



Protective Coatings for Steel and Concrete Bridge Components

Bobby Meade – Greenman Pedersen Inc., Sudhir Palle – University of Kentucky Theodore Hopwood II – University of Kentucky

Content from Two Research Studies

• KTC-16-03/SPR12-433-1F Thin Film Concrete Coatings

KTC-16-08/SPR14-484-1F
 Chloride Contamination Remediation
 On Steel Bridges

Action levels for chloride levels of concrete that result in steel corrosion

- 0.03 percent chloride to weight of concrete = initiation of corrosion
- 0.08 percent chloride to weight of concrete = accelerated corrosion
- 0.18 percent chloride to weight of concrete = major section loss of steel

Changes in Chloride Content in KYTC Bridge Components

- 2002 -bridge decks at the upper mat level were less than 0.01%
- 2011 -bridge decks at the upper mat level were often 0.20% - 0.30%
- 2011 -pier caps and abutment seats were often 0.30% to 0.40% range

Result of Increased Chloride Contamination



Result of Increased Chloride Contamination



Result of Increased Chloride Contamination



Research Approach

- Identify potential thin film coatings
- Minimal system application time requirements
- User friendly
- Evaluate in laboratory (ASTM D4587) and field

Performance Criteria Evaluated

- Adhesion
- Resistance to chloride transmission
- Color stability
- Gloss retention

System	Description		
1	Two component, high solids, high build, polyamide epoxy, applied in one coat		
	Two component, polyester modified, aliphatic, acrylic polyurethane, applied in one coat		
2	Two component, high solids epoxy, applied in one coat.		
	Single component, water-born acrylic, applied in one coat.		
3	Single component, water-born acrylic sealer, applied in one coat.		
	Single component, elastomeric high build acrylic, applied in one coat.		
4	Single component, waterborne blend of silanes, siloxanes and acrylics, applied in one coat		
	Single component, waterborne, silicon resin coating, applied in two coats		
5	Methyl methacrylate-ethyl acrylate copolymer sealer, applied in two coats		
6	Two component, cycloaliphatic amine epoxy mastic, applied in one coat.		
	Two component, Aliphatic Acrylic-Polyester Polyurethane, applied in one coat.		
7	Single component, Waterborne Acrylic, applied in one coat.		
	Single component, Modified acrylic terpolymer, applied in one coat.		
8	Two component castor oil/gypsum coating, applied in one coat.		

Coating Application



Coating Application



Coating Application



Coating Adhesion - Laboratory

System	Pre- exposure	1,000 hr exposure	2,000 hr exposure	3,000 hr exposure
	Psi	Psi	Psi	Psi
1	738	798	811	1005
2	1029	915	1120	860
3	288	640	707	636
5	798	697	746	810
6	1150	723	858	754
7	505	625	758	767
8	283	255	230	619

Coating Adhesion - Field

System	6 Month
	Psi
1	493
2	1452
3	549
5	1128
6	1635
7	551
8	519

% Chloride



■ 1/2" ■ 1"

Sample Depth



Delta E



■ 1000 hrs ■ 2000 hrs ■ 3000 hrs



60 degree Gloss Readings



Conclusions From Thin Film Concrete Coating

- Adhesion of coatings and the ability to resist chloride penetration are two characteristics very important for concrete coating performance.
- Systems 1, 2 and 6 perform better in these characteristics than other systems tested.
- Each of these are two-coat systems with epoxy primers. Two systems have urethane top coats and the third has an acrylic top coat.

Research Approach

- Precondition steel panels by cyclic salt fog exposure (ASTM B117)
- Clean the corroded steel panels with candidate surface preparation methods
- Assess the retained chlorides
- Recommend surface preparation methods for KYTC maintenance painting.

Test Panel Preconditioning



Test Panel Preconditioning



Test Panel Preconditioning

Surface roughness of the preconditioned panels was approximately 20 mils and chloride contamination averaged 500 µg/cm².

Test Panel Apportionment



Pre-surface Preparation Boiling Extraction



Surface Preparation Methods

Thirty-two surface preparation methods.

Eight dry methods, with combinations of abrasive material (steel grit, mineral slag, glass, and aluminum oxide), abrasive size, and re-blasting (after flash rusting).

Twenty-four wet methods, with combinations of water pressure, water abrasive mixes, water temperature, and chemical additives.

Surface Cleanliness



Surface Cleanliness



Post-surface Preparation SEM Assessment



Post-surface Preparation SEM Assessment



Post Cleaning % Cl⁻



Post Cleaning Cl⁻ Surface Concentration



Chemical Water/Abrasive

- 1. Map is 73 mils x 59 mils.
- 2. Spot is 4.7 mils across the horizontal axis.
- 3. Chloride removed 99.1%
- 4. Chloride 6.4 µg/cm²



Chemical Water Jetting



- Map is 50 mils x 37.5 mils.
 Spot is 2.25 mils across the
- horizontal axis.
- 3. Chloride removed 98.5%
- 4. Chloride $10.3 \,\mu g/cm^2$

Chemical Steel Grit 40/50

- 1. Map is 49 mils x 37 mils.
- 2. Spot is 3.6 mils across the horizontal axis.
- 3. Chloride removed 98.1%
- 4. Chloride 7.9 μ g/cm²



Chemical Mineral Slag

- 1. Map is 117 mils x 88 mils.
- Spot is 30.0 mils across the horizontal axis.
- 3. Chloride removed 98.0%
- 4. Chloride $10.3 \,\mu g/cm^2$



4.8K psi wash, Steel Grit 40/50

- 1. Map is 86 mils x 60 mils.
- 2. Spot is 18.1 mils across the horizontal axis.
- 3. Chloride removed 95.9%
- 4. Chloride 17.1 μ g/cm²



Conclusions

- Wet surface preparation methods are most effective in remediating chlorides
- Repeated dry abrasive blast cleaning is nearly as effective
- No method tested cleaned to less than 5 µg/cm² chloride
- Remaining chlorides are deposited in "hot spots"





Thank You

Contact information for authors

- Bobby.meade@uky.edu
- Sudhir.palle@uky.edu
- Ted.hopwood@uky.edu