### Bridge Deck Preservation Tool (BDPT)

#### **THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2024**

#### Mohamed ElBatanouny, PhD, SE, PE

Senior Associate and Unit Manager Wiss, Janney, Elstner, Associates, Inc.





2024 National Bridge Preservation Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah

### **Objective of the BDPT**

How do we balance rehab needs with preventive maintenance? What are our "preventive maintenance needs" anyway? We can't do everything...how do we choose?

Good decision-making requires good information.

The objective is to create a tool that will supply

cost, service life, and risk (uncertainty) information

so bridge owners can choose good bridge deck maintenance strategies.

Focus on the deck permits more detail & accuracy than current network- or bridge-level systems.

### **Bridge Deck Preservation Tool (BDPT)**

- Bridge Deck Preservation Portal Phase I (ElBatanouny et al. 2020)
  - Project led by Iowa DOT & FHWA, but ME, WA, OR, and NC DOTs also on TAC
  - Objective: to develop a framework for a BDPP to aid engineers in choosing an <u>optimal preservation strategy</u> for <u>a given bridge deck</u> based on calculated <u>cost</u>, <u>service life, and risk/uncertainty</u>
  - 5 modules (User Inputs, Selection of Maintenance Actions, Algorithms, Optimization, Output)

### **Project Scope**

- Bridge Deck Preservation Tool Phase II (Implementation)
  - Pooled fund study TPF-5(474) with IA, IN, MN, MO, NM, TX DOTs and FHWA

#### To develop

- a fully-functional, cloud-based Bridge Deck Preservation Tool (BDPT) hosted on the FHWA LTBP InfoBridge web portal.
- 1. Finalize BDPT framework (*Tier 1*)
- 2. Incorporate final BDPT into InfoBridge (*Tier 2*)
- 3. Promote use of the BDPT (*Tier 3*)



### **BDPT** Overview

### **Applicability of BDPT**

#### When it can be applied:

- Project- or asset-level analysis
- Concrete bridge decks
- Min. to max. amount of condition info known
  - NBI-58, NBE, in-depth
- Governing deterioration mechanism is [Cl<sup>-</sup>]induced corrosion of deck topside
- Selection between preventive maintenance options for decks with NBI-58 ≥ 5

#### When it should NOT be applied:

- Network-level analysis
- Steel & timber decks
  - Catalog alternatives
- [Cl<sup>-</sup>]-induced corrosion of deck underside requires repairs
- Other concrete degradation mechanisms govern deterioration (e.g., abrasion, ASR)
- Structural capacity is in question
- Selection between rehabilitation, replacement, and/or deferred replacement

### **BDPT Framework**



### User Inputs & Database

Describing current conditions (of the deck and the region)

SETTING THE PARAMETERS OF THE ANALYSIS

### **User Inputs**

- Physical Description (from InfoBridge or user input)
  - Deck Age
  - Deck Construction Material
  - Deck Area
- Bridge Deck Conditions
  - NBI general condition
  - Element level

WJE

Detailed inspection data

- Exposure Conditions
  - Climate
  - Chloride exposure
  - Traffic
- User Preferences
  - When to apply maintenance
  - Action versus plan
  - LCCA parameters
  - Optimization weights

### **Deck Conditions: Detailed Inspection Data**

Inspection Technique:	Requested Information:	Possible Responses:
Crack Mapping	Typical crack widths	Hairline, OR
		Greater than hairline
	Crack density (ft/ft <sup>2</sup> )	Numeric
Delamination Survey	Total delaminated area (%)	Numeric
HCP Survey	Deck area likely to be corroding (%)	Numeric
Chloride Testing	Is the chloride concentration at the depth of the reinforcing	Yes, OR
	steel sufficiently elevated such that corrosion is a risk?	No

- Crack widths:
  - Guidance for definition of "hairline" (< 0.012 to 0.015 inches) but up to user/agency
  - User's interpretation if "typical" or "maximum" appropriate
- Chloride test results:
  - Sampling, testing, and interpretation of chloride results is complex
  - User must judge extent of chloride concentration and risk of corrosion initiation

### **Maintenance Actions Database (defaults)**

 Background database with default values for cost and service life. Default replacement cost is \$100/square foot

Maintonanco Action	Default Agency Costs		Default User Costs	
	Unit Cost	Unit	Cost	Unit
Applying a Penetrating Sealer	1.4	\$/square foot	(empty)	\$
Crack-Chasing	5	\$/linear foot	(empty)	\$
Applying a Floodcoat	3	\$/square foot	(empty)	\$
Applying a Thin Polymer Overlay	8	\$/square foot	(empty)	\$
Applying a HMA Overlay with a Waterproofing Membrane	10	\$/square foot	(empty)	\$
Applying a Modified Asphalt Overlay	15	\$/square foot	(empty)	\$
Applying a Rigid Cementitious Overlay	20	\$/square foot	(empty)	\$
Applying an LMC Overlay	16	\$/square foot	(empty)	\$
Applying a PPC Overlay	15	\$/square foot	(empty)	\$
Applying a UHPC Overlay	56	\$/square foot	(empty)	\$

### Filters & Thresholds Module

SELECTING APPROPRIATE MAINTENANCE OPTIONS FOR ANALYSIS



### **Exclusion Filters**

- Non-Condition Based
  - Material incompatibilities, smooth riding surface
  - Not enough info to get cost estimate (crack density for crack chasing)
- Condition Based
  - Removed if NBI-58 is 5 or 6:
    - Applying a penetrating sealer
    - Crack-chasing
    - Applying a floodcoat
    - Applying a thin polymer overlay

### **Decision Tree: NBI-58 of 9**



14

### **Decision Tree: NBI-58 of 8**



### **Decision Tree: NBI-58 of 7**



### **Decision Tree: NBI-58 of 5 or 6**



Assume [CI-]-induced corrosion is present → no need for detailed inspection data

### **F&T Module Output**

- Applying a penetrating sealer
- Crack-chasing
- Applying a floodcoat
- Applying a thin polymer overlay
- Applying an HMA overlay with a waterproofing membrane
- Applying a modified asphalt overlay
- Applying a rigid cementitious overlay
- Applying an LMC overlay
- Applying a PPC overlay
- Applying a UHPC overlay

### SLEE, DM, & LCCA Algorithms

- ESTIMATING SERVICE LIFE BENEFITS
- EXTENDING DECK SERVICE LIFE
- CALCULATING LIFE-CYCLE COST

### **Purpose of SLEE & DM Algorithms**

Service Life Extension Estimate (SLEE) Algorithm:

 Estimates service life extensions offered to the deck by the maintenance actions
Unless user gave estimate; then SLEE Algorithm not needed

- Deterioration Model (DM) Algorithm:
  - Updates deterioration model/forecasted conditions to reflect maintenance
    - Assume no condition improvement, but slowed deterioration rates
- Results from both algorithms are used to calculate life-cycle cost

### **SLEE Algorithm**

#### $SLEE_{deck} \approx SLE_{ma} = max \{ SL_{upb} * f_{pec} * f_{Cl-} * f_{ADTT} * f_{FT} * f_{CR}, SL_{lob} \} * f_{bar}$

- $\begin{array}{ll} SLEE_{deck} &= \text{ service life extension estimate experienced by deck} \\ SLE_{ma} &= \text{ service life estimate of the maintenance action} \\ SL_{upb} &= \text{ upper bound considered for the service life extension} \\ SL_{lob} &= \text{ lower bound considered for the service life extension} \end{array}$
- $f_{pec}$  = reduction factor for pre-existing condition of the deck
- $f_{Cl-}$  = reduction factor for severity of chloride exposure
- $f_{ADTT}$  = reduction factor for traffic exposure
- $f_{FT}$  = reduction factor for freeze-thaw cycling
- $f_{CR}$  = reduction factor for contractor experience & construction challenge
- $f_{bar}$  = "augmentation" factor for corrosion-resistant rebar

WJE

### **Probabilistic SLEE**

- SLEE represented by a distribution rather than an exact number
- Monte Carlo simulation
  - Probabilistic inputs give probabilistic outputs

SLEE for Rigid Cementitious Overlay High [Cl-], Low CR, PEC of 6





60

#### SLEE for PPC Overlay (High CR, PEC of 6)



Solutions for the Built World



- Applying a modified asphalt overlay
- Applying a rigid cementitious overlay
- Applying an LMC overlay
- Applying a PPC overlay

**SLEE Output** 

□ Crack-chasing

membrane

□ Applying a penetrating sealer

Applying a UHPC overlay

### WIE

### **DM Algorithm**

- 1. Deterioration model of "unmaintained" bridge deck (from User Inputs)
- 2. Adjust to reflect preventive maintenance
  - Assuming only deterioration rate is affected



### DM Algorithm: Model for Unmaintained Deck



WJE

### DM Algorithm: Calculating Slowed Rates



- 1. Add SLEE to end of deck life.
- 2. Calculate adjustment ratio.
- Draw DM of maintained deck using adjusted deterioration rates.

$$m_{ij,n} = \frac{m_{adj}}{m_{net}} m_{ij}$$

### **DM Algorithm Outputs**

- Remaining service life of maintained deck
  - Expressed using 10<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, and 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles of the SLEE

#### **Slowed Deterioration Rate:**

- Visual DM that is output to user
- Forecasted NBI-58 at end of life of maintenance action

Only needed if analyzing MAPs



Used in LCCA

### **LCCA** Overview

- Defined cash flow:
  - Agency costs
    - Maintenance, rehabilitation costs
    - Replacement costs
    - Salvage value
  - User costs
    - E.g., travel delays

- Analysis period to make options comparable
- Future values discounted to present value:

$$PV = FV_n * \frac{1}{(1+r)^n}$$
 n = age  
r = discount rate



### Analyzing Maintenance Action Plans (MAPs)

 Auto-generation of MAPs and analysis of their service life benefits, OR

ANALYSIS OF SERVICE LIFE BENEFITS OF USER-DEFINED MAPS

### **Auto-MAPs: The MAP Loop**

#### **Assumption:**

Next maintenance action occurs at end of life of previous maintenance action.

- F&T Module relies on NBI forecasted by DM Algorithm.
- 2. SLEE Algorithm:
  - Relies on F&T Module to select next maintenance actions to analyze.
  - Relies on forecasted NBI.
- 3. DM Algorithm relies on SLEE.



Note: Full life cycle must be characterized before conducting LCCA.

### **User-Defined MAPs: Sequence Only**

#### Same assumption:

Next maintenance action occurs at end of life of previous maintenance action.

- F&T Module relies on NBI forecasted by DM Algorithm.
- 2. SLEE Algorithm:

WIE

- Relies on F&T Module to select next maintenance actions to analyze.
- Relies on forecasted NBI.
- 3. DM Algorithm relies on SLEE.



### **User-Defined MAPs: Sequence & Timing**

#### Same assumption:

- Next maintenance action occurs at end of life of previous maintenance action.
- 1. F&T Module relies on NBI forecasted by DM Algorithm.
- 2. SLEE Algorithm:
  - Relies on F&T Module to select next maintenance actions to analyze.
  - Relies on forecasted NBI.
- 3. DM Algorithm relies on SLEE.



# Optimization Module & BDPT Outputs

RANKING MAINTENANCE OPTIONS BASED ON SERVICE LIFE BENEFITS AND COSTS



### **Optimization Module**

- Linear Weighted Sum Method
  - Minimize agency life cycle costs
  - Maximize remaining service life of the deck
  - Minimize user life cycle costs

$$maximize \ Z_{i} = W_{LCCa} \left( \frac{1}{S_{LCCa,i}} \right) + W_{LCCu} \left( \frac{1}{S_{LCCu,i}} \right) + W_{RSL} S_{RSL,i}$$

Scaled values:

$$S_{LCCa,i} = \frac{LCCa_i}{max\{LCCa_1, LCCa_2, \dots, LCCa_N\}} \qquad S_{RSL,i} = \frac{RSL_i}{max\{RSL_1, RSL_2, \dots, RSLu_N\}}$$

### **BDPT Outputs:**

Ranked list of maintenance options, with:

- Initial cost
- Agency life cycle cost
- User life cycle cost (if analyzed)
- Remaining service life of deck before replacement
- Service life extension
- Plot of deterioration model for maintained deck, assuming slowed deterioration rates
- Z-value (objective function)



Federal Highway Administration

Eederal Highway Administration | 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE | Washington, DC 20590 | 202-366-4000 Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center | 6300 Georgetown Pike | McLean, VA 22101

## Questions?

Mohamed ElBatanouny, PhD, SE, PE Senior Associate and Unit Manager **Email: melbatanouny@wje.com**  For more information, visit wje.com or call 800.345.3199

Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc. 330 Pfingsten Road Northbrook, IL 60062 info@wje.com



Solutions for the Built World