicals lead to higher concentrations of chlorides, and subsequently, corrosion of reinforcing steel [2]. While there is no general consensus on the influence of crack width on corrosion of reinforcing steel, there is agreement that thickness and porosity of concrete covering the reinforcement are important parameters influencing corrosion [3]. There are generally two approaches that can be taken with regards to cracking. The first approach is to design concrete members not to crack under service loads. To do this the sources of cracking must be identified and measures taken to reduce the potential for the development of cracks. These measures include designing not only for the mechanical loads but also for the structural effects of restrained deformations. Examples of restrained deformations include differential settlements, differential shrinkage, temperature gradients, and uniform changes in temperature. Measures that can be taken to reduce the potential for cracking include modifying concrete material properties and adjusting construction sequences and techniques. Article 3.3.2 of AASHTO [4] classifies force effects due to shrinkage and creep as permanent loads. In addition, Table 3.4.1-1 in AASHTO [4] stipulates the service and strength level load combinations which include the effects of shrinkage and creep. ACI 209.1R [5] provides guidance on the factors affecting drying shrinkage and creep and discusses the effect of mixture proportions, the environment and the effect of design and construction on shrinkage and creep. ACI 209.2R [6] presents several models for calculating shrinkage strains and creep coefficients so that the structural effects of shrinkage and creep can be accounted for in the structural design. The second approach is to design concrete members to crack under service loads and take measures to control crack width. For example code provisions provide guidelines on the amount of reinforcing steel needed to control crack width. A combination of both approaches is also a viable option, which includes taking measures to reduce the likelihood of cracking but also includes specifications for bar size, spacing and concrete cover to control crack width if cracks were to occur. The discussion presented in this paper focuses on cracking that may be developed in the cast-in-place deck as a result of differential shrinkage and demonstrates how the likelihood of cracking in short-to-medium-span bridges can be reduced by controlling the long term properties of the deck concrete and by choosing a bridge system that is resistant against time dependent effects.

RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE

Excessive deck cracking leads to deck deterioration and expensive repair and rehabilitation procedures. Cracks in concrete bridge decks provide easy access for water and deicing chemicals to reinforcement, which shorten the life of the deck, especially in bridges subject to aggressive environments. One cause of excessive deck cracking is differential shrinkage between the cast-in-place concrete deck and the precast concrete girder. The restraint of the

shrinkage of the deck by the girder creates tensile stresses in the deck which may exceed the tensile strength of deck concrete. This paper demonstrates how the likelihood of deck cracking in short-to-medium-span bridges can be reduced by controlling the long term properties of the deck and by choosing a bridge system that reduces the extent of critical tensile stresses in the deck resulting from differential shrinkage.

SCOPE OF STUDY

The scope of this study is to demonstrate the potential for differential concrete shrinkage to induce tensile stresses in cast-in-place bridge deck in excess of the tensile strength of concrete and recommend a deck mix that reduces the likelihood of cracking due to differential shrinkage. In addition, one traditional and two relatively new bridge systems intended for short-to-medium-span bridges are investigated for their resistance to tensile stresses resulting from time dependent effects. A series of seven deck mixes developed by the researchers at Virginia Center for Transportation Innovation and Research (VCTIR) are investigated by measuring: compressive strength, modulus of elasticity, splitting tensile strength, shrinkage, and creep. A numeric investigation and several finite element analyses are conducted with the purposes of simulating and quantifying the effects of differential shrinkage in short-to-medium-span bridges and ranking these three bridge systems in order of resistance to this phenomenon. The three bridge systems chosen for this investigation will be presented later in this paper.

STRUCTURAL EFFECTS OF DIFFERENTIAL SHRINKAGE AND CREEP IN COMPOSITE SYSTEMS

The inherent difference in shrinkage and creep properties between a cast-in-place deck and precast girder will cause self-equilibrating stresses at the cross-sectional level in a composite system. Even if the composite girder is used in a single span simply supported bridge, these self-equilibrating stresses will form along the entire span of the bridge. The difference in shrinkage properties is exacerbated by the difference in age between the two components. As a result, when the cast-in-place deck is placed, it will tend to shrink while the majority of the shrinkage in the precast girder has already taken place. The restraint provided by the precast girder to the free shrinkage of the deck will create a tensile force in the deck while the free shrinkage of the deck will exert a compressive force in the precast girder. In addition, because the centroids of the precast and cast-in-place components are at different locations, this differential shrinkage will cause a positive curvature. The curvature will result in a prestress gain in the bottom layer of prestressing in the precast girder, whereas the compression force from the shrinkage of the deck will cause a prestress loss. Figure 1 shows the redistribution of forces in a composite system consisting of a precast prestressed concrete girder and a cast-in-place deck. The time dependent strain at any fiber in the precast girder or cast-in-place deck can be calculated by summing the elastic and creep strains due to initial stresses, elastic and creep strains due to changes in stress, and the shrinkage strain (Eq. 1).

$$\varepsilon_t = \underbrace{\frac{\sigma_0}{E_0}(1 + \varphi_{t,t_0})}_{\text{Term 1}} + \underbrace{\int_{t_0}^t \left[\frac{1}{E(\tau)} \frac{d\sigma(\tau)}{d\tau} (1 + \varphi(t, \tau)) \right] d\tau}_{\text{Term 2}} + \underbrace{\varepsilon_{sh,t}}_{\text{Term 3}} \quad (1)$$

where

ε_t = total strain at time t

$\sigma_0, \sigma(\tau)$ = stress at time t_0 and τ , respectively

$E_0, E(\tau)$ = modulus of elasticity at times t_0 and τ , respectively

$\varphi_{t,t_0}, \varphi(t, \tau)$ = creep coefficient at time t due to load applied at time t_0 and τ , respectively

$\varepsilon_{sh,t}$ = shrinkage strain at time t

Term 1 represents the elastic and creep strains due to a stress applied at time t_0 . Term 2 represents the elastic and creep strains due to changes in stress in the time interval t_0 to t . Term 3 represents the shrinkage strain at time t . Eq. 1 uses an integral type creep law for Term 2, which is a Volterra type integral, and uses the principle of superposition of stepwise prescribed stress histories [7]. The integral term can be replaced by an algebraic expression if an aging coefficient μ is introduced [8,9]. Eq. 1 can then be reformulated as follows:

$$\varepsilon_t = \frac{\sigma_0}{E_0}(1 + \varphi_{t,t_0}) + \frac{\Delta\sigma}{E_0}(1 + \mu\varphi_{t,t_0}) + \varepsilon_{sh,t} \quad (2)$$

As defined earlier σ_0 represent initial stresses. These stresses can be created by forces and moments that are initially directly applied to the precast girder or the cast-in-place deck ($M_{Ddirect}^0, N_{Ddirect}^0, M_{Gdirect}^0, N_{Gdirect}^0, N_{psdirect}^0$) or by forces and moments that are initially applied to the composite system (M^0, N^0). For example an eccentric prestressing force in a pre-tensioned girder creates axial forces and bending moments that are applied directly to the girder in addition to the axial force applied directly to the prestressing strand. To utilize the free shrinkage and creep properties of the precast and cast-in-place concrete it is useful to decompose the internal forces and moment acting on the composite section, into forces and moments acting separately on the girder and deck ($M_D^0, N_D^0, M_G^0, N_G^0, N_{ps}^0$). Examples of axial forces and bending moment that are applied initially to the composite system include post-tensioning forces applied after the system is made composite and bending moments created due to superimposed dead loads. The term $\Delta\sigma$ in Eq. 2 represents the change in stress due to changes in axial forces and bending moments in the deck, girder or prestressing strands. These are denoted as $\Delta M_D, \Delta N_D, \Delta M_G, \Delta N_G$ and ΔN_{ps} in Fig. 1. The changes in strains and stresses due to time dependent effects can be calculated by using equations of material constitutive relationships, equilibrium and compatibility. Menn [1] provides detailed guidance on how this analysis can be performed. Some of the theoretical background provided in Menn's book is presented below for convenience. For example the change in axial strain at the centroid of the deck and girder can be expressed by summing the creep strain due to initial axial forces, the elastic and creep strain due to the change in axial force over time and the free shrinkage strain (Eq. 3 and 5). The change in curvature in the deck and girder can be expressed by summing the creep curvature due to initial moments and the elastic and creep curvatures due to changes in these moments over time (Eq. 4 and 6). The change in prestressing strand strain over time can be simply calculated by dividing the change in stress in the strand by the modulus of elasticity of the strand (Eq. 7). The change in stress in the strand over time represents either a prestress loss or prestress gain due to differential shrinkage and creep. In a statically determinate system, because there are no externally applied axial forces over time, the sum of changes in the axial forces in each component must equal zero (Eq. 8). In addition, in such a determinate system because there are no externally applied bending moments over time, the sum of moment about the centroid of the girder must equal zero (Eq. 9). Finally, assuming perfect bond between deck concrete, girder concrete and prestressing strands the axial strains at the centroid of each of these components can be inter-related by using the change in curvature and the distances between the centroids (Eq. 10 and 11). The assumptions made in this method of analysis are: a) plane sections remain plane, b) sections are un-cracked, c) creep and shrinkage properties are assumed to represent the average behavior of the whole cross-sections, or components thereof, in drying conditions, d) tensile creep is the same as compressive creep. Equations 3 to 11 form a set of linear equations which can be solved simultaneously to determine the 9 unknowns caused by the time dependent effects ($\Delta\epsilon_D, \Delta\epsilon_G, \Delta\epsilon_{ps}, \Delta X, \Delta N_D, \Delta N_G, \Delta N_{ps}, \Delta M_D, \Delta M_G$). Initial and final stresses can then be calculated using Eq. 12-17. This method can be easily implemented in a mathematical analysis program, such as Mathcad 14 [10], or in a computer spreadsheet program. It should be noted that the approach used in Eq. 3-17 considers only stresses and strains in one direction at a time. Finite element analysis can be used to account for the 3D state of stress and quantify time dependent effects when such an option is available. Both of these methods are used in this paper to determine the structural effects of differential shrinkage and shrinkage induced creep. Because differential shrinkage can cause tensile stresses in the deck that may exceed the tensile strength of concrete, a deck mix with low shrinkage will reduce the likelihood of cracking. In addition, a deck mix with high creep will alleviate the tensile stresses created as a result of differential shrinkage. The following section presents an experimental investigation on seven deck mixes with the purpose of identifying the mix with lowest free shrinkage and highest creep.

EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

Seven deck mixes developed by the researchers at VCTIR were put through a battery of tests to investigate their short term and long term properties. The deck mixes contained normal weight and light weight coarse and fine aggregates. The mixture proportions for each mix design are provided in Table 1. The cementitious materials that were used were fly ash and blast furnace slag. To increase the workability of the mixes without increasing the water content, super plasticizer was used as needed. In addition, because bridge decks are structural components that are exposed to weather, an air-entrained mix is typically used to improve durability when the deck is subjected to freeze-thaw cycles and deicing salts. This improvement is typically accomplished by adding an air entraining agent. The resulting even distribution of pores in the concrete prevents large air voids from forming and breaks down the capillary pathways from the surface to the reinforcement [11]. Target material properties were as follows:

- Minimum compressive strength at 28 days = 4000 psi (28 MPa)
- Maximum coarse aggregate size for:

- ✓ normal weight mixes = No.57 stone (1 in.) (25mm)
- ✓ light weight mixes = ¾ in. (19 mm)
- Minimum cementitious materials content = 635 lbs/yd³ (377 kg/m³)
- Maximum water cementitious materials ratio for:
 - ✓ normal weight mixes = 0.45
 - ✓ light weight mixes = 0.43
- Slump = 4 in. to 7 in. (100 mm to 180 mm)
- Air Content = 6 ½ ± 1 ½ %

When a high-range water reducer (superplasticizer) was used, the upper limit on air content was increased by 1 %. One batch was placed for each concrete mix design.

Material Constitutive Relationships

$$\Delta \varepsilon_D = \frac{N_{Ddirect}^0 + N_D^0}{E_D A_D} \varphi_D + \frac{\Delta N_D}{E_D A_D} (1 + \mu \varphi_D) + \varepsilon_{SHD} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{where: } N_D^0 = \frac{n A_D}{A_c} N^0 - \frac{M^0 a_D E_D A_D}{I_c E_G}$$

$$\Delta X = \frac{M_{Ddirect}^0 + M_D^0}{E_D I_D} \varphi_D + \frac{\Delta M_D}{E_D I_D} (1 + \mu \varphi_D) \quad (4)$$

$$\text{where: } M_D^0 = \frac{M^0 E_D I_D}{E_G I_c}$$

$$\Delta \varepsilon_G = \frac{N_{Gdirect}^0 + N_G^0}{E_G A_G} \varphi_G + \frac{\Delta N_G}{E_G A_G} (1 + \mu \varphi_G) + \varepsilon_{SHG} \quad (5)$$

$$\text{where: } N_{Gdirect}^0 = -P_e + \frac{M^0 a_{ps} E_{ps} A_{ps}}{I_c E_G}, \quad N_G^0 = \frac{A_G}{A_c} N^0 + \frac{M^0 a_D E_D A_D}{I_c E_G}$$

$$\Delta X = \frac{M_{Gdirect}^0 + M_G^0}{E_G I_G} \varphi_G + \frac{\Delta M_G}{E_G I_G} (1 + \mu \varphi_G) \quad (6)$$

$$\text{where: } M_{Gdirect}^0 = -P_e e + M_{Gself} + M_{Gslab}, \quad M_G^0 = \frac{M^0 I_G}{I_c}$$

$$\Delta \varepsilon_{ps} = \frac{\Delta N_{ps}}{E_{ps} A_{ps}} \quad (7)$$

Equilibrium

$$\Delta N_D + \Delta N_G + \Delta N_{ps} = 0 \quad (8)$$

$$\Delta M_G + \Delta M_D - \Delta N_D a + \Delta N_{ps} e = 0 \quad (9)$$

Compatibility

$$\Delta \varepsilon_D = \Delta \varepsilon_G - \Delta X (y_{Dbottom} - y_{Gbottom}) \quad (10)$$

$$\Delta \varepsilon_{ps} = \Delta \varepsilon_G + \Delta X (y_{Gbottom} - y_{psbottom}) \quad (11)$$

Stresses

$$\sigma_{D0} = \left(\frac{N_{Ddirect}^0 + N_D^0}{A_D} + \frac{(M_{Ddirect}^0 + M_D^0)}{I_D} y \right) \quad (12)$$

$$\sigma_{Dfinal} = \left(\frac{N_{Ddirect}^0 + N_D^0 + \Delta N_D}{A_D} + \frac{(M_{Ddirect}^0 + M_D^0 + \Delta M_D)}{I_D} y \right) \quad (13)$$

$$\sigma_{G0} = \left(\frac{N_{Gdirect}^0 + N_G^0}{A_G} + \frac{(M_{Gdirect}^0 + M_G^0)}{I_G} y \right) \quad (14)$$

$$\sigma_{Gfinal} = \left(\frac{N_{Gdirect}^0 + N_G^0 + \Delta N_G}{A_G} + \frac{(M_{Gdirect}^0 + M_G^0 + \Delta M_G)}{I_G} y \right) \quad (15)$$

$$\sigma_{psinitial} = \left(\frac{N_{psdirect}^0 + N_{ps}^0}{A_{ps}} \right) \quad (16)$$

$$\sigma_{psfinal} = \left(\frac{N_{psdirect}^0 + N_{ps}^0 + \Delta N_{ps}}{A_{ps}} \right) \quad (17)$$

Short term properties

Short term properties determined for the deck mixes include compressive strength, splitting tensile strength, and modulus of elasticity. These short term properties are useful in assessing the quality of concrete and the response to

short-term loads such as vehicle live loads [11]. Sometimes these short term properties are modified to account for the long term effects. For example, the Age Adjusted Effective Modulus (AAEM) method [8,9] accounts for the increase in strain due to creep of concrete under sustained loads by employing a reduced long term modulus of elasticity. The compressive strength, splitting tensile strength and modulus of elasticity were determined in accordance with ASTM C39 [12], ASTM C496 [13], ASTM C469 [14] respectively. The short term properties for all seven mixes are provided in Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4. Experimental data for tensile strength and modulus of elasticity are compared to the values obtained using the equations in AASHTO [4]. These equations are provided in AASHTO [4] Section 5.4.2.4 and Section 5.4.2.6-7, respectively. When cracking is caused by the effects of flexure, AASHTO [4] provides a series of equations for the determination of modulus of rupture (f_r) for both normal-weight and light weight concrete. These values vary between $0.20\sqrt{f'_c}$ to $0.24\sqrt{f'_c}$ ($0.53\sqrt{f'_c}$ to $0.64\sqrt{f'_c}$) for normal weight concrete and between $0.17\sqrt{f'_c}$ to $0.20\sqrt{f'_c}$ ($0.45\sqrt{f'_c}$ to $0.53\sqrt{f'_c}$) for lightweight concrete, where f'_c is in ksi (MPa). The commentary of Section C5.4.2.6 states that data show that most modulus of rupture values are between $0.24\sqrt{f'_c}$ and $0.37\sqrt{f'_c}$ ($0.64\sqrt{f'_c}$ and $0.98\sqrt{f'_c}$). In addition, the commentary of Section C5.4.2.7 states that the given values may be un-conservative for tensile cracking caused by restrained shrinkage, anchor zone splitting, and other similar tensile forces caused by effects other than flexure and that the direct tensile strength stress (f_t) should be used in these cases. Equation 18 is taken from the commentary of Section 5.4.2.7 –Tensile Strength and may be used for normal weight concrete with specified compressive strengths up to 10 ksi (70 MPa). Because the focus of this paper is potential cracking due to restrained differential shrinkage, Eq. 18 is used to compare calculated and tested tensile strength values. Equation 19 is used to calculate the tensile strength of mixes that contained light weight coarse aggregates and normal weight fine aggregates (sand-lightweight). There is no equation in AASHTO [4] that is applicable to the mixes that contained normal weight coarse aggregates and a mixture of normal weight and light weight fine aggregates. Because the normal weight aggregates represented the majority of aggregates in these mixes, Eq. 18 was used for comparison with tested values. However, as can be seen from the results in Table 3, Eq. 18 overestimated the tensile strength of the two mixes that contained a mixture of normal weight and lightweight aggregates. In the calculation of concrete tensile strength using Eq. 18 and 19, the tested values were used for the compression strength of concrete. Although in general, AASHTO's [4] equations overestimated the tensile strength of the investigated mixes, they provided reasonably good estimates for design purposes. The tensile strength of concrete is an important short term property because the likelihood of cracking is estimated by comparing the magnitude of tensile stresses created due to differential shrinkage with the tensile strength of the cast-in-place concrete deck. Table 3 provides also a summary of the tested tensile strength of the seven concrete mixes at 28 days. The mix with the lowest tensile strength was the one with normal weight coarse aggregates and saturated lightweight fines. The mix with the highest tensile strength was the mix with normal weight coarse aggregates and slag denoted (NWC-SL2). The mixes that contained lightweight aggregates exhibited lower tensile strengths at 28 days compared to the mixes that contained normal weight aggregates. However, the compressive strengths at 28 days of the lightweight mixes were not always lower than those of the normal weight mixes. For example, the mix with the highest compressive strength at 28 days was the mix with saturated lightweight coarse aggregates and slag (SLWC-SL), whereas the mix with the lowest compressive strength at 28 days was the mix with normal weight coarse aggregates and fly ash (NWC-FA).

$$f_t = 0.23\sqrt{f'_c} \text{ where } f'_c \text{ is in ksi, or } f_t = 0.61\sqrt{f'_c} \text{ where } f'_c \text{ is in MPa} \quad (18)$$

$$f_t = 0.20\sqrt{f'_c} \text{ where } f'_c \text{ is in ksi, or } f_t = 0.53\sqrt{f'_c} \text{ where } f'_c \text{ is in MPa} \quad (19)$$

$$E_c = 33,000 K_1 w_c^{1.5} \sqrt{f'_c} \text{ where } w_c \text{ is in k/ft}^3 \text{ and } f'_c \text{ is in ksi} \quad (20)$$

$$E_c = 1.76 \cdot 10^{11} K_1 w_c^{1.5} \sqrt{f'_c} \text{ where } w_c \text{ is in kg/m}^3 \text{ and } f'_c \text{ is in MPa}$$

Tested modulus of elasticity values for the seven mixes were compared with those calculated using Eq. 20 from AASHTO [4]. Tested unit weight and compressive strength values were used in the evaluation of Eq. 20. In general, Eq. 20 underestimated the modulus of elasticity of the seven investigated mixes, however, it provided reasonably fair estimates for design purposes. Modulus of elasticity is another short term property that plays an important role in the evaluation of composite bridge systems for the effects of differential shrinkage. Because in this study the quantification of stresses due to differential shrinkage is based on the age adjusted effective modulus method, a higher modulus of elasticity for the deck leads to higher tensile stresses in the deck. Conversely, a lower modulus of elasticity for the deck leads to a lower age adjusted effective modulus and represents a mix that can alleviate the tensile stresses in the deck created as a result of differential shrinkage. In addition, with time the modulus of elasticity of concrete increases, which is why the age adjusted effective modulus method employed in this study uses

an aging coefficient, which accounts for this effect. Such an increase in the modulus of elasticity works against the concept of alleviating tensile stresses as a result of differential shrinkage because it makes the mix stiffer and less accommodating towards restrained deformations. Table 4 provides a summary of the moduli of elasticity values for the seven mixes at 28 days. The mix with the lowest modulus of elasticity is the mix with saturated light weight coarse aggregates and fly ash. Whereas the mix with the highest modulus of elasticity is the one with normal weight coarse aggregates and slag denoted (NWC-SL2). The comparison of tensile strength and modulus of elasticity for the seven mixes illustrates how it is difficult to find a mix that embodies all the desired properties. For example the mix denoted NWC-SL2 had the highest tensile strength but also the highest modulus of elasticity.

Long term properties

Typically, compressive strength, tensile strength and modulus of elasticity of concrete increase with age, however, in this paper the phrase long term properties is used to describe shrinkage and creep properties of concrete. Shrinkage is considered to be a change in volume during hardening and drying under constant temperature, whereas creep is defined as increase in strain over time under constant stress. Shrinkage and creep tests were performed in accordance with ASTM C157 [15] and ASTM C512 [16], respectively. Creep specimens were loaded at 7 days and the applied load was maintained at approximately $0.4f'_{c7}$ (where f'_{c7} is the average cylinder compressive strength at 7 days). The time dependent properties of concrete are influenced by the environmental conditions at the time of placement and throughout its service life [11]. These properties are used in determining the structural effects of differential shrinkage and creep. ACI 209.2 [6] provides four models for calculating shrinkage and creep properties as a function of time. AASHTO [4] has its own models for creep and shrinkage. ACI 209.2 [6] states that: “The variability of shrinkage and creep test measurements prevents models from closely matching experimental data. The within-batch coefficient of variation for laboratory-measured shrinkage on a single mixture of concrete was approximately 8% [17]. Hence, it would be unrealistic to expect results from prediction models to be within plus or minus 20% of the test data for shrinkage. Even larger differences occur for creep predictions. For structures where shrinkage and creep are deemed critical, material testing should be undertaken and long-term behavior extrapolated from the resulting data.” It should be noted that the tests performed on the deck mixes described in this investigation were performed only on one batch for each mix. It was outside the scope of study to investigate the repeatability and consistency of the results obtained from each mix. One of the purposes of this study was to demonstrate the structural effects of differential shrinkage and creep and how they may influence the durability of composite bridges. The next section describes the results from the shrinkage and creep tests and identifies the mix with the desired long term properties.

COMPARISON OF SHRINKAGE AND CREEP PROPERTIES FOR EACH MIX

Figure 2 shows the development of drying shrinkage strains with time for the seven mixes investigated. In this paper shortening strains are positive. Because the changes in shrinkage strains recorded after 70 days were generally negligible, shrinkage testing was stopped at 100 days. It is important to note that the measured shrinkage strains represent only drying shrinkage strains. Shrinkage specimens were moist cured for 7 days and were then exposed to drying. Table 5 provides a summary of the shrinkage strains at 100 days. The mix with the lowest shrinkage was the mix with normal weight coarse aggregates and saturated lightweight fine aggregates. The mix with the highest shrinkage was the mix saturated light weight coarse aggregates and slag. Both mixes that contained saturated lightweight coarse aggregates exhibited the highest shrinkage strains. Figure 3 shows the development of measured strains with time during the creep test. Figure 3(a) shows the total strain which is defined in Eq. 21. Total strain is equal to the summation of elastic strain, shrinkage strain and creep strain. Elastic strain is the strain measured immediately after the creep specimens are loaded. Shrinkage strain is the strain due to the shrinkage of the creep specimens during the creep tests and is measured from unloaded companion cylinders. Creep strain is the increase in strain in the creep specimens over time as a result of the applied load.

$$\text{total strain} = \text{elastic strain} + \text{shrinkage strain} + \text{creep strain} \quad (21)$$

Because the change in total strains recorded from the creep test after 80 days were negligible, creep tests were terminated at a 106 days. Figure 3(b) shows the shrinkage strain measured in the creep specimens, which was deducted from the total strain to obtain the stress induced strain. Figure 3(c) shows the stress induced strain which is defined in Eq. 22. Stress induced strain is the strain caused only by the sustained load (or sustained stress) over time and can be expressed as the summation of the elastic strain and creep strain. Alternatively, stress induced strain can be expressed as the total strain measured in the creep specimens minus the shrinkage strain measured in unloaded companion cylinders.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{stress induced strain} &= \text{elastic strain} + \text{creep strain} & \text{or} \\ \text{stress induced strain} &= \text{Total strain} - \text{shrinkage strain} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Figure 3(d) shows the creep strain. Creep strain was obtained from deducting the elastic strain from the stress induced strain. One of the parameters used in the analysis for time dependent effects is the creep coefficient. Creep coefficient is the ratio of creep strain to the initial elastic strain (Eq. 23).

$$\text{creep coefficient} = \frac{\text{drying creep strain}}{\text{initial elastic strain}} \quad (23)$$

Table 6 provides a summary of the experimental data from creep tests. Elastic strains for the two mixes containing saturated lightweight coarse aggregates are higher than the rest of the mixes. This is expected because lightweight mixes typically have lower moduli of elasticity compared to normal weight mixes (as shown in Table 4). Although there were several differences between the shrinkage strains measured during the shrinkage tests and those measured from the unloaded companion cylinders during the creep tests, there were also some similarities. For example the NWC-SLWF, NWC-SL2 and NWC-SLWC-SL mixes exhibited the lowest shrinkage strains during both, shrinkage and creep tests. The lowest shrinkage strain however in the creep tests was measured in the NWC-SL2 mixes as opposed to the NWC-SLWF mix. Shrinkage strains measured during the creep test in the NWC-FA, NWC-SL1, SLWC-FA and SLWC-SL were also not entirely consistent with those measured from the shrinkage prisms. The highest disparity was observed in the shrinkage measurements for the SLWC-SL mix. During the creep tests this mix exhibited the lowest shrinkage strain compared to NWC-FA, NWC-SL1 and SLWC-FA mixes, whereas the data from the shrinkage prisms revealed the opposite. Despite these differences, the lowest average shrinkage strain from shrinkage and creep tests was still exhibited by the NWC-SLWF mix, which was identified as the mix with the lowest drying shrinkage strain during the shrinkage tests. Additionally, the shrinkage strains obtained from both tests agree well for the NWC-SLWF mix. Because creep strain is calculated by subtracting elastic and shrinkage strains from the total strain the magnitude of the elastic and shrinkage strains plays an important role in this determination. In this study creep coefficient is used as the metric for comparing creep properties of the seven mixes, because it is this coefficient that is employed in the age adjusted effective modulus method. Table 7 provides a summary of the long terms properties of the seven investigated mixes. The NWC-SLWF mix exhibited the lowest shrinkage, whereas the SLWC-SL mix exhibited the highest one. The NWC-SLWF mix also exhibited the highest creep coefficient, whereas the SLWC-SL mix exhibited the lowest creep coefficient. While it may be typically difficult to find a mix that exhibits both low shrinkage and high creep properties, in this study the NWC-SLWF mix possessed both of these characteristics and is considered to be the most desirable mix, whereas the SLWC-SL mix is considered to be the least desirable one. For other situations where the combination of low shrinkage and high creep may not be possible, priority should be given to a mix with the lowest shrinkage because it is the free shrinkage of the deck that serves as a catalyst for the creation of tensile stresses in the cast-in-place topping and potentially excessive cracking. In addition, sensitivity studies can be performed for a given structure to determine the influence of the short and long term properties of the concrete materials on the structural effects of shrinkage and creep.

NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

To illustrate the advantages of a deck mix with low shrinkage and high creep a composite bridge system with adjacent voided slabs is considered. This type of system is typically used for short-to-medium-span bridges. Because the adjacent precast voided slabs serve as stay-in-place formwork, this system offers accelerated bridge construction and replacement by eliminating the need for site installed formwork. Figure 5 shows a typical transverse cross-section for this bridge system. The cross-sectional dimensions shown in Fig. 5 represent those used in a two-span continuous bridge constructed during the spring of 2014 near Richmond, VA. Prestressing and mild steel reinforcing details are not shown for clarity. Each span is 41.5 ft (12.7 m). A time dependent analysis using the age adjusted effective modulus method and Menn's [1] approach described earlier in this paper was conducted with the purpose of quantifying the distribution of initial and final stresses in such a composite bridge system. A total of seven analyses were conducted with the purpose of exploring the influence of the long term properties of the seven deck mixes on the final distribution of stresses in this composite bridge system. The variables in each analysis consisted of the tested short and long term properties of each deck mix. Because the contract documents specified an age of 90 days for establishing continuity, the ultimate shrinkage strain and the ultimate creep coefficient for the precast voided slab were taken equal to zero. The age of continuity refers to the time when the cast-in-place deck is placed over the adjacent precast voided slabs, making the two-span bridge continuous. This time starts after the fabrication

of the individual precast voided slabs. 90 days is considered a long enough time to allow the majority of the shrinkage and creep to take place in the precast voided slab. The aging coefficient was taken equal to 0.7. This investigation was also conducted with the purpose of revealing which investigated deck mix offers the best combination of short term and long term properties with regards to minimizing the tensile stresses in the deck as a result of differential shrinkage. Figure 6(a) shows the distribution of the initial longitudinal normal stresses in the precast voided slab due to its self-weight, the prestressing force and the weight of the cast-in-place topping. Because the adjacent precast voided slabs serve as stay-in-place formwork for the cast-in-place topping, they support the wet weight of the topping and initial stresses in the topping are zero. In addition, the differences in the initial stress distribution along the depth of the girder among the deck mixes is because of the different unit weights of each topping mix. With time, the composite section will be subject to additional stresses due to differential shrinkage as the cast-in-place topping will try to shrink and the precast girder will tend to restrain this shrinkage. These additional stresses due to time dependent effects are illustrated in Fig. 6(b). The combination of the initial stresses and those created due to time dependent effects is shown in Fig. 6(c), which highlights the variation of final stresses depending on which topping mix is selected. For example if the NWC-SLWF mix is selected, the maximum final tensile stress at the bottom of the cast-in-place topping is 0.214 ksi (1.5 MPa). Whereas, if the SLWC-SL mix is selected then the maximum tensile stress at the bottom of the cast-in-place topping can be as high as 0.756 ksi (5.2 MPa), which is greater than the modulus of rupture for the corresponding mix. Table 8 provides a summary of the maximum tensile stresses created at the bottom of cast-in-place topping for each of the investigated mixes. It also provides a comparison between the maximum tensile stress at the bottom of the deck and the corresponding tensile strength of the mix used in that analysis. As can be seen, the lowest ratio is provided by the mix that has normal weight coarse aggregates and saturated lightweight fine aggregates, whereas the highest ratio is provided by the mix that contains saturated lightweight coarse aggregates and slag. Only two of the mixes provided ratios that were smaller than one, which means that if the other mixes are used for the cast-in-place topping then the bridge may exhibit transverse cracks along both spans. It should be noted that in the time dependent analysis presented herein, the short and long term properties were based on the tested values for each mix and ultimate shrinkage strains and creep coefficient were not adjusted to account for the relative humidity at the bridge site and the volume to surface ratio of the structural components. The purpose of this analysis is to demonstrate how the long term properties of the deck mix can influence the resistance of the composite bridge system against time dependent effects. As a result, it is essential to specify a topping mix with low shrinkage and high creep to reduce the likelihood of excessive cracking and consequently increase the longevity of composite concrete bridges.

FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS

The method illustrated in Eq. 3-17 using the age adjusted effective modulus is a sectional analysis method and can provide the distribution of longitudinal and transverse normal stresses due to time dependent effects for any given composite cross-section. Along the longitudinal axis of the bridge the voided slab composite section is prismatic and the results of time dependent analysis based on Eq. 3 to 17 will apply at any given transverse cross-section. However, because of the presence of the voids, the voided slab system is not prismatic in the transverse direction and the results of the time dependent analysis performed on a section by section basis will vary. To account for the interaction of these adjacent longitudinal sections a finite element model representing a typical transverse composite cross-section of the voided slab system was created. The material properties for the deck mix with normal weight coarse aggregates and saturated light weight fines were selected for this investigation because this mix had the best long term properties. To simulate the effects of differential shrinkage, the cast-in-place topping was subjected to a uniform decrease in temperature. The magnitude of the decrease in temperature was chosen such that when multiplied with the coefficient of thermal expansion for concrete resulted in a strain equal to the tested shrinkage strain at 100 days for the selected deck mix (Eq. 24). No temperature effect was applied to the girder, to be consistent with the earlier assumption that when continuity is established the majority of the shrinkage and creep in the girder have already taken place. Creep effects were simulated using an age adjusted effective modulus (Eq. 25). Poisson's ratio for both mixes was taken as 0.2. The finite element model for the typical composite voided slab cross-section was for a simply supported beam with the purpose of investigating only the effects of differential shrinkage at a cross-sectional level and not those due to restraint moments that are present in a multi-span bridge application. The length of the span was 41.5 ft (12.7 m). A 2 in. (51 mm) mesh was used for both the cast-in-place topping and the precast voided slab.

$$\Delta T_{deck} = \frac{\epsilon_{deck \text{ at } 100 \text{ days}}}{\alpha_{concrete}} \quad (24)$$

where:

$\epsilon_{deck \text{ at } 100 \text{ days}}$ = shrinkage strain at 100 days for NWC-SLWF deck mix (215 ue)

$\alpha_{concrete}$ = coefficient of thermal expansion for concrete ($6.5 \times 10^{-6} / ^\circ\text{F}$)

ΔT_{deck} = uniform decrease in temperature to simulate the effects of differential shrinkage (33 $^\circ\text{F}$)

$$E_{AAEM} = \frac{E_{deck}}{(1 + \mu \varphi_{deck \text{ at } 100 \text{ days}})} \quad (25)$$

where:

E_{AAEM} = age adjusted effective modulus for NWC-SLWF deck mix to account for creep effects

E_{deck} = modulus of elasticity for NWC-SLWF deck mix

μ = aging coefficient (taken as 0.7)

φ_{deck} = creep coefficient at 100 days for NWC-SLWF deck mix

Figure 7(a) shows a comparison of the magnitude and distribution of longitudinal normal stresses caused by differential shrinkage obtained based on Eq. 3 to 17 with those obtained from the finite element model. The longitudinal stresses in the finite element model were obtained at mid-width of the composite cross-section. There are some small differences in the magnitude of these stresses, because the values obtained from Eq. 3 to 17 are based on a sectional analysis using a one-dimensional stress state and represent the average behavior of the typical composite cross-section. Whereas those obtained from the finite element model account for the interaction between sections above the voids with those above the precast webs and also account for the three-dimensional stress-state. The results obtained from Eq. 3-17 provide a reasonable estimation of the stresses due to time dependent effects for design purposes and are a viable alternative to finite element analysis. Figure 7(b) illustrates that the location where the tensile stresses in the cast-in-place topping are highest is the interface between the girder and the deck. In addition, because the model represents a simply supported beam application, the magnitude of these stresses is relatively uniform along the span of the beam. Accordingly, if the highest tensile stress in the cast-in-place topping exceeds its tensile strength, transverse cracks will likely develop along the entire span of the beam. The spacing of these cracks will depend on the bond strength between the reinforcing steel and the surrounding concrete. To compare the relative resistance of the voided slab system (Fig. 8(a)) against time dependent effects two other bridge systems were investigated. The second one is shown in Fig. 8(b) and consists of adjacent precast Inverted T-beams with straight webs and a cast-in-place topping. This bridge system was identified in 2004 in France during a scanning tour funded by FHWA and AASHTO and has been used on several bridges in the state of Minnesota. The third system is similar to the second one with the exception that the precast webs are tapered rather than straight (Fig. 8(c)). This bridge system was implemented for the first time in Virginia for the replacement of a two-span continuous bridge on US 360 near Richmond, VA. The overall depth of the composite cross-section in the two inverted T-beam models was the same with the voided slab composite system. The width of the precast inverted T-beams was 6 ft (1.8 m). The width of the flange was 12 in. (300 mm), whereas the thickness of the flange was 4 in. (100 mm). The angle for the tapered webs in the system implemented in Virginia was 45°. The thickness of thinnest portion of the topping in both inverted T-beam systems matched that used in the voided slab system and was 7.5 in. (190 mm). The investigation of differential shrinkage induced stresses in the longitudinal and transverse directions of the bridge was of interest to explore the likelihood of transverse and longitudinal cracking, respectively. Figure 8 shows transverse and longitudinal normal stress contours caused by differential shrinkage and shrinkage induced creep. In the voided slab system, longitudinal tensile stresses are highest at the precast-CIP interface (Fig. 8 (a)), which is consistent with the results presented in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7. Similarly, transverse tensile stresses are also highest at the interface between the precast and cast-in-place components. The same applies for the inverted T-beam systems, except that in these systems the interfaces between the precast and cast-in-place components are at two different elevations, with the interface between the top of the precast web and cast-in-place topping being the most critical. Hence, reducing the length of this interface will help reduce the extent of potential cracking due to time dependent effects. Tensile stresses also develop in the cast-in-place topping at the interface between the precast flange and cast-in-place topping, however these stresses reduce towards the top of the composite cross-section and are compressive in the upper portions of the cast-in-place topping. Because it is the top of the cast-in-place topping that is subject to water and deicing salts these locations are not critical compared to the portion of the topping above the precast web where the entire cast-in-place section is in tension. Figure 8(c) suggests that the inverted T-beam system with tapered webs features the narrowest cast-in-place topping top of precast web interface and therefore minimizes the extent of potential longitudinal and transverse cracking. Figure 9 shows the magnitude and distribution of longitudinal and transverse normal stresses along the depth of the three composite bridge cross-sections investigated. This distribution was obtained from the finite element models created for each bridge system.

Transverse and longitudinal stress values were obtained from a column of finite elements located at mid-width of the composite cross-sections. Figure 9(a) shows that the magnitude of transverse normal stresses caused by time dependent effects in the three investigated bridge systems is similar. The voided slab system appears to be experiencing slightly smaller tensile stresses at the top of the cast-in-place topping due to the slightly more flexible restraint provided by the precast component as a result of the holes. However, this reduction is small compared to the advantage of a shorter critical interface offered by the inverted T-beam systems. Figure 9(b) shows that the magnitude of longitudinal normal tensile stresses in the CIP topping is smaller in the precast inverted T-beam systems with tapered webs compared to the other two systems. The combination of smaller tensile stresses in the CIP topping and a shorter interface at the top of the precast web reduces not only the likelihood of transverse cracking but also the extent of it. Table 9 shows a comparison of the vulnerability to cracking of the three bridge systems in terms of the ratio between the maximum tensile stress at the bottom of the cast-in-place concrete deck and the tensile strength of the deck. The tensile strength of the concrete deck was taken equal to the tensile strength of the concrete mix with normal weight coarse aggregates and a portion of saturated lightweight fine aggregates. Table 9 shows that the bridge system with precast inverted T-beams features the lowest average ratio between the maximum tensile stress at the bottom of the deck and the tensile strength of the deck. Tapering the precast webs helps reduce the extent of the critical interface between the top of the precast web and the cast-in-place deck in both the transverse and longitudinal directions. Any tensile stresses developed at the interface between the precast flange and cast-in-place topping, or those created between the tapered precast webs and cast-in-place topping are less likely to cause cracking in the top surface of the bridge deck. The selection of the inverted T-beam system with tapered webs for short-to-medium-span bridges combined with the specification of a cast-in-place concrete topping mix that exhibits low shrinkage and high creep will offer a bridge system that accelerates construction and is less likely to exhibit cracking due to time dependent effects.

CONCLUSIONS

Reducing the likelihood of bridge deck cracking is essential for increasing the longevity of bridges. This study has demonstrated that the effects of differential shrinkage and creep in composite bridges can cause tensile stresses in the deck that exceed its tensile strength. To reduce the likelihood of excessive cracking it is recommended that the concrete mix for the cast-in-place deck possesses low shrinkage and high creep properties. Low free shrinkage reduces the tensile stresses developed due to restrained differential shrinkage and high creep helps relax any tensile stresses that may develop. In addition, the short term properties that will help reduce the extent of cracking due to differential shrinkage include a mix with high tensile strength and low modulus of elasticity. Because it is difficult to find a concrete mix that embodies all the aforementioned long term and short term properties, priority should be given to a mix with the lowest shrinkage because it is the free shrinkage of the deck that serves as a catalyst for the creation of tensile stresses in the cast-in-place topping. In addition, sensitivity studies can be performed for a given structure to determine the influence of the short and long term properties of the concrete materials on the structural effects of shrinkage and creep. While a concrete mix with high creep is advocated for the cast-in-place deck to help alleviate tensile stresses due to differential shrinkage, long term deflections should be checked to ensure that they are within the allowable limits. Although the investigation described in this study was focused on slab-type short-to-medium-span composite concrete bridges, the benefits of a cast-in-place deck with low shrinkage and high creep apply also to composite girder-slab bridges in which the girder is either precast concrete or steel. In girder-slab bridges the free shrinkage of the deck is restrained by either the precast or steel girder. Such a restraint to the free shrinkage of the deck could lead to transverse and longitudinal cracks, which could affect the service life of the bridge. Seven deck mixes developed by the researchers at VCTIR were investigated with the goal of identifying a mix with low shrinkage and high creep. Drying shrinkage strains recorded in the shrinkage prisms showed that the mix with normal weight coarse aggregates and saturated light weight fine aggregates exhibited the lowest shrinkage strain. In addition, data obtained from the creep test showed that the mix with normal weight coarse aggregates and saturated light weight fine aggregates also exhibited the highest creep coefficient. It should be noted that the tests performed on the deck mixes described in this investigation were performed only on one batch for each mix. It was outside the scope of study to investigate the repeatability and consistency of the results obtained from each mix. Two methods for determining the structural effects of differential shrinkage and shrinkage induced creep were presented. The first is based on Menn's [1] approach and is suitable for a design office, because it can be easily implemented in a mathematical analysis program, such as Mathcad 14 [10], or in a computer spreadsheet program. The second method was based on finite element analysis and takes into account the 3D stress state and can be used in situations where such an analysis is an option. The results from both methods were compared for a slab-type composite concrete bridge and it was demonstrated that the first approach provided a reasonable estimation of the stresses due to time dependent effects for design purposes and is a viable alternative to finite element analysis. Three

composite bridge systems intended for short-to-medium-span bridges were investigated with the purpose of identifying the system that is most resistant against time dependent effects. The voided slab system is the traditional system and the inverted T-beam system with straight and tapered precast webs are relatively new bridge systems used in Minnesota and Virginia, respectively. The precast inverted T-beam system with tapered webs minimizes the width of the interface between the top of the precast web and the cast-in-place topping, which is the most vulnerable interface to longitudinal and transverse cracking as a result of differential shrinkage. While the magnitude of transverse normal stresses was similar in all three bridge systems, the inverted T-beam with the tapered webs exhibited lower longitudinal tensile stresses at the interface between the precast web and cast-in-place topping, which is desirable for reducing the likelihood of transverse cracking. The results presented in this investigation suggest that the combination of the precast inverted T-beam system with tapered webs and the implementation of a cast-in-place topping mix with normal weight coarse aggregates and saturated light weight fine aggregates should help increase the resistance of short-to-medium-span bridges against time dependent effects.

NOTATION

A_D = area of cast-in-place deck
 A_G = area of precast girder
 A_{ps} = area of prestressing strands
 a = distance between the centroid of cast-in-place deck and centroid of precast girder.
 a_D = distance between the centroid of the cast-in-place deck and centroid of composite section
 a_G = distance between the centroid of the girder and centroid of the composite section
 E_D = modulus of elasticity of the cast-in-place deck
 E_G = modulus of elasticity of the precast girder
 E_{ps} = modulus of elasticity of prestressing strands
 e = eccentricity of the prestressing force with respect to the centroid of the precast girder
 f'_c = specified compressive strength of concrete for use in design, ksi (MPa)
 I_D = moment of inertia of the cast-in-place deck
 I_G = moment of inertia of the precast girder
 K_1 = correction factor for source of aggregate
 M_D^0 = initial moment in the deck due to forces applied to the composite system
 $M_{Ddirect}^0$ = initial moment applied directly to the deck
 M_G^0 = initial moment in the girder due to forces applied to the composite system
 $M_{Gdirect}^0$ = initial moment applied directly to the girder
 N_D^0 = initial axial force in the deck due to forces applied to the composite system
 $N_{Ddirect}^0$ = initial axial force applied directly to the deck
 N_G^0 = initial axial force in girder due to forces applied to the composite system
 $N_{Gdirect}^0$ = initial axial force applied directly to the girder
 N_{ps}^0 = initial prestressing force in the strand due to forces applied to the composite system
 $N_{psdirect}^0$ = initial prestressing force in the strand
 $\Delta\epsilon_D$ = change in strain at the centroid of deck due to time dependent effects
 $\Delta\epsilon_G$ = change in strain at the centroid of girder due to time dependent effects
 $\Delta\epsilon_{ps}$ = change in strain in the prestressing strand due to time dependent effects
 ΔX = change in curvature due to time dependent effects
 ΔN_D = change in axial force in the deck due to time dependent effects
 ΔN_G = change in axial force in the girder due to time dependent effects
 ΔN_{ps} = change in prestressing force due to time dependent effects
 ΔM_D = change in moment in the deck due to time dependent effects
 ΔM_G = change in moment in the girder due to time dependent effects
 w_c = unit weight of concrete, kcf (kg/m³)

REFERENCES

- [1] Menn, C., 1990, *Prestressed Concrete Bridges*, translated and edited by Paul Gauvreau, Birkhauser Verlag, Basel-Boston-Berlin, pp. 161-167.
- [2] Darwin D., Browning J., *Project Summary: Phase I pooled fund study for the construction of crack-free concrete bridge decks*, The University of Kansas, <http://www.iri.ku.edu/projects/concrete/bridgecrack.html> (accessed January 2012)
- [3] Ghali, A., Favre, R., Elbadry, M., 2012, *Concrete structures – Stresses and deformations: analysis and design for serviceability*, Spon Press.
- [4] AASHTO, 2013, *LRFD Bridge Design Specifications*, 6th Edition, Washington, DC.
- [5] ACI Committee 209.1R, 2005, *Report on Factors Affecting Shrinkage and Creep of Hardened Concrete* (ACI 209.1R-05), American Concrete Institute, Farmington Hills, MI.
- [6] ACI Committee 209.2R, 2008, *Guide for modeling and calculating shrinkage and creep in hardened concrete* (ACI 209.2R-08), American Concrete Institute, Farmington Hills, MI.
- [7] Partov, D., Kantchev, V., 2009, "Time-dependent analysis of composite steel-concrete beams using integral equation of volterra, according EUROCODE-4." *Engineering Mechanics* 16.5: 367-392.
- [8] Bazant, Z.P., 1972, "Prediction of concrete creep effects using the age adjusted effective modulus method", *ACI Journal*, V.69, No.4, pp. 212-217.
- [9] Dilger, H.W., "Creep analysis of prestressed concrete structures using creep transformed section properties", *PCI Journal*, V.27, No.1, January-February 1982, pp. 98-117.
- [10] Mathcad 14 User's guide, (2007), Mathsoft Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- [11] Barker, M., R., Puckett, A., J., 2007, *Design of highway bridges-an LRFD approach*, Second Edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- [12] ASTM C39, 2010, *Test method for compressive strength of cylindrical concrete specimens*, American Society for Testing Materials, West Conshohocken, PA.
- [13] ASTM C496, 2010, *Standard test method for splitting tensile strength of cylindrical concrete specimens*, American Society of Testing Materials, West Conshohocken, PA.
- [14] ASTM C469, 2010, *Standard test method for static modulus of elasticity and Poisson's ratio of concrete in compression*, American Society of Testing Materials, West Conshohocken, PA.
- [15] ASTM C157, 2010, *Standard test method for length change of hardened hydraulic-cement mortar and concrete*, American Society of Testing Materials, West Conshohocken, PA.
- [16] ASTM C512, 2010, *Standard test method for creep of concrete in compression*, American Society of Testing Materials, West Conshohocken, PA.
- [17] Bazant, Z.P., 1987, "Statistical extrapolation of shrinkage data – Part I: Regression," *ACI Materials Journal*, V.84, No.1, Jan.-Feb., pp 20-34.

Table 1—Design Mixture Proportions for Topping Concrete

Mixture Proportions				
Constituent	NWC-FA lbs/yd ³ (kg/m ³)	NWC-SL1 lbs/yd ³ (kg/m ³)	SLWC-FA lbs/yd ³ (kg/m ³)	SLWC-SL lbs/yd ³ (kg/m ³)
Portland Cement	476 (283)	413 (245)	476 (283)	413 (245)
Fly Ash	159 (94)	0	159 (94)	0
Slag Cement	0	222 (132)	0	222 (132)
Water	286 (170)	286 (170)	273 (162)	273 (162)
Coarse Aggregate	1780 (1060)	1780 (1060)	901 (535)	901 (535)
NW Fine Aggregate	1030 (611)	1080 (641)	1360 (807)	1400 (831)
Total	3740 (2220)	3780 (2240)	3170 (1880)	3210 (1900)
Unit Weight	138 (82)	140 (83)	117 (70)	119 (71)
w/cm	0.45	0.45	0.43	0.43
Mixture Proportions (continued)				
Constituent	NWC-SLFA-SL lbs/yd ³ (kg/m ³)	NWC-SL2 lbs/yd ³ (kg/m ³)	NWC-SLFA lbs/yd ³ (kg/m ³)	
Portland Cement	382 (227)	382 (227)	635 (377)	
Fly Ash	0	0	0	
Slag Cement	254 (151)	254 (151)	0	
Water	261 (155)	286 (170)	261 (155)	
Coarse Aggregate	1730 (1030)	1730 (1030)	1730 (1030)	
NW Fine Aggregate	666 (395)	1290 (765)	666 (395)	
LW Fine Aggregate	403 (239)	0	403 (239)	
Total	3700 (2200)	3940 (2340)	3700 (2200)	
Unit Weight	137 (81)	146 (87)	137 (81)	
w/cm	0.41	0.45	0.41	

NWC-SL = normal weight coarse aggregate slag mix 1, NWC-FA = normal weight coarse aggregate fly ash mix, SLWC-SL = saturated light-weight coarse aggregate slag mix, SLWC-FA = saturated light-weight coarse aggregate fly ash mix, NWC-SLFA-SL = normal weight coarse aggregate with saturated light weight fines aggregates and slag, NWC-SL2 = normal weight coarse aggregate slag mix 2, NWC-SLFA = normal weight coarse aggregate with saturated light weight fines aggregates

Table 2—Compressive strength test results

Age (days)	Compressive Strength, psi (MPa)						
	NWC-FA	NWC-SL1	SLWC-FA	SLWC-SL	NWC-SLWF-SL	NWC-SL2	NWC-SLWF
7	3100 (21)	3580 (25)	2600 (18)	4020 (28)	3660 (25)	4080 (28)	2650 (18)
14	3530 (24)	nm	3790 (26)	5270 (36)	4130 (29)	4830 (33)	3280 (23)
28	4260 (29)	5200 (36)	4600 (32)	5950 (41)	4560 (31)	5370 (37)	3540 (24)
56	4140 (29)	5250 (36)	4910 (34)	6420 (44)	nm	5410 (37)	3610 (25)
90	4060 (28)	5410 (37)	4880 (34)	6440 (44)	nm	nm	nm

nm=not measured, nc=not calculated

Reducing Deck Cracking in Composite Bridges by Controlling Long Term Properties

Table 3–Tensile strength test results

Age (days)	Tensile Strength, psi (MPa)					
	NWC-FA			NWC-SL1		
	Tested	Eqn. 5.1	Tested/(Eqn. 5.1)	Tested	Eqn. 5.1	Tested/(Eqn. 5.1)
7	317 (2.2)	405 (2.8)	0.78	391 (2.7)	435 (3.0)	0.90
28	418 (2.9)	475 (3.3)	0.88	455 (3.1)	524 (3.6)	0.87
90	412 (2.8)	463 (3.2)	0.89	541 (3.7)	535 (3.7)	1.01
			Avg. = 0.85			Avg. = 0.93
	SLWC-FA			SLWC-SL		
	Tested	Eqn. 6.1	Tested/(Eqn. 6.1)	Tested	Eqn. 6.1	Tested/(Eqn. 6.1)
7	274 (1.9)	322 (2.2)	0.85	374 (2.6)	401 (2.8)	0.93
28	370 (2.6)	429 (3.0)	0.86	391 (2.7)	488 (3.4)	0.80
90	435 (3.0)	442 (3.1)	0.98	503 (3.5)	508 (3.5)	0.99
			Avg. = 0.90			Avg. = 0.91
	NWC-SLWF-SL			NWC-SL2		
	Tested	Eqn. 5.1	Tested/(Eqn. 5.1)	Tested	Eqn. 5.1	Tested/(Eqn. 5.1)
7	377 (2.6)	440 (3.0)	0.86	417 (2.9)	470 (3.2)	0.89
28	370 (2.6)	470 (3.2)	0.79	483 (3.3)	510 (3.5)	0.95
90	nm	nc	nc	nm	nc	nc
			Avg. =0.83			Avg. = 0.92
	NWC-SLWF			Summary of Tested Values (28 days) f_t , psi (MPa)		
	Tested	Eqn. 5.1	Tested/(Eqn. 5.1)	NWC-FA		418 (2.9)
7	287 (2.0)	370 (2.6)	0.78	NWC-SL1		455 (3.1)
28	340 (2.3)	420 (2.9)	0.81	SLWC-FA		370 (2.6)
90	nm	nc	nc	SLWC-SL		391 (2.7)
			Avg. = 0.80	NWC-SLWF-SL		370 (2.6)
nm=not measured, nc=not calculated				NWC-SL2		483 (3.3)
				NWC-SLWF		340 (2.3)

Table 4–Modulus of elasticity test results

Age (days)	Modulus of Elasticity, ksi (MPa)					
	NWC-FA			NWC-SL1		
	Tested	Eqn. 7.1	Tested/ Eqn. 7.1	Tested	Eqn. 7.1	Tested/Eqn. 7.1
7	4530 (31200)	3220 (22200)	1.41	4760 (32800)	3350 (23100)	1.42
14	4280 (29500)	3430 (23700)	1.25	nm	nc	nc
28	4430 (30600)	3770 (26000)	1.18	5010 (34500)	4040 (27900)	1.24
56	4150 (28600)	3720 (25700)	1.12	5180 (35700)	4060 (28000)	1.28
90	4360 (30100)	3680 (25400)	1.18	4730 (32600)	4120 (28400)	1.15
			Avg. = 1.23			Avg. = 1.27
	SLWC-FA			SLWC-SL		
	Tested	Eqn. 7.1	Tested/ Eqn. 7.1	Tested	Eqn. 7.1	Tested/Eqn. 7.1
7	2620 (18100)	2230 (15400)	1.17	2780 (19200)	2690 (18600)	1.03
14	3180 (21900)	2680 (18500)	1.19	3160 (21800)	3080 (21200)	1.03
28	3080 (21200)	2970 (20500)	1.04	3540 (24400)	3270 (22600)	1.08
56	3460 (23900)	3070 (21200)	1.13	3260 (22500)	3390 (23400)	0.96
90	2950 (20300)	3060 (21100)	0.96	3010 (20800)	3400 (23400)	0.89
			Avg. = 1.10			Avg. = 1.00
	NWC-SLWF-SL			NWC-SL2		
	Tested	Eqn. 7.1	Tested/ Eqn. 7.1	Tested	Eqn. 7.1	Tested/Eqn. 7.1
7	3700 (25500)	3200 (22100)	1.16	4840 (33400)	3720 (25700)	1.30
14	3390 (23400)	3400 (23400)	1.00	4960 (34200)	4050 (27900)	1.23
28	4160 (28700)	3570 (24600)	1.17	5460 (37700)	4270 (29400)	1.28
56	nm			4950 (34100)	4280 (29500)	1.16
90	nm			nm		
			Avg. = 1.11			Avg. = 1.24
	NWC-SLWF			Summary of Tested Values, E (28 days), ksi (MPa)		
	Tested	Eqn. 7.1	Tested/ Eqn. 7.1	NWC-FA		4430 (30600)
7	3510 (24200)	2720 (18800)	1.29	NWC-SL1		5010 (34500)
14	4295 (29600)	3030 (20900)	1.42	SLWC-FA		3080 (21200)
28	3990 (27500)	3150 (21700)	1.27	SLWC-SL		3540 (24400)
56	4670 (32200)	3180 (21900)	1.47	NWC-SLWF-SL		4160 (28700)
90	nm			NWC-SL2		5460 (37700)
			Avg. = 1.36	NWC-SLWF		3990 (27500)

nm = not measured, nc = not calculated

Table 5–Summary of experimental shrinkage strains at 100 days

Mix	Shrinkage strains at 100 days (ue)
NWC-FA	466
NWC-SL1	483
SLWC-FA	603
SLWC-SL	606
NWC-SLWF-SL	310
NWC-SL2	264
NWC-SLWF	215

Table 6–Summary of experimental data from the creep tests

	NWC-FA	NWC-SL1	SLWC-FA	SLWC-SL	NWC-SLWF-SL	NWC-SL2	NWC-SLWF
Elastic strain (ue)	439	442	711	720	470	498	372
Shrinkage strain (ue)	402	358	527	321	276	214	260
Creep strain (ue)	819	548	868	502	416	511	719
Total strain (ue)	1660	1348	2106	1543	1162	1223	1351
Creep Coefficient	1.87	1.24	1.22	0.70	0.89	1.03	1.93

Table 7–Summary of experimental data on shrinkage and creep properties (100 days)

Mix	Drying shrinkage strain ($\mu\epsilon$)	Creep coefficient
NWC-FA	466	1.87
NWC-SL1	483	1.24
SLWC-FA	603	1.22
SLWC-SL	606	0.70
NWC-SLWF-SL	310	0.89
NWC-SL2	264	1.03
NWC-SLWF	215	1.93

Table 8–Comparison of tensile stresses in the deck and the tensile strength of the deck

Mix	f_{tmax} , ksi (MPa)	$f_{ttested}$, ksi (MPa)	Ratio = $f_{tmax}/f_{ttested}$
NWC-FA	0.504 (3.5)	0.418 (2.9)	1.21
NWC-SL1	0.653 (4.5)	0.455 (3.1)	1.44
SLWC-FA	0.591 (4.1)	0.370 (2.6)	1.60
SLWC-SL	0.756 (5.2)	0.390 (2.7)	1.94
NWC-SLWF-SL	0.407 (2.8)	0.370 (2.6)	1.10
NWC-SL2	0.399 (2.8)	0.483 (3.3)	0.83
NWC-SLWF	0.214 (1.5)	0.340 (2.3)	0.63

Table 9–Comparison of the vulnerability to cracking of the three bridge systems

Bridge system	Direction of stress	f_{tmax} , ksi (Mpa)	$f_{ttested}$, ksi (Mpa)	Ratio = $f_{tmax}/f_{ttested}$	
Voided Slab	S11	0.240 (1.7)	0.340 (2.3)	0.71	Average = 0.70
	S33	0.236 (1.6)	0.340 (2.3)	0.69	
Precast inverted T-beam with straight webs	S11	0.250 (1.7)	0.340 (2.3)	0.74	Average = 0.68
	S33	0.210 (1.5)	0.340 (2.3)	0.62	
Precast inverted T-beam with tapered webs	S11	0.255 (1.8)	0.340 (2.3)	0.75	Average = 0.61
	S33	0.156 (1.1)	0.340 (2.3)	0.46	




Fig. 1–Redistribution of forces in composite girders




Fig. 2–Experimental data on shrinkage strain versus time (unrestrained shrinkage test)




Fig. 3—Creep test: (a) total strain, (b) shrinkage strain, (c) stress induced strain, (d) creep strain




Fig. 4—Creep coefficient vs time




Fig. 5—Cross-section of composite voided slab system

Reducing Deck Cracking in Composite Bridges by Controlling Long Term Properties




Fig. 6—Stresses in composite voided slab system: (a) initial stresses due to mechanical loads, (b) changes due to time dependent effects, (c) final stresses




Fig. 7—(a) Distribution of longitudinal normal stresses in the composite voided slab system due to differential shrinkage and shrinkage induced creep (b) Longitudinal normal stress contours in the composite voided slab system




Fig. 8–Transverse (S11) and longitudinal (S33) normal stresses for three composite bridge systems due to differential shrinkage and shrinkage induced creep




Fig. 9–Comparison of normal stresses in three composite bridge systems caused by differential shrinkage and shrinkage induced creep, (a) Transverse normal stresses, (b) Longitudinal normal stresses

Monitoring of the 205-ft long Pretensioned Precast Super Girders of the Alaskan Way Viaduct, Seattle, WA

S.S. Badie, D. Chapman, A. Mizumori, Y. Jiang, S.J. Seguirant, and B. Khaleghi

Synopsis: The Alaskan Way Viaduct replacement project is a joint program between the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the City of Seattle, King County and the Port of Seattle. The project consists of several sub-tasks including the total replacement of the State Route 99 double-deck viaduct. The Alaskan Way Viaduct is a vital factor for economic sustainability while serving as a major transportation artery for the greater Seattle metropolitan area. Span 2C of this project is 210-ft (64.01 m) long and consists of an 8-inch (203 mm) thick cast-in-place concrete slab supported on seventeen WF100G precast pretensioned concrete girders. Construction is split into two phases: Phase I includes eight girders spaced at 6 ft-5 inches (1.96 m) on center and Phase II includes nine girders spaced at 6 ft (1.83 m) on center. This span has an eleven-degree skew and includes four cast-in-place concrete diaphragms at quarter points in addition to the end diaphragms. The WF100G girders are each 205-ft (62.48 m) long and 100-inch (2540 mm) deep. Each girder is reinforced with eighty (80) 0.6-in. (15.24 mm) diameter, 270 ksi (1860 MPa), low-relaxation seven-wire strands. WSDOT in collaboration with Concrete Technology Corporation (CTC) and the George Washington University (GW) have instrumented four girders of the second phase with about forty (40) vibrating wire gauges. This paper presents the details of the on-going plan developed by the WSDOT/CTC/GW team to monitor the progress of prestress losses over a period of three years. The paper will also present the challenges that the team faced during the instrumentation stage.

Keywords: precast, prestressed, concrete, bridge, girder, health, monitoring

ACI member **Sameh Badie** is an associate professor at the George Washington University, Washington DC. He is a member of ACI Committees 343, Bridge Design; 444, Structural Health Monitoring and Instrumentation; and SA03, Chester Paul Siess Award for Excellence in Structural Research. His research interests include design and analysis of prestressed concrete structures, precast bridge deck panel systems, prestress losses and structural health monitoring.

David Chapman is the chief engineer at Concrete Technology Corp. in Tacoma, Washington.

Anthony Mizumori is a bridge engineer with the Washington State Department of Transportation in Olympia, WA. He holds a BS in civil engineering from Columbia University.

Yu Jiang is a graduate research assistant at the George Washington University, Washington DC. He received his undergraduate degree in civil engineering in 2012 from Hohai University, China. His research interests include prestress losses of pretensioned concrete members.

Stephen J. Seguirant is vice president and director of engineering at Concrete Technology Corp. in Tacoma, Wash.

Bijan Khaleghi is the state bridge design engineer for the Bridge and Structures Office at the Washington State Department of Transportation in Olympia, Washington.

INTRODUCTION

The Alaskan Way Viaduct replacement project, in downtown Seattle, WA, is a joint program between the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the City of Seattle, King County and the Port of Seattle. The project consists of several sub-tasks including the total replacement of State Route 99 double-deck viaduct that was damaged during the a 6.8 magnitude earthquake that hit Seattle in February 2001.¹ The Alaskan Way Viaduct is a vital factor for economic sustainability while serving as a major transportation artery for the greater Seattle metropolitan area. Span 2C near the south end of the replacement project is 210 ft (64.01 m) long and consists of an 8 inch (203 mm) thick cast-in-place concrete slab supported on seventeen WF100G precast pretensioned girders. Construction is split into two phases: Phase I includes eight girders spaced at 6 ft-5 inches (1.96 m) on center and Phase II includes nine girders spaced at 6 ft (1.83 m) on center, as shown in Fig. 1. This span has an eleven-degree skew and includes four cast-in-place concrete diaphragms at fifth points in addition to the integral pier diaphragms. The WF100G girders are each 205 ft (62.48 m) long and 100 in. (2540 mm) deep. Each girder is pretensioned using eighty 0.6-in. (15 mm) diameter, 270 ksi (1860 MPa), low-relaxation seven-wire strands, as shown in Fig. 2. Forty six straight strands are provided in the bottom flange, twenty six harped strands lumped into five groups are provided in the web, and eight temporary straight strands are provided in the top flange. The top eight strands are used to control shipping and handling stresses and to improve lateral stability during fabrication, delivery and erection. They are debonded over the length of the girder except for a distance of 10 ft (3.05 m) from each end of the girder. These strands are cut through pockets provided in the top flange after the girders are installed on the bridge. All strands are fully pretensioned to a stress of 202.5 ksi (1370 MPa) during jacking. All girder ends are skewed at eleven degrees to conform to the bridge pier geometries and provided with a castellation pattern to provide for shear transfer. Ten No. 7 bars, marked as item 701 in Fig. 2 & 3, are embedded in the web for a distance of about 12 ft (3.66 m) at both ends of the girder and extended into the cast-in-place concrete pier diaphragm. These bars, in addition to the castellation pattern, are used to transmit loads from the girder to the piers. No. 3 cross-ties, marked as item No. 301 in Fig. 2 and 3, are used in the end zone to tie the end zone reinforcement across the web thickness. Fig. 3 shows the distribution of the No. 5 web shear reinforcement including the end zone reinforcement. The bottom flange is provided with No. 3 confinement stirrups. The distribution of these stirrups matches the distribution of the No. 5 web shear reinforcement. Concrete Technology Corporation (CTC), located in Tacoma, Washington, was selected for the fabrication of the girders based on the in-house design performed by WSDOT. The prestressing bed at CTC is provided with special hydraulic movable abutments that allow gradual transfer of the prestressing force. Since precast girders of such magnitude in length and pretensioning levels had not been cast before in the United States, a moderate level of concern existed regarding: