BRIDGE PRESERVATION

Silane Penetrating Sealers the first Defense in Bridge Protection

WATER IS THE ENEMY!

Salts dissolve in Water causing rebar corrosion

Water freezing in concrete causes Freeze/Thaw damage

Melt Water Absorbs Into Capillaries & Pores

Snow & Ice Melt

Water Freezes & Expands

Concrete Substrate

Void Structure

SPALLING

Segi

SCALING

the state

REBAR CORROSION

CRACKING

Think the

ALKALI SILICA REACTION (ASR)

SILANES MAKE CONCRETE HYDROPHOBIC



NATIONAL BRIDGE PRESERVATION PARTNERSHIP CONFERENCE 2014

From Hydrophilic to Hydrophobic

Water repellents penetrate the surface pores and cracks, so that they are internally lined but not filled. water repellent treatment

Reduction of concrete surface tension: inter-molecular attraction of water molecules is much higher than the attraction of water into concrete

From hydrophilic (water-loving) to hydrophobic (water-hating) surface



ATIONAL BRIDGE PRESERVATION PARTNERSHIP CONFERENCE 2014











SILANES DOT TESTED FOR OVER 25 YEARS

Oklahoma DOT	1986
Texas DOT	1995
Indiana DOT	1992
Kansas DOT	1998
lowa DOT	1999
Wisconsin DOT	2005
Missouri DOT	2007
Illinois DOT	2009

CONTINUING UNIVERSITY STUDIES

Purdue University Oklahoma State University Michigan Tech University of Leeds, UK University of Delft, Netherlands



Determining the Effective Service Life of Silane Treatments in Concrete Bridge Decks

Mehdi Khanzadeh Moradllo, Bryan Sudbrink, M. Tyler Ley Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Oklahoma State University



ABSTRACT

Silane is a commonly used surface treatment to reduce water entry into concrete. Current ODOT specifications require 3.2 mm of silane on all in service bridge decks. Only limited work has been done to show the effective lifespan of silane sealers. This work uses 360 cores taken from 60 Oklahoma bridge decks treated with silane that have been in-service between 6 and 20 years. Optical staining techniques were used to image silane depth. These findings will be helpful to practitioners to determine the long-term performance of silane coatings.

SAMPLE ACQUISITION

Cores that were approximately 18 mm in diameter by 25 mm in height were taken from the driving lane and shoulder of 60 bridge decks. Six cores were taken from each bridge for a total of 360 cores. This technique allowed two researchers to sample each bridge in about 1 h. Since the cores were small, this minimized damage and patching to the bridges.



Example of cores were taken from bridge decks

SAMPLE TESTING

- A cross section of each core was exposed by polishing with 120 grit sandpaper for 5 minutes.
- > Each sample was inspected with two techniques to determine the presence of the silane.
- First, the core is ponded in blue dye for 30 minutes. The dye stains the concrete that is not treated with the silane.
- Next, the depth of the silane was measured at six different points by using a caliper and an optical microscope and an average was reported for each core.
- Next, the core was polished to remove the dye from the exposed surface and then ponded in mineral based cutting oil for 60 seconds. The oil will wet the surface of the concrete that does not contain the silane sealer.
- The depth is then measured as described previously with the optical microscope and calipers.
- > These depths are compared to 3.2 mm as this is

TESTING PROCEDURE

ilane boundary

ponded in dye

before ponding





Summary from all bridge decks

DETERIORATION MECHANISM

The silane deterioration seems to move from the bulk of the concrete towards the surface. One possible cause for the deterioration could be the attack of the silane by the alkaline pore solution of concrete.



3 mm silane depth=7.5 mm silane depth= 6.7 mm silane depth= 3.6 mm



3 mm silane depth=2.6 mm silane depth=0 mm silane depth=0 mm

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

- After 12 years of service, 100% of the bridge decks were found to have a silane layer greater than the minimum specified value of 3.2 mm
- After 15 years of service, only 68% and after 17 to 20 years only 16% of the bridges showed evidence of a silane layer greater than 3.2 mm in thickness
- > The average depth of silane is decreasing with time.
- For bridges with 17 to 20 years of service, the average layer thickness reduced by 75%.
- Removal of the silane by abrasion was minimal over the first 20 years of service for the investigated bridges
- The deterioration by the alkaline pore solution appears to be a more important silane deterioration mechanism for these materials and exposure level

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support from the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT). The authors would like to thank Mr. Jake Leflore, Mr. Colin Fleishacker, Mr. Chad Stevenson, and Mr. Jeffery Terronez for their assistance with conducting of the field experiments.



Average silane visual detection denth of samples from bridge decks in travel lane and shoulder

RESULTS

(f)



ponded in oil

silane boundary

(C)

(f)

(b)

(e)

hm



6-12 years



15 years

17-20 years

WHY SILANES

Silanes Work

Silanes are easy to apply

Silanes are very cost effective

Silanes last for years

Silanes don't change skid resistance

Silanes dry fast 30 minutes to 2hours

APPLICATION

Sweeping • Power washing • Shot blasting



APPLICATION

Hand Spray Walk behind spray bar Truck or trailer mounted spray bar









COSTS OF SILANES

20% Silanes Apply at 60 square feet per gallon 11.61 grams of Silane per square foot \$15.00 per gallon \$0.25 per square foot Retreat every 6-10 years

COSTS OF SILANES

40% Silanes Apply at 125 square feet per gallon 11.14 grams of Silane per square foot \$20.00 per gallon \$0.16 per square foot Retreat every 6-10 years

COST OF SILANES

100% Silanes Apply at 300 square feet per gallon 11.61 grams of Silane per square foot \$35.00 per gallon \$0.12 per square foot Retreat every 6-10 years STATE OF CALIFORMA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DIVISION OF ENGINEERING SERVICES DIVISION OF STRUCTURE EARTHQUAKE ENGINEERING & DESIGN SUPPORT OFFICE OF SPECIFICATIONS & ESTIMATES P. O. BOX 942874 SCRAMENTIC, CA. 94274-0001 COMPARATIVE BRIDGE COSTS

JANUARY 2012

The following tabular data gives some general guidelines for structure type selection and its relative cost. These costs should be used just for preliminary estimates until more detailed information is developed.

These costs reflect the "bridge cost" only and do not include items such as: time related overhead, mobilization, bridge removal, approach slabs, slope paving, soundwalls or retaining walls.

The following factors must be taken into account when determining a price within the cost range:

Factors for Lower end of Price Range	Factors for Higher end of Price Range			
Short spans, Low Structure Height, No Environmental Constraints, Large Project, No Aesthetic Issues, Dry	Long spans, High Structure Height, Environmental Constraints, Small Project, Aesthetic Issues, Wet			
Conditions, No Bridge Skew	Conditions (cofferdams required), Skewed Bridges			
Urban Location	Remote Location			
Seat Abutment	Cantilever Abutment			
Spread Footing	Pile Footing (Large Diameter Piling)			
No Stage Construction	2 Stage Construction			
Factors that will increase the price over the high end of the Price Range 25%-150%				
Spread Footing No Stage Construction Factors that will increase the price over the high end	Pile Footing (Large Diameter Piling) 2 Stage Construction of the Price Range 25%-150%			

Structures with more than 2 construction stages

Unique substructure construction	
Widenings less than 15 Ft.	

	(STR. DEPTH / MAX SPAN)		COMMON	**COST	
STRUCTURAL SECTION	SIMPLE	CONTINUOUS	SPAN RANGE feet	RANGE \$/ Square foot	REMARKS
RC SLAB	0.06	0.045	16 - 44	115-345	THESE ARE THE MOST COMMON TYPES AND ACCOUNT FOR ABOUT 75% OF BRIDGES ON CALIFORNIA STATE HIGHWAYS.
RC T-BEAM '····· '	0.07	0.065	40 - 60	120-200	
RC BOX	0.06	0.055	50 - 120	130-200	
CIP/PS SLAB	0.03	0.03	40 - 65	100-240	
CIP/PS BOX COLO?	0.045	0.04	100 - 250	100-225	
PC/PS SLAB	0.03 (+3" AC)	0.03 (+3" AC)	20 - 50	125-250	NO FALSEWORK REQUIRED.
PC/PS LILL []	0.06 (+3" AC)	0.055 (+3" AC)	30 - 120	120-230	
BULB T GIRDER	0.05	0.045	90 - 145	110-200	
PC/PS I	0.055	0.05	50 - 120	110-190	
PC/PS BOX	0.06	0.045	120 - 200	140-250	
STRUCT STEEL	0.045	0.04	60 - 300	170-425	NO FALSEWORK REQUIRED.

NOTE: Removal of a box girder structure costs from \$8 - \$15 per square foot.

**Average Cost/SQFT are calculated using "Bridge Costs Only" as defined by the Federal Highway Administration

DO THE MATH

150 ft. X 38 ft. Bridge 5,700 square feet @ \$140.00 per square foot \$800,000.00 5,700 square feet treated with Silane at 125 square feet per gallon **Requires 45.6 gallons of a 40% Silane** 45.6 gallons of Silane at \$20.00 \$912.00 to protect an \$800,000.00 Investment!

CONCLUSION

Silanes are a tested, studied and proven bridge protective treatment Its never too late to start a Silane program Silanes are cost effective Silanes are easy for local crews to apply Silanes have an extensive life span 6-12 years

SOLVENT VS WATER

SOLVENT BASED SILANES

Fast dry times

Recoatable

No masking of windows

VOC compliant

Deeper Penetration WATER BASED SILANES

Lower VOC

Slower dry times

Windows must be masked

Use solvent based to recoat

SILANE VS SILOXANE SILANE SILOXANE

Deeper penetration Higher solids Longer life expectancy Better water beading Lower cost Less penetration High water vapor transmission



Thank you

Tim Woolery Advanced Chemical Technologies